

THE GALATIA OF THE ACTS: A CRITICISM
OF PROFESSOR RAMSAY'S THEORY.

STUDENTS of Early Church History owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Ramsay which they are not likely to forget. His brilliant achievement in the recovery of the epitaph of Abercius is itself a sufficient title to honour; and that achievement is very far from standing alone. In his last book, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, he has taken a fresh step. In the latter part of that volume he has discussed the relation of the Church to the Empire from the time of Nero till 170 A.D. In the earlier part he has treated of the history of St. Paul in the light of the knowledge which he has gained as a traveller and explorer in the regions in which St. Paul laboured. It is with part of this earlier section of his work that I am now concerned.

There are scholars whom fortune allows to probe the secrets of the very soil trodden by the generations of antiquity. Such men are few in number; in their front rank Prof. Ramsay holds a conspicuous, perhaps in this country the first, place. Others "sit at home at ease"; their flights never take them far from their bookshelves. Yet both classes of students have their peculiar office in the commonwealth of letters. To the former belongs the glory of romantic or startling discovery; to the latter the patient investigation of the text of ancient writings, to which the labours of their more adventurous fellow-workers supply fresh illustration. To them pertains the humbler and less exciting task of testing theories and checking hasty conclusions. The grammar and the dictionary of the stay-

at-home student have a part to play not less necessary than that of the spade of the excavator and the diary of the traveller.

In discussing St. Paul's journeys Prof. Ramsay joins issue with the late Bishop Lightfoot on a point of considerable importance in the Apostle's life. It is this. Does the "Galatian district" which St. Luke mentions (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23) denote "the district popularly and generally known as Galatia" (p. 9¹) or the Roman province which bore that name? To the former view, which Bishop Lightfoot maintained in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Galatians,² Prof. Ramsay gives the convenient designation of "the North-Galatian theory"; to the latter view, which he himself upholds, the designation of "the South-Galatian theory" (p. 9). According to the former opinion, St. Luke gives no details as to St. Paul's visit to Galatia, but hastens on to the Apostle's entrance into Europe, when for a short time he himself became St. Paul's companion (Acts xvi. 10, 40). According to the latter view, St. Luke uses the term Galatia in a brief recapitulation of what he has already related (xvi. 1-4), viz.: St. Paul's second visit to Derbe and Lystra, and probably also (note τὰς πόλεις, v. 4) to Iconium and Antioch.

There are probably many who make it a kind of rule to allow no one but themselves to find fault with Bishop Lightfoot's work; many, that is, who do not admit that his conclusions are in error unless they have sifted the evidence for themselves. I confess that I am of that number. I have tried to review this question as to St. Paul's journeys independently. The conclusion which I have

¹ The references are to *The Church in the Roman Empire*. Second edition, Revised.

² Prof. Ramsay has, I think, overlooked an important note of Bp. Lightfoot's dealing with Renan's theory as to Galatia, written some years after the Commentary on the Galatians; see *Colossians*, pp. 25-28.

reached is that, though I am obliged to disagree with what the Bishop wrote in one important point, I believe that as to the main question the Bishop was right and that Prof. Ramsay is wrong.

The Professor adduces many interesting arguments to support his opinion. But there is a preliminary question to which I venture to think that he has not given sufficient attention. I believe that a careful examination of the narrative of St. Luke leaves no room whatever for doubt that he uses the term Galatia in the popular, not the political, sense; and that consequently the North-Galatian theory holds the field.

It will be convenient to summarize those parts of St. Luke's narrative which introduce the crucial passages and to transcribe the passages themselves.

(i.) xv. 40-xvi. 7. (xv. 40) St. Paul and Silas leave the Syrian Antioch. (41) They pass through Syria and Cilicia. (xvi. 1) The Apostle visits Derbe and Lystra. (2) At the latter city he chooses Timothy as his companion. (3) He circumcises him. (4) As they passed through the cities (*ὡς δὲ διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις*), they delivered the apostolic letter. (5) *αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησῖαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπερίσσειον τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ' ἡμέραν.* (6) *διήλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ,* (7) *ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπέιραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι καὶ οὐκ εἶασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ.* (8) *παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν κατέβησαν εἰς Τρωάδα.*

(ii.) xviii. 22 f. (xviii. 22) St. Paul visits Jerusalem and the Syrian Antioch. (23) *καὶ ποιήσας χρόνον τινὰ ἐξήλθεν, διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, στήριζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς.*

The investigation falls under two heads—(1) the examination of the crucial phrases in xvi. 6, xviii. 23; (2) the

examination of the context of the former of these two verses (xvi. 4-10).

(1) "The passage xvi. 4-6," writes Prof. Ramsay (p. 75), "is one of extreme obscurity; but it must be examined, for the decision of the controversy as to the signification of the term Galatia depends on the meaning to be taken out of it." I cannot for a moment admit that the passage "is one of extreme obscurity." On the contrary, when interpreted according to common Greek usage and the ordinary rules of Greek grammar, it appears to me to be luminously clear. But I am quite at one with the Professor in the belief that the signification of "Galatia" in St. Luke turns on the interpretation of these verses.

Prof. Ramsay, drawing attention to the absence of the article in the true text before *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* says that the phrase *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* (xvi. 6) means "the country which is Phrygian and Galatic,' a single district to which both epithets apply. . . . 'the country which according to one way of speaking is Phrygian, but which is also called Galatic'" (p. 77 f.), "which may in English be most idiomatically rendered 'the Phrygo-Galatic' territory" (p. 79f.). "This," he says (p. 78), "is the only possible sense of the Greek words as they are now read." Here, as far as the grammatical analysis of the phrase is concerned, Prof. Ramsay treads in the steps of Bishop Lightfoot. "The form of the Greek expression," wrote the Bishop (Commentary on Galatians, p. 22), "implies that Phrygia and Galatia here are not to be regarded as separate districts. The country which was now evangelized might be called indifferently Phrygia or Galatia." This view is adopted, apparently not without some misgiving, by Mr. Page, whose notes on the Acts are without a rival as a scholarly exposition of the text.

From this view of "the *vinculum* of the common article"

I am obliged to dissent. In quoting passages from which to deduce what I believe to be the real force of this subtilty of Greek idiom, I shall confine myself to phrases which occur in St. Luke's writings. Just before the phrase under discussion we have the words τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις (v. 4). Are we here to understand persons who "according to one way of speaking" are apostles, "but who are also" elders? Such an interpretation is excluded by the term of the decree itself οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (xv. 23, comp. v. 22). When St. Luke writes in xvii. 18 τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἐπικουρίων καὶ Στωικῶν φιλοσόφων, and in xxiii. 7 ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων, does he mean us to understand in the one passage philosophers who could be "called indifferently" Epicureans or Stoics; in the other Jews who could be "called indifferently" Pharisees or Sadducees? Is this the 'only possible sense of the Greek words'? Does St. Luke in xix. 21 διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαίαν point to "a single district to which" both designations, Macedonia and Achaia, apply? Or in xxvii. 5: τὸ πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν to a tract of country, which might be "called indifferently" Cilicia or Pamphylia?

These examples, which might be multiplied (comp. i. 8, viii. 1, ix. 31, xv. 3),¹ make it abundantly clear, that "the vinculum of the common article" does not imply that the designations which follow the article are alternative expressions (comp. Acts xiii. 9, Σαῦλος δὲ ὁ καὶ Παῦλος: see Bishop Lightfoot's note on Ignatius *Eph.* i.), but rather that from the point of view of the writer at the particular moment they are invested with a kind of unity, sufficiently defined by the context. For example, in xv. 23 the Apostles and the Elders are the common authors of the

¹ The reading in xv. 41 (διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ [τὴν] Κιλικίαν) is considered by Westcott and Hort to be doubtful.

decree ; in xix. 21 St. Paul purposes to traverse Macedonia and Achaia in a single rapid journey which would end at Jerusalem ; in xxiii. 7 the Pharisees and the Sadducees, though they were all but coming to blows, are the common authors of the tumult.

I have reserved for separate consideration an exact and important parallel to the phrase under discussion. In his description of the political condition of Palestine at the time when our Lord began His ministry, St. Luke uses the expression *τετρααρχούντος τῆς Ἰουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας* (iii. 1). This phrase (1) illustrates the view of "the *vinculum* of the common article" which I have maintained above ; Ituræa and the region of Trachonitis were separate districts, but were united in the one tetrarchy of Philip ; (2) indicates that though the phrase in Acts xvi. 6 may be based on a corresponding expression in a "Travel-document," such as Prof. Ramsay supposes St. Luke to have used (p. 6 ff.), yet the *form* of the phrase is St. Luke's ; a reference to Bruder shows that *χώρα* is a favourite word with St. Luke, occurring seventeen times in his writings, eleven times in the rest of the N.T. ;¹ (3) makes it almost certain that in xvi. 6, as in Acts ii. 10, *Φρυγία* is a substantive, not an adjective ; whatever doubt still remains is, I believe, dissipated by a comparison of xviii. 23, *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*.

We arrive therefore at the conclusion that in Acts xvi. 6, St. Luke speaks of St. Paul as traversing in a single journey, which he summarily describes, two districts, Phrygia and the Galatian region.² Now districts known as Phrygia

¹ It is worth while to notice that in Mc. i. 5, *ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα* is simply a variation for *ἡ Ἰουδαία* which is used in the parallel passage (Matt. iii. 5). Such compound names as those under discussion (Lc. iii. 1, Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 22) are mere literary amplifications.

² Thus Wendt's rendering *Phrygien und das galatäische Land*, which Prof. Ramsay criticises as one "which cannot be got from the text which he approves of," is perfectly accurate.

There is a good instance of what may and of what may not be deduced from

and Galatia lie between the cities on the south which St. Paul leaves behind him, and Bithynia on the north towards which he ultimately directs his steps (xvi. 1 ff., 7).

The conclusion to which our examination of the phrase in xvi. 6 has led us, receives complete confirmation when we turn to xviii. 23. Prof. Ramsay indeed again complains of the ambiguity which he discovers in St. Luke's words "The terms," he says (p. 90), "in which the country traversed by him before reaching Asia is described are unfortunately very obscure, 'he went through the Galatic region and Phrygian' (or perhaps 'and Phrygia'), 'in order stablishing all the disciples.'" Again I must refuse to join in the Professor's complaint against St. Luke. We would indeed gladly have learned further details about St. Paul's journey. But what information St. Luke does give, he gives with absolute clearness.

When we recall our analysis of the phrase used in xvi. 6, and when we compare the following passages, xv. 3 *διήρχοντο τὴν τε Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμαρίαν*, xv. 41 *διήρχετε δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ [τὴν] Κιλικίαν*, xvii 1 *διοδεύσαντες δὲ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν*, xix. 21 *διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν*; when, further, we take account of the fact that the *διά* of the compound verb (*διερχόμενος*) in xviii. 23 is reinforced by *καθεξῆς*, it is impossible to doubt that St. Luke speaks of two adjacent districts which St. Paul successively traversed. Further, when we remark that St. Luke, in referring to the journeys of Christian teachers, is careful to give

the use of the *vinculum* of the common article in Eph. ii. 20 (*τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν*); comp. iii. 5 (*τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστ. αὐτοῦ καὶ προφ.*) On the one hand the expression used does not require us to understand persons who might be called indifferently Apostles or Prophets. This interpretation is excluded by iv. 11, *ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας*. On the other hand those indicated are so closely united that they can be represented as a single foundation (ii. 20), as the recipients of a single revelation (iii. 5). Thus the reference must be to the N. T., not the O. T., Prophets. Chrysostom, understanding ii. 20 to refer to O. T. prophets, instinctively inserts the article in his paraphrase—*θεμέλιος οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται*.

the names of places in the order in which they visited them¹ (viii. 1, ix. 31, xi. 19, xiv. 6, 19, 21, xv. 3, 41, xvi. 1, xvii. 1, xix. 21, xxvii. 5), we are convinced that St. Luke intends us to understand that in his third journey St. Paul reversed the order of his second journey, and traversed *first* the Galatian district, and *then* Phrygia.

(2) From the consideration of the crucial phrases in xvi. 6, xviii. 23, I turn to the context of the former of them.

In xvi. 1-4, St. Luke tells us definitely of St. Paul's visit to Derbe and Lystra, and by the use of the phrase, *τὰς πόλεις*, v. 4, seems to imply that St. Paul visited the other chief cities of the district. He next records the *sequel*, which he introduces by the particle *οὖν*. For this *οὖν* of historical sequence see i. 6, ii. 41, v. 41, viii. 4, 25, ix. 31, x. 23, xi. 19, xiii. 4, xiv. 3, xv. 3, 30, xvi. 11, xvii. 12, 17, xxii. 29, xxiii. 18, 22, 31, xxv. 1, 4, 17, 23, xxviii. 5. This *sequel* has two parts, which St. Luke clearly marks off by the use of *μὲν* (v. 5) and *δέ* (v. 6). In the first place St. Luke traces the fortunes of the *Churches* which St. Paul and his companions had just visited (*αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι*). This visit of their founder, probably also the settlement of the Judaic controversy through their reception of the apostolic decrees, issued in their continuous growth, a growth alike intensive and extensive—*ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπερίσσευον τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ' ἡμέραν*. In the *second* place, St. Luke follows the movements of the *travellers*, (*διήλθον δέ*).² After they had

¹ The only exception which I have noticed is ix. 31, *καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρίας*. But the explanation of this variation from the geographical order is not far to seek. Judæa and Galilee (closely connected in our Lord's ministry, Luke v. 17, xxiii. 5; John iv. 47, 54) were Jewish districts; Samaria was the home of an alien population. In ix. 31 the single article before the names of three *distinct* districts will be noticed.

² The connexion of vv. 5, 6 is unfortunately obscured by the division into paragraphs, both in Westcott and Hort's text and in the R.V. The student will find passages bearing a very close resemblance to xvi. 4-6, as far as the connexion of the sentences is concerned, in ii. 41-43, v. 41-vi. 1, viii. 4f., 25f., ix. 31f. (*ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία . . . ἐγένετο δὲ Πέτρον διερχόμενον . . . κατελ-*

left the cities of Lycaonia and Pisidia, they journeyed northwards, traversing successively Phrygia and the Galatian district. The reason why they went northwards and not westwards, as left to their own judgment they would have done, was that they had already "been forbidden of the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia (*διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες*)."

Thus the sequence of the clauses (*μὲν οὖν . . . δέ*) and the relation of the participle *κωλυθέντες* to the indicative *διήλθον* are alike fatal to Prof. Ramsay's theory, that the expression *ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα καὶ Φρυγία* means the Roman province of Galatia, and that consequently in *v. 6* we have "a geographical recapitulation of the journey which is implied in verses 4, 5" (p. 77).

The question of the sequence of clauses is not examined by Prof. Ramsay. He has, however, dealt with the second point indicated just above. It will be best to quote his own words. "It is advisable," he writes (p. 89), "to notice an argument derived from the syntax of *xvi. 6*. It has been contended that the participle *κωλυθέντες* gives the reason for the finite verb *διήλθον*, and is therefore preliminary to it in the sequence of time. We reply that the participial construction cannot, in this author, be pressed in that way. He is often loose in the framing of his sentences, and in the long sentence in verses 6 and 7 he varies the succession of verbs by making some of them participles. The sequence of the verbs is also the sequence of time: (1) They went through the Phrygo-Galatic land; (2) they were forbidden to speak in Asia; (3) they came over against Mysia; (4) they assayed to go into Bithynia; (5) the Spirit suffered them not; (6) they passed through¹ Mysia; (7) they came to Troas."

θεῶν, xi. 19f., xii. 5f., xiii. 4-6, xiv. 3-5, xv. 3f., xvii. 12, 17-19, xxiii. 18f., xxv. 4-6, xxviii. 5f. Compare Mr. Page's note on ii. 41f.

¹ This is a slip. The word *παρελθόντες* (*xvi. 8*) means that they skirted

This paragraph is a remarkable one. Hard pressed by a very simple and decisive grammatical argument, Prof. Ramsay has taken refuge in the desperate expedient of maintaining that a Greek writer can vary "the succession of verbs by making some of them participles." This seems to me, if Prof. Ramsay will pardon the illustration, as if a chess-player, somewhat suddenly checkmated by the combined action of a bishop and a knight standing in certain relative positions, were to plead that in this particular game the action of the chess-men "cannot be pressed in that way," that, in fact, a bishop and a knight are interchangeable, and may be transposed. A player holding these views would play on fearless of defeat.

It is, of course, certain that St. Luke is "often loose in the framing of his sentences." So is Thucydides. But it is no less certain that a Greek writer who, in the way supposed, varied "the succession of verbs by making some of them participles," would be incapable of writing half a page of intelligible narrative. He would set at defiance the elementary laws of the Greek language, and we should be without the means of ascertaining his meaning. If we could believe that St. Luke, in a short and simple clause where there could be no anacoluthon, wrote *διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες* when what he really meant would have been easily and naturally expressed by the words *διελθόντες . . . ἐκωλύθησαν*,¹ it would not be worth while to waste our energies in studying his writings any more. They would remain beyond, because below, criticism.

Mysia without passing through it (comp. Mc. vi. 48). Prof. Ramsay elsewhere (p. 76) correctly paraphrases thus: "Keeping along the southern frontier of Mysia."

¹ In a Greek sentence, when an anarthrous aorist participle agrees with the subject of an aorist indicative, the participle expresses an act *either* coincident in time with (*e.g.* Acts viii. 34, ἀποκριθείς . . . εἶπεν), or prior to (*e.g.* Acts ix. 2, προσελθὼν . . . ἠγάσαστο), that which is expressed by the indicative. See Dr. Moulton's *Winer*, p. 430. Whether the participle stands before or after the indicative is a matter determined simply by considerations of euphony

I am quite confident that Prof. Ramsay wrote the paragraph, which it has been necessary to criticise, hastily, and that he is too good a scholar to hold to the proposition as to the possible functions of the Greek participle, which he has incautiously laid down. Just in proportion as we rate very highly Prof. Ramsay's work as a traveller and an epigraphist, and as we gladly recognise that a volume of lectures from his pen was sure to meet with a warm welcome, and to be widely read, we feel it to be a matter for serious regret that he did not examine the document which he undertook to interpret and illustrate with the care and accuracy which are incumbent on a scholar, especially when he addresses himself to a popular audience. The impression that Prof. Ramsay has made out a very strong, some will think an unanswerable, case, for his view of St. Paul's journeys has probably spread very widely. Very few readers go through Prof. Ramsay's arguments with their Greek Testament in their hands. It is the unguarded statements and arguments of popular, often deservedly popular, books which sow and water popular errors.

The verdict, then, which, as I believe, any Greek scholar who goes into the evidence supplied by St. Luke's language must pronounce on the South-Galatian theory, is that it is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek grammar.

The questions of interpretation, which have been discussed thus far, have prepared the way for an attempt to bring out more clearly what I believe to be the chief points in connexion with St. Paul's visits to Galatia, *i.e.* North Galatia, so far as they seem to be suggested by St.

and emphasis. It will be noticed that in Acts xiii. 4 (*ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος κατῆλθον κ.τ.λ.*) we have an incident which is the converse of that related in xvi. 6.

Some authorities, *e.g.*, HLP lat. vg. (*transeuntes autem Frygiam et Galatiae regionem uetati sunt*) support *διελθόντες* in place of *διῆλθον*. The attestation, however, is decisively in favour of *διῆλθον*.

Luke's narrative. I need hardly say that I have no claim to speak with authority as to the route which St. Paul took. I have simply used the excellent map which accompanies Prof. Ramsay's volume, as a help to the understanding of the brief hints given by St. Luke.

The main interest which the record of the earlier part of St. Paul's second journey has for us, lies in the fact that it was a period of preparation for his entrance into Europe as a Christian missionary. In xv. 35-41 St. Luke records St. Paul's sojourn at the Syrian Antioch. But the only details of his stay there, of which we are informed, are his separation from Barnabas and his choice of Silas as a companion. Of the four verses (xvi. 1-4), which St. Luke devotes to the Apostle's visit to the churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia, three relate to St. Paul's call of Timothy. Again, in xvi. 6-10, our attention is concentrated not on the Apostle's journey itself, but on the divine interpositions, which closed first one door of activity, and then another, and which finally summoned him into Europe.

At each stage of the narrative we crave fuller information. St. Luke tells us little probably because he knew little. We can hardly doubt that the history reflects the mind of St. Paul. Whether St. Luke gained his information from oral communication, or, as seems more likely, from written memoranda, St. Paul himself is probably the ultimate authority. And to St. Paul the matter of absorbing interest would be the way in which there was brought home to him God's call to enter on a new stage of missionary activity, a stage which included within itself the foundation of the churches of Macedonia and of Achaia. He would reckon it a call second in importance only to the primary call on the road to Damascus.

But Prof. Ramsay cannot believe that, if St. Paul really penetrated into Northern Galatia, St. Luke would have given us so little information about his visit there. "On

the above interpretation," he writes (p. 83), "we have to interpose between the two verbs a tale of months of wandering over Galatia. No person who possessed any literary faculty could write like this." It will have already appeared that I cannot altogether agree with Prof. Ramsay as to what could or could not be written by a Greek author "with any literary faculty." But the point of real importance seems to me very obvious. The number of details which a conscientious historian records at any given part of his work depends not on his "literary faculty," but rather on the amount of information which he possesses. If he knows only the bare outline of the facts, he will record only the bare outline of the facts. Every student of the Acts must have been struck by St. Luke's silences. I will take a single example. In two verses (xviii. 22 f.) St. Luke summarizes a journey by sea from Ephesus to Cæsarea, from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, from Jerusalem to Antioch; a sojourn of some duration at Antioch; a journey through "the Galatian territory and Phrygia." "Nothing is more striking," wrote Bishop Lightfoot in his article on the Acts in the new edition of the *Dictionary of the Bible* (p. 33), "than the want of proportion in the Acts. In some parts the history of a few months occupies several chapters; in others the history of many years is disposed of in two or three verses. Sometimes we have a diary of a journey or a voyage; elsewhere a bald statement of the main facts is given."¹

¹ Compare Prof. Ramsay's treatment of the relation of the Acts to St. Paul's Epistles. "On the usual theory," he writes (p. 103), "we find throughout St. Paul's writings no single word to show that he retained a kindly recollection of them [the South-Galatian group of Churches] or an interest in them. Once he does refer to them, but only to recall his sufferings and persecution among them (2 Tim. iii. 11); in no other way, at no other time, does he make any allusion to them. . . . It would be impossible to conceive a more direct contradiction in tone and emotional feeling than exists, on this theory, between Acts and Galatians as regards St. Paul's attitude to the South-Galatian churches." This argument would be a strong one if (1) we had any reason for thinking that all St. Paul's letters have been preserved; (2) his letters

The narrative is brief. But it is worth while to endeavour to expand the writer's hints, always remembering that in such an expansion much must be largely conjectural.

The missionaries then determined that, when they left the cities of Lycaonia and Pisidia, they would travel westwards along the road which led from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus. But the proposal was frustrated. They were "forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia." It is very probable, as Prof. Ramsay suggests (p. 75), that this divine intimation came to them at Antioch. It came probably through the utterance of one or more of those who were known in the earliest age of the Church as Prophets. Such a prophetic intimation of the Divine will had started St. Paul on his first missionary journey (xiii. 2ff.), and was again to be vouchsafed to him as his third journey drew towards its close (xxi. 10f.). And yet further, as St. Paul had miraculous guidance as to the course of his journey, so, it would appear, at Lystra he had already received similar direction as to the choice of a companion. Writing to Timothy (1 Tim. i. 18) years afterwards, he reminds him of "the prophecies which led the way to thee (*τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας*)"; he reminds him, that is, that the Holy Spirit, speaking probably through the prophets, had directed his "separation for the work" (Acts xiii. 2).¹

Forbidden to turn westwards, the travellers had but little choice as to the direction in which, after leaving

were systematically autobiographical. As to "tone and emotional feeling" the Acts and the Epistles are mutually complementary. Thus we should not gather from the brief notices in the Acts (xvi. 12-15, 32, 40, xx. 6) that St. Paul had at Philippi a large body of converts, towards whom he felt a special affection. This we learn from the Letter to the Philippians. Further, in all the other extant Epistles of St. Paul "once he does refer to" the Philippians, "but only to recall his sufferings and persecution among them" (1 Thess. ii. 2).

¹ This is the interpretation which Dr. Hort, as I remember, maintained in some lectures on the Pastoral Epistles.

Antioch, they should journey. They bent their steps northwards, passing along the road, it seems likely, which led through Phrygia to Nakoleia. At this point they turned aside and entered "the Galatian district" on the east. We may conjecture that they halted at Pessinus.

Here, however, Prof. Ramsay asks a question which deserves consideration. "The question," he says (p. 81), "has then to be met, How did St. Paul come to be in North Galatia? What theory can be suggested to explain his route and his plans consistently with the rest of the narrative?" The answer, as it seems to me, is a simple one. St. Paul just now had no definite and well-considered plan. He had had a clear policy—the evangelization of Asia; but he had been prevented from carrying it out in a way which he dared not gainsay, but which he could not as yet explain. He was bewildered. He allowed himself to drift. He moved from place to place waiting on Providence.¹ We may conjecture that he intended, so far as he had a plan at all, to pass through the cities in the west corner of Galatia, and so to journey further north to the cities in the east of Bithynia and of Pontus.

But the wanderer became once again an evangelist. He was quickly, almost aimlessly, passing through "the Galatian district." Suddenly an attack of illness, probably that mysterious malady which he elsewhere calls "a thorn in the flesh," brought him to a standstill. The attack, whatever its nature, may have been short; it was certainly sharp, and it left its painful traces upon him. Before however he recovered, the Apostle learned to feel an interest in the warm-hearted Galatians: he saw how ripe they were to receive the tidings of the gospel. His illness, like the words of the prophets at Antioch and at Lystra, like

¹ For a somewhat similar crisis see 2 Cor. ii. 12 ff., vii. 5 f. It is worth while to notice how brief is St. Luke's account of this latter period (Acts xx. 1 f.).

the vision at Troas, was a voice of God. He stayed in Galatia for a time, "doing the work of an evangelist"—journeying perhaps to Ancyra or even to the cities further east. "Ye know," he afterwards wrote to his converts, "that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the former time" (Gal. iv. 13).

Such an account as this, though of course largely conjectural, seems precisely to suit the hints which we gather from the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians. It is necessary, however, to turn aside and consider Prof. Ramsay's criticisms and suggestions in connexion with St. Paul's illness.

(i.) Prof. Ramsay finds in this connexion an argument against the "North-Galatian theory." "On the North-Galatian theory, I fail to comprehend the situation implied in Gal. iv. 13. It is remarkable that the long toilsome journey, involving great physical and mental effort, and yet voluntarily undertaken, should be described as the result of a severe illness; such a result from such a cause is explicable only in certain rare circumstances" (p. 64 f.). I have already indicated what I believe to be the answer to this criticism. The exact point of St. Paul's phrase has, I think, escaped Prof. Ramsay. The apostle says, not that he *visited* the Galatians, but that he *evangelized* them, "because of an infirmity of the flesh." His illness, in other words, was the cause, not of a journey, but of a delay which was over-ruled for the spread of the gospel.

(ii.) Prof. Ramsay's own account of St. Paul's illness must also be considered. He holds that in Pamphylia St. Paul had "a bad attack of malarial fever" (p. 63), that it therefore became advisable for him to go as soon as possible "to the high lands of the interior"; that St. Paul, accordingly, crossed the Taurus and entered the Roman province of Galatia, and that thus "the evangelization of the Galatian churches was due to 'an infirmity of the

flesh' ” (p. 64). The meaning of the term Galatia has been already discussed. Does the theory that St. Paul's illness was an attack of malaria satisfy the conditions of the problem? It is true that malarial fever could be well described by the phrase which St. Paul uses in Galatians iv. 13, ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός. But is it conceivable that it is alluded to in the words which follow in the next verse, which Prof. Ramsay does not notice? Travellers recovering from malarial fever must have been common enough in those parts. “The attack,” writes Prof. Ramsay (p. 65), “described in the letter to the Galatians need not be understood as lasting long; that is not the character of such attacks.” Could St. Paul's illness, if it was such an attack as this, be described as a “temptation” to the Galatians, or as something which might reasonably have called forth their contempt and loathing (Gal. iv. 14 οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε)? Further, it is very probable, though it cannot be said to be absolutely certain, that in the two Epistles to Corinth (written, according to the common view, about the same time as the Epistle to the Galatians) there are allusions to this same “infirmity of the flesh” (see 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 8 f., xii. 7 ff.). These allusions, if such they are allowed to be, confirm the verdict against the “malaria” theory which the evidence of Galatians iv. 14 has already rendered necessary.

To resume the thread of the narrative—after spending some time (how long it is impossible to say) in Galatia, the travellers turned their steps westward. Following, possibly, the course of the Tembrogius, they arrived, we may suppose, at Dorylaion. Here they might be described as being “over against Mysia (κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν).” “And when,” St. Luke tells us (xvi. 7), “they were come over against Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia”; they determined, that is, at this point to take the road northwards leading from Dorylaion to Nicæa. But again they

were not allowed to have a policy of their own. "The Spirit of Jesus¹ suffered them not." Every door was thus closed to them save one. They could go westwards; accordingly, without entering Mysia, they skirted its southern boundary. At last they reached the sea at Troas. There the call, for which the preparation had been so long and so perplexing, came and summoned them to cross into Europe.

Briefer still is the account which St. Luke gives of St. Paul's visit to Galatia during his third missionary journey.

As the section (xvi. 1-10) which we have just considered is simply the introduction to the history of St. Paul's work in Europe, so this later section (xviii. 22, 23) is but a brief preface to the record of St. Paul's sojourn in Asia.

After a visit to Jerusalem (implied by the word *ἀναβάς*), St. Paul went to the Syrian Antioch and made there a stay of some duration. Leaving Antioch, he would pass through the Syrian and Cilician Gates. He then would travel along the north road to Sasima. At Sasima he would either take the road which goes almost due north to Tavium, or would follow the track, which afterwards became the Pilgrims' Road from Constantinople to Jerusalem, leading to Ancyra. Then, going eastwards, he would revisit "in order" the Galatian churches, which he had planted some two or three years previously. At length he would strike the road which traverses Phrygia and leads to the Pisidian Antioch. From Antioch, on the former occasion, he probably started on his journey "through Phrygia and the Galatian region." At Antioch he now probably ended his journey through the same districts, but in the reverse order—his journey "through the Galatian region and Phrygia." Passing along the road which led direct from Antioch to Ephesus—the road which before

¹ This remarkable phrase should be taken in connexion with the accounts of St. Paul's conversion (Acts ix. 5, xxii. 8, 17 f., xxvi. 15 ff.).

he had been forbidden to traverse—he at length set foot in the latter city, and there founded the Church which in the closing years of the century succeeded Jerusalem and the Syrian Antioch as the metropolis of Apostolic Christianity.

F. H. CHASE.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

II.

3. DOES פַּחְרִין in Aramaic mean *tiles*? Prof. Marshall argues, without any misgivings, that it does. In the EXPOSITOR, March, 1891, p. 219, he says, “פַּחְרִין would be tiles.” When challenged by Mr. Allen for his proof, he now produces it: “פַּחְרָא = a potter, *κεραμεύς*, פַּחְרָא = earthenware, as in J, Exod. 12, 22, מִן דְּפַחְרָא = vessel of earthenware. The plural of nouns of material denotes pieces of that material. Hence פַּחְרִין must denote *κέραμοι*, tiles.” It is allowed, then, that פַּחְרִין is not known to occur with that meaning, but it is argued that it ought to have it. Obviously, however, the argument is fallacious. There is no doubt that פַּחְרָא means *earthenware*, but it does not follow from this that the plural פַּחְרִין has the definite sense of *tiles*: it may have been used to denote *fragments*, or *pieces*, of earthenware: can it be shown that Job (2, 8), when he took, in the Hebrew a חָרַשׁ, in the Aramaic a פַּחַר, to scrape himself with, took definitely a “tile?” What the native Aramaic word for a *tile* was I am very ready to own I do not know. And the translators of the *Lectio* and of the *Harkleian Version* appear to have been in the same predicament. For they know well enough what *κεράμων* in Luke 5, 19 means, but they express it, not by any genuine Aramaic word, but by *κεραμίδες*, or *κεραμίδιον* (ܟܪܡܝܕܝܘܢ), the diminutive of *κέραμος* itself, and the recognised