

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## FORMS OF CLASSIFICATION IN ACTS.

THE author of *Acts* speaks of the pair of missionary travellers, Paul and Barnabas (or of the other pair, Paul and Silas) sometimes as *ὁ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας* (e.g., xiii. 2, 50; xv. 22; xvi. 29), sometimes as *ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας* (e.g., xiii. 43, 46; xv. 2; xvi. 19; xvii. 10), and sometimes as *Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας* (xv. 2, 12, 35). The question suggests itself whether any difference of sense is intended in this variation, or whether it is purely accidental, or whether any difference of style, implying either variety of authorship or the use of different authorities by one author, has been the cause of the variety of expression. The purpose of this paper is to show that a difference of sense between *ὁ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας* and the other two is intended, and that the same adaptation of grammatical form to express difference of meaning runs throughout *Acts* as a whole or in great part. The subject is slippery, and involves too much of mere subjective opinion to be trustworthy except as subsidiary to other investigations;<sup>1</sup> but it seems worthy of consideration, if only to give to others the opportunity of refuting or of modifying the tentative opinion here stated.

Two persons may be clothed with joint authority, and form really a board of two officials created by a definite act of authority. In that case they constitute a *duumvirate*, a *collegium*<sup>2</sup> or committee of two, able to act with united

<sup>1</sup> Especially there is always a danger of mixing up the use of the article to indicate previous mention with the use suggested here. I quite acknowledge this and other possibilities. Every person with grammatical interests begins by trying to find rules or at least tendencies to rule in the use of the article by any single writer; and almost every one ends by recognising the impossibility of discovering any rule. My old master in grammar, Prof. Theodor Benfey, of Göttingen, always urged that there is never any rule in such subjects, but only a tendency (often modified by circumstances) towards a rule.

<sup>2</sup> I use this term roughly: strictly each *collega* 'possesses individually the

authority as it was delegated to them; and they may justly be designated as a unity, grouped together not by a capricious or arbitrary act of the writer's mind founded on accidental juxtaposition, but by real connexion. Moreover these two individuals, of course, do not always act as a single body; many of their actions are performed by each separately as an individual. A writer who possessed a fine sense for delicate distinctions might, in speaking of such a pair of individuals, distinguish between the occasions on which they act as a duumvirate and those on which they act as separate individuals, even though performing similar or even identical actions. The distinction is a delicate one; but I think that the author of *Acts* was guided by it when he varied between  $\delta$  Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας the duumvirate,<sup>1</sup> and  $\delta$  Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας or Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας the individuals.<sup>2</sup>

An enumeration of the cases in which each form is used by the writer of *Acts* will show that he had this distinction in his mind. In the following cases he is speaking of a duumvirate: the united pair, Paul and Barnabas, is set apart for the work xiii. 2, arouses persecution by its work xiii. 50, and has its number increased by two xv. 22.<sup>3</sup> But after Paul's speech, they separately and individually addressed meetings, xiii. 43, 46; they separately disputed with the Judaizing brethren, xv. 2, and separately made

whole power of his office, whereas a committee only possesses power collectively.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Chase seems to be in agreement on this point (EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 407 note), for he most correctly defines what may be deduced from the common article, p. 407, n: "Those indicated are so closely united that they can be represented as a single foundation (*Eph.* ii. 20), as the recipients of a single revelation (iii. 5)." *O si sic omnia!*

<sup>2</sup> There is probably a distinction between the last two, but it is *literary* rather than *real*, and therefore does not concern this investigation.

<sup>3</sup> xv. 25 does not violate the rule; the grammatical form couples the pair in another way by the phrase "our beloved." But in any case the passage is professedly a quotation from a decree which is given *verbatim*, and not composed by the author of *Acts*.

speeches to the meeting in Jerusalem xv. 12 (here no article at all is used); and the two strangers, and not the united body of two officials, were summoned to his presence by the curious proconsul (xiii. 7). Again the gaoler makes a single prostration in the Oriental style before the pair, Paul and Silas, not two prostrations before each separately, xvi. 29;<sup>1</sup> but in xvi. 19, xvii. 10, they are as individuals arrested by distinct acts, and similarly smuggled out of the city.

In xvii. 4 we find a case of a very delicate kind: the reading is doubtful, and Westcott and Hort give a primary reading τῶ Παύλῳ καὶ τῶ Σίλῳ, and a secondary τῶ Παύλῳ καὶ Σίλῳ.<sup>2</sup> The latter, which B alone has among the great MSS., is probably to be preferred as giving the better sense: the converts adhered to Paul and Barnabas as representing in their union a belief and a principle. There is a marked contrast between the sense of this passage and xiii. 43, where the crowd followed after Paul and Barnabas from curiosity and interest, hoping naturally to hear speeches from each of these two individuals (ἠκολούθησαν τῶ Παύλῳ καὶ τῶ Βαρνάβῳ).

It might seem to violate the rule that in xv. 2, when the brotherhood at Antioch arranged that Paul and Barnabas and certain others should go up to Jerusalem, the common article is not used. But on consideration we see that this is not a suitable case. Paul and Barnabas are not here a duumvirate; they are nominated one by one as members of a large deputation; they speak one by one at Jerusalem (xv. 12). But in xv. 22 they are treated by the apostles as already invested with authority, and two individuals are nominated (first one and then another) to be associated with them.

<sup>1</sup> This case is markedly different from xiii. 43, where the crowd follows the two individuals from curiosity to hear their separate speeches.

<sup>2</sup> Tischendorf reads τῶ Σίλῳ.

It is, perhaps, pressing the rule too far; but apparently, even larger bodies are treated in the same way, xiii. 1<sup>1</sup> and i. 13; whereas seven individuals are one by one selected for the official duty of deacons, vi. 5.<sup>2</sup> Four species of the *genus* which Cicero would call the *miseri* are united in *Luke* xiv. 21. But there are too few examples to permit a judgment as to the writer's practice in respect of larger bodies.

If the distinction which has been here insisted on is correct, it follows that Silas and Timothy could never be contemplated as a duumvirate, for no official authority was delegated to them. Paul and Barnabas were set apart for a special duty by the Divine selection and by the imposition of hands by the brotherhood of Antiochian Christians xiii. 2 f.; and the same action of the brotherhood may be confidently understood as implied in xv. 40.<sup>3</sup> But Silas and Timothy, though travelling in company and performing a special duty for some time, are not said to have had a joint office conferred on them; and accordingly they are never mentioned as *ὁ Σίλας καὶ Τιμόθεος*, but three times as *ὁ Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος* (xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5).

We now take the classification of places. In a writer whose interests are geographical, the fact of geographical contiguity would be a proper and sufficient reason for classing two or three districts as a unity. But to a writer whose interests lie in a different direction mere proximity is not

<sup>1</sup> If this is right, xiii. 1 would mean that there was a definite body of prophets and teachers in the Antiochian brotherhood, constituting it an organized Church, as distinguished from a mere congregation of "the brethren." I put all this in the most tentative fashion.

<sup>2</sup> If the seven were afterwards enumerated as a board (as the twelve are in i. 13), they would be held together by the common article, if the principle could be pressed to such an extreme, which is doubtful.

<sup>3</sup> The same expression is used about the charge given by the brotherhood to Paul and Barnabas xiv. 26, "they had been committed to the grace of God," as about Paul and Silas xv. 40, "being commended by the brethren to the grace of the Lord" (*παραδομένοι* and *παραδοθέντες*).

a sufficient cause for uniting two districts; he requires some stronger reason. Either the unity must be forced on him by the political facts, or there must be some moral or intellectual bond between them which couples them in his mind. To the author of *Acts* the missionary interest was strong; and, if two districts were united in a single missionary enterprise, or otherwise held together by some tie of missionary connexion, that would constitute them a real, organic unity to him; but if, on the other hand, we find on examination that places or districts are grouped together by the common article in *Acts* on mere ground of contiguity, the principle for which we are contending cannot be maintained. If that principle is correct, we shall find a deeper unity in such connexions. Geographical interest is not sufficiently strong in the writer's mind to form a link of classification.

In the following passages two or three districts or places are classed as a unity under the binding power of the common article; but there is more than mere geographical contiguity to serve as a bond of connexion between them. Thus in xv. 3 we have two parts of the province Syria<sup>1</sup> united as τὴν τε Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμαρίαν<sup>2</sup> in the journey (which was accompanied with preaching)<sup>3</sup> to Jerusalem. Here is a unity in missionary enterprise as well as in political connexion. Again in xix. 21 the writer makes τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν a unity. They were not, it is true,

<sup>1</sup> The minute details of the relation between the province Syria and the parts, which have often been stated, need not be given here.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Blass is probably right in reading Σαμαρείαν with A B and many other MSS. The balance of evidence is delicate in most cases; but Ptolemy and Josephus seem to have Σαμαρεία.

<sup>3</sup> This journey was more than a mere ascent to Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas took the opportunity of announcing the new departure in the Church's method and the "opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles" (xiv. 27) to a wide circle of hearers in Phœnicæ and Samaria, as distinguished from Judæa (where the news would not have been so welcome). An organic unity connects the two.

a single province when the journey was made, but the writer had grown up regarding them as a single province;<sup>1</sup> and, if the view that he was a Macedonian be correct (as I think it is), it would be natural to him to look on Achaia and Macedonia as one morally and intellectually, constituting in their unity the great country of Greece. An Athenian would have denied the right of Macedonia to be united in this way with Greece; but the Macedonians maintained that they were Greeks, not barbarians. Moreover, the thought in the writer's mind is here that Paul purposed to review the whole body of his European churches before he revisited Jerusalem.

In xviii. 23 *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν* form a strict unity, both as two districts of the province Galatia and as constituting the group of Galatic churches, if we take the South-Galatian view. But, on the North-Galatian theory they do not form a unity except geographically; one is a Roman province, the other (Phrygia) is a piece of a different Roman province; one is Paul's group of the churches of Galatia, the other is a fragment of his group of the churches of Asia.

A difficult case occurs in xv. 41, where the reading is uncertain; Westcott and Hort (as in xvii. 4) admit a primary and a secondary reading; but doubtless Tischendorf and Blass are right in preferring *τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν* with the majority of the great MSS.<sup>2</sup> It is practically certain that Syria and Roman Cilicia were included in a single province throughout the first century of our era;<sup>3</sup> this

<sup>1</sup> They were united as a single province from 146 to 27 B.C., and from 15 to 44 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> *τὴν* is repeated in B and D.

<sup>3</sup> There is some obscurity and controversy as to details; but so much is certain, that Cilicia was ruled by the governor of Syria at the beginning of the century, and that near the end of the century (under Domitian or very soon after him) there was still in existence at Antioch as capital of the province a festival *κοινὸς Συρίας Κιλικίας Φοινίκης*.

unity therefore was forced on the author, and probably Paul would have classed his churches of Syria and Cilicia together as one mission field with Antioch as centre.<sup>1</sup> In the letter to the brethren in Syria and Cilicia xv. 23 the same view is taken which we attribute to Paul.

The reason is obvious why we find as a united pair viii. 1 τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρίας;<sup>2</sup> and in ix. 31 the three parts of the Holy Land are united τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρίας.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, in xvii. 1 we find τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν, for these two neighbouring cities belonged to different districts, Edonis and Mygdonia,<sup>4</sup> though they were in one province, Macedonia. They do not naturally form a unity except in mere geographical proximity.

It is in some degree a parallel point of literary method, that, though Lystra and Derbe are in some ways a pair and are strongly marked as members of one class in xiv. 6,<sup>5</sup> yet in xvi. 1 it is necessary to hold them absolutely separate and to emphasize that they are not classed as a unity, in order to make it clear that the following sentence is true only of Lystra; and hence the governing preposition is repeated εἰς Δέρβην καὶ εἰς Λύστραν.

One exception must be made to our statement about the want of geographical interest in the author of *Acts*. He had a far keener interest in sea-travel than in land-travel; though he was not a sailor, as is clear from many points in

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that the same doubt exists in *Gal.* i. 21 as in *Acts* xv. 41. Tischendorf there reads τῆς Κιλικίας, here Κιλικίαν without the article.

<sup>2</sup> Here also Dr. Blass prefers Σαμαρείας, as I think rightly.

<sup>3</sup> Blass, as elsewhere, has Σαμαρείας.

<sup>4</sup> In my *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158 note, it is argued from *Acts* xvi. 12 that Macedonia was divided into *μερίδες*, and we might fairly use this passage as an argument that the two cities belonged to different *μερίδες*. The writer had the idea of these divisions in his mind when writing the account of the journey across Macedonia.

<sup>5</sup> Where the expression τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας Δέρβην καὶ Λύστραν is similar in construction to xv. 22, τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβη καὶ Παύλῳ, which has been noticed already.



his language, he must have seen a great deal of the sea, and acquired familiarity with ships.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious in xx., xxi., xxvii., xxviii., with what love he notes little incidents of the voyage, partly indeed because then he was travelling with his teacher, but partly also from the true Greek instinct for the sea and all connected with it. Hence xxvii. 5 τὸ πέρασος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν is the expression of a sailor, to whose distant sight the long indivisible Cilico-Pamphylian coast-line is a single conception. This little detail, however, is one of those unintentional touches which mark the first-hand witness, for the author claims to have been present in the ship, and therefore he naturally speaks from the sailor's point of view. As he wrote, the picture of that marvellously beautiful view, with the long line of the coast, and behind it the long mountain wall of Taurus stretching unbroken across Cilicia and Pamphylia from the eastern to the western horizon, stood clear before his memory, and determined his expression. His purpose in this case is purely geographical; he is defining the position of the ship, and describes the line of coast on the right and the left. He is not thinking of the two provinces, Cilicia and Pamphylia, which did not touch one another and therefore could not in any view be taken as a unity, but of the single coast line where the two countries (as sailors spoke of them) unite indistinguishably.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It was a great pleasure to find the conception of Luke's character and feeling for the sea, which I had formed from independent study, confirmed by the far more experienced judgment of James Smith: see the introduction to his *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*.

<sup>2</sup> This case seems to be one of the strongest of the whole set, but it is my regular experience that the geographical arguments, which to me are far the strongest, fall flat and unheeded on many readers. The delicate tone or tint, which to the eye-witness is the most telling evidence, is naturally lost on those who have not seen it themselves. Here Cilicia is naturally and necessarily used in the common geographical sense in a geographical touch, and not in the Roman sense, for Roman Cilicia was separated from Roman Pamphylia by a wide stretch of country, viz., the *Regnum Antiochi* (see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, v. 94) See p. 38 below.

The result, then, which I venture to state in the hope of eliciting criticism, is that, where in *Acts* the common article is used to bind together two persons or places or classes, the meaning and the intellectual attitude of the writer will be made clearer to us if we substitute for the enumeration of separate items some single term expressing the unity of the group (*e.g.*, "the European churches" in xix. 21), though literary art and the want of suitable general names prevent the author from using the more complicated form which is often required to express the unifying idea. Further, the unifying idea is never a mere capricious or arbitrary one, but stands in close relation to actual facts and to the permanent and guiding purpose of the author; his mental attitude and historical method become clearer and more definite to us as we examine the classes which he constructs.

Almost every train of minute reasoning about *Acts* brings us to the central question as to the two Galatian theories. The question is so fundamental, that it affects almost every general enquiry whether in regard to *Acts* as a history and as a literary composition, or in regard to Paul's policy and character. You can hardly make a step in advance without assuming consciously or unconsciously an attitude towards this fundamental question. In xvi. 6 the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν is taken on the North-Galatian theory as a closely united pair, Phrygia and Galatia. That is a distinct violation of the principle which we have been examining. They belonged to different provinces, Phrygia being in Asia;<sup>1</sup> and they were on the present occasion strongly contrasted in the writer's mind, for Phrygia was forbidden as a preaching-sphere, while the theory maintains that Galatia was evangelized. I find it impossible

<sup>1</sup> Of course the North-Galatian theorists are bound to this, for if they were to say that here Phrygia means the part of Phrygia included in Galatia, they would be accepting the South Galatian theory.

to express by any unifying single term the pair, as it is here brought together, on the North-Galatian theory.

Another fundamental question that emerges in every minute investigation about *Acts* is the character of the Bezan text. This distinction, which we have found so well maintained in the Eastern Recension, is often violated in *Codex Bezae* (e.g. xv. 35, xvii. 15, xviii. 5), which however might perhaps be explicable as due merely to errors in the transmission of the text.

The principle is not observed in the list of synagogues vi. 9; but that enumeration has always been a difficulty, and the bad form of the list is doubtless due to Luke's being here dependent on an authority whose expression he either transcribed *verbatim* or did not fully understand. Similarly in ii. 9, 10 the form of expression is not Lucan,<sup>1</sup> but is adopted *verbatim* from some authority on whom the writer was dependent in this place.

In xii. 25 we might expect, on this principle, that Barnabas and Saul, who had been sent to Jerusalem from Antioch, should be treated as a unity: the fact mentioned there that their ministry was finished may possibly affect the expression, but that seems too wire-drawn. I cannot claim to find a satisfactory explanation; but it has always appeared to me that a certain slight and yet distinct difference of style exists between the first and the second part of *Acts*. Personally I think that this difference is such as to imply, not difference of authorship, but difference of time and circumstances in the life of the same author.

Connected with the subject there is a point of much significance. Mr. Rendall, in a fine and suggestive article (*EXPOSITOR*, November, 1893) has pointed out that St. Paul classified his churches according to the Roman Pro-

<sup>1</sup> Another reason for the same view (which I imagine will seem self-evident) is given in my *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 149.

vinces, Achaia, Macedonia, Asia and Galatia.<sup>1</sup> I think it is clear that the author of *Acts* always uses Roman terms when he mentions missionary districts. This is no slight or accidental point. The Roman political divisions defied and contradicted ethnical affinities, and claimed to rise superior to them; and to choose those divisions as the basis of classification implies a definite and conscious preference of the unifying imperial policy to the disintegrating native policy. The choice implies that, in the great political question of the day in Central Asia Minor between Roman civilization, on the one hand, and native barbarism, favoured by the native religion and priests during the first century, on the other, Paul was on the side of Roman unity and government. Any one who considers what was the attitude of the extra-Palaestian Jews, and especially of Jewish-Roman citizens, towards the emperors, must feel that this choice was natural and almost necessary for the Roman Paul. The Church Catholic was always, from the earliest moment when we can detect its existence, on the same side; and there is little or no doubt that its determination towards that side was given by Paul. The Church always claimed to be loyal towards the empire; and the tendency of all that I have written on this subject is to show that it was (or became) more imperial than the emperors. When Paul called his converts "Galatians," he in effect bade them remember that they were not barbarian Lycaonians or Phrygians, but members of the great Roman empire. Consideration of the language of *Acts* will, I think, show that the Greek Luke was on the side of his master Paul on this great question. In all classifying expressions he takes the Roman view; though, where he is

<sup>1</sup> I would add to these as a fifth Syria and Cilicia, a single province at the time, see xv. 23 and 41 compared with *Gal.* i. 21 (on the reading see note on p. 32).

simply geographical, he necessarily uses the current geographical terms.

In the following places there occurs, at the point where Paul is entering or intending to enter on the work, a formal definition of the district over which the evangelizing is to extend.

- (1) xiii. 4, Cyprus.
- (2) xiii. 13, Pamphylia.
- (3) xiv. 6, the cities of Lycaonia, Derbe and Lystra, and the region round about.
- (4) xiv. 21, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch.
- (5) xiv. 24, Pamphylia.
- (6) xv. 41, Syria and Cilicia.
- (7) xvi. 1, Derbe and Lystra (a group defined on the same principle as that in xiv. 21).
- (8) xvi. 6, τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν.
- (9) xvi. 6, Asia (this intention was forbidden).
- (10) xvi. 7, Bithynia (intended, but not entered upon).
- (11) xvi. 10, Macedonia.
- (12) xviii. 21, ἑμάς.
- (13) xviii. 23, τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν.
- (14) xix. 1, Ἀσίαν (in the Bezan text, but not in the Eastern text).
- (15) xix. 21, τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν.
- (16) xx. 1, Μακεδονίαν.
- (17) xx. 2, Ἑλλάς.

To these may be added incidental expressions of classification, as in xix. 10, all they which dwelt in Asia.

Of these districts, the most remarkable is No. (3). The peculiar phrase is intended simply to define the Roman district and to exclude non-Roman Lycaonia from the range of Paul's work.<sup>1</sup> Only between A.D. 37 (or 41) and 72 was it the case that such a division existed; but in that period there was a distinction between Roman and Antiochian Lycaonia, the former including two cities, Lystra and Derbe, and a stretch of territory in which there were

<sup>1</sup> Confirming the view advocated in my *Church in R. Emp.*, p. 70 and elsewhere, that Paul directed his work to the Roman countries alone; though on p. 68 I found this expression obscure.

no cities but only villages. This division might also be termed Galatic Lycaonia, or, in local usage, simply ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα; and in xvi. 1 it is designated by mentioning the two cities.<sup>1</sup> Thus (3), (7), and the first half of (13) are all designations of the same district, each appropriate in its place; and that district has no meaning and no reason except as one of the territories of the Roman province.

But further, all these districts are Roman. Several, of course, of the names have the same denotation in popular usage, but some have no existence except in the Roman provincial system. Cilicia is used here of the Roman territory, and does not designate the entire country then popularly called Cilicia, which included Tracheia and extended as far as the borders of Pamphylia (xxvii. 4). Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, are used in the Roman sense, not in the Greek or popular sense; to the Greeks Macedonia and Achaia were narrower terms, the former not embracing Philippi, and the latter not embracing Athens;<sup>2</sup> while Asia was only used by the Greeks to designate the continent in a vague, undefined way, or to denote a very small district near the coast.<sup>3</sup> No. (13) designates two divisions of

<sup>1</sup> This was necessitated by the fact that one of them was the scene of an important incident and a considerable stay. But for that, the author would probably have summed up this district with the other district of Galatic Phrygia in a double expression similar to xviii. 23.

<sup>2</sup> To make it quite clear that he means by Achaia the wider Roman province, the author employs in (17) xx. 2 the term Hellas, as the one that was used by the Greeks in the same wider sense.

<sup>3</sup> Rarely Strabo uses ἡ Ἀσία ἰδίως λεγομένη of the Roman province (cp. Ptolemy v. 2, 1, ἡ ἰδία Ἀσία); but regularly he employs it in the wider sense. Dr. Blass's idea that Asia meant *Mysiam, Ioniam, Lydiam, Cariam* (note on xvi. 6-8) seems to be quite erroneous. He quotes in support of it Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, v. 28 (102), but incorrectly apprehends that passage, as is obvious both from a careful reading of the words and from a wider study of Pliny. The precise sense of Asia (which he desires) was created by the breaking up of the large province of Asia about A.D. 295, and could not occur in *Acts*. I have erred on p. 166 of *Ch. in Rom. Emp.*, in saying that the narrow sense of Asia is intended in *Acts* xix. 26, 27: the province Asia is obviously meant, and I now can hardly understand how I made such an error (except that, in thinking over such theories as Spitta's, one's head grows dizzy).

Roman Galatia, which included all the Pauline Churches of Galatia, one division having been already defined more narrowly in no. (3), and the other in no. (8), while both together were summed up in xiv. 21.

In two cases the district is not defined when Paul enters it, viz. in xiii., when he entered the province Galatia, and in xvii., when he entered Achaia. But in these two cases Paul entered them without the intention of evangelizing; he went to Athens to wait for the moment when it would be judicious to continue his work in Macedonia (to which he believed himself called, until a new order was given him in Corinth); and he went into Galatia at first "on account of an illness." In neither case was a definition of the range of work possible, for missionary work was not the determining cause of the journey.

No. (14) is remarkable: there the Western text contains a definition, and the Eastern text contains none (unless *ὑμᾶς* in xviii. 21 be taken in the sense of "you Asians," which it surely has in xx. 25<sup>1</sup>): a definition is here certainly required; and its absence is a serious want in the accepted (Eastern) text, and a decided gain in the Bezan text. I have often been inclined to think that the remarkable expression *τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη* was defined by the author with the addition *τῆς Ἀσίας*, and that these two words have perished in the transmission of the text before the beginning of the fourth century. The evidence here is distinctly more favourable to Blass's theory than in any other passage of *Acts*; but I have always held that there is a fair number of cases in which the Bezan text preserves the original text (more or less accurately) against the Eastern text.

The tendency of this minute evidence, then, is (1) to show that *Acts* is minutely accurate in local nomenclature

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, 1895, p. 389.

of the first century, (2) to establish a close connexion between *Acts* and the thought and expression of Paul, (3) to point out much delicacy of expression in *Acts*, (4) to suggest that definite form was given to the idea of the Universal Church, when Paul addressed his first converts in central Asia Minor as Galatians, *i.e.* as members of the Roman province and of the unified Roman empire.

W. M. RAMSAY.