

GALATIAN PROBLEMS

2. NORTH OR SOUTH GALATIANS ?¹

By F. F. BRUCE, M.A., D.D.

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

THE Epistle to the Galatians is so called because it is explicitly addressed "To the churches of Galatia" (Gal. i. 2); moreover, the addressees are apostrophized in the course of the letter: "O foolish Galatians!" (Gal. iii. 1). The question before us is: Where were these churches and who were these Galatians? Should we locate them in the territory of the former kingdom of Galatia or somewhere else in the more extensive Roman province of Galatia, which included the former kingdom and much additional territory? Were the recipients of the letter Galatians in the ethnic sense, or only in the political sense, as inhabitants of the Roman province of that name?

I

The Greek word *Γαλάται* is a variant form of *Κέλται* or *Κέλτοι*, "Celts" (Latin *Galli*). When we first meet the Celts, they are resident in Central Europe, in the Danube basin. Some place-names in that area retain Celtic elements to the present day; Vienna (Latin *Vindobona*)² is a good example. From the Danube basin they migrated in a westerly direction into Switzerland, South Germany and North Italy, and then into Gaul and Britain; they also migrated in a south-easterly direction and settled in North-Central Asia Minor, giving their name to their new homeland as they also did to Gaul (Latin *Gallia*, Greek *Γαλατία*).³

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 12th of November 1969.

² The first element is Celtic **windos*, "white" (cf. Welsh *gwyn*, Gaelic *fionn*).

³ Livy (*Hist.*, xxxviii. 12), Strabo (*Geog.*, xii. 5. 1) and other writers give Galatia the alternative name *Gallograecia* (i.e. the land of the Greek-speaking Gauls).

Those Celts who migrated towards the south-east ravaged Thrace, Macedonia and Thessaly, and invaded Greece itself, but they got no further than Delphi, from which they were repulsed in 279 B.C. The following year (278-277 B.C.), a large body of them crossed the Hellespont into Asia Minor at the invitation of Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, who thought he could use their services against his enemies. For a generation they menaced their neighbours in Asia Minor, until a series of defeats at the hands of Attalus I, king of Pergamum (c. 230 B.C.), confined them within fixed limits, in territory which had formerly belonged to Phrygia. This territory, a broad strip of land stretching over 200 miles from south-west to north-east, between the longitudes of 31° and 35° E. and the latitudes of 39° and 40° 30' N., was occupied by the three tribes of which the invading force consisted—the Tolistobogii in the west, with their centre at Pessinus,¹ the Trocmi in the east, with their centre at Tavium, and the Tectosages between them, around Ancyra, which in due course became the capital of the kingdom of Galatia (as today, under its modern name Ankara, it is the capital of the Turkish Republic).² Each tribe comprised four tetrarchies. The Galatians settled as overlords, with a subject population of Phrygians. As time went on they adopted the Phrygians' religion and culture, but not their language. The Phrygian language died out in Galatia, whereas it survived for some centuries in the neighbouring Phrygian territories. The Galatian speech also survived for several centuries, although the Galatians inevitably came to use Greek as the language of commerce and diplomacy.³

In 190 B.C. a body of Galatian mercenaries fought on the side of the Seleucid king Antiochus III against the Romans at the battle of Magnesia. Their presence attracted Roman reprisals against the Galatians, who were subdued the following year by

¹ Pessinus was not occupied by the Galatians until after 205 B.C. When in that year the Romans, through the good offices of the Pergamene king Attalus I, sent to procure the image of the Magna Mater from Pessinus, it was still a Phrygian city (Livy, *Hist.*, xxix. 11, 14).

² Polybius, *Hist.*, v. 77 f., 111; Livy, *Hist.*, xxxviii. 16; Strabo, *Geog.*, xii. 5. 1-4.

³ Cf. W. M. Calder, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, vii (Manchester, 1956), p. xv.

the consul Manlius but were allowed to retain their independence under their own rulers on giving a pledge of good behaviour for the future.¹

Henceforth Roman influence was paramount in Asia Minor, apart from the period (88-65 B.C.) during which Mithridates VI of Pontus dominated the peninsula. The Galatians quickly appreciated the wisdom of keeping on good terms with Rome. With Roman permission or connivance they augmented their territory during the second century B.C. They suffered severely under Mithridates because of their friendship with Rome, but when he was finally defeated by Pompey in 64 B.C. their loyalty was rewarded by Galatia's receiving the status of a client kingdom, and so she remained for nearly forty years. When her last king, Amyntas, fell in battle against the warlike Homonades, who raided Galatia and other neighbouring states from their home base in the northern Taurus, Augustus reorganized the kingdom as an imperial province, governed by a *legatus pro praetore* (25 B.C.).²

By this time the kingdom of Galatia had expanded considerably beyond its original limits. In 36 B.C., for example, Mark Antony presented Amyntas with Iconium, a city of Phrygia, together with part of Lycaonia and Pamphylia.³ Some time after taking over Amyntas's kingdom, Augustus reduced its size by transferring Eastern Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia, which it had included, to the sovereignty of his ally Archelaus, king of Cappadocia. Even so, the province of Galatia comprised much territory to the south which had never been ethnically Galatian—Pisidia and the adjacent region which Strabo calls "Phrygia

¹ Polybius, *Hist.*, xxii. 16; Livy, *Hist.*, xxxviii. 12 ff.

² Dio Cassius, *Hist.*, liii. 26. 3.

³ Dio Cassius, *Hist.*, xlix. 32. About 400 B.C. Xenophon calls Iconium "the last city of Phrygia" (*Anabasis*, i. 2. 19). About A.D. 70 Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, v. 41) lists it (under the name Conium) among the most famous towns of Phrygia, although elsewhere (ii. 25) he assigns it to Lycaonia, as do many writers from Cicero onwards. About A.D. 163 Hierax, one of Justin Martyr's co-defendants, describes himself as a slave "torn away from Iconium in Phrygia" (*Acts of Justin* 3). W. M. Calder thought that *Εἰκόμιον* was a later form invented by etymologizing Greeks in place of an earlier *Κόμιον*, reflecting Phrygian *Kawania* ("Corpus Inscriptionum Neo-Phrygiarum", *JHS*, xxxi (1911), 189, n. 48).

towards Pisidia",¹ with Isaurica and Western Lycaonia. Rome inherited from Amyntas the task of crushing the Homonades, who were a constant menace to "Phrygia towards Pisidia" in particular. They were ultimately subjugated by P. Sulpicius Quirinius, governor of Galatia, in the years following 12 B.C.²

In 6 B.C. inland Paphlagonia, on the north, was added to the province of Galatia, as three or four years later were some areas to the north-east which had formerly belonged to Pontus. These latter areas were henceforth known as Pontus Galaticus.³ By analogy with this it has been inferred that (for example) those parts of Phrygia and Lycaonia which were included in the province were known respectively as Phrygia Galatica and Lycaonia Galatica, to distinguish them from that part of Phrygia which lay within proconsular Asia (Phrygia Asiana) and from Eastern Lycaonia (Lycaonia Antiochiana)⁴ which, from A.D. 37 to 40, and again from A.D. 41 onwards, belonged to Rome's ally Antiochus IV, king of Commagene. These terms are convenient enough, but without proper attestation we cannot assume confidently that they were part of the official Roman nomenclature.

In our period, then, Provincia Galatia stretched from Pontus on the Black Sea to Pamphylia on the Mediterranean.⁵ Paul's "churches of Galatia" might theoretically have been situated anywhere within these limits. The question is: Were they situated in the original Galatian territory ("North Galatia") or in Phrygia Galatica and Lycaonia Galatica ("South Galatia")? The latter alternative identifies them with the churches planted by Paul and Barnabas during their so-called first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 4-xiv. 26)—in the Phrygian cities of Pisidian Antioch (modern Yelvaç) and Iconium (modern Konya) and in the Lycaonian cities of Lystra (modern Zoldera, near Hatunsarai)⁶

¹ Strabo, *Geog.*, xii. 8. 13: ἡ πρὸς Πισιδίαν [Φρυγία].

² Ibid. xii. 6.5; cf. R. Syme, "Galatia and Pamphylia under Augustus", *Klio*, xxvii (1934), 122 ff.

³ E.g. in *CIL*, iii. 6818 Pontus Galaticus (distinguished from Pontus Polemonianus) is specified in a list of the regions over which the legate of Galatia exercised command.

⁴ *CIL*, v. 8660.

⁵ Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, v. 147: "Galatia touches on Cabalia in Pamphylia."

⁶ Cf. M. H. Ballance, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, viii (Manchester, 1962), pp. xi ff.

and Derbe (modern Devri Şehri, near Kerti Hüyük).¹

II

The "North Galatian" hypothesis held the field almost unchallenged until the eighteenth century. That it should have been taken for granted in the patristic age was natural.² In the second century (c. A.D. 137) Lycaonia Galatica was detached and united with Cilicia and Isaurica to form an enlarged province, and towards the end of the third century (c. 297) the remainder of South Galatia with some adjoining territories became a new province of Pisidia, with Pisidian Antioch as its capital and Iconium as its second city.³ The province of Galatia was thus reduced to North Galatia, and when the church fathers, in their study of our epistle, read of "the churches of Galatia", they understood "Galatia" without more ado in the sense familiar in their day.

The Marcionite prologue to the Epistle to the Galatians does indeed begin with the surprising statement "Galatians are Greeks"; but this may simply mean that the recipients of the letter were Greek speaking—which could be inferred from the fact that Paul wrote to them in Greek, not to mention the continuing designation *Gallograecia*. Whether in actual fact the inhabitants of the reduced province of Galatia in the Marcionite author's

¹ Cf. M. H. Ballance, "The Site of Derbe: A New Inscription", *Anatolian Studies*, vii (1957), 147 ff.; "Derbe and Faustropolis", *Anatolian Studies*, xiv (1964), 139 ff.; G. Ogg, "Derbe", *New Testament Studies*, ix (1962-3), 367 ff.

² Asterius, bishop of Amaseia in Pontus (died A.D. 410), seems to understand "the Galatic region and Phrygia" of Acts xviii. 23 as meaning "Lycaonia and the cities of Phrygia" (*Homilia VIII in SS Petrum et Paulum*; Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, xl. 293 D). W. M. Ramsay thought he represented a persisting although scantily attested South Galatian tradition ("The 'Galatia' of St. Paul and the 'Galatic Territory' of Acts", *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, iv (Oxford, 1896), 16 ff.). See p. 259 below.

³ Cf. W. M. Calder, "A Hellenistic Survival at Eucarpia", *Anatolian Studies*, vi (1956), 49 ff. In New Testament times "Pisidian Antioch" (cf. Acts xiii. 14, Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν Πισιδίαν) was so called not because it was in Pisidia but because it was, as Strabo calls it (*Geog.*, xii. 6. 4), "Antioch near Pisidia" (τὴν . . . Ἀντιόχειαν . . . τὴν πρὸς τῇ Πισιδίᾳ). The later reading of Acts xiii. 14, "Antioch of Pisidia" (Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας, interpreted by A.V. as "Antioch in Pisidia"), reflects the fourth-century situation.

day spoke Greek or Celtic is probably not a question in which he would have been greatly interested.

The linguistic question, however, did interest one Latin commentator on Galatians. In the preface to the second book of his commentary on this epistle Jerome tells how, in addition to Greek, the Galatians of his day (later fourth century A.D.) spoke a vernacular which he recognized as similar to that which he used to hear at Trier, where he had stayed for some time in his early twenties.¹ Whether indeed the Celtic of North-Central Asia Minor and that spoken on the banks of the Moselle were mutually intelligible in Jerome's time, when their speakers had been so far separated for six and a half centuries or more, may be doubted; Jerome may have recognized a resemblance between some words for specific objects or actions.

In the same preface Jerome quotes the Christian writer Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius as saying that the Galatians were so called because of the whiteness of their skin, as though their name was derived from Greek γάλα ("milk").² More has been made of his quotation from a poem by Hilary of Poitiers, of Gallic origin himself, in which the Gauls were described as "unteachable" (Latin *indociles*); "no wonder, then", says Jerome, "that the Galatians were called 'foolish' and slow of understanding".³

John Calvin in his commentary on Galatians (1548) followed his predecessors in holding the North Galatian view, but curiously combined it with the view that the epistle was written before the Jerusalem council of Acts xv.⁴ (He identified Paul and Barnabas's Jerusalem visit of Gal. ii. 1 ff. with the famine-relief visit of Acts xi. 30.) One wonders when he supposed the evangelization of North Galatia to have taken place.

The first scholar known to us who held that the recipients of the Epistle to the Galatians at least included the churches planted by Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey

¹ *In Gal. ii, praef.* (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxvi, 382 C).

² *Ibid.* 379 B-C.

³ *Ibid.* 380 C.

⁴ *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, E.T. by T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh and London, 1965), pp. 24 f.

appears to have been J. J. Schmidt¹ in 1748, followed in 1825 by J. P. Mynster, whose position might be described as "Pan-Galatian" rather than either North or South Galatian.² In the nineteenth century (apart from its last decade) the South Galatian view was championed mainly by French scholars, such as Georges Perrot, who argued for it in *De Galatia Provincia Romana* (1867),³ and Ernest Renan, who assumed it rather than argued for it in his *Saint Paul* (1869).⁴ The majority of others continued to propound the North Galatian view, and among these others J. B. Lightfoot stands out with special distinction.⁵

Lightfoot's commentary on Galatians first appeared in 1865; it remains a standard work which no student of the letter can afford to overlook—and there are not many commentaries over a hundred years old of which this sort of thing can be said. He recognized the ambiguity in the phrase "churches of Galatia", but rejected the view that they were the churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe in favour of locating them at Ancyra, Pessinus and perhaps Tavium (possibly also at Julio-polis, the ancient Gordion). His arguments against the South Galatian view are mainly to the effect that the churches planted during Paul and Barnabas's first missionary journey are not called Galatian churches in Acts—but Luke's usage is not necessarily Paul's.⁶

His positive arguments for the North Galatian⁷ view include the consideration that the "Galatic region" of Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23 is most probably ethnic Galatia, that Paul's two visits to the region mentioned in these passages coincide with his two visits to Galatia implied in Galatians iv. 13, and especially that

¹ Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, E.T. (London, 1965), p. 192.

² I.e. he propounded what Kümmel (loc. cit.) prefers to call the *Provinzhypothese* as against the *Landschaftshypothese* (*Kleine Theologische Schriften*, Copenhagen, 1825).

³ *De Galatia Provincia Romana* (Paris, 1867), pp. 43 f.

⁴ E.T., *Saint Paul* (London, 1890), pp. 24 ff., 63 f., 169 f., 173.

⁵ *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1865). See also his criticism of Renan in his *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (London, 1875), pp. 25 f., n. 2.

⁶ Lightfoot, *Galatians*¹⁰ (London, 1890), pp. 19 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 20 ff.

the temperament of the Galatian Christians reflected in the letter harmonizes (a) with the testimonies to the fickleness of the Gauls found in classical authors (especially Caesar)¹ and (b) with the fact that the Gauls were (Caesar again being witness) “a superstitious people given over to ritual observances”² and that Deiotarus, king of Galatia in the mid-first century B.C., was characterized by an “extravagant devotion to augury”.³

The weight laid by a scholar of Lightfoot's calibre upon these alleged affinities between the recipients of Paul's letter and the Celts known to Caesar and his contemporaries is surprising. Caesar is not an entirely objective witness where the Gauls are concerned and, for the rest, the argument seems to reduce itself to a syllogism of this order :

The Gauls were fickle and superstitious.

Paul's Galatians were fickle and superstitious.

Therefore : Paul's Galatians were Gauls.

The undistributed middle is not hard to recognize ; the argument would be valid only if fickleness and superstition were not characteristic of other nations than the Gauls (and Galatians). We have to look no farther than the Galatians' Phrygian neighbours for another well-known example, while Luke's account of Paul's adventure at Lystra suggests that fickleness and superstition were not wanting among the Lycaonians.

III

Nevertheless, Lightfoot's dismissal of the South Galatian view in favour of the traditional one was natural ; when he wrote, the South Galatian view had not yet been placed on a sufficiently sound basis. The scholar by whom this was achieved was W. M. Ramsay (1851-1939), whose statement of the case in *The Church in the Roman Empire* (1893)⁴ and *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1899) was

¹ Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, ii. 1, iv. 5 ; cf. Hilary's description of them as *indociles* (p. 248 above).

² *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 16.

³ Lightfoot, *Galatians*¹⁰, p. 16, referring to Cicero, *De Divinatione*, i. 5, ii. 36 f.

⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire*⁵ (London, 1897), pp. xii f., 8 ff., 97 ff.

founded on his systematic survey of Central Asia Minor on the spot, coupled with his comprehensive and detailed study of epigraphy and classical literature.

Ramsay's reputation as a scholar of the first rank (which he certainly was) suffered somewhat in the course of the years, largely by his own doing.¹ The Ramsay of the 1880's and 1890's was a very great man, but the reputation which he deservedly established for himself in those two decades was in danger of being buried under the reputation for popular apologetic which he acquired after 1900. He was persuaded to keep on writing articles and books for a large, enthusiastic and uncritical public, and on occasion to pontificate (the word is not too strong) on subjects which really lay outside his field, as in his reviews of G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*² and James Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*.³ People who knew Ramsay only by his later writings got the idea that he need not be taken too seriously—although even in them the persevering reader will be rewarded by nuggets of pure gold, especially where the historical geography of Asia Minor is concerned.⁴

It was the early Ramsay who laid the archaeological foundation for the South Galatian hypothesis, and laid it so firmly that to

¹ Cf. W. F. Howard, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* (London, 1949), pp. 138 ff.; W. W. Gasque, *Sir William M. Ramsay* (Grand Rapids, 1966), pp. 7 f., 62 f.

² In *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (London, 1908), pp. 267 ff., reprinted from *The Expositor*, Series 5, i (1895), pp. 55 ff. In this review Ramsay makes the acute point that different strata in an Old Testament document may reflect not different times but different places, thus anticipating an argument stated more fully and precisely fifty-five years later by A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, 1949), p. 3.

³ W. M. Ramsay, *The First Christian Century* (London, 1911); see critique by J. Denney, *Letters to W. Robertson Nicoll* (London, 1920), p. 182; *Letters to his Family and Friends* (London, 1922), p. 161.

⁴ Cf. his *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London, 1897; 141920); *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia* (London, 1904); *The Cities of St. Paul* (London, 1907); also *The Thousand and One Churches*, in collaboration with Gertrude Bell (London, 1909), of which J. Denney's impression was that they had "baked a huge cake with very little meal" (*Letters to W. Robertson Nicoll*, p. 150). His last contribution to scholarly literature was the posthumously published *The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor* (Aberdeen, 1941).

many of his disciples it is no longer a mere hypothesis.¹ When he began his exploration of Asia Minor he accepted (mainly on Lightfoot's terms) the North Galatian view, as he also accepted F. C. Baur's reconstruction of the course of primitive Christian history. He abandoned the one view, as he abandoned the other, by the compelling evidence of facts as he faced them *in situ*. The whole organization of Asia Minor in the first-century Roman Empire, he held—its administration and communications—pointed inexorably to the South Galatian destination of our epistle. In the preface to the fourth edition of *The Church in the Roman Empire* (1896) he tells his readers that they will find all the evidence for the South Galatian view in the first volume of his *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (1895), although the view is neither mentioned nor discussed there. But the solid evidence for the South Galatian view is contained in such studies as his *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* and his earlier *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (1890)—studies conducted with no thought of the Epistle to the Galatians or of establishing or demolishing any theory about its destination.

In these earlier works Ramsay carefully avoided appealing to the usual series of ambiguous arguments in favour of the South Galatian view.² Such arguments are :

1. Paul habitually uses Roman imperial nomenclature—but then any inhabitants of the province of Galatia, including the ethnic Galatians, would have been "Galatians" to him.

2. Paul addresses his Galatians in Greek—but Greek would have been familiar in Ancyra and Pessinus at least.

3. Paul mentions Barnabas (Gal. ii. 1 ff.), who was personally known to the South Galatians but not (so far as we can tell) to the North Galatians—but he mentions him also in 1 Corinthians ix. 6, and there is no evidence that he was personally known to the Corinthians.

4. Paul's travel-companions in Acts xx. 4, who presumably

¹ Cf. J. A. Findlay, "It is significant that all those who know the geography of Asia Minor well are 'South Galatianists' to a man" (*The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1934), p. 166).

² He lists ten (including the six mentioned here) in *The Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, pp. 97 ff.

were carrying their churches' contributions to the Jerusalem fund, include South Galatians (Gaius of Derbe and Timothy of Lystra) but not North Galatians—but such an argument from silence is precarious (no Corinthian representative is named).

5. The presence of Jewish emissaries is more probable in South Galatia than in North Galatia—but they might make it their business to visit any city where Paul had planted a church.

6. Paul's Galatians received him "as an angel of God" (Gal. iv. 14), which is a remarkable coincidence with his identification with Hermes by the Lystrans (Acts xiv. 11 ff.)—but the coincidence is somewhat spoiled by the Lystrans' later murderous attack on him (Acts xiv. 19).

He based his case rather on the facts of historical geography, coupled with his interpretation of Paul's policy as one of concentration on the main roads and centres of communication in the Roman provinces. The main line along which Christianity advanced in Asia Minor was the road from Syria through the Cilician Gates to Iconium and Ephesus, and so across the Aegean. There were two subsidiary lines: one following the land route by Philadelphia to Troas, and so across to Philippi and the Egnatian Way, and the other leading north from the Cilician Gates by Tyana and Cappadocian Caesarea to Amisos on the Black Sea. These are in fact the principal lines of penetration from the Cilician Gates into the peninsula, and none of them led through ethnic Galatia. The southern side of the Anatolian plateau was more important than the northern under the earlier Roman Empire; the full development of the northern side did not take place until Diocletian transferred the centre of imperial administration to Nicomedeia in A.D. 292. In Ramsay's view, the South Galatian hypothesis was the one which agreed best with the facts of the historical geography of Asia Minor.¹

The North Galatian case, however, has never lacked defenders, especially in Germany, but few of these have dealt adequately with Ramsay's positive arguments. Among those who have dealt with them most seriously were P. W. Schmiedel, in the

¹ *The Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, pp. 10 f.; cf. *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), pp. 197 ff.

section which he contributed to the article "Galatia" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1901),¹ and J. Moffatt, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911).² Moffatt's arguments are about the weightiest ever presented for the North Galatian view after Ramsay's presentation of the evidence for South Galatia.³ He appreciates the weakness of some traditional arguments for North Galatia—e.g. the appeal to the Galatians' alleged fickleness—and points out some weaknesses in Ramsay's case. Did Paul always follow the main roads and evangelize the principal centres of communication? Then what took him to Lystra and Derbe? In Ramsay's own words: "How did the cosmopolitan Paul drift like a piece of timber borne by the current into this quiet backwater?"⁴ On the other hand, Ancyra in North Galatia, the provincial seat of administration, was, on Ramsay's own showing, "one of the greatest and most splendid cities of Asia Minor".⁵

Even so, many of Moffatt's arguments, like Schmiedel's before him, and Lightfoot's still earlier, concern the interpretation

¹ Sections 8-13, following on W. J. Woodhouse's defence of the South Galatian view in sections 5-7.

² J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*³ (London, 1918), pp. 90 ff. Moffatt commends, in addition to Schmiedel's treatment, the defence of the North Galatian view in "A. Steinmann's thoroughgoing essays on *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes* (1906) and *Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes* (1908)".

³ One may justly take exception to Moffatt's remark that the identification of the Jerusalem visits of Acts xi. 30 and Gal. ii. 1 ff. "has found favour with several South Galatian advocates in their manipulation of the Lucan narratives" (*Introduction*³, p. 102)—the word "manipulation" conveys an unworthy innuendo.

⁴ Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 408 (in reference to Lystra).

⁵ Moffatt, *Introduction*³, p. 97; cf. Ramsay's words: "Ancyra was quite a Romanized city, civilized and rich" (*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, ii, Edinburgh, 1899, s.v. "Galatia", p. 84). But the earliest clear reference to Christianity at Ancyra is dated A.D. 192 (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 16. 3), although it had no doubt been planted there a century earlier. Indeed, Ramsay himself, interpreting an entry in the early Syriac Martyrology with the aid of a Byzantine milestone inscription at Barata in Lycaonia, argued (somewhat precariously) for a large-scale martyrdom of Christians at Ancyra at the end of the first century A.D. or the beginning of the second ("Two Notes on Religious Antiquities in Asia Minor: I. Gaianus, Martyr at Ancyra of Galatia", *Expository Times*, xxi (1909-10), 64 f.).

of Acts and not of our epistle, like the argument that Luke's "Galatic region" is ethnic Galatia, as against Ramsay's view that the "Phrygian and Galatic region" of Acts xvi. 6 is Phrygia Galatica and the "Galatic region" of Acts xviii. 23 Lycaonia Galatica. Moffatt admits that this is so: "Luke's usage, it may be retorted, is not decisive for Paul. This is perfectly true, but Paul's use of *Γαλατία* corresponds to the inferences from Acts."¹

To the evidence of Acts we must now turn.

IV

The issue of the destination of the Epistle to the Galatians is strictly independent of the references to Galatian territory in Acts. Granted that Paul usually adopts Roman provincial nomenclature—as when, for example, he repeatedly refers to Achaia in the Roman sense, as including Corinth, and not in the traditional Greek sense, of a territory in the North-Western Peloponnese, to which Corinth did not belong—it might be argued that Luke prefers the more popular geographical terms and so would use Galatia in the ethnic sense.² But what are the facts?

There are two relevant passages in Acts. The first is in Acts xvi. 6, where Paul and Silas, having journeyed on their westward way from Syria and the Cilician Gates through Derbe and Lystra and co-opted Timothy as their travelling companion at the latter place, "went through the Phrygian and Galatic region (*τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*),³ having been forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia." Accordingly, instead of proceeding west to Ephesus, "they came opposite Mysia (*κατὰ*

¹ *Introduction*³, p. 94.

² Paul was not reverting to Homeric usage, in which all the Greeks are Achaians. Luke uses "Achaia" in Acts xviii. 12 where he reproduces Gallio's official title, but "Greece" in Acts xx. 2.

³ The non-repetition of the article before *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* (except in the Byzantine text) suggests that this, and not "Phrygia and the Galatic region", is the proper translation. *Φρύγιος* appears as an adjective of both two and three terminations; for the construction cf. "the Ituraean and Trachonitid region" of Luke iii. 1.

τὴν Μυσίαν)¹ and attempted to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus did not allow them, so, passing by Mysia, they came down to Troas"—and from there crossed over to Macedonia. Where, having regard to this fairly detailed itinerary, should we locate the "Phrygian and Galatic region" through which the missionary party passed after receiving the prohibition to evangelize Asia? Ramsay, as we have seen, identified it with Phrygia Galatica—the part of Phrygia included within the province of Galatia, Strabo's "Phrygia towards Pisidia". Lightfoot's suggestion was that it denoted ethnic Galatia, because that area had once been Phrygian (before the second half of the third century B.C.) but had subsequently become Galatian.² But such an antiquarianism is uncharacteristic of Luke. Kirsopp Lake, who in his *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (1911) had followed Ramsay's interpretation,³ reviewed the evidence afresh for his note on "Paul's route in Asia Minor" in volume V of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I (1933) and concluded that the most probable explanation was that Paul, instead of going west from Iconium along the Lycus and Maeander valleys,

went north through Phrygia and territory where Galatians were numerous. If this view be accepted "Phrygian and Galatian country" means territory in which sometimes Phrygian and sometimes Gaelic⁴ was the language of the villagers. His route may have been through Laodicea, Amorion, and Orkistos (surely a Gaelic place)⁵ to Nakoleia and perhaps to Dorylaeum. Either Nakoleia or Dorylaeum might be said to be κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν. He was also on the direct road to Nicaea, and certainly from Nakoleia and probably from Dorylaeum there was a straight road to Troas, "skirting" Mysia—if that be the meaning of παρελθών. In one or the other of these places he was once more prevented by

¹ "When they had reached such a point that a line drawn across the country at right angles to the general line of their route would touch Mysia" (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, p. 75 n.); W. M. Calder suggests "in the latitude of Mysia" (letter dated 18 February 1953).

² *Galatians*¹⁰, p. 22; he recognized that Φρυγίαν and Γαλατικὴν were both adjectives qualifying χώραν (cf. his *Colossians*, p. 23).

³ *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*² (London, 1914), pp. 255 ff.

⁴ He means Gallic or Galatian; Gaelic is a Q-Celtic language, whereas Gallic was P-Celtic.

⁵ Presumably taking it as cognate with Latin *porcus*, with normal Celtic loss of Indo-European *P (cf. *Orcades*, "Orkneys"). But Orkistos was Phrygian-speaking (cf. Calder in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, vii, p. x).

revelation from working as he had intended—this time in Bithynia—and so he turned to the left and went through Mysia to Troas.¹

This route, as Lake remarks, does not differ substantially from that postulated by Ramsay, apart from the interpretation of the “ Phrygian and Galatic region ”. But the aspect in which it does differ from Ramsay’s comes to grief on the hard facts. The frontier between Galatic Phrygia and ethnic Galatia has been delimited much more precisely than it was in Ramsay’s day²; it ran due west from a point near the northernmost part of Lake Tatta (Tuz Gölü) to Orkistos (where the Sangarius divided the province of Asia from the province of Galatia)—say from 32° 50’ E. and rather north of 39° N. Since Paul’s plan, according to Acts xv. 36, was to visit all the cities which he and Barnabas had evangelized in South Galatia a year or two earlier, he and his companions probably intended to travel west from Lystra through Iconium and Pisidian Antioch. The prohibition against preaching in Asia was probably communicated at Lystra³: the Pastoral Epistles contain reminiscences of prophetic utterances given on the occasion when Timothy joined the apostolic company.⁴ Now they had to follow some other road than that which led to Ephesus, but it was necessary to go on to Iconium in any case. If by this time they thought of Bithynia they could cut out Pisidian Antioch and take the road to Phrygia Paroreios (the territory lying north and south of the range of Sultan Dağ), or they could go on to Pisidian Antioch and reach Phrygia Paroreios from there by crossing Sultan Dağ. In either case they would arrive at Philomelium. Leaving Philomelium by either of two possible routes for the north-west they passed at once into Phrygia Asiana: they would not touch

¹ *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, I, v (London, 1933), 236.

² Cf. W. M. Calder, “ The Boundary of Galatic Phrygia ”, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, vii, pp. ix ff.

³ Ramsay unnecessarily followed Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, London, 1893, p. 237) in adopting the inferior Byzantine reading *διελθόντες* instead of *διήλθον*, thus making the prohibition come after their passing through Derbe and Lystra (*St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 195 f.). The prohibition was given in good time to enable the missionaries to change their plans without inconvenience.

⁴ 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14 (cf. 2 Tim. i. 6).

ethnic Galatia or pass through any village where the Celtic language would be heard.

The "Phrygian and Galatic region" cannot be understood in the sense suggested by Lake: it can only mean the territory through which Paul and his friends passed after leaving Lystra, the territory in which Iconium and Pisidian Antioch were situated. Even if they by-passed both these cities and made straight for Mysia after receiving the divine monition at Lystra, they would still have crossed from Lycaonia Galatica into Phrygia Galatica and continued in the latter region until they reached the frontier of the province of Asia. To reach a road which would take them through territory where the Phrygian and Celtic tongues would both be heard, they would have had to go straight north from Lystra until they reached the latitude of 39° N. (without hearing a word of Celtic) and then turn west through a series of villages, remote from any contact with city life. There indeed they would have heard Phrygian on their left and Celtic on their right. But why should Paul make a detour to visit such a district "unless he had a prophetic vision of what Lake was going to say in the fulness of time, and some interest in proving him right?"¹

The narrative of Acts xv. 41-xvi. 8 is certainly more intelligible if the "Phrygian and Galatic region" is that part of Phrygia included in the province of Galatia. Although there were naturally lines of communication linking the various regions of the province, the cities of North Galatia were not readily accessible from the road leading from the Cilician Gates through Lystra; as the countryman told a perplexed motorist who asked his way to a certain place "If I were going there, it's not here I'd be starting from", so we may say that anyone proposing to evangelize North Galatia would have been better advised to set out from some other place than Lystra.

The second passage in Acts which is relevant to our subject is xviii. 23, where Paul, having paid a hasty visit to Palestine after his Corinthian ministry (probably in the summer of A.D. 52), returned to the west to begin his evangelization of Ephesus and "went from place to place through the Galatic region and

¹ W. M. Calder, letter, 18 February 1953.

Phrygia (*τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*), strengthening all the disciples ". It may be that by this geographical phrase Luke means much the same as the "Phrygian and Galatic region" of Acts xvi. 6. Ramsay thought the "Galatic region" of Acts xviii. 23 was Galatic Lycaonia, in distinction from that part of Lycaonia which belonged to the kingdom of Commagene (Lycaonia Antiochiana),¹ but this is uncertain. The "Galatic region" might be Galatic Lycaonia and Galatic Phrygia while "Phrygia" on this occasion could include Asian Phrygia. The reference to Paul's "strengthening all the disciples" indicates that he was not pioneering but retracing his former footsteps. If the expression in Acts xvi. 6 could cover ethnic Galatia, so could the expression in Acts xviii. 23; if ethnic Galatia is excluded from the former passage, it is excluded here too. It is simplest to understand Acts xviii. 23 in the sense of Paul's passing once more through Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch. In Acts xix. 1 he is said to have passed through "the upper country" (*τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη*) on his way to Ephesus. More or less any part of inland Asia Minor could have been called "the upper country" in relation to Ephesus: here the reference may be to the road leading due west from Pisidian Antioch, reaching Ephesus by the north side of Mount Messogis, instead of the main road farther south following the Lycus and Maeander valleys.

V

Other New Testament references to Galatia or the Galatians can be disposed of quickly. The "churches of Galatia" which, according to 1 Corinthians xvi. 1, had received Paul's instructions about the collection for Jerusalem, are no doubt identical with the "churches of Galatia" addressed in Gal. i. 2. If Paul's companions on his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4) were the delegates of the contributing churches, it may be relevant that they include two South Galatians, Gaius of Derbe² and Timothy

¹ *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 90 ff. Cf. p. 247, n. 2.

² The Western text has "Gaius of Doberus" (in Macedonia), perhaps by way of harmonization with "Gaius and Aristarchus, Macedonians who were Paul's companions in travel" (Acts xix. 29, where *Μακεδόνας* immediately

(of Lystra), but no North Galatians ; as has been said above, however, the list of companions may not be exhaustive.¹

The " Galatia " to which Crescens was sent by Paul (2 Tim. iv. 10) is not easily identified ; its significance is the more complicated because of the variant (but improbable) reading " Gaul " (*Γαλλίαν* for *Γαλατίαν*).²

As for " Galatia " in 1 Peter i. 1, that seems to denote the province in general, as it is named along with other Anatolian provinces—Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia—as an area in which " exiles of the dispersion " (i.e. Christians) lived.³

VI

The debate on the location of Paul's Galatians does not appear to be carried on today as seriously as it once was. R. M. Grant holds that in general " Acts does not assist us in locating these churches " ⁴ but suggests that the Spirit's prohibition in Acts xvi. 6 " may well be a theological expression of one aspect of Paul's illness " ⁵ which, according to Galatians iv. 13, occasioned Paul's first visit to Galatia. We have been accustomed to hearing the argument pressed against the South Galatian view that there is no hint in Acts xiii. 13 ff. that Paul was ill when he first visited Pisidian Antioch and the other cities of Galatic Phrygia and Lycaonia, and the answer readily presented itself that equally there is no hint of illness in the record of his passing through the Phrygian and Galatic region of Acts xvi. 6. But the force of this answer (negative as it was) is now threatened. Even so, Dr. Grant's interpretation of the Spirit's prohibition is no more probable than Ramsay's suggestion that Paul went up from the

followed by *συνεκδήμους* may be a dittography for *Μακεδόνα*, which would then refer only to Aristarchus, called in Acts xxvii. 2 " a Macedonian from Thessalonica ").

¹ Cf. pp. 252 f. above.

² So Codd. \aleph C and a few other authorities ; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 4. 8.

³ Lightfoot, *Galatians*¹⁰, p. 19, n. 5 ; cf. Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, pp. 110 f. ; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London, 1898), pp. 157 ff.

⁴ *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1963), p. 185 (because the reference to " the former " occasion—R.S.V. " at first "—in Gal. iv. 13 " probably does not imply two visits ").

⁵ *Ibid.*

Pamphylian coast to the highlands of Pisidian Antioch (3,600 feet above sea level) because of an attack of malaria (which he identified with the "thorn in the flesh" of 2 Cor. xii. 7).¹ Dr. Grant's understanding of the Spirit's prohibition in the light of Gal. iv. 13, along with the unlikelihood that Paul would address as "Galatians" (Gal. iii. 1) people who spoke Lycaonian (Acts xiv. 11),² leads him to conclude "that the letter was addressed to a group of communities near Ancyra"³—a conclusion which is sustained with difficulty when the journey of Acts xv. 41-xvi. 8 is plotted on the map.

It is disquieting to see how superficially the North Galatian hypothesis is defended by many of its champions nowadays, when we think of the careful arguments adduced by scholars of two and three generations ago—especially disquieting to see how little attention is paid to the relevant data of historical geography. Thus in Willi Marxsen's *Introduction to the New Testament* we read: "If Paul meant by 'Galatia' the Roman province, he could have been in the southern part of the province even on the first missionary journey—although not in the 'region of Galatia', as Acts always calls it."⁴ This implies that the *Γαλατικὴ χώρα*—an expression which occurs but *twice* in Acts (xvi. 6, xviii. 23)—can refer only to ethnic Galatia; in fact the adjective *Γαλατικός* (Latin *Galaticus*) is well attested for those regions of the province which were not ethnically Galatian,⁵ and also for the province as a whole,⁶ but not at this period for ethnic Galatia.⁷

¹ *Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, pp. 62 ff.; *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 92 ff.

² But the point is that (on the South Galatian view) Paul's addressees included people who were not Lycaonians linguistically, but who were "Galatians" politically (see p. 263 below).

³ *Historical Introduction*, p. 185.

⁴ *Introduction to the New Testament*, E.T. (Oxford, 1968), p. 46.

⁵ E.g. Pontus Galaticus (cf. p. 246, n. 3).

⁶ E.g. in *CIG*, 3991, where an official entrusted with the delimitation of boundaries c. A.D. 54 is called "procurator of the Galatic province" (*Γαλατικῆς ἐπαρχείας*).

⁷ About A.D. 150 Arrian can describe Alexander the Great as setting out "for Galatic Ancyra", or "for Ancyra of the Galatic territory" (*ἐπ' Ἀγκύρας τῆς Γαλατικῆς*), meaning the land which was to become "Galatic" in the century after Alexander; by Arrian's time the province of Galatia had begun to shrink back to its ethnic limits.

Dr. Marxsen continues : “ The South Galatian hypothesis, however, is extremely improbable.” In support of this statement three arguments are adduced :

1. “ The assertion that is often made, that Paul always uses the names of the Roman provinces, is incorrect.”¹

If anyone said that Paul *always* uses the names of the Roman provinces, he would be imprudent ; the fact is that Paul *normally* uses them. There may be deviations from this norm, but they will be recognizable deviations, and the burden of proof lies on those who understand *Γαλατία* and *Γαλάται* in his writings in another than the provincial sense.

2. “ Besides, Paul would hardly have been able to say in i. 21, ‘ Then I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia ’, for this is the Pauline parallel to the first missionary journey in Acts. According to the South Galatian hypothesis he must have founded the Galatian churches at that time but there is no mention of this.”

This argument seems to imply that Paul might have included the churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe in “ the regions of Syria and Cilicia ”² (if Acts xiii-xiv rightly

¹ He refers to E. Haenchen’s note on Acts xvi. 6 (*Die Apostelgeschichte*¹³ (Göttingen, 1961), p. 428, n. 2). Haenchen remarks that “ the view that Paul always uses the Roman provincial names has, without warrant, almost become a dogma ” ; if this were so, it were a grievous fault in a situation which calls for evidence, not dogma. He is right in pointing out that a number of terms occurring in Paul could be used either in the technical Roman sense or more generally and traditionally (e.g. Macedonia, Asia), but this argues neither for nor against the technical Roman sense in other instances.

² Dr. Marxsen may mean, like H. H. Wendt, *Die Apostelgeschichte*⁹ (Göttingen, 1913), pp. 242 f. (an earlier edition of which is cited by Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, pp. 106 ff.), that Paul was inaccurate in Gal. i. 21, but that the North Galatians would not have noticed this, whereas the South Galatians would have done so since it concerned them. Even if Paul was inaccurate, does a man perpetrate inaccuracies only when he knows that his readers or hearers will not notice them? It might be argued further that Luke himself attaches the churches of the “ first missionary journey ” to Syria and Cilicia when he represents Paul and Silas as delivering to them (Acts xvi. 4) the letter addressed to “ the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia ” (Acts xv. 23 ; cf. xv. 41). But see on this A. S. Geysler, “ Paul, the Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth ”, in *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan*, ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 124 ff., where a case is argued for the deletion of Acts xvi. 4.

makes him evangelize these cities at this stage), but not those which he calls "the churches of Galatia"; the latter would therefore be different from the four churches of Acts xiii-xiv and be located in North Galatia. That Paul would have included the South Galatian churches in "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" is incredible; but it was argued in the preceding lecture in this series that Galatians i. 21 is parallel, not to the "first missionary journey" of Acts xiii-xiv but to the interval between Acts ix. 31 and xi. 30, when Paul was active first in Tarsus and then in Antioch—the two leading cities of the united province of Syria-Cilicia.¹

3. "Finally it seems unlikely that Paul would address the inhabitants of Pisidia and Lycaonia as 'Galatians' (iii. 1: 'O foolish Galatians'). This can only be a racial term and cannot refer to the inhabitants of a Roman administrative district."

This argument, which is sometimes reinforced by the consideration that to address Christians who were not ethnic Galatians as "Galatians" would be psychologically disastrous,² will hardly stand up to investigation. What comprehensive term could have been used (other than "Galatians") to address Pisidians (or rather Phrygians) and Lycaonians together? We may reflect that the one comprehensive term which is acceptable when Englishmen, Welsh, Cornish and Scots are referred to or addressed together is "British", which "ethnically" is appropriate only to the Welsh and Cornish (and the Bretons, who are part of another political unit). The name Britain, or Great Britain, to denote our whole island, is a political expedient; yet Highland and Lowland Scots would much rather be called British (which they are not "ethnically") than English (which is applicable to them only linguistically, and even so is unacceptable).

If Paul's readers found anything objectionable in being called "foolish Galatians", the objection arose from the adjective "foolish" rather than from the substantive "Galatians".

¹ Syria and Cilicia were united to form one province in 27 B.C.; cf. J. G. C. Anderson, "Provincia Cappadocia", *Classical Review*, xlv (1931), 189 ff., and in *Cambridge Ancient History*, x (1934), p. 279.

² Cf. Lightfoot, *Galatians*¹⁰, p. 19.

If they were South Galatians, some of them lived in Phrygia and some in Lycaonia, and in addition to Phrygians and Lycaonians they included Jews, Greeks and perhaps Romans (since Pisidian Antioch was a Roman colony). The one political feature which they shared in common was their residence within the frontiers of the province of Galatia; the only single political term that could be applied to them all was Galatians. Ramsay's judgment may be quite soundly based: "I can entertain no doubt that about A.D. 50 the address by which an orator would most please the Iconians, in situations where the term 'Iconians' was unsuitable, was *ἄνδρες Γαλάται*, 'gentlemen of the Galatic province'."¹ Even "Phrygians" might not have been very acceptable to the Iconians, because of its currency in a sense practically synonymous with "slaves" or "cowards"² (and it would have been in every way inapplicable to the people of Lystra and Derbe). As for the people of Pisidian Antioch, they might well have preferred the designation "Galatians" to either "Phrygians" or "Pisidians", for if "Phrygians" was tantamount to "slaves" or "cowards", "Pisidians" (which the people of Antioch were not in any case) would have been little better than "barbarians".

W. G. Kümmel's *Introduction to the New Testament*, in which the North Galatian destination is upheld, similarly lays weight on the reference to "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" in Gal. i. 21 and the address "O foolish Galatians" in Gal. iii. 1³; but the defence of the North Galatian hypothesis deserves weightier arguments than these.

In fact, more recent statements of the North Galatian case represent no advance on Lightfoot and fall short of the statements of Schmiedel and Moffatt. This may be due in some measure to the fashion of paying more attention to the style of Luke's narrative than to the narrative itself⁴; besides, if the

¹ *Church in the Roman Empire*⁵, p. 43; cf. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* ii, p. 92 (s.v. "Galatia").

² Cf. Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 433, where a slave in Athens bears the name *Φρύξ* ("Phrygian"), and the proverb "more timid than a Phrygian hare" quoted by Strabo, *Geog.*, i. 2. 30.

³ W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, E.T., p. 193.

⁴ Cf. M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, E.T. (London, 1956), pp. 1 ff.

narrative is regarded as a partly fictitious and in any case idealized construction by a writer of a later generation, detailed study of its historical geography is not of the first relevance. Against this fashion it must be reiterated and underscored that Luke's narrative is true to its dramatic date,¹ and in this regard the study of its historical geography is of the utmost importance.

In recent years especially there has tended to be a correlation between acceptance of the South Galatian view and a high estimate of the historical reliability of Acts, on the one hand, and between acceptance of the North Galatian view and a more sceptical assessment of Acts on the other. This correlation may be little more than coincidental: it is neither necessary nor deliberate. An exception is provided by R. H. Fuller's *Critical Introduction to the New Testament* in the Duckworth series. There, as in the identically entitled volume by A. S. Peake which Dr. Fuller's work has replaced,² the South Galatian view is adopted but (in contrast to Peake's treatment) there is a lower estimate of the historical value of Acts. "The motive, conscious or unconscious, behind the North Galatian theory", says Dr. Fuller, "seems to be the desire to avoid making Gal. the earliest Pauline letter".³ This is doubtful, because by no means all South Galatianists make Galatians the earliest Pauline letter: those who infer from the reference to the "former" or "first" visit (τὸ πρότερον) in Galatians iv. 13 that Paul had visited the South Galatian churches twice before he wrote to them must date his letter after Acts xvi. 6. Dr. Fuller undertakes to satisfy the North Galatianists' difficulty by taking the first missionary journey of Acts as a duplicate of the second, so that Paul's visit to South Galatia in Acts xvi. 1-6 was really his first (after the Council of Jerusalem), and the visit of Acts xviii. 23 was his second. Galatians is then dated during Paul's Ephesian ministry.

¹ Cf. H. J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York, 1955); A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 48 ff., 144 ff., 189.

² A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1909), pp. 17 ff.

³ R. H. Fuller, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1966), p. 25.

But this dating of the epistle is independent of Dr. Fuller's view of the structure of Acts : it was held, for example, by T. W. Manson, who accepted Luke's narrative of the first and second missionary journeys as it stands.¹

VII

The question of the North or South Galatian destination of our epistle is not one in which it is proper to take up partisan attitudes or indulge in dogmatic assertions ; and it ill becomes champions of either view to disparage the rival view of those who maintain it. The fact that so many competent scholars can be cited in support of either position suggests that the evidence for neither is absolutely conclusive. But the weight of the evidence, it seems to me, favours the South Galatian view. If the Epistle to the Galatians was indeed addressed to the churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, then we have important historical, geographical, literary and epigraphic data which will provide material for its better understanding.

¹ "The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians", *BULLETIN*, xxiv (1940), 59 ff., reprinted in *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Manchester, 1962), pp. 169 ff.