

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

risive song, but a prophetic threat in the form of a catalogue of offences, the chapters of which are introduced with ך״. A similar instance is not Isaiah xiv., but Isaiah v. 8 sqq. Accordingly 6^a, as far as ך״אכר״, must, with Rothstein, be deleted, and 6^b sqq. follows, as the prophet's word, immediately upon the announcement of Jahweh.

Rothstein's extremely careful comparison of the little book with Jeremiah is also of great value. The agreement in detail is often close. This proves that the prophets were contemporaries, and thereby establishes the *substantial* genuineness of the first two chapters of Habakkuk. But at the same time Rothstein acknowledges¹ that with all this close relationship no such thing as dependence on Jeremiah is implied. And together with all this pervasive relationship in details to Jeremiah, in the broad distinctive features Habakkuk yet belongs undoubtedly to Isaiah's school. To i. 13-17 no better parallel passages could possibly be found than Isaiah x. 5 sqq.; other parallels are: ii. 2-4 with Isaiah viii. 1 sqq.; i. 6-10 with Isaiah v. 26 sqq.; ii. 6^b sqq. with Isaiah v. 8-23, x. 1-4. Thus Habakkuk has been assigned his secure place in the body of prophetic literature and, as it seems to me, a not less secure place in the political and religious history of his people.

Strassburg.

K. BUDE.

THE WORDS IN ACTS DENOTING MISSIONARY TRAVEL.²

In his admirable book on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, James Smith has pointed out the studied variety of terms used in *Acts* "to express the progression of a ship," and the appropriateness with which each is selected at the

¹ Especially pp. 61, 83; on p. 70, lines 6, 7, the expressions are somewhat different.

² The following article enlarges, without essential change in the theory, some pages printed in January, 1894.

proper occasion "to indicate the particular circumstances of the ship at the time." Thirteen verbs¹ are used in *Acts* in this way, all with such strict precision that his brief descriptions are found more significant in proportion as they are studied more minutely and critically. The purpose of this paper is to examine the terms in *Acts* that denote travel by land, or travel in general, and to show that the same quality of strict appropriateness can be detected in their use. The subject is important, and much of the peculiar and delicate art of the author of *Acts* is concealed if we neglect it.

The most important, and at the same time the most peculiar and characteristic usage, is that of *διέρχεσθαι* or *διελθεῖν* with the accusative of the region traversed. Of the usage the following nine examples occur in *Acts*.

(1) xiii. 6, "When they *had gone through* the whole island (Cyprus) unto Paphos" (*διελθόντες*).²

(2) xiv. 24, "They *passed through* Pisidia" (*διελθόντες*).

(3) xv. 3, "They *passed through* both Phœnicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles" (*διήρχοντο ἐκδιηγούμενοι*).

(4) xv. 41, "He *went through* Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (*διήρχετο ἐπιστηρίζων*).

(5) xviii. 23, He *went through* the Galatic region and the Phrygian (region) in order, establishing all the disciples (*διερχόμενος στηρίζων*).

(6) xix. 1, "Paul *having passed through* the upper country, came to Ephesus (*διελθόντα*).

(7) xix. 21, "Paul purposed in his spirit, when he *had passed through* Macedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem" (*διελθών*).

(8) xx. 2, "When he *had gone through* those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece (*διελθών*).

(9) xvi. 6, They *went through* the Phrygian or Galatic region³

¹ Viz., πλέω, ἀποπλέω, βραδυπλοέω, διαπλέω, ἐκπλέω, παραπλέω, ὑποπλέω, εὐθυδρομέω, ὑποτρέχω, παραλέγομαι, φέρομαι, διαφέρομαι, διαπεράω. A fourteenth, καταπλέω, occurs in the Third Gospel viii. 26; and πλέω also occurs in the Gospel, though none of the other twelve are used in it. The difference of subject and circumstances explains the paucity of terms in the Gospel as compared with *Acts*.

² Where the rendering of the Revised Version is adopted *verbatim*, it is given in inverted commas.

³ *kai* is used in Greek, where in English we should use "or," between two

(διήλθον), *i.e.*, the region that is Phrygian by race and Galatian by provincial division.

Along with these nine cases, we must take the only other example in the New Testament.

(10) 1 *Cor.* xvi. 5, "But I will come unto you when I shall *have passed through* Macedonia; for I do *pass through* Macedonia" (ἔσταν διέλθω, διέρχομαι γάρ).

The question demands consideration and reply whether the verb in these ten cases merely indicates that the persons spoken of passed across the country, or whether it implies that they passed through it in execution of their purpose of preaching. It is obvious that, in a description of missionary enterprise, there is needed some term to describe the process of going over a country as a missionary for the purpose of evangelizing. When Paul was travelling, he, of course, had in view always the one purpose of preaching and converting. The same may be said in general of all the Apostles and travelling Christians, even though some of them confined their preaching to Jews;¹ but, with regard to Paul especially, we can hardly doubt that, where he was not actually forbidden to preach, he was at every stage on the outlook for "an open door."² This sort of travelling through a country was Paul's normal method, and a well-expressed account of his work must necessarily have some way of indicating it. As we look over the examples just quoted, it is indubitable that most of them describe this kind of travelling, and my aim is to show that

alternative epithets applied to a person or place: thus, *e.g.*, the Heracleotic or Canopic branch of the Nile (which bears indifferently either name) is called τὸ Κανωβικὸν καὶ Ἡρακλεωτικὸν (στόμα), Strab., p. 788: so here in *Acts*. But where two mouths are mentioned, the right order is τὸ Κανωβικὸν στόμα καὶ (τὸ) Σαΐτικὸν (cp. *Acts* xviii. 23).

¹ xi. 19, "speaking the word to none save only to Jews."

² 2 *Cor.* ii. 12, "Now, when I came to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and when a door was opened unto me in the Lord": cp. *Acts* xiv. 27, "he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles."

all do so.¹ As to example (1), probably no one has ever doubted that Paul preached in city after city on his way through Cyprus from Salamis to Paphos. As to (8), the case is even clearer, and the same circumstances are referred to in (10) by the actual traveller, Paul, who uses the same verb. Example (7) is perhaps the most conclusive case: Paul intended to go through Macedonia and Achaia,² and thereafter to visit Jerusalem. Here it is beyond doubt that Paul's intention was to make a preaching tour in Macedonia and Achaia; and the Greek *διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαιίαν* is used to convey that sense.

Examples (3), (4), and (5) are of slightly different character. In them a participle is added in order to bring out the purpose which was executed on the journey, stage by stage. But in them the writer wishes to express a more precise and definite idea than that of a simple missionary tour, and he therefore adds the defining participle.³ These three cases show that, in the four examples, (1), (7), (8), (10), there is really another verb latent in the thought, viz. *καὶ εὐαγγελίσσατο*: the writer's mind is so entirely filled with the idea of missionary effort, that he assumes the idea as always present, and expects the reader to look from the same point of view as himself.⁴ In one case the participle denoting simple preaching is added

¹ This sense of *διελθεῖν* has more resemblance to the classical usage of *διεξελεθεῖν* than of *διελθεῖν*.

² Compare (10); he executed the intention, example (8).

³ It lies in the distinction between present and aorist tenses, that in these three cases the present (imperfect) is used, in the other the aorist. The author of *Acts* was more sensitive to delicacy of tense usage than Paul shows himself in xx. 25.

⁴ The author of *Acts* always expects his readers to do this. He wrote for a public familiar with the surroundings and accessories of the action (*i.e.* for a public of the same country and period), and he always assumes this knowledge on their part. If the reader wishes to appreciate the realism of *Acts* (at least in xiii. f.), he must always imagine himself a spectator, and reproduce in his thought the scene, and the surroundings, and the relative position of the actors; he must stand on the deck of the ship in xxvii. and in the proconsul's hall xiii. 5f.

to the verb, viz., in the speech of Paul at Miletos, xx. 25, "Ye all, among whom I went about preaching the kingdom," ἐν οἷς διήλθον κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν. It would be difficult to find an exact parallel to this example; but the unusual construction arises from the substitution of the persons for the locality where the preaching was done. It was impossible to say διήλθον ὑμᾶς, and therefore ἐν ὑμῖν had to be substituted; but otherwise the example is similar to the preceding ones, and it is clear that διήλθον κηρύσσων coalesces into a single idea, and that the Greek is practically equivalent to "among whom I was a preacher." In speaking to the Elders, Paul lays special emphasis on his evangelizing purpose in his travels. His words in this case bring out the sense of example (6) "having passed through the upper country." Paul spoke to the Elders about missionary travels in Asia,¹ and the only journey through Asia² when preaching had been permitted to him was the excursion from Pisidian Antioch along the higher lying regions (as distinguished from the low and level but longer road³ through Laodiceia) to Ephesus. Paul therefore had preached stage by stage along that journey (as we should naturally expect); and διελθὼν τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη has its usual Pauline sense of a missionary journey.

Example (2) "they passed through Pisidia" is a peculiarly interesting one. These words, xiv. 24, describe the journey back from Pisidian Antioch to Perga. Why then, a critic may ask, is the upward journey from Perga to

¹ It is probable that the words "among you" should not be restricted to the Ephesians; they denote the provincials of Asia (hence the emphatic "ye all"). Paul's intention for the future was evidently to go on to the central and western provinces of the Empire, and to return to the province Asia no more.

² In xvi. 6-8 he went through Asia, but was forbidden to preach in that province. The journey in xx. 1, when Troas was evangelized, 2 Cor. ii. 12, was doubtless only a coasting voyage.

³ On the sense of "the higher regions" see the second or later editions of *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 94. It is not explained in Ed. I.

Antioch passed over so slightly in xiii. 13, 14? If Paul regularly evangelized stage by stage on his journeys, why is he described as evangelizing on the downward journey, while the upward journey is slurred over? Does not the discrepancy prove that I am refining over much when I press the sense of *διήλθον* in this way? I shall not have recourse to the supposition, so much favoured by some writers, of "a gap" in the narrative, xiii. 13, 14. On the contrary, I find in the discrepancy between xiv. 24 and xiii. 14 a conclusive proof of my position. Let us survey the circumstances of the two cases.

It is pointed out in the *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 62f., that Paul's journey from Perga across Taurus and his entry into the province of Galatia were caused by physical infirmity, as he states in his Epistle to the Galatians iv. 13. When convalescent from a sharp but short illness¹ at Perga, he sought the recuperative atmosphere of the high lands beyond Taurus. In such a journey he naturally went straight on to the *sanatorium*; and, moreover, he was probably unfit for the severe strain of a preaching journey immediately after such an illness.² Hence the writer says that they went across³ from Perga and arrived at Antioch; but, when he returned in better health along the same road, he made a missionary journey through Pisidia and came into Pamphylia.

¹ The conditions of time show that it must have been short, while the facts of his life prove that it was sharp. It was, probably, a sharp attack of a disease that was, or afterwards became, constitutional.

² Formerly I inferred this illness and the consequent interruption of the work intended in Pamphylia merely from *Gal.* iv. 13. I hope at no distant time to point out that three separate trains of reasoning, founded on peculiarities in the language of Acts xiii. 13-15, prove that there was such an interruption of a definite project in regard to Pamphylia, and that the writer knew this and brings it out in his own style.

³ *διελθόντες*, without an accusative, is used here to denote the crossing over an intervening obstacle, viz., Taurus (see *Ch. in R. Emp.*, p. 18f.). Similarly in xviii. 27, *διελθεῖν εἰς Ἀχαΐαν* describes the crossing over (the sea) to Achaia. Compare xii. 10 (passing the watch, accusative), ix. 38, Luke ii. 15, iv. 30. This sense of *διελθεῖν* is quite classical.

The exact sense of example (5) xviii. 23, (he went through the Galatic region and the Phrygian region in order, establishing all the disciples), is explained by Asterius in his Homily on Peter and Paul as follows: *μετήλθεν οὖν ἐκ Κορίνθου πρὸς τὴν τῶν Πισιδῶν χώραν εἶτα τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις καταλαβὼν, κάκειθεν τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπισκεψάμενος, εἶτα τὴν Μακεδονίαν, κοινὸς ἦν τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος.*¹ This important passage, for which I am indebted to my friend, Mr. A. F. Findlay (once, I am proud to say, my pupil in Aberdeen), describes St. Paul's missionary work from the time when he left Corinth (xviii. 18) until he went back to Macedonia (xx. 1); and it defines his purpose excellently to be "teaching the civilized world."

Incidentally it is worthy of note that one, or perhaps two inaccuracies occur in it. In the first place, Asterius takes the Antioch of xviii. 22 as Pisidian Antioch. This curious misapprehension seems to have been common in the fourth and the fifth centuries, for I find in the account of Paul's travels composed by the Egyptian deacon Euthalius, about 458 A.D., that from Corinth Paul went to Ephesus and Cæsareia (Acts xvii. 19, 22), *εἶτα δεύτερον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας, εἶτα εἰς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, εἶτα πάλιν δεύτερον εἰς Ἐφεσον κτλ.*² In the second place, Asterius probably uses Asia in the Byzantine sense to indicate the smaller province Asia of his time, whereas in *Acts* the province Asia has the wider limits that existed in the first three centuries. But, allowing for these misconceptions, the passage is instructive as regards the inter-

¹ I cannot in Aberdeen find a complete edition of Asterius, and depend entirely on Mr. Findlay's quotation. Asterius, bishop of Amaseia, in Pontus, about 360-400, is an authority of great weight; and here he defines *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* as *Λυκαονίαν*.

² Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, vol. lxxxv., p. 650. It is worth note that in xvi. 6 Euthalius reads *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, whereas the published text of Chrysostom's commentary has the false reading *τὴν* before *Γαλατικὴν*.

pretation of Paul's travels that prevailed in the fourth and fifth centuries; and it is necessary to suppose either that Asterius had never heard of the North-Galatian theory, or that he expressly rejects it and declares his adhesion to the South-Galatian theory.¹

In all these examples therefore we find that in *Acts* the making of a missionary tour through a district is expressed in Greek by διέρχασθαι or διελθεῖν construed with the accusative of the district traversed. There remains only one more example of this construction, viz. (9), xvi. 6, "they traversed the Phrygian or Galatic region." On the South-Galatian theory² this example corroborates the rule, for it describes Paul's progress from Lystra over the converts made during his former residence at Iconium and Antioch; and this part of his journey was a continuation of the same process that is described in xv. 41 by the same expression (example 4). After finishing this region, he entered Asian Phrygia, but, essaying to preach there³ in his usual fashion, he was "prevented by the Holy Spirit."

If we press closely this sense of the Greek verb, we may render xvi. 6 thus: they made a preaching tour through the Phrygian country, viz. the Galatic part alone (neglecting

¹ After Mr. Findlay's letter reached me, I consulted Chrysostom's commentary on the passage, but it gives no clue to his conception. His commentary on xvi. 1-6 is also inconclusive—at least in this sense that, whereas his words show good geographical conceptions, if interpreted on the South-Galatian view, they show very hazy ideas if interpreted on the North-Galatian view.

² At least as I understand it. Dr. Gifford works it out differently in *Expositor*, July, 1894, p. 1f. His view on this point is syntactically and topographically possible, but seems to me open to certain objections (notably, it sacrifices the strict sense of Γαλατικῶν in local usage).

³ The studied difference in expression between xvi. 6 and 8 shows that Paul was actually in Asia (*i.e.* the region Phrygia as part of the province Asia) when he was prevented from speaking, but was stopped from even setting foot in Bithynia. I find myself unable to depart from what I have said on this point in my *Church in R. Emp.*, p. 75 (except that in the first edition I thought that the prohibition might have been made known to Paul in Pisidian Antioch, which I now see to be impossible: the prohibition is implied to have been imparted in Asia).

the Asian part), because they were prohibited from preaching in the province Asia.¹ It is quite within the ordinary limits of Greek expression to leave part of the thought latent in this way, and to expect it to be completed by the intelligence of the reader. I prefer, however, as being more simple, the construction which is advocated in my book, p. 89; but it is apart from the present subject to state reasons.

Prof. Blass agrees as to the sense of *διέρχομαι*. In his note on xvi. 6 he says, *mirus error est eorum qui verbo διήλθον eam vim inesse putant ut praedicatio excludatur*, though in his reading and interpretation of xvi. 8 he disregards this sense of the verb.

If the author of *Acts* denotes in this way a missionary tour through a country, the questions suggest themselves, were there any cases in which Paul traversed a country rapidly without preaching in it but pressing on to a point beyond; and, if so, how is such a journey indicated in *Acts*? We have just seen such a case, viz., xiii. 14, where Paul went across Pisidia from Perga to reach Antioch. In that case Pisidia is not mentioned; it is simply left out of the narrative. Take again xv. 41-xvi. 4, Paul is there described as making a missionary tour through the province of Syria and Cilicia, and then as arriving at Derbe and at Lystra. The large country ruled by King Antiochus, which he must have traversed, is left out of the narrative.² Here

¹ This interpretation was referred to in my article in the *EXPOSITOR*, Feb., 1894, p. 139, *note*. "I shall in due time proceed to show that the South-Galatian theory is perfectly consistent with taking *καλυθέντες* in xvi. 6 as giving the reason for *διήλθον*; and several friends, who accept or regard favourably the theory, prefer to take it in that way; but I shall also set forth the reasons that lead me to prefer the interpretation given in my book."

² In the map in my *Church in R. Emp.*, the kingdom of Antiochus is represented too small. It is given as two separate parts, one in Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia, the other in North Syria; but these two parts were continuous, for the intervening region of Taurus and its passes belonged to Antiochus. Before Paul, on leaving Tarsus, reached the Cilician gates, he had entered the realm of Antiochus.

the reason is the same. Paul preached in Syria, which was Roman; he passed rapidly over the non-Roman territory; and he began again to preach when he reached Roman territory once more at Derbe. Similarly, on his first journey, when he reached the limit of Roman territory at Derbe, he turned and went back over the churches that he had already founded.

We see, then, that such omissions in the narrative are in accordance with the author's plan: he omits all that is not essential to his purpose, and his purpose is to describe the missionary enterprises of St. Paul. Many cases, where the supposed "want of proportion in Acts" is criticised, are specially instructive with regard to the author's circumstances, his intentions, and his attitude towards his subject. Similarly in xvi. 6, 7, Paul traversed as a sphere of duty the Phrygo-Galatic region (*i.e.* the region round Iconium and Antioch), and then no further geographical information is given till he came *κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν* and was approaching the Bithynian frontier with the intention of entering that province and preaching there. A considerable journey across Asia is here passed over almost in silence, being only hinted at in the words "being prevented from preaching in Asia." In the brief, pregnant style of Acts this must be understood to imply that, being in Asia, he found himself prevented from preaching there.

Only in one case does the author describe more carefully a journey across a region where no preaching was done, *viz.*, in xvi. 8, *παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν*. It is obvious to any one who looks at a map that Paul and his company could not reach Troas except by passing through Mysia; therefore either *παρελθόντες* is a false reading, or it must be translated "neglected," *i.e.* "did not treat as a sphere of duty." In his recent edition Prof. Blass takes the former alternative,¹ and reads *διελθόντες* (with *Cod. Bez.*);

¹ He says, "*παρελθόντες* sensui adversatur; non prætereunda sed transeunda erat Mysia."

but, according to our previous results, that reading would imply that he preached through Mysia, whereas we learn from v. 6 that he was forbidden to preach in any part of Asia.¹ We are therefore forced to the other alternative. The writer desired to lay special stress on this peculiar non-preaching journey;² and his reason for that is obvious. It is clear that the writer of the paragraph beginning xvi. 6 was filled with the idea of the marvellous and miraculous way in which Paul was led to Europe at this time.³ This idea dominates the narrative and guides the expression. This episode was personally most deeply interesting to the writer. There are perhaps no two paragraphs in Acts that are written so carefully and with such minute delicacy and studied expression as the opening part of the narrative of the second journey; if they are read in South Galatia, every word will bear pressing to the utmost, and the vivid realism becomes clearer the more we press the phraseology. And the reason for this minute elaboration lies in the conclusion of this part of the narrative, viz., the meeting of Paul with the author of *Acts*, and the spread of the new religion to his own country.⁴

¹ In accordance with this prohibition, we find that the evangelization of Troas was reserved for a later journey, 2 *Cor.* ii. 12, *Acts* xx. 2. That, of course, would not preclude Paul from converting any individual who came into closer relations with him on the journey.

² It deserves note that this journey impressed itself deeply on popular tradition; but the Mysian tradition about St. Paul would require a separate article, I have touched on it in the *Expositor*, Oct., 1888, p. 264, and April, 1894, p. 295.

³ Bishop Lightfoot has an excellently conceived and beautifully expressed passage to the same effect as the following sentences in his *Biblical Essays*, pp. 237-8. I might simply quote his words to serve my purpose; but I prefer to leave my words as they were printed in January, 1894, long before I read his essay.

⁴ That Renan was right about Luke's European and Macedonian origin I cannot doubt. *Acts* is the composition of a Greek and specially of a Macedonian; its peculiar tone and emotion can be explained or appreciated on no other view (as I venture to believe, and will elsewhere try to prove at length). This gives one of the many concurrent arguments against Prof. Blass's view of the Lucan origin of the Western Text (see xi. 28 in *Cod. Bez.*).

The direct intervention of the Holy Spirit turned Paul away from the natural path forward, a path that he afterwards trod on his third journey, and one that seemed peculiarly suitable. The same action over-ruled his next idea, and guided him, step by step, down to Troas, where he met his destiny, and learned at last what was the Divine will. He was called onwards to Macedonia. Nowhere else in Luke's narrative is the Divine guidance introduced three separate times in a short paragraph.¹ The connexion of ideas, the pressing on of the narrative to this conclusion, gives the tone to the whole paragraph; and the phrase, "he neglected Mysia" (an idea never elsewhere expressed in *Acts*) is one of the impressive details that contribute to the general effect. Prof. Blass and the Bezan Reviser sacrifice this telling point, and force *παρελθόντες* into xvii. 15, where it has no special effect, but at the best would be an interesting little detail (but it is in fact inconsistent with the purpose of Paul and of the historian).

On the North-Galatian view this paragraph is mere rhetoric, for that immensely important historical event, the evangelization of Galatia, is interposed in the midst of the narrative, and the first Divine guidance was directed, not to Europe, as the narrative suggests and implies, but to Galatia. Either the narrator, thinking that the evangelization of Macedonia utterly outshaded and dwarfed that of Galatia, deliberately minimised the place of the latter in order to give prominence to the other, sacrificing historical accuracy to rhetorical effect, or he was ignorant that any visit to Galatia took place at this time. Only the obscurity

¹ In xiii. 1-12 the Divine action is three times mentioned, but (1) it really manifested itself only twice, and (2) its different manifestations do not lead towards one single issue as in xvi. 6-10. But it is important to note that these two great steps in Paul's work are introduced by similar insistence on the Divine purpose, whereas the author is silent about any Divine origin for the journey to Jerusalem and the Apostolic Council in xv. (but he insists on the Divine origin of the journey in xi. 28-xii. 25).

in which Asia Minor was enveloped could have prevented Lightfoot from seeing all that was involved in his own reasoning.

In xvii. 23 the verb is used in an instructive way by Paul: "as I was going through and surveying your cults" (*διερχόμενος καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν*). The speaker's intention was to suggest to his audience that, like other visitors to their famous city, he had gone about examining the numerous temples. The old view that, in passing by, he chanced to see the altar of the "Unknown God," seems quite unsatisfactory. There is no reason to think that Paul would be devoid of interest in this centre of the world's education, or that he merely pretended to have been surveying its objects of interest in order to catch the attention and please the feelings of his audience. He went through the city from point to point, with a definite purpose in his mind; but his attention always turns towards the religious side, and suggests to him means and ways of appealing to the population and presenting to their favourable consideration that gospel which, as he travelled, he preached. This is confirmed by the words used immediately before, *v.* 16, "his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols."

Our view of Paul's method and spirit as a traveller seems not to be shared by all scholars. According to the most careful exponent of the North-Galatian theory,¹ the apostle, as he traversed Galatia, "was bewildered. He allowed himself to drift. He moved from place to place waiting on Providence"; "he intended, so far as he had any plan at all, to pass through the cities in the west corner of Galatia, and so to journey further north to the cities on the east of Bithynia and of Pontus." "He was quickly, almost aimlessly, passing through 'the Galatian district.'" Such was St. Paul's way of travelling in a country where

¹ EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 415.

he was not forbidden to preach, and where indeed he might construe the absence of a prohibition, following immediately after the express prohibition with regard to Asia, as equivalent to a permission to preach! But this is an accurate statement, I think, of what necessarily follows from the North-Galatian theory. Only on the South-Galatian view can we find harmony, purpose, and order in St. Paul's action.

It is remarkable that this construction of *διέρχομαι* never occurs in *Acts* i.-xi., though the idea of a missionary tour several times requires expression. When that idea comes up, the verb is used intransitively, viii. 4, 40, xi. 19 (*ἕως Φοινίκης*), also x. 38 in Peter's speech; and in these cases it is accompanied by the verb *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* or *λαλεῖν*, defining the purpose of the journey; and in ix. 32 (*διὰ πάντων*) it is used absolutely in the sense of "going over all the saints, place by place" (with the intention of confirming and encouraging them). This intransitive construction is found also in the Third Gospel, *Luke* ix. 6 (*κατὰ τὰς κώμας εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*, cf. xi. 24, where the purpose is a different one, but the use of the verb is exactly similar).

This difference (like some others which have been alluded to elsewhere) points either to difference of authorship, or to the difference of circumstances and time in which the same author was placed. The former alternative appears to me to be negatived by numberless signs of unity of purpose and literary character, and we are reduced to the supposition that in describing the Pauline journeys, the author used almost unaltered the account which he had written long before, and in which he had employed almost as a technical term a word caught from Paul's own lips. Finally it may be noted that the Pauline technical term is more remote from classical Greek usage than the construction adopted in *Acts* i.-xi. and the Third Gospel.

An interesting word occurs in *Acts* xvii. 1: taking their way through (*διοδεύσαντες*) Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica. The word is strikingly appropriate. The writer implies in his narrative that he was with Paul in Philippi, but not in Thessalonica. He would therefore naturally be present when Paul, Silas and Timothy were receiving directions for their journey (*διοδεύειν*) along the main Roman road (*ὁδός*) of the province. In *Luke* viii. 1 the same verb is used with the participles *κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος*, where it seems to be a mere synonym for *διέρχεσθαι*,¹ but there is a clear difference between the connotation of the two verbs as used in *Acts*.

The sense of *χωρισθεῖς* in xviii. 1 is connected with the difficult question of Paul's Athenian speech, and would require a whole article to itself.

W. M. RAMSAY.

RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

To Prof. Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge University Press) Mr. F. C. Burkitt has contributed *The Book of Rules of Tyconius*. Mr. Burkitt claims that "the *Liber Regularum* is here printed for the first time in something of the form in which Tyconius wrote it." There is no MS. extant of greater antiquity than the ninth century; but whatever can be done by ascertaining the family relationship of extant MSS., and by careful collation, has been done by the present editor. And, according to his own account, the previous editions by Grynæus, Schott, and Galland were not hard to beat in accuracy. To produce a trustworthy edition of Tyconius is undoubtedly a good work, although we do not sympathize with Mr. Burkitt in his estimate of its intrinsic, apart from its historical, importance. But the use Mr. Burkitt makes of the scripture quotations found in Tyconius is of very great importance as shedding much needed

¹ Perhaps, if we had Luke's original authority in this passage, we should find that some reason dictated the employment of *διοδεύειν*. There seems to be nothing corresponding to it in the other Gospels.