



Harvard Divinity School

Saul Who Also Is Called Paul

Author(s): G. A. Harrer

Source: *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Jan., 1940), pp. 19-33

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Harvard Divinity School

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1507962>

Accessed: 06-09-2016 05:52 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Harvard Theological Review*

SAUL WHO ALSO IS CALLED PAUL

G. A. HARRER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

FROM the time of Origen and of Rufinus and St. Jerome¹ the question of the apparent change of the apostle's name from *Saul* to *Paul* has interested students of the New Testament. The problem is due to the fact that the author of the Acts in briefly giving an account of Paul's meeting with the Roman governor of Cyprus, Sergius Paullus, and with the false prophet Elymas, simply states:² "Then Saul (who also is called Paul) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, etc." Before this verse in Acts the apostle's name is invariably given as *Saul*, and after this verse he is always called *Paul*, except in two passages where there is reference to the very beginning of his career, his conversion.³ In his letters the name *Paul*, and never *Saul*, is used.

From this statement of facts several related questions arise. Was Saul's name then changed to *Paul*? Was the name *Paul* added to the name *Saul*? Was any alteration at all then made? What part or element of the man's complete name was *Paul*? And what element was *Saul*? Able modern scholars have expressed entirely divergent views. Another attempt at a solution may seem foolhardy, but may be justified by the use of new evidence on the text of Acts, on the history of Paul's first missionary journey, and on further study of the forms of names of provincials who became Roman citizens.

Paul was a Roman citizen, born a Roman, according to evidence in the Acts.⁴ A citizen in the reign of Augustus, when Paul was born, regularly had the *tria nomina, praenomen* (given name), *nomen* (name of *gens* denoting ultimate founder of the family and usually ending in *-ius*), *cognomen* (family name); for

¹ Origen in the translation of Rufinus given in Migne, P. G. XIV, 836. St. Jerome, De Viris Illustribus V.

² Acts XIII, 9.

³ Acts XXII, 7 and 13; XXVI, 14. Cf. Acts IX, 4 and 17.

⁴ Acts XXII, 25-29; XVI, 37. The author of Acts represents Paul as making the claim. Cf. Acts XXIII, 27.

example, *M. Tullius Cicero*.⁵ But Paul was also a Hebrew.⁶ Therefore his father, or some more distant male descendant, must have been made Roman either by the grant of freedom, if he were a slave, or by naturalization, if he were a free provincial or foreigner. A slave, when given freedom, would legally and regularly assume the *praenomen* and *nomen* of his master and would add his slave name as his *cognomen*,⁷ for example Cicero's freedman *M. Tullius Tiro*. Quite similarly a free foreigner, when granted Roman citizenship, would take the *praenomen* and *nomen* of the Roman who proposed him for the grant, or of the emperor who made the grant, and would retain his native name as his *cognomen*.⁸ Such a procedure must have been followed by Paul's ancestor, if he were a free provincial. A son, especially the oldest son, might retain the *tria nomina* of his father — he would retain the *nomen* — but might be given a different *praenomen* and *cognomen*. A native *cognomen* was very often dropped for a son in favor of a regular Roman *cognomen* of Latin or Italian origin.⁹

⁵ By the *Lex Iulia Municipalis*, put in force by Julius Caesar as dictator in 45 B.C., citizens living in *municipia*, *coloniae* and *praefecturae* of Italy were to be listed in the census by the *tria nomina*, *praenomen*, *nomen*, and *cognomen*. See C. G. Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui*, Tübingen, 1909 (7th ed.), no. 18, paragraphs 142–148. Cf. no. 10, of 112 B.C., paragraphs 14 and 17. This law shows clearly the form established long before the birth of Paul, and it continued long after. There are some exceptions, or apparent exceptions, known as late as the reign of Augustus. For example the famous historian Livy is known only as T. Livius. Of course by custom, and for convenience, in all forms of Roman literary works a man may be called by only one or two of his *tria nomina*.

⁶ Acts XXI, 37–XXII, 3; XXIII, 6. Philippians III, 1–6. Galatians I, 13–14.

⁷ A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1928, pp. 50–55.

⁸ Marquardt-Mommsen, *Manuel des Antiquités Romaines* XIV, I (*La Vie Privée des Romains*), Paris, 1892, p. 30 ff. Pauly-Wissowa, *Supplement I* (1903), s.v. *civitas* (by Kornemann), cols. 305 and 313. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, Paris, 1914, pp. 77–80. An excellent illustration is given by H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* I (1892), no. 1977, of a man C. Iulius Vepo who had been given citizenship by the emperor Augustus. The "C. Iulius" was taken from Augustus' personal name as the adopted son of Julius Caesar. Cicero gives an instance illustrating the taking of a Roman name and something of the legal procedure. In *Epistulae ad Familiares* XIII, 36, he tells that at his request P. Cornelius Dolabella had obtained citizenship from Caesar, when dictator, for a Greek of Sicily named Demetrius Megas. As then a Roman citizen Megas took for his *praenomen* and *nomen* P. Cornelius, from Dolabella, and retained *Megas* as his *cognomen*. These illustrations are of the time of Paul and his immediate ancestors.

⁹ Tenney Frank, *Race Mixture in the Roman Empire*, a study in the American His-

To these matters of custom and of law concerning the *tria nomina* of Roman citizens of foreign birth one other element of nomenclature must be added in an approach to the explanation of St. Paul's name. In the Greek East, possibly beginning in Macedonian Egypt, and later, certainly by the second century after Christ, spreading even to the West of the Roman Empire, it became customary among numbers of provincials and Roman citizens to add informally another name, a name by which a person was called among his acquaintances. This name, termed *signum* and *supernomen* among the Romans, was doubtless often given at birth, but might have been assumed later.¹⁰ It appears in large numbers of inscriptions and is connected normally with one or more of the other parts of a man's name by the expression δὲ καὶ, in Latin *qui et*. Sometimes connecting expressions such as δὲ ἐπικαλούμενος, δὲ λεγόμενος and others were used.

Now the text of the passage essential for an understanding of

torical Review XXI (1915/1916), pp. 689–708. Frank, in an examination of some 13,900 inscriptions of the common people of the city of Rome, found 1,347 in which the names of a father and son both appeared. From these he showed that of all *cognomina* found the Greek diminished in one generation from 64% to 38%. The fathers were "very prone to give Latin names to their children." See also A. M. Duff (p. 57), who has, however, misinterpreted Frank's calculations as referring only to freedmen. Caesar, Gallic War I, 47, gives an excellent example in a reference to a C. Valerius Procillus, son of C. Valerius Caburus who had been made a Roman citizen by C. Valerius Flaccus, Roman governor of Gaul. Cicero, Pro Archia X, 24, states that Pompey gave Roman citizenship to Theophanes of Mytilene, a writer of history. This man then took the name Cn. Pompeius Theophanes (*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* IV, 56); but his son was Pompeius Macer. See Prosopographia Imperii Romani vol. III, 67, 471. Another example, possibly from Paul's lifetime, comes in inscriptional form from Cyprus: the father is C. Ummidius Pantauchus, who may have received citizenship through a governor of Cyprus, C. Ummidius Quadratus. Pantauchus' son is named C. Ummidius Quadratus qui et Pantauchus. The inscription is in Greek. (I. G. R. III, 950; Prosopographia III (1st ed.), 468, 600.)

¹⁰ M. Lambertz, Zur Doppelnamigkeit in Ägypten, Jahresbericht über das K. K. Elisabeth-Gymnasium in Wien XXVI (1911). M. Lambertz, Zur Ausbreitung des Supernomen oder Signum im römischen Reiche, in Glotta IV (1913), pp. 78–143, and V (1914), pp. 99–170. This is by far the most important study of the use of δὲ καὶ and *qui et*. Bruno Doer, Die römische Namengebung, Stuttgart, 1937, and especially pp. 179–201. This is a useful study, but marred by the omission of any account of the names of Jewish Romans. Hélène Wuilleumier, Étude Historique sur l'Emploi et la Signification des Signa, in Mémoires à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres XIII (1933), pp. 559–696, while giving a splendidly analyzed listing of *signa*, has nothing to add for this study.

Paul's name, in Acts XIII, 9, shows: Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος. This reading is obviously an instance of the giving of the *signum* or *supernomen*. Jerome in translating the ὁ καὶ by the regular *qui et* evidently recognizes the almost technical nature of the expression. This most regular of the connecting expressions appears only here in the New Testament; but in references to other persons a few passages use the participial connectives for the same purpose.¹¹

It appears then certain that either *Saul* or *Paul* is the *signum* of the apostle, and since he was a Roman citizen, one of the names should be a part of his *tria nomina*. There is general agreement today that the name *Saul* is the same as that of Israel's first king, and the name *Paul* is Roman, belonging especially to the great Aemilian *gens*, one of whose members, L. Aemilius Paullus brought Macedonia under Roman sway.¹²

¹¹ Acts XIII, 1; Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ. Acts XII, 12: Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου. See on the same man Acts XII, 25 and XV, 37 for essentially the same expression. Acts I, 23: Ἰωσῆφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν, ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος, Acts IV, 36: Ἰωσῆφ δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων. Col. I V, 11: Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος. It is rather interesting to note that Christ himself is said to have given a "surname," *Boanerges*, to James and John (Mark III, 17), and of course, *Cephas* translated *Peter*, to Simon (John I, 42; Mark III, 16). The writer of Acts is particularly interested in recording the *signa* in the case of "John Mark" three separate times. It may be of some significance that, when a Roman (Latin) name is given with another, it always appears last. There are four individuals so designated. But it is not here my purpose to assert or to deny that they were Roman citizens. M. Lambertz, *Glotta* V (1914), p. 159, has shown from inscriptions that provincials in Syria and Asia Minor often took on a Latin name. He also proves that very often the *cognomen* and the *signum* have a similarity in sound, sometimes close, sometimes not. This custom may help as an indication that *Saul* and *Paul* are those two elements of the name, whatever the identity of each may be. But as the Greek form for *Paul* is Παῦλος, while for *Saul* it may have been Σαοὺλ (about which evidence will be presented), the point can not be emphasized. It can have no bearing at any rate on the problem of the time of the assumption of either name.

¹² See the excellent, though brief, presentation of various views in K. Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. IV (1933), pp. 145–146. There it is pointed out that "Augustine, using the meaning of the name, thinks that it is a reference to Paul's modesty, 'I am the least of the apostles' (Augustine, *De Spiritu. et litt. XII*, Serm. cclxxix. 5, cccxv. 5)." But Ausgutine's view assumes that Paul adopted the name *Paulus* himself, and that he was so well acquainted with Latin that he chose for himself a Latin adjective as a name, instead of some Greek term. Very unlikely. (See A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, New York, 1919 (3rd ed.), pp. 109 and 263.) Lake and Cadbury (*loc. cit.*) also point out that a German scholar in 1882 suggested that the name *Paul* came from a Hebrew root

It is here important to stress the conclusion of M. Lambertz in his thoroughgoing study on *signa* that the position of a name before or after δὲ καὶ does not fix its identity. The *signum* is found in either position.¹³ Of course when a Roman's name is given first in the full formal *tria nomina* and another name is added following δὲ καὶ, the added name is regularly the *signum*, but here that is not the situation.

Whatever part of the apostle's name *Saul* is, it is clear from the Acts that he had the name *Saul* from his early years.¹⁴ But when did he get the name *Paul*? The answer to this question will be of decisive importance. Diametrically opposed views have been and are held by eminent scholars. Some assert that Paul took the name, after his interesting experience in Cyprus with the Roman governor Sergius Paulus, to honor the governor or because he had converted him.¹⁵ Others, that he had the name *Paul* already and that after the visit to Cyprus he began to use it regularly, perhaps from association with the governor, and perhaps because he now began to carry the Gos-

meaning "chosen." This view has not won acceptance. That the name *Paullus* and the adjective *paullus* are one and the same word is doubtless true; but the word as a name in both Greek and Latin form had been known to the Roman world for centuries before Paul's time and was still in use in great senatorial families, as the name of the governor of Cyprus witnesses, and other illustrations are readily found of the use of the name in the Greek East. (See Prosopographia III, 1st ed., pp. 17–18, and I. G. R. IV, p. 626.) It seems certain then that it is the name *Paullus* with which we have to do. The varied spelling of the name is of no significance. In the Latin the name is spelled both *Paullus* (the correct form) and *Paulus*. In the Greek of the New Testament the form Παῦλος is used, and this form appears in inscriptions as well as Παῦλλος. (See the references immediately above.)

¹³ M. Lambertz in *Glotta* IV (1913), pp. 133 and 140; cf. pp. 130 and 131.

¹⁴ Acts VII, 58 and 60, at the stoning of Stephen, is the earliest mention. The reason that the apostle's father gave him the name *Saul* is probably to be found in the fact that the king and the apostle were both of the tribe of Benjamin. (Acts XIII, 21; Romans XI, 1; Philippians III, 5; I Samuel IX, 1–2 and 21.) H. J. Leon, *The Names of the Jews of Ancient Rome*, in *Transactions of the American Philological Association* LIX (1928), pp. 205–224, shows *inter alia* the use of Semitic *signa* at Rome by Jews.

¹⁵ In general see Lake and Cadbury, op. cit.; Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Berlin, vol. III (1923), pp. 196–197; H. Dessau, *Der Name des Apostels Paulus*, in *Hermes* XLV (1910), pp. 347–368; P. Andrien Boudou, S. J., *Verbum Salutis* VII — *Actes des Apôtres*, Paris, 1933, pp. 275–276; K. Lake and Silva Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York, 1937, pp. 83–84; Ernst Renan, *Saint Paul*, Paris, 1869, p. 18.

pel to the Gentiles.¹⁶ These and other related explanations must be evaluated.

But first a new factor should be introduced, one of great importance, and only very recently available to scholars. It has long been observed that in the Greek text of Acts the Greek adaptation Σαῦλος, very like Παῦλος, is invariably used except in the "vocatives," those passages where the voice from Heaven is heard, and where Ananias addresses the apostle. There the indeclinable form is Σαούλ, which is also used for King Saul in the Acts, and is doubtless derived from the Septuagint, where first this Greek approximation to the Hebrew name is to be found.¹⁷ However, in the Beatty Papyri, the earliest text of Acts by a century or so, and dating possibly not over 200 years from the apostle's lifetime, the Greek form Σαῦλος does not appear at all, but only the form Σαούλ, and fortunately several separate passages which contain it are preserved.¹⁸ This form not only

¹⁶ Sir William M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, New York, 1896, pp. 81-88; Adolf Deissmann, *Paul*, translated by William E. Wilson, Haddon and Stoughton, London, 1926 (2nd ed.), p. 91; Adolf Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 181-186; F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, in the Moffat New Testament Commentary, Richard R. Smith, New York, 1931; August Holland, *Saint Paul*, Paris, 1934, p. 35; J. Alec Findlay, *The Acts of the Apostles, A Commentary*, London, 1934, p. 132; F. A. Spencer, *Beyond Damascus*, Fr. Muller, London, 1935, pp. 171-174; C. T. Wood, *The Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1925, p. 50.

¹⁷ For Σαῦλος in the narrative passages, see Acts VII, 58 and 60 (VIII, 1); VIII, 3; IX, 11, 22, 24, and 26; XI, 25 and 30; XIII, 1, 2, 7, and 9. For the "vocatives," Σαούλ see Acts IX, 4 and 17; XXII, 7 and 13; XXVI, 14. The last reference describes the voice from Heaven as "in the Hebrew tongue." The Septuagint (e.g. Kings I, 9 and *passim*) gives Σαούλ for the king, and this is used also of the king in Acts XIII, 21.

¹⁸ F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus II, The Gospels and the Acts*, London, Emory Walker Limited, 1933; and the accompanying volume of Plates, 1934. For the form Σαούλ, indeclinable, see Acts VII, 58 (genitive case); IX, 24 (dative); XI, 30 (genitive); XIII, 7 (accusative). Kenyon gives all these as certain in his text. The Facsimiles are none too clear on XI, 30 and IX, 24, though in the latter the spelling with the three vowels Σαού is sure, and the λ may be. The scribe regularly writes an apostrophe after the last letter Σαούλ', indicating his awareness of the fact that he is giving a non-Greek indeclinable name, exactly as he does, for example, in the case of the names *Joseph*, *Abraham*, and *Jerusalem* (Acts VII, 13, 14, and 18; XIII, 26 and 27). This usage of the apostrophe for Hebrew names is found of course in other early manuscripts, though not in the case of the name *Saul*. It means that a regular Greek termination is not used, and does not mean that the scribe is omitting an ending. For the use of the apostrophe in other manuscripts see W. H. P. Hatch, *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament*, Chicago, The

lacks a Greek termination, but includes an extra vowel, *omicron*, not found in the “Greek” spelling. Now if the Greek scribe of the Beatty text of the Acts had the developed Greek form Σαῦλος before him in the manuscript from which he was copying, it seems very improbable that he would change to the Hebrew-like Σαούλ. In all probability he had Σαούλ before him. This reasoning suggests that the form Σαούλ was actually the name of the apostle.

A suggestion for the history of the development of the spelling is here appropriate. The translators of the Septuagint introduced the form Σαούλ, as has been stated, for the name of King Saul. The writer of the Acts accepted this form too for the king, and accepted it not only in the “vocatives” for the apostle, but as the Beatty Papyri indicate, throughout. Interesting is the use of Josephus, whose works were written at about the same time as the Acts. He, and the Greek scholars who assisted him, tend to give Greek endings to Hebrew names. So the name *Saul* appears as Σάουλος the form of the Septuagint plus a Greek ending.¹⁹ Clement,²⁰ about 100 A.D., still keeps the spelling Σαούλ for the king’s name. The Beatty Papyri, a century and over later, preserve the form. The other later manuscripts of the New Testament give for the apostle, not for the king, Σαῦλος, a form not in the Septuagint nor in Josephus. It will be remembered that the spelling for *Paul* is invariably Παῦλος. It seems then extremely likely that at some time in the third or fourth century, under the influence of analogy, the form Σαῦλος was created to match Παῦλος. But even after this change in spelling of the apostle’s name *Saul* in the Greek New Testament the distinction was being kept there and elsewhere between the spelling of the name of the king and

University of Chicago Press, 1939; plates VI, XI, and XXI, from the third to fifth centuries.

¹⁹ Josephus, Antiquities VI, 9, 170 ff. In the Jewish War II, 556 and 558, he uses the same form for an individual of the time of Nero; but in II, 418 the form Σαῦλος appears for the same man, probably by error in copying, cf. Ant. XX, 214. In Jewish War II, 469 another individual is called Σάουλος. In V, 51 (Loeb text) Γαβάθ Σαούλ is interpreted λόφον Σαούλον. The accentuation of the various forms seems pretty well established, but Naber (Teubner, 1895), Jewish War II, 556 and 558, gives Σαοῦλος.

²⁰ Clement, To the Corinthians I, cap. IV, 13.

of the apostle. And Jerome, in his Latin New Testament, gives *Saul* for the king, but for the apostle, uses *Saulus*, and in the vocative, *Saule*.²¹

If this is so, if the Beatty Papyri present the correct form for the name *Saul*, then the name may be identified as the *signum* of the apostle and not as one of his Roman *tria nomina*. The *tria nomina* are forms which can be regularly declined with regular case endings,²² while Σαοῦλ has none. Σαοῦλ would never do as a Roman name, but as a native name given as a *signum* to a Roman citizen it will do very well indeed. That is a common practice, as Lambertz' study shows in countless places, while it is true that in most instances the foreign names have taken on Greek or Latin endings.²³ Παῦλος is then not the *signum*, but is one of the *tria nomina*, in all probability the *cognomen*, as that

²¹ In two inscriptions found in Christian churches of Gerasa, very late it is true, but possibly not under literary influence, the spelling Σαῶλας has been lately found, probably representing *Saul*. See Carl H. Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, New Haven, 1938, p. 479, no. 304, and p. 487, no. 335, dated in 526 and in 511. See also A. H. M. Jones, *Inscriptions from Jerash*, *Journal of Roman Studies XVIII* (1928), p. 168, no. 35. In the two inscriptions the name appears in the same case, the genitive, Σαῶλα, of which the nominative is probably Σαῶλας. Tertullian, around 200 A.D., uses in Latin, for the name of the king, *Saul*, but definitely puts it in the third declension. See *Adversus Marcionem II*, 23 and 24; V, 1. Cyprian, about 50 years later, in *Epistulae XIII*, II, 2, gives a nominative *Saul*. The Old Testament (Vulgate) appears to use both the indeclined form and the third declensional form, as readily appears from a reading of I Kings IX. It may then be possible that Tertullian established for Latin the third declensional form of *Saul*. But in the Old Latin version of the Acts (Palimpsest Floriacensis) the second declensional form clearly appears, *Saulus* and *Saule*, for the apostle. See Old Latin Biblical Texts: No. V, ed. by E. S. Buchanan, Oxford, 1907, p. 114, text of Acts VII, 58–60 and IX, 4. Jerome then is evidently following the Old Latin in this, and he uses the second declensional form also in *De Viris Illustribus V*, for the apostle; but in *Chronicon*, adapted from Eusebius, he has the nominative *Saul*, for the king. See Rudolf Helm's edition, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 65. And in his Letters Jerome seems to use both the indeclined and the third declensional form for the name of the king, while keeping the second declensional form for the apostle. See *Epistulae XXIX*, 3, 2 and 7; 6, 2; LIII, 8, 5; CXXI, 6, 16; also *In Hieremiam VI*, 34. Augustine shows the same differentiation. See *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. LVIII (1923), pp. 281 and 315, ed. Al. Goldbacher. This differentiation in the Latin may be an added proof of the contention that the Greek spelling Σαῦλος comes by analogy from Παῦλος.

²² See for example L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions*, Princeton, 1916. Dean lists some 1,333 different *cognomina* and some 5,700 persons, all Roman citizens. Incidentally the name *Saul* does not appear among them.

²³ Lambertz, *op. cit.* (1914), pp. 113, 114, 165 and *passim*.

is its normal Roman use, but barely possibly the *praenomen*,²⁴ or given name. This result carries with it inevitably the conclusion that the name *Paul* was then the apostle's from youth, either given him by his parents, or, as a *cognomen*, possibly an inheritance from his father, who was also a Roman citizen.

The arguments of scholars who have agreed that the name *Paul* was the apostle's before the episode in Cyprus must now be briefly stated. Deissmann insists that the statement of the name in Acts XIII, 9, Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, does not mean that the apostle then changed his name, but only that he changed from his former use of *Saul* to his future use of *Paul*. Sir William Ramsay points out that it was a custom in the bilingual sections of the Greek East for every Easterner to bear also a Greek name, and that the situation of the moment might determine which name a man would use. This will apply, he thinks, to *Saul-Paul*. In earlier days among the Jews he preferred *Saul*; now before the Roman governor of Cyprus he stresses *Paul* showing his own Roman standing. Foakes-Jackson states that it is not probable that Luke intends us to believe that the apostle dropped his Hebrew for a Roman appellation. The purpose of the change in the name by which the apostle is called is to prepare the reader for the work of the apostle among the Gentiles. Lake and Cadbury point out that the passage may mark a "Paul" source, that is, documentary material available to Luke, which used the name *Paul*, while his materials for the earlier part of Acts used *Saul*; that there is here marked a coincidence of name with that of the proconsul; that for the first time the writer was dealing with Gentile surroundings. J. Alec Findlay is in essential agreement with the review of opinions stated by Foakes-Jackson, and adds: "It is difficult to believe that Paul was snobbish enough to take his new name from his first distinguished convert!"²⁵

²⁴ As a *cognomen* the form is known for centuries. As a *praenomen* it was given in Augustus' time to Paullus Fabius Maximus, whose family, related to the Aemilian Paullus family, evidently wanted to keep the great name, and so made a *praenomen* from a *cognomen*. The same may be said of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus. Both these men were consuls, and were proconsuls of the province of Asia — hence known to some extent in the Greek East. See Prosopographia I (1st ed.), 32, 250 and II, 48, 38.

²⁵ See note 16, above, for the references.

On the other hand H. Dessau's scholarly study brought him to the conclusion that the apostle took his name *Paul* from the governor of Cyprus, Sergius Paullus. Dessau's arguments, though now to a degree antiquated by later evidence, are still more important to the question than any others, and they are championed, though not strengthened, by Eduard Meyer,²⁶ and have been supplemented by E. Groag.²⁷

Dessau begins with a brief discussion of the views of ancient scholars which are worth repeating. Jerome²⁸ took the position in more than one work that *Saul* assumed the name *Paul* because of his victory over Sergius Paullus, that is his conversion of the governor, as Scipio took the name *Africanus*. The answer to this position is that there is no proof of it, that the parallel with Scipio and others is not valid, that the taking over of a man's name in any such way is unheard of. Rufinus, a contemporary of Jerome, possibly reproducing Origen, does not deny the view of Jerome entirely, but on the basis of popular precedent thinks that the apostle had these two names before the episode in Cyprus.

Dessau thinks it strange that it should have occurred to Paul's parents, living so far in the East, to give him a Latin name. But when one considers that they lived in Tarsus, a busy metropolis of a Roman province often visited by prominent Romans after the middle of the first century B.C., e.g. Cicero, Caesar, Mark Antony,²⁹ that they were themselves Roman citizens and that several Jewish associates of Paul had Roman names,³⁰ to say nothing of the fact that *Paullus* was a Roman name already widely known in the Roman Empire in both Greek and Latin form, and that, as we have shown, Romanized foreigners very often gave their sons Roman names, Dessau's objection has little weight. Dessau again states that the assumption of the name *Paul* was really a change of *cognomen*, and that this is not unheard of even though not common. It is in fact extremely uncommon. Moreover, if the name

²⁶ See note 15, above, for the studies of Dessau and Meyer.

²⁷ Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie II. A. (1923), col. 1716, s.v. Sergius Paullus.

²⁸ Dessau, cp. cit., p. 349. Lake and Cadbury, p. 145.

²⁹ Ruge in Pauly-Wissowa IV (1932), col. 2413 ff., s.v. Tarsos.

³⁰ Dessau, p. 366/7. See also above, note 11.

Paul was assumed in Cyprus, it would be more in accordance with the custom in the Greek East to consider it an added name, a *signum*. Dessau's study here suffers from a lack of information which Lambertz' later work would have given him. The δ καὶ connecting the *Saul* and *Paul* surely has been shown by this study to be a practical proof of the association of the *signum* with part of the formal *tria nomina*. Dessau thinks that the apostle, now in Cyprus, engaged in his first great missionary journey, with the possible thought of continuing on into Pamphylia and Pisidia on the mainland, felt the need of a name familiar to Greeks and Romans and took that of the governor with whom he had had an interesting and successful meeting. Finally Dessau finds it a very strange coincidence, if the apostle happened to be the possessor of the very same *cognomen* that the proconsul had.

It is indeed a strange coincidence which demands explanation. Why does Luke in the account of the meeting with the governor first call the apostle *Paul*, the only name by which he is known in Acts and Epistles alike thereafter? The governor is a well authenticated person. His name in the form Σεργίω Παῦλω is supported by all the great manuscripts and, fortunately, is preserved also in the Beatty Papyri.³¹ In Latin he is known by official inscriptional evidence as L. Sergius Paullus, of the senatorial order.³² His position in Cyprus shows that he was probably an ex-praetor, a man of the same class and rank as

³¹ F. G. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 45. To Tertullian also he is known, undoubtedly from the passage in Acts, in his *De Idololatria*, cap. IX. This passage is an early and additional support for the form of the proconsul's name.

³² C. I. L. VI, 31545. See also the admirable presentation by Kiropp Lake in F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kiropp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. V, Additional Notes to the Commentary, London, 1933, pp. 455–459. With their statement on the uncertainty of the reference to the governor Paullus in a Greek inscription of Cyprus, I would agree. But I would rather strongly insist on the identification of Sergius Paullus of Cyprus with L. Sergius Paullus of the Latin inscription from Rome. This man by his position was probably an ex-praetor, and he certainly was serving as *curator* at Rome in the rule of Claudius. This fits perfectly with the known chronology of the governor of Cyprus. I would add that the Roman Senate of the period consisted of only some 600 men. (O'Brien Moore in *Pauly-Wissowa Supplementband VI* (1935), cols. 760–761.) In no one generation are we at all likely to find two senators of the same name and of approximately the same position. Moreover, the name *Sergius Paullus* is very rare. The case for identity is then very strong.

Gallio of Achaia, whom Paul was to meet some years later. From a practical point of view the favorable impression which the apostle made on a man of such high rank could be very useful, and Paul may well have taken great satisfaction from this meeting. Nothing of the later career of Sergius Paullus is known; but it is known that the family probably, or, at any rate, Paullus' son and daughter and descendants had a home in or had close connections with the important Roman colony, Antioch in Pisidia,³³ the very place to which Paul went almost directly after leaving Cyprus.³⁴

Here is another coincidence in the lives of the apostle and the governor, and one which has not received the attention it deserves except in Groag's study.³⁵ He alone has suggested that the favorable attitude of the governor may have resulted in advice and assistance to Paul and a suggestion about the city of Antioch. In support of this is another item of the itinerary — Paul met the governor in the city of Paphos and from that city he and his companions sailed to the mainland, though there were other ports and though they had not yet very

³³ The inscriptional evidence is excellent. Lake (see above, note 32) has paid little attention to it, and seems not to know of Groag's studies in *Pauly-Wissowa II*, A (1923), cols. 1715–1721, nos. 34, 35, and 52. See also for inscriptions the study by G. L. Cheeseman, *The Family of the Caristanii at Antioch in Pisidia*, *Journal of Roman Studies III* (1913), pp. 253–266. Also Sir William Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, ed. 4, London, 1920, p. 150 ff.; p. 285 ff. I agree with Lake in not accepting all Ramsay's interpretations and especially his idea that the whole Paullus family became Christians.

First there is known at Antioch *Sergia Paulla*, daughter of *Lucius*, and wife of *C. Caristanius Fronto*, governor of *Lycia* and *Pamphylia* under *Titus* and then *Domitian*, that is, about 81 A.D. This woman on the basis of her name, her father's name, her rank, the time, was in all probability daughter of *Sergius Paullus* of *Cyprus*. Then in another inscription of Antioch we are given by Ramsay (*The Bearing etc.* p. 151) the name of a senator, *L. Sergius L. f. Paullus filius etc.* The inscription, not dated but of lettering "of about 60–100 A.D." is doubtless of the son, or grandson of the governor of *Cyprus*. Again the same inscription which gives information about *Paulla* gives the name *C. Caristanius Paulinus*, her son, whose name indicates the union of the *Sergian* and *Caristanian* families. See *Prosopographia II* (2nd ed.), 1936, pp. 100–101 on all these persons.

³⁴ *Acts XIII*, 12–14. On Antioch and Paul's route see Jean Bérard, *Les Itinéraires de Saint Paul en Asie Mineure*, in *Revue Archéologique V* (1935), pp. 60–70.

³⁵ See note 33. Groag also, like Dessau, wants to associate this situation with the assumption of the name *Paul* by the apostle, but with no other proof.

thoroughly covered Cyprus in their tour.³⁶ This suggestion has not been made before; but Ramsay³⁷ suggested some years ago that the trip from Perge, after the voyage from Cyprus, to Antioch was due to an illness of Paul, possibly malaria, brought on by the unhealthy conditions of the coastal region. That Paul was ill at Antioch, or in that region, may be true; but it is not necessary to conclude that he went to Antioch because of illness. The passage, Galatians IV, 13, if it may be applied to this "first" journey, may simply mean that he remained at Antioch, or some one of the Galatian cities, from illness.³⁸ Nothing of this illness is in the Acts. Moreover, there is a passage in Acts XV, 38 which certainly states that Paul and Barnabas then went from Pamphylia to Antioch "to the work." That there had been a change of plan for the tour made at Paphos or at Perge seems clear from the fact that after they reached the mainland John Mark left them, very much against Paul's wishes,³⁹ and returned to Jerusalem. Ramsay⁴⁰ suggests that Mark was unwilling to go so far inland when Paul was forced to do so by his illness. An explanation equally logical, and much

³⁶ Strabo, Geography XIV, 6. A reading of this passage with the account in Acts XIII, 4 ff. and the map of Cyprus shows the evidence. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, op. cit., p. 224, state: "Probably one reason for going to Antioch was its large Jewish colony." This may well have been a factor, as Acts XIII tells of a Jewish synagogue there. Lake's reference, however, to Josephus apparently has to do with Antioch in Syria.

³⁷ Sir William M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, Putnam's, New York, 1893, pp. 59-66.

³⁸ The place of his illness was not necessarily Antioch at all. The letter which contains the passage is addressed to the Galatians, city not specified. *δι' ἀσθετείαν . . .* in all probability means "owing to infirmity of the flesh," and not "in a time of illness." See Frederic Rendall on the passage in the Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. R. Nicoll, New York, vol. III (1903), p. 178. See also C. T. Wood, *The Life, Letters and Religion of St. Paul*, Edinburgh, 1925, p. 51. If the reference in Galatians IV, 13 should be applied to another later trip, then Ramsay's entire explanation would not belong here and would be pointless. On the chronological question involved, see A. D. Nock, *St. Paul*, New York, 1938, pp. 119 and 161.

³⁹ Acts XIII, 13; XV, 36-39. The passages state that Paul, long after the event, was so angry at Mark's desertion that he and Barnabas quarreled, and after that were no longer associated in the missionary work. Emphasis on the importance of the work at Antioch seems also to be given by Luke in placing the locale of Paul's first long sermon in that city, and in assigning to that episode also the apostles' expressed intention, "we turn to the Gentiles." See Acts XIII, 14-48.

⁴⁰ Cf. note 37.

more to John Mark's credit, is at hand if the suggestion that the plan to go to Antioch was made at Paphos is accepted. Then John Mark may have decided during the voyage from Cyprus that he would not go further, or he may have been permitted to make the voyage with them to the mainland which then would enable him to go to Jerusalem on foot.

If these explanations seem valid, the fact that the mention of the name *Paul* first occurs in the episode concerning Sergius Paullus is to be explained on the very coincidence of the names, and in the plan made to carry the gospel far into Asia Minor, entirely new territory. The apostle assumes now (the author of Acts seems to say) the regular use of his regular *cognomen Paul* because of the association with the governor and possibly because of the increasingly frequent contact with Greeks and Romans, which he saw must be ahead of him.⁴¹

But it could, of course, be supposed — and eminent scholars have asserted it — that the name *Paul* may have been first taken by the apostle in Cyprus, in which case *Paul* would be the *signum*, according to the custom of the Greek East, and *Saul* would be his Roman *cognomen* from birth. This conclusion, however, involves the assumption that the Hebraic Σαούλ had already been given a Greek form Σάουλος, as in Josephus long after the apostle's birth, or Σαῦλος, the form appearing in most New Testament manuscripts.⁴² This conclusion further involves the assumption that the Beatty Papyri text is incorrect for the name, and of course is a denial of the proof advanced above that the spelling Σαῦλος comes by analogy from

⁴¹ Behind these suggestions lies obviously an assumption of the essential historicity of the episodes on this topic given in the Acts about Paul. In this position this study differs little, when at all, from the works cited on either side of the main question here at issue. If, however, the use of the name *Saul* up to the episode in Cyprus and the use of the name *Paul* thereafter should prove to be only a device of narrative on the part of the author of Acts, one might readily conclude that the meeting with the governor Paullus made a great impression on the writer, with nothing known of its impression on Paul. If one advance to a denial or serious question of the historicity of the narrative in Acts on Paul's name, it could appear that we know one thing alone in this matter, namely that the apostle calls himself *Paul* in his Letters. The evidence of this paper as to how and why a Jewish Roman could very properly have a Roman, Latin *cognomen* and a Jewish *signum* would still stand. I am indebted to Prof. A. D. Nock, of Harvard, for the suggestion of caution set forth in this note.

⁴² Roman citizens' names are regularly declinable. See above, and note 22.

Παῦλος. It also necessarily means that a grown Roman citizen took on as *signum* the name of another Roman citizen, for which one knows no precedent. Finally, it denies the custom which so often led Romanized foreigners to give their sons full Roman names.

We may claim then at least probability in favor of a view that the apostle was named *Paul* from birth, with *Saul* as his *signum*. Progress in the solution of the problem seems difficult unless by good luck still other papyri of the Acts are found or other inscriptions concerning the governor Paullus. We do not know Paul's *praenomen* or *nomen*. Perhaps they may have come from the great Aemilian family as well as the *cognomen*. In such case his Roman name might have read Λ. Ἀιμίλιος Παῦλος δ καὶ Σαούλ or in Latin dress, L. Aemilius Paullus qui et Saul.