

between Religion and Science, and now he has gathered them into a volume which he calls *God and the Universe* (S.P.C.K.; 4s.).

Mr. Tunzelmann discerns three stages of progress in the controversy between Religion and Science—first, antagonism; next, independence; then, aid. It is of the last stage that he himself is the happy exponent. He believes that Religion needs Science, as much as the scientific man needs religion. He believes that the foundation of all true and reliable Religion is scientific investigation. And now all that the study of physical science can do is to point the way to the acceptance of such a God as the God who is seen in the face of Jesus Christ.

The Rev. J. P. Lilley, M.A., D.D., has made a study of all that has been told us of *Four Apostles*, and his book has been published by the S.P.C.K. He has made this study for the purpose of discovering the secret of success in missionary work. For St. Philip, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, and St. Thomas were all men like-minded as we are and yet they were eminently successful. Their secret is not to be announced in a sentence. Dr. Lilley, a most accomplished scholar, has taken great pains. He has followed them step by step. He has interrogated them at

every departure. He has entered into the very sanctuary in which their lives were spent.

As character sketches these studies are memorable. But how much more than character sketches are they to the preacher of the Gospel, whether at home or abroad. Dr. Lilley has written many books; he has reserved his best intellectually and spiritually for this book.

It would be unfair to speak of *The Wider Gospel* (Stock; 3s. 6d. net), by Mary L. Dodds, as a contribution to the doctrine of universalism. For, although there is a marshalling of Scripture texts, which at a first glance suggests the old method of proof-text argument, the author arrived at her conclusion in a very different way and holds it now in a very different spirit. Is she right? Is she wrong? No one can answer it who does not take Christ into account.

There seems to be no end to the surprises which the British Museum has for us in its manuscript room. The latest, and it is a surprise, so quaint in language, so intimate in approach to God is it, is entitled *The Cloud of Unknowing*, which has been edited, with an introduction, by Evelyn Underhill (Watkins; 3s. 6d. net). Do not on any account forget to add it to your literature of devotion.

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.

V.

X. THE GROUP OF THE FOUR CHURCHES.—St. Paul habitually grouped his churches in certain larger unities.¹ He did not think that the Universal Church was made up of single congregations. He classifies the ultimate units, viz. the congregations, in larger groups, and speaks of the churches of Asia, Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia. In these groups of congregations Professor Harnack, as we shall see in section XI., recognizes unhesitatingly the Roman provinces; and this we consider to be certainly true; but we must not

¹ Gal 1², I Co 16¹. 5. 16, 19, 2 Co 1¹. 16 8¹ 9³ 11¹⁰, I Th 1⁷, 8, Ro 15²⁰, etc. Luke uses geographical rather than political expression.

assume it even on his authority. One province, however, he leaves out, or veils under the 'etc.,' viz. Galatia. Those who hold the North-Galatian theory cannot admit that province.

The organizing character of St. Paul's mind appears in this habit. He felt that the highest unity, the Universal Church, could not safely be constructed *at that period*² out of separate, single, individual congregations. The causes leading to

² It is illogical to argue that, because Paul in practice acted on this principle, therefore it is a universal and absolute law. It is relative to human society and character, and political circumstances, and is permanent just in so far as those conditions are permanent.

isolation and disunion were too strong; and it was necessary to combat these causes by means of intermediate groups in each of which there existed a certain unifying and consolidating influence, and which (as one cannot doubt) involved some kind of intermediate authority, intervening between the authority of the Universal Church and the powers of the single congregation. Even when there was in Achaia only the single Church of Corinth,¹ still Paul thought and wrote about the congregations of Achaia.

Now what was the case with the four congregations or churches, Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra? They had been converted² and organized together; they were situated not far from one another on or near a great Roman highway, the 'Imperial Road,'³ so that a traveller by land moving eastwards or westwards between Syria and Jerusalem on the one side and the province Asia, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome on the other, would have the whole four on his path. That Paul must have grouped them in a higher unity, or in two higher unities, is in accordance with his settled practice and custom. Therefore, either they must have been grouped (as the South-Galatian theory maintains) in the Roman province to which they all belonged, or they must have been classified in two groups, viz. the two regions in which they were situated. There is no other possibility, except to say that they alone were never grouped by Paul, but remained isolated and individual congregations. It may be doubted if any one will venture to maintain that last supposition.

Could they then have been grouped as churches of two regions, Phrygia and Lycaonia? This seems impossible.

1. Iconium would then be in a separate group

¹ Cenchræe was part of Corinth: in Athens there was no church, but only a few unorganized adherents. See I Co 16⁴⁵.

² The mere fact that they were converted together on one journey proves nothing as to their classification. Paul converted Philippi, Thessalonica, Beroea, and Corinth on one journey in rapid succession; but he classed the first three as churches of Macedonia, and the last as a church of Achaia, proceeding there according to the Roman provincial division, as Professor Harnack rightly says (see section XI.).

³ Via Sebaste, βασιλική ὁδός. At first I rendered the Greek term as 'Royal Road'; but the Latin shows that 'Imperial' is the more correct epithet. The emperors were commonly called βασιλεῖς by those people who spoke and wrote Greek.

from Lystra, yet they were close together and in close connexion with each other (Ac 16⁹).

2. Luke calls both regions Galatic; this must imply that he regarded the two regions as included in a higher (*i.e.* Galatic) unity; and there is no other way of interpreting this 'Galatic' unity, except that 'Galatic' means 'belonging to the province Galatia.' Such is the meaning of this adjective in local usage at that time (as will be shown below, section XII.).

3. There is no evidence that Paul ever spoke or thought of 'the churches of Phrygia' or 'the churches of Lycaonia.' Such names could only begin (and did come into use) at a later date, when Phrygia and Lycaonia became Roman provinces.

4. The writer of 2 Ti 3¹¹ (whether Paul himself or, as some say, a pupil, *e.g.* Timothy himself) seems to have grouped Antioch and Iconium and Lystra together, as being all three in some special connexion with Timothy: he does not add Philippi or other places where Paul's sufferings were equally known to Timothy.

5. Antioch was a Roman colony, and the inscriptions show that not merely the Latin colonists, but also the Greek-speaking natives prided themselves on this fact: the personal names in the city became in a very large degree Roman in type, even when written in Greek: the honour and distinction of the city lay in its rank as a Roman colony. The same was the case with Lystra. It is enough to mention the honorific titles Claudio-Derbe and Claudiconium. Was Paul indifferent to the municipal feeling? That certainly is not like him. Even John, who was naturally much less considerate of the pagan side of the Christians' situation, regards each of his churches of Asia as representative of its city and heir to the city's history, its glory, and even its weaknesses.⁴

6. No one has ever attempted seriously to maintain that there existed at this time a group of two Phrygian churches, Antioch and Iconium, and a separate group of two Lycaonian churches, Derbe and Lystra, and to explain why the fully organized churches of the two regions should have dropped entirely out of early Church history after

⁴ This may probably be assumed with universal consent. Almost every commentator tries to trace the likeness of the Church to the city. That the Church is, so to say, the soul of the city is proved in minute detail in my *Letters to the Seven Churches*.

the second journey of Paul (Ac 16¹⁻⁵).¹ When about A.D. 295 there came into existence two real provinces, Pisidia (including Antioch and Iconium, and probably Lystra²) and Isauria (including Derbe), and when in A.D. 372 the permanent Byzantine provinces were formed, Pisidia (including Antioch) and Lycaonia (with Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra), these districts were already more completely equipped with bishoprics than any other part of the Christian world. These two great Christian cities Iconium and Antioch must have exercised a continuous and powerful influence in the country around from their foundation onwards; and their history is less obscure than that of any other bishoprics in Asia Minor (except one or two of the greatest cities). Yet they are unknown henceforth to Paul, to Luke, and to Peter, unless they are churches in Galatia.

Accordingly, we must conclude that St. Paul paid no attention to the difference of race and language that existed between the Phrygians and the Lycaonians. He regarded the four cities as Imperial cities, and he addressed them in Greek (which was the language of the Roman East). He deliberately ignored and opposed the separating tendency of racial and linguistic differences. He found in the Roman and Imperial unity an instrument whereby the unity of the Universal Church might more easily be attained. Constant intercommunication, and frequent mutual offices of help and love, were the means of maintaining the community of feeling and belief and ritual among the scattered congregation. The strength and stability of the Empire rested on roads and travel, and on ease and certainty of intercommunication. The insistence on, even the mere acknowledgment of, racial differences must tend to impede the unification alike of the Empire and the Church. Rome originally had of set purpose trampled on racial differences and framed her governmental districts with complete disregard of the old national lines of demarcation. Strabo about A.D. 19 mentions in regard to the province Asia that the Romans had disregarded national

¹ The term used about 170-200 A.D., 'Churches of Phrygia,' in the letter about the Lugdunensis persecution, and in Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* I, has a different meaning: this question cannot here be discussed, as belonging to later usage.

² Tiberius (A.D. 325) in Isauria was probably bishop of Ilistra.

distinctions,³ and organized the *dioeceses (conventus)*, i.e. the subdivisions of Asia *provincia* for judicial purposes,⁴ according to another principle; and remarks that this Roman custom caused great difficulty to the geographer.

St. Paul follows the same line. He is thoroughly Roman on this side of his genius. He is an organizer, methodical and constructive, turning to his own purpose all the resources which Imperial organization had supplied. Amid the great struggle which was being fought out in the Empire between the centrifugal or destructive and the centripetal or unifying currents of social conditions,⁵ he whole-heartedly favoured the latter, and opposed the isolating influence of race: 'There is neither Jew nor Greek.'

Accordingly, the supposition that he could ever have dreamed of classifying his churches according to such subdivisions as Phrygia and Lycaonia is wholly opposed to his nature, and hostile to his purpose and his method.

We are therefore driven to the other view, viz. that those four churches were grouped by Paul in a unity as the churches of the province. There was no other title except the provincial possible for them as a unified group. They could not be called the churches of Phrygia, for two were Lycaonian; nor the churches of Lycaonia, for two were Phrygian; nor the churches of Asia Minor, because such a name was then unknown and such a unity had no existence: and the term 'the churches of Asia' does not and could not possibly include Antioch, etc. I know of no possible unity and no possible title under which those four cities could be grouped together except that of the Roman province to which they

³ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φύλα διελεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξαι κ.τ.λ., p. 629.

⁴ Cicero, it is true, speaks of several *conventus* in his province by national names (*Att.* v. 21. 9), *Pamphylia*, *Lycaonium*, *Isauricum*; but he unconsciously illustrates the truth which Strabo mentions: his *conventus Lycaonius* was the one that met at Philomelium in ordinary course (cf. Pliny, v. 95), his *Isauricus* at Iconium. The commentators, ignoring Strabo's caution, assume that the *conventus* which met at Iconium must have been the Lycaonian: but cf. Ptolemy, v. 4, 12.

⁵ These opposing forces (of which the centrifugal finally proved the stronger) are described briefly in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, March 1912, pp. 340 and 343 ff. I take the terms centripetal and centrifugal from Mr. Zulueta's article in *Oxford Essays*, edited by Professor Vinogradoff, 1909.

belonged. Is it, then, in accordance with Pauline custom and early Christian usage that they should be?

No one has attempted to explain how the fully organized churches of the two regions could have dropped entirely out of early Church history after the second journey of Paul (Ac 16¹⁻⁵). There was no other way except to leave this difficulty on one side.

Why should Paul be unwilling or unable to classify his churches according to Roman pro-

vinces? Is there anything in contemporary or in later Church history to suggest that this was unlikely, or inconsistent with the spirit of the Christian Church? The general principle of the Church is to accept the established government, and to use for its own purposes and advantage the organization that rules in society. Was there anything tending to prevent it from using the provincial divisions, and to make it use some other system of classification? To answer this let us look at the facts.

Contributions and Comments.

Modern Arabic.¹

'IN Arabia as well as in Greece,' says Gibbon, 'the perfection of language outstripped the refinement of manners; and her speech could diversify the fourscore names of honey, the two hundred of a serpent, the five hundred of a lion, the thousand of a sword, at a time when this copious dictionary was entrusted to the memory of an illiterate people.' Certainly the Orientals one sees at Alexandria should not need the eight volumes of Lane's *Lexicon* for all they have to say. Spiro Bey is convinced that classical Arabic has shared the fate of Greek and Latin 'which are dead and buried.' He would have school books and newspapers conform more closely to the living language which is spoken by all classes.

His grammar aims at teaching the student 'to speak, read, and write modern [Egyptian] Arabic correctly in the shortest space of time.' The Arabic is unpointed, even *teštid* is rarely inserted; but an English transliteration supplies the pronunciation. The English reader may in a few cases be doubtful of the precise sound indicated: e.g. *fallâhyn*, p. 16, 186; *afandy*, p. 26, for 'Effendi'; *zal* pronounced 'd,' pp. 2, 7, but indicated by 'z' *passim*; *hyya* for 'she' or 'it.' Probably the reference to the dictionaries would clear up such points. The syllable, and what is known as the construct state in cognate languages might have been more fully explained. But with a native teacher the book should be of the greatest service to English soldiers, missionaries, or traders settling

¹ *A New Practical Grammar of the Modern Arabic of Egypt.* By S. Spiro Bey, Privatdocent, Geneva University. Luzac & Co., 1912. xiv + 251 pp. 8s. 6d. net.

in Egypt. Philologists will be interested to note how the Arabic of Egypt to-day has reached the same phonetic stage (form of suffixes, loss of case-endings, disappearance of Passive Voice, etc.) at which Hebrew had arrived when the Old Testament was pointed. It seems that France, Russia, and Germany have founded chairs for modern Arabic; and Britain, despite her interest in India and Egypt, has here to thank Geneva for an Arabic grammar in English. D. M. KAY.

St. Andrews.

St. John iv. 52.

It is usually suggested, I believe, that the nobleman showed his full confidence in Christ's word by not hurrying home. Alford (*e.g.*) says: 'He appears to have gone leisurely away—for the hour (1 p.m.) was early enough to reach Capernaum the same evening (twenty-five miles).' But are we bound to assume, with Alford and others, that he did *not* reach Capernaum the same evening? If he got home, say, at 8 or 9 o'clock, or indeed any time after sunset, would it not have been natural, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, to refer to the previous 1 p.m. as the seventh hour of yesterday? How else could they have expressed it?

F. G. CHOLMONDELEY.

Adlestrop Rectory, Chipping Norton.

New Testament Greek.

THE following extract from the Preface to Robinson's *Lexicon of the New Testament*, dated as far back as 1836, seems to confirm the saying that