

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

NOTES ON A RECENT CONTROVERSY.

PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY'S very interesting and important work on *The Church in the Roman Empire* has thrown much new light upon the record of St. Paul's missionary journeys in Asia Minor, and has revived a question which of late years had seemingly been set at rest for English students by the late Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on "The Churches of Galatia" in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*.

The question, as there stated (p. 17), is whether the Churches mentioned in *Galatians* i. 2 are to be placed in "the comparatively small district occupied by the Gauls, Galatia properly so called, or the much larger territory included in the Roman province of that name."

Dr. Lightfoot, with admirable fairness, first points out in a very striking passage some of the "considerations in favour of the Roman province." "The term 'Galatia,'" he says, "in that case will comprise not only the towns of Derbe and Lystra, but also, it would seem, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch; and we shall then have in the narrative of St. Luke (Acts xiii. 14-xiv. 24) a full and detailed account of the founding of the Galatian Churches." . . . "It must be confessed, too, that this view has much to recommend it at first sight. The Apostle's account of his hearty and enthusiastic welcome by the Galatians as an angel of God (iv. 14), would have its counterpart in the impulsive warmth of the barbarians at Lystra, who would have sacrificed to him, imagining that 'the gods had come down in

the likeness of men' (Acts xiv. 11). His references to 'the temptation in the flesh,' and 'the marks of the Lord Jesus' branded on his body (Gal. iv. 14; vi. 17), are then illustrated, or thought to be illustrated, by the persecutions and sufferings that 'came unto him at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra' (2 Tim. iii. 11). The progress of Judaizing tendencies among the Galatians is then accounted for by the presence of a large Jewish element such as the history describes in those Churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia."

Bishop Lightfoot does not himself accept this view, but proceeds to argue with his usual ability that the Churches addressed in the Epistle were to be found in the chief cities of North Galatia, Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium, and perhaps Juliopolis or Gordium.

Professor Ramsay, whose work is founded on his own travels and explorations, adopts the former, or, as he conveniently names it, "the South Galatian theory."

This part of his work has been criticised in THE EXPOSITOR, December, 1893, by the Rev. F. H. Chase, Principal of the Cambridge Clergy Training School. The criticism has given rise to a discussion in several numbers of THE EXPOSITOR for the present year. Unfortunately, the Professor and his Critic are still at issue on various points of more or less interest, and especially on the main question, What was the locality of "the Churches of Galatia?" This being a matter of the greatest importance to a right understanding of the personal history and work of the great Apostle, and to the determination of the order, date, and true interpretation of his earlier epistles, I have been encouraged by the known wishes of several learned friends to try to clear up some of the points now left in dispute, and to ascertain, as far as I may be able, which of the rival theories is the better entitled to our acceptance.

I. The first point on which Professor Ramsay and his Critic are at issue is the connexion between the clauses *ai*

μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο . . . (v. 5) and διήλθον δὲ . . . (v. 6).

Mr. Chase states the connexion as follows (THE EXPOSITOR, December, 1893, p. 408) :—

“ 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. . . . This *sequel* has two parts, which St. Luke clearly marks off by the use of μὲν (v. 5) and δέ (v. 6).”

Mr. Chase evidently regards the whole passage vv. 1–8 as *one continuous narrative proceeding entirely and originally from the same author*; and from this, which has been the usual point of view, his statement of the connexion of the passage is strictly in accordance with the general use of the distributive particles μὲν and δέ.

On the other hand, Professor Ramsay regards this as one of the passages which prove that “the account given in Acts of St. Paul’s journeys, is founded on, or perhaps actually incorporates, an account written down under the immediate influence of Paul himself.”

The same view is taken by Wendt, in his revised edition of Meyer’s *Commentary*. Verses 4, 5, he says, stand out conspicuously as an insertion by St. Luke in the summary Travel-document, which is resumed in xvi. 6 ff.¹ “The writer,” says Professor Ramsay, “retains the precise words of his authority in xvi. 6, 7, and this authority was a document written, whether by himself at an earlier time or by some other person, under the immediate influence of St. Paul himself.”

¹ A similar view is approved by Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, The Epistle to the Galatians, No. x. note. He thinks it highly probable “that there is in this place a dislocation of the text, and that the fourth and fifth verses of the sixteenth chapter ought to follow the last verse of the fifteenth. . . . And then the sixteenth chapter takes up a new and unbroken paragraph.”

On this view of the passage the δέ in xvi. 6 is one of "the precise words" of the Travel-document, and as such is naturally regarded by Professor Ramsay as having no reference to μέν in v. 5. This he explains by the remark that in the double particle μέν οὖν "the μέν has no relation whatever to a following δέ, but coheres and is merged in the unified compound μενοῦν."

I do not find that Professor Ramsay has quoted any examples in which either μέν οὖν or μενοῦν is so used that "the μέν has no relation whatever to a following δέ." It is however a matter on which grammarians are not altogether agreed. Dr. Donaldson, *Greek Grammar*, § 567, says: "When μέν stands by itself, without any corresponding δέ, the latter, or some equivalent, is virtually implied, and μέν looks forward to the completion of the sentence, just as οὖν looks back to what has been already said. Thus when Socrates is going to catechize Meno's slave, he asks the master, Ἑλλήν μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐλληνίζει; "He is a Greek, I suppose, and talks Greek?" (Plato, *Meno*, 82B). Here an εἰ δὲ μὴ is obviously implied: "if he is not, he will not serve my purpose of questioning him."

This is particularly obvious in the combination, μέν οὖν. Thus in the answer, πάννυ μὲν οὖν, which is so common in the Platonic dialogues, there is a manifest suspension of part of the sentence: "You are right as to what you say, but what follows?" (τί δ' ἔπειτα;)"¹

Other grammarians for the most part take the same view. Thus Hermann, on Viger, *de Idiotismis Græcis*, p. 839, says: "Μέν si dicitur non sequente δέ, aut intelligi potest δέ, aut omittitur illa pars orationis in qua sequi debebat δέ."

So A. Buttmann, in his *Grammar of the New Testament Dialect*, p. 312, observes that "Every sentence with μέν, not followed by any corresponding δέ, is properly always to

¹ For other instances of this use of μέν in questions, see Plat., *Charmid.*, § 2, Eur., *Med.*, 676, 1129; *Alc.*, 146; *Hipp.*, 316, etc.

be considered as an Anacoluthon"; on p. 317 he adds that *οὖν* is often melted into one particle with *μέν*. "With this *μέν οὖν* transitions are often made to what follows; and even when *δέ* follows, it by no means always stands in a responsive relation to the preceding, but simply carries forward the narrative." . . . "In this genuinely classical manner Luke often uses *μέν οὖν*, especially in Acts."

On our present passage Dr. Bernard Weiss, in his recent edition of *Acts*, in Harnack's *Studien*, vol. ix., says that "*μέν οὖν* adds yet another supplementary remark on the result of this progress through the cities (*v.* 4), corresponding to 'confirming the churches,' in xv. 41."

Any one who thinks it worth while to pursue the grammatical question further, may find it treated at large in Bäumlein, *Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln*, 174-184, in Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II., p. 393, in Grimm's *Clavis*, sub. voc. *μέν*, and in Dr. Moulton's note on *μέν οὖν*, in his edition of Winer's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, 1877, sect. lxiii., ii. 2 *e.*

In the passage before us I do not think that the connexion between *v.* 5 and *v.* 6, in whichever way it is viewed, has any material bearing upon the main issue, What were "the Churches of Galatia" to which St. Paul's Epistle is addressed?

II. The most important and at the same time the most difficult point in the interpretation of the passage is the meaning to be assigned to the words *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. (*a*) Do they denote two districts or one? And (*b*) what geographical position is to be assigned to the district or districts so denoted?

(*a*) "Professor Ramsay," as Mr. Chase says correctly, (*THE EXPOSITOR*, 1893, p. 404), "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. 79 f.)”

In this view Professor Ramsay has the support of the Revised Version, which gives “the region of Phrygia and Galatia” instead of the rendering in the A.V., “Phrygia and the region of Galatia.”

The same interpretation was strongly and repeatedly asserted by Bishop Lightfoot: *Galatians*, p. 22: “The form of the Greek expression 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.” Compare *Colossians*, p. 23: “‘The Phrygian and Galatian country.’”

Against this view Mr. Chase contends in his second article (*THE EXPOSITOR*, May, 1894, p. 331 ff.), that St. Luke is referring to two separate districts, chiefly on the ground that *Φρυγίαν* must be a substantive. “I will state again,” he writes, “somewhat more explicitly than I did in my former article, what appear to me to be convincing reasons for thinking that St. Luke in Acts xvi. 6 uses *Φρυγία* as a substantive.

“(i.) In xviii. 23, St. Luke uses the phrase *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. Must not *Φρυγίαν* here be a substantive? Is it not certain that, if St. Luke were employing the word as an adjective, he would have written *τὴν Γαλατικὴν καὶ Φρυγίαν χώραν*?”

To these questions there can be but one answer: Mr. Chase is undoubtedly right so far.

He proceeds: “We must interpret xvi. 6 in the light of xviii. 23,” and adds a note: “Though Bishop Lightfoot took *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective in xvi. 6, he is careful to tran-

slate it as a substantive in xviii. 23: "This brought him to 'the Galatian country and Phrygia'" (*Galatians*, p. 24; so *Colossians*, p. 24). I cannot think that he was justified in separating the two passages."

Mr. Chase has another passage in his favour: "(ii.) *Φρυγία* is beyond dispute a substantive in the one passage besides xvi. 6, xviii. 23, in which St. Luke mentions the country, viz., Acts ii. 10 (*Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν*)."

This is unquestionably the strongest point in Mr. Chase's objection to Bishop Lightfoot's view of the phrase before us; and it is certain that the Bishop was fully aware of his apparent inconsistency in taking *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective in xvi. 6, and as a substantive in xviii. 23. His reasons for so doing are repeatedly and deliberately stated.

In *Galatians*, p. 22, note 3, he writes: "The second *τὴν* of the received reading ought to be omitted with the best MSS., in which case *Φρυγίαν* becomes an adjective. . . . On the occasion of the second visit the words are (xviii. 23) *διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. The general direction of St. Paul's route was rather westward than eastward, and this is expressed in the second passage by naming Galatia before Phrygia, but it is quite consistent with the expression in the first, where the two districts are not separated."

Again (*Colossians*, p. 23, note 1) the Bishop writes: "Acts xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, the correct reading. For this use of *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective comp. Mark i. 5: *πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα*, John iii. 22 *εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν* Luke iii. 1 *τῆς Ἰουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας*, Acts xiii. 14 *Ἀντιόχεια τὴν Πισιδίαν* (the correct reading)."

"This view," Mr. Chase writes on p. 404, "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."

As Mr. Page is a classical scholar of the highest acade-

mical distinction, it may be well to quote his own words on v. 6. “διήλθον δέ, ‘They went through the Phrygian and Galatian district, because they had been hindered from preaching in Asia.’ They turned off either to the North or North-West.”

“T.R. (*Textus Receptus*) has διελθόντες δέ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, obscuring and probably altering the sense. τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, “not two districts (as the reading of T.R. makes it) but one. It was the country ‘which might be called indifferently Phrygia or Galatia.’ See however xviii. 23.”

If Mr. Page had any misgiving about this interpretation, as Mr. Chase suggests, it can only be found in the reference to xviii. 23; but on turning to his note on that passage, I find no more than these words: “For ἡ Γαλ. χώρα, which is here distinguished from Phrygia, see xvi. 6, n.” Mr. Page thus seems to adopt the interpretation of Bishop Lightfoot without any reserve.

Weiss adopts the same construction: “Observe the expression Γαλατικὴν χώραν instead of Galatia, which might also indicate the Province in a more comprehensive sense. But then Φρυγίαν, which is connected with it under one article, must also be an adjective, as Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν Πισιδίαν in xiii. 14.”

Bishop Jacobson, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, gives the same interpretation of the phrase as Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Weiss, and Mr. Page. The statements of these eminent scholars make it clear that, in their opinion, the phrase not only may but must indicate one district “the Phrygian and Galatian country.”

There is in fact a very real and strong objection to taking Φρυγίαν as a substantive, in the presence of the adjective Γαλατικὴν “under the *vinculum* of the common article” and qualifying χώραν: for the geographical idea expressed by χώραν is one to which Φρυγίαν and Γαλατικὴν, both taken

as adjectives, are equally and peculiarly appropriate. It can hardly be doubtful in such a case that we ought to prefer the well-known rule of construction, which would make *Φρυγίαν* an adjective.

Mr. Chase however argues (EXPOSITOR, May, 1894, p. 333) that the two words *Γαλατική χώρα* coalesce so as to express a single idea. "They are, in fact, compound nouns; and thus the construction *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is seen to be parallel to *τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρίᾳ* (Acts i. 8), *τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν* (xix. 21); see also viii. 1, ix. 31, xv. 3, xxvii. 5."

In all these examples however both members are simple substantives, and Mr. Chase has quoted none in which the second member consists of an adjective and substantive, none therefore parallel *in form* to *τ. Φ. κ. Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. For a *grammatical* parallelism what is required is identity, not of idea, but of *form*.

If St. Luke meant *Φρυγίαν* to be taken as a substantive, he should have written *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατίαν*: and it is no answer to this to say that he wished to avoid *Γαλατίαν*, because it might have been understood in the political sense of the Roman Province Galatia; for "Galatia" has also the popular sense which makes it equivalent to Galatia proper, and it would here have been connected with *Φρυγίαν*, which has a popular sense and no other, so that there could have been no doubt as to the sense in this passage.

(b) We have next to inquire, what is the country thus described as "the region of Phrygia and Galatia," and then further, what are "the Churches of Galatia" addressed by St. Paul in his Epistle?

These are two distinct questions, though closely connected, and liable to be confused by advocates of the rival theories concerning the position of the Galatian Churches. We must be careful therefore to remember that the convenient phrases "North Galatian theory" and "South

Galatian theory" refer only to the Churches addressed in the Epistle, and not to the interpretation of the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, which is prior and independent.

The importance of this distinction will appear as we proceed with our inquiry. It will be convenient to quote first the statement of Bishop Lightfoot, one of the ablest and most determined advocates of "the North Galatian theory."

The Gauls, he tells us, in their first invasion, about 279 B.C., "overran the greater part of Asia Minor. They laid the whole continent west of Taurus under tribute" (*Galatians*, p. 5). Afterwards, by successive checks, "they were compressed within comparatively narrow limits in the interior of Asia Minor. The country to which they were thus confined, the Galatia of history, is a broad strip of land over two hundred miles in length, stretching from north-east to south-west" (p. 6).

The Bishop's expression "the Galatia of history" is fully justified by the manner in which Strabo, writing after the division of Asia Minor into provinces by Augustus, still speaks of "the country of the Gallo-Græci which is called Galatia" (c. 130 init.), and says that the Gauls had been permitted to occupy "what is now called Galatia and Gallo-Græcia" (c. 566).

But "Galatia as a Roman province would include, besides the country properly so called, Lycaonia, Isauria, the south-eastern district of Phrygia, and a portion of Pisidia. Lycaonia is especially mentioned as belonging to it, and there is evidence that the cities of Derbe and Lystra in particular were included within its boundaries" (*Galatians*, p. 7). But on the other hand "St. Luke distinctly calls Lystra and Derbe 'cities of Lycaonia' (Acts xiv. 6), while he no less distinctly assigns Antioch to Pisidia (xiii. 14); a convincing proof that in the language of the day they were not regarded as Galatian towns. Lastly, the expres-

sion used in the Acts of St. Paul's visit to these parts, 'the Phrygian and Galatian country,' shows that the district intended was not Lycaonia and Pisidia, but some region which might be said to belong either to Phrygia or Galatia, or the parts of each contiguous to the other" (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 19).

Prof. Ramsay and Mr. Chase accept only parts of this statement, and each a different part.

Mr. Chase, as we have seen, holds that *v.* 6 describes a journey through two separate districts which were traversed successively, namely Phrygia and Galatia, but agrees with the Bishop that by "Galatia" in the Epistle we are to understand the country popularly so called, that is, Northern Galatia.

Professor Ramsay, on the other hand, holds that the journey described in *v.* 6 led from Lystra onwards through "the country which is Phrygian and Galatic," and that this description denotes "the parts of Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, which were by the Romans incorporated in the vast province of Galatia" (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 9), and is strictly true of "the country about Iconium and Antioch" (*ib.*, p. 78, cf. p. 81). Through *this* country St. Paul and his company had passed *before* they were "forbidden to preach the word in Asia"; but then could this be what St. Luke calls "the Phrygian and Galatian country"? Professor Ramsay holds that it was, and that, instead of "They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, *having been forbidden*," etc., the rendering ought to be "and were forbidden," etc., as in A.V. Whether the grammatical construction of the participle *καλυθέντες* required by this view of the passage is admissible, is a point which must be considered later on. For the present I may be allowed to assume that the Revised Version, "*having been forbidden*," represents the right order of events; and if so, the country about Iconium and Antioch could not be

“the region of Phrygia and Galatia” through which they passed *after* “having been forbidden,” etc.

Proceeding with the geographical question, we may now ask, Why does St. Luke use the expression *Γαλατική χώρα* instead of *Γαλατία*? Wendt replies that this “circumstantial expression” is used “to distinguish this district from the Roman Province Galatia”: that is from “Galatia” in the official sense. May we not say with equal truth, that it is used to distinguish the region in question from “Galatia” in the popular sense, that is, from Northern Galatia?

Without denying or doubting that the description is in itself, apart from the context, “strictly true of the country about Iconium and Antioch,” to which Professor Ramsay applies it, I believe that this also, like Galatia proper, is too narrow a limitation of a phrase which seems to be purposely chosen as a general and comprehensive description rather than as the exclusive denomination of any one particular district. It denotes, as Bishop Lightfoot says, “some region which might be said to belong either to Phrygia or Galatia, or *the parts of each contiguous to the other.*” (The italics are mine.) The border-lands of Phrygia and Galatia exactly correspond to this description; and Mr. Chase (THE EXPOSITOR, 1893, p. 406) opportunely reminds us that “districts known as Phrygia and Galatia lie between the cities of the south, which St. Paul leaves behind him, and Bithynia on the north, to which he ultimately directs his steps” (xvi. 1 ff., 7).

The whole district thus traversed belonged originally to Phrygia, but had been overrun by the Gauls, and parts of it were included in the Roman province of Galatia.¹ Thus the eastern border of Phrygia was probably no better defined than its western boundaries as described by Strabo, c. 628 f.: “The parts next in order towards the south are intermingled (*ἐμπλοκάς ἔχει*) with these places as far as

¹ See Professor Ramsay's *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 254.

Taurus, so that the Phrygian, and Carian, and Lydian, and even the Mysian parts are difficult to distinguish as they lie alongside of one another. And this confusion is not a little increased by the fact that the Romans did not divide them according to tribes, but arranged in a different manner the administrative districts (*διοικήσεις*) in which they hold their conventions and courts of justice."

Of such a borderland there could be no more appropriate description than that which St. Luke adopts, "the Phrygian and Galatian region."

We may now endeavour to trace the Apostle's route as closely as the brief record of it permits.

The last place actually mentioned as visited by St. Paul is Lystra; but it is agreed on both sides that, in accordance with the original purpose of his journey (xv. 36), he also visited Iconium and Antioch. Here he was on the ordinary and frequented route from Antioch to Asia and its capital, Ephesus. But "having been forbidden by the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia," the Apostle now took a northerly and north-westerly direction, the first part of the route leading him through a region to which the description "Phrygian and Galatian" is exactly applicable. This is, in fact, admitted by Bishop Lightfoot in his later work, *Colossians*, p. 24 :—"His course, as determined by its extreme limits—Antioch, in Pisidia, its starting point, and Alexandria Troas, its termination—would be northward for the first part of the way, and thus would lie *on the borderland of Phrygia and Galatia*." (The italics are mine.)

Through this "Phrygian and Galatian region" they appear to have travelled northward until "*they were come over against Mysia*." If they proceeded in this northerly course as far as Nakolia, they would there be "on a line with Mysia" (*κατὰ Μυσίαν*),¹ and on the direct way to Bithynia

¹ This sense of *κατὰ* is extremely well illustrated by Professor Ramsay's reference to *Herod*, I. 76, where Pteria, in Cappadocia, is said to be "about on

through Dorylæum. From the place where they were forbidden "to go into Bithynia," their route to Alexandria Troas would lie nearly due west.

It seems impossible, without doing extreme violence to St. Luke's narrative, to intrude into such a journey as this a digression of at least three hundred miles eastward to Pessinus, Ancyra, and Javium, and a long period of most important missionary labour of which the author gives not the slightest hint. But that is what is, and must be, done by the advocates of the North-Galatian theory. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 19; and on the difficulties involved in the theory compare Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 83.

The absolute silence of St. Luke on so important a part of St. Paul's apostolic work as the foundation of the churches of Galatia seems to me quite inexplicable.

Bishop Lightfoot endeavours to support the conjectural journey by an equally conjectural motive, namely, that "the historian gladly drew a veil over the infancy of a Church which swerved so soon and so widely from the purity of the gospel" (*Galatians*, p. 20).

Mr. Chase thinks it a simple explanation of the Apostle's route and plans to say (EXPOSITOR, 1893, p. 415) that "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." The explanation might be less improbable, if we had a shadow of evidence for the supposed fact which it is intended to explain.

a line with Sinope," though distant from it, according to Spruner's map, twice as far as Nakolia or Dorylæum from the frontier of Mysia. Cf. *Herod*, II. 158, with Bähr's notes on both passages.

Mr. Page, in a note on *v. 6*, offers a better, though not quite adequate explanation: "The narrative here is extremely brief, the writer being clearly anxious to pass on to the preaching of Paul in Europe." I would rather say that the writer passed on rapidly, because the journey itself was direct, and uninterrupted by any important incident such as the supposed preaching and founding of churches in Northern Galatia. St. Paul's mission to Europe was, according to the indications given in the narrative, the divinely appointed purpose of the whole journey. Twice he is forbidden to turn aside from the direct route between Antioch and Troas. "To speak the word in Asia," "to go into Bithynia," would each have been a cause of much delay; and in each case the Apostle found himself constrained by the Spirit's guidance to go straight forward on his appointed way. One of these Divine interpositions occurred before, and one after the supposed digression into Northern Galatia. Do they not make an intermediate sojourn in that district, which must have been of long duration, and of which the writer gives no hint whatever, quite inconceivable?

The natural meaning of the narrative seems to be that, as M. Renan says, "The apostolic band made almost at one stretch (*d'une seule traite*) a journey of more than a hundred leagues, across a country little known, and one which in the absence of Roman colonies and Jewish synagogues offered them none of the opportunities which they had hitherto found." (*S. Paul*, p. 128.)

Bishop Lightfoot (*Colossians*, pp. 24-28) has criticised M. Renan's account of the journey in a long and elaborate note, one portion of which shows, if I may venture to say so, far less than his usual accuracy. I mark by italics the phrases which appear to be inconsistent with the order of St. Luke's narrative.

"On the first occasion St. Luke states that the Apostle

set out on his journey with quite different intentions, but that *after he had got well to the north of Asia Minor* he was driven by a series of Divine intimations to proceed first to Troas and thence to cross over into Europe. This narrative seems to me to imply that he starts for his further travels from some point in the western part of Galatia proper. *When he comes to the borders of Mysia, he designs bearing to the left and preaching in Asia, but a Divine voice forbids him.*"

Here the order of St. Luke's narrative is strangely disregarded, as will at once appear from a glance at the original words: διήλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπέιραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι· καὶ οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ.

Can any one, with these words before him, be induced to believe that St. Paul had come to the borders of Mysia, before he was forbidden to preach in Asia?

Further, Mr. Chase is, I think, fully justified by the ordinary usage of the Greek participle in maintaining (EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 409) that "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.'"

III. This remark leads us to notice the third point of Greek syntax, on which Mr. Page and Professor Ramsay are throughout the discussion entirely at variance.

The latter in his "Epilogue" (EXPOSITOR, April, 1894, p. 293) adheres to his original view (*Church in Roman Empire*, p. 9) that St. Luke "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, etc." Professor Ramsay adds ("Epilogue," p. 279),

“Were this question to be argued out, numerous examples which justify in the completest way my interpretation of Acts xvi. 6 might be quoted.”

On this point my learned friend, Dr. Sanday, has kindly called my attention to the remarks in Mr. Burton's very suggestive and valuable treatise on the *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 1893. Mr. Burton begins by admitting (§ 145) that “no certain instance of an aorist participle used adverbially as the equivalent of an adverbial or co-ordinate clause, and referring to a subsequent action, has been observed in classical Greek, though one or two possible ones occur.” Mr. Burton gives a reference to Demosthenes, which I am unable to verify, and another to Thucydides, ii. 49, 3, the well-known passage in the description of the plague: *λύξ τε τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐπέπεσε κενή, σπασμὸν ἐνδιδοῦσα ἰσχυρόν, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ ταῦτα λωφήσαντα, τοῖς δὲ καὶ πολλῶ ὕστερον*. The only doubt about the meaning of the passage was caused by Dobree's strange proposal to make *λωφήσαντα* agree with *ταῦτα*. It may, I think, be properly rendered thus: “Most of the patients were attacked by a dry hiccough, causing a violent spasm, which in some cases abated presently (*μετὰ ταῦτα*), but in others after a long time.” The participle *λωφήσαντα* represents an incident subsequent to *σπασμὸν ἐνδιδοῦσα*, but too closely connected with it as a description of *σπασμὸν* to give any support to the proposed construction of *κωλυθέντες*.

“For New Testament instances,” Mr. Burton proceeds, see Acts xxv. 13; also xvi. 23; xxii. 24; xxiii. 35; xxiv. 23. In all these cases it is scarcely possible to doubt that the participle (which is without the article and follows the verb) is equivalent to *καὶ* with a co-ordinate verb, and refers to an action subsequent in fact and in thought to that of the verb which it follows. These instances are perhaps due to Aramaic influence.”

It is true that in some of these cases the action denoted by the participle is in time subsequent to that of the verb, but in others it appears to be simultaneous, and in all it is *in thought* closely connected with and dependent upon the action of the verb.

Thus in xxv. 13: *κατήντησαν . . . ἀσπασόμενοι* (the true reading) the journey of Agrippa and Bernice to Cæsarea had for its very purpose the salutation of the new Procurator.

In xvi. 23: *ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι*, the action is simultaneous, and we might fairly translate—"cast them into prison, with a command to the jailor." A similar explanation may be easily applied to the other examples.

Dr. Sanday has kindly drawn my attention to a passage in *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Reub. γ¹ fin.: *καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπέθει ἐπ' ἐμοί, μηκέτι ἀψάμενος αὐτῆς*. The meaning appears to be that Jacob was grieved over his son, and never touched his concubine again. Here it may fairly be said that the action of the participle is connected with, and even dependent on, the continued grief of Jacob over his son's offence.

In my own reading I have recently noticed another singular passage in Clem. Alex., *Protrept.*, c. 2 (p. 5, Migne), quoted by Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, p. 64a: (*Ζεὺς*) *μίγνυται δράκων γενόμενος, ὃς ἦν ἐλεγχθεῖς*. "He makes his approach in the form of a serpent, it being afterwards discovered who he was." This, perhaps, gives some support to the construction for which Professor Ramsay contends, as the action described in the participle, though connected with what precedes, is not dependent on, but rather contrasted with it. Enough at all events has been quoted to show that, in later Greek, the learned Professor's view is in itself quite capable of being defended, though not applicable, I think, to the present passage.

If however I may be allowed to express my own opinion of the matter, I do not think that any sufficient reason has yet been shown for introducing what is certainly an unusual construction into the passage before us. There is no doubt that "Phrygo-Galatic" is a description which might, in other contexts, be applied either, as by Bishop Lightfoot, to Northern Galatia, or, as by Professor Ramsay, to Southern Galatia, both those districts having originally been occupied by Phrygians. But in its present context, as I have endeavoured to show above, it can only mean the borderland of Phrygia and Galatia northward of Antioch, through which the travellers passed *after* "having been forbidden to speak the word in Asia."

It may be well to add Mr. Chase's last words on this point (EXPOSITOR May, 1894, p. 342): "It was in reference to the construction *διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες* that I said that in my belief the South Galatian theory is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek Grammar. I venture to repeat this verdict." Were I Professor Ramsay's advocate, I should plead that "the verdict" is not in accordance with the evidence. For it has been shown above (1) that his proposed construction is not impossible in later Greek, and (2) that "the South Galatian theory," rightly understood, does not depend at all upon this construction, but solely upon the right interpretation of the geographical expression, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*.

In this belief I am strongly confirmed by finding that it agrees with the conclusion which so distinguished a classical scholar as the Rev. Frederick Rendall has reached by a totally different line of argument (EXPOSITOR, April, 1894, p. 254). And sharing, as I do most fully, Mr. Rendall's admiration of the learning of "our great Church historian," Bishop Lightfoot, I gladly conclude this article with the words of his elder schoolfellow: "If an enlarged knowledge of the facts bids us change our opinion and distrust his

verdict, it is no true loyalty to the memory of so fearless and open-minded a searcher after truth to shut our eyes to the growing light, and hold fast by ancient authority."

E. H. GIFFORD.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

IV. CEREMONIAL.

OUR Lord's idea of righteousness is illustrated by His attitude towards the outward religious observances of His day. What His attitude was is not at once obvious. The teaching of St. Paul regarding the relation of ceremonial to morality is easily intelligible, because in more than one of his epistles the subject is explicitly discussed. Pushing his idea of the spirituality of the religion of Christ to its logical issue, St. Paul declared that ritual belonged to the childhood stage of religion. It was part of that system of tutors and governors which was left behind by the spiritual adult. It was the symbol which became insignificant when the reality appeared: the shadow which was displaced by the body, which was Christ. When St. Paul expressly handles any subject he leaves one in no doubt of his mind: but the ideas of our Lord can only be gathered from a careful examination of His conduct as well as of His words.

Respect for the ceremonial law is legibly written in the life of Jesus. He was circumcised and thus bound theoretically to the whole ceremonial law; He ate the Passover and paid the Temple tax. In compliance with the injunction of the ceremonial law He commanded the healed leper to show himself to the priest. The fiery zeal which usually smouldered in His breast was fanned into consuming flame by the desecration of the centre and stronghold of ritual and ceremony, His Father's house. Sacred places, sacred seasons, sacred actions and sacred persons were alike