

PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

X. FIRST APPEARANCE OF PAUL AND BARNABAS IN
THE ANTIOCHIAN SYNAGOGUE.

WE turn now to study the visits which Paul paid to Antioch, and to compare the information given in the Acts with the results attained in the preceding Sections.

On his first visit Paul and Barnabas crossed the broad and rugged mountain region of Taurus, coming northward from Perga to Antioch probably in the late summer or autumn of the year 46¹ after Christ. As the narrative of Luke states the circumstances, the two Apostles entered the Synagogue as comparative strangers on the first Sabbath after their arrival, and took their seat. The Rulers of the Synagogue after the lessons for the day (probably from Deuteronomy i. and Isaiah i.)² had been read, sent them an invitation to address the congregation: "Brethren, if ye have any word [of exhortation for the people, say on."

It cannot be supposed that the Rulers would have invited any chance stranger to speak in public. We must therefore conclude either that Paul and Barnabas took their seats in some special place, showing thereby that they desired to address the people, or that previously they had made known to these Rulers their character and mission as teachers: perhaps both these preliminaries had been observed. The former alternative is adopted by J. Lightfoot, who supposes that they sat down in the place appropriated to the Rabbis. The example of Jesus in Luke iv. 16 shows that a person who desired to speak in the synagogue

¹ *Church in the Roman Empire*. p. 65 f.; *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 365.

² The association between these two passages, which is found in the present table of Jewish lessons, is probably of very early origin.

had the opportunity permitted him by Jewish custom, just as is the Quaker custom still ; but there was this difference, that among the Jews the Rulers were charged with the superintendence of public worship, the choice of speakers, and general care for the order of the proceedings, whereas among the Quakers any one whom the Spirit prompts is free to rise and speak. It seems therefore probable that the Rulers satisfied themselves previously as to the qualifications of Paul and Barnabas ; and this implies either that some private communication had taken place before the public worship began, or that the Apostles had already been some time in Antioch and acquired a reputation as teachers and preachers.

Formerly I took the last view,¹ and supposed that that inattention to precise statement of the lapse of time, which characterized Luke in common with most ancient writers, made him here slur over a certain interval during which the Apostles lived and worked in Antioch till they had become noteworthy figures in the city. This supposition would explain how it came that the Rulers on a certain Sabbath invited the Apostles to address the congregation ; and it is quite in keeping with Luke's style of narrative that he should hurry over the early days of the residence in Antioch, and consecrate attention on the critical moment. At that time it seemed to me to be impossible and incredible that already, on the second Sabbath of their residence (xiii. 44), Paul and Barnabas should have succeeded in catching the ear of "almost the whole city" and in alienating the Jews. But further study has gradually brought me to a different view. That which once seemed impossible and incredible must be accepted as the fact. A similar change of opinion has come about in regard to many things during the last years of the nineteenth and the first years of the twentieth

¹ *St. Paul the Trav.* p. 99 f.

century: hundreds of assertions which would formerly have been pronounced incredible and impossible are now accepted as obvious statements of fact. The word "impossible" should rarely be used in criticism, or only in a different way from that in which it was formerly employed: it is a dangerous and question-begging term.

In this case Luke is quietly explaining and emphasizing that instantaneous and marvellous effect on the Galatians, which so deeply impressed Paul himself and which he describes in his letter, "ye received me as an angel of God." He was welcomed by the native pagan Galatians as one who came bringing the message of God, as one who must be believed and trusted implicitly, as one for whom nothing that they could do was too much, to whom they were ready to give up all that was dearest and to sacrifice their very eyes. Such a reception—that a pagan city should welcome a Jewish stranger as an angel of God—was marvellous, impossible, incredible; but Luke describes how it occurred; and this striking agreement between Acts and the Epistle proves that we must accept to the fullest extreme the strange and at first sight almost incredible account given by Luke. Paul was invited to address the audience in the Synagogue on the first Sabbath after he arrived. Weak and showing traces of an illness which was popularly regarded as a direct infliction of Divine wrath on a guilty and accursed person, he was received by the heathen part of his audience at least not with contempt or disapproval as outcast and cursed by God, but with enthusiasm as the messenger come from God.¹

This striking inauguration of the Galatian mission, natu-

¹ That which was a trial to you in my physical frame ye despised not, but received me as an angel of God (Gal. iv. 14). The effects of the illness were apparent when Paul came to Galatia, as the quotation clearly shows. It is quite extraordinary that scholars, in spite of Paul's own words, should maintain that the illness began after he came to Galatia.

rally, made a deep impression on Paul's mind, as we see throughout the impassioned outpouring of his feelings in the Galatian letter. While we cannot explain with perfect confidence exactly how it was that the Rulers came to invite these strangers to speak, we must accept the fact that it was so. Just as at Philippi (xvi. 13), so at Pisidian Antioch, the events of the first Sabbath in a new city and a strange land are described with especial interest and minuteness by the historian—a good example of his method in narrative.

XI. PAUL'S FIRST ADDRESS TO A GALATIAN AUDIENCE.

A speech delivered on an occasion like this must be interesting to the student of history. The question must be asked, whether we have in Acts xiii. 16-41 a report of that speech, or merely an address embodying in Luke's own language his conception of the way in which Paul was in the habit of appealing to a mixed audience such as might gather in a Synagogue of the western Jewish Diaspora. This important question is sometimes put in a misleading fashion, as for example in the long footnote in Meyer-Wendt's *Kommentar*, eighth edition, p. 234, where it is expressed in the form of an alternative; either this address was found by the author of Acts in the written Source on which he was dependent in this part of his work, or it is the author's free invention without any authority. Neither alternative is correct. Both are false. But when the question is so expressed, the unwary reader, like the incautious critic, is readily seduced into the belief that one or other alternative must be right; and, as the style and vocabulary of the Lukan writings have influenced the passage, there is an almost inevitable tendency towards the conclusion that we have in this passage a freely invented oration which the author of Acts considered suitable for the

occasion and characteristic of Paul. Luke was not in this part of his work dependent on any written Source, but on information from the actors and eye-witnesses, and on his own personal knowledge.¹ His style has free play, when he is reporting in brief a long speech.

Let us therefore take the address as Luke reports it, and consider its character and its suitability to the audience before whom it is said to have been delivered.

In the first place we observe that it is not addressed to the Jews of the Synagogue alone. From the opening to the close it is addressed to the double audience, the Jews and the God-fearing Gentiles,² all pagans by education, but attracted within the circle of Jewish influence in virtue of a certain natural affinity in them to the lofty morality of the teaching in the Synagogue.

Nor is this double address expressed in the way of depreciating the second kind of auditors as an inferior class. There is nothing resembling the tone of the modern Greek priest in a Greek village of Macedonia, where a small body of Wallachian settlers, too poor to have a church of their own, attended the Greek service, and listened to the address of the priest: "Christian Brethren, and ye Wallachians."³ Paul's opening words are perfectly courteous to both classes, "Men of Israel and ye that fear God, hearken."

Incidentally we observe here how inaccurate is the view taken of this address in the above-quoted footnote of Meyer-

¹ See, for example, Harnack's *Lukas der Artzt*, and the review of that work in *EXPOSITOR*, December, 1906, February, 1907.

² There can be no doubt that this is the meaning of the formula so often employed by Luke. "Those that feared God" were in a sense pagans still, they had not professedly and overtly abandoned paganism.

³ I speak of a period fully forty years ago, before racial hatreds became so intense as they are now, when such a mixed audience has become almost an impossibility. I heard the story twenty-seven years ago from a British subject, speaking Greek with perfect fluency, who had resided for business purposes in Thessaly and southern Macedonia.

Wendt's *Kommentar* : Dr. Wendt states the opinion that this address is a free composition by the author of the Acts, in which he tried to exemplify the way that Paul on his missionary journey preached the Gospel before the Jews. The distinguished commentator has failed to observe the most important fact about this address, the fact which gives character and effect to it, that it includes in its clearly-expressed scope the Gentiles from first to last. What help for the understanding of the speech can be expected from a discussion which leaves out of count the most essential and remarkable fact in the address ?

In the second place, as the orator proceeds and grows warm in his subject, his address becomes still more complimentary to the God-fearing Gentiles and actually raises them to the same level with the Jews as "Brethren." At first he had distinguished the two classes of auditors, Jews and God-fearing ; but in xiii. 26 he sums them up all together with a loftier courtesy as "Brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and those among you that fear God." Doubtless this was the first occasion on which either in this or in any other Synagogue the Gentiles had been addressed by a Jew as "Brethren."¹ Then finally in verse 38 the distinction of two classes in the audience disappears, and all are identified on the higher plane of Christian thought as "Brethren." Here we stand on the same level as in the Galatian letter iii. 26-30, "Ye are all sons of God . . . there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female : for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

What a development here appears from the language which Paul had used to Peter in a Gentile city before a

¹ That Brethren is not confined to the first class, but common to both, is shown by verse 38 ; by the comparison of the climax from 16, through 26, to 38 ; and by the terms *ἡμῖν* and *ὑμῖν* in 26.

Gentile audience only a short time before! "We being Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles." It is, of course, true that the words were uttered dramatically, as Paul was speaking from the point of view of his Jewish antagonists and employing their language. But even with this explanation I feel no longer able to hold the opinion expressed in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 138 f., that that scene occurred immediately before the Apostolic Council. After hesitating long I find myself decisively driven over to the view which at first I rejected¹ (but which my friend Mr. F. Warburton Lewis has often urged on me) that the visit of Peter to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) preceded the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, and that he was sent from Jerusalem as far as Syrian Antioch to inspect and report on this new extension of the Church, just as he had been sent previously to Samaria along with John on a similar errand.

Accordingly we see that the sermon at Pisidian Antioch was given by Luke in such detail, not merely because it inaugurated an important stage in the development of Paul's sphere of work, viz. the beginning of the Galatian Churches, but also because it represented a new step in his thought and method.

XII. THE APPROACH TO THE GENTILES.

But, while the Gentiles are associated on a footing of such perfect equality with the Jews in this address, they are regarded entirely on the side of their approach to the Jewish beliefs, and not the faintest reference is made to their own religious conceptions apart from and previous

¹ Always, however, with a good deal of hesitation; from the very first sketch of *St. Paul the Traveller* onwards there were often times when this view (which now at last I adopt definitely) exerted a strong force on me.

to Judaism. In that respect this sermon stands in marked contrast to the oration to the Athenians and the brief address to the Lystran mob, in which Christian doctrine is set before the auditors as the development of their own natural conceptions of and aspirations towards the Divine power. Here, on the contrary, the God-fearing Gentiles are addressed as standing on the same plane of thought with the Jews, and the correct text (followed in the Revised Version)¹ shows that the Jews in the Synagogue did not at the moment appreciate (any more than Dr. Wendt appreciates) the importance of the inclusion of the Gentiles by Paul in his address and in his gospel. The topics were so purely Jewish that the appeal to the Gentiles, though clearly marked, was ignored as a mere piece of courtesy by the Jews generally or regarded as accidental. Possibly some of the Jews were offended already by this extreme complaisance to the Gentiles, but they are not alluded to by the historian, who only says that many of the Jews and Gentiles followed the Apostles, when they continued their mission.

But on the next Sabbath almost the whole city flocked to the Synagogue. It was now clearly apparent what interpretation was put on the words of Paul. Even the Gentiles who had not previously been attracted within the circle of the Synagogue came to hear the new message of a widened Judaism. The teaching, which on the first Sabbath had been allowed to pass without open disapproval and had even been welcomed by many of the Jews, was now openly

¹ xiii. 43; Revised Version, "And as they went out they besought that these words might be spoken to them the next Sabbath." The Authorized Version (on which see the end of the Section) is due to an ancient alteration in the text intended to bring it into conformity with a mistaken conception of the nature of the situation. From verse 45 it was concluded that the Jews could not have joined in the invitation to Paul; and "the Gentiles" were introduced as sole givers of the invitation.

contradicted, when one or both of the Apostles addressed the crowded assembly. The Jews of Antioch were not prepared to admit the Gentiles to an equality with themselves.

No explanation is given in the oration quoted by Luke of the way in which this equality which Paul preached was explained and justified by him. The equalization is simply assumed and acted upon. "You," throughout the speech, embraces Jews and Gentiles. "We" in xiii. 26 includes all who will. But one cannot suppose that the entire Gospel was explained in one oration to an audience wholly unprepared for it. The aim of the sermon was to drive home into the minds of the audience one or two fundamental principles, especially the universality of the gospel; and the subsequent events showed that this part of the message was caught with avidity by the hitherto unprivileged Gentiles in the audience. The oration was only the introduction, not the completion, of a course of instruction.

This consideration shows the unreasonableness of Professor McGiffert's criticism of the oration; he regards it as composed by Luke, and not as a trustworthy reproduction of what Paul said. He points out that in xiii. 39, "where it is said that 'every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,' a conception of justification is expressed, which, if not distinctly un-Pauline, nevertheless falls far below Paul's characteristic and controlling idea of justification as the state of the saved man who is completely reconciled to God and enjoys peace with him." Dr. McGiffert's words are quite correct, but his inference that Paul could not have made the statement is incorrect. This statement was a first step towards making the new idea intelligible to minds wholly unprepared for understanding the full Pauline conception. That able modern scholar and

writer sees that the statement, though "not un-Pauline," is incompletely Pauline; that is precisely what we should expect in such a preparatory announcement. But, when Dr. McGiffert regards "the forgiveness of sins" (xiii. 38) as sufficiently un-Pauline to excite suspicion, we find no reality in his criticism. Even if the words were never used by Paul elsewhere, it is mere pedantry to regard the idea as un-Pauline; but they occur (as the learned critic mentions) in Ephesians i. 7 and Colossians i. 14. They are a simpler and less philosophic expression of a process which Paul dwells on always, but as a rule in a more mystic and more transcendental way—a process which every Christian preacher must in some form or other always dwell on.

The occurrence of such simpler, as one might say pre-Pauline or preparatory-Pauline, expressions at the climax of the address is eminently suitable to the situation and strongly confirms the character of this oration as a trustworthy report of the speech actually delivered by the Apostle in the Galatian Synagogue.

It is needless to repeat here the analysis of the topics in this address which are described by Paul in the Epistle as having constituted his teaching to the Galatians. They are treated in my *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, pp. 399-401, to which I may be permitted to refer. The common topics there described are:—

(1) The history of the Jewish people becomes intelligible only as leading onward to a higher development: this higher stage came in "the fulness of time" (Gal. iv. 4), and constituted the climax of their history, when God fulfilled His promise, and when the Jews by condemning Jesus fulfilled prophecy (Acts xiii. 27, 32 f.).

(2) The promise given originally to the Jews cannot be fulfilled except through Christ. Such is the burden of the Epistle and of the address. The Law cannot save: it is

incomplete: it cannot justify:¹ through Christ every one that hath faith is justified (Acts xiii. 23, 32 f., 38 f.).

(3) Christ must be hanged on a tree and be accursed (Gal. iii. 13, Acts xiii. 29).

(4) Christ is not dead, though He was slain (xiii. 30, 32 f., 34 f., 37).

This is not a complete outline of Paulinism, but it is a characteristic sketch preparatory to the evangelizing of an audience which knew nothing but the Law. It is not what a later writer would compose as a presentation of Paulinism to any audience; but it is the way in which, as we cannot deny, Paul might well take the first steps to introduce his gospel to such an audience as this. The idea of liberty, which is so prominent in the Epistle, could not suggest itself at this stage before a mixed audience. It belongs to the further ministration after xiii. 47.

The Received Text of xiii. 42, which appears in the Authorized Version, "when the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath" (apart from the mistranslation² of the first participle) misses the delicacy of the situation, exaggerates the share attributed to the Gentiles in the action, and gives a quite irrational picture of the situation. We cannot possibly admit that the Jews could depart first from the Synagogue and leave the Gentiles alone with Paul in it. Even with a correct translation, "while the Jews were going out of the Synagogue," the situation as described remains almost the same, for the

¹ In the address Paul does not actually go further than that the Law cannot justify in all things, xiii. 39; but this is already un-Jewish, and suggests much more than it actually says.

² ἐξιόντων cannot possibly imply that the Jews "were gone out of the Synagogue," but only that they were in the act of going out or on the point of going out. This stage is antecedent to xiii. 43, when the Synagogue had broken up and the audience had been dismissed.

Jews are still represented as beginning to go out and leaving the Gentiles gathered round Paul and Barnabas ; and, moreover, this reading anticipates the situation as it developed in the ensuing week, whereas the Jews did not understand its nature until the following Sabbath. Moreover, the evidence of the manuscripts is overwhelming and indubitable.

It is gathered from xiii. 42 by some commentators that Paul and Barnabas went out beforehand¹ and afterwards the Synagogue was dismissed. But the words "as they were going out," may very well be interpreted as referring to the time occupied in the gradual departure of a large audience. During the breaking up of the audience the hearers in general asked that the address might be repeated, a request which (as we must understand) the Rulers complied with. After the breaking up occurred the scene described in the following verse.

XIII. THE DOOR OF THE GENTILES.

This turning away from the Jews to address the Gentiles directly and alone was a very important step in the development of the Pauline evangelization. That it was made now for the first time seems certain. It is the method of Luke to emphasize the great stages in the development of the Church ; and the attention which he devotes to this address would alone be a sufficient proof that it marked a decisive step in advance. Moreover, on their return to Syrian Antioch, Paul and Barnabas reported about their journey and its results ; and the fact on which they laid special stress was that God "had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles" during this journey.

The address to the Synagogue was not the opening of the door : it was only a preliminary that led up to that

¹ So Meyer-Wendt.

decisive step. It is only in *xiii. 46* that the step is actually described. When Paul took this step, the door was opened for the Gentiles to enter direct into the Church (instead of through the Synagogue).¹ It was not opened in Cyprus, for there Paul and Barnabas spoke only in the synagogues, Barnabas, not Paul, was the leader, and Paul still appeared in his Hebrew character under the name of Saul. It had not been open in Syrian Antioch, for there also the leader was Barnabas, and Paul appeared only as the Hebrew Saul in a subordinate position ; and no reasonable doubt can exist that the Christian teaching in Syrian Antioch reached the Gentiles through the Synagogue and not direct : had the door stood open already there, it would not have been necessary or correct for Paul and Barnabas to report that God had opened a door to the Gentiles on the journey.

Can we gather from the general situation any information to explain how it was that Paul made such a distinct step forward in his outlook and method at this time ? It is quite natural that the idea of the gospel of the Gentiles, deep-seated in his mind, should gradually translate itself into action, and grow stronger and more commanding as it becomes more active. That this must have been so lies in the nature of the case ; and Luke's narrative marks the gradual development very clearly. It was never part of this author's method formally to state reasons and estimate causes ; but he certainly conceived that Paul's missionary aims gradually expanded and developed, and he certainly modelled his history so as to exhibit the steps by which this development took place : no one has any doubt as to this intention on the part of the author of *Acts* : the only doubt is as to his competence and trustworthiness in carrying out his intention.

¹ The meaning of this step is more fully discussed in *St. Paul the Traveller, passim*.

What, then, was it that led Paul to take this large and sudden step onwards in his course at the very beginning of his Galatian mission ? The answer to this question must be to a great extent conjectural and dependent on a more or less subjective estimate of the preceding conditions. The sole authority is Luke ; and we have to try to divine the purpose in his mind, prompting his choice and his emphasis ; and this attempt must inevitably be conditioned by personal judgment about Luke's character as a historian.

In the first place we cannot but notice that this event comes shortly after the scene in Paphos, where Paul for the first time became the leader. At Paphos also he ceases to be conceived by Luke as a mere Jew among Jews ; and the change in his name marks a change in method and outlook. The first missionary action which Luke mentions after this change was the speech in the Antiochian Synagogue, for the residence in Pamphylia had been rendered abortive by the illness, which was still affecting him when he spoke in the Antiochian Synagogue, but which the Galatians overlooked in their enthusiastic reception. We must understand that Luke marks the three steps in the process of opening of the door as (1) the scene in Paphos, (2) the first Galatian sermon addressing Greeks and Jews as equal, (3) the turning away from the Jews to address the Gentiles directly and outside of the Synagogue.

In the second place, Paul was now entering a new country, where the conditions of life and the relations of Jews to Gentiles were probably different from those to which he was accustomed. An orator like him must have been sensitive to the new conditions and guided almost unconsciously by them. There was something in the moral atmosphere of the Synagogue at Antioch that led him on to the issue of addressing the Gentiles as " Brethren "

equally with the Jews, and exhibiting the Gospel ("placarding it before them," as in Gal. iii. 1) as their own. Can we determine what was this electric quality, to which Paul was sensitive? Surely, it is to be connected with the friendly relations of Jew and Gentile. We should not expect that in an ordinary Graeco-Roman city, almost the whole population would gather¹ to hear a Jew preach to them in the atmosphere of a Synagogue. What was it that made the Antiochians do this? That they should do so must be regarded as on a parallel with the general sympathy of spirit that existed between Anatolians and Jews. This sympathy I have elsewhere described.² The ancient people of Phrygia was the ground-stock into which melted and was absorbed both the old conquering tribes of Phryges or Bryges from Europe and the Magnesians colonists of the third century: it had marked affinity with the Semitic peoples. In the character of this ground-stock lies the explanation, both why Paul now was drawn on to address them so sympathetically in his first speech, and why later they attempted to reconcile his teaching with a strict and complete obedience to the Jewish Law (an attempt which elicited the Epistle to the Galatians). Only such an affinity could render it possible that almost the whole population crowded to hear the Jewish stranger preach his message to themselves.

A possible objection that may suggest itself on a hasty view may here be alluded to. We have laid much stress on the Hellenized character of Pisidian Antioch, and on its diversity from the purely Anatolian character of the surrounding population; and yet now we are laying stress

¹ A certain degree of rhetorical stress and exaggeration may perhaps be felt in the expression; but one cannot doubt that a large and impressive concourse of citizens to the Synagogue took place.

² *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, p. 194 f., 256, etc.

on the fundamentally Anatolian spirit of the Antiochians. It may be thought that these are inconsistent opinions. There is, however, no real inconsistency between them, and the reader who detects inconsistency fails to conceive rightly the Graeco-Oriental character in those Seleucid colonies of Phrygia. In them Hellenic education adapted itself to Oriental peoples, and in doing so was profoundly modified in spirit. Each of those cities was an experiment in the amalgamation of the Oriental and the Western. Therein lies their deep interest. They were attempting to do, and on the whole with remarkable success, what must be achieved on a wider scale at the present day if the peace of the world is to be maintained and progress to be made. The warfare and antagonism between Eastern and European has to be changed for peaceful interpenetration, which will result not in domination of the one over the other, but in harmonious development of a reconciled common civilization, in which each side contributes what the other lacks.¹

Accordingly, the mass of the population of Antioch was Hellenic or Hellenized: it was not, however, Greek, but Graeco-Oriental. Hellenism is rather an educational fact than a racial fact. Even the Magnesians who had colonized Antioch were not a Greek people racially; they came from a Hellenized city of Anatolia, in which the mixture of Greek blood can have been only slight. It was precisely in those Graeco-Oriental cities that the Jews found themselves most at home. In the strictly Greek cities of European Greece the Jews seem never to have been able to affect such an accommodation with their Greek neighbours.

The appeal which Paul made to the non-Jewish Antiochian Galatians was evidently addressed mainly to the older population, the Hellenized Anatolian, not the Roman,

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, Preface.

section of the city. Consideration of the circumstances will bring this out clearly.

Not the whole city had come to hear Paul. There was a class that did not come ; and it is easy to see what class it was that was not interested. It was the class to which belonged the women of rank to whom the Jews soon after had recourse in order to excite persecution against Paul. That is to say, it was the Roman colonists, the local aristocracy. They were not drawn so much to the Synagogue. An address in Greek would not be so attractive to them, for Greek had not yet become their home language, as it did two centuries later.¹ They had not the same affinity of spirit with the Semites as the older population had. An aristocracy is, as a rule, not so easily and quickly affected by missionary influence as the humbler classes are.

This class, which did not come to the Synagogue in any great numbers, held the reins of government ; it was the privileged burgher class. To it the Jews went for help, moving it through the women who belonged to it.

In conclusion we cannot but observe that the narrative of Acts implies a very marked concord and friendly relations between the Jews and the other two chief sections of the Antiochian people. The man of the population gathers in the Synagogue. The governing coloni are easily induced by the Jews to act against the strangers, and it can hardly be doubted that the charge against them was that they had disturbed the harmony of the state. This picture of the Roman Colonia is very favourable, and is quite in accordance with all that has been gathered from the extra-Biblical evidence.

XIV. THE RELIGION OF ANTIOCH.

The chief god of Antioch was Men, as Strabo mentions,

¹ See EXPOSITOR, March 1907, p. 285.

and his authority is confirmed by the coins and by the inscriptions of the city. One of the commonest types on the very numerous and varied coins of the Colonia shows the god (named on many *Mensis* in the Latin translation), a standing fully draped figure wearing the Phrygian high-pointed cap on his head, with the horns of the crescent moon appearing above and behind his shoulders : he rests his left arm on a column to bear the weight of a Victory which stands on his hand, and raises the left knee to plant the foot on a bull's head lying on the ground : in his right hand he holds a long sceptre : beside his right foot a cock stands on the ground. The complicated symbolism is difficult to interpret ; but certainly it shows the effort of Greek anthropomorphic art to indicate a complex Divine idea, remote from any strictly Greek conception. The bull's head often appears on tombstones in Asia Minor, and was certainly widely employed as a symbol that was efficacious to avert evil. The cock also occurs alone as the type on the reverse of some small Antiochian coins : in such cases it is doubtless to be understood as a part standing for the whole of the Divine image, when the representation had to be simplified and abbreviated on a small coin. The meaning of the symbol is obscure. The Victory which he bears on his hand marks him as the supreme god and victorious power.

The resemblance of the name Men to the Greek word Men (month) led to much confusion and even error¹ regarding the correspondence between Anatolian and Greek religious ideas. It was falsely supposed that the Anatolian deity Men was simply the Moon-god² ; and the objects above

¹ The error was made by the Greeks, and has been commonly followed by modern scholars.

² Hence also his name was mistranslated in Latin as *Mensis* on coins and *Luna* in an inscription, C.I.L. III. 6829.

his shoulders were misunderstood as the horns of the crescent moon, whereas originally they were probably only wings as represented in archaic art. The symbolism shows that the Men of Antioch was not the mere embodiment of a single object like the moon, but an envisagement of the general Divine idea, supreme and many-sided. He was simply the great god ; and his name Men was probably a shortened form of the longer Manes, which also occurs widely as the name of an Anatolian deity.

The variety of Greek names that were applied to Men at Antioch (as seen in the inscriptions) also indicate that his nature was very complex, so that he could be plausibly identified with widely diverse Greek gods. He is called Dionysos, Apollo and Asklepios ; and he must therefore have been the giver of wine, the god of prophecy (or the sun-god), and the great physician. In short, he is the Anatolian supreme god, the impersonation of their entire conception of the Divine nature and power.

In the religion that was characteristic of Central Anatolia generally and of Phrygia especially, the principal deity was not male but female. The Great Mother was to the Phrygian peoples the true and supreme embodiment of the Divine nature. The god was secondary and subordinate, though always a necessary element in her life inasmuch as the Divine life was the model and prototype of human life and human society. In various districts of the country we find that the god stands forth most prominently in the exoteric form of the religion ; but even there, if we can penetrate beneath the surface, we find that in the esoteric ritual of the Mysteries the goddess was the prominent personality, and the god was only secondary. The exoteric form of the religion was largely determined by historic conditions and especially by mixture of races. New peoples, among whom the female sex occupied a less honoured and influential position than

it did in the primitive Anatolian society, came to be widely dominant in Central Anatolia. These new peoples must, of course, recognize the old religion of the country; and generally they recognized it as their supreme religion; but the new social conditions demanded new religious forms to correspond to them, and the god was publicly more acknowledged and regarded than the goddess.

It might, therefore, be plausibly conjectured that in the more secret ritual of the Antiochian god, the Great Goddess would assume great prominence. We are, however, not reduced to conjecture; clear evidence exists that such was the case. A glance into the history of the Antiochian cult is necessary to show the character of this evidence.

The region of Antioch and the Limnai¹ was the property in primitive times of an ancient hieron and priestly establishment² which exercised theocratic authority over a wide district and a large subject population. Strabo says that Antioch was the centre and seat of this priestly establishment; but this is not exactly correct. Antioch was a Greek foundation within the territory of the hieron; and there was in the city a temple of the local religion in an outwardly Hellenized form. The true seat of the old cult was nearer to the north-eastern corner of the great double lake called Limnai; but exact localization can hardly be made without excavations.

The territory of the deity was probably taken possession of by the Seleucid kings, part being used to found Antioch, and perhaps part to found Apollonia. When the Romans destroyed the Seleucid rule over these parts of Asia Minor in 189 B.C., they set Antioch (and doubtless also Apollonia)

¹ *χώρα*, Acts xiii. 49, Sterret, *Epigraph. Journey*, no. 92, p. 121 (where *πεγειωνάριον*, i.e. *regionarium*, is the true reading).

² The inscriptions afford no evidence of a college of priests; but the analogy of Pessinus and of the Ormelian *hieron* may be regarded as conclusive.

free. The property of the hieron and the priests was then restored; and the old theocracy lasted until the formation of the Province Galatia in 25 B.C., when the vast estates of the god became Imperial property, as Strabo mentions.¹ In place of government by the god through his priests (a system which apparently had not been changed by the kings, who doubtless made the priests the representatives and agents of the reigning king), a more Roman method of administration was inaugurated. The inscriptions are not sufficient to furnish conclusive evidence, but they point to the view that the Imperial administration through a Procurator (an Imperial freedman) and Actor or Actores (Imperial slaves) was veiled to some degree under old forms, so that the Procurator was priest of the cultus. The population of the estates² were subjects directly of the Emperor, and did not form part of the Provincia. They were enrolled in a religious association (*collegium*), worshipping the Emperor and the ancient Phrygian deity. The supreme deity is frequently mentioned as Great Artemis. She was the old Phrygian Mother Goddess, the unwedded mother, nourisher, teacher and ruler of all her people; and the forms of the cult, so far as allusion occurs to them, are those of the old Phrygian religion, with a body of subordinate priests or ministers called by the ancient title Galloi and an Archigallos as their chief. All these Galloi and Archigallos were under the Procurator's authority.

The Roman administration and the old Phrygian system on these estates are treated, as far as the evidence permits, in the writer's paper, *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, pp. 305-377, where all the evidence is collected.

¹ His account is not quite clear, and probably he himself did not exactly comprehend what took place, as he had never visited Antioch. In all probability the Divine property had been taken by Amyntas, and passed as part of his inheritance to Augustus.

² ὄχλος, *plebs collegiæ*.

The religion of Antioch was in origin identical with the Artemis worship of the native population on the estates ; but Hellenic education and custom imparted a certain superficial alteration to the cult without giving any really Greek character to it. The " very manifest god Dionysos," as the god is styled in one inscription, is not really more Greek in character than Men himself. The citizens were Hellenes in education. They had the tone inevitably nurtured in freemen, who for generations had exercised the sovereign rights of self-government through elective magistrates, and had met for free discussion in public meetings, Thus they were raised intellectually far above the level of the still half-enslaved Phrygian population on the Imperial estates around Antioch, and in such a position the Hellenic pride of birth and intellect must have been fostered and strengthened. But in religion and in racial temperament they were Anatolian (except the colonial Romans, who were still a separate and superior caste in the time of St. Paul).

W. M. RAMSAY.