

We are so apt to fancy that God's purpose concerning us must surely be fulfilled if we succeed in doing some grand and beneficent work for the good of mankind. But surely God is far more pleased if we are steadily growing more grand and noble and beautiful ourselves—and the two things do not necessarily go together at the beginning. When I say 'at the beginning,' I mean on this side of death, for death marks off a very short space of our life. It is certainly true that every man shall reap the harvest of good or evil that he has sown; but the better the harvest is, the longer he may have to wait for it. And we can well afford to wait. Yes, if need be, to wait until we see things as they really are in the clearer light beyond the veil of death—for we have all eternity to enjoy the harvest. All good work is put into God's hands, and He will never let it fail in the long run, though it may appear to fail at first. And all bad work is playing into the hands of Satan, and will certainly bear its bitter fruit. 'God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' To do wrong is to be sure of failure, while to do right is to place one's self in the army of the Divine Conqueror, and to be sure of lasting victory in the end. God's great 'Well Done!' will not necessarily be given to those who have successfully carried out great and world-wide schemes for good, but belongs to those, and those alone, who have been good and faithful servants. No matter what your position may be, nor how cramped your circumstances, you have as good a chance of winning that glorious commendation as any one in this boundless universe. No one can make you a failure—no one but yourself—for faithfulness is always success, and you can be faithful if you will. To you has this inspiring promise been spoken: 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.'¹

Speak, History, who are life's victors? unroll thy long annals and say—

Are they those whom the world called the victors, who won the success of the day?

The martyrs, or Nero? the Spartans who fell at Thermopylæ's tryst,

Or the Persians and Xerxes? his judges, or Socrates? Pilate, or Christ?

(2) Then there is the other side of the matter. What does Christ Jesus bid us do concerning

¹ D. Farncomb, *The Vision of His Face*, 189.

man? What is our relation to the human race? His life tells us what that is. It is a relation of absolute sacrifice of self. He commands—and He lived out this command—that we should, hour by hour, devote our life, everything that we are and have, to the love of the human race; to promote its spiritual, imaginative, intellectual, and moral growth; to surrender our very being, save that which we have in God, for the collective whole. And we are only not to surrender that being which we have in God, because it is by that—by our union, that is, with perfect love—that we are enabled to offer up our life for the cause of our brother men.

Years ago when I had a class among the flower girls at Charing Cross, I succeeded in persuading one of them to promise to lead a new and better life, but she wished to postpone her amendment; she promised to give it all up six weeks later, but not just then. In vain I tried to persuade her, thinking it was but a subterfuge and an excuse to avoid making an immediate decision; but the girl stood as firm as a rock—she would do what I wished in six weeks' time. Seeing I could prevail nothing, I desisted, very discouraged, and feeling almost sure that her excuse was only offered in order to be quit of my importunity. Imagine my feelings when at the promised time the girl came, neatly dressed and ready to carry out her promise. And then it leaked out, bit by bit, that at the time when I spoke to her, the friend with whom she lived was on the verge of being confined. It fell to her lot to support her friend in the hour of her weakness, and repugnant as her life had become to her, she actually carried it on for six weeks, till her friend was up and about again, sacrificing herself and imperilling her chance of a new life, out of loyalty to her friend. You can imagine, but I cannot adequately describe, how humbled I felt when this story came out. I had been judging her as one who was giving excuses, but in very truth she had been making a sacrifice of self, which might well bring into my cheek the blush of inferiority and shame. Verily she loved much; to her the Master could say, 'Go in peace.'²

² *Quintin Hogg*, 52.

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.

INTRODUCTION: PRINCIPLES AND METHOD.

THE general character and bearing of this problem are familiar to every reader of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and need not be here described. It will be useful to state only new evidence, and new

aspects of the previously known evidence. I may, however, reiterate my former statements, which are fundamental principles: (1) The matter is one of geography; (2) Luke's narrative is minutely accurate. Both need some further elaboration.

(1) There would be no difficulty and no problem,

if scholars would only familiarize themselves with the facts, geographical and historical, and specially with the organization of the province Galatia. The problem is a geographical one, although its bearings on Church history, Pauline chronology, and ecclesiastical organization have indirectly very great importance; and it must be judged on geographical grounds, both of political and of historical and of local geography. It involves questions of provincial organization which are obscure. In my old treatment of the subject I followed boldly the guidance of Luke, and thus solved various difficulties, as all the new discoveries go to prove. Many still remain.

The North-Galatian theorists have not yet learned that there was any organization of the province Galatia. Marquardt gives practically no information on the subject, because he had none to give; the only authority known on this subject in his time was Luke; and Marquardt did not devote to Luke the needed study, though he sometimes quotes him as an authority. Many New Testament scholars, in order to interpret Luke and Paul and decide offhand such questions, have turned up the page in Marquardt; but the silence of that leading authority, long the only authority, on this matter of organization in a province which had never been studied with minute care, does not justify those scholars in concluding that there was no organization. My friend, Dr. Brandis, in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, attempts to piece together the evidence; but he starts with his mind made up to false prepossessions, and he therefore was bound to come to wrong conclusions on many of the details; much of the epigraphic evidence was naturally unknown to him, and he sometimes fails to interpret correctly what was known.

As the progress of discovery was certain to test the whole theory of Galatian organization which I had elicited from Luke, I have for many years said nothing further on the subject; and my silence produced the impression in German circles that I had tacitly withdrawn from the South-Galatian view. Two distinguished scholars, one a North-Galatian, the other on my side, put the question to me in conversation and in letter, whether that was so. It seems, therefore, right and timely to review once more the evidence, avoiding as much as possible the repetition of what has already been rightly stated in my earlier

books, and in the articles 'Galatia' and 'Galatic Region' in Hastings' *D.B.*

These facts of geography and provincial organization are not merely antiquarian details: these facts were the surroundings and environment in which the life of the Christian communities was lived; they are assumed tacitly and not described by writers and historians. The allusions to this environment are often obscure, until the whole situation is clearly understood; and such allusions, often unconscious, form the best external criteria of date and trustworthiness.

Perhaps the most amazing example of inconsequence in argument on this subject that I have ever seen is quoted by Professor K. Lake in his *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 263 f. I give it in Professor K. Lake's words, as I should perhaps be accused of misrepresenting a great scholar if I stated it in my own words. 'Jülicher,' says he, 'tries to ridicule the suggestion that St. Paul would use the name of a Province, by saying that no one would refer to the inhabitants of Frankfort-on-the-Maine as men of Hesse-Nassau.' If the argument were merely valueless, I should not refer to it. It is misleading, and tends to hide the real issue. Every one knows that, if St. Paul had written to the church of Antioch or to the church of Iconium, he would probably (or, as I would venture boldly to say, he would certainly) have called his readers 'Antiochians' or 'Iconians.' So he calls his Corinthian correspondents 'Corinthians' (2 Co 6¹¹), although Corinth was to him an Achaian church (2 Co 1¹ 9², 1 Co 16¹). Again he calls his readers at Thessalonica 'Thessalonikeis,' and at Philippi 'Philippesioi' (Ph 4¹⁶), though he reckons both those churches as Macedonian (2 Co 9² 4⁸ 1, 1 Th 17⁸ 4¹⁰), and other places; cf. also Ac 20⁴ with 27²). The city name was the usual and the correct one; the city was the unit of political existence; popular self-consciousness and pride centred in the city. It would have been unusual and un-Pauline for him to write to the Iconians alone, or to the Antiochians singly, as 'Galatians.' It is, however, amazing that Professor Jülicher should not perceive the facts: Paul never wrote to the Antiochians singly or to the Iconians singly; he wrote to the Galatian congregations as a whole, and these Galatian Christians of several cities he sums up as Galatians. Similarly it cannot be doubted that St. Paul could include the Christians of Philippi

and Thessalonica among 'the Macedonians,' and would have done so if he had written a letter to the churches of Macedonia.

To make his argument suit the facts, Professor Jülicher would have to put it as follows: If an orator were addressing an audience drawn from four towns of Hesse-Nassau, would he call them 'men of Hesse-Nassau,' or something else? He certainly could not call them 'men of Frankfort-on-the-Maine.' He must find some unity of which they are all members, and address them accordingly. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the facts of German life to say what would be the right mode of address; but I suspect that the name would probably be 'Germans.' That touches the one supreme unity in which the whole audience would feel its brotherhood—the German Empire. Now in the case of the four South-Galatian cities, the supreme unity in which all felt their brotherhood was the Empire; and (as their history and customs show) their part in the Empire was their chief source of pride as municipalities. They could not, however, be addressed as 'Romans,' because they had not that right. They belonged to the Empire only in virtue of being members of a province. This is the fundamental fact of the situation; and the whole body of churches in any province was called by Paul, 'churches of the province.'¹ It is evident that Paul's new churches were classified as the churches of Macedonia, Achaia, Asia, and Galatia. This classification is unintelligible, unless these are taken as the four Roman provinces. Troas was not in Asia, unless Asia be taken either in the sense of the Roman province or as the continent Asia; and the latter meaning would not distinguish an Asian church from a Galatian, or a Cilician, or a Phœnician, or Palestinian church. Corinth was not in Achaia, unless Achaia be taken in the sense of the Roman province.

The objection which Jülicher tries to make, but fails to state intelligibly, must be either that the four South-Galatian cities were not in the province of Galatia at all, or that, although they were in the province, Paul would not class them together as a group of churches, or that, if he classed them together as a single group, he would not address them by the name of the province. Instead of restating the arguments against these forms of objection, let us take the positive method, and determine what it is that Luke really tells us.

¹ So Harnack, a North-Galatian, rightly says: see section x.

This has never yet been done. When I wrote on this subject I was working out the organization of the province step by step from Luke. Now the organization is much better known, and Luke's words are seen to be far more luminous.

(2) I regret to have to wound the feelings of some, and perhaps to weary others, by pointing out the minute and remarkable accuracy of Luke. He got his information from Paul ultimately; but he does not use Paul's terminology. He speaks as the Greeks and the natives spoke about the province, and its divisions; and this difference of naming, though quite natural, has been the cause of some misunderstanding and some false arguments. When you take Luke's narrative, and read it with intelligent appreciation of the provincial facts, you find that it bears and demands the closest scrutiny; and that it becomes more full of meaning as it is more minutely examined. It is really a first-hand narrative. This way of reading Luke is now unpopular. Hardly anybody wants it. It destroys all the wire-drawn theories about Luke's carelessness and inaccuracy and inability to tell a story that he has got from a good source without muddling it by his own stupidity. What I maintain is that he has re-expressed on a different plane of terminology the narrative which he got from Paul, and done this with admirable skill and accuracy. Why there are two planes of terminology in this province will be explained in the following pages; but briefly it may be said that a narrative which Paul would express according to Roman thought, Luke expresses according to Greek thought.

(3) One other cause of misunderstanding must be guarded against. Even some of the South-Galatian theorists are affected by the North-Galatian, and allow that Luke speaks of Galatia. But Luke never speaks of Galatia; he never uses the term Galatia, which in the New Testament occurs only in 1 Co 16¹, Gal 1², 1 P 1², and perhaps 2 Ti 4¹⁰. Through inaccurate translation the English and German Versions have 'Galatia' in Ac 16⁶ 18²⁸; but the Greek has 'Galatic Region' or 'Galatic Territory.' The scholars whom I have mentioned assume that this Greek term means 'Galatia'; but they are bound first to prove that these terms are equivalent, and secondly to explain why Luke preferred the periphrasis to the simple noun. There must have been some reason; and the real reason was that

'Galatic Territory' meant to Luke something quite different from Galatia. If in a modern travel narrative one read that the traveller now entered and traversed 'British Territory,' one would forthwith understand that he crossed territory possessed by Britain, territory of the British Empire, but not that he landed in Great Britain. It is the same with 'Galatic Territory.' Ancient usage is clear. The only passage ever quoted to prove that 'Galatic Territory' means 'Galatia' is Arrian, *Anab.* ii. 4, ἐπ' Ἀγκύρας τῆς Γαλατικῆς, falsely translated 'towards Ancyra of the Galatic (Territory).' It really means 'towards Ancyra the Galatic city,' distinguished from Ancyra

the Phrygiac city (cf. Strabo, p. 567, Ἀγκυρα ὁμώνυμος τῇ πρὸς Ἀνδία περὶ Βλαῦδον πολίχνη Φρυγιακῆ).

There will be more to say about the meaning of Γαλατικῆ. Meantime I will only add that accurate interpretation of geographical terms is far from universal among the best and in other respects most accurate scholars. It sometimes amazes me to read geographical remarks, made in admirable and justly admired commentaries: see, for example, Blass's note on Ac 16⁸⁻⁹, p. 176, where he quotes Pliny, *N.H.* 5, 28, as a proof that the term Asia, as sometimes used, included Mysia, Lydia, etc., excluding Phrygia: the words of Pliny have no bearing on this subject.

The Latest Issues of the 'International Critical Commentary.'¹

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE Commentary on Isaiah in this great series was originally entrusted to Professor A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh. His lamented death, before he had reduced to anything like final shape the material he had collected, necessitated other arrangements, and the work was divided between Professor G. Buchanan Gray and Professor A. S. Peake. It was universally felt that the death of Professor Davidson had robbed the world of a unique commentary; for, in addition to the most accurate scholarship, he had a rare insight into the meaning of the O.T. prophets and a sympathy with their spirit which have never been surpassed. We are fortunate, however, in having amongst us two such competent O.T. scholars as Professor G. Buchanan Gray and Professor Peake—names that are both familiar to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and the *Dictionary of the Bible*. It is with Professor Gray's work alone that we are concerned in the present volume. That scholar as long ago as 1896 established his

claim to front rank by his *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, and he has already enriched the 'International Critical Commentary' by his volume on *Numbers* (1903). The Commentary on Isaiah is to be in two volumes, the first of which contains Professor Gray's introduction to the whole book, and the exegesis of chapters i.—xxvii. The second volume will deal with chapters xxviii.—xxxix., also by him; while chapters xl.—lxvi. will be treated by Professor Peake.

In his preface our author takes full cognizance of the work of other scholars. He acknowledges obligations to Dillmann and Duhm, although he thinks that the latter sometimes leads his followers astray, 'particularly by his line and strophe divisions.' Justice is done also to the works of such men as Marti, Cheyne, Driver (who has also offered valuable suggestions in the present work), and G. A. Smith. The Introduction deals with the following subjects: Title and Place of Isaiah in the Canon; Text and Versions; the Book of Isaiah a post-exilic compilation; Origin and History of the Book; Criteria for distinguishing the words of Isaiah from the additions of later writers; the poetic forms of the Prophetic literature, and of the Book of Isaiah in particular; Isaiah in relation to the political and social con-

¹ *The Book of Isaiah*, i.—xxxix., by Professor G. Buchanan Gray, Mansfield College, Oxford. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912. Price 12s. *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Joel*, by John Merlin Powis Smith, Ph.D.; William Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D.; Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D. Price 12s. 6d.