

gave Himself to repair the wasting life of humanity, and to quicken those who were dying of hunger.

Herein lies the deepest meaning of Paul's fine phrase, *the philanthropy of God*. We have our small philanthropies—our loaves for the poor, our crumbs of comfort for the sad and solitary, our orthodox schemes of relief for temporal or spiritual poverty. But how small a distance we are willing to go in the direction of real sacrifice, of personal trouble, of pain and toil and self-renouncement! We have paid agents to bear the cross for us. This is the glory of the philanthropy of God—the feature of it which puts most of our philanthropies to shame—that it cost Him all that He could give and all that He could bear.¹

2. *It means death*.—It surely is not without significance that in the discourse in which His theme is Himself as the bread of man's life our Lord should hint so frequently, and not obscurely, at His death. His flesh is to be 'given' for the life of the world. It is to be broken before men can eat it. His 'flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed.' Evidently He means that

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The Self-Portraiture of Jesus*, 72.

it is only through sacrifice and pain and death that the life which He brings, and is, is to be made available for man's hunger and need.

God sharing with us to the uttermost; God proving that His will is our righteousness; God bearing our sorrows and our sins; God coming into our human race, and becoming a part of its history—all this is seen in the Cross of Christ; but it is also seen that absolute love for men and absolute submission to God were the moving forces of Christ's life. He was obedient even unto death. This was *His* life, and by the Cross He made it ours. The Cross subdues our hearts to Him, and gives us to feel that self-sacrifice is the true life of man.

So the grapes must be trodden in the winefat, so the thyme must be bruised if you would get its richest perfume. It is a law from which even Christ was not exempt. It is broken bread we eat: it is in this great sacrifice, in this obedience unto death, in this suffering for, and bearing of, our sin that Christ becomes the bread of life. He makes us feel that this spirit of giving to the uttermost is the true life of men.²

² D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, 246.

What were the Churches of Galatia?

BY SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

III.

IV. THE WESTERN REGION AND ITS CHURCHES.—Geographically considered, St. Paul's course in Ac 13⁴⁹–14⁷ is as follows. After the startlingly rapid progress of the gospel described in the previous verses (on which see *Cities of St. Paul*, p. 298 ff.), 'the word of the Lord was spread abroad through the whole region (*χώρα*),' of which Antioch was the principal city. Such was the course also at a later date in Ephesus and the entire province Asia (19⁸⁻¹⁰); and these two cases may be taken as typical. From the principal city the news spread to the limits of the province or the region, whose inhabitants habitually resorted to the city for the many purposes of Roman administration, such as festivals (an attraction that exerted a very powerful influence), the decision of suits, and all

the many interests presented by a metropolis to the whole region of which it was the centre (*Cities of St. Paul*, p. 273). That is the reason why Paul came to prefer more and more to work from a great centre, as he gained experience.

The analogy of Ephesus and Asia (19⁸⁻¹⁰) shows that the region round Antioch over which the Word was spread was wider than the mere lands that belonged to the city. It goes without saying that the city lands were within the circle of Pauline influence: those lands belonged to, and were cultivated by, the Antiochians: to affect Antioch (13⁴⁴) implied in itself an influence extending over the lands and properties of the city. In 13⁴⁹ a country is meant over which in its entirety the influence of Pauline preaching was spread abroad: this verb (*διεφέρετο*)

implies wide-reaching effects. The effect on the city has already been described in 13^{43f.}; it culminated in the great scene on the second Sabbath, when 'almost the whole city was gathered together to hear the word.' After this it would be an absurd anti-climax to say, as if it were something great, that the Word was spread abroad through all the property (a comparatively narrow circle) owned by the Antiochians. A certain large region, of which Antioch was the administrative and mercantile centre, is here described (corresponding to Asia in Ac 19¹⁰). 13⁴⁹ therefore describes the second stage of the conversion of Asia Minor, in which 13⁴⁴ expresses the first stage.

We postpone for the moment the task of determining what was this region, noting only that the aristocratic section of the *colonia*, influenced through their wives by Jewish agitators, arrested Paul [had him scourged by lictors (2 Co 11²⁵); cf. 2 Ti 3¹¹], and expelled him outside of the city limits, *i.e.* beyond the territory of the Antiochians over which the authority of the colonial magistrates (the *duo viri iure dicundo*) extended. The terms used in 13^{49, 50}, are strictly accurate: the 'borders' (*ὄρια*) are the limits of the city territory, the *χώρα* is a wider region.

Paul and Barnabas now fled to Iconium. There is at this point no indication that the Apostles were going beyond the limits of the region: the Apostles went out of the bounds of Antiochian territory, and came to Iconium. It is true, we must not from the words argue with absolute certainty that Iconium was within the region¹; but that interpretation suits the narrative perfectly, and is the most natural. Moreover, if there be any background of truth to the legend of Paul and Thekla (as is shown in the *Church in the Roman Empire before 170 A.D.*, p. 375 ff.),² that tale suits well with the supposition that Iconium was within the region, and had already heard about the new teaching. According to the legend, Onesiphorus of Iconium does not know Paul by sight, but only in the spirit; and no one at Iconium betrays any surprise at the new teaching, which seems to be already in some degree known. It is true that the

tale is half legendary and brings in the action of Titus to explain why Onesiphorus was Christian before Paul's arrival; but Ac 13⁴⁹ fully explains the circumstances, if Iconium was part of the region affected from Antioch; for in that case the doctrine of Paul was familiar by hearsay to many who had not seen his face (cf. Col 2¹ with Ac 19⁸⁻¹⁰).

This region of which Antioch was the centre is distinguished by Luke from Pisidia (Sect. II.), which Paul traversed, but in which he established no churches. That Iconium must have been in the Phrygian region (as we have inferred with probability from Ac 13⁵¹) is proved by Paul's later journeys and by extra-Biblical evidence.

V. THE SECOND OR EASTERN REGION.—In Ac 14⁷, as soon as Paul passed beyond Iconium, he crossed a frontier, and came into a new district or region. This was Lycaonia; and Lycaonia was a *χώρα* or region (as appears from 14⁷, *τὴν περιχώρον, i.e. τὴν περὶ τὰς πόλεις χώραν*). The striking accuracy implied in the mention of a frontier between Iconium and Lystra has been illustrated elsewhere (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 37 f.): Paul here passed out of Phrygia into Lycaonia, from a town where the uneducated part of the population spoke Phrygian (*The First Christian Century*, p. 165 ff.) to a Roman *colonia* where the *plebs* spoke Lycaonian. When he reached Derbe he was at a frontier city of Roman territory: beyond Derbe on the east lay foreign land, the country of King Antiochus, called 'Ἀντιοχίανή (*χώρα*) by Ptolemy, v. 6, 17; on the exile of Antiochus in 72 A.D., it was taken into the Roman province, and thus became the (*Regio*) *Antiochiana*³ (over which Antiochus had once reigned: the same happened to the country ruled at this time by King Polemon, which, after it became part of the Galatic province in 65 A.D., was called Pontus Polemoniacus). From Derbe Paul turned back westwards, and organized all his churches, appointing everywhere presbyters.

On the other hand, on the road eastward from Derbe lay Laranda; and, if such a great city as Laranda had been comprised in the Region Lycaonia, the definition given in Ac 14⁷ would be very loose and inaccurate. As a fact we know that, under Claudius and Nero, Laranda must have been ruled by Antiochus, whose Lycaonian coins were struck there.

¹ To accept such an argument as conclusive requires a belief in the vividness and perfect accuracy of the narrative which as yet I have not been able to make scholars fully accept.

² See also Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*, p. 49 ff.

³ Ptol., v. 6, 17, or Lycaonia Antiochiana, *C.I.L.*, v. 8660.

VI. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE REGIONS.—From Ac 13 and 14, therefore, it appears that Paul and Barnabas affected powerfully two regions (*χώρας*): one unnamed, of which Antioch was the metropolis, and in which probably Iconium was included; the other the region Lycaonia¹ with two cities and the surrounding *χώρα*. After his second visit to Antioch, Paul returned across Pisidia into Pamphylia. Such is the geographical outline of Paul's journey; and it is in striking accordance with the facts of the time. The lines of division between the districts of this country varied greatly at different times; and the incidence of these lines as they can be determined from the Acts suits perfectly the period 41–72 A.D., and applies to the Roman governmental divisions (on which see below, § 12). In these chapters, as is evident, Luke does not mention by name a province, but only two separate regions.

The eastern *Regio* consisted of the two cities, together with a district in which there existed no city, but only villages. The ruder population of the villages, wholly ignorant of Greek, uninterested in any movement of thought, totally uneducated, formed a class which the Pauline movement could not touch. In this region the influence of Paul was therefore restricted to the two cities. Further, in this region there was no metropolis, holding a position such as Antioch held in the first region.

In 14²¹ Westcott and Hort admit into their text a 'secondary' reading, *εἰς τὴν Λύστραν καὶ εἰς Ἰκόνιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν*, as possessing good authority (though they regard *εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν* as resting on higher authority). This 'secondary' reading groups closely together Iconium and Antioch, as distinguished from Lystra.² In other words, it observes the distinction of the western region from the eastern, and is true to fact and the conditions of that time. Now there was a natural tendency to make the enumeration uniform by introducing *εἰς* before the third name, as the memory of the distinction of regions could not last in the country later than the third century (when the old province was suppressed), and was even during the earlier centuries unknown outside the province. The

¹ Luke calls it *Lycaonia* in 14⁷. He defines it by its two leading towns, and mentions that the plebs of Lystra spoke the Lycaonian tongue.

² As *Ἰκόνιον* and *Ἀντιόχειαν* differ in gender, they could not be joined under a common article; but they have no article, whereas Lystra has. The difference emphasizes the separation of Lystra here from the other two.

fact that the text which recognizes the difference could maintain itself in MSS. so good that it gained admission into the text of *W.H.* as a variant is therefore a proof that this was the true text, gradually disappearing, but not lost in good MSS.

VII. THE TWO REGIONS ON THE SECOND JOURNEY.—On Paul's second missionary journey he came (15⁴¹) from Syrian Antioch through Cilicia, where his party preached and confirmed the churches, and thence across the independent kingdom of Antiochus (which is not mentioned because no preaching took place there, and it was outside of Paul's plans) to Derbe the frontier town (16¹), and thence to Lystra: the force that lies in the repetition of *εἰς* must be observed (see below).

In 16³ the party is still at Lystra. The reference to Iconian testimony in 16³ does not imply that Paul went on to Iconium to get evidence; it merely states a fact which was known and public: the high reputation of Timothy at Iconium and Lystra was an element in forming Paul's judgment (2 Ti 1⁶), because Iconium was near, and there was much trading and social intercourse (cf. Ac 14¹⁹). On the other hand, Timothy's reputation at Derbe is not mentioned, because, although Derbe was in the same *Regio*, yet intercourse between Lystra and the distant Derbe was more restricted. Luke mentions intercourse even between Antioch and Lystra (14¹⁹), though the distance was much greater; but Lystra was a 'Sister Colony' of Antioch, and we learn from epigraphic evidence that there was a close relation between the two sister cities. Intercourse between Lystra and Iconium was due to proximity and trading connexion. Intercourse between Lystra and Antioch was due to their Roman character, their colonial rank, and their common purpose as garrisons against the mountaineers. Between Lystra and Derbe, however, there seems to have been a less close relation. They tended to be rivals, because neither had the rank of capital of the *Regio*, and each had its own claims to be 'first city.' One of the most familiar facts in the Eastern provinces is the competition between two or more cities for this rank and title: so in Cilicia, Tarsus and Anazarba; in Asia, Pergamon, Ephesus, and Smyrna; in Bithynia, Nicomedia and Nicæa; so also Philippi and Amphipolis in their division of Macedonia, a fact recorded only by Luke, but so natural that it could have been inferred without

record. The last case is a close parallel to Lystra and Derbe. The competition was in both cases between a Roman *colonia* and a Greek *polis* in the same division of a province.¹ Derbe was a frontier and customs station (λιμὴν) since 41 A.D., and honoured with the title Claudio-Derbe. On the other hand, where rank and precedence was fixed

¹ Ac 16¹², where the meaning of *πρώτη* is disputed by those who do not know the Eastern provinces.

and competition eliminated, harmony was more easily attained, as Antioch was the military and governing centre beyond dispute. If Luke had implied that such close relations existed between Lystra and Derbe it would have been rather unexpected, and we should have asked why it existed, and why the preposition *εἰς* is repeated in 16¹. As it is, everything is natural, and all the circumstances work readily into a uniform picture.

Literature.

THE ETHICS OF THE FAMILY.

PROFESSOR W. F. LOFTHOUSE is recognized by Wesleyans as one of their most accomplished theologians. He is recognized by the whole world of scholarship as an original and progressive thinker. His new book will fulfil the expectation that a great work would yet be accomplished by him. Its title is *Ethics and the Family* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net).

Ethics and the Family—that is the subject of to-day. Competent observers are unanimous in saying that the ills we have fallen heir to can be cured only by curing the bad practice and worse notions that prevail regarding the family. Professor Lofthouse surveys the whole subject. Beginning with a sketch of the history of the family—a successful survey of a ‘most difficult and complicated field of inquiry—he proceeds to set forth the ethical basis on which the family and family life rest, being careful not to separate his ethics from the knowledge of God and so leave it hanging helplessly in the air; and then he makes his conclusions tell on all the notions and all the practices that are seething around and like to submerge us. With the skill of a well-disciplined understanding he steers his way among the problems of population, employment, the equality of the sexes, parental authority, and all the rest. And to those who come to him for bread, he does not give a stone. He has proposals that are practicable. But, above all its proposals, the book which he has written at so much expense of brain and heart sets us right on the great fundamental matter—‘as in the sight of God.’

PSYCHOLOGY.

We are greatly taken up with the study of psychology at the present time. It is the study of man—the most interesting object that man can study. But, more than that, it has held out hopes of a fresh contribution to religious experience. We are much occupied with it.

But what is psychology? The question is raised in a rather disconcerting fashion in *A History of Psychology, Ancient and Patristic*, which has been written by Mr. George Sidney Brett, M.A. (George Allen; 10s. 6d. net). We find that Mr. Brett takes into his province matters which we had thought were outside—matters theological and even physiological. He seems to think, in short, that he has to do with the whole person of man—body, soul, and spirit. And being aware of his breadth, he openly tells us that *his* definition of psychology includes all these: ‘The study of human activities as the psychologist sees them, the study of human life as the doctor looks at it, the growth of systematic beliefs as reflected in philosophy and religion.’ His book, therefore, either demands a new and vastly enlarged conception of psychology, or else it had better have been called, as he seems once to have thought of calling it, the *Autobiography of the Human Mind*.

With such a range of subject and such a range of time, it is inevitable that the exposition of any particular man’s contribution, whether Epicurus or St. Paul, should be of the most general character. But our author has succeeded conspicuously in the very purpose which he had in writing his book. That is to say, he has linked individual