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.

VIII.

In two of the inscriptions, *C.I.L.* iii. 251 and 6753, a procurator of Galatia is mentioned: this title is evidently equivalent to 'procurator of the Galatic province' (*C.I.G.* 3991, ἐπίτροπος Γαλατικῆς ἐπαρχείας, referred to in 1 (1) of this section). 'Galatia' and 'Galatic province' are names of the great composite province. Similarly in *C.I.L.* iii. 6753, an official who had been procurator of Galatia is promoted to be procurator of the Imperial establishment of gladiators (*proc. fam. glad.*) throughout Asia, Bithynia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Cyprus. This list enumerates all the provinces of the whole of Asia Minor (to use the modern name for the entire Anatolian peninsula); and Galatia must therefore mean the great composite province, the sense which the name bears in another part of the same inscription (as quoted above in this paragraph).

To those who have not sufficiently appreciated the extreme complexity of administrative divisions in central Anatolia some difficulty might be caused, and a ground for making objection provided, by the fact that in *C.I.L.* iii. 6753 Pontus[1] and Paphlagonia are mentioned in addition to Galatia: these were parts of the complete vast province Galatia. Pontus and Paphlagonia, however, were not in the original province Galatia, as that province was constituted in 25 B.C., but were subsequent accretions, Paphlagonia in 5 B.C., Pontus at various later times. In St. Paul's time a large part of Pontus was ruled by King Polemon II., and was outside the province: it was incorporated in the province only in 63–64 A.D. As regards procuratorial arrangements, Pontus was grouped apart from the province Galatia: the procurator of Galatia (*i.e.* the Galatic eparchy or province) was procurator of the original province Galatia, including Lycaonia, Isauria, Phrygia, and Pisidia. When Pontus was taken into this province, it was for purposes of the fiscus grouped separately, and placed under the procurator of Bithynia-Pontus: this we learn, not only from iii. 6753, but also from iii. 251, where a procurator of Galatia is said to have acted also as temporary governor of Galatia and Pontus (owing doubtless to the illness or death of the legate-governor): this means that as procurator he administered only the original province Galatia, but as *vice praesidis* he governed Galatia along with Pontus. The same applies to Paphlagonia.[2]

Exceptional importance attaches to one example, which has been widely misinterpreted as belonging to the second type: see later under 3.

2. *The Eastern Type.*—Much the commonest way of designating the province Galatia in the local inscriptions is to enumerate the *regiones* of which it was composed. This is the method, especially on provincial milestones of the period 72–107 A.D., when Galatia was united under one governor with Cappadocia. The enumeration then makes an imposing list, even though it is seldom quite complete, as one or even two of the parts are usually omitted in irregular and accidental fashion.[3] The custom of naming provinces in this way spread widely in the East, and arose from a combination of causes. The double province of *Lycia et Pamphylia*, two provinces under one governor,

[1] Pontus here means Pontus Galaticus, Polemoniacus, Cappadocicus (all three being parts of Cappadocia prov.), and not the Ora Pontica (which is included under Bithynia). There was apparently an exceptionally large number of gladiators in those barbarous regions (where a sword stuck in the ground was a god, or a symbol of god). More thoroughly Greek regions did not love gladiators (*Cit. and Bish. of Phr.* i. p. 77). In Phrygia Galatica there were gladiators, as is proved by an inscription (which Mr. Anderson will soon publish in the *Journal of Roman Studies*) and by the Acta of Paul and Thekla.

[2] That procuratorial spheres of administration differed in extent from the provinces governed by legates is well known (see, for example, Brandis on Galatia, as quoted in this section under 1 (1) first paragraph). A procurator's sphere of administration was called his *provincia*, and this double use of the same word increases the complexity. *Provincia* strictly means 'sphere of duty.'

[3] An example is given later in this section of two enumerations of the provinces governed by the same procurator, which complete one another.

each with distinct constitution, is regularly called by the double name; but in one inscription it is called Lycia-Pamphylia-Isauria.[1] This triple name was due to the inclusion of some west-Isaurian towns in Pamphylia. It does not imply (as is by some modern writers assumed) that the whole of Isauria was detached from the province of the Three Eparchial (Cilicia-Lycaonia-Isauria) and incorporated for a few years in Lycia-Pamphylia, for Ptolemy's list shows that several western towns of Cilicia Tracheia (*i.e.* Isauria)[2] were included from the beginning in the province Pamphylia. In this case mere ostentation of extensive power seems to have been the motive; and the same motive acted to some degree in other cases. In the second place, on milestones the mere geographical meaning of the names exercised some influence: 'the Emperor remade the roads throughout Galatia-Cappadocia-Lycaonia-Pontus-Pisidia, etc.' These two motives readily combine.

The correct order in designating the great double province between 72 and 107 A.D. was *provincia* (less idiomatically *provinciae*) *Galatia Cappadocia Pontus Pisidia Paphlagonia Lycaonia Armenia Minor*; the unified names of the two parts of the double province are placed first, then follow the names of regions of Galatia, then Armenia which was a part of Cappadocia.[3] The revival in official nomenclature of the names of parts of this huge province was facilitated by the fact mentioned above, that the national names of the parts probably remained in official use as designations of the *Regiones* into which the province was divided for administrative purposes, *e.g.* Pisidia with metropolis Sagalassos, Phrygia with metropolis Antioch, Lycaonia with no metropolis but two co-ordinate cities[4] (as stated correctly in Ac 14[7]), and so on. Similarly, though no one can doubt that Cappadocia Provincia was regularly called by that name, yet in one case of the procuratorial class we find it described with all its additions, *provincia Cappadocia item Pontus Mediterraneus et Armenia Minor et Lycaonia Antiochiana* (about 166 A.D.), *C.I.L.* v. 8660. Here both ostentation and the desire to show clearly the extent of the procuratorial administrative sphere are operative.

The chief cause, however, was the gradual change in the force of the Roman provincial conception and idea. The idea which was in the time of Augustus entertained about the nature and function of a "province" in the East, is excellently illustrated by the use of ἔθνος as the Greek translation of the term *provincia*: ἡ Ασία τὸ ἔθνος is used by Dion Cassius LIV. 30 as equivalent to *Asia Provincia*. The same usage appears in inscriptions: the proconsuls of Asia are ἡγεμόνες τοῦ ἔθνους (*Inscr. Br. Mus.* 387: cp. *C.I.G.* 2802, etc.). Yet Asia was quite as heterogeneous as Galatia: it contained as many and as diverse nations and races. These, however, are all regarded by a sort of genealogical fiction as made into one stock by the fact that they are united as a single constituent part of the great Empire.[5] Asia is a unit of the Empire: so is Galatia. The province is the Roman substitute for the old national unity, which was reckoned non-Roman. I may be allowed here to quote in illustration a few sentences, written from a very different point of view in my *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, i. p. 12:—

'The main aim of Roman policy was to foster the feeling of unity and the sense of patriotism. It discouraged the old tribal and national divisions; but it made the serious error of arranging its political divisions, both provinces and sub-divisions of provinces, in defiance of the lines of national demarcation.[6] The boundaries of both provinces Asia and Galatia were purely accidental in origin. Yet for a time Roman policy partially succeeded in improving these new divisions: the people of all the parts of the province Asia accepted the name

[1] *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xi. p. 348 f.

[2] The name Isauria was not originally used to designate the vast country of Tracheia. Strabo (p. 576) speaks of Isaurica as a district round the two towns Isaura. In course of time the name Isauria grew wider in denotation, and the name Cilicia Tracheia ceased to be used.

[3] Brandis in his article on Galatia (p. 551), regards Armenia as part of provincia Galatia. For this opinion I find no justification: *C.I.L.* iii. 291 (better 6818) seems to mention Armenia as if it were part of prov. Galatia, but the probability seems to be that Cappadocia is omitted by a slip of the engraver, and that the inscription belongs to the age of the great double province Galatia-Cappadocia. One or more names often drop out of these long lists.

[4] From 25 B.C. to 41 A.D. it is probable that Laranda was metropolis of Lycaonia; but in 41 Claudius, evidently, gave Laranda to Antiochus of Commagene, and Derbe became a frontier city and *limen*.

[5] The same is the case with Lycia: τὸ Λυκίων ἔθνος is *provincia Lycia* (Le Bass Wadd. 1219, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1886, p. 48, and frequently). Strictly speaking, ἔθνος implied tribal unity: the three Gaulish tribes of Galatia were τὰ τρία ἔθνη.

[6] Compare Strabo, p. 629, as already referred to.

Asians. This was absolutely necessary where the unity of several parts of these two great provinces had to be expressed: no single name for the people of Mysia and Phrygia and Caria could be found except Asians.

'But the differences of national character were too great to be set aside so completely as the unifying policy of the first century tried to do. These differences lasted and survived the great composite provinces. Roman Asia existed for four centuries, but in the long run it produced no real effect on the popular feeling; and the moment that the common governmental unity ceased to exist, there remained no trace of a political fact that had lasted so long. Yet the ultimate failure of the policy must not blind us to its importance, or to the earnestness and vigour with which it was carried out under the early Empire.'

In the early Imperial system the province was a powerful and vital idea. The old idea of separate nations was done away in the Roman unity. The very mention of a nation, except as a mere geographical term, implied foreignness and exclusion from the Empire: slaves, auxiliary troops, and *classiarii* (sailors, for the fleet was in origin non-Roman and servile, and always retained servile terminology[1]) were Phryges, etc.: the occurrence of the name Λυκαόνων on coins implies that part of Lycaonia was non-Roman (as is proved also by other evidence). The possession and the enjoyment of legal rights in the Empire came through the enrolment in a province. Freeborn members of the Empire were either *cives Romani* or *Latini*, or provincials. A name for the provincial unity was a necessity of the Roman idea, *e.g.*, Asia, Achaia, Macedonia, Galatia; and it follows as a matter of course that the people of the province were summed up as Achaei, Asiani, Galatae, Macedones, etc.; they are the ἔθνος = *provincia*, and an *ethnos* implies an ethnic.

Yet this Roman idea, though insisted on for a time, could not establish itself permanently; and the old national idea ultimately proved stronger in the East. The Orient conquered Rome in the end; Phrygians, Isaurians, Arabs, Armenians, sat on the throne of the Cæsars; and finally Turks seized it. The old nations broke up the provincial idea.

A person who was not a Roman citizen belonged to the Empire only as a provincial, *i.e.* member of a province. It might be necessary to describe him by his nation; but to do so was to emphasize his non-Roman origin. Those who regarded him as a part of the Empire must regard him as a provincial—*i.e.* they must designate him by his province or by his city, for cities were the units out of which the province and the Empire were built up. Provinces were, of course, generally designated by a national name, such as Syria, Sicily, Sardinia. Thus the word Syrian or Sicilian might be applied to a person in two totally different senses, denoting either the nation or the province to which he belonged; and the context alone can determine which of the two senses was intended. But there were many national names which were not names of provinces; and they are unambiguous.

It is due, probably, to the revival of the old national feeling that the word ἔθνος in the plural came to be used in the third century to denote the old national constituents of the province Asia, *i.e.* Lydia, Caria, etc. Modestinus the jurist, commenting on a rescript of Pius, explains that the μέγισται πόλεις in Asia mentioned in that rescript are the μητροπόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν: it is clear that these ἔθνη are the Lydian, Carian, and other races which were all united in the province Asia. This revival of national feeling had its effect in 295 A.D., when Asia provincia was broken up into the provinces Hellespontus, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, and Asia proper.

The province of Bithynia-Pontus is apparently an exception. I do not profess to explain the facts fully, but note that Ptolemy calls this province by the simple name Bithynia, and regards the whole as a single province, whereas he treats *Lycia et Pamphylia* as two distinct provinces under one governor. If we knew fully the constitution of Bithynia, probably there would be no difficulty; but, in any case, it is impossible here to examine the scanty evidence that we possess. Much difficulty has been caused by the common confusion between different senses of the term Pontus.[2]

[1] Mommsen in *Hermes*, 1884, p. 33 ff. This point is discussed more fully in my article in *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 37. It should be noted, as it makes the principle very clear.

[2] The various meanings of Pontus are explained in my article in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.*