

received of His Father, He fulfilled the will of His Father. There was a sphere where His Life was the rule, where His dialect was the language of the country and His was the habit of living. His unlikeness to this world implies His likeness to another world. One evening you find among the reeds of your lake an unknown bird, whose broad breast and powerful pinions are not meant for this inland scene. It is resting midway between two oceans, and by to-morrow will have gone. Does not that bird prove the ocean it left, does it not prove the ocean whither it has flown? "Jesus, knowing . . . that He was come from God and went to God," is the Revelation and Confirmation of Ageless Life.

JOHN WATSON.

A REPLY TO MR. CHASE.

II.

ON the preliminary part of this discussion, viz. the question whether the South-Galatian theory is grammatically possible, enough probably has been said; and we now enter on the real subject, viz., Is that theory right or wrong? Perhaps it might seem better to have dispensed with the preliminary part altogether, and begun at once to the main question; but, in answering any critic,¹ I have always met him on his own ground. Now Mr. Chase chose this method of attack, and pressed home the charge of grammatical impossibility in reiterated assertions. It seemed to me that a reply was imperatively required, and that it must be immediate; and there was naturally very little time be-

¹ In this case I spent some time in trying more than one device to avoid the necessity. Mere pressure of college work, besides other reasons, p. 45, counselled silence. Only the fortnight's vacation at Christmas has made the following series possible.

tween the arrival of the advance sheets for December, and the closing of the January number of the EXPOSITOR.

I must begin by an expression of apology to Mr. Chase on two points, where I fear I have been uncharitable to him. In my former article, p. 44, the words "deliberate error" are liable to misconstruction, as a friend points out. I meant only to distinguish the case where Mr. Chase weighs the right and the wrong interpretation against each other, preferring what I consider the wrong one, from the case where he reads one particle, forgetting entirely the existence of another; and I did not dream of the construction that he chose the wrong interpretation because it suited him. I regret much to have used words that have a harsh and unfair appearance.¹

The second is more serious. On p. 59 I have to retract what is said about the Authorised Version. It translates a text which Mr. Chase expressly notices, and which takes away any slight relevancy that there was in my remarks. It may be added that I went to our University Library to look up old texts of *Acts*, and to see whether there was any discrepancy of reading that affected the sense: but I was foolishly content with looking up some comparatively recent texts, which I thought were old enough to satisfy my object. Such are the mistakes which one makes in a subject where one is not a specialist. I have taken my life in my hand and ventured among the critics, fully recognising, as I said, that "I want the sureness of touch which long familiarity with the subject alone can give," and that I am almost certain to trip occasionally. Had I the oppor-

¹ Another friend, whose opinion I count one of my safest guides, objects to a note on p. 56, and I regret the form it has. It was a hasty and ill-considered addition, made after I had forgot the plan of that paragraph, which was to insist on the possibility of two different interpretations of *μὲν οὖν*, reserving for the sequel the discussion as to which was the better. I may add that the discussion on this point is purely academic; the South-Galatian theory is as easy with one as with the other view. Mr. Chase is quite in error when he says (p. 409) that the sequence of clauses is fatal to my view.

tunity of appealing oftener to Dr. Sanday's ever ready and ever certain help, I should be safer. For the statements on this point I therefore apologise to Mr. Chase and to the reader.¹

It will be noticed that the section in question contains no argument that bears on the Galatian question, but was introduced merely to relieve my feelings on account of Mr. Chase's accusation that I had failed in the "care and accuracy that are incumbent on a scholar, especially when addressing himself to a popular audience." I still think that it would have been better if Mr. Chase had confined himself to setting forth what he considered to be my errors of intellect and scholarship; on that ground I can meet him with perfect equanimity and, I trust, good temper. But I must confess that I am apt to grow warm when accused of inability to feel and practise (for, as the Turks say, the two are one) the first essentials of scientific investigation. The accusation is so easy to make, and so hard to refute! Nor can it advance in any way what ought to be Mr. Chase's real object, viz., the disproof of the "South-Galatian theory."

I have also been unjust to Weiss in saying, p. 55 n., that he perhaps agrees with Mr. Chase about $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ in xvi. 5. He says, on the contrary, that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, *fügt noch eine andere nachträgliche Bemerkung über den Erfolg dieser Durchreise* (v. 4) *an*. I transferred to this place his note on ix. 31. I must therefore apologise also for the note on p. 57. Weiss has not forgotten the particle; he merely differs from some scholars as to whether it occurs in ix. 31.

¹ I have inadvertently given the impression that I admitted Mr. Chase's assertion that I was "pressed by a grammatical argument." On the contrary, I shall in due course proceed to show that the South-Galatian theory is perfectly consistent with taking *καλωθέτες* in xvi. 6 as giving the reason for *διήλθον*; and several friends, who accept or regard favourably the theory, prefer to take it in that way; but I shall also set forth the reasons that lead me to prefer the interpretation given in my book.

It is quite justifiable to doubt whether or not the compound participle is used in ix. 31 or in xvi. 5; it is quite unjustifiable to assert, as Mr. Chase does, that there can be no question. Mr. Chase has a perfect right to differ from me, but he has not proved his right to deny the *possibility* of my opinion.

As I have already said (see pp. 43, 45), Mr. Chase is right to assume the place of a critic. It is a proceeding most laudable and salutary to criticise keenly, and even severely, a theory on any historical point, especially on one of special importance and of wide interest; but it is a very different thing to declare that the theorist offends in the foundations of his theory against "the elementary laws of Greek grammar." Such an accusation is justifiable only in very extreme cases of incapacity, and requires to be supported by great accuracy and completeness in the steps of the criticism. As Mr. Chase has not confined himself to arguing against my theory, but has, with ingenuous frankness, made very plain his opinion that I am unfit to understand the meaning of "luminously clear" passages of Greek, he will grant that it is both fair and necessary for me occasionally to bring out what is the precise value of his opinion on points of scholarship. My book is founded from beginning to end on careful consideration of delicate shades of meaning of the Greek or Latin authorities, and I am therefore bound to show that his opinion is untrustworthy.

Hitherto, in opposition to Mr. Chase's confident declaration that my opinion on the Galatians is "shipwrecked on the rock of Greek grammar," I have confined myself to proving that the theory gives a possible and justifiable interpretation of the passages on which it is founded, and that it has the right, which Mr. Chase absolutely denied it, to be considered. I shall now go further, and take up in succession every point he has criticised, and examine

with minute and microscopic care the passages of *Acts* on which he has touched; and, if the editor permits me, I feel confident that before long one or other of the rival theories as to the Galatians will be dead. In vindicating the right of my theory to be heard, I invoked the authority of other scholars, who had agreed in one point or another with my interpretations; for their agreement was, in itself, a justification of the right. For the future, I shall make less use of authority, as I intend now to attack Mr. Chase's position; and such an attack must be made by reasoned argument, not by appeal to any authority, however high. It will also be out of place, in arguing that my theory is right and his theory wrong, to use the same tone that seems suitable in asserting my right to get a hearing. Against such a summary ejection from court, as Mr. Chase proposed to inflict, the strongest protest is the best. I have a *locus standi* in this case, and confidently claim it. But now, assuming that I have a place, I shall leave to the reader's judgment my reasons in defence of my position.

I do not defend all my old arguments. When I wrote the book, the scales were only beginning to fall from my eyes, and I did not see the full meaning and consequences of the theory I was supporting. Some things were said wrongly, many things inadequately, others not said at all. But I feel more strongly than before that I was standing on the right foundation, and that my position is unshaken, though I have been in the second and third editions casting away some of the encumbrances that hindered the clear exposition of my thesis.

VIII. It will, perhaps, be allowed, even by Mr. Chase, that I have already succeeded in establishing the admissibility of Lightfoot's view, that *Φρυγίαν* in xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, is an adjective. But I shall now attempt to show that Lightfoot, Page, Weiss, and Bishop Jacobson are right in saying that it *must* be taken

as an adjective.¹ Mr. Chase has not made it quite clear whether he intends to maintain that classical Greek writers would use *Φρυγίαν* in this way as a noun, or merely holds that this individual author (Luke, as he and I are agreed) was so incorrect in expression and grammar as to use a form which classical Greek language would never permit. His confident belief that *Φρυγίαν* must be a noun, p. 406, and his unhesitating assertion that "according to the ordinary rules of Greek grammar," the passage is "luminously clear," would suggest that he intends to maintain the former of these two alternatives. Now, if one of Mr. Chase's pupils at college had ever ventured to put before him a Greek prose exercise, in which the English phrase "the father and the good boy," was rendered *τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἀγαθὸν παῖδα*, or "Scythia and the province of Thrace" was rendered *τὴν Σκυθίαν καὶ Θρακικὴν ἐπαρχίαν*, Mr. Chase would, I believe, have made short work with him, and ordered him to repeat the article in both cases, and, if he defended himself by supposed analogies, would gently but firmly have exposed his error in every case that he brought forward. I feel so sure that Mr. Chase is scholar enough to take this course, that I conclude that he merely "wrote the paragraphs hastily" (p. 411), and did not fully realize what, in his eagerness to dispose of me, he was committing himself to. Until he actually asserts that he fully meant this extreme statement, I cannot believe that he was more than hasty and incautious in language.

We, therefore, must take the other alternative. Mr. Chase, we suppose, holds that we must, in this case,

¹ Bishop Herve, on the other hand, emphatically agrees with Mr. Chase; his argument is remarkable: "Phrygia is always a noun substantive, and cannot here be taken as an adjective belonging to *χώρα*." In English, Phrygia is always a noun, but a glance at any suitable dictionary will show that *Φρυγία* in Greek is frequently an adjective. [A passage in *Ælian, Epist. penult.*, is quoted by Stephanus as *τῆ Φρυγία καὶ Θράττῃ* (the pair of slaves, Phrygia and Thratta); but the texts of Aldus, Gesner, and Hercher, all have *τῆ Φρυγία τε καὶ τῆ Θράττῃ*.]

conclude that Luke, a late writer in a period which classical scholars call degenerate, used a form of expression which classical Greek would disown, but which, as analogy and surroundings prove, can have no other meaning than that which Mr. Chase assigns to it.¹ The case then depends on analogies from other passages in the author, and on arguments from the circumstances in which the action lay. As to the latter, we are simply in the old position, discussing which of two theories is right; and if Mr. Chase had from the first confined himself to that position, he would have been perfectly justifiable and prudent. The question between the two theories is open ground, full of interest, void of offence and hard judgments, and wide enough for him and me and a host of other disputants.

As to the analogies by which we can determine what *Luke* would be likely to write, I have already shown that Mr. Chase has found only one, *Luke* iii. 1; and that it not only is susceptible of being understood in the way Lightfoot quoted it, but also, when so understood, avoids a linguistic anachronism (viz. the use of a noun Ἰτουραία) to which Mr. Chase would expose it. I shall now give reasons for the view that *Luke* iii. 1 cannot be understood as Mr. Chase understands it, and must be understood as Lightfoot took it.

IX. In discussing this difficult passage, I was unconsciously touching upon one of the oft discussed "inaccuracies" of Luke. For example, Holtzmann, in his *Hand-Commentar* to the Synoptic Gospels, p. 58, after enumerating the districts which Josephus assigns to Philip's government, proceeds to point out that Luke is in error when he mentions among them Ituræa in addition to

¹ In that case Mr. Chase will see that he must cut out his statements about "the ordinary rules of Greek grammar," and that in common honesty he is bound to apologise to the *manes* of Lightfoot, and to Mr. Page (whom also he quotes).

Trachonitis;¹ and he suggests that the origin of Luke's error lies in an anachronism, viz., that Luke attributes to the time of Philip the arrangement of territory which existed afterwards under Agrippa. It is clear, then, that Holtzmann, like Mr. Chase, takes *Ἰτουραίας* in Luke iii. 1 as a noun, attributing to that author an utter disregard of the rules of Greek expression as observed by the older classical authors; and, if the result were to bring Luke into accordance with historical fact and with contemporary usage of geographical terms, one might regard favourably the interpretation, and conclude that Luke wrote degenerate Greek, and did not observe the old accurate rules of expression. But why should Mr. Chase insist with such emphasis that Luke must have spoken in that way, merely with the result of thrusting an inaccuracy on him? That is hard to understand. From his article one would infer that Mr. Chase has a sincere admiration for Luke, and would rather be inclined to discover in him proofs of historical accuracy, so far as he conscientiously could. Yet here he makes him write bad grammar, and consequently bad history.

It must be observed that, to make good my defence, it is not necessary for me to prove that Luke's history and geography were both right in this phrase. I do, indeed, think that something can be said, and has been already said in part, in favour of his accuracy in both respects, if my interpretation is followed; whereas it is generally allowed that his statement is indefensible on the interpretation followed by Dr. Holtzmann and Mr. Chase. But even if he were partly wrong on my interpretation, he would still be saved from some of the worst faults which the other interpretation forces on him. Further, even if he is wrong in identifying the Ituræan with the Trachonitic country, he

¹ Auf einem Irrthum beruht es daher schon, wenn Lucas neben Trachonitis noch Ituræa nennt.

has at least the company and the emphatic confirmation of Eusebius, bishop of the neighbouring city of Cæsarea,¹ who was a native, educated in the country, and a first-class authority.

It would be a quite fair and justifiable position that Luke wrote good Greek and accurate history, siding with Eusebius as to the geography of Syria, and did not write bad Greek and false history, siding with Mr. Chase in the geographical question.

I shall, however, not confine myself to this safe ground; but go on to argue that Luke is right even as to geography. In short, the charge of inaccuracy against this excellent historian is founded here on bad translation and buttressed by bad geography.

In writing the notes on the Ituræan country in my last article, I used only the ancient writers and those modern authorities whom I quoted by name. Being compelled to write very hurriedly in order to be in time for the first issue of the EXPOSITOR after Mr. Chase's article appeared, I did not think of looking into Prof. E. Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*; but I now observe that he has examined the point minutely in his second edition, vol. i., p. 593f., and that he arrives at a very different conclusion from me. I am sorry once more to have, unintentionally, come into collision with Dr. Schürer; but I find myself unconvinced by his arguments and unable to recede from my position. In the first place, as to the name of the country, Dr. Schürer, while he is for the most part careful and accurate, sometimes uses Ituræa as a proper regional name,² and quotes prominently, p. 594,

¹ Euseb., *Onomast.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 298: Τραχωνίτις χώρα ἢ καὶ Ἰτρούπαλα. I quote from Schürer, as explained below, not having access to the original. I also assume that Schürer is right in taking the work as genuine.

² This is almost confined to the heading of the chapter: in the text Dr. Schürer is precise and accurate throughout, speaking everywhere of the country

n. 2, from Appian, *Civ.* v. 7, τὴν Ἰτουραίων. I do not know what edition of Appian he uses; but the one which lies before me (Didot, Paris, 1840) confirms my statement that Appian uses only the words τὴν Ἰτουραίων, and I feel inclined to suspect, either that there is a misprint in Dr. Schürer's note, or that, having in his mind the idea of the country, he has here misquoted. None of the other passages which he quotes contain the regional name *Ituræa*, till we come down to the fourth century, when we find the doubtful language of Epiphanius (quoted already by me), and a phrase of Eusebius (which escaped me), *Onomast.*, p. 268, Ἰτουραία ἢ καὶ Τραχωνίτις. I may, therefore, fairly claim that Dr. Schürer's exhaustive learning (combined with a few additional references quoted by me), places beyond doubt my accuracy in saying that a regional name *Ituræa* was unknown till the fourth century; and that those who interpret Luke as using that name force an anachronism on him.

In the second place, as to the relation between, the *Ituræan* country and *Trachonitis*, Dr. Schürer argues that they were distinct and separate countries, at a considerable distance from one another. But he admits that Eusebius expressly and positively identifies them in two passages.

For my own part, I have always gone on the principle that a distinct and positive statement by a competent witness like Eusebius, familiar with the country, cannot be set aside by such an elaborate chain of comparison and inference from inferior authorities as Dr. Schürer relies on. Even, if I could trace no flaw in his reasoning, I should distrust his authorities; but I cannot accept all his reasoning. Without troubling the readers of the *EXPOSITOR* too much with this geographical question, let me point

of the *Ituræans*, except on p. 600 (see also p. 353 f.), where he interprets *Luke* iii. 1 as mentioning *Ituræa*.

out¹ that Dr. Schürer is not very consistent and clear in his argument, for he begins by saying that, while Christian theologians try to put the Ituræans as close as possible to Trachonitis (on account of *Luke* iii. 1), and Eusebius has even identified them, "all historical evidence points in the most distinct way to Lebanon";² yet immediately after this he goes on to say that the Ituræans must certainly be looked for in Anti-Lebanon.³ But Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon are as distinct as Taurus and Anti-Taurus, almost as distinct as the Alps and the Northern Apennines. Between them lies the great plain called Cœle-Syria. Dr. Schürer does not of course mean that the Ituræans inhabited Cœle-Syria. He has, therefore, committed himself to one of two alternatives. Either he holds that the Ituræans lived in two separate tribes, one inhabiting Lebanon, and the other Anti-Lebanon; or when he admits that some of the historical evidence points to Anti-Lebanon, he contradicts his own previous statement that all the historical evidence points most precisely to Lebanon. To me it appears that the best evidence points to Anti-Lebanon;⁴ and that Trachonitis is the rough hilly land extending back to the south and south-east from Anti-Lebanon. This country, including Anti-Lebanon, was the

¹ Dr. Schürer objected in very strong terms to my procedure in my *Church in the Empire*, pp. 13-15, where I disagreed from him without giving reasons. I believe, therefore, that he would prefer that I should indicate even briefly my reasons in the present case.

² Aber alle historischen Zeugnisse weisen auf's bestimmteste nach dem Libanon, p. 595.

³ Da die Ituræer öfters mit den Arabern zusammen genannt werden, so sind sie wohl in dem die Marsyasebene im Osten begrenzenden Gebirgszuge, d. h. im Antilibanos zu suchen, *ib.*

⁴ The strongest evidence for Lebanon is found in a Venetian inscription, once considered a forgery, but now justified against all possible scepticism, *adversus Ituræos in Libano monte* (*Ephemeris Epigraphica*, iv. p. 537). But there is not the slightest difficulty in supposing that the framers of the inscription in honour of this Roman official had no care for accurate distinction between *Libanus* and *Anti-Libanus*. In the long controversy as to the authenticity of this inscription Boyle and Lewin took the right side.

home of the Ituræans, and, if so, Eusebius and Luke are fully justified. In fact, Dr. Schürer himself, in another place, vol. i. p. 354, comes so close to this view that I can only wonder why he does not carry it out consistently. He says that the statement of Luke is *nicht ganz unrichtig*, for the district Panias towards the source of the Jordan formerly belonged to the state of the Ituræans. Now Josephus expressly asserts that Philip governed Panias. I would only propose to modify Dr. Schürer's expression a very little, and read *die Angabe des Lukas ist ganz richtig*, when it is rightly translated. The Ituræans inhabited a wide district, Anti-Lebanon and the Trachonitic Plateau (in part or in whole) stretching back from it towards Arabia; Philip governed the Ituræan country, viz. that part which was included in the Trachonitic plateau.¹ Similarly Paul traversed the Phrygian country, viz. that part which was included in the Galatic country. In proportion as Mr. Chase's parallel would have been strong against me if he had been right in his translation, so it is strong in my favour when properly understood.

Prof. Rendel Harris points out to me that the Peshito version gives the countries separately, "Ituræa and the region of Trachon." The Syriac translator, as we can well imagine, was not so good a Greek scholar as Eusebius, while he was not, as Eusebius was, a native of Palestine

¹ It deserves notice also that, whereas Dr. Schürer claims that the frequent references to the rugged and mountainous nature of the country inhabited by the Ituræans confirm his identification of Ituræa with Lebanon, these references suit equally well with Eusebius's view that Ituræa was Trachonitis, for Trachonitis means "the rugged stony tract or plateau." As I have already said, Strabo's description seems clear in favour of Eusebius and against Dr. Schürer, who tries in vain to explain Strabo in his own favour. The close connexion implied by Strabo between the Ituræans and the Arabians is, as Dr. Schürer himself seems to recognise, inconsistent with a situation in Lebanon, and demands a situation in Anti-Lebanon and Trachonitis. [I leave to others better informed than I am the question whether Trachon and Trachonitis are absolutely identical, or whether some partial distinction can be drawn between them, one being wider than the other; also the task of indicating more accurately the bounds of the Ituræan country.]

and familiar with Trachonitis. Accordingly he fell into the same enticing error that so many of the modern critics have given way to.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.—To the department of Introduction several notable contributions have recently been made. Probably that to which readers will turn with the most eager expectation is Prof. Sanday's Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration* (Longmans, Green & Co.). It will doubtless disappoint some to find that in this volume there is no full and thorough dogmatic treatment of this important and difficult theme: but, as the sub-title warns us, the volume contains "Eight Lectures on the *Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration.*" This leads Prof. Sanday to enquire into the character and reception of the books of the Old and New Testaments, and much of the material which he adduces in connection with the New Testament Canon is valuable. Indeed, the chief value of the volume will be found not in any final conclusions arrived at, but in the prominence given to facts and ideas which have not received sufficient attention. A good deal of hesitation and uncertainty appears in the treatment of certain points, and this may be referred to the writer's characteristic caution and fairness. Sometimes, however, greater exactness would have been desirable and could have been arrived at. To say that "the authority of the Bible is derived from what is commonly called its inspiration" is rather a loosely stated axiom to lay as the foundation of a book; and it might be thought to indicate some uncertainty both as to the source of authority and as to the test of canonicity. His uncertainty regarding 2 Peter is wise, although the similarity he finds between

¹ But on this point a friend says that, from a comparison of the Peshito and the Curetonian fragment, he infers that the oldest Syriac version must have agreed with my translation. *Cur.* has "in the district (*athro*) of Ituræa and in the region (*cōr*) of Tracono": *Pesh.* "in Ituræa and in the district (*athro*) of Tracono." These look like two modifications of a primitive form "in the district Ituræa and Trachonitis," the changes being made in order to bring "district" close to "Trachonitis" as in the Greek.