

it is "His Holy Spirit" which "He put in the midst of them," which "led them through the depths." It is Yahweh Himself who "brought them up out of the sea together with the shepherds of his flock" (Is. lxviii. 11-14).*

In order to deal fairly with the question: Jewish or Christian? we must take account of this unquestionably Jewish basis in the poet's conception of Redemption as in the previous instances. When in this as in the other dominant controlling ideas we have clearly located the Odes with reference to later Judaism, with its transcendentalised Messianism and its large admixture from Persian and Greek speculation, we shall at least have done something toward giving them their true place in the history of our religion. It is possible that thereafter we may be able to distinguish authentic material from interpolation, and pronounce a verdict on the collection as a whole.

B. W. BACON.

DID ST. PAUL SPEAK LATIN?

THE question whether St. Paul spoke Latin or not is one which, like most questions connected with the New Testament, may have been the subject of a special discussion somewhere, but if it has, I am unaware of the fact, and I think that in any case the matter is of sufficient interest to deserve a fresh consideration. The existence of undisputed epistles written in semi-colloquial Greek is adequate evidence that he spoke Greek, and the Acts narrative shows that he spoke Aramaic.¹ There is enough evidence to suggest

* On pre-Christian forms of the doctrine of the Harrowing of Hell, see Bigg's comments on 1 Pet. iii. 19 (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*, p. 163) with the references; especially the two citations from *Bereshith Rabba*: "But when they that are bound, they that are in Gehinnom, saw the light of the Messiah, they rejoiced to receive Him," and "This is that which is written: We shall rejoice and exult in Thee. When? When the captives climb up out of hell and the Shechinah at their head."

¹ Acts xxi. 40.

that he could also speak the third of the languages in the inscription above the cross, namely Latin.

In Italy during the greater part of the thousand years preceding the birth of Christ the spoken languages were the Italic dialects, of which the most famous was Latin, which ultimately killed all the others, and Greek, spoken in the Southern part of the country known as *Magna Graecia*. In early times trade relations with *Magna Graecia* and with other parts of Greece in the widest sense had made certain Greek words known in Rome. We see from the comedies of Plautus, written towards the end of the third century and in the early part of the second century B.C., that the Roman populace attending the theatre could understand a good deal of colloquial Greek. From the time at which the Romans began to interfere in Greek affairs, about 200 B.C., down to the constitution of Greece as a Roman province in 146 B.C., the knowledge of Greek in a wider and deeper sense had greatly increased in Rome and Italy. Scipio Africanus was an apostle of Greek culture, and even the unbending Cato succumbed in his old age to the influence of the language and literature of Greece. From their time every person of any education in Rome aimed at a thorough knowledge of Greek. Every household contained Greek slaves, and all the arts, such as medicine and cookery, were practised almost exclusively by Greeks. In a real sense "captive Greece had taken her fierce conqueror captive."¹ So prevalent was the Greek language, that it was the regular thing to speak of Latin and Greek as "both languages," *utraque lingua, ἑκατέρα γλώσσα* simply.²

But if the position of Greek as a second language in Italy was perfectly assured long before St. Paul's time, it is

¹ Hor. *Epist.* ii. 1, 158.

² See Hor. *Carm.* iii. 8, 5; Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* vi. proœm. 11; Suet. *Aug.* 89; Plut. *Lucull.* 1, and a host more examples in Bentley's note on the passage of Horace.

still more important to understand the positions of the various languages in the East. The situation in the East was briefly, that since the time of Alexander the Great Greek was spoken and understood in every part of his former dominions. This does not mean that the native languages had disappeared, only that they were less and less prevalent in the cities, and more and more confined to the country districts.¹ In Palestine, for example, Greek was the one language understood by all or nearly all of the inhabitants, but there, in a country with strong national feeling, Aramaic continued to be spoken by a great many Jews. That Latin was the ordinary language of some in Palestine is proved by the inscription on the cross.

This situation was brought about by the fact that the Romans never attempted to impose Latin upon their Eastern provinces. Where they found Greek in possession as the language of civilisation, they left it in that position. From the very beginning of their connexion with politics east of the Adriatic, Greek was recognised as a second official language of the Roman government. There were definite Greek equivalents for every word connected with Roman administration in the widest sense of that term.² Rome corresponded with Eastern powers in Greek.³

What then is the place of Latin in the East ? A very small one indeed. If we take, for instance, the occurrence of inscriptions in that language in an oriental province as a kind of index of the place of Latin in ordinary intercourse,

¹ For example, at Lystra the natives in a moment of excitement spoke Lycaonian (*Acts* xiv. 11).

² This subject can be studied now as never before in the following works : R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, 3 éd. (Paris, 1898) ; Kornemann, *De Civibus Romanis in Provinciis Imperii Consistentibus* (Berlin, 1892) ; R. Cagnat, etc., *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* (Paris, 1901 ff.) ; Viereck, *Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Populusque Romanus . . . uti sunt . . .* (Göttingen, 1888) ; Magie, *De Romanorum Iuris Publici Sacrique Vocabulis Sollemnibus in Graecum Sermonem Conversis* (Halle a. S. 1904).

³ Cf. 1 Macc. c. viii.

we shall see this. There is no reason to suppose that the situation in Pontus south of the Black Sea was in any way exceptional, and I have selected that province as a test simply because I happened to be reading the inscriptions recently published in the third volume of the excellent *Studia Pontica* of J. G. C. Anderson, F. Cumont, and H. Grégoire (Bruxelles, 1910). This work contains a complete collection of all Greek and Latin inscriptions yet discovered in certain districts of Pontus. Out of three hundred and sixty-one inscriptions only seven are Latin ; in other words there is only one Latin inscription for every fifty-two Greek. If we accept this as a sort of ratio for the Eastern provinces,—and an extended study of others in Asia Minor as well as some study of those in Syria gives much the same impression,—we shall see that Latin held a place of no great importance.

If we examine these Latin inscriptions themselves, we shall generally find that they refer to Roman soldiers. No doubt the Latin inscription on the cross was intended specially for their benefit. Besides the soldiers who formed part of the regular garrisons of Imperial provinces, there were the citizen-soldiers and other settlers of the Roman *coloniae* or garrison-cities, throughout the East, who constituted the aristocracy of the communities in which they dwelt. We should expect such to have a marked preference, to say the least, for the Latin tongue ; for *coloniae* were really parts of Rome itself set down at particular points throughout the Empire.¹

It would be hazardous to argue from the fact that Paul was a Roman citizen,² that he must necessarily have spoken Latin ; but, if we follow him throughout his journeys in the Eastern half of the Roman Empire, we shall note the large number of *coloniae* which he visited, where the most influen-

¹ See Ramsay, *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, p. 121, note.

² Acts xvi. 37, etc.

tial people would be most influenced by Latin. The following list is, I believe, complete :—Pisidian Antioch, Lystra, Troas, Philippi, Corinth, Ptolemais.¹ This does not, of course, exhaust the places where Latin would be useful. Sir W. M. Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* has shown once for all how persistently Roman Paul's attitude was, and that we might almost say that he avoided places which from the Roman point of view were unimportant. Paul is the only Greek writer who uses the Latin forms *Φιλιππησιοι* and *Ταλλυρικόν*; and Professor J. H. Moulton follows up Ramsay's remark that the earlier tombs of Lystra show Latin inscriptions,² by the suggestion that "This may involve our substituting Latin as the language of Paul's preaching at Lystra: such a conclusion would not in itself be at all surprising."³ The word *ἀκατακρίτους*, put into Paul's mouth at Philippi by Luke, is convincingly explained by Ramsay as a Greek's imperfect rendering of the Latin *re incognita*.⁴ The same author, too, has well pointed out that the mere intention of Paul to preach in Spain⁵ is sufficient proof that he had a good command of the Latin tongue.⁶ Greek was probably not understood there except in one or two coast-towns like Emporiae, old Greek colonies. But it is in connexion with the primarily Greek city Corinth that we get the strongest evidence that Paul could speak Latin.

Corinth, as we have said, was a *colonia*, and, therefore, a certain very important proportion of the population spoke and understood Latin. If we try to make a list of the names of Corinthian Christians known to Paul, which have survived, we shall find half the number to be Latin: Aquila, Priscilla, Titius Iustus, Crispus, Fortunatus, Gaius (who may be

¹ Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s.v. *Coloniae*.

² *EXPOSITOR* for September, 1905.

³ *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. i. (ed. 2), p. 233.

⁴ *St. Paul the Traveller*, etc., p. 225.

⁵ Rom. xv. 24, 28.

⁶ *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, p. 276, etc.

identical with Titius Iustus ¹), Quartus, Lucius, Tertius.² The proportion in the case of the Roman Christians enumerated in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is much smaller, about a quarter of the total number. This might perhaps be sufficient to show that Paul must have spoken Latin in Corinth, but a passage in the First Epistle to that church would make it indubitable, if we could accept a well attested variant in chapter xiv. verse 18. The accepted reading now is πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις (or γλώσση) λαλῶ (R.V. "I speak with tongues more than you all"), and this must be right, as the context clearly shows that the reference is to glossolaly. The singular γλώσση, probably an older reading than the plural γλώσσαις, offered a difficulty to a Western simplifier of the Pauline text, probably as early as the second century, and he ejected the μᾶλλον. This latter form of text has slender Greek attestation, but is supported by practically all the Latin authorities, including the Vulgate. The only possible meaning of this reading is that Paul could speak all the languages of his Corinthian converts. Paul, of course, did not mean this, but the fact that an early² reviser represented him as saying it, joined to the cumulative effect of the small points already brought forward, makes it hardly possible to doubt that one of the unique sum of St. Paul's qualifications for the Apostleship to the Gentiles was a command of the Latin tongue.

ALEX. SOUTER.

¹ Ramsay, *op. cit.* p. 205, n. 2.

² There remain only Stephanas (=Stephanephoros), Achaicus, Phoebe, Sosthenes, Erastus, Jason, Sosipater, Erastus.