

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

69a  ; on f. 79a  ; on f. 89a traces of  ; on f. 99a 'no trace. Perhaps goat-skins are rendered to.

This book was seen at the Convent by Dr. Rendel Harris in 1889, when he photographed some pages of it. When he returned with us on our second visit in 1893, and Mrs. Lewis was making her catalogue of the Syriac books, it could not be found. As Dr. Harris was convinced that it had been stolen since he had seen it in 1889, Mrs. Lewis asked him to give her one of the photographs he had taken from it on his former visit, that she might make from it the frontispiece to her catalogue (*Studia Sinaitica*, No. i.). This was accordingly done, with a view to discovering the whereabouts of the MS. and, if possible, its thief.

One Sunday in January 1895, a Cairo dealer brought some MSS to Mrs. Lewis and me for sale at our hotel. While I was examining an Arabic codex, Mrs. Lewis said to me in a mysterious whisper, 'It is stolen,' and I saw her go to a sofa where she had laid this identical volume open, with her catalogue in her hand. A glance from the frontispiece to the MS. was sufficient to assure her of its identity, and she asked the dealer to allow her to keep the latter for twenty-four hours. When he was gone, we consulted as to what we should do. There were two plans open to us. One was to buy the MS. and say nothing, which would have been the one more to our advantage in future transactions with dealers; the other being to denounce the theft. The second course recommended itself to our conscience, besides which it would have seemed a shady transaction for my sister to buy the very volume she had professed to take the means to protect for

the Sinai Library. To do so might even have led the monks to suspect that we had stolen it ourselves. We therefore wrote to the agent of the Branch Convent in Cairo, and he came to consult with us. On Monday morning we took it to the British consul, Mr. Borg, along with the catalogue, and a glance at the frontispiece of the latter beside its corresponding page in the book was sufficient to convince him that we were not mistaken. The book was accordingly seized in our rooms that afternoon by an agent of the Mixed Tribunal. When the dealer came in the evening, there was a scene in the manager's room; happily the agent of the Convent happened to call about the same time, and the two men fought out the matter between them. A suit was brought by Archbishop Porphyrios against the dealer; it was decided during our absence at the Convent; and we saw no account of it; but we understood that it could not be proved that the volume had actually been stolen, and therefore the Court kept possession of it. This unsatisfactory state of things lasted till last year, 1901, when the MS. was released on payment of £25 by the archbishop and monks. It was shown us with much satisfaction by Father Polycarp, the librarian, and we have the consciousness at least that we have acted in a straightforward way with regard to it. I have now photographed the whole of it, and copied all its weak places with the help of the re-agent. It is a very fine manuscript. I have compared its text on some dozen pages with those published by Lagarde and Ceriani from the ancient MSS at Milan and in the British Museum. It is not exactly identical with either of these, but it does not yield to them in the purity of its text. Until I can develop all my 208 photographs of it, its exact value can hardly be determined.

The South-Galatian Theory.

BY THE REV. DAWSON WALKER, M.A., DURHAM.

THOSE of us who have been converted to Professor Ramsay's view on the locality of the Galatian churches have to reckon with the fact that certain English scholars, of acknowledged eminence in this field of study, still decline to come over to his side. Two notable examples

are Professor Findlay and Professor Chase. The latter gave emphatic expression to his dissent in the *Expositor* soon after the publication of the *Church in the Roman Empire*, and we expect with keenest interest a further statement of his views in his *Commentary on the Acts* in the 'International

Critical Commentary.' Professor Findlay has in two places indicated the reasons why he cannot accept the South-Galatian theory: in a postscript to the third edition of his invaluable book on *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, and in his article on 'Paul' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. The position is substantially the same in both places, but the postscript gives it in a form that most easily lends itself to discussion.

The first objection is based on the language of Ac 16⁶.¹ Professor Findlay denies that v.⁶ is recapitulatory of vv.⁴ and ⁵; he also agrees with the Revisers in treating the participle *κωλυθέντες* as *causal*. 'They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia "because they were" forbidden to preach the word in Asia.' (This is the point on which Professor Chase laid such great emphasis in the *Expositor*, 1893, vol. viii. pp. 409-411.) He thinks the 'Phrygian and Galatian country' means the country lying north and north-east of Antioch, and says, 'Under the Roman government *surely* (the italics are mine) some passable road existed from Antioch, "the governing and military centre of the southern half of the vast province of Galatia," to Ancyra, its capital city.'

Now are not the words introduced by this 'surely' a little too vague for the purposes of a definite argument? The supposition may turn out to be true; but a simple '*must have been*' is too *à priori* to be very effective as a controversial argument.

Professor Findlay's second point is that Professor Ramsay is compelled by his theory to place Galatians 'in the first group of Epistles with 1 and 2 Thessalonians, instead of the second,' whereas 'Lightfoot's conclusion that Galatians comes between 2 Corinthians and Romans will not easily be set aside.' To this last remark I assent entirely. Lightfoot's argument for the position of the Epistle among the Pauline writings seems to me to be unanswerable. Mr. Askwith, however, has shown that if τὸ πρότερον (Gal 4¹⁸) be translated simply *formerly* instead of *on the former visit* (of two), those who hold the South-Galatian theory are not necessarily compelled to agree with Professor Ramsay's dating of the Epistle: as he says 'the words τὸ πρότερον seem to me to be absolutely neutral.'

Professor Findlay's second point, therefore, may call for an answer from Professor Ramsay; but it

¹ According to the reading adopted by the Revisers.

does not affect those holders of the South-Galatian theory who are still able to accept Lightfoot's dating of the Epistle.

In the third place, Professor Findlay holds that the references to Barnabas in the Epistle to the Galatians are hard to reconcile with the South-Galatian theory. The Churches of the First Missionary Journey owed allegiance to Barnabas as well as to Paul. Yet Paul only refers thrice to Barnabas—once in terms of condemnation—and thus seems to ignore 'the paternal rights and interest' of Barnabas in these churches, and so seems to have 'elbowed him out of the partnership.' Professor Findlay thinks that all this is quite inconsistent with Paul's habit of refraining from interference with another man's sphere of work.

May we not, however, account for Paul's action on other grounds? Since the First Missionary Journey he had had 'a sharp contention' with Barnabas. They had agreed to part, and had gone to different spheres of work. Possibly the breach between them was still so wide that Paul did not care to associate Barnabas with himself in his reproachful Epistle to the Galatian converts. Or, again, may not Paul have felt that the quarrel was solely between *himself* and the Galatian converts, and that the debate must lie solely between them and *himself*? If so, he would naturally leave Barnabas out of the question, and speak in his own name only. Indeed, it is not impossible that the sympathies of Barnabas may have been so much on the side of the Judaizers as to make it out of the question for Paul to claim him as an ally.

The fourth point does not count for very much either way. Professor Ramsay has argued that South Galatia was a district of greater importance than North Galatia in the first century, and that its churches played a larger part in the propagation of the gospel than those of the northern district. Professor Findlay quite rightly argues that Paul need not necessarily have 'written his letters only to churches of the first rank,' and instances the case of Colossæ. He suggests that North Galatia was not so unimportant as Professor Ramsay would have us think. These considerations are interesting, but inconclusive either way. There is one suggestion, however, made by Professor Findlay in this connexion which is open to criticism. He thinks the fact that the gospel had reached Pontus

so soon as is indicated in 1 Peter 1¹ shows that it 'must have travelled to North Galatia early in the apostolic age.' But need the gospel have reached Pontus by way of Galatia at all? Could it not have equally well been taken there by voyagers landing at some of the busy and populous ports on the Pontus coast of the Euxine?¹

Professor Findlay thinks, finally, that if Paul had not evangelized the district 'north of the Syrian high road and put the gospel in the way of reaching the whole of Asia Minor,' he boasts too much in Ro 15¹⁰. Is not this, however, we may ask, to lay too much stress on a statement couched in very general terms? He also thinks it not improbable that the Galatian churches were lost ultimately to the Pauline mission, and that this may explain Luke's brief mention of them in Ac 16⁶. Some such hypothesis becomes almost necessary if the North-Galatian theory be true. If, on other grounds, the South-Galatian theory be accepted, the hypothesis is unnecessary, as the Galatian churches play a very large part in Luke's narrative.

It would seem, then, that Professor Findlay's arguments do not seriously affect the position of those who, while accepting Professor Ramsay's view of the locality of the Galatian churches, prefer to keep Lightfoot's dating of the Epistle to the Galatians. One point, however, calls for a little further attention.

I have always had feelings of suspicion about the rendering of *καλυθέντες* in Ac 16⁶ given by some prominent upholders of the South-Galatian theory—notably Professor Ramsay himself, Mr. Askwith, and lately Mr. Rackham (*Acts*, p. 274). They all agree to make the participle part of the predicate and = *καὶ ἐκωλύθησαν*. Now one cannot help feeling that, if we retain the reading agreed on by the Revisers and Westcott and Hort, the Revisers are right in taking the participle causally. And what is more, if it had simply been a matter of translating the Greek as it stands, and no other considerations had claimed a place in the field, no one would have ever dreamed of translating the words in any other way.

Is it possible to translate *καλυθέντες* causally, with the Revisers, and still retain the South-Galatian theory? I think it is.

Examining the passage in detail we see that the

¹ Hort (following Ewald) supposes that Silvanus, the bearer of 1 Peter, landed at a seaport of Pontus.

last places definitely mentioned are Lystra and Iconium in v.². From there, 'as they went on their way through the cities they delivered them the decrees,' etc. (v.⁴). Now it is not at all improbable that Paul's intention was to go straight forward to Ephesus—but his plans were divinely thwarted. 'Having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia, they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia (v.⁶), i.e. on an itinerant preaching tour. Being excluded from *work* in Asia, Paul and his companions then turned their faces to Bithynia and attempted to reach the province by a route 'over against Mysia' (v.⁷), i.e. by the high road leading up to Dorylæum, and again were divinely thwarted, this time by 'the Spirit of Jesus.' One naturally speculates as to how these divine monitions were conveyed, and I am not at all sure—at the risk of seeming excessively fanciful—that this part of Luke's narrative does not find its interpretation in 2 Co 12⁷⁻⁹.

Let me in the briefest outline recall the circumstances. Paul had had one successful missionary journey. His action there, in admitting Gentiles freely to Christian fellowship, had been challenged by a section of the Church at Jerusalem, and from the resulting conference he had emerged triumphantly. Paul would no doubt realize more vividly than most men the importance of the interests at stake and the greatness of the victory which had been won. It must have been a time of intense spiritual strain and high spiritual exaltation. He went up to Jerusalem for the momentous conference 'by revelation.' 2 Co 12¹ speaks of 'visions and revelations of the Lord.' Soon after the victory was won he proceeded to revisit his converts of the First Missionary Journey—the converts on whose behalf he had won so great a victory. He would then feel eager to press on to a grander sphere of work in Ephesus. Was it not natural that he should feel something of the greatness of the part he had played and so be 'exalted.' But (as he afterwards said) that he 'should not be exalted over much,' there was given to him a thorn in the flesh.'

Is it too fanciful to think that the intervention of the Holy Spirit, preventing him and his companions from working in Asia, came in the form of a distressing illness—a thorn in the flesh which made him for the time being incapable of work? And that when they essayed to find in Bithynia a

worthy sphere for their efforts, 'the Spirit of Jesus' again, by the intervention of the distressful malady, checked the designs of Paul? If Professor Ramsay be right in supposing that Paul's weakness was malarial fever contracted in Pamphylia, which caused him to alter his plans on that occasion too, we have a curious coincidence with 2 Co 12⁸, 'Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.' *Once* in Pamphylia, *once* in Phrygo-Galatia, when he was aiming at Ephesus, and *once* again when Bithynia was his goal, did this trouble come upon him to hinder his work. On each of the three occasions

did he pray for release. But the Master said, 'My power is made perfect in weakness.' Looking back upon these times Paul saw himself, and taught his loving biographer to see that it was the Spirit of Jesus that thus brought him low that he 'should not be exalted over much.'

Whatever be the truth of this supposition—and I do not think it is an utterly impossible one—I feel strongly convinced that the Greek text of Ac 16⁶ compels us to believe that it was *because* Paul and his companions were prevented by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Asia that they went through the Phrygo-Galatian region.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE WORDS OF JESUS.¹

No German book has been more quoted by English scholars for many a day than Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu*. But an English book is always better than a German one to an Englishman, and, besides that, Dalman has worked over his book for this translation, and says it is practically a second edition. The translation is a work of art. Most patient has Professor Kay been to discover the exact shade of the author's meaning, most skilful has he been in finding the exact English to express it. Dr. Dalman himself is no mean English scholar, and co-operated heartily with the translator. Professor Kennedy also lent his aid. It is as satisfactory as one can desire. It does not fall behind Professor Paterson's translation of Schultz's *Old Testament Theology*, the standard and model for the translator of German in our day.

Of the book itself nothing has now to be said. He who does not know that Dalman is necessary, does not know much yet about the study of the New Testament in Greek. There are two recent books, both translated admirably—Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, and Dalman's *Words of Jesus*—on which the ripest scholar and the rawest student can meet. They are not final—they would be

little worth if they were. They may be superseded soon. But no book will supersede them that does not absorb them. And for the present they are the avenues that lead to the freshest and most fruitful fields of New Testament interpretation.

The volume deals with what Dalman calls FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS. Its subjects are: The Sovereignty of God—the Future Age—Eternal Life—the World—the Lord' as a designation for God—the Father in Heaven—Other Divine Names—Evasive or Precautionary Modes of referring to God—the Son of Man—the Son of God—Christ—the Son of David—'The Lord' as a designation of Jesus—'Master' as a designation of Jesus. And the whole is made accessible at any moment by excellent indexes at the end.

IMMANUEL KANT.²

'But how now is it possible to bring together in a unitary view of the world these two independent ways of regarding things,—the scientific explanation and the religious interpretation? Kant's answer is, by means of the distinction between a sensible and a supersensible world. The world which constitutes the object of mathe-

¹ *The Words of Jesus*. By Gustaf Dalman. Authorized English Version by D. M. Kay, B.D., B.Sc. T. & T. Clark.

² *Immanuel Kant: His Life and Doctrines*. By Friedrich Paulsen. Translated from the Revised German Edition by J. E. Creighton and Albert Lefevre. John C. Nimmo.