

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

the unity of the Churches in this land in one great National Church, his work is as purely historical, as little influenced by 'ends,' as any work can be. From step to step he walks with the movement he has undertaken to describe, recalling a vast number of names, and tracing a perpetually changing series of doctrinal developments. And all the while he conceals his own position, so objectively historical is he, till, as the very last sentence in the book, there come the words: 'If His own claim as the Son of God is to be accepted everywhere, by all, and for all time, it will have to be confirmed, not by a mere intellectual apprehension of the facts relating to His life, but by an inward consciousness that He is our Lord and our God,—a vision which flesh and blood cannot reveal unto us.'

Not as a book for a quiet fireside perusal, but as a repository of facts bearing upon a little-studied movement in English theology, the book is most welcome.

'Tell us a story, please!' And the Rev. John Stephenson tells it. His book of Children's Addresses is called *Nuggets of Gold for the Young Folk* (Meyer; 1s. net). It is full of stories. Nor does Mr. Stephenson attempt to appease a bad conscience by drawing their moral. He has no bad conscience. They carry their moral with them, for they are such stories as transcribe actual life typically.

There is a fine encouraging air of optimism blowing through all the writings of Mr. T. R. Glover. It is felt strongly and refreshingly in his latest book, the Angus Lectures for 1912. The object of the book, which is called *The Christian*

Tradition and its Verification (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net), is to commend Christianity in all its essential features to the modern mind. In all its essential features, for in spite of his title Mr. Glover is not a 'traditionalist.' To him as to all Protestants the Christian tradition is subject to criticism. He respects the past, its great minds, its spiritual guidance, but he does not permit the past to bind the hands and feet of the present. He criticises the Christian tradition, or, as he prefers to say, verifies it. He lets some of the things go silently to which our fathers held tenaciously; he holds tenaciously to the rest because it has been verified in other men's experience, and especially because it has been verified in his own.

And his Christianity, thus verified, is no mean product of life and thought. It is a great religion. Many-sided and true, it touches men in all their aspirations and in all their despairs. It uplifts, enlightens, purifies. It makes fit for the inheritance of the saints in light.

We thank Mr. Glover for his optimism about the Christian tradition—not because it is optimism, but because it is verifiable. In such a time as this, his spiritual breeziness is a tonic. We need bracing. His books, and this book above all his books, will brace us to be and to do.

His method is to face the facts and make us face the facts with him. To know what Christianity is, that is to accept Christianity as the religion for us. And he recommends us to do four things to that end: first, to read the Gospels, next, to exercise the historical imagination; then, to cultivate sympathy with the fundamental ideas and feelings of Jesus Christ; and, finally, to know our own insufficiency.

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.

IX.

3. *A Disputed Case*.—An inscription of Bithynia (*Athen. Mittheil.* xii. p. 182) has caused much difficulty and many errors. The matter is complicated and technical; but it has led to so much misinterpretation and false doctrine, which has

spread far and been repeated by distinguished and honoured scholars, that I am forced to treat it in some detail. In this inscription the title 'procurator of Galatia and the adjoining provinces' (ἐπίτροπος Γαλατίας καὶ τῶν ἀνέναντος)

ἐθνῶν) is mentioned. What is this procurator's sphere of duty? And what is the force of ἐθνῶν here?

As to the sphere of duty, the inscription must be classed with *C.I.L.* iii. 6753 (quoted above, (1) of this section), in which a procurator of all the provinces of Asia Minor is mentioned. That such is the right interpretation of the Bithynian inscription is proved by the analogy of *C.I.L.* iii. 6994, 'procurator throughout Asia and the adjoining provinces' (*per Asiam et adhaerentes provincias*). These two titles are equivalents, Greek and Latin. It seems hardly comprehensible that any doubt should be felt on this point; yet many have classed the sense of 'Galatia' in this Bithynian inscription with the Eastern type, and have understood that it describes a procurator of North Galatia and the adjoining provinces Lycaonia, Pisidia, Phrygia, Pontus, etc. They infer that these countries are here called provinces, and that they must therefore have been organized as separate unities from North Galatia, and were never united with it in one province, but remained distinct, though placed, like Lycia and Pamphylia, under one governor. This would imply that the single name Galatia was only a pure blunder, and that there did not exist a single province bearing that name. I know not merely from published sources, but also from private letters, how much this single inscription influenced the mind of respected scholars. It has produced the title which in the Index to *C.I.L.* iii. p. 2459 is applied to the province Galatia,¹ viz. '*Galatia adiunctaque Provinciae*': this title will probably be quoted henceforth by those who do not investigate authorities as if it were authoritative and ancient, whereas it is the offspring of a modern mistranslation. In the article 'Galatia' in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encycl.* iii. p. 550, Dr. Brandis (who champions the North-Galatian view) asks triumphantly, 'if Galatia here means the whole great Roman province, was bedeuten dann τὰ σύνεγγυς ἔθνη?' The reply is so obvious that one marvels how Dr. Brandis missed it: τὰ σύνεγγυς ἔθνη has the same meaning as *adhaerentes provinciae* in *C.I.L.* iii. 6994 (quoted above).² That a

procurator might administer the Emperor's interests over many provinces is well known, and is acknowledged by Dr. Brandis himself in another page of the same article, 555. In the Bithynian inscription Galatia and the adjoining provinces are combined under one procurator. As Galatia was nearest to Claudiopolis and in closest relations with that city, it is mentioned first and the other provinces are summed up as 'adjoining'; whereas in iii. 6994, 6753, Asia, the most generally familiar, is mentioned first, and the other provinces are 'adjoining.' Similar enumerations of provinces associated with Galatia occur in *C.I.L.* x. 7853 and 7854 add. which are almost duplicates, erected to the same person.³

Next, as to the sense of ἔθνη in this Bithynian inscription, I fully agree with Dr. Brandis and the Index-maker of *C.I.L.* iii., that the word should probably be interpreted as 'provinces.'⁴ It must, however, be remembered, that in the third century ἔθνη came to be used as designating the regions or nations of a great composite province, such as Asia: an example is quoted in the present section at the end of 2. If those scholars persist in understanding Γαλατία καὶ τὰ σύνεγγυς ἔθνη as meaning North Galatia together with Lycaonia, Phrygia, Pisidia, Paphlagonia, etc., then they would have to take ἔθνη in this third-century sense, and regard the whole expression as a shortened form of type 2, the regions of the great province. But to me the analogies quoted above are conclusive.

I may add that another use of ἔθνη occurs in inscriptions, where the πόλεις of the province Asia are distinguished from the δῆμοι and the ἔθνη. Dr. Brandis in Pauly-Wissowa ii. 2, 1556 f., interprets this in a sense which Rostowzew rejects in his *Stud.* 2. *Gesch. d. röm. Kolonats*, 1910, p. 262; and we need not enter on the subject (except to say that the latter, one of the most illuminative and accurate of modern writers on the economic organization of the Empire, had before him Dr. Brandis's state-

quoted from him by O. Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 292. 2: (1) Italia; (2) Transpadanum; (3) Galliae, Britannia, Hispaniae, Germaniae, Raetia; (4) Asia, etc.

³ Yet in 7853 Pamphylia is omitted, and in 7854 Asia is omitted. In a long list of this kind, where not strict accuracy, but rather the effect of an imposing series of names, is aimed at, the omission of one name makes little difference. Phrygia is added in this list, as being a very important procuratorial field: a list of *procuratores Phrygiae* is given in my article in *Mélanges d'Arch.* 1882, p. 8.

⁴ See the examples quoted in the present Section under 2.

¹ On p. 2466 of the same Index the province is rightly styled Galatia simply.

² In the case of the *proc. fam. glad.* the following combinations of districts subject to the same procurator are mentioned by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. p. 1071, 2, and

ment, and was forced by the evidence to take a totally different view).

4. *Lukan and Pauline names for the province.*—St. Paul, as a Roman citizen, and as thoroughly Roman in his way of classifying and organizing, uses the Roman name: to him the province is Galatia. Luke, as a Hellene, follows the fashion of the Greek East: he avoids the name Galatia, and thinks of the great province by its regions. He mentions only the three regions that touch his subject, Pisidia, Phrygia, and Lycaonia; but he acknowledges their provincial relation by adding once in each case the epithet 'Galatic.' The Hellenes, as we know at Iconium (see above in this Section under 1), admitted the name 'Galatic province'; and Ptolemy with numerous Anatolian inscriptions attaches the same epithet to Pontus as a region of the province.¹ One who looks at the evidence with any true geographical perception will recognize from chs. 13, 14 alone that Luke regards the regions as we know them in the province, and from 16^b, 18^{2b}, that he is careful to state their position in it. This was pointed out very briefly in my *Comm. on Galatians*, p. 314; but it seems necessary to fight for every foot of ground. No North-Galatian attends to a brief statement. To Luke, probably, the group of the four churches would rank as 'Churches of the Two Galatic Regions' or 'Galatic Churches,' but he would not use the Pauline term 'Churches of Galatia.'

5. *Meaning of the term Galatic.*—Another indefensible blunder must here be mentioned, as it is frequently repeated and appears even in Dr. Brandis's article, p. 517 f.: I have vainly protested against it,² and must now in a word repeat the exposure. In Arrian, *Anab.* ii. 2, 7, the words ἐπὶ Ἀγκύρας τῆς Γαλατικῆς do not mean 'Ancyra of the Galatica (country),' but 'Ancyra the Galatic (as distinguished from the Phrygiac)': compare Strabo, p. 567. No case is known to me in which Galatic as a geographical or classificatory term means anything except 'belonging to the land, or more commonly the province Galatia.'

¹ The epithet Galatic continued to be attached to this part of Pontus, even after it was attached to the province Cappadocia (as it was from about A.D. 107 onwards). The division into *regiones* continued to exist.

² *Hist. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 316. Moreover, the country was not Galatian in the time of the events which Arrian records, but became so years afterwards (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 80 n., 2nd ed.).

In other cases the adjective Γαλατικός means 'belonging to, or characteristic of, Gauls': e.g. ἔργα Γαλατικά, 'brutal deeds such as the Gauls do,' but doubtless 'deeds done by the Gauls' would be ἔργα τῶν Γαλατῶν. There is much need for a study, careful and thorough, of the use of adjectives in -ικός and -ιακός derived from names of people and countries. For example, Cicero has *Pompeiani Achaici*, 'Pompeian troops from the province Achaia,' but *Pompeiani ex Asia ex Africa*, 'Pompeians from the provinces Asia and Africa' (Att. xi. 15. 1).

Accordingly, the adjective Galatic means 'associated with or belonging to Galatia,' χώρα Γαλατική a region which belongs to Galatia, but Γαλατική is not used as a noun equivalent to Γαλατία, though πόλις Γαλατική can quite properly mean a city inhabited by Galatae.

The wide sense of the adjective appears in Plutarch *Caes.* 7, where the vast province or set of provinces given to Caesar in 59 B.C. (including Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul and Illyricum) is called Γαλατική ἐπαρχία. Appian, *Hann.* 7, uses Ἰταλία Γαλατική for Cisalpine Gaul.

We may also quote some analogous cases: *legio Germanica*, *militēs Germanici*, denote troops of Roman citizens stationed in Germany: *cohors Germanorum*, if it occurred, would mean a squadron raised among the peoples of Germania (so *coh. Tungrorum* and many others). Germanicus is an epithet given to a Roman who acquired distinction in Germany or by victory over Germans. *Equites Bithyni* (Juvenal vii. 14) means Bithynians who have become Roman Equites (so *equēs Asiānus*); but *equēs Bithynicus*, *Asiaticus*, would mean a Roman knight resident in (or closely connected with) Bithynia or Asia. Λακωνική (γῆ) means the whole land possessed by the Lacedaemonians, which included at one time all Messenia, whereas Λακωνία in the strictest sense is a narrower country distinguished from Messenia.

In ancient usage the primary idea is the people: from the name of the people is derived that of the country: from the name of the country or people is formed the adjective in -ικός or -ιακός, belonging to, attached to, characteristic of the country or the people. The exceptions are not numerous and really illustrate the nature of the general principle.³

³ Latium (its origin is unknown, but the country in its earliest known form was a religious confederacy of separate states, worshipping Jupiter Latiaris): Aegyptus, Aegyptii,

Daci or Dacae, Dacia,¹ Dacicus: Umbri, Umbria: and so on. The country acquires its name only when it rises to be a political fact. There are many tribes from which no name of a country was ever formed, because their country never acquired a political unity and character, e.g. Ituraei (with adj. Ituraeus), a nomad tribe, Danai, etc.

It must of course be fully admitted that, as time passed, delicacy in the use of this class of adjectives was lost, and distinctions were confused and obliterated; but this was the idiom and the original force. The proper geographical use of this class of names would repay careful study.²

Now, why does not Luke employ the name Galatia, as Paul does? If he had said simply that Antioch and the other cities were cities of Galatia, no difficulty would have been felt. Luke, however, did not write to convince North-Galatian theorists, though Professor A. Steinmann is given to arguing that because the name which Luke uses is not patently inconsistent in his judgment with the North-Galatian theory, therefore the South-Galatian theory is false. Luke had a clear reason for every geographical term that he uses. He did not speak, e.g. of Γαλατικὴ ἐπαρχία, which was far too wide for his purpose, being used for the whole province by the Iconian contemporaries of Paul, whereas his story moved in two regions of the province. Moreover, he would have shrunk from using such a word as Aegyptiacus (the country stood as a power unified from different peoples at the beginning of history): and so on. The character of these is instructive.

¹ Dacia is hardly used except as the Roman province: it had no unified existence, but was a mere set of peoples—Dacia rura—until the Romans gave it character and unity.

² It is remarkable how often, even the most accurate and distinguished of scholars (such as Blass) go wrong in geographical terms. On Asiaticus, etc., see Boot on Cicero, *Att.* i. 17. 9, xi. 14. 1; Ellendt on Cic. *de Orat.*, ii. p. 372. Cicero never used Asianus, evidently regarding it as exotic and non-Latin.

ἐπαρχία, which is not in accord with his style, and became usual only at a later date in this sense.

Luke seems obscure to the moderns only because he is so full of meaning, and scholars who have no knowledge of provincial constitution and have never dreamed that Paul regarded it, find Luke unintelligible because they have not studied to comprehend him. One would not demand that every Biblical scholar should familiarize himself with the constitution of the provinces in the East; but it is urgently needed that they should understand how complicated and difficult that subject is, and should at least know all that is to be known about the province Galatia before deciding the general questions which depend on a knowledge of its constitution.

The western region Luke first introduces in an elaborate narrative: it was the first-fruits of the Gentiles. Then on the second journey he calls it 'the region of Phrygia, which is also Galatic (i.e. part of the Galatic province)'; and on the third journey he names it simply Phrygia (or the Phrygian region: both are possible, and both come to the same result.³) It would not have been intelligible if Luke had at first used the simple name Phrygia without defining it. The obvious meaning which that name would have conveyed to any reader was Great Phrygia, which was part of the province Asia. It was necessary to guard against this misconception; and Luke does so in the first journey by a detailed account of localities, and in the second journey by stating the relation of Phrygia to the Galatic province. Only on the third journey, when all misconception seemed to him to have been obviated by the previous narrative, does he use (like Pliny, etc.) the simple name Phrygia; yet some modern scholars resolutely declare that Phrygia must mean the Great Phrygia of the Province Asia and nothing else.

³ My own opinion is that Luke meant 'the Phrygian Region'; but this is indifferent.

Contributions and Comments.

Acts xv. 3 and the Early Date of Galatians.

In the July issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Mr. Emmet, who has been for some years a consistent advocate of a pre-conciliar date for Galatians, seeks

to weaken the force of my objection to that date based on Ac 15³ (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, May 1913) on the ground that it is 'an argument from silence.' With all due respect to Mr. Emmet I must demur to that statement. If the defection of the Galatian Churches was actually in progress when