

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

A REPLY TO MR. CHASE.

AN apology is due to the editor and readers of the EXPOSITOR for postponing my concluding article on *Christianity in the Roman Empire during the First Century*, and diverging into a different subject. But I have found it impossible to write my conclusion to the former subject at the present time, because college lectures (which seem to weigh more heavily on me, and to need more of my time, each new winter) and other duties have recently left me no leisure. I think however that the character of Mr. Chase's article in the EXPOSITOR for December leaves me no alternative except to reply to it at once. Had he stated arguments of a real character, founded on the historical or geographical or antiquarian circumstances implied in the narrative of *Acts*, which led him to question the correctness of what I may continue to style the South-Galatian theory, I should have used the excuse that a fair time might justifiably be left for all persons concerned to think over his arguments before I proceeded to discuss them. But, when he in a spirit of such unhesitating confidence and perfect assurance declares that Bishop Lightfoot and I have attributed to the Greek of a fundamental passage in *Acts* a meaning which it cannot possibly bear, and that the simple, necessary, and "luminously clear" construction of that passage absolutely and inexorably precludes the South-Galatian theory, I feel bound to reply. There is no other course open; if Mr. Chase is right, Part I. of my book is hopelessly wrong, and it would be a fraud on the public to permit the continuance of its sale. But as I think that he has fallen into a series of mistakes which vitiate his whole argument, and that he merely helps to strengthen my position, it is a duty to Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (who have spared nothing to give the book a fair chance of appearing before the readers in the most correct and complete form), as well

as to many readers who have credited me with some knowledge of my subject and of the Greek language, to point out what are the facts of the case.

Mr. Chase's criticism is directed mainly on two points; and I shall attempt to prove that it is founded on two errors: the first a deliberate and conscious one, viz., the mistaking an adjective for a noun, and the second an unintentional and unconscious one, viz., the mistaking of a transitional for an expectant particle; and that it is supported by a series of inaccurate and sometimes grossly erroneous reasons.

My reply is necessarily conditioned by Mr. Chase's attack; it must be a battle of words, for such is the ground which he has chosen. There is a great deal more to be said, much to put more clearly and precisely, and further arguments to advance, in addition to what has been set forth in the opening chapters of my book. I have for months been waiting for leisure to say what has to be said; and I hoped, when I first heard of Mr. Chase's coming article, that he would give me a good opportunity for saying it. But he has chosen his ground on verbal disputation, and I must therefore continue this barren logomachy. It is however perhaps not wholly barren, if I succeed in demonstrating, in one more case, Bishop Lightfoot's singular grasp and mastery of the Greek of this period. His mind is never dominated by traditional interpretations. The Greek speaks direct to him; it does not suggest to him corresponding English words, but rouses in his mind the thoughts which it seeks to convey. This is a rare quality even among great scholars; and among all the innumerable commentators on Greek, whether classical or post-classical, whom I have worked through, I could easily number on my fingers without coming back a second time to the same finger, those of whom the same can be said. It has been my good fortune, by no merit of my own, to have justified more than once in

a conclusive manner his intuition in Christian Greek. Now I hope to prove that the sense of *Acts* xvi. 6, which he caught at once and maintained throughout his career,<sup>1</sup> is the right one; though the obscurity that enveloped Asia Minor prevented him from realizing the full geographical import of the words.<sup>3</sup>

First however let me say that the tone and manner of Mr. Chase's article are, so far as I am concerned, excellent. He has performed what he considered a public duty, though one necessarily painful to myself, with perfect courtesy; he has stated his conclusions as to my work even more mildly<sup>3</sup> than I deserve, *if he is correct*; and he has even gone out of his way to compliment me on the discoveries that came in my way as an explorer, though he feels compelled to point out that, as a scholar, I have failed to understand their bearing on the literature of the subject. In return I can say that I never took up the pen so unwillingly as I do now. As I ran over his article I saw that, if I replied, I should be forced to say some very severe things; and I tried by all means I could think of to settle the case out of court, and to give my critic the opportunity of himself revising his statements. But it has been decided, no doubt rightly, that open discussion is best. Mr. Chase assures me that he has fully considered his position, and that I ought, if I think he has made any errors, to expose them ruthlessly.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It stands in edition x. of his *Galatians*, and in his *Colossians*, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> An exact parallel may be quoted. In the corrupt and barely intelligible epitaph of Avireius Marcellus, embedded in a late hagiographer, he rightly caught the ring of genuine second-century expression; he attempted to explain away the difficulties which had seemed to almost every previous scholar to disprove the genuineness of the epitaph; but in this attempt his unavoidable ignorance of certain geographical facts made him for the moment unsuccessful.

<sup>3</sup> Except in one case, pointed out at a later stage.

<sup>4</sup> I am glad to see from the Calendar that Mr. Chase took his degree in the same year that I finished my undergraduate course; hence I owe him neither the respect due to a senior, nor the allowance due to a junior, but merely the courtesy of equals.

I may also express my belief that his errors are due, not to neglect (I quote his own words) of "common Greek usage and the ordinary rules of Greek grammar," but to his being prepossessed by an interpretation which has become familiar, habitual, and stereotyped in his mind, making his vision dulled to facts which he would doubtless have observed at the first glance, if the piece of Greek could have been presented to him fresh and unfamiliar.

I hope to bring out that several of his lines of argument, when properly worked out, result in confirmations of the South-Galatian theory, for which I shall always be his debtor. In fact, the impression made on me is that, whenever any point in the history of the time is worked out thoroughly, it results in a confirmation of that theory.

One result will, I know, please him as much as myself, if I establish it: I hope to bring out two new<sup>1</sup> proofs that the author of *Acts* must have been living in the first half of the first century, and must have been an eye-witness of some of the events that he records. The more closely *Acts* is scrutinized, the more clearly do the unity and the first-hand character of the narrative stand out; and I have felt justified in putting this more emphatically in the third edition of my work (the corrections for which are now finished for press) than I did in the previous editions.

I. Mr. Chase insists in the most emphatic terms that the subjects in regard to which he differs from me are absolutely clear and simple. He will not even allow me to say that there is any difficulty in them. While it was, I think, made fairly plain in my discussion that I myself entertained no doubt, I at least paid the scholars who held a different opinion what seemed to me a deserved mark of respect by putting prominently the admission that the subject was "one of extreme obscurity." But Mr. Chase

<sup>1</sup> They are at least new to me, and are unnoticed in the commentators whom I have seen.

“cannot for a moment admit that the passage is one of extreme obscurity,” “On the contrary,” says he, “when interpreted according to common Greek usage and the ordinary rules of Greek grammar, it appears to me luminously clear.” Of another passage, which involves a complex geographical question, he remarks that “what information St. Luke does give, he gives with absolute clearness.” I need quote no further examples, but the general impression left on a reader is that Mr. Chase is in a state of wonder as to how Lightfoot and I could be so bad scholars as to mistake the meaning of a sentence which is so plain.

But Mr. Chase mistakes radically my meaning when I used the term “obscure.” The passages referred to seem to me obscure, not on account of any ambiguity or uncertainty in the author’s language, but on account of the scantiness of our knowledge. I thought that, if there was anything made plain in my book, it was my belief that the author of *Acts* is an authority of the first rank, giving us the clear and direct description of an eye-witness. I believed that I was defending him from attacks, whose strength lay solely in our ignorance. Yet Mr. Chase accuses me of making “complaint against St. Luke.” I have often put my opinions in a tentative way, simply to avoid the appearance of dogmatism and over-confidence; but this humility is not a thing that Mr. Chase understands.

Mr. Chase’s own article will, I believe, be generally considered as in itself a sufficient proof that I was right in characterizing the subjects as difficult. I think he has not gone deep enough to see the difficulty; and that if he had done so, his criticism would have been couched in very different terms.

II. Dividing Mr. Chase’s attack into separate heads, I find that the first and the most serious one is that the interpretation which I have given (following Bishop Lightfoot),

of the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν is impossible "according to the ordinary rules of Greek grammar," and "is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek grammar." I have therefore first to show that it is philologically possible, and that it is consistent with Greek grammar. I may assume that Φρυγίαν and Γαλατικὴν are admitted by Mr. Chase to be correctly formed accusatives feminine of the widely used adjectives Φρύγιος and Γαλατικός. It is also a generally recognised phenomenon in Greek and all other languages that the name of a thing, *i.e.* a noun in the singular, may have two adjectives applied to it; and that in Greek, when two adjectives are applied to a singular noun, they are quite correctly coupled by καὶ, and that the article is used only with the first of them. Mr. Chase will not argue that the phrase "the good and noble boy," ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ εὐγενὴς παῖς, must denote "the good boy and the noble boy," *i.e.* two separate individuals. Even if I could admit that that rendering were a possible one, Mr. Chase will not maintain that the other is an impossible one. It is, "according to common Greek usage and the ordinary principles of Greek grammar," possible that the one phrase should be rendered "the boy to whom the epithets, good and noble, apply," and that the other phrase should be rendered "the country to which the epithets, Phrygian and Galatic, apply." The South-Galatian theory is therefore not "shipwrecked on the rock of grammar": it may be right or wrong, as other reasons must determine, but in this fundamental passage it gives a rendering that is grammatically possible.

For the moment I content myself with this; but at a future stage I shall bring forward arguments and parallels to show that Φρυγίαν in this phrase *must* be taken as an adjective. Meanwhile I shall merely state the opinion that any one to whom Greek is a living language and not a congeries of foreign words, feels intuitively and immediately

that in τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, Φρυγίαν must be, as Lightfoot said, an adjective; <sup>1</sup> and I appeal with perfect confidence to the verdict of Greek scholars. I go on to discuss the parallels advanced by Mr. Chase for his view.

III. When Mr. Chase condemns so confidently Lightfoot's unhesitating translation, he has never discovered what is the point that the Bishop had in mind. In quoting parallel passages, he confuses two distinct and separate points. One point is the sense of two nouns connected by καὶ and having a common article; the other is the sense of a singular noun which has in agreement with it two adjectives connected by καὶ and having a common article. These are two totally different phenomena, each having its peculiar grammatical character. I take an example in English: the question as to the grammatical distinction between "the French and the English" and "the French and English," is totally different from the question as to the distinction between "the French and English Army" and "the French and the English army." Mr. Chase makes many correct and excellent observations as to the former distinction; but these remarks have no bearing on the latter class, and the point on which Lightfoot and myself insist belongs to the latter class.. I do not assert that "the French and English" must mean "those who are both French and English," but I do assert that, if a writer is grammatically accurate, we may interpret in him the phrase "the French and English army" as being equivalent to "the Anglo-French army," viz., an allied army, which each nation may justifiably claim, "the army which is both French and English."

For the moment, then, we set aside all Mr. Chase's parallels on pages 405-6, except two, τῶν Ἐπικουρίων καὶ Στωικῶν φιλοσόφων and τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος

<sup>1</sup> Weiss in his newly published edition sees that Φρυγίαν must be an adjective.



χώρας. He asks sarcastically, "does St. Luke mean us to understand philosophers who could be 'called indifferently' Epicureans or Stoics?" I marvel that Mr. Chase fails to see that the plural noun makes all the difference. To take our simple instance, we have seen what must be the sense of "the French and English army"; but it is a totally different thing to say "the French and English armies." Those words may with perfect grammatical propriety be used to designate two separate armies, one French and the other English. But let Mr. Chase bring forward an instance of τοῦ Ἐπικουρίου καὶ Στωικοῦ φιλοσόφου, and I will maintain that the writer either had a sarcastic sense (as we might speak of a philosopher who unites the most opposite systems), or he wrote bad grammar and bad Greek. Mr. Chase's second example deserves, as he says, to be "reserved for special consideration"; but, before touching it, we must note that his contention is that, in the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, Φρυγίαν is a noun, not an adjective. It must also be pointed out that one of the difficulties in these words is that few cases can occur in which a country bears two distinct and apparently inconsistent geographical epithets. Accordingly the rendering which Lightfoot gives strikes a reader who has not plunged much into ancient geography as unusual. On the spur of the moment I could not have given a parallel passage, and should have required to ask the reader to believe that I was quite familiar with a small number of similar passages (though I could not at the moment quote one), and that Lightfoot's confidence about the interpretation proves that he also was familiar with parallels.<sup>1</sup> But here, fortunately, Mr. Chase comes to my aid and supplies me with a parallel passage from the same author, viz. *Luke* iii. 1; and, with

<sup>1</sup> Why then did Lightfoot not quote them? Simply because he did not think it necessary to prove that such a phrase as ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ εὐγενὴς παῖς can and must mean "the boy to whom the epithets good and noble both apply."

sublime unconsciousness of the meaning, he quotes it as a proof that Lightfoot is wrong.<sup>1</sup>

IV. With regard to the statement in *Luke* iii. 1, that Philip was tetrarch τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, Mr. Chase says, without the slightest hesitation, "Ituræa and the region of Trachonitis were separate districts"; and he declares that this "exact and important parallel" "makes it almost certain that in xvi. 6, Φρυγίαν is a substantive, not an adjective." I might have been unable to detect his error on this point, and should perhaps have yielded to his superior knowledge on a point which belongs peculiarly to his department as a Syriac scholar (whereas it lies far away from my sphere of knowledge), had it not been for the fortunate chance that I undertook to direct two of my pupils recently in editing a collection of inscriptions from the Hauran for the Palestine Exploration Fund; and thus I had occasion to look into the geography of the Peræa. In doing so I learned at least that it is a very obscure subject, in which many statements are glibly made in modern geographical treatises, which are quite unproven, and, I venture to think, hardly susceptible of proof. Mr. Chase no doubt finds this subject, like the topography of Galatia, "luminously clear"; but here again he has merely failed to go deep enough to discover what the difficulties are. His reasoning suggests that he has done little more than look into the modern maps, which print ITURÆA in bold type in one place, and TRACHONITIS in similarly bold type in another: this does indeed make the subject "luminously clear"; but is it correct? Mr. Chase forgot to put that brief question before he condemned Lightfoot and me.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chase, I presume, had read and considered Bishop Lightfoot's arguments before condemning him so confidently. If so, he ought to have warned his readers that Lightfoot quotes *Luke* iii. 1 in his own favour, and thus have suggested to them that two views on the subject were held. His reticence would seem, unintentionally of course, to suggest that he had discovered an unnoticed and conclusive parallel.

(1) He assumes that *Ἰτουραίας* must be a substantive in *Luke* iii. 1. On what authority does he found this assumption? The word has all the appearance of being an adjective, like *Ἀθηναῖος* and a host of others. Only prepossession by an idea would permit a scholar to assert that it is a substantive in *Luke* iii. 1. Its usage in the ancients is predominantly adjectival. We find often the people *οἱ Ἰτουραῖοι* (like *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι*); but where does Mr. Chase find *Ἰτουραία* the country except in modern maps, in a fourth century author (I concede this case, which is not entirely certain), and in his own misunderstanding of *Luke* iii. 1?

It is true that even the Indexes to ancient authors, like the modern books, often quote in loose terms references to *Ituræa*, but on consultation we usually find that the original text knows no country *Ituræa*, but uses the adjectival form: thus Josephus,<sup>1</sup> Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus, Dion Cassius,<sup>2</sup> even Cicero and Virgil and Lucan, know only the people, not the land. De Vit, in his *Onomasticon*, gives two separate headings, *Ituræa* and *Ituræi*; but those references which I can look up at the moment mention only the people, not the land. Stephanus's Greek lexicon knows *Ἰτουραῖοι*, but not *Ituræa*. Appian mentions in a list of countries *Παλαιστίνην καὶ τὴν Ἰτουραίων*<sup>3</sup> (*Civ.*, v. 7; compare *Mithridat.*, 106). The oldest example of *Ituræa* as the country that I can find is in Epiphanius, *Haeres.*, 19, a fourth century writer.<sup>3</sup> If St. Luke meant *Ἰτουραίας* as a noun, he was ignorant of contemporary and proper usage, and inaccurate in his geographical nomenclature (in addition to what I maintain to be a grammatical fault).

By making *Ἰτουραίας* a noun, then, Mr. Chase separates Luke from the early authors, and classes him among

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, xiii. 11, 3 (twice). Forbiger, in his *Alte Geographie*, p. 691, also refers to xiii. 9, but Idumæans not Ituræans are mentioned there in Naber's text.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Dion, *Ἀραβίαν καὶ τὴν Ἰτουραίων*.

<sup>3</sup> Examples in Hieronymus are discussed in the following paragraph.

the inaccurate and late writers. The same is the case in general. The South-Galatian theory places *Acts* in harmony with first-century language, usage, and circumstances; but Mr. Chase is resolved to force into *Acts* all the inconsistencies and awkwardness which long obliged me to confess that the higher criticism was right in recognising it as a second-hand and second-century document. On the other hand, if the South-Galatian theory is right, *Acts* must be a first-century document, for it implies a state of Asia Minor which had ceased to exist before the date at which many of the advanced critics have placed the composition of that book.

(2) If Mr. Chase will seek for himself to define from the original authorities the situation of the Ituræan country, and to distinguish it from the country called Trachon or Trachonitis, I think he will allow that it is very hard to maintain his confident statement that "Ituræa and the region of Trachonitis were separate districts"; and he may even grant that there is after all something to be said for my own conclusion that St. Luke observes the correct contemporary usage of *Ἰτρουπαίας* as an adjective. Some slight indication of the evidence in our favour (which was, I have no doubt, all in Lightfoot's mind when he stated so emphatically the view that Mr. Chase controverts so lightly) may be usefully added. Josephus defines more accurately the sovereignty of Philip (*Ant. Jud.*, xvii. 11, 4; *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 6, 3); he does not name Ituræa as forming part of it, and my (I might almost say our) position is that Josephus does not name it because it was undistinguishable from Trachonitis. Again, Jerome seems to have taken our view of *Luke* iii. 1, for he says (as I learn from De Vit) *Trachonitis regio sive Ituræa*; and again, *Ituræa et Trachonitis regio*,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strabo's account seems to me to point to the same conclusion; but I cannot and need not go further into this point. Ituræa in the two passages of Hieronymus I take unhesitatingly as an adjective. Hieronymus understood

*cujus tetrarcha fuit Philippus* (*Onom.*, pp. 355 and 243 *Parth.*).

Further, if we compare the modern authorities with each other, we find that, while De Vit puts Ituræa south of Trachonitis (so also E. B. James in *Smith's Dictionary*), Kiepert puts it east, and the Palestine Exploration Fund Map puts it north-west, and old Forbiger remarks that Ituræa is, "strictly speaking, only the southern part of Trachonitis" (p. 691).

The conclusion is inevitable that, on this point, which lies peculiarly within the sphere of his studies alike as a Semitic and a Biblical scholar, Mr. Chase has not looked with his own eyes into the facts, but, relying entirely on second-hand knowledge, condemns in the most confident way his own master, not to mention also a brother student.

The excellent writer whom we are studying had the instinctive sense of a real historian for situations in which minute and almost pragmatistical distinctness is suitable. In defining an important date he speaks of the time when Philip was tetrarch of the region to which the epithets Trachonitic (derived from its physical conformation) and Ituræan (derived from its inhabitants) both apply; and in describing a delicate and difficult point in the history of the diffusion of Christianity towards the west, he resolved to leave no doubt in the mind of his readers as to the precise district which he meant, and says, "the region to which the epithets Phrygian and Galatic both apply." To understand him we have simply to find out what was the contemporary usage of these terms; and that I have tried to do. I ven-

Luke correctly. But, if Mr. Chase insists on reading Ituræa here as the country, he does not get any earlier company for St. Luke, but merely confirms my assertion that Ituræa is a late noun, originating after the people and the correct usage had been forgotten. In Hieronymus's *Comment. in Matt. ad init.* the expression *tetrarcha Iturææ et Trachonitidis regionum* occurs in old texts; but the Migne edition says that all MSS. read *regionis*, i.e. the Ituræan and Trachonitic region.

ture still to call the subject a difficult one, in spite of Mr. Chase's assertion that it is "luminously clear."<sup>1</sup>

V. I pass next to Mr. Chase's discussion of a complete episode in the narrative, Acts xvi. 1-6. He says (I shorten his exposition, but hope that I represent him quite accurately) that *vv.* 1-4 describe St. Paul's visit to Derbe and Lystra, with the other chief cities of the district (*τὰς πόλεις*, *v.* 4). "He next records the sequel, which he introduces by the particle *οὖν*." "This sequel has two parts, which St. Luke clearly marks off by the use of *μὲν*, *v.* 5, and *δε*, *v.* 6. In the first place, St. Luke traces the fortunes of the *Churches* which St. Paul and his companions had just visited (*αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι*)." "In the second place, St. Luke follows the movements of the *travellers* (*διήλθον δέ*)." "Thus the sequence of the clauses (*μὲν οὖν—δέ*)" is "fatal to Prof. Ramsay's theory," etc.

In a note Mr. Chase remarks naively, "the connexion of *vv.* 5, 6 is unfortunately obscured by the division into paragraphs, both in Westcott and Hort's edition and in the Revised Version. Mr. Chase, of course, does not imagine that the division into paragraphs in these two works is accidental. It is the result of careful and prolonged consideration by the authors; and it would be difficult to imagine a stronger combination of opinion than is represented by the union of Bishop Westcott, Dr. Hort, and the Revisers. Few scholars now living would care to dispute their combined opinion on a point of the kind (strengthened, too, by the *consensus* of almost all the great foreign scholars whom I have looked into<sup>2</sup> on the passage); and I should

<sup>1</sup> I shall return again to this point: but at present I go on to Mr. Chase's second point, in order to suggest in the first issue of the *EXPOSITOR* my line of reply.

<sup>2</sup> Many of them consider the want of connexion between *v.* 5 and *v.* 6 so glaring that they attribute them to different authors. Weiss, however, in his recent edition, in Harnack's *Studien*, vol. ix., perhaps, as we shall see below, agrees with Mr. Chase.

not have believed that any scholar who had no new evidence to bring forward would have the courage to lightly dismiss their opinion in a footnote with the flippant remark that they obscure the connexion, and to print his own opinion boldly in the text as indubitable, had not Mr. Chase done so.

What then are his reasons for holding that 5, 6 are wrongly apportioned by these scholars to two different paragraphs, and are really two halves of a balanced sentence? His sole reason is that the first begins with *αἱ μὲν οὖν*, and the second with *διήλθον δέ*. He has apparently forgot entirely the existence of the double particle *μὲν οὖν*, in which the *μὲν* has no relation whatever to a following *δέ*, but coheres and is merged in the unified compound *ἐν μοῦν*. This compound particle is of wide use in all periods of Greek; from early Attic to the date when St. Luke was writing; it is explained in numerous excellent manuals and in the ordinary lexicons. There are, it is true, also cases in which *μὲν οὖν* represents two separate particles, *μὲν* corresponding to a following *δέ*, and *οὖν* being a distinct particle. But the present, like every other case where *μὲν οὖν* occurs, must be examined to determine whether *μὲν* seems to balance the following *δέ*. Mr. Chase has not made a very careful examination; otherwise he must have seen that the arrangement of words (*αἱ μὲν ἐκκλησίαι—διήλθον δὲ [οἱ περὶ Παῦλον]*) does not suggest a balance between the two sentences. Neither the thought<sup>1</sup> nor the verbal form justify his assertion that *μὲν* in *v. 5* must correspond to *δέ* in *v. 6*; and I feel confident both that every qualified arbiter will pronounce in favour of Westcott, Hort, the Revisers, etc., and that Mr. Chase himself, when he reflects over the matter in the course of years, will abandon his present opinion.

It will aid in making the matter clear, if we glance for a

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chase's laboured attempt to bring out an antithesis between the churches and the travellers appears to me the lamest and poorest exegetic discussion that I have ever seen: and to found on this artificial interpretation a condemnation of Westcott and Hort is not likely to add to his reputation.

moment at the formidable (in appearance) array of parallel instances from other parts of Acts by which Mr. Chase supports his view as to the *μὲν* in xvi. 5. He finds in ix. 31, 32, a passage which he reckons so strong in his favour that he quotes its terms alone among his fifteen parallels (31. *ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία*; 32. *ἐγένετο δὲ Πέτρον*). Here the verbal form is as far as possible from suggesting a correspondence between *μὲν* and *δὲ*; and Mr. Chase takes no notice of the fact that his former opponents, Westcott and Hort, and both the Authorised and Revised Versions,<sup>1</sup> are once more opposed to him. They take v. 31 as a brief summing up of the issue of the events in the preceding paragraph, and v. 32 as the opening of a new section of the narrative, quite out of connexion with the preceding verses. Westcott and Hort make a division of their broadest species between v. 31 and v. 32; but here again Mr. Chase would, no doubt, say that "the connexion is unfortunately obscured by the division into paragraphs."

There are some cases of *μὲν οὖν* which are more in Mr. Chase's favour, and to which he would have more wisely attached the prominence which he assigns to ix. 31. I do not possess that minute familiarity with the style of *Acts* and the Third Gospel, which would justify me in expressing an opinion offhand whether or not the *μὲν* and the *οὖν* are to be treated as two separate particles in viii. 4, 5, where the verbal order is not opposed to Mr. Chase's view. But I observe that in viii. 25, 26, where also the verbal order can be quoted on Mr. Chase's side, Westcott and Hort and the Revised Version are once more ranged against him. In several other of his examples, word and thought and "the division into paragraphs, both in Westcott and Hort's text and in the Revised Version," all combine to obscure the connexion which he finds.

<sup>1</sup> Weiss on this passage takes the same view as Mr. Chase, and on the same ground; he also has forgotten the existence of that very common particle *μὲν οὖν*



Here again we see that Mr. Chase's courage and confidence are wasted on a bad cause. His argument against me is opposed to grammar, to the sequence of thought, and to the almost unanimous opinion of other scholars; whereas the South-Galatian theory accepts the generally recognised view of the passage, merely interpreting it with more close attention to the facts of geography.

Mr. Chase is quite right to be on his guard against the serious error of being a slave to authority; questions of interpretation ought to be settled, not by appeal to authority, but by argument. But, against a weighty consensus of authorities, one should weigh one's arguments long and carefully.<sup>1</sup> It would, for ordinary people, be a serious consideration, if he succeeds in demolishing with a touch of his finger the general view on so simple a point as this. Whose opinion can we trust, if the scholars whom we have been accustomed to regard as supreme have been unable to avoid the blunder of ending a paragraph in the middle of a balanced sentence? I trust however to have shown that the authorities are right, and that Mr. Chase has forgotten his particles.

VI. As to the ridicule that Mr. Chase casts on my statement that in *Acts* xvi. 6, 7, the succession of verbs is varied by making some of them participles, I repeat the statement, which I can only suppose that Mr. Chase has not rightly understood.<sup>2</sup> To take a simple example in English: one may say, "Cæsar attacked the Gauls and defeated them," or one may "vary the succession of verbs by making one a participle," and say, "Cæsar attacked the Gauls, defeating

<sup>1</sup> It would be easy to apply to this case the maxim quoted by the greatest of Cambridge Latinists, H. A. J. Munro. "Hermann warns us, when we disagree with Lachmann, to think twice, lest we, not he, be in fault."

<sup>2</sup> I am quite willing to grant to him that my expression of the fact might be improved, as is the case in regard to many facts in my book. I would gladly rewrite the paragraph, maintaining my translation in this respect, and correcting it in a point that Mr. Chase does not observe. See preface to edition iii.

them in a great battle." The two statements are not precisely identical, but they approximate very closely; and a correct writer will be guided by circumstances in selecting one or the other. The action in *καλυθέντες* is contemporary with one stage of that in *διήλθον*, but yet subsequent to it looked at in a broad view.<sup>1</sup>

My interpretation of the verses is that of the Authorised Version (a fact which I only recently noticed, as I used regularly the Revised Version). The Revised Version prefers to leave ambiguous a sentence which is in its grammatical form doubtful<sup>2</sup> in the Greek, but which geographically seems to me to admit no interpretation except that of the Authorised Version. I am not afraid to call the passage a difficult one, though Mr. Chase, as usual, finds nothing but a "luminous clearness" in it.

It is on this point that Mr. Chase condemns me in terms which would, I think, be unjustifiable, even if he were right. In the previous cases I was in good company, and he could not speak severely of me without including Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, etc. But here he seems to have thought I stood alone, and his condemnation is pronounced in no light terms (p. 411). Let him content himself in controversy with exposing the errors of his antagonist: it is a mistake to sneer at his honesty and sense of duty!

Now, Mr. Chase must either have noticed that the Authorised Version agrees with me—and in that case it was hardly fair not to tell his readers that I had again good company—or he did not know it—and in that case he cannot have looked very carefully into the subject. But there is little doubt that he did not know, or had forgotten,

<sup>1</sup> I omit for the present the simple answer to Mr. Chase's footnote, pp. 410-11, and his whole text on p. 410. He will doubtless see it for himself. A good strong misunderstanding of an opponent's position is an excellent foundation for a controversy and a slaughter of the other party.

<sup>2</sup> A participle may stand in several relations with its verb: context and sense must decide between them.

the fact; for his condemnation of me applies also to the Authorised Version; and I believe that Mr. Chase would never consciously apply to it the unmeasured language he applies to me on p. 411.

VII. Mr. Chase, in the same paragraph, draws a marked distinction between my book as one "addressed to a popular audience," and books which are really scholarly. Can he point out any single case in which I have spared the reader a single step in the most complicated and the closest argument? One of the chapters was a lecture addressed to a small Cambridge society, drawn from the most educated class that exists in this country, including Dr. Hort and Dr. Westcott. Many others were addressed to an audience, equally learned, though perhaps disposed to be more lenient from old connexion, in Oxford, including such hearers as Dr. Sanday, Dr. Fairbairn, Professor H. F. Pelham. Are those chapters a whit more deep, or more carefully and minutely worked out, than the rest? The book addresses an educated audience, and could interest none but educated people, habituated to weighing delicate and close arguments.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chase's statement that "very few readers go through Professor Ramsay's arguments with their Greek Testament in their hands," is only one out of a host of indications that he has entirely failed to gauge the problem that he solves so confidently.

I have got only a very little way into my subject. I have omitted half of the points which I have to criticise in Mr. Chase's discussion of *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, not to mention all the rest of his article. I am ready to go on in a future number with the dissection of his arguments; but I hope he will spare me the unpleasant task.<sup>2</sup> I regret

<sup>1</sup> So far as I recollect, I made only one concession. I spared my readers a long geographical discussion of the denotation of "Galatia Provincia," in reply to Professor E. Schürer; but that in no sense formed a part of my subject.

<sup>2</sup> I should be prepared to try to meet him in the Christmas Vacation, and to see whether we could not come to an agreement on some points, and thus

deeply to be compelled to write this article; but I think all who read his criticism will allow that I have no alternative. The arguments alluded to above in favour of the South-Galatian theory and of the accuracy and first-hand character of *Acts*, drawn from the topics which he has suggested, must also wait, though they are already written out.

Let me conclude by thanking Mr. Chase for directing my attention to several points which I had not fully grasped, and for aiding me to strengthen my case so much.

W. M. RAMSAY.

#### MAURICE MAETERLINCK ON RUYSBROECK.

SOME years ago the Society known as *De Maetschappij der Vlaemsche Bibliophilen* re-edited the complete works of Jan van Ruysbroeck, the fourteenth century mystic, to whom his countrymen gave the title "L' Admirable." M. Maeterlinck, using the amended Flemish text, has translated the whole of Ruysbroeck's most important book, *L'Ornement des Noces Spirituelles*, and has prefixed to the volume an introduction of a hundred pages, containing extracts from other writings of Ruysbroeck, along with a critical estimate which is in some respects his own most remarkable contribution to literature.

He begins with apologies for his author. This monk of Brabant, leading a hermit's life in the forest of Soignes during the wildest years of the fourteenth century, must not be judged by the ordinary canons of style. He is awkward, often commonplace, full of repetitions, and of seeming contradictions. He has the ignorance of a child with the wisdom of a man returned from the dead. Lost in vast conceptions, he can hardly find language to describe

save part at least of this gladiatorial logomachy, which to me is very disagreeable.