TARSUS.

VII. Tarsus as an Oriental Town.

It has been argued in the preceding part of this study that the early Tarsus was one of the "sons of the Ionian." This expression must be properly understood. It is not intended to mean that Ionian Greeks were the first people that formed a settlement at Tarsus. Tarsus was doubtless one of those primeval towns, like Damascus and Iconium, which have been such since settled habitations and towns began to exist in the countries. It is, indeed, highly probable that the earliest Tarsus was situated on the outer hills, about two miles north of the present town, because defensive strength was one of the prime necessities for early towns, and only on the hills could this be attained.

Nor do we mean that the early Ionian Tarsus was inhabited solely by Ionian Greeks. There was rarely, if ever, a case in which Greeks formed the sole population of a city which they founded in a foreign land. The strength and permanence of the Greek colonies were due to their power of assimilating the native population, and imparting to it something of their own genius and aspirations; but a mere settlement of unmixed aliens on a foreign shore would have been unable to maintain itself against the untempered hostility of a native population nearly as high in capacity and vigour as the aliens themselves. All analogy points to the conclusion that this Ionian colony was a mixed town, not a pure Ionian settlement.

With regard to that early time, we must content ourselves for the present with analogy and indirect argument. Until Cilicia is better known and more carefully studied, its earliest history must remain almost a blank, just as its mediæval history also is enveloped in obscurity.

The reasons from which the identity of the city Tarshish with Tarsus has been inferred seem to the present writer to be as strong as can be expected in a case of this kind; but so long as this Ionian Tarsus-Tarshish continues to be a subject of division and controversy, it would not be right to make inferences from the identification. At any rate, it seems to be certain and admitted that the document in Genesis x. bears witness to a distinct extension of Ionian, i.e. very early Greek, influence along the Asiatic coasts in the second millennium B.C. Almost all authorities and theorists are agreed that some of the "sons of Javan" are to be found on the south coast of Asia Minor, or in the Levant islands. The following millennium shows a retrograde movement in the extent of Greek influence, and a distinct strengthening of the Asiatic power and spirit, in this region; and this strongly affected the fortunes of Tarsus.

Such ebb and flow in the tides of influence of East on West, and West on East, has always characterized the movement of history in the borderlands, and especially along the land roads across Asia Minor, that bridge of nations stretching across from Asia to Europe, and along the sea-way of the southern coast. At one time Europe sweeps over great part of Asia, and seems on the point of overrunning the whole continent; but always Asia recruits its forces, rolls back the tide of conquest, and retaliates by engulfing parts of Europe. If Alexander marched to the Indus and his successors ruled over Bactria and Afghanistan, the Arabs marched to the banks of the Loire and the Turks to the walls of Vienna, and all of them made only evanescent conquests. Europe cannot permanently subdue Asia, nor Asia Europe.

Thus from an Ionian colony Tarsus became an Oriental city, and in this character it is revealed to us in the oldest

historical records in which it is mentioned. The earliest reference to Tarsus occurs on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria : he captured this with other towns about the middle of the ninth century B.C., and at this time may be dated (so far as evidence or probability reaches) the first entrance of a thoroughly Asiatic race into the country west of Mount Amanus. Neither the domination of the Assyrians, nor that of the Medians afterwards,[1] nor the rule of the Persians from the sixth century onwards, was likely to cause much change in the organization of the country or the character of the cities. Those Oriental states, only loosely knit together even near the centre, exercised their power over such outlying provinces chiefly by means of a governor, who represented the king in his suzerainty over the native chiefs and townships, while the latter retained much of their old authority within their own territories.

The reinvigoration of Orientalism, or rather the weakening of the Western spirit of freedom and self-assertion in Cilicia, is marked by the growth of a native Cilician dynasty of petty kings, who ruled Cilicia under the Persian kings as overlords ; thus the Cilicians were the servants of the servant of the Great King. Kingship is the condition that seemed natural to an Oriental race, while it was alien and repellent to the ancient spirit of the European races, and spread among them only as an exotic, which gradually established itself among them through the influence of war in modifying the old national temper. So, when the last king of a Cappadocian dynasty died, the Romans offered the people their freedom. The Cappadocians, who did not

[1] No definite proof is known that the Median empire included Cilicia but, as it extended to the Halys, it is likely to have embraced Cilicia, though that cannot be assumed as certain, for an extension of Median power across the Eastern Taurus to the Halys without touching Cilicia is quite possible.

know what freedom was, begged for a king. The Romans marvelled that any people could prefer slavery to freedom, but treated them after their own character and appointed a king to rule over them.

Accordingly in 401, when Xenophon crossed Cilicia with the Ten Thousand Greeks of the younger Cyrus's army, he found a king Syennesis, whose capital was apparently Tarsus. A Cilician king of the same name is mentioned as having co-operated with the king of Babylon in making peace between Cyaxares the Mede and Alyattes the Lydian in 585 B.C., a second about 500 B.C., and the same or a third Syennesis fought in Greece under Xerxes in 480 B.C. On the other hand, when Alexander the Great entered Cilicia in 334 B.C., there seems to have been no king of Cilicia, but only a Persian officer directly governing the country. The kings, therefore, seem to have been put down; and this in all probability was due to the growth of stricter organization in the Persian Empire, and stricter exercise of the power of the Great King in the outlying provinces through his representatives or Satraps. The action which Syennesis and his queen Epyaxa took in 401 in favour of Cyrus against king Artaxerxes may perhaps have shown the danger involved in suffering Cilicia to be governed by subordinate tributary kings, and led to the suppression of the kings and the introduction of a new system with more direct control. At any rate, it may be stated with confidence that the Persian kings inherited the system from the Assyrian (and perhaps the Median) domination, and, after permitting it to continue for fully a century and a half, put an end to it some time after 400 B.C. for the above or some other reason.

The character of the Cilician kingdom, and the constitution of Tarsus as its capital, are unknown. Nothing is recorded. The repetition of the name Syennesis has suggested to almost every modern inquirer that this name was a title,

like Pharaoh, mistaken by the Greeks for a personal name, just as Pharaoh has often been misunderstood by foreigners: though some, after consideration, reject this opinion. It seems quite probable that the old Cilician kings may have been really priest-dynasts, such as are known to have long ruled at Olba among the Cilician or Isaurian mountains, and at other places in the eastern regions of Asia Minor.[1] The priestly power naturally tended to grow greater in times of disorganization; and the Assyrian kings may probably have found it convenient to rule through the leading priest, who was quite ready to suit himself to the foreign sovereign and buy temporal power at the price of service to a foreign sovereign. In such cases the priest's authority was always based originally on his position as representative on earth of the supreme god of the district: the priest wore the dress and bore the name of the god.[2] If the origin of the Cilician kingship were of this kind, it may be thought probable that Syennesis was a Divine name, rather than a title, and that the kings at their accession lost their own name and assumed the priestly name taken from that of the god, just as the priests at Pessinus assumed the name of Atis.

The coinage of this Oriental Tarsus, while showing the strong influence of the Hellenic element in the population, also reveals the weakening of that influence. The coins belong to the fifth and fourth centuries, and were evidently struck, not by a self-governing city of the Greek kind, but by kings and by Persian satraps.[3] Yet even here a certain Greek character is apparent. Some of the earliest coins are more Hellenic in feeling than the latest, and occasionally there occurs a revival of Hellenic character, accompanied by

[1] The phrase *δυναστεύων* is used of one Syennesis; and that word was appropriate to priest-kings in western Cilicia.

[2] Religion of Greece and Asia Minor in Hastings' *Dict.* v. p. 128.

[3] We omit entirely some coins of the sixth century, which have been very doubtfully attributed to Tarsus.

the use of Greek letters on the coins ; but the latest coins of Tarsus under the Persian domination, though imitated from Greek models, were strongly Oriental in character, wholly devoid of the true Hellenic spirit, and bore purely Aramaic legends.

VIII. Legends of the Foundation of Tarsus.

During fully five centuries therefore Tarsus was merely a town under Oriental domination. The Assyrian rule left a strong impression on the historical memory, which created various legends veiling, but not wholly concealing, the real facts of that time. Alexander Polyhistor, as quoted by Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, i. p. 27 (ed. Schoene), says that Sennacherib, king of Nineveh, was the founder. A more Hellenized form of the Assyrian legend makes Sardanapalus the founder of Tarsus, and tells how he recorded on his tomb at Anchiale, thirteen miles south-east from Tarsus, that he had built those two cities in one day. The story ran that on this tomb was a statue representing Sardanapalus snapping his fingers, with an inscription in Assyrian letters : " Sardanapalus, son of Anakyndaraxes, built Anchiale and Tarsus in one day. Eat, drink, and play, for everything else is not worth this (action of the fingers)." The poet Choirilos versified the sentiment, and Aristotle quoted it, remarking that it was more worthy to be written on the grave of an ox than on the tomb of a king. There is some difference among the ancient authorities as to whether this monument was in Anchiale or in Nineveh ; but the authority of Aristoboulos may be accepted that it was really at Anchiale. It was an easy error to transfer the monument of an Assyrian king from Anchiale to Nineveh. The opposite process could not have occurred to any one.

The form of this legend shows that it is founded partly on a historical fact, viz., the Assyrian domination, and

partly on the misunderstanding of a work of art, probably a relief, in which a male figure was represented with right hand raised in front of the face. This attitude, which appears in the reliefs at Ibriz and Iflatun-Bunar, on the north side of Taurus, was readily misinterpreted by the Greeks in later time as expressing the snapping of the fingers; and the second part of the legend expresses the sentiment by which the later people explained the gesture shown in the relief. The Assyrian letters were either cuneiform, or more probably Hittite hieroglyphics; and were certainly quite unintelligible to the Greeks when this legend took form.

Thus on a real monument at Anchiale was founded this mere legend, in itself devoid of any truth or historic value, and yet veiling real historical facts.

From such legends as these it has been quite unreasonably inferred by some scholars that Tarsus was an Assyrian foundation. Such a literal method of interpreting Greek local legend is never right; and in this case the falseness of the method is demonstrated by the fact that at their first entrance into Cilicia the Assyrians conquered Tarsus, already an important city.

Other legends current locally show that some memory of the old Ionian city was preserved in Tarsus. Athenodorus, the great Tarsian philosopher in the time of Augustus, says that its original name was Parthenia, a purely Greek name, and that it took this name from Parthenius, grandson of Anchiale, the daughter of Iapetos, i.e. Japhet. The Oriental idea that Javan, the "Ionian," was son of Japhet (Gen. x. 2) has been transformed by Greek fancy into this legend, which thus connects the two cities, Anchiale and Tarsus, with Japhet and the Ionians.

Strabo, again, says that the people whom the Greeks called Cilicians had borne at first the name of Hypachaeans,

but afterwards got the name Cilicians from Cilix, son of Agenor, king of Phœnicia. It is very common to find the changes in the history and population of a town expressed in legend as a series of changes of name. In this case the thoroughly Greek-sounding name, Hypachaeans, is an echo of the old Ionian settlement in Cilicia, and Cilix represents the Asiatic, probably Semitic, immigration and conquest.

Other legends current in the later Greek Tarsus made Perseus or Herakles the founder of Tarsus. These, perhaps, are merely Hellenized expressions of the Oriental character of Tarsus. Perseus and Herakles seem to be two names applied by the Greeks to a hero or god of the locality, whose influence in very similar forms can be traced very widely through the eastern parts of Asia Minor. Perhaps it might be discovered, if evidence had been preserved as to the course of Tarsian history, that at different periods the same Anatolian Divine figure was expressed by the Greek element in Tarsus at one time as Perseus and at another time as Herakles. This local hero was treated as a religious expression of historical relations and racial facts.

The Tarsian legends and beliefs regarding Herakles are unknown. He occurs on coins only in stereotyped Greek forms, and he is mentioned by Dion Chrysostom, speaking to the Tarsians, as "your leader," or "ancestor." [1]

The legends of Perseus at Tarsus are better known; they are often represented on coins of the city, though in an obscure and as yet unexplained form, quite different from the ordinary Hellenic representations of Perseus. He appears sometimes in company with a fisherman, sometimes greeting Apollo or adoring the image of that god, which is placed on a lofty column, or carrying the image on his

[1] The word ἀρχηγός is used in the sense both of "leader in a migration" and "ancestor and founder of a race."

right hand. It is not possible to consider these in detail without illustrations to show the forms ; and the one thing that can be said with confidence about them is that they show a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental ideas. The Apollo of Tarsian cult as shown on coins is the old Apollo of the Ionians, pre-Hellenic and almost barbarous in type, holding up by the hind legs two wolves, one grasped in each hand ; and Dion Chrysostom speaks of the Tarsian Apollo with the trident, a form in which he approximates to the other Ionian god, Poseidon, with strong emphasis laid on the necessarily maritime character of the Ionian god.

There is apparent in these forms a vague suggestion of strangers, viz., an immigrant and a native people, meeting one another. This east-Anatolian Perseus has a half-Greek look, and he is found in localities such as Iconium, where no very early Greek immigrants can possibly have penetrated, The choice of name may perhaps be due, in some vague, unreasoning, and now unintelligible way, to the Persian domination.

IX. The Revival of Greek Influence.

In a sense this revival begins with the entrance of Alexander the Great into Tarsus in 334 B.C. We cannot doubt that this event strengthened the influence and numbers of the Greek element, which under the Persian rule was apparently in process of being slowly eradicated. Yet the revival of the Greek Tarsus was very slow. It is not even certain, though it is probable, that coins with the types of Alexander the Great were struck at Tarsus. At any rate no coins seem to have been struck by Tarsus as a city during the later fourth or the third century. Freedom and autonomy did not fall at that time to the lot of Tarsus. It was evidently regarded by the Greek kings who ruled it as an

Oriental town, unfitted for the autonomy that belonged to a Greek *polis*.

Cilicia was subject throughout the fourth century to the Greek kings of Syria of the Seleucid dynasty; and those kings were much influenced in their policy by Oriental fashions. They administered the outlying provinces through officers who bore the Persian title of Satrap; and they were not disposed, as their policy in general shows, to encourage everywhere within their Empire the development of Greek autonomy with the accompanying freedom of spirit and conduct. Wherever the growth of an autonomous city in the Seleucid Empire can be traced, its origin is found to lie in the needs of the central government, requiring a strong garrison city in a district which was threatened. In such cities the Seleucid kings planted new colonies of strangers to the district. The interests of these strangers lay in maintaining the Seleucid power, to which they owed their privileges and their favoured position in their new country.

It is unnecessary here to describe the way in which those Seleucid garrison cities were organized: that has been done sufficiently in the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, chapter xi. A right understanding of their character is essential to a correct appreciation of the society in the Eastern Provinces during the Roman period—the society in which the Christian churches of Asia Minor took their origin. Without a thorough study of those cities, the student of early Christian history of Asia Minor has his view inevitably distorted to a serious degree by preconceptions and prejudices, derived from the classical Greek period and other causes. Almost every city that plays an important part in the early Christian history was founded, or at least refounded and increased in population, by a Seleucid or other monarch from one or another of the various dynasties that ruled over parts of Asia Minor.

The cities are easily recognized as a rule by their names, which were almost always derived from some member of the royal family: Antiocheia, Seleuceia, Apameia, Laodiceia, appear with extraordinary frequency all over the Seleucid Empire. In some cases the new dynastic name soon fell into disuse, and the old native name revived, in the case of cities which had a great early history, and which clung to their identity with real Greek municipal pride. Tarsus was one of this class. Coins prove that for a time it bore the name of Antioch-on-the-Cydnus. But the pride of birth and past history among the Tarsians maintained the individuality and continuity of the city; the new citizens, filled with a sense of its dignity and honour, soon made themselves a real part of the ancient city; and the new name was quickly disused.

X. The Greek Colony of Antiocheia—Tarsus.

During the third century Cilicia lay near the centre of the Seleucid Empire, which extended far beyond it westwards to include Lycaonia, Phrygia and parts of Lydia (during part of the century down even to the Aegean coasts). In this period Cilicia was the helpless slave of the dynasty; no danger was to be apprehended from it; and there was no reason to make any of its towns into garrison cities. Accordingly, none of the Cilician cities struck autonomous coins during the third century: the imperial Seleucid money was the only coinage.

The peace of 189 B.C. inaugurated new conditions in Asia Minor. Lydia, Phrygia and Lycaonia were taken from the Seleucid king Antiochus the Great; the Taurus was now made the limit of his Empire; and Cilicia became a frontier country. It was not long till these new conditions began to produce their inevitable effect. The Cilician cities, especially those of the western half of the country, could not

but feel conscious of their growing influence. They saw that across the frontier on the north-west there was a much freer country, subject only to the mild Pergamenian rule, and barely to that, for Lycaonia was so distant from Pergamum and so difficult of access (especially when Pisidian Antioch and Apollonia were free) that the kings could not exercise real authority over it. The very sight and neighbourhood of freedom in others produces an ennobling effect; and we cannot doubt that some of the Tarsians after their long hopeless slavery began now to remember that their city had once been great, energetic, and free.

These changed conditions resulted at last in the reorganization of Tarsus as an autonomous city. Fortunately, a brief reference in 2 Maccabees iv. 30 f., 36, when taken in connexion with the rest of the evidence bearing on this subject, enables us to restore with practical certainty the date and circumstances in which the change was brought about.

This is a decisive event for the whole future history of Tarsus. Everything hereafter depends on this establishment of Tarsus on the footing of an autonomous Greek city, striking its own coinage as a self-governing state. The evidence, therefore, must be carefully scrutinized.

In the first place we notice that the new name, under which Tarsus began its autonomous career, was Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus. It was, therefore, refounded by a king named Antiochus. The coins were struck under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes,[1] and, therefore, the name must have been given either in his reign, 175–164 A.D., or in that of his father, Antiochus III. the Great, between the peace of 189 and his death in 187. It is quite improbable that the effect of the changed conditions would be realized in Cilicia and at the court of Antiochus within so short a time as two years, 189–187: moreover, if the refoundation of Tarsus as Anti-

[1] The dates of the coins are, of course, taken from the numismatic authorities, and need no discussion.

ocheia took place during those two years, it might reasonably be expected that coins struck under the founder or his son Seleucus IV., 187–175, would be known.

The possibility that Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus was founded under Seleucus IV. and named after his father, may be set aside as too remote: it is an accepted rule that cities which were named after one of the Seleucid kings must be presumed to bear the founder's name. The arguments for this are overwhelming. Clear evidence must be given for any theory of an exception to the rule; and an exception would most naturally come at the very beginning of the reign of Seleucus IV., which would leave the above arguments almost as strong as if the foundation were placed under Antiochus III.

The fair and reasonable conclusion is that the refoundation took place under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, 175–164 B.C., and that it was followed at once, and as it were ratified, by the issue of coins, which demonstrated to all the world the existence of this new city. It required about fifteen or twenty years till the effect of the changed Cilician relations to the Seleucid Empire became obvious and demanded a change in the dynastic policy.

All this is so natural, and follows so plainly from the facts and coins, that it might have been stated in a sentence as self-evident, were it not for the rigid and almost hostile scrutiny to which everything is subjected that bears, however remotely, on the books of the New Testament and on St. Paul.

In the second place we turn to 2 Maccabees iv. 30 f., 36. About 171 B.C., "they of Tarsus and Mallos made insurrection, because they were given to the king's concubine, called Antiochis.[1] Then came the king in all haste to appease

[1] There is some doubt as to the status of Antiochis. It is possible that she was legally the second wife of the king, and that the disparaging term in 2 Maccabees is due to Jewish hatred of their enemy.

matters." . . . "And when the king was come again from the places about Cilicia," etc.

It was quite a regular practice under the Persian kings (and doubtless long before the Persian Empire began) for the monarch to give to his favourites the lordship and taxes of some town or towns in his dominions. This Oriental way was followed by Antiochus IV. in regard to Tarsus and Mallos: we have already pointed out that various other Oriental customs persisted under the Seleucid kings. It is clear that those two cities were not autonomous, otherwise Antiochus could not have bestowed them on Antiochis. It is equally clear that the cities were not mere unresisting, slavish Oriental towns, resigned to live under the heel and the all-powerful will of a despot. In the third century, so far as we can judge, the word of the king had been the law in Cilicia, and the Cilician towns would necessarily have accepted their fate, which after all was not likely to be any worse under Antiochis than under Antiochus: there is no appearance that cities given in this fashion by a king were worse off than their neighbours. But now, in 171 B.C., the Greek spirit of freedom was reviving. Those two cities were precisely the two old Greek settlements in Cilicia, according to the view already stated; and that view (though still only a hypothesis, perhaps) makes the action that followed in 171 seem quite natural.[1] The Greek spirit revolted against the indignity of being handed over at the caprice of a despot. Mutiny broke out, and became so dangerous that the king had to intervene in person.

Another remarkable feature about this incident is, that there was no thought in the king's mind—on this point the very clear statement is conclusive—of military force or

[1] It would have been much harder to understand the facts if such purely Cilician and non-Greek cities as Adana and Anazarba had begun the insurrection.

compulsion to be exercised against the two cities. The king saw at once that it was a case for arrangement and diplomacy. He went "in all haste to appease matters." Arguing from the facts stated above, we must infer that the new conditions in Cilicia had already attracted his attention; and he had recognized that he had gone too far, and that he must strengthen the feeling of friendliness in Cilicia to himself and his dynasty by conceding something to the claims of the cities: we must also infer that he saw at once what form his action must take, and that he proceeded to get the consent of, and arrange terms with, the two cities.

Following the account which has been stated above as to the methods of Seleucid policy, we can therefore say with confidence that a compromise was arrived at. Tarsus was recognized as a self-governing city, but a body of new citizens, who owed their privileges to the king and were likely to be loyal to him, was added to the population. Tarsus now obtained the right to strike coins, the symbol and proof of municipal independence and autonomy; but it had to take the new name Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus, as a mark of its loyalty. This name, however, lasted only a few years, till the death of Antiochus.

It has a distinct bearing on this subject that Antiochus IV. Epiphanes made sweeping reforms and changes in Cilicia. Alexandria-near-Issus began at this time to strike autonomous coins; and Adana, Aegeae, Hieropolis-on-the-Pyramus and Mopsouestia all were permitted to strike coins with the effigy of Antiochus IV. on the obverse, but with their own types and names on the reverse—a privilege beyond what they had before possessed, though much less honourable than the purely autonomous coinage which was permitted at Tarsus and Alexandria-near-Issus. Adana was honoured with the name Antiocheia-on-the-Sarus, but

this more purely Oriental city did not receive such a degree of freedom and self-government as Tarsus.[1]

Mopsouestia, at the crossing of the Pyramus, on the one great road leading from east to west across Cilicia, occupied a peculiarly important position, yet one in which it could never become a great city. It was not strong defensively, and yet it must inevitably be defended and attacked in every war that occurred for the mastery of Cilicia. It barred the road; but it was too weak in situation to bar it effectively. When the kings began to recognize after 189 B.C. that they must study and prepare to defend Cilicia more carefully than in the previous century, this guardian city of the road was the first to attract attention. Seleucus IV., 187–175, perceived its importance, and called it Seleuceia-on-the-Pyramus. The bestowal of this name implies a certain honour and privilege, which we cannot specify. It did not apparently carry the right of coinage, but it must beyond all question have been accompanied by strengthening of the fortifications and improvement of the roads beside the bridge and the city. In the next reign this new city was allowed to strike coins on the same footing as Adana, Aegeae, and Hieropolis; the coins at first bore the name of Seleuceia-on-the-Pyramus, but quickly the old name reappeared, and even under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes the coins began to bear the name of Mopsus.

It would illuminate this subject further, if the action of Antiochus at Mallos could be certainly determined. A city named Antiocheia was founded at Magarsus or at Mallos; but the situation of this new city, and the relation of Mallos to Magarsus, are quite uncertain; probably Magarsus was

[1] Possibly also Epiphaneia was founded or refounded by Antiochus Epiphanes; but it played no part in history till a much later period, and Epiphanes was a common epithet of the kings in this Syro-Cilician region during the following period, one of whom may have founded this city. It began to strike coins only in the Roman period under Hadrian.

simply the port-town of Mallos, and the relation between the two was as intimate, and as obscure to us, as that between Athens and Piraeus or between Notion and Colophon. Coins have been attributed to this Antiocheia-on-the-Pyramus; coins have also been attributed to Magarsus; but these are all rather uncertain. It seems highly probable that Antiocheia-on-the-Pyramus, like those on the Cydnus and the Sarus, was founded by Antiochus Epiphanes at this time as part of his scheme for pacifying and reorganizing Cilicia. It is, however, certain that Mallos was treated far less generously than Tarsus. Mallos was more remote from the frontier, and less important, than Tarsus; perhaps also the Greek element, always prone to discontent and mutiny, was too strong there[1]; and Mallos sunk into insignificance during this whole period, reviving again to a small degree in numismatic history about 146 B.C. It is possible, and even probable, that Antiocheia-on-the Pyramus was founded at Magarsus with the intention of depreciating and ruining Mallos.

This long survey of the facts has been necessary in order to prove conclusively the importance of the epoch of reorganization about 175–170. Cilicia was then recast, and its cities were reinvigorated. New life was breathed into a country, which for centuries had been plunged in Orientalism and ruled by despotism. But, of all the cities, Tarsus was treated most honourably (setting aside Alexandria as unimportant). It now stands forth as the prominent city of the whole country, with the fullest rights of self-government and coinage permitted to any town in the Seleucid Empire. The Tarsus of St. Paul dates in a very

[1] The rich coinage of Mallos, thoroughly Greek in character during the sixth and early fifth centuries, as M. Imhoof Blumer was the first to recognize it, proves how much more Greek Mallos was than Tarsus. The Greek element in those colonies had to be counterbalanced by a strong Oriental element, before it was sufficiently amenable to Seleucid requirements.

real sense from the re-foundation by Antiochus Epiphanes.

Now at last Tarsus had the status of an autonomous city, choosing its own magistrates and making its own laws, though doubtless subject in all foreign relations to the king. For its future history much depended on the new citizens and the terms of the new constitution ; and we must ask what evidence there is as to them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

A CAREFUL contribution to the study of early Christianity in its doctrinal aspect has just been made by Dr. W. Lütgert, the Halle scholar, in his monograph on *Love in the New Testament* (Leipzig, 1905). After two introductory chapters, the second of which lays stress on the influence of Hellenism in fostering such concepts as " virtue," " friendship," and " philanthropy," within pre-Christian Judaism, the author proceeds to discuss the New Testament teaching in detail. Paul and Jesus, he argues, were at one on this point. For, though the former laid exceptional stress on the mortification of one's natural affections in order to gain true love, the enemy of the latter was not for Paul, any more than for Jesus, merely hate, but that natural love which leads men to live to themselves and by themselves—the love of one's own soul and self which ruins life. To overcome this, Paul, no doubt, fell back on the death of Christ. But, Lütgert argues, even in the synoptic Gospels a similar method is assumed, for the elimination of self-love there is not only Christ's command, but His act. " Paul's conclusion, that fellowship with Jesus means fellowship with His death, and consequently the death of one's own Ego and the birth of love, amounts to the same thing as the saying of Jesus that following Him must involve the will to die,