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

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

not the foe of human rule; a great reality, yet not needing jealously to assert its rights as against civil governments, able rather to assert itself within these, and through them." Wholesome, beneficent teaching! For of all forms of misgovernment, the worst is a theocracy administered by professional religionists, which is what it always comes to. The reign of God sounds well; but when it means the reign of Rabbis, scribes, zealots, priests, ecclesiastics, the despotism of the basest Cæsar that ever abused imperial power is to be preferred. This kills the body, that kills the soul.

A. B. BRUCE.

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

XIII. SPIRIT OF CHAPTERS III., IV.

THE historical questions connected with the second chapter are the most difficult and most keenly debated in the whole Epistle; and it seems best to leave them aside for the moment, in order to examine them with more advantage after having discussed all the other chapters. We assume, then, at present, that in his autobiographical retrospect Paul has impressed upon his Galatian readers the direct divine origin of the message which he had brought to them. God had spoken to him, and he had delivered the message to them, as he had been commissioned to do. Some private communications had passed between himself and the older Apostles; but these had been simply a declaration of his intentions and views, and there had been no communication made by them to him of any ideas which he should transmit to his converts.

Paul's aim now is to revivify among the Galatians the memory of their first condition, before any contradictory

and confusing messages had affected them. He must touch their hearts, and make them feel for themselves the divine word in their own souls. He reminds them, by many subtle touches of their original experience, how the divine message worked in them, raised them to a higher nature, made them instinct with divine life, implanted marvellous powers in them. If he can work them up again into that frame of mind in which he had left them fresh from his first message, his immediate purpose will be gained. Thereafter, other steps would be required. But, for the moment, he must work on their nature and conscience: he must appeal to their true selves: they had known in themselves how they had begun by simple faith, and whither it had led them. Paul knew what Goethe knew when he said,—

> "Oh! never yet hath mortal drunk
> A draught restorative,
> That welled not from the depths of his own soul!"

How utterly out of place in effecting this purpose would laborious proofs of his own rectitude and consistency be! "Timeserver" is he? Think of the marks of Christ his owner branded on his body! "Preacher of the Law" is he? Then he is false to his own message, and the cross which he placarded before their eyes is set aside by him as no more needed! But they know from their own experience what has made them Christians! If he has been untrue to his message, he is accursed, but let them hold to what they have felt and known!

The letter is not logically argumentative. To look for proofs addressed to the intellect, and to criticise the reasoning on the question as to whether it is or is not intellectually convincing, is merely futile. Each new paragraph, each fresh train of thought, is intended to quicken and reinvigorate the early Christian experiences of his readers. Naturally, we cannot fully appreciate the effect of every

paragraph. In many of them we can see that he is referring to facts in the past relations between them and himself, facts otherwise unknown to us, and guessed only from the brief, pregnant words which he here uses, words full of reminiscence to the Galatians, but sadly obscure to us. In other paragraphs we can be sure he is referring to something which we can hardly even guess at. The effect of the letter depended to a great degree on circumstances which are to us quite unknown. Here, if ever in this world, heart speaks to heart: the man, as he was, appeals direct to the men, as they were.

> "If feeling does not prompt, in vain you strive;
> If from the soul the language does not come,
> By its own impulse, to impel the hearts
> Of hearers, with communicated power,
> In vain you strive. . . .
> Never hope to stir the hearts of men,
> And mould the souls of many into one,
> By words which come not native from the heart."

Thus Paul reiterates his blows, and heaps appeal on appeal and illustration on illustration, all for the one sole end. He must rekindle the flame of faith, languishing for the moment, under misapprehension, doubt as to Paul's purpose, doubt as to his character, suspicion as to the witness and work of the other Apostles. If the flame leaps up fresh and strong in their souls, it will melt all suspicions and solve all doubts. They will once more know the truth.

Such is the spirit in which we must try to interpret chapters iii. and iv. I cannot do it. Probably no one will ever do it completely. In some cases, I fancy, I can in a small degree catch the tone in which the words ought to be recited, if the meaning is to be brought out of them; and by the hope thus to contribute something to the understanding of this, the most wonderful and enigmatical self-

revelation in literature, I have been driven to publish these pages (many of which have been written long ago, and kept back from consciousness of their inadequacy).

XIV. "GALATIANS" IN III. 1.

The opening three words of the chapter, "O foolish Galatians," have in Paul's mouth, if I estimate him and them correctly, a strongly pathetic effect. It is, I think, customary to say that here his anger speaks, and he sharply censures the senseless conduct of the Galatians.[1] The most curious development of this idea is seen in Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 263 ff. After the harsh and angry tone of the earlier pages of the letter, according to Deissmann, Paul concludes, in vi. 11, with a little joke, so that the Galatians, his "dear silly children" (*liebe unverständige Kinder*), may understand that his anger has not been lasting, and that it is no longer the severe schoolmaster who is addressing them: he therefore makes the jocular remark about "big letters," which are more impressive to children than the smaller letters of the secretary who wrote most of the Epistle: "When Paul spoke thus, the Galatians knew that the last traces of the seriousness of the punishing schoolmaster had vanished from his features!"

Not anger, but pathos, on the contrary, seems to be the prominent note in this apostrophe. The authoritative tone, of course, is there; but the feeling is that of love, sorrow, and pathos, not anger.

It is only on rare occasions that Paul addresses his

[1] *Scharfrügender Ausdruck* is Dr. Zöckler's expression. Lightfoot, in his edition, p. 64, evidently reckons this apostrophe among those "outbursts of indignant remonstrance," by which "the argument is interrupted every now and then. Rebuke may prevail where reason will be powerless." That the tone is "severe" (in Lightfoot's previous phrase) is quite true; but to take "indignation" as its prominent note seems to me to be a misreading of the purpose and drift. This misconception is one of the many wrong consequences of the North-Galatian view.

hearers, as in this case, directly by the general appellation that embraces them all and sums them all up in one class. But in certain states of emotion the necessity comes upon him to use this direct appeal, so that every individual shall feel that he is personally addressed. The only other cases in the Epistles of Paul are 2 *Corinthians* vi. 11, and *Philippians* iv. 15. Let us compare the three.

To show the tone of 1 *Corinthians* vi. 11, it is only necessary to recall the intensly emotional words (*vv.* 1–10) describing Paul's life as an evangelist, and his prayer "that ye receive not the grace of God in vain," and then to read *v.* 11, "Our mouth is open unto you, O Corinthians, our heart is enlarged." He goes on to address them as his children. But though he is censuring them, it is not anger that prompts the apostrophe; deep yearning affection dictates the direct personal appeal.

So again in *Philippians* iv. 15. Paul's feelings are deeply moved as he recalls that Philippi was the one Church which sent and forced on him money for his pressing wants. Here again the apostrophe, "Philippians," follows upon an autobiographical passage, describing how "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me."

Thus in all three cases we notice the same conditions leading Paul up to the direct address. He has been for a time putting forward prominently his own work and the spirit in which he does it. Compare the words of *Philippians* just quoted with *Galatians* ii. 20, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live: and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me," etc., and with 2 *Corinthians* vi. 9, 10, "as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, not killed; as poor, yet making many rich," etc. Wrought up to a high pitch of emotion in this retrospect of his life in death as a servant and minister, he turns direct on his hearers, and places them face to face with himself, "Galatians," or "Philippians," or "Corinthians." The man who reads

anger into this address as its prominent characteristic is for the moment losing his comprehension of Paul's mind. Pathos is the characteristic, not indignation.

It is not exactly the same situation, but is at least analogous, when Paul directly appeals by name to a single correspondent. This he only does in 1 *Timothy* i. 18; vi. 20. In the former case there is exactly the same movement of thought and emotion as in the three cases just quoted. He casts a glance over his own career as the "chief of sinners," who "obtained mercy, that in me might Jesus Christ show forth all His longsuffering, for an ensample of them which should hereafter believe on Him unto eternal life"—the same idea, life gained through the divine patience (though the idea of Paul's personal suffering and affliction is not made so prominent here). Then he continues, as in the other cases, "This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy."

Incidentally, we remark here that no one who trusts to his literary sense, could attribute this passage in 1 Timothy, with its deep feeling, to a forger, who put on the mask of Paul in order to gain currency for his theological ideas. If you permit your feeling for literature to guide you, you know that the friend and spiritual father of Timothy is speaking to him in these words.

The other passage in which Paul addresses Timothy by name, vi. 20, is different in type. Towards the end of a long series of instructions to Timothy about his work, Paul sums up earnestly, "O Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee." Here it is the concluding sentence; and the letter ends, as it began, with the direct address to Timothy.

But, it will be asked, Was Paul not expecting too much, when he thought that the Galatians would understand these delicate shades of feeling, which escape many modern readers? Are we not trying to read our own fancies into

the Epistle? I think not. Paul was a great orator, not in the sense of elaborate artistic composition—as to which he felt with Goethe, who makes his Faust sneer at mere "expression, graceful utterance" (which the silly pupil considered "the first and best acquirement of the orator"), because they

> "Are unrefreshing, as the wind that whistles
> In autumn, 'mong the dry and wrinkled leaves"—

but in the sense that he knew exactly what he could count upon in his audience. He swept over their hearts as the musician sweeps over the strings of his instrument, knowing exactly what music he can bring from them, and what he must not attempt with them. Let us read the letter to the Galatians without the misconceptions and preconceived theories which lead most commentators astray; and let us acquire beforehand some idea of the political and religious situation, and the character of the Galatians. Then the meaning will strike us plainly between the eyes, and we shall no longer talk of anger as influencing the expression of the writer (except for the moment, and on a special point, in i. 8 f., v. 12). You never understand Paul's motives or purposes unless you take them on the highest level possible: when you read in them any mixture of poorer or smaller purpose, you are merely misunderstanding Paul and losing your grasp of him. But they who talk so much about his indignation in *Galatians* are missing the real emotion that drives him on: it is intense and overpowering love and pity for specially beloved children.

In iii. 1, then, the movement of feeling in the writer's mind forces him to apostrophize his readers in one general address. But by what appellation could he sum up the whole body whom he addressed in Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra? There was only one name common to them all. They all belonged to the Roman province.

The Churches addressed had already been summed up as "the Churches of Galatia." The one title common to the hearers was "men of (the province) Galatia," *i.e.* Galatae.

Here we find ourselves on ground that has been disputed. Those who hold the North-Galatian view have advanced three separate arguments on this point, and each demands a short consideration. They ask, in the first place, what reason there was why Paul should have sought for some common appellation for the people of the four cities: they say that, if he were addressing Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra, he might have contented himself with the superscription (in i. 2), as he does in many other letters. In the second place, they say (or, at least, used to say) that the name Galatia was not applied to the country in which these four cities were situated. In the third place, even if it be admitted that the four cities were in Galatia, they maintain that their inhabitants could not be called Galatae, for none who were not Gauls by race could be called Galatae.[1]

The first argument has already been answered, when we showed how the march of emotion brought Paul to the point where he must apostrophize his audience.

The second and third arguments demand separate consideration.

XV. Galatia the Province.

The one decisive argument that Paul's "Galatia" must be the province, and not simply the region inhabited by the Gauls, is stated by Zahn. Paul never uses any geographical names except Roman provincial. This has been stated above, § xii., where additional arguments are given

[1] *Errarunt qui Galatas Pauli intellegi voluerunt Lycaonas, quippe qui a Romanis Galatiæ provinciæ essent attributi; neque enim, ut mittam alia, ea re ex Lycaonibus Galli facti erant* (*Gal.* iii. 1), says one of the most learned and scholarly supporters of the North-Galatian view.

to strengthen Zahn's observation: not merely did Paul use the Roman provincial names, but he even used them in the Latin form, transliterating them into Greek, and in one case employing a Latin form which was avoided by Greek writers and never occurs elsewhere in Greek. Paul writes as a Roman and a citizen of the Empire.

Here we note that Paul is much more Roman in his tone than the Greek Luke. The latter never uses the term "Galatia," he mentions only the "Galatic Territory." Now, if Paul and Luke had been speaking of North Galatia, the country of the three Gallic Tribes, it is impossible to understand why they should differ as to the name. Among the immense number of references to North Galatia made by Greek and Latin writers,[1] I do not know a single case where any other name than Galatia is used for the country. Why should Luke alone employ everywhere a different name for the country, diverging from the universal usage of Greek and Latin writers, and also from his master Paul? No possible reason can be given. It would simply be an unintelligible freak of Luke's; he chose to differ from everybody, because—he chose to do so.

But, on the South-Galatian view, it was almost unavoidable that he should differ from Paul as to the name of the country. The custom of naming the province varied according as one wrote from the Roman or the Greek point of view. Now it has been shown in page after page of my *St. Paul* that Luke follows the Greek popular and colloquial usage, as it was current among the more educated half of society in the cities of the Ægean land. So far as evidence goes, that class of persons never used "Galatia" to denominate the Roman Province; only persons who consciously and intentionally adopted the Roman Imperial point of view did so. The Greeks generally repeated the list of regions comprised in the Province (or, at least, as

[1] Most are collected in Holder's *Altkeltischer Sprachschatz*, s.v. *Galatia*.

many of the regions as served their immediate purpose), thus: "Galatia (*i.e.* North Galatia), Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Isauria, Pontus, Paphlagonia"; but occasionally they employed an expression like "the Galatic Eparchy." This is exactly what Luke does. Sometimes he speaks of the region or regions with which he is concerned, Pisidia, Phrygia, Lycaonia; sometimes he employs the expression, "the Galatic territory."

Further, take into consideration that the adjective "Galatic" is frequently applied, in inscriptions and the geographical writer Ptolemy, to countries like Pontus and Phrygia, which were included in the Province, but that this adjective is never used in a geographical way to designate by a circumlocution North Galatia;[1] and you can only marvel that scholars could ever conceal the facts from themselves so far as to think that Luke meant "Galatic territory" to indicate North Galatia.[2]

In truth, nothing except the obscurity in which Asia Minor was enveloped, combined with the general lack of interest taken by scholars in mere geographical matters—which are commonly regarded as beneath the dignity of true scholarship—made the North-Galatian view ever seem tenable. And now it stands only because its supporters among "the great scholars" of Germany will not look into the facts. Their minds have long ago been made up, and there is so much to do in other directions that they

[1] It is naturally used in such ways as ἔργα Γαλατικά, deeds like those of the Galatai, πόλις Γαλατική, a Galatian city like Ancyra.

[2] An Englishman who caught the words, "At this point he entered British territory," would at once understand that a journey was described not in Great Britain, but in Africa or Asia or America. A German, however, unless English was very well and accurately known to him, might hesitate as to the meaning. So a Greek of Paul's time would unhesitatingly understand "Galatic territory" in the sense in which the inscriptions and Ptolemy use it. One might write a chapter on the geographical use of adjectives in -ικός. Compare, *e.g.*, Thucydides on the sense of "Laconic land" (γῆ Λακωνική), in which he includes not merely Laconia proper, but also Messenia and Pylos; in short, all the territory added to Laconia during previous history.

cannot reconsider *choses jugées*. The appearance of Prof. Zahn's *Einleitung*, with its frank acceptance of the main points in the South-Galatian view, will, as we may hope, produce a change in Germany, and show that the subject cannot be pushed aside.

The great difficulty for the moment is that the North-Galatian theorists have committed themselves to such sweeping statements in geography and history, in order to prove the South-Galatian view impossible, that they have, as it were, burned their boats and must fight to the last, no longer for truth, but merely for victory: *es wäre wenig rühmlich, wenn die Theologen, welche mit ihren Mitteln in der Geschichte des Urchristenthums und der alten Kirche jahrzehntelang gearbeitet haben, ehe Ramsay seine Mittel auf dieselbe Gegenstände anwandte, gu allem . . . Ja sagen würden.* Take one example, which is typical of the present situation. Learning that many inscriptions designate the Province by the list of regions composing it, a distinguished German Professor wrote an elaborate article, boldly asserting that the name Galatia was never rightly applied to the whole Province, and therefore drawing the inference, as final and conclusive, that Paul could not have called Antioch, Iconium, etc., "Churches of Galatia." Now this was a real danger to scholarship. Many English theologians are accustomed to regard that distinguished Professor as one whom "no one would accuse of error in a field which he has made peculiarly his own." [1] He was understood to have gone and investigated the subject with the true German thoroughness so characteristic of him, and the paper was considered by many as closing the question; if he was right, there was no more to say, and no one would even think of attributing error to him. Yet he had written

[1] I quote the words of a distinguished English Professor writing on this topic. The inerrancy once attributed to the text has been transferred by some theologians to the German commentators.

that bold and sweeping negative without looking into the familiar Roman treatises on geography, which must be the foundation of all reasoning on the subject; and, as soon as his attention was called to Pliny and Ptolemy, he retracted the assertion. In truth, his assertion could not be entertained for a moment; it was flatly contradicted by the fundamental authorities. Had any English scholar made it, what scorn would have been poured on English superficiality! how the moral would have been drawn that he should study German!

Even, after the German Professor has withdrawn his statement and confessed his error, and other prominent German adherents of the North-Galatian theory have frankly acknowledged that Iconium, etc., were in Galatia, some English theologians continue to quote the original article as authoritative.[1] If that is the case, after the article has been retracted, what would be the case if no one had ventured to charge its author with error?

XVI. Galatians and Gauls.

But the distinguished author, while briefly retracting his statement about Galatia, committed himself to another equally sweeping negative—the title *Galatae* could not be used to designate the people of Roman Galatia (being presumably confined to those who had the blood-right[2] to it). Before making this sweeping negative, it is clear that the learned Professor did not take the trouble to review the passages mentioning the *Galatae*, or to recall the facts. Had he done so, he could not have made the statement. But, apart from that, no scholar outside the North-Galatian ranks, would even ask for proof that, when the Romans called a

[1] See, for example, the paper of a distinguished Cambridge scholar, Dr. Cheetham, in *Classical Review*, 1894, p. 396, a paper never retracted, and therefore presumably maintained by the learned author.

[2] See the quotation from another great scholar, note on p. 125.

Province by a definite name, they summed up the inhabitants of the Province by the ethnic derived from the name. That is an axiom from which all historical and archæological students start. It was necessary in the administration of a Province to have some designation for the whole body of Provincials: *Afri* all the people of Africa Provincia, whatever their race; *Baetici* of Baetica Hispania; *Asiani* of Asia; and *Galatae* of Galatia.

A single case is sufficient.[1] Tacitus, with his love for variation in expression, speaks of *dilectus per Galatiam Cappadociamque* and *Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia.* When this was quoted as an example, the North-Galatian champion replied that these troops were obviously recruited among the Gaulish tribes (as the most warlike), and not from the Province as a whole. Once more he spoke without investigating the facts, simply inventing reasons to prop up a theological theory. The evidence has been fully collected and tabulated by Mommsen,[2] and it is to the opposite effect. Recruits were drawn from all parts of the Province, and (so far as the evidence reaches) in larger numbers from the parts outside of North Galatia; there were, at least, three auxiliary cohorts styled *cohortes Paphlagonum,* but no auxiliary cohort takes its name from the *Galatae.*[3]

The details of this argument are quoted as a specimen of the straits to which the North-Galatian theory reduces

[1] Other examples are given in *Studia Biblica*; iv. p. 26 ff.; and Dr. Zahn says that the discussion there given *handelt hievon ausführlich und überzeugend* (*Einleitung*, p. 130). See also *Galatia* in Hastings, *Bible Dictionary of the Bible*, II.

[2] *Observat. Epigraph.* xxxviii., *Militum Provincialium Patriae*, p. 190 f. (*Eph. Epigr.*, vol. v.).

[3] In the names of auxiliary cohorts, words like *Galatarum*, *Cilicum*, must be taken in the sense of nation, not of Province, according to Mommsen's acute distinction. Auxiliary cohorts were in theory assumed to originate from foreign tribes (as in truth they once did originate), not from Roman Provinces; and they bore names national and non-Roman after they were recruited entirely from the Provinces.

its defenders. They fall into error after error, when they try to make any statement about the facts of Galatian history in favour of their theory.

But, further, even before the formation of the Roman Province, the name "Galatian" had ceased to imply Gaulish descent. We must remember that the Gauls who settled in Galatia were a very small body. The first great horde that entered Asia Minor is said to have numbered 20,000, of whom only half were fighting men.[1] Though others followed, yet the constant wars, with some serious defeats, which they had to face must have kept their numbers down; and the total number who settled in Galatia, a country nearly 200 miles long by 80 broad, can only have been a very small conquering and aristocratic caste amid a great subject population. Especially the trading population of the great cities must have been mainly native Phrygian, mixed with Greeks (Romans and Jews later) and an upper class of Gauls. That is the conclusion of Van Gelder and of Staehelin, who are the chief authorities on the subject. The former says that the Gauls lived almost wholly in the open country as nomads and shepherds; but that perhaps restricts the Gauls too narrowly. Tavium was, probably, mainly Gaulish, and Ancyra also was a Gaulish capital. Possibly, at the first, neighbouring peoples distinguished Galatae from native Phrygians in Galatia; but it is impossible to suppose that the distinction was long maintained. The mixed population of the country soon came to be called the Galatian people.

First, consider the natural probabilities. The conquerors seized, according to the usual principle[2] (which is believed by ordinary scholars to have been observed by the Gauls in Galatia), one-third of the land, leaving two-thirds to the old population. But the older population had all trade

[1] Livy (who represents the authority of Polybius), xxxviii. 16.
[2] Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.*, I. 31.

in their hands, for the conquerors were mere barbarians, fighting naked, and scorning manual labour. Thus there is every probability that the wealth of the non-Gaulish population would increase, while that of the territorial aristocracy would decrease, until they adopted civilized habits and ways, and lost their Gaulish pride. It would appear that during the latter part of the second century Galatia fell under the power of the Pontic kings,[1] and continued so until the Romans aided them to gain their freedom in the Mithradatic wars. Such circumstances were calculated to strengthen the native element and to weaken the aristocratic Gaulish caste, though the Gauls retained their vigour and individuality sufficiently to reassert themselves with Roman help, 84–64 B.C., and regain their ascendency (though probably not so thoroughly as before the Pontic rule).

But now began tetrarchic and then monarchic rule, which was necessarily unfavourable to the freedom-loving aristocracy, and supported itself on Greek connexion and Greek civilization. The Roman rule, which succeeded the monarchic, was still more unfavourable to class distinctions among the people of the Province; all the people were summed up as Provincials, and we need not doubt that a wealthy Greek-speaking merchant of the city was more important in the eyes of the Romans than an impecunious landowner of the country. At the same time there is evidence that the Gaulish aristocracy still maintained itself, and must therefore have adapted itself in some degree to the new conditions. In such a situation it is wholly improbable that the name "Galatians" was restricted to the small body of Gauls, and denied to the mass of the Phrygian population.

But we are not left to mere general estimate of prob-

[1] Van Gelder, *de Gallis in Graecia et Asia*, p. 183.

abilities. Pausanias, vii. 17, 10, says that "the Galatians of Pessinus abstain from swine." Evidently, he is speaking of the general population of Pessinus, not merely of the Gaulish part of it. Now, Pessinus was free, and hostile to the Gauls, until some time between 189 and 164 B.C.[1] It then probably made a compromise with the Gauls, for half the places in the college of priests were retained by the old Phrygian priestly families.[2] Thus the Gaulish element in the city is likely to have been much slighter than in Ancyra or Tavium; yet its population was summed up as "Galatae."

Again, during the second century before Christ we find that among the slaves manumitted at Delphi Galatians were most numerous after Syrians and Thracians, more numerous than Phrygians, that race of born slaves. Are we to believe that that proud aristocracy sold their own children into slavery, and not rather that they sold their subjects, and that the Greeks classed all who came from Galatia as Galatians?[3] Or are we to think that Gaulish warriors taken prisoners in battle were common as slaves among their Greek conquerors? It was well known to the Greeks that the Gauls were untamable barbarians, preferring death to capture. But the slaves manumitted at Delphi got their freedom because they were well-behaved, industrious, and able to earn money, and to be more useful to their masters free than enslaved. One of them was a shoemaker, another a skilled workwoman: the former was set free between 150 and 140 B.C., the other between 150 and 100 B.C. No one can fancy that the Gauls of whom Polybius was writing with such admiration for their proud

[1] Körte, in *Athenische Mittheilungen*, 1897, pp. 16, 39.

[2] Körte, in *Philolog. Wochenschr.*, 1898, p. 3.

[3] It must be remembered that the term Galatian in the Delphic inscription means one purchased from abroad: the child of a foreign slave born in the Greek country is classed as ἐνδογενής or οἰκογενής.

and noble character were more familiar as well-behaved slaves and shoemakers in Greece than any race except Syrians and Thracians.

Moreover, the names prove that these slaves were taken from the old Phrygian population of Galatia. Though slave names depended on the master's caprice, they were commonly characteristic of the slaves' origin and language, as Strabo says, p. 304. Among the Delphic Galatians is Maiphates, set free 170–157 B.C. That is a pure Anatolian name, found in Phrygia and in Pontus; and the first syllable is peculiarly characteristic of Phrygian and Lydian names.[1] We find also among them Sosias, the name of the Phrygian slave in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes:[2] Sosias of Delphi was a shoemaker. But none of the names shows any trace of Gaulish origin. Now, while foreign slaves were often renamed by their Greek owners, some, apparently, were allowed to retain their original names; and that is evidently the case with Maiphates. Many other examples might be given.[3] One is interesting here: we find a Jewess Antigona, with two daughters, Theodora and Dorothea, and we cannot doubt that these names are chosen in the family and not given by her owner. The love of the Jews for names containing the element θεός is well known:[4] these were the translation of Hebrew names, as has been illustrated fully by Dr. Herzog in an elaborate paper.[5] Besides such names, the Jews were fond of taking names from the Greek royal families of Alexander and his successors: hence the mother was Antigona.

[1] Probably Ma, Maia, the Mother, the Earth, the Great Goddess. The subject will be treated more fully in "Varia III.," *Classical Review*, Oct., 1898.

[2] See "Varia I.," in *Classical Review*, *loc. cit.*

[3] At Delphi, *e.g.*, Phrygian Menophilos, Cappadocian Menophilos and Mithradates, Illyrian Ana and Ammia, Syrian Libanos and Enome and Ladika, Thracian Bithys, etc. See "Varia III."

[4] So afterwards among the Christians, *Cities and Bish. of Phr.*, pt. ii., p. 500, note and no. 250.

[5] *Philologus*, lvi. p. 50 ff.; see also S. Reinach, *Rev. Ét. Juives*, 1893, p. 126 ff.

These illustrations bring out the principle that in the first century the Greeks in ordinary usage thought not about blood, but simply about country, when they called a person "Galatian." He who sprang from Galatia was Galatian. Still more was that the case with Romans, who summed up all persons in a Province as provincials.

XVII. St. Paul's Roman Point of View.

When he uses the terms Galatia and Galatians, Paul speaks as no mere Greek spoke: he speaks as the Roman. If so, we must look to find this view ruling both in this Epistle and through his whole policy. That principle I have attempted to illustrate throughout my *St. Paul the Traveller*. Here it remains to illustrate it in the following paragraphs of the Epistle.

The use of *Galatae* in the Roman sense may be illustrated by the term Φιλιππήσιοι. The commentators on *Philippians* iv. 15 do not observe that this form is not Greek, but Latin. It is the Greek representative of the Latin *Philippensis*, according to a rule familiar to archæologists: thus, *e.g.*, *Mutinensis* becomes Μουτουνήσιος. So thoroughly does Paul take the Roman view that he avoids the Greek ethnic, which was Φιλιππεύς or Φιλιππηνός: he would not address the inhabitants of a Roman colony by a Greek name, but only by a Latin form. How else, then, would he address the united people of the colonies Antioch and Lystra, of the cities that bore officially an Emperor's name Claud-iconium and Claudio-Derbe, except by the one title which indicated their common Roman connexion, "ye of the Province Galatia," *Galatae?*

W. M. Ramsay.