

phesy and also a saying of the Apostle Paul. The one endorses its application to the companions of the glorified Christ; the other, its use of Christ Himself. Both passages are familiar to Christians of all ages.

Micah said: *Out of thee, Bethlehem, shall come forth one to be governor of Israel . . . and he shall stand and see; and Jehovah shall shepherd his flock. And in the glory of Jehovah their God shall they subsist (ὑπάρξουσιν); for now he shall be magnified unto the ends of the earth.*¹ St. Paul said, *Christ Jesus, subsisting in the form of God . . . humbled himself. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him.*²

Later and more clearly Jesus repeated this warning against Zealot and Herodian. Neither had a gospel for the Nation, which was as truly as these crowds or the followers of Moses, in the wilderness. They must *beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod.*³ For the Zealots cannot be distinguished from the Pharisees save by one like Josephus, who, professing Pharisaism, would live at peace under heathen domination. But the ideals of both parties, Nationalist and Hellenist alike, were destined to be realized in Christianity.

Shaken once by the wind, which is the Spirit, clad now in royal robes, the exalted Jesus Christ sits in the Palace of the great King—the true Zealot and the true Herodian.

J. H. A. HART.

PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

VI. CHARACTER OF THE ORIGINAL HELLENIC CITY.

APART from the few facts mentioned in the preceding Sections—facts inferred from inscriptions of the Roman period—the history of the old Hellenic city Antioch is

¹ Micah v. 2 ff. (LXX).

² Phil. ii. 5 ff.

³ Mark viii. 15.

extremely obscure. Strabo mentions that in 189 B.C., when the Seleucid power over Asia Minor was destroyed, Antioch was made a free city by the Romans. For 150 years it seems to have remained in this condition, a self-governing sovereign state, maintaining the Hellenic system of autonomy and education in the borderland between the servile country of Phrygia and the free but barbarous Pisidian mountain-tribes. We can only vaguely infer what was the spirit of the city in this period, for not a single memorial is preserved above ground, though doubtless excavation would disclose in a deeper stratum monuments which belong to that earlier time.

The facts from which we have to judge are the following. In the first place, it continued to feel itself a Hellenic city. It never sank back to the level of a mere Oriental and Phrygian town. Centuries later we find that its people spoke of themselves as Magnesians residing in Phrygia¹: Magnesians the origin of the Greek colony was still living in their minds. The same thought was fresh in the memory of the surrounding population when Strabo travelled across Asia Minor, and passed through Philomelion, the city on the other side of the lofty ridge of Sultan-Dagh.

The geographer did not visit Antioch or see it with his own eyes: he only heard about it as situated on the opposite side of the mountains from Philomelion. His description of the two cities and of the intervening mountain-ridge shows clearly that he knew only the Philomelian side, and assimilated in imagination the Antiochian side, which he had not seen, to the side which he knew. On the latter side the landscape is a deep-lying, perfectly level valley from which rises sharp and steep the great ridge of Sultan-Dagh. On the Antiochian side there is neither a level valley nor a definite mountain ridge: it is only in the more

¹ A single example is sufficient proof of the general custom: see *Exposros*, January, 1907, p. 83 (misunderstood by Kaibel, Kern, etc.).

distant view from the west that the continuity and grandeur of Sultan-Dagh is realized: the country near the mountains is very rough and undulating, with ridges of hills considerable in size, which reach back to merge themselves gradually in the superior mass of Sultan-Dagh.

Strabo's description, therefore, is founded, not on what the Antiochians thought of themselves, but on what other townspeople beyond the mountains thought of them. He describes it as a free Hellenic city, and this means a great deal; it implies free institutions, elective form of self-government, popular assemblies, and above all a certain well-established system of education for the young, which was continued throughout their later life by their experience as citizens and voters, producing in them a general knowledge of and interest in political facts and in questions of domestic and foreign policy, on which they had often to vote in the Assembly or *Ekklesia*—and producing in them also a pride of birth as Magnesians, a pride of education as Hellenes, and a contempt for the slavish Oriental Phrygians or the barbarous Pisidians. All this has to be inferred, but can be inferred with perfect confidence. Excavations to prove the facts by the discovery of written documents of the period are much to be desired.

The only epigraphic evidence which bears on the history of the first Antioch is an imperfect inscription found at Magnesia on the Meander, the parent-city of Antioch: this document is one of a long series of decrees passed by many Hellenic cities in recognition of the privileges of the Magnesian goddess Artemis. In one of the decrees, where the name of Antioch occurs without any distinguishing epithet, Kern (who has published the whole series) understands that the document emanated from Pisidian Antioch; and there can be no question that he has good reason for doing so.¹ These decrees were made during the last years

¹ O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia*, no. 80.

of the third century before Christ in response to courteous messages conveyed by Magnesian ambassadors to the leading Hellenic cities of Asia and of Greece, and among others to Pisidian Antioch.

This decree in honour of the Magnesian Artemis entirely confirms the account which we have given of Antioch, proving that it was recognized as a Hellenic city by its neighbours, that it remembered its relation to its parent-city and acknowledged its obligations to Hellenism generally.

This event belongs to the third century before Christ ; but there is no reason to think that the Hellenic spirit died out in the following century. Antioch lay on a great commercial highway. It was in easy and constant communication with many other Hellenic cities, accessible readily to ambassadors from them (such as had brought the request from Magnesia regarding the worship of Artemis), and this intercourse exercised a strong influence in maintaining the spirit of Hellenism. The whole course of contemporary history shows that Hellenism was an undiminished power at that time in Western Asia. The whole burden of proof would lie with one who asserted that Hellenism died out in Antioch during the last two centuries before Christ, for the assertion is contrary to all the probabilities of the case and the analogy of other west-Asian centres of Hellenism.

In 39 B.C. Antioch, with Apollonia and the whole of Pisidia and Phrygia adjoining Pisidia, was given by Antony to Amyntas the last king of Galatia ; and thus this large district became part of the Galatian realm. While Antioch now ceased to be a free city, it is not probable that any serious change was made in its internal affairs. It was no longer a sovereign state ; it ceased to have a foreign policy ; it was controlled by the king, and probably paid tribute to him. But all analogy points to the opinion that

it continued to administer its own internal affairs by its own elected magistrates. In any case the kingly period was too short to affect seriously the spirit of the city, for Amyntas was soon killed in battle against the Pisidian mountaineers; and he bequeathed his whole property and realm to the Roman Empire.

VII. THE ROMAN COLONY OF PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

A new period in the history of Antioch began in 25 B.C., when the country passed into the possession of Rome at the death of Amyntas. The city was then made a Roman Colony. The date of the foundation is not recorded, and absolute certainty cannot be attained; but there can be little doubt that the statement which is usually made by the numismatists is correct, and that the establishment of the Colony took place as soon as the Roman dominion over the kingdom of Amyntas, which now became the Province Galatia, was organized. The name *Caesareia Antiocheia*, by which the city was henceforth designated, marks it as separate from the other Pisidian Colonies, which were all called *Julia*, most of them *Julia Augusta*¹; and if its foundation belonged to a different time, it must have been earlier and not later than them. Now the other Pisidian Colonies were founded about 7-6 B.C., and probably are connected with the government of Quirinius (Cyrenius), who commanded the armies of the Province Syria in the war against the Pisidian mountaineers at that time.² Antioch, being older, may therefore safely be connected with the first organization of the new Province.

It was a real elevation in rank and dignity that was conferred on the Hellenic city Antioch, when it was constituted and refounded as a Roman colony. It was thus placed in

¹ They are *Coloniae Julia Augusta Olbasena*, *Julia Augusta Prima Fida Comama*, *Julia Augusta Felix Cremnensium* (or *Cremna*), *Julia Felix Gemina Lustra* (the omission of *Augusta* may perhaps be accidental in our authorities), *Julia Augusta Parlais*.

² See the proof stated in *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 238 ff.

the highest class of provincial cities : it was made, so to say, a piece of the imperial city, a detached fragment of Rome itself, separated by space, but peopled by *coloni*, who were of equal standing and privileges in the eye of the law with the citizens of Rome—*cives optimo iure*, according to the technical formula.

The *coloni*, or citizens of the *colonia*, new inhabitants introduced from the West, for the most part veteran soldiers of the legion Alauda,¹ must be clearly and broadly distinguished from the older Hellenic population, who now ranked only as dwellers (*incolae*) in their own city, and who did not possess the same rank and rights as the *coloni*. The former did not forthwith become Roman citizens and *coloni*; the latter were Roman citizens in their own right before they became *coloni*. But still even the old Hellenic citizens had some share from the first in the increased dignity of the city. They were certainly on a more favoured and honoured footing than the citizens of ordinary Hellenic cities. They, probably, were freed from direct taxation and enjoyed some other privileges; but no evidence remains on the spot, and it is not possible to do more than speak in general terms from the analogy of the *incolae* in other Roman *coloniae*. Their most important privilege, however, lay in the future: they had a more favourable opportunity than the citizens in ordinary Hellenic cities of attaining the coveted honour of the Roman citizenship. The success of the Roman government in permanently conciliating the loyalty of the provincial population² was founded on the settled principle of Imperial administration, according to which the peoples were regarded as being all in a process of education and training to fit them for the honourable estate

¹ So called from the lark, *alauda*, which was the mark or crest distinguishing it.

² The cessation of war and the inauguration of peace at the first established the Empire in the affections of the Provinces (especially of the East); but only good administration could have made this favour permanent.

of full Roman citizenship. The ultimate destiny of the Empire was that all freemen should attain this honourable position ; and that destiny was achieved, perhaps rather prematurely, by Caracalla about A.D. 212 ; but, whether or not he hurried on the final stage too rapidly, this was the goal to which the Imperial policy had been tending from the beginning. As a first stage the outer nations were commonly placed under the rule of client kings, whose duty it was not merely to preserve order, but to instil a habit and spirit of orderliness into their subjects and to naturalize among them the first principles of Roman systematic method in government. After a certain time of such training the people was reckoned worthy of being formed into a Roman Province.¹ Such was the history of Palestine under Herod, of Pontus under Polemon, of Galatia under Amyntas, of Cilicia Tracheia under Antiochus IV., and of many other countries.² When a new Province like Galatia was organized, its different parts and cities were variously treated according to their fitness for the duties of loyal service to the Empire. The most backward parts were left in the old tribal condition, as was, for example, the case with the Homonades, who had killed Amyntas and were at a later time subdued by Quirinius : at a much later time such tribes generally received the city organization. The city was the proper unit in Roman administration ; and wherever there existed a Hellenic city in the new Province, it was made a city in the Roman system and a unit in the Province. In such a city the most influential, wealthy and energetic citizens were gradually elevated to the Roman citizenship ; and these formed a city aristocracy, whose weight and authority in the city rested on wealth, privilege,

¹ The essential and fundamental fact in the Roman Province was not the territory, but the people ; hence the Greek translation of *Provincia* was *τὸ ἔθνος*, the nation ; *Provincia Asia* is rendered *ἡ Ἀσία τὸ ἔθνος* by Strabo.

² The process is described in *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 120 ff.

energy and ability. The highest and most honoured class of cities in the Province consisted of the *Coloniae*. These began with a considerable body of Roman citizens,¹ and the whole tone and spirit was thereby affected and Romanized. The amusements, the public exhibitions, the education, were more Roman: so also were the magistrates, the public language, the law and the institutions generally. In this Roman atmosphere the rest of the population, the *incolae*, lived and moved; they imbibed the Roman tone, adopted Roman manners, learned the Latin tongue, and were promoted to the Roman citizenship more freely and quickly than were the people of Hellenic cities. In most cases, probably in almost every case, Roman citizenship was made universal among the free population (including the original inhabitants of the city) at an early date.² That seems to have been the case at Antioch. The inscriptions, Greek and Latin alike, show no trace of Hellenes, but only of Romans. Every free inhabitant of the city, of whom epigraphic record survives, bears the full Roman name, which marks him as a Roman citizen.³ This seems to constitute a complete proof that the entire city became Roman at a comparatively early date, though later than the Pauline period.

Wherever and whenever the number of Roman citizens became large, their position as a local aristocracy necessarily suffered. It was no longer possible to maintain that standard of wealth on which the influence of an aristocracy must be supported. Under the early Empire, when there were in an Eastern city only a few Roman citizens, some of Italian origin, others representing the leading families of the

¹ A different class occurs later, *EXPOSITOR*, September, 1905, p. 212f.

² One would be disposed to conjecture that Lystra was an exception. Its use as a *colonia* soon ceased; the Roman blood and tone were much weaker there than in Antioch, and perhaps died out naturally during the later second century.

³ One or two apparent exceptions, such as the magistrate Sekoundos in Sterrett, *Epigr. Journ.*, No. 96, belong to the third century, when Roman names were losing their clear form. Sekoundos was a Roman, Secundus.

city, these formed a true aristocracy in the city. But when all freemen became Roman citizens in A.D. 212, there was no longer any distinction ; there were no people to whom the Roman citizens could be superior except the slaves. The lines of class distinction in the third and later centuries were drawn anew. It was no longer an honour to bear the three names of a Roman, for all had an equal right to the three names ; and the old system of Roman personal names gradually ceased to be attended to or maintained. A new period and new fashions had begun.

To a certain extent a similar change took place in Pisidian Antioch, when the whole free population of the city attained the honour of Roman citizenship ; and this honour necessarily ceased to be an object for the older population to aim at. But the lustre of Roman citizenship did not disappear, for though all free Antiochians were now Romans, yet the surrounding world of Phrygia and Pisidia still remained outside the pale of Roman citizenship, and thus all the Antiochian Romans could feel their superiority to the mass of the Provincials ; they were proud that Antioch was a Roman town, a part of the great governing imperial city.

When did this change take place ? When were all the old population of Antioch raised to the rank of Romans ? It is not possible to specify the date ; but one cannot suppose it was much, if at all, earlier than the second century. The cities of Spain were honoured by Vespasian with mere Latin rank, a step on the way to Roman rank, in A.D. 74. The full Roman honour was accorded to Antioch probably later, and not earlier. Hence we must conclude that in the time of St. Paul's visits to Antioch, the mass of his hearers were still not Roman citizens, but they all looked forward to that rank as a possible honour to be attained in the future. The mere presence in their city of a considerable Italian population gave them higher privileges and was a distinction to all the inhabitants of every class. Even those who

were not Romans were on the way to become Romans in course of time, as a reward of merit and loyalty.

Not merely gratitude for the past and hope for their future made the Antiochian population strong philo-Roman, but also the keen sense of daily advantages produced the same result. As chief city of the southern half of the Province Galatia, Antioch was the governing centre of a large country; it was frequently visited by the Roman governors of the Province¹ with their large train of attendants (which would cause considerable influx of money into the city and thus tend to enrich the merchants and shopkeepers); great public exhibitions of games and wild beasts and gladiators were held there, which would attract large numbers of visitors and sightseers, all spending money freely; the courts of justice held by the governors in the city, likewise, brought to the city many litigants and enriched the population. The description given by Dion Chrysostom in his oration delivered at Apameia-Celaenae of the crowds and the wealth which the position of the city as a leading Roman centre of administration brought to Apameia may be applied to Antioch in a higher degree. The dignity and the wealth of almost every person in Antioch depended mainly on its position as a Roman city in the Province Galatia; and its provincial standing was the most important factor in its history during the first century. Hence "the Province," i.e. Rome as it appeared in the land,² must have bulked largely in the minds of the Antiochian populace; and, if the Church of Antioch claimed to represent its city,³ it felt itself to be a Church of Galatia.

The tale of St. Thekla, when read in the light of Dion

¹ Probably each of the numerous inscriptions in honour of Governors of Galatia marks a visit paid by the official in question to the city.

² On the aspect of the "Province" in Asia Minor, see the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 103, about the Province Asia as the Beast that came up from the earth.

³ Our view is that such was always the claim of the Church.

Chrysostom's orations, gives a picture of the assemblage which gathered at a great festival of the Imperial religion, presided over by a high priest of the Emperor.

The outward appearance of the city was made as Roman as possible. Instead of the old classification into Tribes, the population and the town were divided into *Vici*: the names of six of these are known, and they are purely and obtrusively Roman, *Patricius*, *Aedilicius*, *Tuscus*, *Velabrus*, *Cermalus*, *Salutaris*—among them several of the most famous street-names of Rome—and it is a plausible conjecture of Professor Sterrett that there were twelve *vici* as there are twelve quarters (mahale) in the modern town. The magistrates were those usual in Roman *coloniae*, *duoviri*, *iure dicundo* and *Quinquennales*, *aediles*, *quaestors* and *curators*. There was a priesthood of Jupiter, *Optimus Maximus* and one or more *flamens*. The senators were called *decuriones*, the senate was an *Ordo*.

The tale of St. Thekla affords the proof that exhibitions in which criminals were exposed to wild beast (euphemistically called *venationes*) were usual; such exhibitions were never as popular in Greek as in Roman cities. The *Ordo* and the *Populus* concurred in paying honours to distinguished citizens or strangers, instead of the *Boulé* and *Demos* of a Greek city. The *Populus* seems to have expressed its will more by acclamation in the theatre than by formal voting in public meetings.

VIII. DESIGNATION OF THE ANTIOCHIANS BY LUKE.

It is in agreement with the facts just mentioned that the population of Antioch are not called Hellenes or Greeks, but only the Gentiles or the Nations. The latter is a wider term, which included at once Greeks and Romans and Phrygians and other native races. In Iconium and Thessalonica and Beroea and Corinth¹ the Greeks are men-

¹ Only the Greek women at Beroea are mentioned. As regards Corinth

tioned, which is quite in accordance with the character of those cities ; when, however, the entire population of Iconium and of Thessalonica is mentioned, it is summed up in Iconium as " the Gentiles," and at Thessalonica as " the mob," " the rabble."¹ In the Colonia Lystra² the general mass of the population is clearly marked as Lycaonian (see xiv. 11), though there were some Hellenes in the city (see xvi. 1, 4) who were natives of the country by race, but educated in Greek manners and language. When the general population of Lystra is summed up in one expression, it is called " the mob." This also is in perfect accord with what is known from other sources about that little Roman colony planted in an old Lycaonian town ; the Graeco-Roman civilization and education had permeated it only to a small degree.

In passing, we must point out that it was, doubtless, in the higher strata of the Lystran population that the Western customs and language first established themselves ; this must be regarded as proving that Timothy, whose father was a Greek and whose mother was a Jewess, sprang from a family of some wealth and good standing in Lystra ; and the words of Luke, that Timothy " was well reported of by the brethren in Iconium," and that all the Jews in other cities knew that his father was a Greek, show that he was not an obscure individual of the humbler rank, but a person whose name and position were widely known. This is only one of the many incidental details which prove that most of the important figures in the early centuries of Christianity sprang from the educated higher-middle class of Anatolia, the local gentry,³ whose position opened to them the path

see Acts xviii. 4, and the Bezan reading in xviii. 17, " all the Greeks laid hold of Sosthenes."

¹ ἔχλος corresponds to the Latin " plebs " ; sometimes the plural is used in Acts, sometimes the singular.

² Strictly the Latin name was Lustra, not Lystra : the change sought to give a Latin appearance and meaning to the Lycaonian name Lystra or Lистра. ³ See *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 376.

of education, from which the mere peasantry were debarred.

Lystra was never so strongly Romanized as Antioch. The proportion of Italian settlers was probably smaller, and the circumstances were not so well calculated to keep the Roman connexion so clearly before the attention of the city. Yet even in Lystra the fact that the colonial character alone gave it any importance, and that before and apart from the Roman connexion it was a mere uneducated, rude Lycaonian town, made the population found their municipal pride on their position as a Roman colonia, and strive to write their epitaphs and other documents in Latin, sometimes so rudely and badly as to be partly unintelligible. Hence the mixture of races is far more clearly perceptible in the Lystran narrative than in the Antiochian.

Corinth is marked as a Greek town in xviii. 4 and perhaps xviii. 17 (Bezan text). It was a Roman colonia, and the individual names which are mentioned are chiefly Latin, as appears both in *Acts* and in the *Epistles*. But one can understand that, in the position of the city as the capital of Greece and as one of the most important trading cities of the Levant and Aegean seas, the Greek spirit and language were necessarily strong in it. We should, however, not have expected that the population should be called Greeks; but we must infer that the Greek feeling was stronger in Corinth than in Pisidian Antioch, which after all is not unnatural or out of harmony with the rest of our knowledge. In one case (xviii. 7) the entire population is called by Luke "the Corinthians."

Considering how much importance was attached by ancient feeling to the method of designating a group of citizens, and how much of compliment lay in the use of a generic term that implied the sovereign character of their state, we must find it a noteworthy fact, and most suggestive fact, that the only cities of the Greek world whose popula-

tion Luke designates by the complimentary and strictly Greek title are Athens and Corinth : only in those cities does he use the term "men of Corinth" or "men of Athens," and he sums up the population of Athens quite in the technical Greek formula as the "Athenians and the strangers that dwell among them." These were the two capital cities of Greece : the old intellectual head of the country, still the leading University city of the world, and the new capital of the land.

In Ephesus Luke makes the Ephesian agitators speak of themselves as Ephesians : the Secretary of the State addresses the populace as Ephesians (just as Paul addressed his audience in Athens as Athenians) ; most striking of all the letter introducing Apollos was written by the Ephesians to the disciples in Corinth. It is natural that the Ephesian populace and orators addressing them should use the complimentary title ; and it is an interesting indication of the claim which the Church in Ephesus was making at such an early stage in its history to speak as representative of the city that it wrote as "the Ephesians to the disciples in Corinth."¹

At Philippi Luke never names the general population of the colonia, but only mentions the magistrates and a few individuals.

These examples show how much appropriateness is observable in Luke's varying ways of designating the population of different cities² ; his usage is all drawn from living facts, not from dead history. His avoidance of the term "Antiochians" or "Iconians" is not accidental, but arises from instinctive perception of a certain unsuitability.

¹ That Paul should address the Church of the Thessalonians or should appeal to the Korinthians in an impassioned apostrophe (2 Cor. vi. 11) is not nearly so notable a fact as this at Ephesus.

² The topographical designation by Luke of a man as Derbaean or Corinthian, and of two men as Thessalonians, does not belong to the present subject.

Similarly his avoidance of the expression "the Hellenes" at Antioch and his use of it at Iconium and Corinth are due to correct instinct.

IX. HELLENISM IN PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

While the spirit and tone of Roman loyalty was thus dominant in Pisidian Antioch during the first century, there is no reason to think that Hellenic civilization and manners were entirely displaced by Roman. It is much to be desired that excavation should be made on the site, in order to give some clear objective evidence on this point; but analogy and general considerations tend to show that Greek ways and Greek education must have maintained themselves in the city, even while the Roman spirit was most thoroughly dominant. Rome was never hostile to Greek custom and Greek law in the East: it recognized that in Asia Greek civilization was an ally, not an enemy, nor even a competitor. The civilization which Rome sought to spread over western Asia was bilingual. Accordingly all probability points to the opinion that Greek was the familiar language spoken at Antioch in the home life, except among the Italian immigrant or colonist families, and, even among these, the knowledge of Greek gradually spread in course of time. Thus it came about that as the Roman vigour died and the Oriental spirit revived, during the third century, Greek seems to have become the practically universal language of the Antiochian population, though some few inscriptions of government were written in Latin as late as the fourth century. Hence also it is quite in accordance with the circumstances, that Greek was the language used in the synagogue.

To trace the disuse of Latin and the recurrence to Greek as the public and formal language of the *Coloniæ* would be a useful task, but as yet this cannot be essayed. Though the inscriptions are numerous, no regular system of dating

them was ever employed in Antioch and no era seems ever to have been used there. The want of any chronological system here shows by contrast how useful even a bad system of dating by some local era was in many cities of Asia Minor ; still more, how important a step was made when a uniform era of the Province came into general use throughout a whole region, as, for example, in the cities of Asian Phrygia, or when the Seleucid era, reckoning from 312 B.C., was brought into widespread employment in the Seleucid Empire and lasted in some parts of Syria for many centuries. This invention of a useful general system of chronology was one of those apparently small things which lie in reality at the basis of the social fabric and help to form the foundations on which educated society rests. It was in the Græco-Asiatic cities that this important advance in the methodical organization of society was made : it was among them that common employment of a uniform era for a large country was first carried into practical effect. The purely Greek cities thought it a point of honour to employ a purely municipal system of dating by the name of the annual magistrates of the city where the document was executed. This Greek method, which naturally was unintelligible beyond the limits of the single city, was put in practice in Rome ; and, owing to the wide Imperial sway of Rome, the dates by consuls became generally intelligible over the Empire, though such a complicated system formed a serious bar to practical usefulness, as it gave no indication of the interval that lay between any two dates.

Neither Latin nor Greek inscriptions in Antioch were dated by any system or in any way. A number of the Latin documents, however, can be assigned to a narrow period or a definite reign by internal evidence and the mention of some known person, but the Greek inscriptions are almost all quite vague, and internal evidence is rarely of any use for dating them. The lettering furnishes little

evidence under the middle and later Empire, for forms were at that period employed capriciously and without any uniformity or principle of development.

The Greek dedication by the colonia Lystra of a statue of Concord to its sister colonia Antiocheia¹ may be taken as one of the earliest public documents written in Greek in the whole Antiochian series. Lystra lost the knowledge and power of using Latin earlier than Antioch (as has been pointed out above). Lystra would also have been very chary of using Greek when it was addressing its sister colonia, and claiming kinship with Antioch the metropolis of the Province; and we must infer that it no longer possessed, when this inscription was composed, the ability to write Latin and engrave a document in that language. Now, Latin was employed in Lystra for inscriptions at least as late as the reign of Trajan, A.D. 98.² The dedication of the statue of Concord, therefore, could not be dated earlier than about 150 A.D. On the other hand, the event probably took place while the colonial character of Lystra was still recognized in both cities. It might be connected with the attempt which seems to have been made in the time of Antoninus Pius (138–161 A.D.) to revive the colonial memory by striking colonial coins (which had almost ceased since the early Empire); but those coins were struck in Latin, and the Antiochian dedication, therefore, is not likely to be much, if at all, earlier than about 200 A.D.

None of the other Greek inscriptions of colonial times seem to be earlier than this, and therefore they may all be assigned with considerable confidence to the third and fourth centuries after Christ.

Through these public documents in the Greek language we trace the recurrence of the Oriental spirit in the Græco-Roman cities, but it is Orientalism under Greek forms, not

¹ Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.*, no. 352.

² Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1904), p. 114.

under the old purely native forms : it is really a mixture of Asiatic and Greek tone, rejecting only the more purely European tone of Rome, which had not assimilated, but only dominated the East. Domination of one by the other is an impossible basis on which to arrange an amalgamation of East and West. Greek civilization, on the contrary, had adapted itself to the Eastern races and coalesced with Orientalism in a mixed Græco-Asiatic system of law and custom ; out of this union sprang many of the improved methods in social administration which were taken up and put in practice by the Roman Imperial government.

In this way the later Roman Antioch gradually ceased to be a Roman city, and took on the character of a Græco-Asiatic city. It styled itself no longer a *Colonia*, but in Greek as a Metropolis. Its magistrates gradually disused the Latin title *duumvir* and took the Greek title *strategos*.¹ The Senate no longer called itself an *Ordo*, but a *Boulē*. These changes are not merely a matter of outward names ; they are the outward indication of a deep-lying and complete change of spirit. The Roman spirit was dying out, and the Provinces were establishing their supremacy in the administration of the whole Imperial body.²

These facts, though belonging to a later time, indicate the permanent vitality of the Greek civilization in Antioch, underlying the Roman character which was so triumphant in appearance during the first century. A right instinct led Paul to appeal in Græek to the Greek side of Antiochian feeling ; but the facts of the city at the moment guide the historian and prevent him from using the term Hellenes about the auditors to whom Paul appealed.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ It is an interesting parallel that when the Greek Luke describes the action in the Roman *Colonia Philippi*, he calls the *duumvirs* *strategoi* (also using the general term *archontes* or *magistrates*).

² On this subject, compare *Studies in the Art and History of the Eastern Provinces* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), pp. 4 ff., 282, 287, 357 ff.