
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ST. PAUL'S FIRST JOURNEY IN ASIA MINOR.

II.

THE notes which follow may perhaps seem to be unnecessarily minute; but their sole reason for existence lies in the fact that it is important to weigh accurately and minutely minute details. Fidelity to the character and circumstances of the country and people is an important criterion in estimating the narrative of St. Paul's journeys; and such fidelity is most apparent in slight details, many of which have, so far as I can discover, hitherto escaped notice. The writer's subject is restricted to the country with which he has had the opportunity of acquiring unusual familiarity, and about which many false opinions have become part of the stock of knowledge, handed down through a succession of commentators. Even that most accurate of writers, the late Bishop Lightfoot, had in his earlier works not succeeded in emancipating himself from the traditional misconceptions; we observe in his successive writings a continuous progress towards the accurate knowledge of Asia Minor which is conspicuous in his work on Ignatius and Polycarp. But in his early work, the edition of the *Epistle to the Galatians*, there is shown, so far as Asia Minor is concerned, little or no superiority to the settled erroneousness of view and of statement which still characterises the recent commentaries of Wendt and Lipsius;[1] and only a few signs appear of his later fixed habit of recurring to

[1] Wendt's sixth (seventh) edition of Meyer's *Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1888; Lipsius' edition of *Epistle to the Galatians* in Holtzmann's *Handcommentar zum N.T.*, iii. 2, Freiburg, 1891. These works are referred to throughout simply as Wendt and Lipsius.

original authorities about the country and setting the words of St. Paul in their local and historical surroundings, a habit which contrasts strongly with the satisfied acquiescence of Lipsius and Wendt in the hereditary circle of knowledge or error. The present writer is under great obligations to Wendt especially, and desires to acknowledge his debt fully; but the vice of most modern German discussions of the early history of Christianity, viz., falseness to the facts of contemporary life and the general history of the period, is becoming stereotyped and intensified by long repetition in the most recent commentators, and some criticism and protest against the narrowness of their treatment of the subject are required.

I regret to be compelled in these papers to disagree so much with Lightfoot. Perhaps therefore I may be allowed to say that, sixteen years ago, the study of his edition of Galatians marks an epoch in my thoughts and the beginning of my admiration for St. Paul and for him.

In order to put the reader on his guard, it is only fair to state at the outset that the paper has a definite aim, viz., by minutely examining the journeys in Asia Minor to show that the account given in Acts of St. Paul's journeys is founded on, or perhaps actually incorporates, an account written down under the immediate influence of Paul himself. This original account was characterised by a system of nomenclature different from that which is employed by the author of the earlier chapters of Acts, viz., i.–xii.: it used territorial names in the Roman sense, found also in Paul's Epistles, whereas the author of i.–xii. uses them in the popular Greek sense; and it showed a degree of accuracy which the latter was not able to attain.[1] In carrying out this aim, it will be necessary to

[1] The general agreement of this view with that stated by Wendt, pp. 23 and 278, is obvious; and certain differences are also not difficult to detect. He dates the composition of Acts between 75 and 100 A.D., and holds that the original document alone was the work of Luke.

differ in some passages of Acts from the usual interpretation; and the reasons for this divergence can be appreciated only by careful attention to rather minute details. For the sake of brevity, I shall, so far as regard for clearness permits, venture to refer for some details to a special work,[1] whose results are here applied to the special purpose of illustrating this part of the Acts; but I hope to make the exposition and arguments complete in themselves.

As this idea that the narrative of St. Paul's journeys, beginning with chapter xiii., had an independent existence before it was utilised or incorporated in Acts, must be frequently referred to in the following pages, the supposed original document will be alluded to as the "Travel-Document." The exact relation of this document to the form which appears in Acts is difficult to determine. It may have been modified or enlarged; but I do not feel certain that in the parts relating to Asia Minor, to which this paper is restricted, any verses can be with confidence characterised as pure additions.

I hope to show that, when once we place ourselves at the proper point of view, the interpretation of the Travel-Document as a simple, straightforward, historical testimony offers itself with perfect ease, and that it confirms and completes our knowledge of the country acquired from other sources in a way which proves its ultimate origin from a person acquainted with the actual circumstances. If this attempt be successful, it follows that the original document was composed under St. Paul's own influence,[2] for only he was present on all the occasions where the vividness of the narrative is specially conspicuous.

The impression conveyed in the preceding paragraph

[1] *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, where I have discussed the points more fully.

[2] I wish to express his influence in the most general terms, and to avoid any theorising about the way in which it was exercised, whether by mere verbal report or otherwise.

differs from that of my words in the EXPOSITOR, January, 1892, p. 30, which I wish to correct to some extent by better knowledge. It has cost me much time and labour to understand the account given in Acts;[1] and it was impossible to understand it so long as I was prepossessed with the idea adopted from my chief master and guide, Bishop Lightfoot, that in St. Paul's Epistle the term Galatians denotes the Celtic people of the district popularly and generally known as Galatia. To maintain this idea I had to reject the plain and natural interpretation of some passages; but when at last I found myself compelled to abandon it, and to understand Galatians as inhabitants of Roman Galatia, much that had been dark became clear, and some things that had seemed loose and vague became precise and definite.[2] As the two opposing theories must frequently be referred to, it will prove convenient to designate them as the North-Galatian and the South-Galatian theories; and the term North Galatia will be used to denote the country of the Asiatic Gauls, South Galatia to denote the parts of Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, which were by the Romans incorporated in the vast province of Galatia.

The discussion of St. Paul's experiences in Asia Minor is beset with one serious difficulty. The attempt must be made to show clearly the character of the society into which the apostle introduced the new doctrine of religion and of life. In the case of Greece and Rome, much may be assumed as familiar to the reader. In the case of Asia Minor, very little can be safely assumed; and the analogy of Greece and Rome is apt to introduce confusion and mis-

[1] Among other things I was obliged to rewrite the sketch of the history of Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia given in *Hist. Geogr.*, p. 371, where I wrongly followed M. Waddington against Prof. Mommsen in regard to the coins of M. Antonius Polemo. This error vitiated my whole theory.

[2] Fortunately none of the details on which my opinion has been altered have come under notice in the preceding part of this paper.

conception. C H have attempted,[1] in a most scholarly way, to set forth a picture of the situation in which St. Paul found himself placed in the cities of Asia and of Galatia. But the necessary materials for their purpose did not exist, the country was unknown, the maps were either a blank or positively wrong in regard to all but a very few points; and, moreover, they were often deceived by Greek and Roman analogies. The only existing sketch of the country that is not positively misleading is given by Mommsen in his *Provinces of the Roman Empire*; and even it is only a very brief description of the provinces during a period of several centuries. Now the dislike entertained for the new religion was at first founded on the disturbance it caused in the existing relations of society. Toleration of new religions as such was far greater under the Roman Empire than it has been in modern times: in the multiplicity of religions and gods that existed in the same city, a single new addition was a matter of almost perfect indifference. But the aggressiveness of Christianity, the change in social habits and everyday life which it introduced, and the injurious effect that it sometimes exercised on trades which were encouraged by paganism, combined with the intolerance that it showed for other religions, made it detested among people who regarded with equanimity or even welcomed the introduction into their cities of the gods of Greece, of Rome, of Egypt, of Syria. Hence every slight fact which is recorded of St. Paul's experiences has a close relation to the social system that prevailed in the country, and cannot be properly understood without clearly grasping the general character of society and the tendencies which moulded it. The attempt must be made in the following pages to bring out the general principles which were at work in each individual incident; and such an attempt involves minuteness

[1] I use C H and F as before to indicate Conybeare and Howson, and Farrar, respectively.

in scrutinising the details of each incident and lengthens the exposition. It will be necessary to express dissent from predecessors oftener than I could wish; but if one does not formally dissent from the views advocated by others, the impression is apt to be caused that they have not been duly weighed.

The city of Antioch was the governing and military centre of the southern half of the vast province of Galatia, which at this time extended from north to south right across the plateau of Asia Minor, nearly reaching the Mediterranean on the south and the Black Sea on the north. Under the early emperors it possessed a rank and importance far beyond what belonged to it in later times. This was due to the fact that between 10 B.C. and 72 A.D. the "pacification," *i.e.* the completion of the conquest and organisation, of southern Galatia was in active progress, and was conducted from Antioch as centre. Under Claudius, 41–54, A.D., the process of pacification was in especially active progress, and Antioch was at the acme of its importance.

In the Roman style, then, Antioch belonged to Galatia, but, in popular language and according to geographical situation, it was said to be a city of Phrygia. Even a Roman might speak of Antioch as a city of Phrygia, if he were laying stress on geographical or ethnological considerations; for the province of Galatia was so large that the Romans themselves subdivided it into districts (which are enumerated in many Latin inscriptions), *e.g.* Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Isauria, Lycaonia, Pisidia, etc. It is commonly said that Antioch belonged to Pisidia, but, for the time with which we are dealing, this is erroneous. Strabo is quite clear on the point.[1] But after the time of Strabo there

[1] See pages 557, 569, 577. Ptolemy mentions Antioch twice, v. 4, 11, and v. 5, 4 (this error, of which he has often been guilty, is founded on his use of two different authorities in the two passages); in one case he assigns it to Pisidia, in the other to Pisidian Phrygia.

took place a gradual widening of the term Pisidia to include all the country that lay between the bounds of the province of Asia and Pisidia proper. It is important to observe this and similar cases in which the denotation of geographical names in Asia Minor gradually changes, as the use of a name sometimes gives a valuable indication of the date of the document in which it occurs.

The accurate and full geographical description of Antioch about 45–50 A.D., was "a Phrygian city on the side of Pisidia" (*Φρυγία πόλις πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ*). The latter addition was used in Asia Minor to distinguish it from Antioch on the Mæander, on the borders of Caria and Phrygia. But the world in general wished to distinguish Antioch from the great Syrian city, not from the small Carian city; hence the shorter expression "Pisidian Antioch" (*Ἀντιόχεια ἡ Πισιδία*),[1] came into use, and finally, as the term Pisidia was widened, "Antioch of Pisidia" became common. The latter term is used by Ptolemy, v. 4, 11, and occurs in some inferior MSS. in Acts xiii. 14. Pisidian Antioch, however, is admittedly the proper reading in the latter passage.

From these facts we can infer that it would have been an insult to an Antiochian audience, the people of a Roman Colonia, to address them as Pisidians. Pisidia was the "barbarian" mountain country that lay between them and Pamphylia; it was a country almost wholly destitute of Greek culture, ignorant of Greek games and arts, and barely subjugated by Roman arms. Antioch was the guard set upon these Pisidian robbers, the trusted agent of the imperial authority, the centre of the military system designed to protect the subjects of Rome. "Men of Galatia" is the only possible address in cases where "Men of Antioch" is not suitable;[2] and "a city of Phrygia" is the

[1] Compare Ptolemy's *Pisidian Phrygia*, quoted in the last note.

[2] "Phrygians" was also an impossible address, for Phrygian had in Greek and Latin become practically equivalent to slave.

geographical designation which a person familiar with the city would use if the honorific title "a city of Galatia" was not suitable. These accurate terms were used by the Roman Paul, and they are used in the original document employed by the author of Acts, though in one case the looser but commoner phrase, "Pisidian Antioch" is used to distinguish it from Syrian Antioch.

As to the route by which Paul and Barnabas travelled from Antioch to Iconium, widely varying opinions have been entertained by recent authorities. Professor Kiepert, the greatest perhaps of living geographers, who has paid special attention to the difficult problems of the topography of Asia Minor, has drawn the map attached to Renan's *Saint Paul*, and has concluded that in all his three journeys Paul travelled between the two cities along the great Eastern Trade Route,[1] a section of which connected Philomelium and Laodicea Katakekaumene: according to Kiepert, Paul crossed the Sultan Dagh to join this route at Philomelium, and left it again at Laodicea to go south to Iconium. C H indicate his route along the western side of Sultan Dagh, until that lofty ridge breaks down into hilly country on the south, across which the route goes in as direct a line as possible to Iconium. F indicates a route midway between these two, passing pretty exactly along the highest ridge of the Sultan Dagh.

The line marked out by C H, though not exactly correct, approximates much more closely than either of the others to that which we may unhesitatingly pronounce to be the natural and probable one. But, partly in deference to Professor Kiepert's well-deserved and universally acknowledged authority, and partly on account of an interesting problem of Christian antiquities which in part hinges on

[1] Of this road, which came into use during the later centuries B.C., and which was the main artery of communication and government in Asia Minor under the Roman Empire, a full account is given *Hist. Geogr.*, chaps. iii., iv.

this question, it is necessary to state as briefly as possible the main facts.

According to Kiepert, Paul in each case preferred to cross the lofty Sultan Dagh. There is no actual pass across that lofty ridge. The path climbs a steep and rugged glen on one side, crosses the summit of the ridge, fully 4,000 feet above the town of Antioch, and descends a similar glen on the other side.[1] On the map Antioch seems very near Philomelium; but six hours of very toilsome travelling lie between them. Then follows a peculiarly unpleasant road, twenty-seven hours[2] in length, by Laodicea to Iconium. Except in the towns that lie on the road, there is hardly any shade and little water along its course. It is exposed to the sun from its rising to its setting; and, if my memory is correct, there are only two places where a tree or two by the roadside afford a little shadow and a rest for the traveller. This road makes a circuit, keeping to the level plain throughout; but it would not be used by pedestrians like Paul and Barnabas. If they went to Philomelium, they would naturally prefer the direct road thence to Iconium through the hill country by Kaballa. This path is nowhere very steep or difficult, is often shady and pleasant, and is shorter by an hour or two than the road through Laodicea: it is in all probability older than the great Trade Route, and was undoubtedly used at all periods for direct communication by horse or foot passengers between Philomelium and Iconium.

But there is no reason to think that Paul ever crossed the Sultan Dagh. The natural path from Antioch to Iconium went nearly due south for six hours by the new Roman road to Neapolis, the new city which was just growing up at the time.[3] Thence it went to Misthia on the

[1] See the description given of the crossing by my friend, Professor Sterrett, in his *Epigraphic Journey in Asia Minor*, p. 164.

[2] The "hour" indicates a distance of about three miles.

[3] On the history of Neapolis, see *Hist. Geogr.*, pp. 396–7.

north-eastern shores of the great lake Caralis. A little way beyond Misthia it diverged from the Roman road, and crossed the hilly country by a very easy route to Iconium. The total distance from Antioch to Iconium by this route is about twenty-seven hours,[1] as compared with thirty-one or thirty-three by way of Philomelium. This route is still in regular use at the present day.

The line indicated in the map of C H is straighter, and I believe that it is actually practicable; but it has never been traversed by any explorer, and I know only part of the country through which it runs. It would pass east of Neapolis, and may possibly have been a track of communication in older time. But in B.C. 6 Augustus formed a series of roads to connect the Roman colonies which he founded as fortresses of defence against the Pisidian mountain tribes.[2] Hence we might feel some confidence in assuming that Paul and Barnabas would walk as far as possible along the Roman road. This road indeed was not the shortest line between Antioch and Iconium, because its purpose was to connect Antioch, the military centre of defence, with the two eastern colonies, Lystra and Parlais; and it did not touch Iconium. But communication would be so organised as to use the well-made road to the utmost; all trade undoubtedly followed this track, entertainment for travellers was naturally provided along it, and the direct path, though a little shorter, would be less convenient and would no longer be thought of or used. We are not, however, left in this case to mere probabilities. We have the express testimony of an ancient document that Paul used this Roman road; and my object in giving this minute

[1] Arundel, *Asia Minor*, ii. p. 8, gives the distance as twenty-eight hours by report; neither he nor Hamilton traversed this route. No description of the road is, so far as I remember, published.

[2] The existence of a system of military roads may always be assumed, according to the Roman custom, connecting a system of fortresses (*coloniæ*); on these roads, see page 172.

and perhaps tedious description of the road and of its origin has been to bring clearly home to the reader the exactness with which this document describes the actual facts.

The document in question is one of the apocryphal Apostle-legends, the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*. The general opinion of recent scholars[1] is that this tale was composed about the latter part of the second century. In that case it would have no historical value, except in so far as it quoted older documents. I hope soon[2] to go into the whole question of the date and character of these Acta; but at present we are concerned only with one passage, in which the road from Antioch to Iconium is described.

In the opening of the Acta a certain Onesiphorus, resident at Iconium, heard that Paul was intending to come thither from Antioch. Accordingly he went forth from the city to meet him, and to invite him to his house. And he proceeded as far as the Royal Road that leads to Lystra, and there he stood waiting for Paul; and he scanned the features of the passers-by.[3] And he saw Paul coming, a man small in size, with meeting eyebrows, with a rather large nose, baldheaded, bowlegged, strongly built, full of grace, for at times he looked like a man, and at times he had the face of an angel. This plain and unflattering account of the apostle's personal appearance seems to embody a very early tradition.

[1] There are some exceptions. I have not yet had the opportunity of seeing M. Le Blant's paper on these Acta.

[2] In a work on *The Church in the Roman Empire*, now nearly ready.

[3] The Greek text is usually and naturally translated, "he proceeded along the Royal Road," but the following εἱστήκει implies that the first clause indicates the point to which Onesiphorus went and where he stood. The Syriac translation makes the sense quite clear: "he went and stood where the roads meet, on the highway which goes to Lystra." Lipsius, in his recent critical edition, omits this Syriac passage, which is of cardinal importance. In many cases he shows a preference for the easiest, the least characteristic, and therefore the worst reading; *e.g.*, he here prefers ἐρχομένους to διερχομένους.

The "Royal Road" (*βασιλικὴ ὁδός, via regalis*) that leads to Lystra is obviously the Roman road built by Augustus from Antioch to Lystra. The epithet is a remarkable one, and very difficult to explain. The first impression that any one would receive from it is that it denotes the Roman road built by the Basileis, as the emperors were commonly called in the second century, and that it points to a second century date more naturally than to any earlier period.

So far as I can judge, this argument as to date would be unanswerable, were it not for an inscription discovered in 1884 at Comama, the most western of Augustus's Pisidian colonies, a city whose name had entirely disappeared from human knowledge until this and other Latin inscriptions were found on the site. It was then observed that numerous coins of the city existed, but had been misread and attributed to Comana in Cappadocia; it also appeared that the city was mentioned by Ptolemy and other authorities, but that the name was always corrupted.

In the ruins of Comama there still lies a milestone, with the inscription—

"The Emperor Cæsar Augustus, son of a god, Pontifex Maximus, etc., constructed the Royal Road by the care of his lieutenant, Cornelius Aquila." [1]

The roads built by Augustus to connect his Pisidian colonies [2] were doubtless built with a solidity unusual in the country. They are two in number, one leading to Olbasa Comama and Cremna, the other to Parlais and Lystra. The former is called Via Regalis on a milestone, the latter in the Acta.

[1] C. I. L., III., Supplem., No. 6,974. The reading Regalem, suggested tentatively by Mommsen, suits the copy in my note-book even better than appears from the printed text.

[2] The name "Pisidian" is convenient, though they were not all in Pisidia. Augustus in enumerating his colonies seems to sum them all up as in Pisidia. (Mommsen, *Monumentum Ancyranum*, p. 119.) But colonies on the Pisidian frontier to keep under control the Pisidian mountain tribes are readily called Pisidian. Thus we have above explained the term "Pisidian Antioch."

The original Acta then described the scene with a minute fidelity possible only to a person who knew the localities. Onesiphorus went out from Iconium till he came to the point a few miles south of Misthia, where the path to Iconium diverged from the built Roman road that led from Antioch to Lystra; and here he waited till he observed Paul coming towards him. I am far from assuming that the facts here narrated are historical; but I do hold that the tale was written down by a person familiar with the localities, and that the route now employed for traffic between Iconium and Antioch was used to the exclusion of any other at the time when he wrote.

It is therefore proved that the term Royal Road in the Acta furnishes no proof of a second century date. It may even be proved that the term is not consistent with an origin later than the first century, because the very name Via Regalis, denoting the road from Antioch to Lystra, was soon disused. The sentence where it occurs was written[1] before the name passed out of use. Can we fix approximately the date when the name ceased to exist, and before which some written authority for the tale must have come into existence? Several arguments point decisively to the conclusion that the name did not survive the first century, but belonged to a state of the country which characterised the first half of the first century and then ceased to exist. As this subject is of great consequence in our attempt to realise the circumstances in which Paul's journey was made, and has never been properly described or understood, I shall try to state briefly the main facts.

The purpose of Augustus's roads was to keep in order the recently subdued Pisidian mountaineers. When the paci-

[1] No mere tradition can be so strong as to fix in the memory of posterity verbal peculiarities which no longer correspond to actual facts. It will appear in the following paragraphs that the name Via Regalis was retained in the MSS. long after it had ceased to be understood.

fication of Pisidia, and the naturalisation of the imperial rule and the Græco-Roman civilisation in the country had been completed, the need for these roads disappeared; they were no longer maintained by the imperial government with the care that was applied to roads of military importance, and they were merged in the general system of communication across Asia Minor.[1]

The period when this pacification of Pisidia was taking place can be determined precisely from the evidence of coins, of inscriptions, and of authors, and from the dates at which the constitutions of cities on the northern frontiers were fixed. I need not weary the reader by enumerating here the long lists of facts which show that the earlier emperors from Augustus to Nero directed close and continuous attention to this district of Asia Minor, and that in the reign of Claudius the process of organisation was in specially active progress. Vespasian in A.D. 74 remodelled the government, separated great part of Pisidia from the province of Galatia, and attached it to Pamphylia.[2] This marks the end of the Pisidian colonial system and military roads. Antioch, the centre of the system, was now entirely separated from at least three of the colonies,[3] which were transferred to a different province. Moreover there were no soldiers in the province Lycia-Pamphylia, as there were in Galatia: Pisidia would not have been united to the unarmed province, unless all possible need for soldiers and garrisons had been considered to be at an end.

Lystra, the most easterly point of the colonial system, must have been a place of great importance under the early emperors; but after 74, it sank back into the insignificance of a small provincial town with nothing to distinguish it.

[1] This opinion was arrived at as the natural explanation of the known facts, and published before its application to the present case had become apparent. (See *Hist. Geogr.*, pp. 57–8.)

[2] He made Lycia and Pamphylia a single province.

[3] Comama, Cremna, and Olbasa were henceforth attached to Pamphylia.

Direct communication between Antioch and Lystra had previously been maintained only for military and political reasons; no commerce could ever have existed between them. After A.D. 74 therefore the road from Antioch to Lystra ceased to be thought of as a highway, and must have disappeared from popular language. Iconium, not Lystra, was the natural commercial centre, and has maintained that rank from the earliest time to the present day. Thus the road from Antioch to Iconium was, after the year 74, the only one present to the popular mind; and it ceased to be possible that a traveller from Antioch to Iconium should be described as going along the road to Lystra for a certain distance and then diverging from it.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be concluded.)

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND.

VI. THE STRONG PLACES OF SAMARIA.

AT the close of my last paper I gave as the fifth feature of Samaria her fortresses, the large number of which was due to the openness of the land and to the fact that, unlike Judæa, Samaria had no central position upon which her defence might be consolidated. The fortresses of Samaria lay all around and across her, but chiefly as was natural upon those passes that draw up to her centre. They occupied the high isolated knolls or mounts which are so frequent a feature of her scenery.

1. Of those strong places the chief was that which was so long the capital and gave its name to the whole kingdom. *The head of Ephraim is Samaria.*[1]

[1] Isa. vii. 9.