THE GALATIA OF THE ACTS:

A CRITICISM OF PROFESSOR RAMSAY'S REPLY.

I HAVE to thank Professor Ramsay for the attention which he has given to my criticism of his theory as to the Galatia of the Acts. It is due to the Editor and to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR that I should try to be brief in my reply to his three articles; nor does my case need lengthy advocacy.

I attacked the "South-Galatian theory" on three sides.[1] I venture to think that this threefold attack has not been repelled. This assertion I shall endeavour to make good.

(1) I must again call attention to the two crucial phrases in the Acts, of the first of which I fear that the readers of THE EXPOSITOR must by this time be somewhat weary, viz., *διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* (xvi. 6), *διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν* (xviii. 23). It will be remembered that Prof. Ramsay maintains that these two expressions are synonymous and that both alike denote a single district, "the Phrygo-Galatic territory"; that I contend that in both passages St. Luke is referring to two separate districts, which St. Paul successively traversed, viz., Phrygia and Galatia in one case, and Galatia and Phrygia in the other.[2]

[1] Prof. Ramsay, quite unintentionally, I am sure, has so written throughout his Reply, as to give the impression that I am the assailant, he the defender, of Bishop Lightfoot. The fact is that the Bishop argued at length for "the North-Galatian theory" in his earliest (*Gal.*, p. 18 f.) and in his latest (*Col.*, p. 24 n.) commentary on St. Paul. In one point, for reasons which I in part repeat in this article, I ventured to differ from him.

[2] It will be noticed that I argue the question of the construction in Acts xvi. 6 without reference to what I before termed, and what I still believe to be, "an exact and important parallel," viz. Lc. iii. 1 (*τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας*). My reference to this passage has led to an interesting discussion between Prof. G. A. Smith and Prof. Ramsay. In a certain sense

My treatment of the matter in my former paper was conditioned by my view, for which I gave my reasons, that *Φρυγία* in both passages is a substantive. This being so, among the phrases which I quoted from the Acts to illustrate "the *vinculum* of the common article," I wrongly included the following—*τῶν Ἐπικουρίων καὶ Στωικῶν φιλοσόφων* (xvii. 18). I fully admit my error in so doing; but, for the sake of clearness, I would add that I believe this to be the only mistake of which Prof. Ramsay has convicted me.

I will state again, somewhat more explicitly than I did in my former article, what appear to me to be convincing reasons for thinking that St. Luke in Acts xvi. 6 uses *Φρυγία* as a substantive. (i.) In xviii. 23 St. Luke uses the phrase *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. Must not *Φρυγίαν* here be a substantive? Is it not certain that, if St. Luke were employing the word as an adjective, he would have written *τὴν Γαλατικὴν καὶ Φρυγίαν χώραν*?[1] We must interpret xvi. 6 in the light of xviii. 23. (ii.) *Φρυγία* is beyond dispute a substantive in the one passage besides xvi. 6, xviii. 23, in which St. Luke mentions the

the matter has passed out of my hands. My remarks will be brief. (1) It is essential to Prof. Ramsay's case to show that Ituræa and Trachonitis are identical. I cannot think that this has been proved. I am glad to be able to sympathise with Prof. Ramsay in the eagerness with which he looks forward to the appearance of Dr. Smith's *Geography*. (2) Is *ἡ Ἰτουραία* used as the name of a country? *All* such names of places are properly adjectives. Thus, *e.g.*, we have *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*; *ἡ Ἰουδαία γῆ* (Jn. iii. 22), *ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα* (Mc. i. 5); *ἡ Ἰουδαία*. If then *ἡ Ἰτουραία χώρα* is admissible, it appears to me impossible to assert that the simple *ἡ Ἰτουραία* is inadmissible. (3) If the country is in literature commonly called *ἡ Ἰτουραίων*, this is surely because to the world at large the Ituræan soldiers (see Schürer, *The Jewish People*, div. i. vol. ii. pp. 326, 340, Eng. Trans.) were much better known than their land. (4) In Prof Ramsay's argument as to the Syriac versions of Lc. iii. 1 (p. 149, n.) he has not, I think, noticed that the Curetonian "cōr" "the region (cōr) of Tracona," is simply a transliteration of *χώρα*.

[1] Though Bishop Lightfoot took *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective in xvi. 6, he is careful to translate it as a substantive in xviii. 23: "This brought him to 'the Galatian country and *Phrygia*'" (*Gal.*, p. 24; so *Col.*, p. 24). I cannot think that he was justified in separating the two passages.

country, viz. Acts ii. 10 (*Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν*). Prof. Ramsay is silent as to these two points.

But Prof. Ramsay urges a grammatical objection against taking *Φρυγίαν* as a substantive in Acts xvi. 6. "If," he writes (p. 142), "one of Mr. Chase's pupils at college had ever ventured to put before him a Greek prose exercise, in which the English phrase 'the father and the good boy' was rendered by *τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἀγαθὸν παῖδα*, or 'Scythia and the province of Thrace' was rendered *τὴν Σκυθίαν καὶ Θρᾳκικὴν ἐπαρχίαν*, Mr. Chase would, I believe, have made short work with him, and ordered him to repeat the article in both cases." Prof. Ramsay therefore holds that if *Φρυγιαν* were a substantive in xvi. 6, the phrase must have run thus—*τὴν Φρ. καὶ τὴν Γαλ. χώραν*. I venture to think that the answer to this criticism is not far to seek. In the first of the two phrases coined by Prof. Ramsay, *ἀγαθόν* is a mere epithet, which can be removed at pleasure. In the second phrase *Θρᾳκικήν* is not a mere epithet; without it *ἐπαρχίαν* is meaningless. In other words, the two words *Θρᾳκικὴ ἐπαρχία*, and the two words *Γαλατικὴ χώρα* coalesce so as to express respectively a single idea. They are, in fact, compound nouns; and thus the construction *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is seen to be parallel to *τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρίᾳ* (Acts i. 8), *τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαίαν* (xix. 21; see also viii. 1, ix. 31, xv. 3, xxvii. 5).

For other points which fall under this head of the subject—the reversal of the order of the names in xviii. 23 as compared with xvi. 6, the use in St. Luke of *διελθεῖν* (reinforced in xviii. 23 by *καθεξῆς*) before two or more names of countries, not seldom under the *vinculum* of the common article"—I must refer to my former article (p. 407 f.). These arguments derived from St. Luke's usage Prof. Ramsay has not in any way noticed.

(2) I pass next to the connexion of clauses in xvi. 1–7.

I entirely adhere to what I wrote in regard to the corre-

spondence of μὲν οὖν in xvi. 5 and δέ in xvi. 6.[1] Prof. Ramsay indeed assails my position on the ground that I "forgot entirely the existence of the double particle μὲν οὖν, in which the μέν has no relation whatever to a following δέ, but coheres and is merged in the unified compound μὲν οὖν" (p. 56). The case of μὲν οὖν is, I believe, this: the particle οὖν looks back; the particle μέν looks forward to a correlative clause introduced by δέ. Frequently, however, a writer fails to adhere to the strict logical arrangement of his sentences, and the μέν in μὲν οὖν, like the μέν in μὲν γάρ or the simple particle μέν itself, has no correlative δέ[2]; in such cases μὲν οὖν may be practically regarded, to use Prof. Ramsay's phrase, as a "unified compound." The fact, however, that sometimes the expected δέ does not present itself, is no reason why we should disregard it when it does. In Acts xvi. 5 f. μέν and δέ quite naturally, as it appears to me, introduce two *consecutive* sentences, dealing respectively with the two sets of actors in the drama which St. Luke has described—the Churches (*v.* 5), the travellers (*v.* 6).

But Prof. Ramsay has another objection. "Mr. Chase," he writes (p. 56), "has not made a very careful examination; otherwise he must have seen that the arrangement of words (αἱ μὲν ἐκκλησίαι . . . διῆλθον δὲ [οἱ περὶ Παῦλον]) does not suggest a balance between the two sentences." It is of course true that the correspondence between αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι and διῆλθον δέ is not formally exact. Strictly, the latter clause should have commenced thus: οἱ δὲ περὶ Παῦλον (comp. xiii. 13) διῆλθον. But I do not think that it is possible to turn over many pages of a Greek prose writer[3] without lighting upon correlative clauses, intro-

[1] Among the parallels which I referred to, I gave the words of ix. 31, 32, not, as Prof. Ramsay thinks (p. 57), because I reckoned it a stronger instance than the others, but because the two verses resemble xvi. 5, 6 in substance.

[2] A striking instance of such a construction of clauses is found in 1 Cor. xi. 18, where even πρῶτον μέν has nothing formally to answer to it.

[3] I take two passages at random from two very different writers: (*a*) Thuc. i. 36, Τοιαῦτα μὲν οἱ Κερκυραῖοι εἶπον· οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι μετ' αὐτοῖς τοιάδε; (*b*) Socrates,

duced by μέν and δέ, which yet do not exhibit a precise and rigid correspondence. It must suffice to refer to instances of such clauses in the N.T. See *e.g.* Matthew xxvi. 24, John x. 41, Acts xii. 5, Romans ii. 25, 2 Corinthians viii. 17, Philippians ii. 23 f.

In the text of Drs. Westcott and Hort and in the R.V. a new paragraph begins with xvi. 6. Prof. Ramsay insists with great earnestness (pp. 55 f., 293) that the authority of the Cambridge editors and of the R.V. disposes of my view as to the μέν and δέ in *vv.* 5, 6. I made the remark, which Prof. Ramsay characterises as "naive" (p. 55), and "flippant" (p. 56), that "the connexion of *vv.* 5, 6 is unfortunately obscured by [this] division into paragraphs." The division into paragraphs is a convenient, in some form a necessary, arrangement. But it is an artificial arrangement, and as such often involves some sacrifice. In the particular case under consideration, the gain derived from the clear articulation of the different stages of St. Paul's journeys, is greater than the loss involved in the separation of the two clauses introduced respectively by μέν and δέ.[1] Thus, I do not, and did not, criticise, far less condemn, the paragraphing in Westcott and Hort and in the R.V. And, on the other hand, it does not follow that the scholars who adopted the paragraphing which in a particular case separated a μέν from a δέ, rejected the correlation of the two particles. For this last statement I have the authority of Bishop Westcott in his note on Hebrews ix. 1. "The particles μὲν οὖν," he writes, "correspond with the δέ in *v.*

Hist. Eccles.; i. 36, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν τὸ σύγγραμμα Εὐσέβιος . . . ἀνέτρεψε, ἐξελέγξας τὴν κακοδοξίαν αὐτοῦ. Μάρκελλος δὲ ὕστερον κ.τ.λ.

The fact seems to be that the verb (διῆλθον) is taken to include the subject. St. Luke uses the singular verb (Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξ. Σίλαν ἐξῆλθεν, xv. 40) till after Timothy has become St. Paul's companion. Then, without further definition, he uses the plural verb—διεπορεύοντο . . . παρεδίδοσαν . . . διῆλθον.

[1] In just the same way, clauses undoubtedly introduced by μέν and δέ are placed in different chapters in (*a*) Thuc. i. 45, 46; 46, 47; (*b*) Socr., *H.E.*, i. 30, 31; 35, 36.

6. . . . The combination does not occur again in the Epistle; and it is found in St. Paul only in 1 Corinthians ix. 25, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν . . . ἡμεῖς δέ . . .; Philippians ii. 23, τοῦτον μὲν οὖν . . . πέποιθα δέ . . . ὅτι καὶ αὐτός . . . It is frequent in the Acts (viii. 4, 25, etc.)." It will be noticed that Bishop Westcott is speaking not of μὲν οὖν alone, but of μὲν οὖν . . . δέ. When we turn to Acts viii. 25, in the text which Bishop Westcott edited with Dr. Hort, we find that the clause introduced by μὲν οὖν ends one paragraph, and that the clause introduced by δέ begins the next paragraph.

But in truth, the correspondence of μέν and δέ, though these two particles materially contribute to the cohesion of the passage, is a subsidiary point. It is the οὖν of historical sequence (which, as I showed by many examples, is a favourite particle in the Acts), which is the narrow defile through which the "South Galatian theory" cannot, as I believe, force its way. The particle οὖν shows that St. Luke is passing on to another stage of the history. Prof. Ramsay, however, does not anywhere in his three articles refer to what I said as to the force of this particle.

Yet, after all, Greek particles are but finger-posts to keep readers to the high road of common-sense in the interpretation of Greek sentences. Let us disregard the sign-posts, and look at the surrounding country in itself. In *vv.* 1–4 St. Paul relates the Apostolic visit to Lycaonia and Pisidia. In *v.* 5 he tells of the result to the Churches of that visit. In *v.* 7 he speaks of St. Paul as having reached a point far north of Pisidia—"over against Mysia." Can any reason be given why in St. Luke's rapid summary of St. Paul's movements, *v.* 6 should give a recapitulation of what has been already related in *vv.* 1–4, while nothing is said of the northward journey between Pisidia and the point "over against Mysia"? If anything were needed to increase the improbability of this interpretation of St. Luke's language,

it is the perilous ambiguity of each part of the supposed compound name, *i.e.*, the fact that the first term (ἡ Φρυγία . . .) used in the supposed recapitulation, describes a district immediately north of Pisidia, and that the second term (ἡ . . . Γαλατικὴ χώρα) denotes a district immediately north-east of the region denoted by the first term.

At the risk of being wearisome, I will venture on an illustration. I will put the following sentences, which, *mutatis mutandis*, I believe exactly to correspond to St. Luke's sentences, as interpreted by Prof. Ramsay, into the mouth of some historian of Henry the Eighth's reign. "The Commissioners visited Bury St. Edmunds and Ely and delivered the Royal letters. So then the Monasteries were much perplexed. And the Commissioners passed through Cambridgeshire, and when they came over against Leeds they purposed to visit Hull." Reading this sentence should we not conjecture that Cambridgeshire was a *lapsus calami* for Lincolnshire?

It would be affectation on my part to pretend to doubt that the sequence of clauses, or (to use less technical language) the whole structure of the narrative, is fatal to the "South-Galatian" theory.

(3) The third and last point must now be considered, viz., the bearing on the "South-Galatian" theory of the aorist indicative and the aorist participle in xvi. 6 (διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ). My discussion of this question, in view of what Prof. Ramsay has said in his Reply, must be twofold.[1]

(i.) In his second article (p. 139 n.) Prof. Ramsay wrote,

[1] Prof. Ramsay (p. 295) writes: "Mr. Chase says that my words, 'they passed through Mysia,' are wrong. . . . I maintain that my translation is correct grammatically, and necessary geographically." The Greek is παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν (xvi. 7). I am not myself aware of any passage which is evidence that παρελθεῖν does not differ in meaning from διελθεῖν. Any passages which Prof. Ramsay may adduce, will, I am sure, be carefully considered.

"I shall in due course proceed to show that the South Galatian theory is perfectly consistent with taking κωλυθέντες in xvi. 6 as giving the reason for διῆλθον." I cannot find that Professor Ramsay has redeemed this pledge. The only passage which deals with the matter in his remaining article (p. 293) is as follows: "Although the South-Galatian theory is quite reconcilable with the interpretation of κωλυθέντες as giving a reason for διῆλθον, my personal preference is for the view already followed in my book."

I do not know what view of St. Paul's journeys Prof. Ramsay had in his mind when he promised to show that "the South-Galatian theory is perfectly consistent with taking κωλυθέντες as giving the reason for διῆλθον." It appears to me, however, that (*a*) geographical and (*b*) historical considerations forbid the belief that the meaning of Acts xvi. 6 is that the missionaries passed through South Galatia *because* they had been forbidden to preach the word in Asia. I will take these two points separately.

(*a*) Leaving the Syrian Antioch, the missionaries, traversing Syria and Cilicia (xv. 41), approached South Galatia from the East. I am unable to understand how it could be said that St. Paul and his companions *passed through* South Galatia, *because* they were forbidden to preach in Asia, when the nearest route to Asia from the Cilician Gates lay through South Galatia and then along the road which led from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus. It will be remembered that on the subsequent journey it was, when St. Paul had passed through South Galatia, according to Prof. Ramsay, that he took the road to Ephesus (xviii. 23, xix. 1).

(*b*) From geography we turn to history. St. Luke in one and the same sentence tells us of the first suggestion of the journey which we are discussing and of its motive. It was proposed by St. Paul to Barnabas, during their sojourn at the Syrian Antioch, with a view to revisiting the

churches planted in their former journey. "And after some days Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us return now and visit the brethren in every city wherein we proclaimed the word of the Lord, and see how they fare" (xv. 36). Before the journey began, the estrangement between Paul and Barnabas arose, and they parted company. It would appear, however, from the subsequent history, that before they separated they agreed that the Churches which they had intended together to revisit should be divided between them. Barnabas with Mark went to Cyprus (xv. 39; comp. xiii. 4 ff.); St. Paul took the cities on the mainland, *i.e.* the cities in South Galatia, which he had before visited in company with Barnabas; and, as Barnabas had gone to Cyprus, he approached them by a different route from that which he followed in his former journey, *i.e.* by the route which lay through Syria and Cilicia. Thus we have an express notice in the Acts of the *motive* with which the journey through South Galatia was undertaken. St. Luke's narrative, so far as I can see, excludes the supposition that this journey was due to St. Paul having been forbidden by the Spirit to preach the word in Asia.

(ii.) Thus those who hold the "South-Galatian theory" have no course open to them but to take the view of the participial construction, διῆλθον . . . κωλυθέντες, which Prof. Ramsay took in his book, and which he tells us that he himself prefers, viz., "He [St. Luke] varies the succession of verbs by making some of them participles. The sequence of the verbs is also the sequence of time: (1) They went through the Phrygo-Galatic land; (2) they were forbidden to speak in Asia," etc. (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 89). I criticised this position by pointing out that it is impossible to believe that "St. Luke, in a short and simple clause where there could be no anacoluthon, wrote διῆλθον . . . κωλυθέντες, when what he really meant would have been easily and naturally expressed by

the words διελθόντες . . . ἐκωλύθησαν." "As to the ridicule," writes Prof. Ramsay in his Reply (p. 58 f.), "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. . . .[1] The action in κωλυθέντες is contemporary with one stage of that in διῆλθον, but yet subsequent to it looked at in a broad view."

Of this theory of the Greek aorist participle Prof. Ramsay offers a three-fold defence:—

(i.) "To take," he says (p. 58), "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 them in a great battle.'"

I submit that an idiomatic use of the *English present* participle is no guide as to the use of a *Greek aorist* participle.

(ii.) Feeling, perhaps, that this treatment of the matter was not wholly adequate, Prof. Ramsay, in his third article, appeals to an idiom of a classical language. "Even a past participle," he says (p. 294), "is used in that way in Latin. . . . Thus in Livy, xxvii. 5, 9, we find *in Siciliam tramisit . . . Lilybæum revectus*, and in Acts xvi. 6 we find διῆλθον τὴν χώραν κωλυθέντες."

Again, I submit that, while a *Latin* usage may be legitimately quoted to illustrate, it cannot be used to establish, a *Greek* usage.

(iii.) Lastly, Prof. Ramsay has some significant words to say about Greek (p. 293 f.). "The question as to the sequence of the verbs and of the thought in xvi. 6–8 opens up a wide investigation. I maintain (asking liberty to complete and to improve the statement) my former point of

[1] Prof. Ramsay adds in a footnote: "I am quite willing to grant to him that my expression of the fact might be improved."

view. . . . I venture to think that the construction is characteristic of the author, and characteristic of the period and of the development of style that marks it. I am ready to argue that both present and aorist participles are sometimes used by this and other authors along with a verb to indicate an action closely connected with that of the verb (often one that arises directly out of that of the verb), but subsequent to it logically and (in a general view) chronologically. . . . Were this question to be argued out, numerous examples which justify in the completest way my interpretation of Acts xvi. 6 might be quoted."

Professor Ramsay's procedure in this passage reminds me of Milton's description of Death :—

"Death his dart
Shook, but delayed to strike, though oft invoked."

If Prof. Ramsay has grounds for thinking "that the construction is characteristic of the author," he could give at least one single reference to show that it does occur in this author. He gives none.

But, indeed, Prof. Ramsay has pronounced the most decisive condemnation of his own position. "My interpretation of the verses," he writes (p. 59) "is that of the Authorized 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 ts grammatical form doubtful in the Greek.[1]

The Greek text which Prof. Ramsay interpreted runs thus: διῆλθον . . . κωλυθέντες . . . ἐλθόντες δὲ . . . ἐπείραζον. The Greek text which the A.V. translates, as Prof. Ramsay has since discovered (p. 138), is:

[1] Prof. Ramsay adds in a footnote: "A participle may stand in several relations with its verb: context and sense must decide between them." The R.V. has: "They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost," etc. I do not myself see how English words could be less ambiguous.

διελθόντες . . . κωλυθέντες . . . ἐλθόντες . . . ἐπείραζον. Prof. Ramsay's interpretation of the text which lay before him cannot be right, when, as he himself points out, it is identical with the translation of a text differing from his just at the critical point.

It was in reference to the construction διῆλθον . . . κωλυθέντες that I said that in my belief "the South-Galatian theory is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek grammar." I venture to repeat this verdict.

F. H. CHASE.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

XVI.—THE LAW.

THE negative side of St. Paul's doctrine of justification was, we have seen, that a God-pleasing righteousness is not attainable through the keeping of the law. "Apart from law a righteeousness of God has been manifested."[1] The negative thesis is not less startling than the positive one that righteousness comes through the imputation of faith. One who breaks so completely with tradition is in danger of going to extremes. A temper of indiscriminate depreciation is apt to be engendered under the influence of which the innovator, not content with setting existing institutions in their own proper place, is tempted to refuse them any legitimate place and function. On a superficial view it might appear that some traces of this temper are discernible in the Pauline Epistles, and especially in the earliest of them, the Epistle to the Galatians. The tone in which the law is spoken of in that Epistle is certainly depreciatory in comparison with that which pervades the Epistle to the Romans. The expression "weak and beggarly elements,"[2] whatever its precise reference, applies at least generally to the Jewish law, and conveys the opposite of an exalted con-

[1] *Rom.* iii. 21. [2] *Gal.* iv. 9.