

question about the addressees of 'Galatians' " (p. 36); but, if he wishes to make his statements into facts available for reasoning, he must give more information regarding the authority on which they rest.

✓ He says that "the zone of the olive-tree, if we leave out Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco, coincides almost exactly with the map of St. Paul's missionary work" (p. 41). We must leave out a great deal more: we must leave out Spain,¹ France, the southern Alpine slopes, all the islands of the western Mediterranean, and many other districts where Paul never penetrated. On the other hand, we must remember that there were no olives in Lycaonia and in North Galatia (where Dr. Deissmann places Pauline churches). What is the use or value of a generalisation which requires so much restriction on one side, and so much widening on another? It would be almost as true to say that Paul's mission work does not coincide with the olive zone, because it embraces much where olives are unknown and leaves out many large Mediterranean countries where olives are cultivated.

¹ Perhaps Dr. Deissmann holds that Paul was not condemned on the so-called "first trial" in Rome, in which I should gladly find him as an associate, and that the journey to Spain was actually performed.