

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

What were the Churches of Galatia?

BY SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

VII.

XII. THE NAMES OF THE PROVINCE GALATIA.—There are two types of designation for this province during the first century: one type was produced by the unifying and centralizing tendency of the Imperial governor, the other by the separatist and isolating and centrifugal tendency which manifested itself at an early date and slowly broke up the Empire. These two ways of naming the province require careful attention. One is used most frequently in Latin, the other in Greek (though in neither case exclusively): one is usual in the west and in Ancyra, the capital of the province, the other is the prevailing fashion through most of Asia Minor: one may fairly be called the Roman custom, the other is the Græco-Oriental. The former type is shown in two designations, 'Galatia' and 'Galatic Eparchia' (the latter being the Greek form corresponding to a possible Latin form *provincia Galatica*, which is not known in actual use).¹ The second type appears in a number of slight varieties enumerating more or less fully the parts or 'regions' of which the province was composed.

Among the examples analogous to the names Galatia and Galatica Eparchia, one may be quoted. Aquitania or Gallia Aquitanica lay between Garonne and Pyrenees. In 27 B.C. fourteen tribes north of Garonne were added, and the enlarged province Gallia Aquitanica was formed (Pliny, iv. 19, 108), called in inscriptions 'provincia Aquitanica' (so also Pliny, xxvi. 4), or 'Aquitania' simply (Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 76, etc.; Sueton. *Galb.* 6; and inscriptions, e.g. *C.I.L.* xiv. 2925, etc.). This is an exact parallel to the use of 'Galatic Eparchia' and 'Galatia' simply. The people of Aquitanica provincia, whether non-Aquitanian Celts or non-Celtic Aquitanians (who spoke a totally different language, probably of Basque or Iberian type), were summed up as 'Aquitani'; and even 'Aquitani Bituriges' occurs, though the Bituriges were a purely Celtic people, distinguished from the Aquitani by Strabo, p. 191, but incorporated in Aquitanica

in 27 B.C. by Augustus. Just as the non-Aquitanian Celts of the province Aquitania were summed up by the Romans as Aquitani, so the non-Galatian peoples of the province Galatia were known collectively to the Romans as Galatæ.

1. *The Western Type.*—(1) As to the name which was applied in St. Paul's time to the great central province of Asia Minor by the people and the government of the southern cities, Iconium, Apollonia, Antioch, etc., there is known as yet only one epigraphic proof in an inscription of Iconium (*C.I.G.* 3991), of 54 A.D., where the province is called Γαλατική ἐπαρχεία.² Brandis on Galatia (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopædie*, p. 555) objects that this inscription is dedicated to a Procurator, and that procuratorial provinces sometimes varied in boundaries and extent from the provinces governed by legati or by proconsuls.³ But the objection is not pertinent, for the question is not regarding extent and limits, but whether the Iconians would or would not call the province to which they belonged by the name 'Galatic.' Evidently the city of Iconium officially used the term 'Galatic' at the time when St. Paul was travelling there, to designate its provincial relationship: it reckoned itself to be included in the southern extension of the province Galatia. Similarly Luke reckons Iconium as included in the Galatic region, otherwise called Phrygia.

(2) The name ordinarily used by the Romans for this province was simply Galatia. Ptolemy

² In such a matter the official usage is proved by one example quite as conclusively as by ten.

³ He neglects the inscription of south-western Phrygia Galatica, in which the procurator of *C.I.G.* 3991 acts along with the governor of the province Galatia (*Amer. Journ. Arch.* ii. p. 128; *O.G.I.S.* No. 538). He also says that Γαλατικής ἐπαρχείας is markedly divergent from ordinary usage, *procurator Asiæ*, etc., and that analogy would require *procurator Galatiæ* if Galatia was the recognized name. The learned author ought to add that the correct formula is *procurator provinciæ* followed by the name Asiæ, etc., and that it is an abbreviated title when *provinciæ* is omitted: also that ἐπαρχείας is only the translation of *provinciæ*. The important fact is that Iconium officially as a city called itself part of the 'Galatic' province.

¹ Naturally there are not many references to this province in the literature and epigraphy of the West.

gives a chapter to each Roman province of Asia Minor: i. Bithynia-Pontus; ii. Asia; iii. Lycia; iv. Galatia (including as parts of it the regions Paphlagonia, tribal Galatia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Isauria), v. Pamphylia,¹ vi. Cappadocia. Pliny, v. 146, enumerates under his term Galatia² cities of Paphlagonia, Pontus Galaticus, tribal Galatia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Pisidian Phrygia. Stephanus Byz. says that Karana was a city of Galatia: now Karana was in Pontus Galaticus. These are three leading geographical authorities. Tacitus (*Hist.* ii. 9; *Ann.* xiii. 35) calls this province Galatia; and so do the late historians (who took the name from older authorities) Syncellus, i. p. 592; Eutropius, vii. 10; *Scr. Hist. Aug.* xxi. 7. 2, xxiv. 18. 8. Professor E. Schürer formerly maintained that the single name Galatia was never used so as to include the southern part of the large province, and that it always meant simply the original Galatia of the three Gaulish tribes in the north; but when his attention was called to the passages of Ptolemy, Pliny, etc., he withdrew from this position, and admitted that the term Galatia was

¹ He gives Lycia and Pamphylia separately; they were strictly two provinces under one governor (as were Galatia and Cappadocia for a considerable time; and later also the Three Eparchies), not like Bithynia-Pontus, Asia, etc. There were a Lykiarch and a Pamphylarch, separate from each other.

² Pliny sometimes confuses the two senses of Galatia because he used authorities who employed it, some in one, some in the other sense (cf. vi.).

used sometimes for the entire Roman province, viz. large parts of Pisidia, Galatia, Lycaonia, Isauria, with Paphlagonia and two regions of Pontus. As his first article in *Zft. f. Protestant. Theologie*, xii., was a long and ambitious one, it is still sometimes quoted as representing his final opinion; and therefore I give the reference to his brief withdrawal, *Theolog. Wochenschrift*, 30th Sept. 1893, p. 507.

Needless to say, the fact that his first reasons could not be maintained made no difference to his opinion: he continued as staunch to the North-Galatian theory as ever. In my first reply to him in *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 180*, p. 34, I quoted only one epigraphic proof, as this appeared to be conclusive (though inadvertently the plural 'inscriptions' was allowed to remain in a correction of text). I will therefore state now the epigraphic evidence at greater length, though not with any attempt at systematic completeness.

The name Galatia simply is used in inscriptions to designate the Roman province as a whole: I have not tried to make a full collection, but quote *C.I.L.* iii. 251, 254, 272 (*Eph. Ep.* v. 51), 6753, vi. 332, 1408, 1409, 1644 add p. 854, viii. 11028 (Mommsen rightly, but not Schmidt), 18270, x. 7583, 7584 (also Allmer-Dissard *Inscr. de Lyon*, i. p. 185, as is quoted, though I have not access to the book, and the inscription may not give any evidence). Some of these need further elucidation.

Contributions and Comments.

Professor Nestle.

THE death of Dr. Eberhard Nestle, of Maulbronn, will probably come as a surprise to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, to which he has long been a constant and valued contributor. He underwent two serious operations at Stuttgart a few months ago, which were reported to be successful as far as surgical skill could go; and his friends hoped that a further span of life and usefulness would be granted to him; but his remains are to be laid in the earth to-day at Maulbronn, at the age of 61.

Others can tell better than I of Dr. Nestle's vast store of learning, and his solid contributions to the sacred literature of our day, affecting our

understanding of both Testaments. His most enduring monument will be the Greek text of the New Testament, compiled at first for the Wurtemberg Bible Society, and afterwards adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Such an achievement by one single scholar is a proof that his sound learning and cautious judgment were appreciated both by his own countrymen and ours. Dr. Nestle spent part of his life as a Professor, but he was perhaps too erudite for the work required of him; and he was transferred from Ulm to Maulbronn, where he had the charge of lecturing to youths who were preparing for the ministry. His duties there gave him ample time for the editing of Holy Scripture.