

St. Paul and the Shroud

by *Lennox Manton*

Collegamento pro Sindone Internet – June 2003

© All rights reserved

It seems best to begin at the beginning! Acts firstly starts with the appointment of Matthias as an Apostle to take the place of Judas, and then follows on with a description of their activities in Jerusalem in spreading the Gospel and doing good works (Acts 1-4); as a result the Sanhedrin rounds them up but eventually lets them go with a warning (Acts 4:21). However, they still persevered in attracting many converts who sold up their possessions to give to the Church, which is where Barnabas, a Levite of Cyprus who sold up his land there to join the Apostles, is first mentioned. The subsequent activities of the Apostles again lead them to be brought before the Sanhedrin who wish to put them to death, but they are reprieved by the intervention of Rabbi Gamaliel. Many more converts join the Church and Stephen is chosen to further proclaim the Gospel, which he fervently does to the extent that he is denounced by the Libertines [thought to have been at some time Roman political or military prisoners who had subsequently become freedmen and with their own Synagogue; they were Stephen's chief accusers]. This resulted in the stoning of Stephen and the first mention of Paul in Acts who consented unto his death and subsequently made 'havoc of the Church' (Acts 8:1,3). It is not clear as to whether Paul was in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion but apparently not, only coming onto the scene during the post Crucifixion activities of the Apostles which seem to have been very assertive.

Acts 9:1 begins with Luke's account of Paul's conversion on the Damascus road which could have taken place around A.D. 34-35, the Crucifixion having taken place around A.D. 31. The exact circumstances of his conversion appear not to have been resolved, apart from Theological causes. I feel that some medical phenomena was certainly involved as he was left with a temporary blindness that could well have been of an hysterical nature in that it was relieved by Ananias in Damascus. In those days the journey from Jerusalem to Damascus was not easy and could have been strenuous. Did he walk, or ride a donkey? Verse 8 suggests that he was waking, but this could have been on the last stage after his blindness when he was led by the hand. However he journeyed, it was a long way by caravan taking some six days or so. I drove the route he could have taken in 1940 from Jerusalem through Samaria and Nazareth, Galilee, lake Hula, [that the Israelis have now drained and in so doing have completely upset the ecology], and under Mount Hermon to Damascus. Paul gives a second account in Acts 22:5-13, that follows the first account up to verse 17, which seems to be out of context.

Acts 9:20 states that Paul immediately took the Gospel to the Damascene Jews to the extent that they, expecting him to denounce the Apostolic teaching, found him now proclaiming it, and decided to liquidate him, which resulted in Ananias organising his escape over the wall by night in a basket. Only in Paul's letter to the Galatians does he mention the fact, in 1:17, that he did not go up to Jerusalem but went into Arabia and then returned to Damascus, and it was then after three years that he went up to Jerusalem to see the Apostles (verse 18); this would seem to indicate that he spent some three years in Arabia and Damascus following his conversion and having his sight restored by Ananias. Paul also in his second letter to the Corinthians mentions that it was the troops of Aretas who sought to apprehend him (11:32-33) [the only time Aretas is mentioned in the N.T.] and this no doubt at the instigation of the Damascene Jews. The Aretas he mentions, and only on this occasion, was Aretas IV the king of Petra, the then capital of Arabia Petrea where there was a very civilized and sophisticated culture. Daily caravans plied between Petra and Damascus bringing exotic goods from the far East via the gulf of Aquaba, the Queen of Sheba's route when Solomon went to

welcome her with 'all the powders of a merchant'. The caravans left at dawn to arrive at dusk at the next caravanserai, for protection at night. Paul would have picked up one of these outside the walls of Damascus, and spent the two years in Petra, out of the way of the Sanhedrin. After his conversion in no way could he have possibly gone back to Jerusalem to face the wrath of the Sanhedrin, and there was no where else safe enough for him to go.

This course of events, however, does not fit in with theological thought that maintains Paul went into Arabia after he had recovered from his blindness and weakness, to then come back to Damascus after two years had elapsed in Arabia, and to then preach the Gospel to the Jews who sought to kill him. It was then when he escaped to go to the Apostles in Jerusalem to seek to become one of them. To me this is not the logical way. After two years away in Arabia, Paul's original visit would have been history to the Damascene Jews. The discrepancy in the first account in Acts, where Arabia is not mentioned, lies between verses 25 and 26 in Acts 9. Verses 26 onwards is the description of Paul's movements following his return to Damascus after two years in Arabia, to then leave for Jerusalem and go with Barnabas to the Apostles to be accepted on the recommendation of Barnabas to be counted as one of themselves. It didn't work out. In Acts 9:29 he is recorded as having been 'so bold in the name of Jesus' in his preaching to the Judean churches that the Apostles had to get him out of Jerusalem and down to Caesarea where they saw to it that he took the boat home to Tarsus.

This is the background to the first question that has been suggested. When on his way to Damascus to effect the Sanhedrin persecutions, was a sight of the Shroud at that time in any way a catalyst that could have brought about his conversion? If the Shroud was being transported at that time on the Damascus road the question is, by whom, why, where to, and to whom in Damascus. None of the Apostles were on that journey and it is not likely, in the face of the then tension that pertained with the Sanhedrin, that the Apostles would have entrusted it to a third party. The answer is that it was not on the Damascus road. The question then arises, did Paul see it in Jerusalem? Paul's visit to the Apostles with Barnabas must be the same visit as described by Paul in Galatians 1:17. In verses 15-16 he refers to his conversion on the Damascus road, in 17 he states that he did not go up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me, but went into Arabia, to then return to Damascus and after three years [the time spent in Arabia and Damascus] to go back to Jerusalem to see Peter and abide with him fifteen days. Of the other Apostles only James the brother of Jesus was present. However he does say that he returned to Tarsus after having preached to the Churches in Judea, who had heard that it was he who had persecuted them in the past. This is Paul's version of the visit that Luke has recorded in Acts 9. Did the Apostles show the Shroud to Paul on the occasion of this visit? At this juncture in Paul's career it is not likely. In spite of the recommendations of Barnabas and Paul's apparent change of heart is it likely that the Apostles, if they then still had it in their keeping and not being assured of Paul's integrity, would have taken the risk.

Of Paul's activities during the next twelve to fourteen years nothing has been recorded. Did he remain in Tarsus for any length of time? It could have been difficult for the family being, as they were, dedicated Pharisees of the house of Benjamin, and it is not likely that he would have remained quiet during these years. There are a number of legends and traditions still in the Cappadocian valleys that relate to Paul having been in the region: they are quite credible in view of the district being very remote and difficult of access and an ideal location for early Christian Anchorites who certainly migrated there.

When Barnabas was instructed by the Apostles to go and help the Church in Antioch he asked for the help of Paul. Acts 11: 25-26, 'Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus to seek Saul. And when he had found him he brought him unto Antioch,' which suggests that Paul was not, at that time, in Tarsus, but possibly in Cappadocia that was not that far distant. After having spent a year in organising the Church in Antioch Paul and Barnabas had a visit from Agabus telling them of famine in Jerusalem and asking for donations to help the Judean churches; donations that were taken to Jerusalem by

Paul and Barnabas. This would have been around A.D.45-46 when Claudius was Emperor. By this time the Jerusalem Church was suffering under the persecutions of Herod who had killed James and imprisoned Peter, who later escaped to visit the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, to warn the other Apostles of his escape, before he went into hiding until the death of Herod in Caesarea from acute appendicitis not so long after (Acts 12:23). When Paul and Barnabas eventually returned to Antioch they took Mark with them.

The question now arises. Did Paul and Barnabas see the Shroud during this visit?. It would seem not to be very likely. If the Apostles still had it in their keeping it would have been safely hidden in view of the persecutions of Herod and the absence of Peter, who must have left Jerusalem after escaping from prison, and not to return till after the death of Herod. Acts 12:17 'and he [Peter] departed and went into another place.' Did the Apostles at this juncture still have the Shroud? It is a moot point, By now some fourteen years or so had elapsed since the Crucifixion.

The first Missionary journey began around A.D. 47-48. The first intent was to take the Gospel to Cyprus where Barnabas used to have property. But it transpired that the Gospel was so ill received and with such hostility by the Jews of the Diaspora that the Apostles were forced to leave. However, Paulus the Roman Governor whom Paul converted, had considerable family estates and influence in Pisidian Antioch and it must have been he who sent them to Pisidian Antioch and possibly with letters of introduction. The first stop was Perge that lies inland a short distance from the port of Antalya. From there the great Via Sebaste, one of the major paved roads laid down by Augustus, went through the Taurus Mountains near the modern town of Dosmealty, and then via Colonia towns such as Comem and Appolonia. that had protection from the Roman Legions, hence the designation of 'Colonia'. When on one of her travels through Asia Minor Dame Freya Stark discovered and recorded finding the remains of this road near the town of the Dosmealty and when David French, the then Director of the British Archaeological Institute in Ankara, read her record and went to the site he found the milestone of Augustus that confirmed by inscription that this was the pass of the Great Sebaste through the Taurus Mountains.

Pisidian Antioch had a significant population of the Diaspora, it was worth their while in view of the opportunities for trade provided by the presence of the occupying Roman Legion: posted there by Augustus to counteract the raids from the Pisidian tribes that were in the surrounding mountains. Also in Pisidian Antioch there was a large temple with its complement of priests to the Galatian God Men, the god of the family worshipped chiefly in Ancyra, today's Ankara. This must have been a source of some annoyance to Paul! The Jews stirred up the populace to eject Paul and Barnabas from the City [Mark had left them in Perge and gone home to Jerusalem, he must have been only in his late teens or early twenties, and was obviously fed up with Paul and the whole excursion. Paul only forgave him when in Rome, whilst waiting for his trial before Nero and Mark was there as Peter's companion].

Having left Pisidian Antioch there was only one option and that was to follow the Via Sebaste to Konya. The Jews from Antioch came down to Konya and by stirring up the inhabitants had them evicted from the city, whereupon the Apostles took the Sebaste to Lystra that was not so far distant. Lystra was essentially a Pagan city where the Apostles were received as gods, but there were some Jews in the town, including the family of Timothy, in whose house he began the Church. However the Jews of Antioch followed them from Lystra, had Paul stoned and again evicted, but the Via Sebaste ended at Lystra. From there to Derbe was a mud track, a considerable distance that was extremely hot in summer as it crossed the Konya Plain, and almost impassable in winter. H. V. Morton when exploring Paul's journey was bogged down there in the late nineteen thirties. For the Apostles there was no other option; they could not go back in view of the hostility of the Pisidian Jews, they had to go on to reach Derbe, that is now the Turkish town of Karaman. As the paved Via Sebaste ended at Lystra the Jews did not follow them. Derbe was an agricultural town without a Jewish community, it wasn't worth their while, there was little trade for them, and the Apostles stayed for a year before quietly returning back through Lystra Konya and Pisidian Antioch to return

to Antioch by boat from Antalya. There was another way home by going through the Taurus to today's Silifke on the coast, but this was dangerous as it descended through the mountains that were the home of hostile tribes.

The course of the first Missionary Journey was not premeditated from the start but developed through force of circumstance, and the course of the paved Via Sebaste. During the Journey Paul set up his churches in the house of his converts, Timothy of Lystra and Gaius of Derbe, who surfaces later on in Corinth. Lystra was situated in the district known as Lycaonia and Konya in Pisidia. Around 270 B.C. the tribes of the Tectosages from Gaul, the region of today's Toulouse, emigrated to the regions of Ancyra, today's Ankara, and established the district of Galatia with Ancyra the capital. Around 14 B.C. Augustus incorporated into the overall Province of Galatia the regions of Pisidia, Lycaonia, and Derbe, so that the towns of Pisidian Antioch, Konya, Lystra, and Derbe were absorbed into the overall province of Galatia. It is to these Churches that the letter to the Galatians is addressed. It is very doubtful, though some say he did, go to Ancyra and set up a Church there. The letter to the Galatians was not addressed to Ancyra in the district of Northern Galatia.

On the second and third journeys Paul is always at pains to firstly visit the Galatian churches of Derbe, Lystra and Antioch, picking up Timothy of Lystra when on the course of the Second Journey and circumcising him before they reach Konya to avoid any Jewish confrontation when on the way. The date of the Epistle is conjectural. Some authorities think it was the first to be written at some time after the first journey, but it could have been written when Paul was in Rome waiting to be brought before Nero. During that Period Epaphras came from Colossae to tell him of his concern regarding the retrograde behaviour of the churches with which Paul was concerned, turning aside from the Gospel, listening to false teachers and indulging in questionable, as far as Paul was concerned, behaviour, thus initiating his letter to the Colossians and Philemon.

The question is, did Paul ever have the Shroud with him when on these journeys, as suggested in Galatians 3:1 'O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth [that is listening to false prophets] before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you,' and to further admonish them as to their behaviour. It is very evident that Paul and Barnabas could not have had the Shroud with them when on the first Journey. The course of the journey was not according to a preconceived plan but through the force of circumstance that brought about the foundation of the Galatian Churches. He is stressing the import of the Crucifixion and the Gospel that he set before them at that time which culminated in their joining the Apostolic Church, 'before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth crucified among you' and pointing out how foolish they are not to obey the truth.

Not long after the end of the first journey Paul and Barnabas left Antioch to go up to Jerusalem to settle the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles. Those Gentiles who were willing to accept the Gospel were not willing to undergo circumcision as a prerequisite, to them it was a mutilation, and Paul was quick to realise that to be successful in promoting the Gospel amongst them he could not enforce on them the rite of circumcision. They were circumcised in the mind. 1 Cor. 7:19. Romans 2:25-29.3:30. Gal. 5:2.6. Gal. 6:12.15. Col. 2:11. An account of the meeting with the Apostles is given in Acts 15:1-35. A further account of the meeting is recorded in Gal. 2:1-9 which confirms that it was the uncircumcised Titus who went with Paul and Barnabas, but Titus is not named in Acts 15:2. 'that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them,' namely, Titus. The upshot was that Paul should take the Gospel to the Galatians who would maintain their Status Quo whereas the Apostles would concentrate on the Circumcised.

There is nothing in these accounts to suggest the fact that Paul was shown the Shroud at any time during this visit. Not long after the meeting with the Apostles in Jerusalem Peter came down to Antioch to see Paul, but in the course of the visit refused in the end to eat with the Gentiles, due to their uncircumcised state, and to placate those Jews who had recently arrived from Jerusalem, an action that Barnabas endorsed and one that brought about the situation whereby Paul 'withstood Peter to the face because he was to be blamed,' Gal. 2:11. It is fortuitous that Paul won the

argument regarding the circumcision of the Gentiles, had he not done so all males throughout history would have had to have undergone ritual circumcision, willy-nilly, and not as a matter of choice or necessity!

From that time on Peter is mentioned only in passing and on rare occasions in Paul's letters, and from thence on there are somewhat frosty relations between him and the Apostles. Paul does not ever forgive the Apostles for refusing to regard him as truly one of themselves. This is clearly brought out in his letters which almost invariably begin such as in Romans 1. 'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle [Damascus Road] separated unto the Gospel of God.' 1 Corinthians 1. 'Paul, called to be an Apostle' etc. 2 Corinthians 1. 'Paul, an Apostle of Christ by the Will of God.' Galatians 1:1 'Paul, an Apostle not of man neither of men but by Jesus Christ.' Ephesians 1:1 'Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the Will of God,' and so in Colossians and the Epistles to Timothy. He also complains in 1 Corinthians 15:9. that 'I am the least of the Apostles that am not fit to be called an Apostle because I persecuted God, but by the grace of God I am.' In such a marked antipathy that Paul had to the Apostles during his career, and no doubt reciprocated, would they have ever entrusted the Shroud into his keeping as has been suggested?

The Second Missionary Journey began around A.D.47-48. In view of Mark's defection when they were in Perge Paul refused to have him with them. As a result Barnabas also declined not to go and it is possible that he and Mark went to Cyprus for a while. In their place Paul took Silas. They firstly went to Tarsus and then through the Cilician Gates to Pozanti where a portion of this paved road still remains. They then turned westwards to follow the road to today's Eregli and on to Derbe, not a difficult route but possibly not paved. Paul then visited the churches of Derbe, Lystra, picking up Timothy on the way, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, to eventually go on into Roman Asia Minor. But this is where the Journey did not go according to plan. At the border of Galatia and Asia Minor the Spirit moved Paul to turn north to Bithynia. The real reason for the change of direction could lie in Paul's disinclination to fall foul of any Roman administration, as he had had on the previous journey in Pisidian Antioch and Iconium [Konya]. The change of direction could have taken place at Apameia that lay just over the border. The main road then went North to the Colonia of Germa, and then West to Dorylaeum near the Bithynian Border where there was again a marked Roman presence. The Spirit then moved Paul and his companions to turn west through the district of Mysia to the city of Alexandra Troas. Mysia was a neutral corridor that had Bithynia as its northern boundary and Roman Asia Minor its southern.

Alexandra Troas was a very cosmopolitan city with a population of the Diaspora that had little influence, if any, on its municipal administration. From its harbour most of its trade, and other communications, went from Bithynia and Asia Minor to the East coast of Italy, and thence to Rome as the prevailing winds were applicable to the shipping. Here Paul met Luke and Carpus, in whose house he set up the Christian Church, and the 'we' passages in Acts begin. Carpus must have been a wealthy man to possess a house that extended to three stories, Acts. 20:9. [the apartments known as 'the garden flats' in Ostia and around the same date are a comparison] Luke must have been a valued friend. Paul refers to Luke in his letters as his beloved Physician but, what is not generally taken into consideration is the fact that in its suburbs Troas had an Aesculapeum, a Spar, that was dedicated to Apollo Smintheus; it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Luke was the Medical Director.

Luke could have been a Macedonian from Philippi who had studied medicine in the nearby medical school and Aesculapeum of Pergamum, where Galen studied and taught to later become the friend and physician to Marcus Aurelius. Acts indicates that he was well acquainted with the Philippi area and it could have been Luke who instigated the Apostles going on to Philippi, which resulted in a sojourn of some two years in Corinth before Paul went on to Ephesus and Jerusalem for the feast of the Pentecost and a final return to Antioch. On arrival in Corinth Paul stayed with Aquila, who was born in Pontus, and Priscilla both having been recently turned out of Rome together with the rest of the Diaspora by Claudius, who was fed up with the incessant rioting staged by the Jews in

pursuance of their so called rights. Gallio was appointed Proconsul of Archaia in A.D. 52. it is during this period, and at the instigation of the Corinthian Diaspora, that Paul was brought before him to answer their trumped up charges. They lost the case and were severely beaten up in the process! Thus this period in Paul's career has a fixed date. Again it does not seem to be at all likely that the Shroud was in Paul's keeping when on this Journey; one that was also dictated by force of circumstance.

About the spring of A.D. 52 Paul set off once more from Antioch and alone on the Third Missionary Journey. Acts. 18:23. In view of his relative success in the Synagogues of Ephesus, where he stayed for a short while when on his way home from Corinth via Jerusalem at the end of the second journey, his main objective could have been Ephesus. In verse 23 he confirms that he visited the Churches of Derbe, Lystra and Pisidian Antioch, and as Paul says 'In order, i.e. in that order, strengthening all the disciples'. Henri Metzger, in his version of Paul's route has suggested that when he left Iconium he diverted to Ancyra, to then reach Ephesus by way of the northern towns of Germa, Pessinus, and Sardis, but this route would not have taken in Pisidian Antioch. Paul's route, according to Grollenberg, suggested that he went due north, after having passed through the Cilician Gates, to Ancyra via the towns of Faustropolis, and Archelais, and thence through Germa, Pessinus and Sardis to Ephesus. However, if Paul had gone by this route he could not in any have been able to visit the churches of Derbe, Lystra, and Pisidian Antioch as he says he categorically did in Acts 18:23. Apart from that the journey, as described by Metzger and Grollenberg, would have been arduous and have taken some months, and not fit in with Acts.

It has been maintained by many Theologians that Paul never visited the cities of Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Colossae, but there is much to point to the fact that he did. These three cities are situated in a triangle and are not so far from each other and about equidistant from Pisidian Antioch and Ephesus, an ideal situation as far as Paul was concerned when on his way from Pisidian Antioch. The ruins of Hierapolis are situated on a level escarpment in the hills that overlook Laodicea, today's Pammakale, with Laodicea being easily visible in the plain below, a short journey only. Colossae was situated on a hill about a days journey away to the south, within easy access of the other two. That Paul personally knew Philemon of Colossae, his wife Apphia and Archippus, quite possibly their son, is evident from Paul's letter to Philemon written from Rome where he begins, 'Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, i.e. an Apostle, and Timothy our brother, unto Philemon our dearly beloved and fellow labourer. And to our BELOVED APPHIA, and Archippus our fellow soldier and to the Church in thy house,' that is to the those Christians who gathered there.

It is not likely that Paul would have been on such close terms had they met only occasionally in Ephesus, and he would certainly not have addressed Apphia so cordially had they not been well known to each other. Paul wrote this letter to Philemon when he was under house arrest in Rome, and it was taken back to him in Colossae by his former slave Onesimus, who later comes into the picture.

Paul mentions in Acts 19 that he finally reached Ephesus, 'having passed through the upper coasts,' that is through the districts that lay north of Ephesus; which could explain the reason for the Metzger and Grollenberg conception of Paul's route via Ancyra.. However, there was a good road that went north from Hierapolis to Tripolis, Philadelphia and Sardis, an easy journey. Sardis was an important town with a fine synagogue, a city as far as Paul could have been concerned, was well worth a visit. From Sardis the road went on to Smyrna and then sharply due South to Ephesus, approximately a days journey, and this would fulfil his remark in Acts. 19:1. 'Paul, having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus.'

Paul's two years stay in Ephesus ended when Demetrius, who would have been today's 'Shop Steward' of the silversmiths union, instigated a riot in the great theatre; this in response to a marked drop in sales of their tourist traffic in silver charms of Diana of the Ephesians, brought about by Paul's evangelical successes. After firstly revisiting Corinth he went back to the House of Carpus in

Troas where he was reunited with, amongst others, Gaius of Derbe and Timothy, they having previously gone on to Troas. The final events and aspects of his last journey to Jerusalem, and finally to Rome for his trial before Caesar, at his own request, are well documented and have the definitive features of an eyewitness account, i.e. Luke. The 'we' passages abound and the distances and sailing times are accurate as conditions then pertained.

An illustration of the accuracy lies in Acts 20:15. 'and we sailed thence, and the next day over against Chios; and the next day we arrived at Samos; and we tarried at Troas; and the next day we came to Miletus.' The text does not mention why they tarried at Troas, but the reason was common knowledge at that time. It was the fixed custom for all shipping then passing Troas to firstly put into the local small harbour to allow the crew, and all who wished, to visit and pour a libation to Poseidon at one of his most revered shrines that was situated on the nearby hill.

There is little in the course of this third journey, which also was subject to force of circumstance, that could indicate Paul having had the Shroud with him at any time during this period. It is also doubtful if the Apostles still had it in their keeping. By now some 28 years had elapsed since the Crucifixion.

After having been brought before Festus in Caesarea, who had replaced Felix as the Governor of Judea, Paul was taken in the charge of the Centurion Julius to Rome to be placed under house arrest, and wait for some two years before having his appeal heard before Nero. Acts 28:30, and here it is also recorded that he received all that came unto him. During this period Epaphras came from Colossae to see him and to tell him of the concern that he had regarding the backsliding of the churches of Colossae, Hierapolis, and Laodicea. Onesimus, the slave to Philemon and without his knowledge, also came from Colossae to see him on the money that he had 'borrowed' from Philemon. Some authorities have suggested that Onesimus took the money and left Colossae for Rome to have a good time and met Paul by accident. This, however, is not credible for at the time Paul was under house arrest and could only see those who came to him.

Onesimus must have known Paul in the past when in the house of Philemon in Colossae, and specifically went to see him in Rome for advice, possibly regarding some problems that had arisen in the Philemon household. The visit of Epaphras and Philemon could more or less coincided for Paul to have then written his letter to the Colossians, and his personal one to Philemon regarding Onesimus, for both were taken back to Colossae by Onesimus and Tychicus. In Colossians 4:1. he appears to rebuke Philemon, 'Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal knowing that ye also have a master in heaven' and in 9, he commends Onesimus to the Colossians as a dedicated Christian. In his letter to Philemon Paul emphasises the worth of Philemon and recommends that Philemon should welcome him back and treat him properly, and at the same time warns him that he would be coming out to Colossae should his appeal be granted, and ends by sending salutations from those of his followers in Rome, including Mark.

In Colossians 4:10. Paul also refers to Mark whom he must now have forgiven for his defection at Perga. It is obvious that Mark, who had been in Rome for some years as the companion to Peter and also thought to have writing his gospel at the same time, must have gone to see him on numerous occasions, as did the others he also names. Paul mentions many by name who went to see him during the two years he spent when under house arrest, but never Peter, nor is Peter mentioned in Paul's imprisonment letters. It would seem that they might not have been completely reconciled to each other and that Mark was the link between them during these two years in custody.

Acts ends abruptly without recording the outcome of Paul's appeal before Nero, but from the letters to Timothy, and possibly that to Titus, it would appear that he won the case and was acquitted. The relationship between the Christians and Nero at the time when Paul arrived in Rome in the custody of Julius appears not to have been in any way oppressive. Many Christians went quite openly from Rome as far as the Three Taverns and the Appii Forum to welcome him, Acts 28:14-16, and he was allowed to reside in his hired house with a guard for the space two years, verses 17-30. In Romans

15:24 he expressed his intention to visit Spain, but there is nothing in Acts or his letters to confirm that he actually did so.

In view of his letter to Philemon, after he had seen Epaphras and Onesimus in Rome, it is more than likely that he did return to Asia Minor to bring the churches of Laodicea and Hierapolis, together with those in Galatia, into line. There is little in his letter that refers to his activities during this period. Titus went to Crete and Timothy to Ephesus as bishop with recommendations as to how he should behave, 1 Tim. 3:1-16. After the great fire in Rome it must have been the political situation that arose that prompted Nero to shift the blame on to the Christians, the most celebrated targets being Peter and Paul. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Paul was arrested by Nero's agents at the house of Carpus in Troas. In his sad last letter to Timothy, no doubt from the Mamertine Prison beneath the Capitol in Rome, 2 Tim. 1:16, he asks him to come from Ephesus to see him and bring the cloak that 'he had left at Troas with Carpus,' 4:13 and to bring Mark with him.

Why had Paul left the cloak at Troas and why was this cloak so important? Laodicea was renowned for its unique breed of sheep that produced a very fine wool and cloth. From this cloth the Laodiceans made various garments that were much sought after and prized throughout the Empire, to the extent that they were known as 'Trimita' and Laodicea known as 'Trimitora.' The cloth was so famous that its price by cubit was laid down by Diocletian in his edict to combat rampant inflation that dogged his administration. This edict in its entirety that controls the wages for all trades and the price of commodities is still extant engraved on the walls of the meat market in the ruins of Cavdahisar, a city to the north-west of Pisidian Antioch. On the course of his third journey Paul could well have bought such a cloak when he visited Laodicea.

One of the disadvantages that the port of Troas had to face was the fickleness of the prevailing winds; they could suddenly change. Vessels had to wait for the suitable wind and suddenly put to sea as it became favourable, which meant hurried embarkation when taking on those travelling to Rome. Had the agents of Nero arrested Paul in Troas they would have to have waited for the favourable winds before embarking, and this could explain why Paul left behind his cloak and books. When the wind changed those travelling would be hurriedly rounded up and put aboard.

Paul's final letter to Timothy is interesting in its sad nostalgia. He recalls his persecutions in Galatia, 2 Tim. 3:11, and also brings to mind the family of Timothy, 1:5, Lois his grand mother and his mother Eunice, Peter is not named amongst the many that he mentions such as Pudens and Claudia. Pudens was the son of a wealthy Senator, a friend of the Emperor Claudius, who had a palace on the Vicus Patricus. Some of the ruins of the palace now lie under the church of St Pudentiana. The Pudens in question was in the legion of the Second Augusta that invaded Britain under Vespasian and Aulus Plautius in A.D.43. They landed at Bosham, near Chichester, and Pudens was the commander of a garrison that was stationed on the lands of a local vanquished chieftain called Cogidubnus who had built a magnificent Roman British Villa at Fishbourne, not far from Chichester. It still has the remains of its beautiful mosaic floors. Pudens built a temple in the grounds of Cogidubnus and the dedicatory marble slab was discovered in Chichester in 1773. It reads "To Neptune and Minerva. This temple for the welfare of the Divine House; By the Authority of Tiberius Claudius, Cogidubnus; legate of Augustus in Britain; the Guild of Smiths and those of it who minister in sacred things; have at their own cost dedicated the site; being given by Pudens the son of Pudentinus." Cogidubnus had a daughter Claudia. Pudens took her back to Rome and married her and it is to her whom Martial dedicated several epigrams. Both of them became Christians and must have been well known to Paul for him to have recorded their greetings in the way that he has done so in 4:21.

Though Paul appears to have been cordially received by the Apostles when on his last visit to Jerusalem he was still the subject of Jewish hostility, being the subject of a riot in the temple that was brought about by the Asian Jews, who suspected that he had been there in the company of the Ephesian Trophimus, an uncircumcised Gentile. To the First Century Jews of Palestine and the

Roman Diaspora the rite of circumcision was the essential visa on their passport to eternity and those that did not submit did not qualify, and in some cases the Gentile converted were considered by their Jewish counterparts as being somewhat inferior in status. The question of circumcision was the stumbling block that dogged Paul's career throughout his ministry. In his letter to the Ephesians written from Rome he tells the Gentiles that though they remain uncircumcised they are as worthy as the circumcised Eph.2:11-20, and this he repeats in Colossians 2:11. Even though his reception by the Apostles, when last in Jerusalem, was apparently cordial, the fact that they still did not regard him as one of themselves is evident in his imprisonment letters where he always begins by stating that he is an Apostle by the will of God.

This latent hostility between Paul and the Apostles, and with those of the Diaspora that opposed his ministry when on his journeys, would seem to suggest that the Apostles would not in any have entertained letting Paul have the Shroud in his keeping. Though Paul could have heard of its existence there appears to be no hint or reference his letters, or in Acts, to suggest that Apostles ever let him see the Shroud, if it was still in their possession at the time when Paul was occasionally in Jerusalem to visit them. Paul met his death around A.D. 67 by being beheaded in the local pine woods that were then a feature of the local countryside out side Rome, the site of today's Three Fountains, the site of a Monastery that was built to commemorate the three springs that were said to have appeared where his head bounced, his remains supposedly lie under the Altar of St Paul's without the Walls. St Peter was martyred by being crucified head down near St Peter's. Part of the road that once traversed the first century Necropolis of Rome now lies under St Peter's with its ancient tombs on either side. Ancient graffiti have identified the one that lies almost directly under the High Altar of the Basilica as the Saint's last resting place.