THE BOOK OF ACTS IN ITS FIRST CENTURY SETTING

VOLUME 2

The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting

Edited by

David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

THE PATERNOSTER PRESS
CARLISLE

CHAPTER 1

ACTS, TRAVEL AND SHIPWRECK

Brian M. Rapske

Summary

Since the book of Acts contains accounts of voyages by both land and sea, it is appropriate to place those accounts against the backdrop of the realities of travel in antiquity. The wealth of recently harvested evidence about this topic sheds considerable light on some passages once thought problematic in the travel narratives of Acts. Paul is more than simply another traveller—the author of Acts sees him as the traveller par excellence, *and the evidence strongly suggests that Paul should be seen as a 'professional traveller', rather than a seasonal or 'fair-weather' one. The details of the overland and sea voyages including the shipwreck scene in Acts mesh well with the ancient parallels, It seems most likely that the author was at least knowledgeable about and more probably a participant in the events he records.*

I. The Context of Antiquity

Flourishing trade called for the existence of three essentials: 'firstly, a peaceable population living unhindered by fear of invasion or brigandage, secondly, the assurance of easy means of intercommunication, and thirdly, a good coinage. To all these essentials Augustus paid careful attention...'[1] Augustus' efforts from his accession in 30 B.C. initiated a two century period of unprecedented peace—the *pax Romana*[2]—the mid-way point of which embraces the period of Acts' description. The highways and byways of Empire saw an increased traffic. Persons moved to and fro, writes Casson, out of the time-honoured motives of 'business, either their own or the government's, for their health, to go on pilgrimage to an oracle or shrine, to be present at well-known festivals, and in a very few cases, to see the world'.[3] To these the Romans added the annual holiday[4] and one ought not to exclude the peregrinations of those whose object was teaching or becoming educated. The Mediterranean Sea—heavy poetic acerbity aside[5]—had become, in the words of Vinson, 'a Roman lake'.[6] The traffic, to be sure, was bound to ebb and flow with the change of season and there were challenges and dangers with which the ancient traveller had to contend. On balance, however, it would be difficult to imagine a period in antiquity better suited to the realization of the prophetic affirmation

---

[1]M.P. Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes and Commerce in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 1924) 10f.

[2]Pliny, *NH* 14.1.2; 27.1.2f.; Philo, *Leg.* 47; Plutarch, *De fort. Rom.* 317.B, C and other sources cited in W.M. Ramsay, 'Roads and Travel (in the NT)', *HDB* 5 (1904) 396. [Unless otherwise indicated, ancient sources are cited from LCL.]

[3]L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974) 147.

[4]Casson, *Travel*, 147.

[5]Horace, *Odes* 1.3 and the balancing comments of Ramsay, 'Roads', 396.

[6]S. Vinson, 'Ships in the Ancient Mediterranean', *BA* 53 (1990) 18. The numbers of sea-going ships involved in the grain supply of Rome alone must have run into the thousands according to G.E. Rickman, 'The Grain Trade Under the Roman Empire', in J.H. D'Arms and E.C. Kopff (eds.), *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History* (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 36; Rome: American Academy, 1980) 263.

of Acts 1:8: '...you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth'.[7]

Among the many possible characterizations of the book of Acts, perhaps one of the most fitting is that it is the record of the geographical spread of the Gospel message by land and by sea. It is also a record of hospitality offered to and accepted by the message-bearers and of various rigours experienced by them along the way. It will be the burden of the present chapter to demonstrate that Acts, being an ancient record, is helpfully analyzed and accurately described against the complex backdrop of the varied aspects and experiences of travel in antiquity.

The pattern of treatment will be first to furnish a description of certain specific aspects of travel in the ancient world and then analyze selected passages from Acts. Paul is the traveller *par excellence* in Acts and the problems many allege regarding his land and sea travels are the inspiration for the choice.

II. Land Travel

1. Paul the Professional

As mentioned above, travel for the ancients had a seasonal aspect to it. Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris,* which draws on first and second century A.D. sources, indicates that land travel was generally closed from 11 November to 10 March.[8] Particularly acute dangers existed where travellers were caught atop mountain ranges or on high plateaus by severe temperature drops or heavy snowfalls. In the wet season or during the spring runoff—which added October and the months of April and May as 'doubtful periods'—the progress of such crossings could also be seriously impeded or entirely foreclosed.[9]

Closure, of course, would be a matter of degree and depend not only upon the terrain and season but also upon the constitution,

---

[7]Unless otherwise indicated, scriptural quotations are taken from the NIV.
[8]Flavius Vegetius Renatus, *Epitoma Rei Militaris,* ed. and tr., L.F. Stelten (American University Studies, Ser. 17; Classical Languages and Literature 11; New York/Bern/Paris: Peter Lang, 1990) 4.39.
[9]Ramsay, 'Roads', 377.

determination and agenda of the traveller. Would Paul and his associates have followed custom and convention or are they to be numbered among those who pushed the limits? The answer one gives is important as it has an impact upon estimates of the time of year of Paul's overland journeys in Acts, particularly where the record shows him making high elevation crossings (Acts 13:14; 14:24; 16:1; 18:23); it either extends or narrows the available annual travel time. Ramsay indicates that

> even in ancient times Cicero crossed Taurus by the Cilician Gates in November 51 and April 50 B.C. Antigonus vainly tried to cross Taurus from Cilicia in B.C. 314, but lost many soldiers owing to the snow. His second attempt at a more favourable opportunity succeeded (Diodor. xix.69.2).[10]

It would seem that Ramsay is inclined to judge these and others to be 'professional travellers'. He cites the letters of Basil of Caesarea (*c.* mid fourth cent. A.D.) as indication that 'ordinary travellers' typically abided by the customary open and closed periods and in this he is followed quite recently by Jewett.[11] Both place Paul in the 'ordinary' category,[12] but is he?

While Basil's letters are a helpful witness, the fervency of his assertions concerning what was possible in the season and the example he and his ecclesiastical fellows furnish might be questioned as vindicating the customary practice or furnishing comparative material by which to assess Paul. Basil himself confesses to frequent illnesses which hinder his travel even in milder weather (*Ep.* 27, 198) and indicates that his brethren, while numerous, are neither courageous nor experienced enough for such undertakings and, on the whole, a rather sedentary lot (*Ep.* 198). The letters are documents of excuse. Ironically, at the same time, they bear witness to a continuing official and unofficial traffic in the off-season—*viz.*, the government personnel, business persons and others by whom these letters are sent to their various destinations. Off-season traffic must certainly have been reduced,[13] but hardly so radically as Basil's letters and those who cite them might at first suggest.

---

[10]Ramsay, 'Roads', 377.
[11]Ramsay, 'Roads', 377, citing Basil, *Ep.* 20 (A.D. 364), 27 (Spring A.D. 368), 191 (A.D. 374 [?]), 198 (Spring A.D. 375), 215 (Autumn A.D. 375). Cf. R. Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 56f.
[12]Ramsay, 'Roads', 377; Jewett, *Chronology*, 55, 57.
[13]Casson, *Travel*, 176.

Jewett has argued for a fairweather traveller Paul on the basis of 1 Cor. 16:5f. where Paul indicates that after going through Macedonia, he plans to come to the Corinthians: 'Perhaps I will stay with you awhile, or even spend the winter [παραχειμάζω]'.[14] This passage, wrongly equated by some with the stay at Acts 20:1-3,[15] may actually suggest that Paul's uncertainty as to the duration of his stay opens the prospect of his not being adverse to moving on at a time which would entail winter travel. Moreover, the principal object in staying, whether briefly or over the winter, is not the desire to avoid inclement weather but to give the Corinthians opportunity materially to assist him in his next enterprise (1 Cor. 16:6b).

Mention can be made, finally, of Paul's words at 2 Cor. 11:26f. It is suggested by some that the references to hunger, thirst, going without food, and to being cold and ill-clad are to be interpreted in terms of Paul's toils as a manual labourer.[16] Because the Greek proceeds at verse 27 without a verb, however, the labours and toils may simply be elements in the series gathered under the heading of trials suffered during overland journeys (ὁδοιπορία: 2 Cor. 11:26).[17] Murphy-O'Connor apparently construes the passage thus:

> If Paul says that he was 'in hunger and thirst, often without food, in cold and exposure' (2 Corinthians 11:27), it is obvious that on occasion he found himself far from human habitation at nightfall. He may have failed to reach shelter because of weather conditions; an unusually hot day may have sapped his endurance; mountain passes may have been blocked by unseasonably early or late snowfalls; spring floods may have made sections of the road

---

[14]Jewett, *Chronology*, 55. Cf. Tit. 3:12 where a Pauline determination is indicated to winter (παραχειμάζω) at Nicopolis.

[15]So equated by Jewett, *Chronology*, 55; W.H. Mare, '1 Corinthians', *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* [hereafter *ExpBibCom*], ed. F. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), vol. 10, 294. Acts 20:1-3 must, however, refer to a visit later than the planned visit of 1 Cor. 16:5f. in light of the changes indicated at 2 Cor. 1:15-2:4. Further in this regard, G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 817-19; V.P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984) 132-53, esp. 143.

[16]E.g., Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 518f., citing R. F. Hock.

[17]C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York/London: Harper and Row, 1973) 298: 'The shipwrecks suggest travelling in general, which Paul now mentions, going on to list some of the dangers it involved'.

> impassable (he claims to have been 'in danger from rivers') (2 Corinthians 11:26)....[18]

The varied privations and rigours would then be associated with travelling in the 'doubtful' or 'closed' seasons[19] and lead to the conclusion that the apostle, with an unmistakable call to bear witness extensively throughout the Mediterranean and to suffer frequently and variously for the Name, is to be numbered among the intrepid professionals rather than the fair-weather traffic.

2. *Means of Land Transport and Speed*

The speed of overland travel in the ancient world was a function of the means of travel, road conditions and the degree of urgency. The slowest and by far most common means of travel was by foot. Beitzel writes that a considerable body of archaeological and literary evidence from many quarters in the ancient Near East over time permits the conclusion that 'a normal day's journey in the biblical world covered between 17 and 23 miles, with slightly higher daily averages when traveling down-stream by boat'.[20] Peter's trip from Joppa to Caesarea, a distance of some 40 miles, and indications that it took two days one way and four days for a round trip (Acts 10:23f., 30) confirm the average.

Paul's pre-Christian mission from Jerusalem to Damascus, a journey of some 150 miles plus and official as it was, appears to have been undertaken on foot. We read of his falling to the ground (Acts 9:4; 22:7; 26:13) and, after conversing with the risen Christ, being commanded to get up, stand on his feet (Acts 26:16; cf. 9:6; 22:10) and go into Damascus. His companions, who in the first Lukan retelling stand (Acts 9:7) speechless, lead the blind persecutor by the hand

---

[18]J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling Conditions in the First Century: On the Road and On the Sea With St. Paul', *Bible Review* 1 (1985) 41.

[19]The overland winter journey of Aristides to Rome *c.* A.D. 143/44 (*Or.* 24) furnishes a helpful comparison.

[20]B.J. Beitzel, 'How to Draw Ancient Highways on Biblical Maps', *Biblical Review* 4 (1988) 37. Utilizing such evidence as literary sources, travel records, maps, and the roadside remains of towns and stopping places, the following average daily distances by foot have been suggested: Ramsay, 'Roads', 383, 386 (16-20 Roman miles per day or less); Casson, *Travel*, 189 (15-20 miles per day); Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 21f., 24, 43, 247, 258 (16-20 miles per day but rarely more); Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 40 (20 miles per day).

(Acts 9:8; 22:11) into Damascus. Paul's 22 mile overland journey from Troas to Assos is also by foot (πεζεύω: Acts 20:13). These observations carry certain implications.

If Paul's overland journeys were generally undertaken by foot, the recently popular explanation of Acts 18:3 that Paul was a weaver of tentcloth made from goat's hair or linen,[21] whatever its other problems, is rendered even less probable. Such an occupation, requiring tools and equipment inconvenient in size, weight and shape,[22] is hardly in keeping with the impression in Acts of a highly mobile Paul—even less so a pedestrian Paul. The maker/repairer of tents and other leather products, carrying his bag of cutting tools, awls, sharpening stone and such,[23] presents a more consistent and more credible picture. The above observations would also seem to counsel caution when modern readers unaccustomed to extended pedestrian travel are giving estimates of what distances could or could not be travelled by foot. This holds for Paul, for other Christian travellers, and in special circumstances such as when Roman foot soldiers accompanying Paul part way to Caesarea engage in a quite extended forced march (Acts 23:24, 31f.).[24]

Travellers also made use of beasts of burden. The NT knows of the use of the camel (κάμηλος/*camelus*) for travel and carrying merchandise.[25] Cansdale writes concerning camel transport,

> On ordinary journeys a camel can carry c. 400 lbs. as well as its rider, but for stretches such as the Sinai Desert only about half that would be allowed. Their owners prefer to feed and water them properly every day, but they can easily go three or four days without

---

[21]R.F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 72f. n. 9 for those subscribing to this view and see P. Lampe, 'Paulus—Zeltmacher', *BZ* 31 (1987) 256-61.

[22]On the size, parts and cost/rental of weavers' looms in Egypt, see *POxy.* 2:264 (A.D. 54); 36:2773 (A.D. 82); 7:1035 (A.D. 143). For pictures of Egyptian and Greek weavers' looms and equipment, see illustrations in H.L. Roth, *Ancient Egyptian and Greek Looms* (Bankfield Museum Notes 2/2; Halifax: F. King and Sons, 1913), *passim.*

[23]See Hock, *Social Context,* 25 and 33. For illustrations of shoemaker's instruments, see A. Burford, *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life; London: Thames and Hudson, 1972), *figs.* 3-7.

[24]We shall return to this last instance *infra,* 11ff.

[25]On transport and bearing burdens: Matt. 2:1 [?]; Mark 10:25 [| | Matt. 19:24; Luke 18:25]. Jesus refers to John's wearing a garment made of camel's hair: Mark 1:6 [| | Matt. 3:4]. Further on these and other uses in both the OT and NT, see J.A. Thompson, 'Camel' and 'Camel's Hair', *IDB,* vol. 1, 491-93.

> drinking and there are many records of loaded camels passing a week without water. An average of up to twenty-eight m. a day can be maintained, but a fast dromedary, carrying only its rider, has been known to cover nearly 100 m. in thirteen hours, though it could not do this every day.[26]

The camel's size, build, ability to feed on desert vegetation and to go without water for extended periods fitted it chiefly for desert and semidesert areas S. and E. of Palestine.[27] Luke, however, says nothing of camels being used in the book of Acts.

The use of donkeys (ὄνος/-άριον, [cf. πῶλος]/*asinus;* cf. ὑποζύγνοιν) and mules (ἡμιονός/-άριον/*mulus*) was more widespread in antiquity.[28] An inscription regulating requisitioned transport in the region of Sagalassos (Pisidia) in A.D. 18/19 indicates the following equivalences: one mule[ox?]-driven cart (κάρρον/ *carrum*) ≈ three pack mules ≈ six donkeys.[29] This mode of transport was assessed in terms of carrying power in a set period of time rather than in terms of speed over a distance. Mitchell estimates that a cart could carry between 625 and 950 lbs.; a pack mule about 250 lbs.[30]

The NT does mention the use of donkeys for transport, but they are never noted as a travel option in Acts.[31] As to wheeled conveyances, Luke mentions the chauffeur-driven carriage (ἅρμα: Acts 8:28f., 38) of the Ethiopian minister of finance who drove along

---

[26]G.S. Cansdale, 'Camel', M.C. Tenney (ed.), *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* [hereafter: *ZPEB*] (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), vol. 1, 697. Cf. *id.*, 'Animals of the Bible', in J.D. Douglas (ed.), *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Leicester: IVP/Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1980), vol. 1, 53. Thompson, 'Camel', 492, estimates 60 to 75 miles a day for riding camels and a bearing capacity from 450 to 550 pounds on good terrain.

[27]Thompson, 'Camel', 492. Further in this regard, see Cansdale, 'Camel', 697f.; *id.*, 'Animals', 53.

[28]For a fuller discussion of this kind of transport service, cf. *New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9; *New Docs,* vol. 2, #28; S. Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia', *JRS* 66 (1976) 106-31 and sources there cited.

[29]*New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9.

[30]Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport', 123 n. 100, calculated from their respective rates of hire; i.e., ten *asses* per *schoenum* (a time period of travel) for a cart, four *asses* per *schoenum* for a mule.

[31]Πῶλος: Mark 11:2, 4f., 7 [| | Matt. 21:2, 5, 7; Luke 19:30, 33, 35; John 12:15]. Ὄνος: Matt. 21:2, 5, 7; Luke 13:15 [cf. 14:5 var. MSS]; John 12:15. Ὀνάριον: John 12:14. Ὑποζύγιον: Matt. 21:5; 2 Pet. 2:16.

the desert road from Jerusalem to Gaza,[32] but Acts is silent as to whether Paul ever personally hired such. The luggage-bearing potential of this kind of transport would have increased somewhat the daily distances travelled, or at least given greater ease to the traveller. Cansdale offers that laden asses could make an average of 20 miles a day.[33] Casson states that over normal terrain wheeled conveyances would permit a daily rate of 25-30 miles.[34] These various options, however, carried a cost which Paul would probably not have been willing—or perhaps able—to undertake.[35] The trip from Puteoli to Rome would seem to have furnished the most likely opportunity for Paul's use of such conveyances but we may doubt that the centurion Julius would easily have been able to requisition any of these for his company.[36]

Travel on horseback could double or treble the daily distances normally attained by pedestrian traffic.[37] Rates of speed up to ten miles per hour over long hours could result in daily distances of 100 to 150 miles, but these were almost invariably logged by government or military couriers or in exceptional circumstances.[38] Horses were used chiefly by cavalrymen, hunters, and dispatch-riders according to Casson.[39] Long distance travel on primitively outfitted beasts

---

[32]See Casson, *Travel*, 178-82 for a description of different kinds of wheeled vehicles and draught animals and for illustrations.

[33]G.S. Cansdale, 'Ass', *ZPEB*, vol. 1, 367.

[34]Casson, *Travel*, 189. Ramsay, 'Travel', 386 suggests a somewhat lower rate (4 Roman miles per hour/ 25 per day).

[35]So Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 40, who adds on the basis of Arrian, *Epict.* 4.1.79 and Apuleius, *Met.* 9.36-10.12 that an individual in possession of such means of conveyance would have been at risk of having it requisitioned.

[36]On this *infra*, II.3.

[37]Casson, *Travel*, 188. Ramsay, 'Travel', 387, estimates the daily distance at 50 Roman miles or about five Roman miles per hour.

[38]Couriers carrying news of Nero's death (ten miles per hour); Tiberius to the bedside of his dying brother (600 miles in 72 hours); news of the mutiny of the legions of Mainz on the Rhine in A.D. 69 reaches Rome in eight or nine days (150+ miles per day); Julius Caesar to Rome from the Rhone in eight days (100+ miles per day). For these and additional examples see Beitzel, 'How to Draw', 37; Casson, *Travel*, 188 and sources pp. 351f.; Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 44 and sources 251; Ramsay, 'Travel', 387f.

[39]Casson, *Travel*, 181.

would have posed a considerable challenge to all but the well-instructed and best-experienced of professional riders.[40]

Did Paul travel by horse? His journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem at Acts 21:15f., it is claimed by some and allowed by others, is one such instance.[41] The 60 miles of this journey could be covered in three days by foot or in two with relative ease by horse. Taken in support of a journey by horseback is the term ἐπισκευάζεσθαι at verse 15 which can mean not only to pack up, equip oneself or prepare for a journey but also to saddle or load a horse.[42] The Western text indicates a stopover: The Caesarean disciples bring Paul's company to an unnamed village (εἴς τινα κώμην: D syr^{hmg}) well along the route between Caesarea and Jerusalem where all lodge with Mnason of Cyprus. The next day the Caesareans return with their mounts while Paul and company proceed on foot to Jerusalem.[43]

The arrangements indicated in the Western text, however, lack credibility. Marshall offers that 'it is doubtful whether Luke would have named Paul's host on the way and not his host in Jerusalem itself'.[44] Moreover, the reference to 'a certain village' suggests a lack of specific knowledge.[45] The fact that a 60 mile journey by foot would

---

[40]On the military horse's tack for parade and battle—the cavalry saddle (*ephippium*; ἐφίππιον/-ειον στρῶμα) and bit (*frenum*; χαλινός; cf. James 3:3)—as well as training generally, see discussion and illustrations in A. Hyland, *Training the Roman Cavalry from Arrian's Ars Tactica* (Dover, NH; Alan Sutton, 1993) 37-65; K.R. Dixon and P. Southern, *The Roman Cavalry from the First to the Third Century AD* (London: Batsford, 1992) 34-77. Further, J. Marshall, 'Ephippium', in W. Smith, W. Wayte and G.E. Marindin (eds.), *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* [hereafter: *DGRA*] (London: John Murray, 1890), vol. 1, 742f.; J. Yates and W. Wayte, 'Frenum', *DGRA*, vol. 1, 876f.

[41]Ramsay, 'Travel', 398 and Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 250, citing Souter, affirm that this is the correct way of construing the text. Cf. I.H. Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles*. TNTC 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 341; F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (3rd edn. rev.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Leicester: Apollos, 1990) 443.

[42]So Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 250; Ramsay, 'Travel', 398; *id.*, *SPTR*, 302. *LSJ*, 656: Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.3.1.

[43]B.M. Metzger*Textual Comm.* (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975) 483. Cf. Ramsay, *SPTR*, 302f.

[44]Marshall, *The Acts*, 341f.

[45]Generalizing or collective references (e.g., 'going from village to village': Luke 5:17; 8:1; 9:6, 12; 13:22); more specific indications of particular villages (e.g., 'a Samaritan village': Luke 9:52, 56; 17:12; 19:30; 24:13, 28; Acts 8:25). The closest expression to Acts 21:16 D is εἰς κώμην τινά at Luke 10:38 which is

normally call for at least one and perhaps two overnight stops by ancient reckoning, probably accounts for what is indicated in the Western text. The Alexandrian text, on the other hand, implies that the hospitality arrangements were made for a Jerusalem residence,[46] and indicates nothing regarding stopovers along the way.

If Paul went by horse, his company would have required at least nine mounts (Acts 20:4f.) for themselves. The Caesarean disciples who Luke indicates accompanied Paul to Jerusalem would hardly have accompanied Paul on foot if speed was the objective. Whether they accompanied him out of a desire to celebrate the feast of Pentecost as Marshall offers,[47] or, more probably, out of solidarity with and loving concern for him in the dangers which certainly awaited him (Acts 21:10-14), a large (and probably costly) number of horses would have been required and this tends to render the picture of a mounted company less likely.

If Paul's journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem was by foot, as seems most likely, his return to Caesarea some days later as a prisoner in danger of assassins was certainly mounted (ἐπιβιβάζω) on a horse according to Acts 23:24. The plural κτήνη may indicate several animals to serve Paul in relief though they are not specifically identified as being for Paul's personal use.[48] It is hardly likely that the plural indicates that Paul was accompanied by a retinue of friends, was chained to a soldier, or had considerable luggage with him.

Luke's reference to the dispatch of some 470 troops including 70 horse, 200 infantry and the mysterious 200 δεξιολάβοι to escort one man at Acts 23:23 has been called by some a sheer fantasy intended to emphasize the importance of the prisoner, the enormity of the danger, and the quality of the measures taken by Roman military officials.[49] Were we ignorant of Roman-Jewish relations during this

---

further identified as the place where a woman named Martha opened her home to Jesus. This village—Bethany according to John 11:1, 18; 12:1—is explicitly referred to at Luke 19:29f.; 24:50.

[46]So, e.g., Marshall, *The Acts*, 341; Bruce, *The Acts*, 443; K. Lake and J.H. Cadbury, *BC*, vol. 4, 270; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, ed. tr. B. Noble *et al.* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971) 607 and n. 6.

[47]Marshall, *The Acts*, 341 in this regard.

[48]Marshall, *The Acts*, 370.

[49]So, e.g., H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, tr. J. Limburg *et al.* (Hermeneia; tr. 2nd ed. 1972; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 194; J.C. Lentz, Jr., *Luke's Portrayal of St. Paul as a Man of High Social Status and Moral Virtue in the Concluding Chapters of Acts*

period, the numbers might seem grossly inflated. The general unrest in Judaea which was ever building during this period,[50] however, and the number of single actions by individuals which touched off explosive and devastating general uprisings calling for strong Roman military responses[51] suggest that the numbers are realistic. It would have been a wise senior officer who heeded trustworthy warnings and anticipated the level of popular animosity toward a particularly unpopular prisoner in his care by taking swift and sufficient measures. This would avoid not only risk to Paul's life but also the more general risk to troops of inviting ambush and slaughter because of the fewness of their numbers. In several ways, the commander's reputation was on the line.

Such details as the provision of mounts, the indication of the numbers involved in Paul's transport, and the reference to the hour of departure (Acts 23:24), because they are so precise and not strictly material to the narrative progress, suggest accurate reporting rather than Lukan romancing. The same may be said of the fitness of the route taken by Paul and his keepers. This route was taken by Cestius Gallus and his army in October of A.D. 66.[52] A section of the Antipatris to Caesarea portion of the route has recently been unearthed.[53] One of the two milestones found along its length—the

---

(University of Edinburgh: Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, 1988) 332. Cf. G.D. Kilpatrick, 'Acts XXIII. 23 ΔΕΞΙΟΛΑΒΟΙ', *JTS* 14 (1963) 393f.; E.M. Blaiklock, *The Acts of the Apostles* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959) 178; Marshall, *The Acts*, 369f.; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Acts* (New Clarendon Bible; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 223, who each note this as a problem for many scholars.

[50]Mentioned, for example, by Blaiklock, *The Acts*, 178; W. Neil, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NCB 42; London: Oliphants/Greenwood: Attic, 1973) 230f.; D.J. Williams, *Acts* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985) 390; R. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKKNT 5; Zurich: Benziger, 1986), vol. 2, 252.

[51]See e.g., Josephus, *AJ* 20.108-12 [20.5.3] (≈ *BJ* 2.224-27 [2.12.1]); *AJ* 20:113-16 [20.5.4] (≈ *BJ* 2.228-31 [2.12.2]). T.R.S. Broughton, 'Note 33. The Roman Army', *BC*, vol. 5, 440f., writes that in the years before the outbreak of war in A.D. 66, troop numbers garrisoned in various cities were increased.

[52]Josephus, *BJ* 2.515f., 546-55 [2.19.1, 8f.]; cf. 2.228 [2.12.2]. Roman milestones as well as Hellenistic and Roman pottery have been found along its length according to C.J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, ed. C.H. Gempf (WUNT 49; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1989) 128 n. 79; cf. Cadbury, *Book of Acts*, 64f. Caesarea was about another 25 miles from Antipatris.

[53]S. Dar and S. Applebaum, 'The Road from Antipatris to Caesarea', *PEQ* 105 (1973) 91-9. Cf. also the map of M. Avi-Yonah, 'The Development of the Roman Road System in Palestine', *IEJ* 1 (1950-51) 57.

other having unfortunately been lost—reads 'ten miles from Caesarea' and dates to the second or third century A.D. The date is not problematic as later Roman roads very frequently represent more permanent confirmations of earlier Roman choices of existing local routes.[54] Of the 450 milestones thus far discovered in Israel, the earliest is dated to A.D. 69 during the reign of Vespasian.[55] Isaac observes in this regard, that 'if milestones are an indication of such things, Judaea may be suspected of having had a provincial government with little initiative of its own'.[56]

A forced night-time trip from Jerusalem to Antipatris with infantry in attendance is seen to be troublesome if the usual speed of 20 miles per day is assumed. Hemer has indicated that a part of the difficulty here arises from overestimates of the distance, which is actually near to 35 English miles.[57] A march over such distance would have been demanding but not impossible, particularly if it is recalled that there was urgency in removing Paul as quickly as possible to avoid further rioting (cf. Acts 21:27-36; 22:22). The turning point for the foot soldiers at or somewhere near Antipatris[58] is also logical.

---

[54]Archaeological evidence confirms this pattern for the Antipatris-Caesarea road according to Dar, 'The Road', 99. Further on the pattern elsewhere, see Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 37, 79f.; R. Cohen, 'New Light on the Date of the Petra-Gaza Road', *BA* 45 (1982) 240f.

[55]Beitzel, 'How to Draw', 39 and see Josephus' comments on Vespasian's and Titus' roadbuilding *BJ* 3.118 [3.6.2]; 3.141 [3.7.3]; 5.47 [5.2.1]. This same observation by M. Har-El, 'Jerusalem and Judea: Roads and Fortifications', *BAR* 44 (1981) 18, that the milestones date to the periods of revolution. Further on milestones B.H. Isaac, 'Milestones in Judaea from Vespasian to Constantine', *PEQ* 110 (1978) 47-60; B. Isaac and I. Roll, 'A Milestone of A.D. 69 from Judaea: the Elder Trajan and Vespasian', *JRS* 66 (1976) 15-19.

[56]Isaac, 'Milestones', 59. Josephus' remarks concerning the predatory behaviour of the various procurators of the pre-revolutionary period may indicate where the principal official interest lay. D.H. French, 'The Roman Road-system of Asia Minor', *ANRW* II/7.2 (1980) 700, offers the following general hypothesis: '...military and administrative requirements initiate the process of [road] development and sustain the process of upkeep and maintenance: when the military and administrative controls decay or are destroyed, the road system decays or is destroyed'.

[57]Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 128. Greater distances: Marshall, *The Acts*, 372 (37 miles); Haenchen, *The Acts* 648 (40 miles); Hanson, *The Acts*, 233 (45 miles).

[58]Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 128 n. 79, observes that there is no insistence within the text that the foot soldiers in fact travelled all the way to Antipatris or that they returned without rest by a second forced march. So also Marshall, *The Acts*, 372 and cf. R.J. Knowling, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. W.R. Nicoll

Antipatris, perhaps even at this time a military station (*mutatio*), was some 25 miles from Caesarea over more open terrain largely populated by Gentiles. Hence, the last leg was much safer.[59] Less security would, in consequence, have been needed by the mounted detail.

3. Stopping Points, Hospitality and Requisition

Ancient travellers had, as a matter of course, to lay plans as to where they would stay at the end of each day's journey. The few who were very wealthy might possess a number of villas along the way to their holiday residence which, with adequate warning to the slaves and freedman caretakers, might be made ready for them. Another option giving maximum freedom and comfort was to travel completely outfitted with a retinue of servants and fully supplied and equipped to set up camp along the way. Outside of these recourses, the next most desirable option was to seek out hospitality in the private homes of family or friends.[60]

Another option, open to those entitled by virtue of their being imperial officials, judges, soldiers on the march, municipal magistrates, or those possessing the appropriate documents, was the power to requisition (ἀγγαρεία/*angaria*)[61] the needs of travel from the local populace. The facilities of the imperial post (*cursus publicus*), a network of less (*mutationes*) and more elaborate (*mansiones*) stopping stations might also be sought out.[62] These stations 'were not built specifically for it, nor did they service only those travelling on official business, although these had an ironclad priority. The post, despite the fact that it was run wholly for the

---

(Expositor's Greek Testament 2; 1901; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 475, on the expression διὰ νυκτός.

[59]See Williams, *Acts*, 391; Bruce, *The Acts*, 473; and Neil, *The Acts*, 232 in this regard.

[60]Further, Casson, *Travel*, 197f.

[61]Αγγαρεύειν: Matt. 5:41; 27:32; Mark 15:21; *New Docs.*, vol. 2, #28, 77. *Angarii: Dig.* 50.4.18.4; 50.5.10.2f.; 50.5.11; *Cod. Theod.* 8 *passim*. For a discussion of the origin of the term, cf. J.D.M. Derrett, 'Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt', *NovT* 13 (1971) 243-49.

[62]J.I. Beare, 'Cursus Publicus', *DGRA*, vol. 1, 586. See further Casson, *Travel*, 184.

benefit of the central government, was largely maintained by the communities along the routes'.[63]

The ordinary traveller, failing to secure one or the other of the above-noted options, would have had no recourse but to put up at a boarding house or wayside inn (*hospitium, deuersorium, caupona, stabulum*). What is known of such facilities in the literature presents a rather unhappy picture. The available literary and archaeological sources generally witness to dilapidated and unclean facilities, virtually non-existent furnishings, bed-bugs, poor quality food and drink, untrustworthy proprietors and staff, shady clientele, and generally loose morals.[64] If these are fair generalizations,[65] it is not difficult to understand the repeated NT encouragements to Christian hospitality[66] and the epistolary recognition of those individuals and groups with whom missionaries stayed. Acts too, concerned as it is with the spread of the Gospel, unsurprisingly shows considerable interest in the matter of lodging and hospitality.[67]

Vigorous Christian hospitality was a boon to missionary travellers, but it could be a potential bane as well. Paul's travel arrangements at Acts 20:16 would seem to be a case of the latter. There Luke records that Paul, newly arrived at Miletus by ship, 'had decided to sail past Ephesus to avoid spending time in the province of Asia, for he was in a hurry to reach Jerusalem, if possible by the day of Pentecost'. Jewett indicates that the explanation 'is refuted in the following verse. Paul broke the journey in Miletus and sent a

---

[63]Casson, *Travel*, 185.

[64]The chapters entitled 'On the Road' and 'Inns and Restaurants' in Casson's *Travel* repay careful reading for the problems associated with such facilities. W.C. Firebaugh, *The Inns of Greece and Rome* (Chicago: Pascal Covici, 1928) too is helpful, if not as carefully documented. For a graphic, but perhaps exaggerated, account of the meanness of a seaside *deuersorium*, its staff and clients, see Petronius, *Sat.* 94-7. Imperial regulatory legislation was restrictive but largely ineffectual in protecting clients according to Casson, *Travel*, 217; W. Smith and W. Wayte, 'Caupona', *DGRA*, vol. 1, 388. Cf. *Dig.* 4.9, *passim.*

[65]One might properly suspect that nightmarish experiences would generally have been chosen by authors in antiquity because they were more interesting and entertaining than pleasant ones. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the entertainment value of such accounts arose from the fact that readers were able to identify with them owing to their own unhappy experiences of such 'hospitality'.

[66]E.g., Rom. 12:13; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:8; 1 Peter 4:9; Heb. 13:2.

[67]H.J. Cadbury, 'Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts III: Luke's Interest in Lodging', *JBL* 45 (1926) 305-22.

messenger back to Ephesus to gather the elders for a farewell address, which would have required a round trip back to the port they had just passed over to save time'.[68] Jewett's suggestion that the journey to and from Ephesus took between three and five days is probably correct.[69] Paul's prior itinerary too might be cited in challenge of the stated motive. Hemer observes: 'On grounds of time he by-passed so important a centre as Ephesus (Acts 20:16). Yet after five days spent reaching Troas, he stayed seven days there. Perhaps he had to await a passage, though the prevailing winds favoured swift sailing in this southerly direction'.[70]

In consequence of such observations, the Lukan indication of Paul's motive is dispensed with as strange, fallacious, or illogical by some. The true motive for the sail-by, they assert, is that Paul was unable or unwilling to enter Ephesus because of the earlier troubles (Acts 19:23-20:1) and Luke covers this up, so that it leaves a Paul who is on amiable terms with the Roman authorities and also piously Jewish in his intentions.[71]

Several things might be offered against this assessment. First, it is hardly the case that Paul would feel hindered from returning to the scene of earlier troubles; he is not afraid to return to Iconium (Acts 14:19f.) or to Philippi (Acts 16:12-40; 19:21; 20:1f., 6). Moreover, why would Paul blanch at the prospect of trouble in Ephesus when it is indicated that he is aware that he is being divinely led into grave troubles at Jerusalem (Acts 20:22-24)? It may, in fact, be to counteract the temptation to draw just such a potentially damaging inference as that suggested above that Luke takes the trouble to indicate what was the true motive. Second, Luke is quite transparent in describing mixed Roman responses to Paul. This hardly favours the view that he is here being zealous to 'cover up'. Third, the indication of a piously Jewish Paul based upon the stated intention at Acts 20:16 is consistent with other evidence of his staunch Jewishness in Acts, but this should hardly be judged false, even if his plan was not ultimately realized (εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη αὐτῷ).

---

[68]Jewett, *Chronology*, 16. Cf. Bruce, *The Acts*, 429.

[69]Jewett, *Chronology*, 16. A round trip journey crossing the Latmicus Bay by ship would be some 60 miles; skirting the bay would nearly double the total distance. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 171, suggests 'at least five days' would be involved. A day or two (so Marshall, *The Acts*, 328) would not be sufficient time.

[70]C.J. Hemer, 'Alexandria Troas', *TynB* 26 (1975) 104.

[71]Jewett, *Chronology*, 16; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 171; Haenchen, *The Acts*, 588.

Finally, what of the notion of an allegedly inconsistent overstaying? The issue must be judged a matter of degree. If a smaller congregation such as that at Troas could draw Paul into spending seven days with them, what might the expectations and pressures of a large metropolitan church like that at Ephesus be? We should think considerable. Paul at his very first preaching in Ephesus had to decline an invitation to stay longer (Acts 18:19f.). His Ephesian ministry on returning, when measured by its duration, extent and impact, was well-received and massively fruitful (Acts 19). That there was a high regard and a deep affection for the apostle can hardly be questioned. The Ephesian elders' highly emotional response to his Miletus address—particularly to his remark that he would not see them again—bears eloquent and current witness to that regard and affection (Acts 20:36-38). The elders would have been the hosts of the church in the capital and others like them would have been scattered throughout Asia Minor (Acts 19:10). One can hardly doubt that, had Paul arrived in their midst, the Ephesians would have expected to treat their apostolic founder to a lavish and lengthy hospitality.

Paul's arrangements to sail by and call the elders to himself at Miletus in such a warm-hearted climate are both logical and consistent, suggesting a dual purpose. The arrangements would avoid the risk of offending the church because in relating to the elders he could be said to be relating to all the Ephesians. At the same time the Miletus locale served as an effective buffer, foreclosing the danger of his plans being held hostage to an affectionate, vigorous and ultimately extended hospitality. Five days in Miletus would hardly seem inconsistent with his travel objective when compared with being obliged in the Ephesian context to accept a hospitality of perhaps several weeks' duration.

Paul's extended stay with the Christians at Puteoli at Acts 28:14 may helpfully be accounted for in terms of the boon of Christian hospitality. The difficulties alleged are several. The first pertains to what some see as the prisoner's apparently unfettered freedom to seek out the Christians of the city and accept their invitation irrespective of the centurion's agenda or preference. Conzelmann writes that 'Paul's time was at his own disposal' and Schille that Luke has lost Paul the prisoner from view.[72] The first person plural

---

[72]Conzelmann, *Acts*, 224; G. Schille, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (THNT 5; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1984) 474 respectively. Cf. Hemer, *The*

aspect of the action downplays the Pauline initiative; Luke and Aristarchus probably sought out and interacted with the local Christians. But it still appears that accommodation arrangements were in the hands of Paul and his two companions rather than the centurion. Second, the seven day duration of the party's stay in Puteoli has called for explanation owing to the doubt it raises in some minds. A continuation and even growth in the centurion Julius' positive attitude toward Paul (Acts 27:3, 43)[73] may partially account for the length of the stay. Others offer the relief and celebrative atmosphere arising from the safe conclusion to a harrowing sea passage,[74] the delay caused by other official business,[75] or the need to report ahead to Rome and receive additional instructions,[76] in explanation of the extended stopover. For various reasons, however, these explanations do not seem to suffice.[77] Haenchen's conclusion, however, that Acts 28:14a is nothing but a Lukan literary device to allow for news of Paul's arrival to reach the Roman Christians seems both premature and unjustified.[78]

Perhaps a way out of the perceived difficulties may be found in a few additional observations regarding certain aspects of the practice of requisitioning travel and billeting. Responsibility for transport and billeting arrangements for the company of prisoners and military escorts would have fallen to the centurion and it is virtually certain that he did this by means of requisition (Acts 27:2, 6; 28:7, 10f.). If the early first century A.D. inscription from the region of Sagalassos (Pisidia) is any indication, Julius, as a centurion, may have possessed the power to requisition 'a cart or three mules or six donkeys'[79] at the minimum rate of hire. The edict concludes:

Book of Acts, 156; R.N. Longenecker, 'The Acts of the Apostles', *ExpBibCom* (1981), vol. 9, 567; Neil, *The Acts*, 256; A. Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (RNT 5; 4th ed.; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1961) 285, who note this same concern.

[73]E.g., G. Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; 4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970) 324; Longenecker, 'The Acts', 567; Neil, *The Acts*, 256.

[74]Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 156. So also Hanson, *The Book*, 253; J.V. Bartlet, *The Acts* (Century Bible [NT] 5; Edinburgh: T.C. and E.C. Clark, 1901) 376.

[75]E.g., F.F. Bruce, *The Acts*, 535.

[76]E.g., Williams, *Acts*, 448; Hanson, *The Book*, 253; Knowling, *The Acts*, 544.

[77]See Marshall, *The Acts*, 419; Haenchen, *The Acts*, 719.

[78]Haenchen, *The Acts*, 719. Schille, *Apostelgeschichte*, 474f., also has problems with the authenticity of 28:14b.

[79] *New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9, *l.* 21.

> Accommodation [Lat.: *mansio;* Gk.: σταθμός] for all those who belong to my staff and for those on military service from all provinces and for the freedmen and slaves of the excellent leader (*Gk:* the Augustus) and their beasts ought to be supplied free, but without their demanding the rest (of their costs) free from those who are unwilling (to supply them).[80]

Mitchell remarks that 'centurions, unless they were absconding, would also always be acting in state service, either detached for a special mission or simply passing through to join another unit'.[81] Julius may have possessed a certificate (δίπλωμα/*diploma*) specifying the terms of his current mission and possibly permitting entitlements beyond the normal to cover the needs of his company.[82]

Despite an ever greater concern to regulate and restrict the powers of requisition, the literature and epigraphic record abounds with instances of abuse of this system in every period. Requisition, generally, was 'the most important area of contact and conflict between state and subject in the Roman Empire', according to Millar, who continues that

> the tensions thus created are reflected in a long series of complaints on the one side and of pronouncements by governors and Emperors on the other. It is surely significant that in our documentary evidence from outside Egypt far more attention is given to this issue than to that of direct taxation in cash or kind.[83]

The evident material pressures and the hostility that was often felt toward officials who had to be billeted at cost to proprietors and

---

[80]*New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9, *ll.* 23-25. Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport', 127, notes that 'the use of the word *mansio* is interesting in this context. In meaning it is evidently equivalent to the term *hospitium* which, like Greek ξενία, acquired the technical sense of hospitality provided to soldiers and other officially authorized persons'.

[81]Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport', 126.

[82]Cf. *New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9, *ll.* 16f. and Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport', 109, in this regard.

[83]F. Millar, 'The World of the *Golden Ass*', *JRS* 71 (1981) 67f. So too B.W. Jones and R.D. Milns, *The Use of Documentary Evidence in the Study of Roman Imperial History* (Sources in Ancient History 5; Sydney: SUP, 1984), #80, 127-29; Derrett, 'Law', 243f. On examples of the burdens, the tensions and attempts to foreclose abuse: *New Docs.*, vol. 1, #9; Mitchell, 'Requisitioned Transport', 125f. (and esp. nn.); W.H.C. Frend, 'A Third-Century Inscription Relating to *Angareia* in Phrygia', *JRS* 46 (1956) 46-56. Further, Pliny, *Ep.* 9.33; Apuleius, *Met.* 9.39f.; Arrian, *Epict.* 4.1.79-81.

private individuals would have made the centurion's responsibility for seeing to his party's provisioning and accommodation along the way a generally tension-filled and unhappy one. Might not then the sincere offer of *hospitium* (παρακαλέω: Acts 28:14) to the entire party[84] from a Christian community (perhaps staying in the home of a wealthy Christian *patronus*?) have been a quite welcome alternative to be seized upon? Recalling too the earlier discussion of the generally poor quality of boarding houses and wayside inns which constituted the standard type of accommodation on the roads leading to Rome, such an offer would have seemed even more attractive. The centurion's knowledge of and evident regard for Paul, while a matter of record for Luke, need not necessarily have been the pivotal motivation behind his permission for and sharing in a 'Christian' stopover in Puteoli; the venue and the offer themselves may have been sufficient reasons for acceptance. We may also fittingly recall at this point how Ignatius' keepers too, without being impressed by either prisoners or helpers, nevertheless accepted the kindness and favour extended *en route* to Rome.[85] Ignatius' stay in Smyrna appears to have been long enough for him to generate four quite extended epistles (*Eph., Mag., Trall., Rom.*) and to send and receive various ecclesiastical delegations. His greetings to the house of Tavia (ὁ οἶκος Ταουΐας) and the wife of the Procurator (or Epitropus?) with her whole house (σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτῆς) and her children there may also suggest Christian lodging and hospitality.[86] The same Christian room and board arrangements may have been on offer and accepted at Troas (cf. Acts 20:4-12) as the Ignatian prison detail awaited a ship to Neapolis.

Two things can be said of the duration of the stay in Puteoli beyond the general observation that warm hospitality generously offered often tempts its recipients to extend their stay. In the first place, it should be taken as a truthful observation in the apocryphal *Acts of Peter* that the road from Puteoli to Rome was rough and flinty, making significant demands upon its travellers.[87] In the light of this, one might quite legitimately wish to steel oneself for the

---

[84]The 'we' of the text would not have to exclude the centurion, soldiers and other prisoners.

[85]Ignatius, *Rom.* 5.1.

[86]Ignatius, *Smyr.* 13.2; *Pol.* 8.2. See nn. in LCL on difficulties with the text.

[87]*Apocr. Acts Pet.* 2.6 in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha: Volume Two—Writings Relating to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects*, tr. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965).

journey by a longer initial rest stop, particularly after a recent sea voyage punctuated in its latter stage by (shipboard?) stops of three days in Syracuse and a single day in Rhegium (Acts 28:12f.). This would hardly be judged an act of military dereliction. Second, travel to Rome using the facilities of the *cursus publicus* might itself encourage such delay. Casson presents perhaps too rosy a picture when he writes:

> The traveller charged with government business, and hence with the facilities of the *cursus publicus* at his disposal, had few problems: he would present his *diploma* to the nearest authorized inn and be issued an appropriate conveyance. He would consult his handlist or map for the stopping places available along his route, and at these he would eat, sleep, and pick up changes of animals and equipment until he reached his destination.[88]

The actual process might have had more fits and starts to it. As one drew closer to Rome, the demands upon the transport and billeting facilities of the *cursus publicus* would have become much greater and more clearly priority-orientated. Consequently, the prospect of there being 'no room in the inns' on the way to Rome, particularly for a detail of soldiers from an outlying province with not a few prisoners in tow, was quite real. This would argue powerfully not only for the desirability of accepting the private hospitality on offer but also, perhaps in anticipation of a dearth of high quality *hospitium* on the road ahead,[89] a tendency to linger. Moreover, Julius could well have had to wait in Puteoli for vehicular transport—if he was able to procure it at all—as he and his company could well have been considered 'non-priority'[90] travellers.

---

[88]Casson, *Travel*, 188. He notes the possibility of pressure on the system when he indicates that 'private voyagers were officially barred from the *cursus publicus*, but, human nature being what it is, exceptions were inevitable'.

[89]*Forum Appii* is perhaps mentioned at Acts 28:15 as it was one of the several stopover points. Almost a century earlier Horace mentions its nasty innkeepers (*Sat.* 1.5).

[90]See in this regard Frend, 'A Third Century Inscription', 54.

III. Sea Travel

1. Seasonal Travel and Pushing the Limits

As with overland traffic, sea travel was generally seen to be subject to seasonal variation. Ancient sources speaking to this matter furnish the following indications: the period from 27 May to 14 September was considered the safe season for sea travel; the periods from 10 March to 26 May and from 14 September to 11 November, when weather and sea conditions were quite changeable, was considered risky; the period from 11 November to 10 March was extremely dangerous.[91] The threats to shipping during the risky and dangerous periods were several. Casson writes that

> it was not merely the severity of winter storms, although these played their part. It was even more a matter of visibility: during the winter a much greater incidence of cloudiness obscures the sun by day and the sky by night, making navigation difficult in an age that did not have the mariner's compass....[92]

and he continues that mists and fogs could mask various perils and render landmarks on familiar coastlines unrecognizable to the navigator.[93] On the basis of the above indications and various examples,[94] there is a tendency to speak in terms of closure in the off-

---

[91]For both specific and more general contemporary indications, see Vegetius, *Epit. rei milit.* 4.39; Pliny, *Nat.* 2.47.122; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.81. For earlier indications, see Hesiod, *Op.* 663-5; Andocides, *De myst.* 137-9. For later indications, see sources cited in J. Rougé, 'La nagivation hivernale sous l'Empire Romain', *Revue de Etudes Anciennes* 54 (1952) 316-25. Further discussion: L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton: PUP, 1971) 270f. and nn. 1f.; *id.*, *Travel*, 150; Ramsay, 'Roads', 376.

[92]Casson, *Ships*, 271.

[93]Casson, *Ships*, 271. Vegetius, *Epit. rei milit.* 4.39, for example, writes: 'For the very short day and the long night, the density of the clouds, the obscurity of the atmosphere, the severity of the winds doubled by rain and snow, deter, not only fleets from the sea, but also travelers from land journeys'. See also Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 45; Jewett, *Chronology*, 56.

[94]Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 283 and Ramsay, 'Roads', 377 cite as examples Horace, *Carm.* 3.7.5; 4.5.9; Josephus, *AJ* 16.15 [16.2.1]; *BJ* 4.632 [4.6.1].

season (*mare clausum*) as though nearly enforced by law.[95] Indications and instances of travel outside of the safe limits[96] are explained as cases of necessity or urgency brought on by the exigencies of government service or religious business which actually prove the rule.[97]

But if, as J. Rougé indicates, 'winter shipping was forbidden by custom and in the case of imperial transports, by law',[98] what are the two Alexandrian grain carriers that Paul was placed on *en route* to Rome doing sailing during the risky and dangerous seasons? At Acts 27:9 the first grain carrier's progress is assessed in terms of much time having been lost and that sailing had already become dangerous because even the Fast (= the Day of Atonement) had gone by. According to Workman, the καί before τὴν νηστείαν in this verse indicates that not only had the 'Roman limit' for safe travel which he identifies with the Autumnal Equinox (23/24 September) been exceeded, so too (καί) had the Fast (10 Tishri), some five days before what the rabbis considered the 'Jewish limit'.[99] From this, Workman

---

[95]Speaking of the Mediterranean being 'effectively' or 'generally' closed, or of a 'relatively complete cessation' of travel: e.g., Jewett, *Chronology*, 56; Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 45. Conceding that travel was not absolutely impossible: e.g., Casson, *Ships*, 271; Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 23; Ramsay, 'Roads', 376.

[96]E.g., Philo, *In Flacc.* 13-16; *Leg.* 28; Josephus, *BJ* 1.279 [1.14.2]; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.1; 4.52; Suetonius, *Cl.* 18f. See Ramsay, 'Roads', 376 and nn. †, †† for earlier examples.

[97]E.g., Ramsay, 'Roads', 376; Rougé, 'La nagivation hivernale', 317.

[98]Summary of Rougé, 'La navigation hivernale', 316-25 in Jewett, *Chronology*, 137 n. 43.

[99]W.P. Workman, 'A New Date-Indication in Acts', *ExpT* 11 (1899-1900) 317. D. Sperber, *Nautica Talmudica* (Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan UP/Leiden: Brill, 1986) 99f., cites *Gen Rab.* 6.5, 44f. as follows: 'R. Isaac bar Marion said: So too the setting off [of ships] to the Great Sea (= Mediterranean)—"Thus saith the Lord, which maketh a way in the sea" (Is 43:16)—from Shavuot to the Feast [of Tabernacles]: "and a path in the mighty waters" (ibid.)—from the Feast [of Tabernacles] til Hanukkah.... R. Joshua bar Tanhum bR. Hiyya of Kfar Hagin was in Asia (near Eilat). He wished to sail off (ie between Sukkot and Hanukkah). An aristocratic lady said to him: Does one sail during these days? How strange (or: Surely not)! His father appeared to him in a dream [saying]: My son, [you will die] without a grave—"[and] also that he have no burial" (Eccles 6:3). <How strange!> [But] he harkened neither to the words of the one nor the words of the other. And [indeed] this happened to him (ie that he drowned).' Jewish reckoning held that the period from Shavuot/Pentecost (*c.* May) to Sukkot/Tabernacles (*c.* September) was the normal sailing season and that the period from Sukkot to

infers that 'Luke is writing of a year in which the Great Fast is subsequent to the Autumnal Equinox, or is at all events very late indeed'.[100] By his reckoning, the year A.D. 59 is most probably in view, as 10 Tishri occurred about 5 October that year.[101] Even if Workman's thesis is not fully conclusive,[102] it is clear that the grain carrier has pushed the limits by beginning its travel at the very end of the 'safe' season. That they are caught by the storm while attempting to fulfill the intention to winter (παραξειμάζω: Acts 27:12 [2x]) at Phoenix only partially mitigates the difficulty.

Workman's thesis carries a second implication. It leads to what he calls 'the impossible conclusion'[103] that the second grain carrier left Malta where it had been wintering (παραξειμάζω: Acts 28:11) in December—i.e., *right in the teeth of the dangerous season!* The problem is more acute if an earlier date for 10 Tishri is in view. Several solutions or combination solutions are proposed to address this alleged anomaly: 1) assume that a 'settling in period' of reasonable duration needs to be added, bringing the start of the three months of Acts 28:11 well into November;[104] 2) assume an earlier start to the 'safe' season;[105] 3) assume that Luke is employing the Syrian-Jewish calendar used by Josephus in which 10 Tishri

---

Hanukkah (*c.* December) was the dangerous season. Sperber indicates that *m. Ketub.* 5.6 implies a sailing season of six months.

[100]Workman, 'A New Date', 317.

[101] Workman, 'A New Date', 317, who indicates that the only other plausible year, if an error can be proven regarding the Jewish reckoning, is A.D. 56. G.A. Krodel, *Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986) 435, however, demonstrates that A.D. 56 can be eliminated on other grounds. Workman's argument is embraced by Marshall, *The Acts*, 406; Bruce, *The Acts*, 515. Incidentally, Casson, *Ships*, 155, observes that no Roman skippers would have shoved off from port on 5 October for it was ill-omened.

[102]Jewett, *Chronology*, 51, indicates that Workman's choice of 23/24 September rather than Vegetius' 14 September as the close of safe sailing is seen by many to undermine the argument.

[103]Workman, 'A New Date', 318.

[104]Noted by Workman, 'A New Date', 318f.

[105]Noted by Jewett, *Chronology*, 52 and 135 n. 24; Marshall, *The Acts*, 406; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 223; Bruce, *The Acts*, 534; Workman, 'A New Date', 319. Pliny, *Nat.* 2.47.122, indicates that the sailing season begins with the onset of the Favonian winds (*fauonii*) on 8 February. Haenchen, *The Acts*, 717, simply works back three months from the February indication in the elder Pliny to arrive at a shipwreck date of early November without apparently attempting to link this with the date indication at Acts 27:9.

would occur about 28 October;[106] or 4) assume that Luke is simply inconsistent or has failed to square his dates.[107] Additional evidence may be put forward, however, which suggests that Luke's account of grain carriers travelling in the off-season is neither inaccurate nor anomalous and that the above explanations may be unnecessary.

Casson likens grain, because of the practical and political importance of its regular and sufficient supply in the ancient world, to oil today.[108] It was a precious commodity. Rickman states that of the eight grains of major importance for human sustenance today, only two of these were widely known in the Mediterranean world of antiquity—wheat and barley. Wheat, the preferred of the two, was a vulnerable and variable yield crop.[109] While there is some debate concerning the specific needs of Rome (estimates of its annual consumption range from 200,000 to 400,000 tons),[110] the fact that the Egyptian portion of that supply was critical to Rome's adequate provision is beyond dispute.[111] Rome had a vital interest in ensuring regularity of production and transport. The question to be asked here is how extensive a control Rome exercised over the enterprise, or better, how much scope there was for freelance operation and private enterprise in the system.

Casson's analysis of government responses to successive grain shortages is instructive in this regard: In the crisis of A.D. 6 Augustus enacted an austerity programme which called for a reduction of the number of those who could make a claim upon the public corn dole (*frumentum publicum*); the inflationary crisis of A.D. 19 resulted in Tiberius setting a maximum price for grain and subsidizing grain

---

[106]Noted by Haenchen, *Acts*, 223; Marshall, *The Acts*, 406. Further, see the number three option offered by Workman, 'A New Date', 319.

[107]Offered by Conzelmann, *Acts*, 216. Cf. Workman, 'A New Date', 319.

[108]L. Casson, 'The Role of the State in Rome's Grain Trade', in *Ancient Trade and Society*, ed. L. Casson (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984) 96. [= *id.*, 'The Role of the State in Rome's Grain Trade', in *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome*, 21-34.]

[109]Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 261.

[110]P. Garnsey, 'Grain for Rome', in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C.R. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (London: Chatto and Windus/Hogarth, 1983) 118 and Casson, 'The Role', 97 respectively. Further, Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 262f.; P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988) 231-32.

[111]Josephus, *BJ* 2.383, 386 [2.16.4], states that Africa furnished Rome's needs for two thirds of the year and Egypt the remaining third. See Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 263f.; Garnsey, 'Grain', 127; Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 30.

dealers; Tiberius' recourse in the crisis of A.D. 32 was simply to give the Senate and magistrates a tongue-lashing.[112] The crises and imperial responses hardly suggest a high degree of government control according to Casson, who writes:

> ...we hear far more often of shortages than surpluses, and in meeting the shortages the emperors consistently used but one approach: blandishment—not regulation—of the private grain dealers. As for controlling prices, which we are assured was one of the functions of the *praefectus annonae,* the evidence shows if anything just the opposite, that prices kept getting out of hand to the point where the emperor had to do something about it.[113]

Casson furnishes and analyzes further evidence of a freedom to speculate in Alexandrian grain. In a villa near Pompeii six wax tablets were found which document the use of large amounts of Alexandrian grain (7,000 *modii* and 13,000 *modii;* i.e., 45 and 82 tons) as collateral on loans to secure the purchase of additional grain. 'They demonstrate beyond a shadow of doubt', writes Casson, 'that, at least up to A.D. 40, the date of the latest piece, individual private dealers were very much involved in the trade'.[114]

When scarcity of grain and inflated prices resulted in his being cursed by the populus in the Forum and pelted with stale bread crusts, Claudius determined to ensure a regular supply. To do this he

> resorted to every possible means to bring grain to Rome, even in the winter season. To the merchants he held out the certainty of profit by assuming the expense of any loss that they might suffer from storms, and offered to those who built merchant ships large bounties, adapted to the conditions of each: to a citizen exemption from the *lex Papia Poppaea;* to a Latin the rights of Roman citizenship; to women the privileges allowed mothers of four children.[115]

Claudius resolved, according to Casson, 'to adopt a long-range solution and not stagger from crisis to crisis. In the measures he took

---

[112]Dio Cassius 55.26.2f.; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.87 and 6.13 respectively. Further on Augustan measures, cf. Suetonius, *Aug.* 42.

[113]Casson, 'The Role', 104.

[114]Casson, 'The Role', 104. The Pompeiian documents analyzed are provided by Casson in an appendix (108-110).

[115]Suetonius, *Cl.* 18f. (≈ Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.43? [A.D. 51]). Cf. Dio Cassius 60.11 [A.D. 42].

there is not the slightest trace of government control or even supervision; he had recourse not to the stick, only to the carrot'.[116] Ramsay's suggestion that the Claudian provisions 'applied chiefly to the short voyages from Sardinia and Africa' is a case of special pleading.[117] Facilitating the regular transport of Egypt's vast grain reserves must surely also have been in view. Men and women sufficiently wealthy to finance the building and manning of ships meeting the minimal cargo requirement (10,000 *modii*/68 tons) to provision the capital for six years[118] found in the Claudian provisions great potential for personal advantage and enrichment—both in what they received and in what they avoided.[119] Garnsey offers that in this early period, the shipowners 'remained free agents. They did not become public employees performing compulsory services as members of self-perpetuating corporations with closed funds until the late third and early fourth centuries'.[120]

Alexandrian grain carriers could travel in fleets[121] and this would certainly have had safety and navigational advantages.[122] But must we believe that the two Alexandrian carriers that bore Paul in Acts were simply lost or belated stragglers from a government convoy? It has been argued elsewhere that the deliberations and actions of Acts 27 indicate that the first carrier was a free-merchant vessel—the centurion does not become 'senior commanding officer'

---

[116]Casson, 'The Role', 102. Garnsey, 'Grain', 128, concurs that the Claudian response was to foster a heavier volume by inducements not by exacting compulsory services.

[117]Ramsay, 'Roads', 376. This serves Ramsay's special interest in demonstrating that Egyptian grain transport was an imperial business carried on by imperial ships and specifically the Alexandrian grain ships that Paul took to Rome. ('Roads', 378; *id.*, *SPTR*, 314-26.)

[118]Garnsey, 'Grain', 123f. and sources there cited. See too his discussion (124) of the increased capacity requirements of the Hadrianic and Antonine period cited at *Dig.* 50.5.3 and 50.6.6.5 respectively.

[119]Nero added to the Claudian incentives exemption of merchant ships from assessment and property-tax according to Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.51.

[120]Garnsey, 'Grain', 127f. For further discussion of the process by which the state moved from interest to control, see Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 268-72

[121]Seneca, *Ep.* 77.1 (mid first cent. A.D.); A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar (eds.), *Select Papyri* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1970), vol. 1, #113 (second or third cent. A.D.); *POxy.* 14:1763 (after A.D. 222).

[122]Ramsay, 'Roads', 378f.

when he steps aboard.[123] The centurion's authority is most probably limited to his exercise of the power to requisition passage for himself and his company.[124] The above indications of a healthy private enterprise system conferring great rewards upon speculators and adventurous transporters, when taken together with the fact that the first Pauline carrier was pushing into the unsafe period and the implication that the second was pushing through the dangerous period, also point in the direction of their being freelance vessels engaged in the lucrative but risky business of squeezing in a second trip.[125] The minimum annual income of the belated grain carrier *Isis* was twelve Attic talents (72,000 *drachmae*),[126] and it would be artificial to exclude grain carrier traffic from Pliny's general observation that 'not even the fury of the storms closes the sea; pirates first compelled men by the threat of death to rush into death and venture on the winter seas, but now avarice exercises the same compulsion'.[127] Anticipating the next section of our discussion somewhat, it can be offered as a possibility that a ship's captain might not necessarily be doing the financially wise thing by waiting out fully the risky and dangerous seasons. Ships in such circumstances would be preserved; but their grain, a vulnerable cargo, might be lost through spoilage over time. We may conclude then that the centurion's finding a grain carrier prepared to sail at

---

[123]B.M. Rapske, 'The Importance of Helpers to the Imprisoned Paul in the Book of Acts', *TynB* 42.1 (1991) 7-13. The centurion's opinion, just as Paul's, would have been given consideration. Cf. Cicero, *Fam.* 16.9.4 and the comments of S.M. Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts', *CBQ* 46 (1984) 690f. and n. 18.

[124]On requisitioning ships, *Cod. Theod.* 14.21 (≈ *Cod. Just.* 11.27); 13.6.7.1; 13.6.7.2 (≈ *Cod. Just.* 11.3); *Pesiq R.* 42.177a and the discussion in Sperber, *Nautica Talmudica,* 114-16. Further on requisitioning, *supra,* II.3.

[125]On fitting in more than one trip, see Casson, *Ships,* 298 and n. 6; Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 29.

[126]Lucian, *Nav.* 13.

[127]Pliny, *NH* 2.47.125. Cicero observed on his journey to Brundisium in November of 50 B.C. that many, out of impatience, are shipwrecked (*Fam.* 16.9.1), warning Tiro not to be too hasty to take a ship as 'sailors are apt to hurry things with an eye to their own gain'. (16.9.4.) Vegetius, *Epit. rei milit.* 4.39, noting that the seas are attempted with danger until 15 May, indicates that 'it does not happen that the business of trading must cease, but more caution must be employed when an army is sailing in LIBURNAE, than when the (greedy) boldness of private merchandising causes hurried voyages'.

Myra is hardly an 'accidental meeting'[128] and the sailing of the *Dioskouroi* in the winter hardly so troublesome to Lukan reliability as is sometimes supposed.

2. *Grain Carriers, Shipwrecks and the Wreck of St. Paul*

We turn next to consider Luke's account of Paul's shipwreck, a disaster which could have been avoided had Paul's warning been taken seriously.[129] While marine archaeologists have identified and excavated considerable numbers of ancient wrecks,[130] it is the case

---

[128]Ramsay, 'Roads', 385.

[129]The warning, incidentally, may further confirm the earlier assertions of this chapter that Paul was more the 'professional' and less the 'customary' traveller. Probably not inspired by a divine oracle (lives were not lost as Paul predicted), Paul's warning at Acts 27:10 ought to be construed as the voice of experience. Acts indicates that Paul frequently travelled aboard ships. Paul himself states at 2 Cor. 11:25 that three times he was shipwrecked and on one of these occasions spent a night and a day in the open sea. Two of the wrecks, which, given the context, were presumably coastal disasters, *may but do not necessarily have to have occurred* in the unsafe or dangerous season; the third, however, is perhaps more likely to have occurred owing to Paul's booking passage with a risk-taking merchant vessel. Further on being adrift in the open sea, cf. Josephus, *Vit.* 14-16 [3]; Lucian, *Tox.* 19.

[130]Shipwreck was distressingly common. P. Throckmorton, 'From Rome to Byzantium: Introduction', in P. Throckmorton (ed.), *History from the Sea: Shipwrecks and Archaeology* (London: Mitchell Beazley, 1987) 60, writes that almost 600 Roman wreck sites from the republican to late imperial period have been thus far identified. Scattered from the Hebrides to the Red Sea, these sites have been computer-plotted on a definitive map by Bristol University's Department of Archaeology. Throckmorton's map (60f.) indicates eight Roman wreck sites for the island of Malta. The reader may recall too such texts as Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.18 which relates how in A.D. 62 nearly two hundred corn ships already in Ostia's harbour sank in a violent storm and how a hundred more ships (shuttle craft known by the name *nauis codicaria*?) were accidentally burnt when already up the Tiber.

The sectional illustration of the Yassi Ada reef in P. Throckmorton, 'Thirty-three Centuries Under the Sea', *National Geographic* 117 (1960) 689, shows why such sites have become extensive and archaeologically rich maritime graveyards. Yassi Ada possesses more than a dozen identifiable wrecks and G.F. Bass, 'New Tools for Undersea Archaeology', *National Geographic* 134 (1968) 409, describes the complications of excavating a Byzantine wreck because two Islamic wrecks have settled on top of it! For maps plotting wrecks relative to the locales from which certain of their cargos originated, cf. P. Throckmorton and A.J. Parker, 'The Amphora: Jerrycan of

that no Alexandrian grain carrier has thus far come to light.[131] The Lukan record may, however, be helpfully assessed in terms of the wrecks thus far discovered and available literary, epigraphic and numismatic records. Writing about the size and elaborateness of ancient Roman ships, Vinson indicates:

> The wine carrier that wrecked at La Madrague de Giens near Toulon, France, had two layers of planking, close-set frames, and

---

Antiquity', in *History from the Sea*, 69, 71; *id.*, 'A Million Tons of Marble', in *History from the Sea*, 75.

The reader is directed to the following for helpful discussion of Roman wreck sites and the conduct of marine archaeology: A.J. Parker, 'Two Wrecks of the Augustan Period Found Near Brindisi', *IntJNautArch* 3 (1974) 147; *id.*, 'Lead Ingots from a Roman Ship at Ses Salines, Majorca', *IntJNautArch* 3 (1974) 147-50 [*c.* A.D. 69-79]; J. Cousteau, 'Fish Men Discover a 2,200-year-old Greek Ship', *National Geographic* 105 (1954) 1-36 [Roman owned?]; P. Throckmorton, 'Ancient Shipwreck Yields New Facts—and a Strange Cargo', *National Geographic* 135 (1969) 282-300 [*c.* second century A.D.]; A.J. Parker and A.M. Squire, 'A Wreck of the Late 2nd Century AD at Terrauzza (Siracusa, Sicily)', *IntJNautArch* 3 (1974) 27-34; D.J.L. Gibbins and A.J. Parker, 'The Roman Wreck of *c.* AD 200 at Plemmirio, Near Siracusa (Sicily): Interim Report', *IntJNautArch* 15 (1986) 267-304; D.J.L. Gibbins, 'The Roman Wreck of *c.* AD 200 at Plemmirio, Near Siracusa (Sicily): Second Interim Report', *IntJNautArch* 18 (1989) 1-25; *id.*, 'The Roman Wreck of *c.* AD 200 at Plemmirio, Near Siracusa (Sicily): Third Interim Report', *IntJNautArch* 20 (1991) 227-46; G. Kapitän, 'A Roman 3rd Century AD Shipwreck at Cape Ognina (Siracusa, Sicily)', *IntJNautArch* 3 (1974) 150f.; B. Basile, 'A Roman Wreck With a Cargo of Marble in the Bay of Giardini Naxos (Sicily)', *IntJNautArch* 17 (1988) 133-42. For a broader discussion of the evidence: A.J. Parker, 'Classical antiquity: the maritime dimension', *Antiquity* 64 (1990) 335-46; D. Gibbins, 'Analytical approaches in maritime archaeology: a Mediterranean perspective', *Antiquity* 64 (1990) 376-89.

For non-Roman wrecks, consult Throckmorton, 'Thirty-three Centuries' 682-703; *id.*, 'Oldest Known Shipwreck Yields Bronze Age Cargo', *National Geographic* 121 (1962) 696-711; G.F. Bass, 'Underwater Archeology: Key to History's Warehouse', *National Geographic* 124 (1963) 138-56; *id.*, 'New Tools', 402-23; M.L. Katzer, 'Resurrecting the Oldest Known Greek Ship', *National Geographic* 137 (1970) 840-57; S.W. and M.L. Katzer, 'Last Harbor for the Oldest Ship', *National Geographic* 146 (1974) 618-25; M.L. Katzer, 'The Kyrenia Ship Restored', in *History from the Sea*, 55-59; G.F. Bass, 'Oldest Shipwreck Reveals Splendors of the Bronze Age', *National Geographic* 172 (1987) 692-733.

[131]So N. Hirschfeld, 'Part I: The Ship of Saint Paul—Historical Background', *BA* 53 (1990) 29. For the problem of finding such cargoes in the archaeological record: Parker, 'Classical antiquity', 342. For some of the wider issues: A.J. Parker, 'Shipwrecks and ancient trade in the Mediterranean', *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 3 (1984) 99-113.

> was more than 130 feet (40 meters) long. Ships of this size are believed to have been relatively common, though most seagoing craft were from 50 to 100 feet (15-30 meters) long.[132]

The first century A.D. merchant wreck discovered just off the coast of Caesarea Maritima is among the largest of Roman craft, measuring some 147.5 feet (45 meters) in length.[133] This comes closest to the dimensions of the Alexandrian grain carrier *Isis* which was 180 feet long, 45 feet wide, and 43.5 feet from the deck to the lowest point in the hold (55 meters x 13.75 x 13.25).[134] Attempts to calculate the cargo capacity of the *Isis* vary widely (1,000-3,500 tons) because the keel length, which should exclude the upward sweep of bow and stern and from which a fair calculation might be made, is not known. Making an educated guess that the keel length was 114 feet, Casson calculates the *Isis* at about 1,228 tons.[135] Such a cargo capacity may be appreciated when one recalls that to qualify for participation in the Claudian benefits, one's craft had to have a minimum grain capacity of 10,000 *modii* (68 tons); later provisions upped the qualifying capacity to single ships of no less than 50,000 *modii* (340 tons) or fleets carrying no less than 10,000 *modii* each.[136] Personal advantages to ship owners were not extended too cheaply and participation had to be significant enough to be useful to the government.

Could a carrier such as Paul's be significantly emptied of its volume of cargo in the stormy circumstances and relatively short period of time that Luke describes (Acts 27:18, 38)? A second or third century A.D. letter indicates that dockside unloading of one such carrier apparently took somewhere near twelve days.[137] Not a few individuals see difficulties in the Lukan text on this point.[138] The answer depends in part upon how the grain would have been stowed. Hirschfeld states that 'texts and representations indicate

---

[132]Vinson, 'Ships', 18.

[133]M.A. Fitzgerald, 'Part II: The Ship of Saint Paul—Comparative Archaeology', *BA* 53 (1990) 36.

[134]For the account of the ship, cf. Lucian, *Nav.* 5.

[135]L. Casson, 'The *Isis* and Her Voyage', *TPAP* 81 (1950) 51-56; *id.*, *Ships*, 171-74, 187f. On the tonnage of similar-sized ancient vessels, see *Ships, passim.*

[136]Casson, *Ships*, 171f. n. 23.

[137]*Select Papyri*, #113: Arrival was on 6 Epeiph (= 30 June) and unloading completed on 18 Epeiph (= 12 July).

[138]See, e.g., the discussion and sources cited in Haenchen, *The Acts*, 704 and n. 2, 707 and n. 5.

grain was loaded or unloaded by means of sacks by porters'.[139] He continues, regarding the ships themselves,

> Historical evidence supports the presence of partitions. Roman legal texts discuss compensation to particular individuals in case their cargo was damaged or lost. Sealed samples of grain were sometimes sent along with specific shipments in the cargo. Both of these situations imply that individual lots could be differentiated and that they were probably stored separately, either within sacks or partitions.[140]

Loose storage would have made for greater difficulty in rapidly dumping the grain overboard. If sacks were used for stowing, however, this would have speeded up the process Luke describes and even more so if a derrick system had been employed.[141]

There remains, however, the problem of the sheer tonnage of the cargo. Indications of the relative capacity of such ships to carry crew and passengers may be helpful in this regard. The *Isis* had a veritable army of crew members according to Lucian[142] and the carrier in which Josephus unsuccessfully attempted to make Rome must have been quite large; besides cargo, there were some 600 individuals aboard.[143] Luke's record indicates that, all told, 276 individuals were aboard the first grain carrier on which Paul travelled (Acts 27:37). Moreover, Luke's reference at Acts 27:30 to the conspiracy of the sailors (οἱ ναῦται) to abandon ship using the lifeboat (σκαφή) would seem to imply a smaller crew.[144] Far from being troublesomely large, the numerical indications may actually show Paul's ship to have been an Alexandrian carrier of significantly less than *Isis* class tonnage. The crew (3rd person plural of ποιέω: Acts 27:18) would first have lightened the ship by jettisoning the topmost cargo (possibly located above decks?) earlier during the storm. The urgent labours of all those aboard (3rd person plural of

---

[139]Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 28. Casson, *Ships*, 200, indicates that papyri from Egypt attest the presence of σιτομετροσακκοφόροι 'grain-measurers-and-sack-carriers'; they are designated *saccarii* in the Latin sources according to Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 263.

[140]Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 29. Further, Casson, *Ships*, 177, 200.

[141]Haenchen, *The Acts*, 707 n. 5. Cf. *infra*, n. 147.

[142]Lucian, *Nav.* 6.

[143]Josephus, *Vit.* 15 [3].

[144]Marshall, *The Acts*, 412, is one who presumes that the reference is to 'just some of them'.

κουφίζω after mention of the 276: Acts 27:38) in the pre-dawn hours of the morning of the shipwreck might reasonably be thought to have significantly lightened such a smaller grain carrier before its run for shore.

If Paul's ship was not an *Isis* class carrier, it would more than likely have had a two rather than three mast configuration.[145] The main mast, just ahead of midships, carried the great sail (ἱστίον/*uelum*) and above the yard two triangular topsails (*sippara* or *suppara*) which together gave the carrier its principal drive.[146] The second mast and yard projecting forward of the bow, carried the smaller foresail (ἀρτέμων/*artemon*) which served in both a driving and steering capacity.[147] The foresail must have been thus used as Paul's ship gave way to the storm (Acts 27:15)[148] and is explicitly noted as being hoisted to the wind (Acts 27:40) in hopes of steering the ship safely to the beach. Such ships had dual oar-like rudders (πηδάλια/*gubernacula*) which, when not in use, were lifted out of the water and lashed against the hull with ropes (Acts 27:40). The mention of four anchors being cast astern and the implication that there were others in the bow of the ship (Acts 27:29f.) would not have been unusual, even for a smaller ship.[149] Throckmorton describes how five anchors of identical design and weight found off Campo Marino near Taranto and cast in a straight line led to the discovery

---

[145]Fitzgerald, 'Part II,' p. 31. The *Isis* was a 'three-master' (Lucian, *Nav.* 14).

[146]The Alexandrian grain carriers were exempt from the regulation which obliged other ships entering the harbour of Puteoli to strike their *suppara*. See Seneca, *Ep.* 77.

[147]Fitzgerald, 'Part II', 32; Vinson, 'Ships', 18. J. Rougé, *Ships and Fleets of the Ancient Mediterranean*, tr. S. Frazer (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1981) 56f. wonders whether the mast might additionally serve as a derrick for loading/unloading cargo.

[148]Haenchen, *The Acts*, 701 n. 4.

[149]Hirschfeld, 'Part I,' p. 27, for a broad spectrum of ancient vessels possessing anywhere from five to twenty-three anchors. Of interest is the 7th century A.D. Byzantine wreck off Yassi Ada which, though 60-70 feet in length, had no fewer than eleven anchors. Further, F. Carrazé, 'Note on Two Decorated Lead Anchor Stocks', *IntJNautArch* 3 (1974) 153-57; V. Cosma, 'Anchors from Tomis. 2', *IntJNautArch* 4 (1975) 21-26; B. Dimitrov and C. Nicolov, 'Stone Anchors from Sozopol Bay', *IntJNautArch* 5 (1976) 81-83; G. Kapitän, 'Ancient Anchors—Technology and Classification', *IntJNautArch* 13 (1984) 33-44; D. Haldane, 'Anchors of Antiquity', *BA* 53 (1990) 19-24; Casson, *Ships*, 252-58; and illustrations in Bass, 'New Tools', 413; *id.*, 'Oldest Known Shipwreck', 706f.

of the wreck of a first century A.D. Roman amphora carrier.[150] A clear implication that may be drawn from the references to the crew of Paul's ship setting anchors and waiting for daybreak is that, though ultimately ill-fated, the ship was nevertheless driven to land in a readied and controlled manner. Beyond making the ship ready, passengers would have had some time to prepare themselves and secure any personal belongings against loss or destruction.[151]

Finally, 'the issue of overall structural integrity is one of the most vexing aspects of the large grain ships'.[152] Beyond their experience of 'extraordinary longitudinal and lateral flexion'[153] in variable seas, such ships had to contend with the peculiar challenges of carrying grain as cargo. Rickman has aptly stated: '...it is not just

---

[150]Throckmorton, 'Shipwrecks, Anchors and St Paul', in *History from the Sea*, 78. Each weighed about 1,320 lbs. On page 80 he offers the following concerning Acts 27:29f., 40: 'The Malta wreck has not been found, but this account rings true. Our five anchor wreck off the coast of Campo Marino suggests only one probable mistake. The text says that they cast four anchors out of the stern and slipped these anchors when they drove the ship on shore. It seems much more likely that they dropped the four anchors one after the other, and that they cast off the last anchor when it was time to drive the ship on shore. So long as the anchor warps did not chafe through, there was a good chance of saving the ship. With three anchors gone, holding to a fourth, and no reserve anchor to be dropped, then it was the best choice to drive ashore in daylight, sacrificing the ship to save the people'. Sufficient account may not have been taken of the crew's great anxiety at dropping anchor in the dead of night (Acts 27:29).

[151]Such skepticism as, for example, R.I. Pervo, *Profit With Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 53f., has expressed regarding the preservation of documents during shipwreck hardly gives sufficient credit to Luke, Paul, the centurion Julius or the other passengers for making the obvious preparations for a sea journey; nor does it take into reasonable consideration the controlled manner of Paul's shipwreck as noted above.

Even in the chaos of sudden seaboard disaster, there is at least some chance of preserving important personal articles. When dumped overboard because of crowding in his own ship, Caesar, for example, 'plunged into the sea, and after swimming for two hundred paces, got away to the nearest ship, holding up his left hand all the way, so as not to wet some papers which he was carrying, and dragging his cloak after him with his teeth, to keep the enemy from getting it as a trophy'. (Suetonius, *Jul.* 64, cited by A.D. Nock, '48. The Book of Acts', in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972], vol. 2, 823 n. 12.)

[152]Fitzgerald, 'Part II', 32. On the details of double hulls, caulking, pumping the bilge and such, 34-38.

[153]Fitzgerald, 'Part II', 38.

heavy and bulky to move about, but in a sense both «mobile» and «alive»'.[154] When piled to a height of six feet, grain exerted a vertical pressure of nearly 240 lbs. per square foot. If not sacked or binned it could 'flow' in rough seas, exerting sudden lateral pressure upon the hull of up to 160 lbs. per square foot at places and threatening breach or capsize.[155] Grain also 'breathes', taking in oxygen and giving off heat, carbon dioxide and moisture. To prevent germination, infestation or rotting, it has to be kept both cool and dry.[156] 'Obviously grain must not be allowed to get damp', writes Rickman, 'Quite apart from the spoiling of the cargo, grain which gets wet can swell so dramatically, doubling in size, that a full load can split the plates of even a modern ship'.[157] This probably explains in part why, when struck by the storm, Paul's carrier crew took immediate measures to undergird (ὑποζώννυμι: Acts 27:17) their ship. They apparently used bracing cables (ὑποζώματα) similar to those employed on triremes of the Athenian war fleet to preserve hull integrity. There is no archaeological or literary evidence to date of such gear being used aboard merchant ships outside of Luke's account, nor do we as yet know exactly how these devices would have been employed.[158]

For a period of some six or more weeks near the end of the sailing season the prevailing winds—known as the Etesians (οἱ Ἐτησίαι / *Etesiae*, meaning annual)[159]—blew from NW. to NE., favouring ships travelling in most southerly directions. Ancient vessels averaged between four and six knots per hour with such

---

[154]Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 261.

[155]The calculations of Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 261.

[156]Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 261.

[157]Rickman, 'The Grain Trade', 265. So too Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 28.

[158]Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 26f. *LSJ*, 1881. Marshall, *The Acts*, 409, helpfully summarizes the possibilities: 'It has been understood (1) of ropes tied vertically round the sides of the ship to hold the planks more firmly together...[i.e., frapping]; (2) of ropes tied longitudinally round the outside of the hull from stem to stern to strengthen it...; (3) of ropes tied across the boat inside the hold to strengthen it; or (4) of ropes tied longitudinally over the ship from stem to stern and tautened in order to prevent the ship breaking its back [i.e., hogging].' For further discussion and illustrations, H.J. Cadbury, 'Note XXVIII. Ὑποζώματα', *BC*, vol. 5, 345-54; Casson, *Ships*, 91, 250; R.R. Stieglitz, 'Long-Distance Seafaring in the Ancient Near East', *BA* 47 (1984) 134-42; E. Warre, 'Navis', *DGRA*, vol. 2, 224; J. Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (4th edn. 1880; rpt., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978) 108f.

[159]Cf. Philo, *In Flacc.* 5, 26; Pliny, *Nat.* 2.47.127; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.98; Aristotle, *Mu.* 4.15.

favouring winds[160] and records indicate that the Rome to Alexandria trip in these circumstances could be made quite directly and would take between 10 and 20 days.[161] Those same winds more than doubled the maximum time for the return journey,[162] permitting vessels a progress of only two or two and a half knots per hour,[163] and forcing them 'into a round about course via the south coast of Asia Minor, Crete, Malta, and Sicily'[164] or perhaps up along the W. coast of the Peloponnesus before cutting across to Sicily as this afforded protection and allowed them to take advantage of off-shore breezes. In contrast to the smooth lines on most maps depicting the controlled portions of Paul's progress to Rome, the journey would have been a zig-zag course of tacking.[165] Such evidence as that cited above, together with the progress of the grain carrier *Isis*, corroborates Luke's account of both the route taken and the troubles of Paul's pre-storm passage (Acts 27:2-13).[166]

The majority decision, over Paul's objections, was to sail on from Fair Havens some forty miles up coast at Phoenix (Acts 27:12).[167] The object was to make winter harbour there. This decision

---

[160]Casson, *Ships*, 152, 283, 287f., calculated from ancient sources. Cf. Smith, *The Voyage*, 217.

[161]So Casson, *Travel*, 151f.; Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 23, 247; Ramsay, 'Roads', 373, 379; Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 46 from ancient sources there cited.

[162]Casson, *Travel*, 151f., suggests two months was not unusual; Ramsay, 'Roads', 381, offers fifty days as normal.

[163]Casson, *Ships*, 291. Cf. Caesar, *Civ.* 3.107; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.98; 4.81; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.15. The Etesians drop at night according to Pliny, *Nat.* 2.48.127.

[164]Casson, *Travel*, 152. Smith, *The Voyage*, 215, indicates that ancient ships could sail only within seven points of the compass. Further on the nautical limitations of their construction, Murphy-O'Connor, 'Traveling', 46.

[165]See the map depicting Paul's journey in Smith, *The Voyage*, between pp. 60 and 61.

[166]So Hirschfeld, 'Part I', 26; Casson, 'The *Isis*', 43-51. Further on the route W. of Akamas Point on Cyprus and the route E. and then N. of Crete, Charlesworth, *Trade-Routes*, 42f., 85, 250; Ramsay, 'Roads', 380f.

[167]Warnecke improbably renders λιμὴν τῆς Κρήτης 'a harbour *for* Crete' rather than *on* Crete, identifying Phoenix with Phoinikas on the Peloponnesus. (H. Warnecke and T. Schirrmacher, *War Paulus wirklich auf Malta?* [Theologie für die Gemeinde; Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler, 1992] 53-55.) J. Wehnert, 'Gestrandet. Zu einer neuen These über den Schiffbruch des Apostels Paulus auf dem Wege nach Rom (Apg 27-28)', *ZTK* 87 (1990) 76f, counters that Warnecke's way of construing the genitive has no analogies in antiquity nor at any other place in the Lukan double work. He sees here a partitive genitive which indicates a harbour on the island of Crete.

begins the inexorable course to disaster and shipwreck.[168] Several islands have been put forward in the literature as the correct locale of the shipwreck: the traditional Malta, off the south coast of Sicily [*Melite Africana*]; Mljet, in the Adriatic sea off the coast of Greece [*Melite Illyrica*];[169] and most recently a tongue of land on the island of Kefallinia in the Ionian sea off the coast of Epirus.[170] A decision on

---

[168]Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 54f., must argue that the ship's intended target was Pylos harbour some considerable distance from Peloponessian Phoinikas to fit the physical conditions described at Acts 27:12. Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 76f., rightly observes that such serious qualification undermines Warnecke's thesis.

Regarding the specific harbour on Crete, R.M. Ogilvie, 'Phoenix', *JTS* ns 9 (1958) 308-14, has argued quite convincingly that Phoinika Bay on the W. side of Cape Mouros should be preferred over Loutro on the E. for which Smith, *The Voyage*, 88-90, spoke. The earlier suggestion that Paul's grain carrier is not an *Isis* class vessel seems further confirmed by Ogilvie's observations concerning first century A.D. docking prospects at Phoinika Bay—he suggests that Paul's ship was 'one of the ordinary corn-and-passenger carrying merchantmen from Alexandria, of about 250 tons'. (312f.). A dedicatory inscription of about A.D. 110 (*CIL* 3:3 [= *ILS* 4395 = *IC* II. xx. 7]) indicates that another Alexandrian grain carrier, the *Isopharia*, also wintered at Phoenix. Cf. Bruce, *The Acts*, 534f.; C.J. Hemer, 'First Person Narrative in Acts 27-28', *TynB* 36 (1985), 97f. For the sites on Crete see I.F. Sanders, *Roman Crete* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1982) 165 no. 16/5 (Loutro / Phoenix)

[169]Recently, A. Acworth, 'Where was St. Paul Shipwrecked? A Re-Examination of the Evidence', *JTS* ns 24 (1973) 190-93; O.F.A. Meinardus, 'St. Paul Shipwrecked in Dalmatia', *BA* 39 (1976) 145-47; *id.*, 'Melita Illyrica or Africana: An Examination of the Site of St. Paul's Shipwreck', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 23 (1974) 21-36.

[170]The present writer did not have to hand the original volume of H. Warnecke, *Die tatsächlichen Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 127; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987), for which A. Suhl provided a two page preface. Warnecke's contribution in the first half of *War Paulus*, a synopsis of *Die tatsächlichen Romfahrt* and a response to his critics, is sufficiently detailed to give a fair sense of his earlier and more fully elaborated arguments. His work has sparked a vociferously polemical debate. Cf. Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 67-99; B. Schwank, 'Als wir schon die vierzehnte Nacht auf der Adria trieben (Apg 27,27)', *Erbe und Auftrag* 66 (1990) 44-49; *id.*, 'Also doch Malta? Spurensuche auf Kefalonia', *BK* 45 (1990) 43-46; C. Sant and J. Sammut, 'Paulus war doch auf Malta!', *TGl* 80 (1990) 327-32; A. Suhl, 'Zum Seeweg Alexandrien–Rom', *TZ* 47 (1991) 208-13; *id.*, 'Gestrandet! Bemerkungen zum Streit über die Romfahrt des Paulus', *ZTK* 88 (1991), 1-28; J. Wehnert, '...und da erfuhren wir, daß die Insel Kephallenia heißt: Zur neuesten Auslegung von Apg 27-28 und ihrer Methode', *ZTK* 88 (1991), pp.169-80. Thomas Schirrmacher, 'Plädoyer für die historische Glaubwürdigkeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Pastoralbriefe', in *War Paulus*, offers a review and critique of the debate.

the location must be based, in the first instance at least, upon meteorological and nautical considerations.

The name of the hurricane force wind has up until recently been considered troublesome. Essentially, if the wind is actually designated Εὐροκλύδω and taken as veering from the (E)SE. (Εὖρος) against (κατά) the Cretan coastland and increasing to gale force (κλύδων),[171] Mljet and Kefallinia become potential locales for the shipwreck; if, however, Εὐρακύλων be accepted as the correct reading and understood as a wind blowing from (E)NE., traditional Malta is more than likely in view. Metzger indicates that Εὐρακύλων appears to be the earliest reading and that it gave trouble to the copyists, thus accounting for the later variants of which Εὐροκλύδω is one.[172] Acworth asserts that Εὐρακύλων is unlikely, being a hybrid Greco-Latin term (Εὖρος +*aquilo*) not elsewhere attested and clumsy because a wind blowing from the NE. would not be known as a SE. by N. wind but by the more usual term καικίας.[173] Hemer responds to Acworth by observing not only that *eurus* and *aquilo* are never so far divergent as SE. and N. on any of the systems he has come across,[174] but also that there are two parallels which confirm *euraquilo* as an ENE. wind. The first, a twelve point wind rose from Thugga in proconsular Africa, indicates the sequence *septentrio aquilo euroaquilo* [*vu*]*lturnus eurus* etc. with *septentrio* and *eurus* generally approximating N. and E. respectively.[175] The second is the reference in Vegetius, *Epitoma Rei Militaris* 4.38, which runs thus: '...to this is joined on the right CAECIAS or EUROBORUS [*huic a dextera iungitur caecias siue euroborus*]...'. Hemer remarks:

> The unique *euroborus* here occupies the place 30° N. of E., like *euroaquilo* in the preceding example, and it is equated with *caecias*, apparently as its Latin (!) counterpart. But *boreas*, it is agreed, equals *aquilo:* Vegetius himself repeats the identification a few lines later and places it 30° E. of N. The strange Latinization *euroborus*

---

[171]So Acworth, 'Where was St. Paul', 191.
[172]Metzger, *Textual Comm.* 497.
[173]Acworth, 'Where was St. Paul', 192. Cf. K. Lake and H.J. Cadbury, 'Note XXVII. The Winds', *BC*, vol. 5, 338-44; and further Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 691.
[174]C.J. Hemer, 'Euraquilo and Melita', *JTS* 26 (1975) 103.
[175] Hemer, 'Euraquilo and Melita', 103. Further, *id.*, 'First Person', 98.

(*euroboreas*) is evidently exactly equivalent to euraquilo, and both appear to function, oddly, as Latin renderings of *caecias*.[176]

Warnecke argues that Paul's ship was caught up in an autumnal low-pressure weather system twisting cyclonally in a counter-clockwise manner and indicated at Acts 27:14 by the term τυφωνικός. The E. side of this anticlockwise low would draw in air masses as S. and SE. winds and these Warnecke identifies with the winds named Νότος and Εὐρακύλων respectively at Acts 27:13f.[177] Such a sequence would, of course, put Paul in the near vicinity of Kefallinia. But Warnecke's theory, as we have just seen, comes to grief over the point that Εὐρακύλων is not a SE. but a NE. wind.[178]

Hemer continues that this NE. wind—not a squall but the fierce *gregale* of the Central Mediterranean winter—would have funnelled down from (κατά) the mountains along a low land basin, catching the grain carrier just as it was passing beyond the shelter of Cape Matala (Loukinos) in an attempt to cross the Bay of Mesara.[179] Luke indicates that giving way to the Εὐρακύλων, the crew feared being driven onto the African Σύρτις (Acts 27:17).[180] The Syrtis was some 400 miles SW. of Cauda. As such, the Εὐρακύλων had to have been consistently and forcefully driving in a SW. direction to inspire such fear; and that fear, like the wind, must have been sustained rather than short-lived.[181]

Smith has offered two calculations which are of interest to the present discussion. The first, based upon Admiral Sir Charles Penrose's indication of a ship's drift (one and one half miles per

---

[176]Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 103f. Hemer emphasizes that 'the discussion has suffered from its orientation to the scheme in Aristotle to the comparative neglect of the material of Imperial times. The change in the placing of Boreas (*aquilo*) is important'. (102 n. 5.)

[177]Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 29-32.

[178]Cf. Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 79.

[179]Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 105f. This takes κατά more naturally and answers Acworth's objection based upon the topography of the SW. coast of Crete. ('Where was St. Paul', 192.) Further on Crete: Sanders, *Roman Crete, passim.*

[180]Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 104f., *contra* the faulty interpretation of Acworth, 'Where was St. Paul', p.192. For sources describing sailors' fears of this locale, see Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 691f.

[181]*Contra* Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 57, who must argue that the winds (from a clockwise high-pressure Aegean system) that first caught Paul's ship were from the NE. but short-lived; hence, his need to assert that the crew's fear must also have been short-lived.

hour) over 14 days (Acts 27:27) gives a distance within a few miles of that between Cauda and Malta.[182] As to the second, Smith writes:

> ...an ancient ship would probably not lie nearer the wind than seven points, which added to six points of lee-way, makes thirteen points, as the angle which such a ship would probably make with the wind. E.N.E. 1/4 N is 2 1/4 points to the north of east: if we add thirteen to this, it makes the azmuth of the ship's course from Clauda W. 3/4 N., or W. 8° N., *which is the bearing of Malta to the nearest degree.*[183]

Luke indicates further that Paul's grain carrier was driven across the Adriatic (διαφερομεννων ... ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ: Acts 27:27).[184] If by Adriatic is meant that body of water along the E. Italian and Illyrian seaboards *only* as far S. as the Gulf of Otranto, those arguing for Mljet would have made a serious case. Numbers of examples can be cited which indicate such a S. boundary; others, however, just as clearly indicate a boundary further S. than the Gulf of Otranto.[185] Those who advocate Kefallinia as the place of shipwreck have attempted to restrict the Adriatic to the S. limits of the Ionian Sea. Warnecke furnishes a discussion of the sources and two maps which suggest that the S. boundary line of the inner Adriatic Sea ran from Mons Garganus to Mljet and that the S. boundary of the outer Adriatic Sea (≈ the Ionian Sea) was described by a line running from Locri under the toe of Italy to the NW. tip of Crete.[186] Again, however, such boundaries are hard to maintain exclusively in the

---

[182]Smith, *The Voyage,* 27 n. 1.

[183]Smith, *The Voyage,* 125-27.

[184]So Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 106-109, citing the second century A.D. indications of the Adriatic's limits in Ptolemy. Further, Hemer, 'First Person', 102 and n. 41; Smith, *The Voyage,* 163-67, 173.

[185]Curiously, Meinardus, 'Melita Illyrica or Africana', 25-8, cites the latter type of example (Livy 5.33.7; Strabo 2.5.29; 7.5.9f.; Lucan 2.613-15) without comment, apparently assuming that if a majority of ancient examples can be put forward this will carry the day.

[186]Warnecke, *War Paulus,* 23-26, 64. Strabo's influence upon the boundaries Warnecke has set on his two maps seems quite clear. The present writer wonders whether the use of an 'ancient' map such as that found in H.L. Jones, tr. *The Geography of Strabo* (LCL; London: Heinemann/Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), vol. 1 inner leaf, might be more helpful in placing boundaries. Would Malta be 'thrown' E. and perhaps even N. on such a map?

face of other sources which indicate a S. boundary which would include the traditional Malta. Bruce writes:

> Strabo (*c.* A.D. 19) says the Ionian Sea is part of Adria (*Geog.* 2.5.20: ὁ δ' Ἰόνιος Κόλπος μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ νῦν Ἀδρίου λεγομένου). Pausanias (*Periegesis* 5.25.3) says the straits of Messina (between Italy and Sicily) unite the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian Seas. Ptolemy (*Geog.* 3.4.1; 15.1) makes the Adriatic Sea (τὸ Ἀδριατικὸν πέλαγος), as distinct from the Adriatic Gulf (ὁ Ἀδριατικὸς κόλπος, known today as the Adriatic Sea), the whole sea as far south as Sicily and Crete. Josephus (*Vita* 15) tells how the ship on which he set out for Italy in A.D. 63 foundered in the midst of Adria (βαπτισθέντος γὰρ ἡμῶν τοῦ πλοίου κατὰ μέσον τὸν Ἀδρίαν) and how he was taken on board a ship of Cyrene and put ashore at Puteoli.[187]

The fluidity of the boundaries of the Adriatic in the ancient literature can hardly be turned against the traditional location. Moreover, a more northerly location cannot be forcefully argued from such evidence.

A number of the other arguments recently put forward for Kefallinia are essentially the same as those offered in support of Mljet.[188] Both theories note the abiding presence of poisonous snakes on their islands but none for traditional Malta. Warnecke even notes the presence of a snakehandling cult on Kefallinia which he holds to be significant.[189] The present lack of poisonous snakes on Malta does not foreclose their existence there in Paul's day (Acts 28:4),[190] and Wehnert rightly asks how a modern Kefallinian snakehandling cult in which Paul plays no part really proves anything.[191] The 'barbarians' of Mljet and Kefallinia, it is argued, were truly barbaric but the islanders on Malta can hardly be so designated (Acts 28:2,

---

[187]Bruce, *The Acts*, 522. Lake and Cadbury, *BC*, vol. 4, 340, observe that 'the Melitene to which Oppian's father was banished is spoken of in one version of the *Vita* of the poet as an island in the Adriatic, in another version as an island of Sicily, both quite correct'. Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 79 and n. 22, notes that Orosius 1.2.90 equates the Silician with the Adriatic Sea. Though a fifth century A.D. document, observes Wehnert, it draws upon older material. Further in this regard, cf. Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 106f.

[188]So Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 71.

[189]Meinardus, 'Melita Illyrica or Africana', 31f.; Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 93f., 106f. and nn.

[190]While snakes inhabit Malta today, none are poisonous. For further discussion, see Bruce, *The Acts*, 531; Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 109f.

[191]Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 83.

4).[192] The term βάρβαροι, may simply connote the inability to speak Greek (well),[193] and it is a fact that even the most civilized of men frequently descend to violence and piratical behaviour in the mayhem of riot and shipwreck. Finally, little can be made of arguments from later traditions. The literary tradition of Paul's landing on Mljet goes back only as far as the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (A.D. 945-59); the tradition for Malta may go back quite a bit earlier.[194] More recent discussion and debate concerning these two traditions is deeply mired in religious politics as Warnecke has clearly indicated.[195] Warnecke's own search for a Kefallinia tradition has turned up two churches (Byzantine?) dedicated to Paul, one of which is located, it is alleged, on the spot where Paul and his fellow travellers warmed themselves by the fire.[196] But this hardly inspires great conviction.[197]

At the end of the day, Mljet is just too far N. to count as a reasonable alternative. The Kefallinia theory, beyond its many other weaknesses and despite its commendable aim,[198] is seriously damaged by the fact that Warnecke cannot find any evidence that this island or any part of it was ever known by the name Μελίτη.[199] We therefore conclude that traditional Malta[200] continues to be the

---

[192]Meinardus, 'Melita Illyrica or Africana', 30f.; Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 35-37 and 144f. nn. 33-42.

[193]Bruce, *The Acts*, 531, writes: 'The Maltese were not uncivilized; they had been for many centuries under Phoenician and then Roman influence. They spoke a Phoenician dialect; hence they were βάρβαροι to the Greeks'.

[194]Meinardus, 'Melita Illyrica or Africana', 32-36. He notes the 5th century subdeacon Arator as the earliest witness for Malta but assesses it as 'rather spurious' (33).

[195]Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 13-22.

[196]Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 100-106.

[197]Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 83.

[198]Warnecke wishes to demonstrate the historical reliability of Acts and to show that the Pastoral epistles can be fitted into Paul's Roman itinerary if Kefallinia is the place of shipwreck.

[199]The fact that a number of islands in the Mediterranean carry the name Melite, that there are often only single attestations for alternate place names in antiquity, and that there are a number of variations on the name Kefallinia does not essentially improve Warnecke's case. Warnecke, *War Paulus*, 22, 37f.; Wehnert, 'Gestrandet', 74.

[200]Μελιτήνη stands in place of Μελίτη in some MSS through dittography (ΜΕΛΙΤΗΝΗΗΝΗΣΟΣ [B* lat syr^{h} cop^{bo} arm] for ΜΕΛΙΤΗΗΝΗΣΟΣ). The name Malta is probably Phoenician; cf. the Hebrew verb flm, 'slip away, escape'. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Comm.* 500; Bruce, *The Acts*, 530; J.R. Harris, 'Clauda or Cauda? A Study in Acts xxvii.16', *ExpT* 21 (1909-10) 18.

most likely location of Paul's shipwreck. The grain carrier would have come to grief somewhere there, whether at the traditional sight on the W. side of St. Paul's Bay near Selmunette Island,[201] on the W. side of Salina Bay off Qawra Point,[202] or perhaps in the Bay of Mellieha.[203] One need not feel unduly pressed to decide whether Malta was unfamiliar to the crew and travellers (Acts 27:39; 28:1) because it was outside of the usual Alexandrian grain carrier lanes or because the storm had obscured its familiar features.[204]

3. *Shipwreck and Providence*

It remains to consider, briefly, what Luke's intention may have been in relating at such considerable length the shipwreck of Paul. For Miles, Trompf and Ladoucer the answer is found in the relationship between shipwreck and Hellenistic conceptions of divine retribution and pollution and what this says concerning Paul's innocence. Miles and Trompf argue that the escape of all 276 passengers amounts to a 'divine confirmation of Paul's innocence'.[205] Troublesome to their argument, however, is the fact that while there is no loss of life, there *is* a disaster; the ship *on which Paul is a passenger* and its

---

[201]E.g., Smith, *The Voyage*, 142f.; W.M. Ramsay, 'St. Paul's Shipwreck', *Expos* V/6 (1897) 154-57. W. Cowan, 'Acts xxvii.39', *ExpT* 27 (1915-16) 472f. argues the same site but entering from the N. through the narrow passage between Selmuna Point and Selmunette Island. *Contra* Cowan, G.A. Sim, 'Acts xxvii.39', *ExpT* 28 (1916-17) 187f. and Cowan's rejoinder, 'Acts xxvii.39', *ExpT* 28 (1916-17) 330f.

[202]E.g., G.H. Musgrave, *Friendly Refuge: A Study of St. Paul's Shipwreck and His Stay in Malta* (Heathfield, UK: Heathfield Publications, 1979) 19-32. He relates that Roman objects found while diving off Qawra Point at a place which he identifies as the wreck site included amphorae and 'part of a Roman anchor' (29). No indication is given of the age of these artifacts.

[203]E.g., N. Heutger, '"Paulus auf Malta" im Lichte der maltesischen Topographie', *BZ* 28 (1984) 86-88. W. Burridge, *Seeking the Site of St Paul's Shipwreck* (Valletta: Progress Press, 1952) apparently also argues for this locale though the present writer was unable to consult his work.

[204]Hemer, 'Euraquilo', 110 and n. 2. For further discussion, cf. Acworth, 'Where was St. Paul', 192; Suhl, 'Zum Seeweg', 208-13.

[205]G.B. Miles, and G. Trompf, 'Luke and Antiphon: The Theology of Acts 27-28 in the Light of Pagan Beliefs About Divine Retribution, Pollution, and Shipwreck', *HTR* 69 (1976) 264.

cargo are completely destroyed.[206] Ladoucer suggests that Paul's safe passage under the sign of the *Dioskouroi* (Acts 28:11), the guardians of truth and punishers of perjurers, may well be 'one more argument in a sequence calculated to persuade the reader of Paul's innocence'.[207] The relationship of the *Dioskouroi* to the Imperial cult may, Ladoucer argues, render the need for a narrative of the trial's outcome superfluous.[208]

Several things may be said. First, while pagan *observers* of the events might well be tempted to make such connections as Miles, Trompf and Ladoucer allege (Acts 28:3-6), Christian (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1f.) and interested non-Christian *readers* are quite definitely being encouraged in other directions (cf. Acts 27:23f.) and would not. Second, it seems quite unlikely that Luke would adopt and argue Paul's innocence from a pagan perspective. In the final analysis, the arguments noted above are too subtle to be sustainable.

Others try to discern Lukan intention by exploring potential literary relationships between Luke's account and secular accounts of sea voyage and shipwreck. Praeder gathers a wealth of secular literature together for her analysis. While certain aspects of Luke's account are identified as relatively unparalleled or unique,[209] for much of the rest the similarity between Luke's account and others[210] indicates that 'Luke is familiar with several literary models or styles from sea voyages in ancient literature and is following some more closely than others'.[211] Praeder offers that 'the sending of the salvation of God to the Gentiles in Jesus Christ and in the Christian community is the common theme of Acts 27:1-28:16 and Luke-Acts'.[212] Pervo alleges that Acts 27 stands fully within the genre of the ancient novel: 'Historians had no need to liven up their material with a shipwreck, but composers of fiction did, often enough to inspire parodies'.[213] Pervo identifies the Lukan objective of the account as

---

[206]D. Ladoucer, 'Hellenistic Preconceptions of Shipwreck and Pollution as a Context for Acts 27-28', *HTR* 73 (1980) 436, 442.; Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 704.
[207]Ladoucer, 'Hellenistic Preconceptions', 446.
[208]Ladoucer, 'Hellenistic Preconceptions', 446.
[209]E.g., Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 686f., 691 and 697-99.
[210]E.g., Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 689, 694, 695 and 701.
[211]Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 705.
[212]Praeder, 'Acts 27:1-28:16', 684.
[213]Pervo, *Profit*, 51.

the 'glorification of the faith, exaltation of its leading exponent, and narration of high adventure'.[214]

Luke's employment of a method in literary expression ought certainly not to be gainsaid. But the above articulations and others like them,[215] while helpful in some respects, fail to convince. Perceived or even actual similarities do not necessarily or invariably 'explain' Acts or indicate either Lukan method or dependency. Pervo's comparative analysis here and in other episodes using the story-retelling technique he terms 'amplification' does not do Acts justice. Pervo himself admits that at times his method looks like distortion.[216] In fact, the 'amplification' has the character of *ex post facto* 'novelization' or 'fictionalization'. Those methods must be considered suspect which, in quest of pattern, genre, or typicality, forbid consideration of or trivialize the remarkable display of accurate geographical and maritime knowledge throughout this episode[217] and which ignore the real witness to frequent shipwrecks both in marine archaeology and in the Pauline autobiography (2 Cor. 11:25). Sandmel's warning concerning 'parallelomania' might well be recalled with considerable profit to such analyses.[218]

Miles and Trompf's work is very helpful to the extent that it identifies a concern regarding 'retributive logic'. It is, however, not a pagan, but a Christian or Jewish-Christian sense of this logic (Luke 13:1-5; cf. John 9:2) which appears to be Luke's concern. Paul is a

---

[214]Pervo, *Profit*, 53.

[215]E.g., P. Pokorny, 'Die Romfahrt des Paulus und der antike Roman', *ZNW* 64 (1973) 233-44, who argues that Paul's voyage to Rome is essentially the realization of Acts 1:8 (p. 232), more literary than factual (p. 234), and shares quite a number of features with the mystery-romance genre (pp. 235f.; particularly the call to be of courage at Acts 23:11; 27:22; 28:15 [p. 241]); V.K. Robbins, 'We-Passages in Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages', *BibRes* 20 (1975) 5-18 and *id.*,'By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Special Studies Series 5; Danville: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978) 215-42, who attempts to demonstrate that the first person plural narrative in Acts 27-28 is simply a convention peculiar to ancient sea voyage and shipwreck texts. The latter has been subjected to a damaging critique by Hemer, 'First Person', 80-86.

[216]Pervo, *Profit*, 10.

[217]See Hemer, 'First Person', 106-9, particularly his comment on the 'immediacy' of the text. Cf. Smith, *The Voyage, passim.*

[218]S. Sandmel, 'Parallelomania', *JBL* 81 (1962) 1-18, particularly his definition of the term at p. 1. Cf. Hemer, *The Book of Acts*, 34 on arguing too much from 'identified' literary parallels.

lightning rod witness who, at virtually every step along the way, sparks community disturbances and brings down upon himself grave physical abuse and burning social stigma. The believer might well ask whether there is something wrong with the messenger—or perhaps his message. Paul may think himself to be for the Lord, *but is the Lord for Paul?* Luke's burden is to demonstrate to his readers by an accurate account (ἀκριβῶς: Luke 1:3) that Paul and the troubled manner of his witness from place to place, far from indicating personal disqualification and censure of his message, actually constitute the beginnings of the fulfilment of the mandate at Acts 1:8. Luke has already prepared his readers by a distinctive recounting of Jesus' words at Luke 21:12-19 that faithful witness and troubles will be inextricably linked in the lives of His disciples. By the record of Jesus' words to Ananias (Acts 9:15f.) that linkage is made clear for Paul and from that point on it begins to unfold.

Luke's object at Acts 27f. is to recount the *actual* events of a rough sea journey and shipwreck in a manner which helpfully addresses what would have been their troubling theological implications to a reader who knows a Paul of distressing experiences and mixed reputation. To this end, Luke furnishes his readers in the record of a divine assurance at Acts 27:23f.[219] the hermeneutical tool by which known pauline difficulties—storm, the threat of summary execution, the shipwreck, and the snakebite—may be accurately deciphered. These actual experiences, when properly interpreted by this key, indicate that neither the messenger nor his message is disqualified. We may doubt alternate hypotheses which suggest that Acts 27f. is a heavily shaped and typical work of imagination which is novelistic in character.

IV. Conclusions

A sampling of modern scholarship in the previous pages has shown that how one characterizes travel and travellers in the book of Acts radically affects, among other things, one's assessment of its chronology of events, the underlying motives of both its characters and author and, ultimately, its worth as an historical record. With so much at stake, it is essential that Acts, as a record of travel, be given

[219]These verses are a reaffirmation of Acts 23:11, which continues to be operative.

a careful and thorough reading, keeping an eye to the patterns and experience of travel in antiquity. It is hoped that the benefits of such a comparative analysis have been suitably illustrated.

The following general indications suggest themselves to the present writer: First, when Acts is viewed against the backdrop of travel in the ancient Mediterranean world, the undesigned marks of its own antiquity suggest that its author was intimately acquainted with and even participant in the events it records.[220] Second, certain puzzling and disputed features in the book of Acts can be helpfully illuminated and perhaps even satisfactorily resolved when attention is paid to the various facets of first century A.D. travel. Finally, reviewing and critiquing the results of earlier scholarship, reassessing the better known ancient materials, and drawing into the discussion what has recently come to light promises to furnish additional mileage toward a clearer and more accurate understanding of Luke's account of the Gospel's spread.

[220]See however the Appendix by Porter in the current volume.