

What were the Churches of Galatia?

BY SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

IV.

IN 16³ the ceremony of 'setting apart' and consecrating Timothy for his new duties is implied, and this took place, necessarily, at Lystra.¹ Paul and his party were now on the frontier of the other converted region, and as soon as they moved a few miles to north or north-west they must enter it. No alternative was open to them. Luke now gives the name of this region, which they must cross, τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν. They entered it, and probably they made a preaching tour through it, as the verb διέρχομαι with the accusative always implies more than the mere passing across the region,² though it is not elsewhere used to indicate the formation of new churches in an unconverted country.

In this region their procedure was not the same as in Cilicia. They did all that is mentioned both in 16⁴ (delivering the Apostolic letter) and in 16⁵ (confirming the churches). In Cilicia they had not delivered the letter, for that letter had been addressed to the churches of Syria and Cilicia, and had been sent direct to them. There was therefore no need for Paul to deliver it. It had not been addressed to the churches of the two regions, and therefore Paul now delivered it to the churches as he went, identifying himself with its intention and decision, and urging all his converts to observe it loyally. As to 16⁵ it is to be taken as stating a universal fact, viz. a process of 'confirming the churches,' similar to what Paul did in Cilicia (15⁴¹); and it describes the result, viz. the strengthening and rapid increase of the congregations. The correct punctuation and division in Westcott and Hort's text shows that this is the interpretation: 16⁴ is of narrower, 16⁵ of wider application.

The statements of 16⁴ and 16⁵, which have been made for the first region, are to be understood as applying to all the rest of Paul's work. Everywhere he carried out the same policy, urging all to live according to the Apostolic decree.

¹ Paul co-operated with the Lystran presbyters in the consecration; cf. 2 Ti 1⁶ with 1 Ti 4¹⁴.

² Perhaps not in 19¹, where any preaching was unsuccessful.

The original aim of this journey is implied in the second clause of 16⁶. This aim had been, after revisiting and confirming his first churches in the two regions, to preach in the next province on the road westwards, viz. Asia. This aim might have been declared before the journey began, but is not stated by Luke, and perhaps was not published by Paul at that time (cf. 15³⁶). The other point at which this aim can most suitably be declared, is when the moment for putting it into execution has arrived in 16⁶. This implies that the 'Phrygian and Galatic region,' which was traversed in 16⁶ before Asia is mentioned, was the western of Paul's two converted regions: he confirmed (1) the eastern region, (2) the western; (3) he was prevented from his next aim of preaching in Asia; (4) he turned in another direction (viz. towards Bithynia, which lay beyond Asia on the north).

The same result follows from another consideration. In 16³⁻⁵ Paul is in Lystra. Unless he went back eastwards towards Cilicia, or turned away south into Isauria, he must cross the western region (that of Antioch and Iconium) before he could reach either Asia or North Galatia; there was no way to avoid this. Moreover, Paul had started from Syria with the intention of visiting 'the brethren in every city' of his first journey. There is no conceivable reason why he should abandon that intention. Such change of purpose for no reason is foreign to his nature and his policy. From Lystra we may say with absolute conviction that Paul went to the cities of the western region, Iconium and Antioch. Could he have abandoned his visit to 'the firstfruits of' the province and of the Roman Imperial mission? This consideration shows that 'the Phrygian and Galatic region,' which is mentioned between Lystra and Asia, is the region of Antioch and Iconium.

As a third argument, that was the name and description of the region in the strictest, most accurate, and most complete sense. The region is now well known through recent investigation. There was such a recognized and delimited ad-

ministrative division of the province Galatia, as will be shown. If there had existed any uncertainty before, it becomes clear, from the name in Ac 16⁶, that this region is the one called Phrygia or Mygdonia in inscriptions and in Pliny and Ptolemy; it was one of the governmental divisions of the province Galatia (on which see a later section).

VIII. CONSTRUCTION OF 16⁶.—The text of 16⁶ has given rise to much discussion. The weight of authority is in favour of *διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες*, and against the *textus receptus διελθόντες . . . κωλυθέντες . . . ελθόντες*. For our present purpose the matter is immaterial; and I need only say that, while here for once (and by no means the only time) the *textus receptus* is probably right, as giving a much more vigorous and Lukan structure, and bringing out prominently the orderly sequence of events, yet the strong consensus of modern opinion in favour of accepting the text of the great MSS. should be deferred to in this investigation. We therefore take the text as *διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες*. Even with that text there is no difficulty in understanding that the verbs follow the orderly sequence of time, and state successive stages in the action;¹ but here again we may defer to the belief that *κωλυθέντες* must indicate an action prior to *διήλθον*, 'because they were prevented . . . therefore they traversed the Phrygo-Galatic region.' In the run of such a narrative, where he has to enumerate a long series of successive actions, Luke generally makes the verbs follow the order of time: a good example is 16²²⁻²⁴. Let us, however, accept the view that *κωλυθέντες* as an aorist must be in time antecedent to *διήλθον* (compare for this sense 16³⁹, *εφοβήθησαν άκούσαντες*). We should then understand the sequence of actions thus: Paul, having in mind at Lystra his plan of going on to Asia from Galatia, was ordered by the Spirit not to preach in Asia. He therefore made a tour through the Phrygo-Galatic region, which he had already influenced so profoundly from end to end (13⁴⁹): cities which he had never seen had been affected indirectly on his first visit: he now visited them. Hence the whole western region is mentioned, and not

¹ There is a common tendency among modern scholars, when one meaning or construction or usage occurs in an author twenty times as often as another, to eliminate or explain away the exceptional cases. This is false method. The less usual occurs. At present, however, I am discussing geography; and the question is indifferent in that view.

merely Iconium and Antioch. In the eastern region he visited only the two cities.² In the western region he had many disciples outside of Antioch, and he made a progress through the whole region of Phrygia Galatica. He carried out his original intention all the more thoroughly because the next stage of his intended journey had been forbidden.

We should then have to suppose that the prohibition to preach in Asia was communicated to Paul already in Lystra, and may have been part of the commands issued by the Spirit which were connected with the choice and the mission of Timothy (1 Ti 4¹⁴). The order of events would then be as follows: (1) The sending forth of Timothy, and prohibition in respect of the further journey in Asia; (2) journey throughout the Phrygian region, waiting further instructions; (3) no instructions having been received and Asia being still barred, Paul at last turned away north to the great cities of Bithynia; (4) having reached (Kotiaion?), where the Bithynian way crossed the road from Mysia to the east, Paul was forbidden to go on to the north, and turned west towards the coast, making his way through Mysia, which was part of the province Asia, and therefore unable to preach there (*παρελθών*).

Thus 'inasmuch as they were forbidden [to put in effect his intention] to preach in Asia, they made a tour [not merely to Iconium and Antioch, but also] in the Phrygo-Galatian region; and when they [turned northwards and] were come over-against Mysia, the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not.' Here is a clear definite description of a journey stage by stage. On the North-Galatian view there is no continuous journey, and no intelligible picture: 'Paul came to Derbe and Lystra: then jumping over the region of which Antioch was capital, and neglecting the disciples whom he had intended to visit there, he travelled through Phrygia Magna (which was part of the province Asia) and North Galatia [founding several churches in the latter, which seem unworthy of mention]; and when they were come over-against Mysia, they were forbidden to enter Bithynia.' There is no continuity in this description. After skipping the region of Antioch, the journey proceeds through Phrygia Magna to

² Though his personal influence did not penetrate beyond the two cities, yet the churches were active centres (see below, § IX.).

Galatia. There it was interrupted: residence in several cities and the founding of several churches there required much time. Yet the writer proceeds as if there had been no break in the journey, 'when they were come over-against Mysia.' A writer who said this did not think of any break: he thought that the travelling was continuous, and was not stopped by a long illness, by a residence in some city during that illness, and then by the work of conversion, teaching of converts and organization of churches in other cities (see § I.). Either he knew of no new churches, or his account is bad in the extreme, and you must take refuge in the theory that Luke could not tell a story and could not describe intelligibly or intelligently a sequence of actions.

IX. THE TWO REGIONS ON THE THIRD JOURNEY. — Both North Galatians and South Galatians are necessarily agreed that Paul's route on his third journey must be interpreted in accordance with the second. 'He went through the Galatic region and Phrygia, establishing all the disciples,' *i.e.* he traversed countries where there already existed converts. Evidently the purpose of the journey was to confirm the disciples. Paul visited every place where there were Christians in the Galatic region and Phrygia; none were omitted. Here already there is an anticipation of the plan which was gradually disclosed on this journey: Paul was making his final and complete circuit of his young churches, then he would visit Jerusalem, carrying the offerings of all his churches, and then he would visit Rome (19²¹). There can hardly be a doubt that on this journey he 'gave order to the churches of Galatia concerning the collection for the saints' (1 Co 16¹); the order was given personally: the 'establishing of all the disciples' was consummated by this collection. The Apostle's plan was to interest 'all the disciples' in the welfare of the original saints in Jerusalem, to bind the new to the old disciples by the tie of charity and love; his heart was already filled with the 'Hymn of Heavenly Love' (1 Co 13¹). He knew from past experience the influence which a contribution for a good and loyal purpose would exert in conciliating the older and the newer churches to one another (Ac 11^{20f.} 12²⁵); and he wished to stimulate fraternal feeling among the newer churches.

The purpose of the third journey was to link up the provinces of Galatia, Macedonia, and

Achaia in two ways: first, geographically, by making the intermediate province of Asia a stronghold of Christianity ('all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word,' 18¹⁰), and thus facilitating communication and intercourse among the scattered churches, so that everywhere the Christian on a journey should find friends and associates;¹ in the second place, spiritually, through the unifying power of love and common action for an ideal. Hence the emphasis laid on the visiting of 'all the disciples': none were to be omitted; all the old converts were personally face to face with Paul for the last time, before he attacked Rome and the west; Asia was partly left to his coadjutors (Col 2¹), owing to its vast size and the number of its great cities. Hence also Luke lays stress on the personal appeal to the disciples (18²³): each individual was, so to say, sought out and made to feel Paul's purpose and warmed with the fire of love: in other similar cases (14²³ 15⁴¹ 16⁵) it is the church, as a whole, rather than the individuals, that Paul approached. Now Paul approached the individual members of the churches.

This purpose imperatively required that, as Luke says, 'all the disciples' should be visited and established. The final survey had to be made, and the final warnings given. The address to the presbyters of Ephesus in Ac 20 must be regarded as typical of much that had been said in similar style to the churches of the other three provinces.

Further, Paul made a progress through both regions, and did not merely go to the four cities. This he did in the western region even on the second journey. Now he does it in both. From Derbe and Lystra, presumably, the new influence had been spreading forth through the villages as the disciples, were strengthened in the faith, and increased in number daily' (16⁵).

If the line of this journey be taken, according to the North-Galatian interpretation of 18²³, as leading from Cilicia through Cappadocia to Taviium, Ancyra, Pessinus, and Phrygia Magna (*i.e.* Asian Phrygia) to Ephesus, the purpose of Paul's progress was not attained. He visited the supposed churches of those three Galatian cities,

¹ Epitaph of Avircius Marcellus: in journeys 'I found everywhere pledged friends' (πάντη δ' ἔσχον συνομήρεις: the last word is uncertain, συνομήθεις, συνομίλους, συνοπαδοίς are possible), *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. 711, 722 ff.

and in Phrygia Magna he would find no disciples, for though Paul traversed that country on his previous journey, yet he was forbidden to speak the Word there. Why, then, does Luke say that Paul confirmed all the disciples in a great country like Phrygia, where there were no disciples? The evangelization of Asian Phrygia was still a matter of the future. The idea that Luke could write like this is absurd, or supposes absurdity in Luke.

Therefore we must understand that there were disciples both in the Galatic region and in Phrygia, and that Paul's intention was to give them the final instructions and arrange the contribution, before he went to Jerusalem and to Rome: in other words, these are the same two regions which were converted on the first journey, and established on the second journey.

Moreover, how could Luke say that Paul visited 'all the disciples' on this journey, if the Apostle did not visit Antioch, or Iconium, or Lystra, or Derbe, or the region round Antioch? The account contradicts Luke's former narrative. Yet if Paul went through the northern Galatia and Phrygia Magna, he could not visit Lycaonia and Galatic Phrygia.

Moreover, the North-Galatian theorists ought to explain why Paul does not mention any contribution made by the South-Galatian churches to the fund for the benefit of the poor in Jerusalem, which he was organizing for years, and which he carried to Jerusalem at such risk. All the more strange is this, when the Acts records that two South Galatians, Timothy and Gaius, were among the delegates who carried the money. It is evident that Paul attached great importance to this contribution. He regarded it as a means of unifying the whole Church of Christ by co-operation in charity, by sympathy for the poor of the mother-Church, by common effort made for some years in weekly collections, and of reconciling the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem to the new Gentile Churches through the gratitude which the liberality of the latter would inspire in the former. This was Paul's supreme effort in constructive statesmanship: through this we know that he worked as zealously and with as far-sighted effort for unification of all the congregations as he did for the conversion of individuals and the foundation of churches in each city. If he set before Corinth the example of the churches of Galatia, why did he omit the example of Lystra, Iconium, etc.?

This, however, may seem to be a mere *argumentum a silentio*, which is proverbially valueless; but it is not really so. There was a reason why those churches should be mentioned: the value of the contribution lay in its being a gift from all the Pauline churches, and proving the universal goodwill to Jerusalem and the Jews felt by them. As a fact, two delegates from them helped to carry the money to Jerusalem, while there was no delegate from North-Galatian churches. If churches of North Galatia contributed, either they were content to send the money through others who were not of their land (as was the case with Corinth), or they reckoned themselves as belonging to the province Galatia, and therefore as represented by the two representatives of the South-Galatian churches.

There is no explanation for the facts except in this, that the author of the Acts writes in a totally different atmosphere from the Pauline, that he omits or treats indifferently much that Paul valued, and laid stress on much that Paul considered of less consequence. There is no way of finding a unity and a common feeling or purpose in the Acts and the letters of Paul on the supposition that the Pauline churches of Galatia were at Pessinus, Ancyra, etc. The historical outlook which sees Antioch, etc., bulking so largely in the work of Paul, and leaves the churches of Galatia unnoticed, is totally different from that in which the churches of Galatia are very important, and the churches of Antioch, etc., are unmentioned. With a sufficient degree of incapacity on the part of the author of the Acts, however, anything is possible, and nothing seems too stupid or too foolish to the interpreter who starts with the preconception that this author was foolish and incapable. The sane criticism of Luke always has to meet a serious difficulty. In a classical author an interpretation is rejected because it would show him to be inconsistent or stupid. In the case of Luke, some scholars welcome an interpretation which supports their opinion that he was inaccurate, fanciful, and incompetent.

Moreover, in 18²³ Paul is brought to the western limit of Phrygia, which he is said to have traversed coming from the east and going to Ephesus. If his line of march was through Tavium, Ancyra, and Pessinus to Ephesus, he would in 18²³ have reached a point not far from Philadelphia, and be on the point of entering the valley of the Hermus,

one of those low valleys that extend up from the sea. Yet in 19¹ the following part of his journey is described, and it still leads on through the high-lying parts of the plateau.¹ Such a statement is irreconcilable with geographical fact. On the supposed route the 'high-lying parts' are completely traversed in 18²³. Only the low country remains for 19¹. On the contrary, we find, according to the South-Galatian view, that, after traversing Galatic Phrygia, Paul had still a considerable journey before him over the high plateau; and there were two roads open to him, one through Apameia, Colossæ, and Laodiceia, reaching the low country sooner, and the other through Eumeneia, reaching the low country only at the head-waters of the Cayster. We know that he did not choose the road through Colossæ (Col 2¹), therefore he must have taken the other, and thus the phrase 'the higher parts' acquires a special significance, 'High Phrygia.'

In 18²³ it is more clearly evident than on either of the previous journeys that Paul's disciples and churches were in two regions, and only in two: 'the Galatic region and Phrygia' (or 'the Phrygian region'²; both constructions are possible, and both have the same geographical import). Coming from Cilicia he traversed first the region of Derbe and Lystra, and then the region of

Antioch. The latter, having been named with minute accuracy in the second journey, is now called simply by its ordinary name. Why is the latter called, not Lycaonia, but 'Galatic region'? This is the name that has specially given rise to misapprehension. Why should one single region of the province be singled out beyond others as specially entitled to the name 'Galatic' simply, when this name was equally appropriate to every one of the regions of the province? The answer is that in adding, or in using simply, the title Galatic, Luke is not employing a mere geographical name, but adds this epithet to give information, and to explain the classification of the Pauline churches. Having once given this information about Phrygia (the Phrygian region), he did not require to give it again; and it is not his fashion to repeat information. That consideration eliminates the fullest form, τὰς Γαλατικὰς χώρας, τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν, while style prohibits an expression similar to 16^{6a}, when two regions have to be mentioned together.

Moreover, we have here a traveller's expression, caught from the lips of Paul. The Apostle was coming from the east, and had traversed the independent non-Roman Lycaonia, governed by king Antiochus, on his way to Derbe, as he did also in 16¹. Luke does not mention that Lycaonia. He now uses the form which Paul had heard near the Lycaonian frontier: the country on the Roman side was 'the Galatic region,' the country on the eastern side was 'the Antiochian region' (as Ptolemy calls it).

¹ τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη. I formerly supposed that 19^{1a} was a recapitulation of 18²³; but this is not defensible, and I had to abandon it in the second edition.

² The common article indicating that the Galatic region and the Phrygian were a pair united by some bond.

Literature.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

THE Rev. W. P. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, was Baird Lecturer in 1905, and the lectures then delivered have now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton under the title of *The Rule of Faith* (6s. net). The delay is all gain. Dr. Paterson has had time to turn the lectures into a book, usually a necessary process, and in this case most admirable in result; and he has been able to publish at a time when there is more interest in the subject of them.

Their subject is the Rule of Faith. That involves two things, and the discussion of these two things divides the book into two parts. First, it involves the question of authority—where we are to go for that law of life in Christ Jesus by which we are more and more made free from the law of sin and death; and next it involves the discussion of the contents of that law.

And it is hard to say in which half of his book Professor Paterson is most effective, for he is irresistibly effective in both parts. Within the first part, perhaps the most brilliant thing is the exposition of the Roman Catholic position, running