

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

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

VI. PAUL AS A JUDAISTIC PREACHER.

WE have remarked in § v. on the intense feeling shown in this paragraph, *vv.* 6-10. Any topic that is touched on in these verses must be taken as a point of transcendent importance in the Galatian difficulty. Why, then, does Paul lay such stress on the supposition that he¹ may begin to preach a different Gospel? Can anything be more improbable? Why does he waste time on such a possibility? What part does that supposition play in the Galatian difficulty?

We are bound to the view that the supposition here introduced in this emphatic position was really a serious element in the Galatian trouble; *i.e.* the Galatians had acquired the opinion that Paul had somehow been conveying a different message, a new Gospel,² contrary to the Gospel which they received from him on the first visit. This opinion, of course, had been instilled into them by the Judaistic emissaries, who had been preaching in the Galatian Churches since Paul's second visit. In *v.* 11 Paul returns to the same topic. "If," he says, "I still preach circumcision." Here there is an unmistakable reference to an assertion made by the Judaistic preachers that Paul himself had been preaching the Gospel of circumcision; and it is noteworthy that here again Paul uses an expression of the most vehement indignation and disgust: "I would that they which unsettle you would even mutilate themselves." It was this accusation of having preached an anti-Pauline

¹ ἡμεῖς, Paul and his companion in preaching. As Lightfoot says, "St. Paul seems never to use the plural when speaking of himself alone."

² So Lightfoot, and (I think) almost every one.

Gospel that hurt Paul and made him use such strong language in both places where he refers to it.

But was not the accusation too absurd? It was, however, believed by the Galatians, for otherwise Paul would have suffered it to "pass by him as the idle wind." Its danger and its sting lay in the fact that the Galatians were misled by it. Now they could not have believed it merely on the bare assertion of the Judaizers. There must have been some appearance of difference in Paul's teaching on his second visit, which gave some support to the statements and arguments of the Judaistic teachers, and so helped to mislead the Galatians.

This is a hard point for the North-Galatian theory; for it is difficult to imagine how Paul's teaching on his third journey (*Acts* xviii. 23) could have seemed more favourable to the Judaistic side than his teaching and action on his second journey (*Acts* xvi. 2-5). On the other hand, as Lightfoot himself, on II. 3, allows, Paul's actions in Lystra, Iconium, etc., on his second journey, are the basis of this distortion of his teaching. The supposed North-Galatian Churches are assumed to have believed that Paul was a Judaizer, because, shortly before he came to them for the first time, he had been acting in South Galatia in a way that they thought Judaistic. But they must have known from the beginning what Paul had done in Lystra, and it is hard to think that there could have been any even outward difference between the teaching of Paul in South Galatia and the teaching of Paul and Timothy a few weeks later in North Galatia.

There is no satisfactory explanation of this paragraph in *Galatians*, except that the Gospel which the Galatians received on the former visit had begun to seem to them discordant with Paul's subsequent action and teaching on his second visit. This is exactly what the South-Galatian theory brings out; and we see that in *Acts* xvi. Luke, as

always, is trying to give us the means of understanding the Epistles. On the second journey Paul came delivering to the Galatians (*Acts* xvi. 4) the decree of the Apostles in Jerusalem. That might fairly seem to be an acknowledgment that those Apostles were the higher officials, and he was their messenger. He circumcised Timothy. That might readily be understood as an acknowledgment that the higher stages of Christian life were open only through obedience to the whole Law of Moses; in other words, that as a concession to human weakness the Gentiles were admitted by the Apostolic Decree to the Church on the performance of part of the Law, but that the perfecting of their position as Christians resulted from compliance with the whole Law. It is clear from *Galatians* iii. 3 that this distinction between a lower and more perfect stage of Christian life was in the minds of the persons to whom Paul was writing. However different Paul's real motive was in respect of Timothy, the view of his action suggested by the Judaistic teachers was a very plausible one, and evidently had been accepted by the Galatians. The action, in truth, was one easy to misunderstand, and not easy to sympathise with.

Moreover, the Decree itself was quite open to this construction. "It seemed good to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things"—this expression can plausibly be interpreted to imply the ellipsis, "but, if you voluntarily undertake a heavier burden, we shall praise you for your zeal in doing more than the necessary minimum." To zealous and enthusiastic devotees, such as the Asia Minor races were, this interpretation was very seductive. They doubtless had heard from Paul of Peter's speech (*Acts* xv. 10), in which he protested against putting on them a yoke too heavy even for the Jews; but, under the stimulus of enthusiasm, they responded to the Judaists

that they could and would support that yoke, however heavy.

Moreover, the Galatians had been used to a religion in which such ritualistic acts (*τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, iv. 3) were a prominent part; and it was natural that they should again "turn to the weak and beggarly elements." The result of the whole series of events described in *Acts* would naturally be that the Galatians were predisposed to follow the Judaistic emissaries, and to think that Paul on his second visit was preaching another Gospel, and that this second Gospel was the true Gospel, as being brought from the real Apostles, the pillars of the Church.

This misinterpretation of his conduct, with all the danger it involved, Paul had to meet at the outset. It was fundamental; and until it was put out of the way he could make no progress in setting the Galatians right. He meets it, not by mere denial (which is always rather ineffective), but by the intense and vehement outburst: "If Silas or I, or an angel from heaven, preach to you any Gospel other than that which Barnabas and I preached unto you, a curse on him!"

VII. ANOTHER GOSPEL.

It is unnecessary here again to delay long on the false sense given to *ἕτερον* and *ἄλλο* by some commentators. That has been already discussed in the *EXPOSITOR*, August, 1895, p. 115 ff. But the immense and well-earned influence exercised by that great scholar, Bishop Lightfoot,¹ makes it advisable to recur briefly to the fact that the distinction between *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος*, when they are contrasted, is not

¹ I have observed some cases in which highly distinguished Biblical scholars unhesitatingly follow his opinion on *ἕτερος*—*ἄλλος* as certainly correct.

(as he asserts) that ἄλλος means "one besides," while ἕτερος signifies "unlike, opposite." Each is perfectly susceptible of meaning "different, unlike"; but when they are used together and contrasted with one another, the fundamental meaning of the words comes into force, and ἕτερος, which means "a second, another of the same class, new" (e.g. a new king, a successor), denotes specific difference, while ἄλλος denotes generic difference. I quoted (on the suggestion of Mr. R. A. Neil) Thucydides ii. 40, 2-3, where ἄλλοις denotes all non-Athenian nations, while ἑτέροις distinguishes one class of Athenians from another. That excellent scholar sends me also another reference, Aristotle, *Pol.* ii. 5, p. 1263 a, 8, ἑτέρων ὄντων τῶν γεωργούντων ἄλλος ἂν εἴη τρόπος, "if the farming class is other, i.e. a distinct subclass of the general body of citizens, then the form of communism would be quite different (from what it would be, if all citizens were farmers)." Mr. A. Souter also points out to me Plato, *Protag.* 329D-330B, where (to put the meaning briefly) Socrates says: "The different parts of the whole class called gold are not different from one another (οὐδὲν διαφέρει τὰ ἕτερα τῶν ἑτέρων) except in respect of size; but the different parts of the whole class called virtue (i.e. the special virtues) are quite different in character from one another (ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἄλλο, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο),¹ and each has its special function; it is the same as in the case of the face and its parts: the eye is not like the ears, nor is its function the same; and of the other objects in the world (τῶν ἄλλων) no specific part is like another specific part (of the same object, οἷον τὸ ἕτερον)." Here, clearly, the various parts of a whole are ἕτερα to one another, whether they be unlike or exactly the same; different wholes are ἄλλα; and when the unlikeness of the parts of a whole is emphatic-

¹ I.e., τὸ μὲν ἄλλο, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο (Stallbaum quotes other instances of the ellipse of τὸ μὲν).

ally asserted, these parts are said to be τὸ μὲν ἄλλο, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο.

In perfect agreement with these examples, Prof. F. Blass, in his *Grammatik des N.T. Griechisch*, p. 175 f., says that “ἕτεροι is in place in the sense of *eine zweite Abtheilung*.” In fact, it would not be inconceivable or unintelligible Greek, though doubtless awkward and harsh, to say about a pair of things, τὸ μὲν ἕτερον ἄλλο ἐστί, τὸ δ’ ἕτερον ἄλλο, the one is quite different from the other.

In view of cases like these, it is impossible, within the limits of Greek, to admit Lightfoot’s rendering of ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, “a different Gospel, which is not another,” *i.e.* “is no Gospel at all.” We must either follow the American revisers, “another Gospel, which is nothing else save that there are some that trouble you,” or we must understand “another Gospel, which is different (from mine) only in so far as some persons confuse you and try to pervert the Gospel of the Anointed One,” *i.e.* the Gospel which is preached, *e.g.*, by Peter, might be called ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, but it is not different from mine except in being perverted by these false teachers.

It is no argument against what is here said to point out cases where ἕτερος means “different.” The word is perfectly susceptible of taking that sense. In fact, you find both ἕτερος and ἄλλος passing into the sense of each other,¹ as a glance at Stephanus will show; and in later Greek this passage becomes steadily more apparent. But the question is, What do they mean when they are pointedly opposed to one another in a sentence?

¹ Yet in Iliad N. 64, ὄρνειον ἄλλο means a bird of a different class (ἀλλόφυλον, as the Schol. says): ὄρνειον ἕτερον is hardly conceivable there, as it would be so urgent to understand “a second eagle.”

VIII. "SEEKING TO PLEASE MEN."

In the *EXPOSITOR*, July, 1897, p. 66, Prof. W. Locke pointed out in a most illuminative paper that, in order to comprehend many passages in Paul's letters, we must understand that certain phrases represent the substance, if not the actual words, of the taunts levelled in speech against him by his Jewish-Christian opponents"; and, to make this clear, he prints those phrases between inverted commas.

The phrases, "persuade men," and "seek to please men" in *Galatians* i. 10 are evidently of this nature. Paul was accused by the Judaizing emissaries of trimming his words and ideas to suit the people among whom he was: it was said that in Jerusalem he Judaized, as when he concurred in the Decree: in Galatia among the Gentiles he made the Jews of no account: even when he brought the Decree at the order of the greater Apostles, he minimized and explained it away to suit the Galatians, but yet, to please the Jews, he circumcised Timothy. It was easy to distort Paul's method of adapting himself to his audience and "becoming all things to all men," so as to make this accusation very dangerous and plausible.

He recurs later to the taunts mentioned here, *vv.* 8-10. In vi. 17 he dismisses them with the words, "from henceforth let no man trouble me." In both places his answer is the same: he appeals to the sufferings which he has endured because of his teaching. If he had sought to please men, he would not be the slave of Christ: he bears in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus, for the marks left in his body by the stones at Lystra (and probably by the lictors' rods at Antioch and Lystra, *St. Paul*, pp. 107, 304), brand him as the slave of Jesus (such marks on the bodies of slaves still catch the eye of the traveller in that country, *e.g.*, Ramsay, *Everyday Life in Turkey*, p. 7). He leaves

the Galatians to judge from his life whether he has aimed at pleasing men or at serving God.

IX. TONE OF ADDRESS TO THE GALATIANS.

This opening paragraph, i. 6-10, does not merely show the intense feeling that raged in Paul's mind: it is also a revelation of Galatian nature. His power of vividly representing the situation in all its reality before his own mind made him in the moment of writing as fully conscious of his correspondents' nature and mind as he was of himself. Things presented themselves to him, as he wrote, in the form which would most impress his Galatian readers. It was that intense sympathetic comprehension of the nature of others that made him such a power among men. Hence, in this Epistle, you see the whole nature of the Galatian converts spread open before you; and it is not the bold, proud, self-assertive nature of a northern race, like the Gauls, that is here revealed. Let any one who has some knowledge of the difference between oriental nature and the nature of the "barbarians" from the north-western lands, or who has studied Polybius and Plutarch's picture of those Gauls who swept in their small bands over Asia, trampling in the dust the multitudinous armies of great kings and populous cities, those fierce, haughty, self-respecting barbarians, keenly sensitive to insult, careless of danger or wounds, settled as an aristocratic and conquering caste among a far more numerous race of subject Phrygians—let any such person judge for himself whether this paragraph, or the fresh start, iii. 1 ff., is the way to address such an audience: the tone of authority, of speaking from a higher platform, is exactly what a man of tact would carefully avoid. But many modern writers seem never to have considered what was the position of the Gauls in Galatia. They write as if Paul were addressing simple-minded, peaceful tribes of

gentle South-Sea islanders, whom he treats as his children. The Gauls were an aristocracy settled for nearly three centuries as nobles among plebeians, like the Normans among the Saxons in England. See below, on chap. iii. 1.

But this very tone, brief and authoritative, is the effective method of addressing the native races of Asia Minor. It is so now, and it was the same in ancient time, when the very word "Phrygian" was equivalent to "slave." Every traveller who mixes with the people of Anatolia learns how necessary is the "touch of authority" mixed with frankness and courtesy. On this point I can only appeal to those who know; and add the statement that the best possible illustration of the tone of this whole Epistle is the experience of the traveller (as, for example, p. 27 ff. of my *Impressions of Turkey*).

This difference of tone from all other epistles has, of course, been noticed by every one, and is usually explained as due to anger. But Paul, even when angry, was not one of those persons who lose their temper and say injudicious things; while deeply moved and indignant, he only became more resolute and alert and watchful: the tone of this letter is misunderstood by those who fail to read in it the character of the persons to whom it is addressed.

X. THE GOSPEL WHICH YE RECEIVED.

The whole paragraph becomes most clear if we understand that "the Gospel which ye received" refers definitely to the occasion and manner in which the good news was first received by the Church or the individual. Similarly in *Acts* xv. 36 the *ἀγγελία τοῦ λόγου* took place on the first journey: on that journey the apostles brought the good news to Antioch and Lystra and Derbe (*Acts* xiii. 32; xiv. 7, 15, 21. But on the second and third journey "strengthening" is the term employed (xvi. 5; compare xv.

41, xviii. 23). In *Acts* xv. 35 διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι describes the two processes of teaching the converts and carrying the good news to those who had not yet heard it.

In view of this difference it is highly probable that Paul's second visit to Galatia was a very brief one, in which he confined his attention to strengthening and instructing the converts without seeking to carry on a further process of evangelization. That has been assumed on the authority of *Acts* in the reckoning of time in my *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 85; and it seems to gather strength from the language of *Galatians*. Εὐαγγελισάμεθα and παρελάβετε refer to the single occasion when the Churches were formed, the first journey; and the instruction given on the second journey is distinguished from it. Paul does not trouble himself to prove that the second message was consistent with the first. He merely says, "if the second message was different, a curse be upon me: you must cleave to the first, which came direct from God."

The point, then, which Paul sets before himself is not to show that he has always been consistent in his message, but to prove that the original message which he brought to the Galatians came direct from God to him. If he proves that, then the other accusation of later inconsistency on his part will disappear of itself.

This method is obviously far the most telling. Even if Paul, by a lengthened proof, difficult to grasp, had proved that he had always been consistent, that did not show that he was right or his message divine. On the other hand, if he proved that his first message was divine, then the Galatians would from their own mind and conscience realize what was the inner nature and meaning of his conduct on the second journey.

The line of proof is, first, an autobiographical record of the facts bearing upon his original Gospel to the Galatians, and

thereafter an appeal to their own knowledge that through this first Gospel they had received the Spirit. That was the ultimate test of divine origin. Nothing could give them the Spirit and the superhuman power of the Spirit except a divine Gospel.

XI. DATES OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

Paul in this retrospect mentions a number of events in his past life. The question has been keenly debated whether the dates which he prefixes to some of the events are intended to mark the interval between each and the preceding event, or the period that separates each from his conversion. Let us put down the facts clearly. The following events are mentioned :—

1. The conversion and call to the Gentiles (i. 15, 16). This is the starting-point, and is therefore introduced by *ὅτε*.

2. *εὐθέως*, the retiring to Arabia; *καὶ πάλιν*, the return to Damascus (i. 17). Probably it would be better to number these as 2 and 3; but I refrain from doing so, lest I seem to some to press the reasoning too hard. It would strengthen my argument to class them as two distinct facts.

3. *ἔπειτα μετὰ τρία ἔτη*, the first visit to Jerusalem, and the stay of fifteen days there (i. 18, 19).

4. *ἔπειτα*, the retiring to Syria and Cilicia, and continuance there (i. 21–24).

5. *ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν*, the second visit to Jerusalem (ii. 1–10).¹

The form of this list with the repetition of *ἔπειτα* seems, so far as I may judge, to mark it as a compact enumeration,

¹ The form of ii. 11 ff. implies that it is not a sixth item in this retrospect. There is no *ἔπειτα* or other similar word to introduce it. It is marked by a new *ὅτε* as a fresh start, parallel to i. 15.

in which the reader is intended to hold the whole together in his mind, and to think of each as a fact in a continuing biographical series. The thought is, as it were, "My life in the Divine reckoning begins from the conversion and call to the Gentiles: in the gradual working out of that call there are the following stages; but in thinking of my life, you must hold always in mind the epoch-making fact of the Conversion; if you would understand my life, you must refer every act in it to that primary revelation of the will of God in me." Hence all the numbers must be interpreted with reference to the great epoch. To consider that in this biographical enumeration each new item, as it were, blots out the previous one, so that the numbers are to be reckoned as intervals that elapsed from the item preceding to the item following, is to lose the dominance of the central and epoch-making event, which is never absent from Paul's mind.

And is it not true even now? On our conception of that one event depends our whole view of Paul's life. So far as we understand his Conversion, do we understand the man. My argument in this section is the same thought which I would apply to Paul's whole life; and, if I be granted time and opportunity, I would write his life with that thought always dominant: "You understand nothing in Paul unless you take it in its relation to his Conversion." He that fails to do that in any case fails entirely: there is but one way, and he that misses it goes wrong inevitably in his conception of Paul's work.

It was a true instinct that led the Church to take the Conversion as the day of St. Paul. For other saints and martyrs their day of celebration was their *dies natalis*, the day on which they entered on their real life, their day of martyrdom. But the *dies natalis* of St. Paul, the day on which his true life began, was the day of his Conversion.

We follow that instinct here, and reckon all the events

in this autobiography by reference to that thought, always dominant in his mind, and which ought always to be dominant in the reader's mind—his Conversion.

Further, we observe that those who take the other view of the meaning of these numbers always argue as if the list consisted of three events: (1) conversion, (2) first visit to Jerusalem, (3) second visit. But Paul, by the form of the list, marks it as containing either five or six separate items, each introduced in a similar way; and it does violence to the form of expression which here rose naturally in Paul's mind, if it be declared that the other items are to be dropped entirely out of sight, and we are to think only of the three.

Again, Paul never neglected the most vigorous and incisive way of putting his thought: he neglects rhetorical verbosity, but he never neglects, he could not neglect, the effect that is given by putting facts in their most striking form. Here the numbers derive their effect on his readers' minds from their greatness; and, if he had been able to use the number 17, he would surely and inevitably (according to my conception of his nature) have taken the expression which enabled him to use the larger number: see above, § IX.

In using this passage for chronological reckoning, it must be borne in mind that Paul's words, *μετὰ τρία ἔτη*, etc., do not correspond to our "three years after." For example, counting from A.D. 31, *μετὰ τρία ἔτη* would be A.D. 33, "the third year after"; but "three years after" would be A.D. 34.

XII. THE REGIONS OF SYRIA AND CILICIA.

The expression has been treated by some scholars as describing two countries; and they seek to find a discrepancy between *Galatians* i. 21 and *Acts* ix. 30, as if in

the former it were asserted that Paul visited Syria first and afterwards Cilicia, whereas in the *Acts* it is stated that he went direct to Tarsus. Then other commentators seek to avoid this inference either by pointing out that on the way to Cilicia he would remain at Syrian ports long enough to justify him in saying that he came to Syria and Cilicia, while others argue that his residence at Antioch during the latter part of the period justifies him in speaking of both Syria and Cilicia, without implying that the Syrian visit was before the Cilician.

All these views start from a misconception of Paul's language and thought. He always thinks and speaks with his eye on the Roman divisions of the Empire, *i.e.* the Provinces, in accordance both with his station as a Roman citizen and with his invariable and oft-announced principle of accepting and obeying the existing government. Thus he speaks of Achaia, Asia, Macedonia, Galatia, Illyricum, using in each case the Roman names, not the Greek: Achaia to the Greeks meant a much smaller country than to the Romans, and it was only in rare cases that the Greeks used either Achaia or Galatia in the wide Roman sense. But the most striking example of Paul's habit of using Roman names is τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ in *Romans* xv. 19. The Greeks used the name Ἰλλυρίς to correspond to the Roman *Illyricum*; and no example seems to occur in Greek of Ἰλλυρικόν used as a noun except in Paul's letter to the Romans. The Greeks never used Ἰλλυρικός except as an adjective. Only a person who was absolutely Roman in his point of view could have employed the term Ἰλλυρικόν, and he could mean by it nothing but "Provincia Illyricum."¹

¹ It is noteworthy that in 2 *Timothy* iv. 10, Paul speaks of this same Province as Dalmatia. The difference of name might be appealed to as pointing to the difference of authorship of the Pastoral Epistles; but, in the more probable view, it is merely a sign of the change which was actually happening during Paul's lifetime. The name Illyricum (universal in early writers) gradually gave place to Dalmatia (which previously was only the southern part of the Province,

Further, the phrase τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας should not be understood as "the κλίμα or region of Syria and the κλίμα of Cilicia." Κλίμα was not used to denote such a great district as Syria or Cilicia; and it is unfortunate that both the Revised and Authorised Versions translate it by the same term that they used for χώρα in *Acts* xiv. 6, xvi. 6, xviii. 23. Χώρα is correctly used to indicate the great geographical divisions of a province (as in those cases); and we might speak of the χώρα of Cilicia and the χώρα of Syria, but not of the κλίμα of Cilicia. I confess that I have never been able to feel any confidence about the precise geographical sense of κλίμα;¹ and scholars, as a rule, scorn to think about the exact distinction between the various geographical expressions. But it is at least certain that the regular usage is τὰ κλίματα Συρίας, κλίματα Ἀχαίας (2 *Cor.* xi. 10): four small districts in the west of Cilicia Tracheia were called τὰ κλίματα;² Sinope and Amisos are defined as πρὸς τοῖς κλίμασι κείμεναι (Justinian, *Novella*, 28).

In accordance with his usual practice, Paul here thinks and speaks of the Roman Province, which consisted of two great divisions, Syria and Cilicia (*Provincia Bithynia et Pontus*). We must accordingly read τῆς Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας, with the common article embracing the two parts of

as constituted by Augustus in A.D. 10, the northern division being Liburnia; and the common name from 70 onwards was Dalmatia (as Mommsen says, "*wie sie seit der Zeit der Flavier gewöhnlich heisst*," *Röm. Gesch.* V. c. vi., p. 184). Suetonius, guided doubtless by his authorities, calls the Province Illyricum under the earlier Emperors, but varies between the names under Claudius and Otho. Similarly, under Nero, Paul varies, following the common usage, which was evidently swinging definitely over from the old to the new name between 57 and 67.

¹ The word has long engaged my attention, see *Histor. Geogr.*, p. 417, where it is suggested that it should be taken in the sense of "lands sloping back from the sea," when applied to Sinope, Amisos, and the four Cilician districts; though in other passages, such as *klima Mnozenia*, (*Acta Theod. Syc.*), it seems to have only the vague sense of "territory."

² *Histor. Geogr.*, p. 417, and table facing p. 362.

one province, according to the original text of \aleph . Although I do not recollect any example of the expression "Prov. Syria et Cilicia," yet the analogy of Bithynia-Pontus is a sufficient defence. Phœnicia, which is in this double name reckoned as part of Syria, is in a more accurate view distinguished from it; and hence the Province is sometimes named by enumerating the three parts;¹ but on the whole the prevalent view classed Phœnicians part of Syria.

The meaning of i. 21, then, is simply that Paul spent the following period of his life in various parts of the Province Syria-Cilicia; and it confirms the principle of interpretation laid down by Zahn that "Paul never designates any part of the Roman Empire by any other name than that of the Province to which it belonged; and he never uses any of the old names of countries, except in so far as these had become names of Provinces" (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 124).

W. M. RAMSAY.

NOTE ON § VII.

Professor Bywater writes that Bonitz recognises a similar distinction between ἕτερος λόγος and ἄλλος λόγος in Aristotle to that which I have drawn between ἄλλο εὐαγγέλιον and ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον (see Bonitz, *Index Aristot.* p. 290 b. 19).

¹ The provincial *cultus* with its ἀγών was κοινὸς Συρίας Κιλικίας Φοινίκης (Henzen, *Bull. dell' Inst.* 1877, p. 109; Mommsen, *Res Gestae D. Aug.* p. 173).

(To be continued.)