Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Studies on Jewish communities in Asia Minor

Paul Raymond Trebilco

How to cite:

Trebilco, Paul Raymond (1987) Studies on Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6696/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Studies on Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.

By Paul Raymond Trebilco.

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
University of Durham.

October 1987.



28 JAN 1988

Abstract.

Studies on Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

by Paul Raymond Trebilco.

October 1987.

This thesis examines the evidence for Jewish communities in Asia Minor from the third century BCE through to the third century CE and beyond. The study begins with a discussion of the founding of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor, the nature of Roman support for these communities, and their religious concerns as they are revealed by the literary sources available to us.

Chapters 2 to 4 present and analyse the evidence for five particular communities – those at Sardis, Priene, Acmonia, Eumeneia and Apamea. The evidence from archaeology, inscriptions, numismatics and literary sources is discussed in an attempt to draw together the material into a coherent account of the nature of Jewish communal life in these cities.

Chapters 5 to 9 are thematic studies. The prominence accorded to women in some Jewish communities and in the cities of Asia Minor is discussed in Chapter 5. In Chapter 6 the use of the title Ὕψιστος for Yahweh and for pagan deities is analysed, along with the supposed link between Jewish communities and Sabazios. The existence of a number of "God–worshippers" in the synagogues of Asia Minor is discussed in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 discusses the provision of water sources in the synagogues of Asia Minor and relates this to Jewish purity concerns. Chapter 9 addresses the issue of Jewish communities and local and Roman citizenship and discusses the evidence which suggests that in some places Jewish communities were well integrated into city life.

Concluding remarks draw out some of the implications of this study for our view of Diaspora Jewish communities. It seems clear that in Asia Minor Jewish communities were involved in and a part of the cities in which they lived whilst also retaining their identity as Jews. We can also recognise a significant diversity of Jewish life in Asia Minor, with local factors providing a strong formative influence on these communities. Yet they all saw themselves as worthy and legitimate heirs of Old Testament faith.

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other University.

Statement of Copyright.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Preface.

A task such as the writing of a thesis cannot be conducted without the assistance of many others. Professor James D.G. Dunn must be singled out for a very special thank you. He has given me a large amount of his time and his guidance and direction has been greatly appreciated. I have also greatly valued his friendship and encouragement, and that of his wife Meta, as this work has proceeded.

I have gained much from discussion or communication with a number of scholars. Earlier versions of Chapters 5 and 9 were presented at the British New Testament Conferences in 1985 and 1986; the ensuing dialogue was very valuable. Dr A.R.R. Sheppard read earlier drafts of Chapters 3 and 6 and I have benefitted from his knowledge. Other scholars have given of their time in helping me on a number of matters. I would particularly like to thank Dr N.G. Cohen, the late Dr Colin Hemer, Professors Martin Hengel and A. Thomas Kraabel, Drs Ross Kraemer, John MacGregor, Tessa Rajak and Miss Joyce Reynolds. I alone remain responsible for the views expressed here.

Research is not possible without financial support. I would particularly like to thank the University Grants Committee of New Zealand for awarding me a Post–Graduate Scholarship, the Gordon Watson Scholarship and a William Georgetti Scholarship. This work would not have been possible without their generous assistance. I am also indebted to the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara for awarding me a Travel Grant which enabled me to visit a number of the sites discussed in this thesis in March and April 1986. The opportunity to visit the Institute, to talk with the staff there and to use the Institute's Library was one I benefitted from greatly.

Finally on a personal note, I would like to thank my wife Gill for her loving support and encouragement during the four years in which my life has been dominated by "the thesis".

Corrigenda.

P65, delete paragraph "Both had taken an active part ... goes back quite a number of years."

P78, four lines from bottom of page, replace "ent" with "**we can suggest**".

P137, a line has been left out. In line 7, after "the Roman Empire.[9]", begin a new paragraph and add: "**2.1 Zeus, the most exalted god of the Olympion, was often described as** ...

P271, footnote 216, for "Akedah Isaac" read "'**Akedath Yiẓḥaq**".

P316, footnote 108, after Philo [Quod. 81 add "**but note that Philo is here discussing the Essenes**"]

Contents.

Preface. i

Contents. ii

Introduction. 1

1. Josephus, Philo and Cicero on the Jewish Communities of Asia Minor. 5

2. The Jewish Communities at Sardis and Priene. 28

3. The Jewish Communities at Acmonia and Eumeneia. 51

4. The Jewish Community at Apamea. 89

5. The Prominence of Women in Asia Minor. 110

6. Theos Hypsistos and Sabazios – Syncretism in Judaism in Asia Minor? 136

7. "God–Worshippers" in Asia Minor. 154

8. Water Sources in the Synagogues of Asia Minor. 178

9. Jewish Community and Greek City in Asia Minor. 188

Conclusions. 205

Appendix 1. The Eumeneian Formula – Jewish and Christian? 208

Appendix 2. Women in Early Judaism according to the literary sources. 226

Footnotes. 235

Abbreviations. 415

Bibliography. 416

Introduction.

It is well known that by the first century CE there were Jewish communities of varying size and significance throughout the then civilized world. These different communities were of great importance for the development of both Judaism and Christianity. This study is devoted to the investigation of one part of the Jewish Diaspora, Asia Minor. The focus of scholarly attention has generally been elsewhere in the Diaspora, most notably in Rome and Egypt where the evidence is more extensive.[1] Indeed the whole of the Diaspora has often been viewed in the shadow of these two great communities. Yet the Jewish communities in Asia Minor are arguably as significant for Jewish history as are these two better known communities. In Asia Minor Jewish communities were established quite early and seem to have flourished, and there are indications of a distinctive Jewish communal life in some places. From sometime in the third century CE until the seventh century the community at Sardis owned the largest and most impressive synagogue yet discovered. The decrees given in Ant 14 and 16, which are largely from Asia Minor, were understood by Josephus as setting important precedents, showing that the situation of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor was significant for Diaspora Judaism in general. Clearly these communities have a significant place in the history of the Jewish Diaspora.

Further, an understanding of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor is important for the study of early Christianity. Paul was a citizen of Tarsus in Cilicia, he travelled extensively in Asia Minor, he lived for an extended period in Ephesus, he founded significant churches in the area, and he engaged in debate with both Jew and Gentile there. It is arguable therefore that Judaism in Asia Minor is as important a context within which to view Paul's mission and theology as is the Judaism of Palestine.[2] Other documents in the New Testament can be located in Asia Minor, and thus it is to be hoped that a greater understanding of Judaism in this area will further elucidate these works. Finally, early Christian communities flourished in Asia Minor throughout the first three centuries CE and beyond, and it is likewise to be hoped that our understanding of their development and the literature they produced will be enriched through a greater understanding of Judaism in Asia Minor.[3]

Although the focus of attention has been elsewhere in the Diaspora, there have been a number of studies of Judaism in Asia Minor. As far as I am aware, Graetz was the first to consider this area as a separated entity,[4] but was soon followed by Ramsay who in a number of different studies attempted to draw together the evidence available to him into an account of Jewish life in Asia Minor.[5] Other studies of varying length followed, most notably by Levy, Pilcher,

Schürer, Juster, Krauss, Leclercq, Kittel and Tcherikover.[6] Whilst much of this work is very helpful, some authors discussed only a part of the evidence or did so in insufficient detail. In addition, the evidence for syncretism was often overestimated.

In 1968 Kraabel wrote the first lengthy treatment of the area. He undertook the important and necessary task of presenting all the available evidence; to only a limited extent did he seek to draw out its significance and develop a picture of the nature of Judaism in Asia Minor.[7] Further studies of varying detail which have sought to deal with the whole area have followed, notably by Cohen, Saltman, Roth-Gerson, Blanchetière, Safrai and Stern, Ovadiah, Schürer–Vermes–Millar.[8] However, some of these studies have been short, whilst others have not sought to probe beneath the surface to any significant extent.[9] Thus, despite that fact that a significant amount of attention has been devoted to this area, we still lack a detailed analysis of the evidence and its synthesis, as far as this is possible, into a description of Jewish life in Asia Minor. It is this task which is carried forward here.

A number of questions have stimulated the present investigation. What was the nature of Jewish community life in Asia Minor? What sort of relationship existed between the cities and the Jewish communities? What influence did the predominant culture have on the Jewish communities and vice versa? What can we know of the "Jewish identity" of these Jewish communities? The material available to answer these questions is diverse. Archaeological evidence is provided by the Jewish synagogues discovered at Priene and Sardis. Jewish inscriptions come from a wide variety of places. They were initially collected by Oehler[10] and then by Frey in Volume 2 of CIJ, which is unfortunately both inaccurate and incomplete and thus must be emended and supplemented by the review of the late Louis Robert.[11] A number of other studies by Robert and his annual review - "Bulletin Épigraphique" - are also invaluable.[12] Other epigraphical collections such as MAMA, TAM and IGSK, and Classical, Jewish and Christian authors provide further evidence which is used as appropriate. Whilst we unfortunately do not have a substantial literary corpus from Jews in Asia Minor, the evidence we do have has the advantage of locating Jewish communities in their contexts. The temporal parameters of this investigation correspond with those of the evidence. Thus most attention is devoted to the period from the late third century BCE to the third and fourth century CE.

The thesis begins with an examination of the literary evidence concerning Jewish communities in Asia Minor provided by Josephus, Philo and Cicero. This is followed by three studies of Jewish communities for which there is a

sufficient concentration of evidence to enable a picture of Jewish life in context to emerge.[13] I then proceed to five thematic studies in which substantive issues which were significant in a number of different communities are dealt with.

No attempt has been made here to present and discuss every inscription or piece of evidence for the Jewish communities in Asia Minor. This is unnecessary since it has already been done by Kraabel and more recently in Vol 3.1 of the new Schürer.[14] In the present work I have sought to discuss at some length the evidence which sheds light on the above mentioned questions. Thus, for example, inscriptions of a purely mundane character will not be discussed.

A word on methodology is important at the outset. It is an ever present temptation for those who, like myself, approach Judaism with an interest in the NT to investigate the former with the concerns and agenda of the latter in mind.[15] Thus the study of Judaism can all too easily be conducted, not for its own sake, but because of its potential contribution to another area of investigation.[16] I have sought here to overcome this difficulty by attempting to describe and to understand the evidence in its own terms and for its own sake, and to let the issues addressed arise from the material itself. Thus I have not imposed on the evidence the issues of significance for NT research, but have sought to assess and investigate the patterns and issues which are germane to the evidence itself.[17] It is to be hoped that this will lead to the description of Judaism in Asia Minor on its own terms as far as this is possible within the confines of the evidence.

Just as it is all tooeasy to investigate Judaism with the agenda established by NT studies, so too one can investigate Judaism in Asia Minor with the agenda established by what we know was significant for other Jewish communities. For example, the Jewish evidence from Asia Minor can be interpreted in the light of the situation in Alexandria or Rome. I have endeavoured therefore to discuss the Jewish communities in Asia Minor without blurring or homogenizing the material by submerging it under evidence from elsewhere in the Diaspora. Thus, it is hoped that in some cases the distinctive aspects of Judaism in Asia Minor will emerge; in other cases the facets Judaism in Asia Minor shared with other areas will be seen through concentrating predominantly on the evidence from Asia Minor. Therefore, comparative evidence will be presented only when this serves to sharpen our picture of Judaism in Asia Minor. On some issues where quite different situations prevailed in various areas of the Diaspora the presentation of other evidence would only serve to confuse the position in Asia Minor.

In addition, some features which Judaism in Asia Minor shared with other

Diaspora communities, but for which we have little evidence from Asia Minor itself, will not be dealt with specifically. For example, apart from the issue of the prominence of women, the titles of the leaders of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor will not be dealt with at length.

Chapter 1.

Josephus, Philo and Cicero on the Jewish Communities of Asia Minor.

1. Introduction.

Josephus, Philo and Cicero preserve documents and information relating to the Jewish communities of Asia Minor. They show us that these Jewish communities were generally supported by the Romans in their attempts to pursue their own religious and social practices in various cities,[1] and also provide us with details of the religious concerns of these communities. A number of the documents come from the Emperor, or from Roman civic officials and are addressed to individual cities;[2] others are decrees of cities in Asia Minor.

Although the authenticity of the decrees to be examined here has been recently questioned by Moehring,[3] his case against their authenticity rests on minor aberrations and corruptions in the text which can be satisfactorily explained by the history of transmission of the documents. Indeed, as Rajak notes, detailed investigation confirms:

> that the formal features of the documents are correct for genre and period to a degree which makes it very difficult to conceive of them as forgeries.[4]

Thus most recent investigators have accepted the authenticity of the decrees.[5] They can therefore be used here as evidence for the Jewish communities of Asia Minor.[6]

2. Antiochus III and the transportation of Jews to Phrygia and Lydia.

Josephus quotes three documents ascribed to Antiochus III, the third of which is a letter to Zeuxis, the governor of Lydia [Ant 12:148–153]. There is an extensive body of literature on the difficult question of the authenticity of these three documents. I will discuss only the third document since it alone relates to Asia Minor. The letter in Ant 12:148–153 was written by Antiochus III whilst he was in the East between 212 and 205/4 BCE.[7] He wrote to his strategos Zeuxis with instructions concerning the settlement of two thousand Jewish families in Lydia and Phrygia in an attempt to maintain internal security in the region which was beset by rebellion.[8]

The Seleucids, like other Hellenistic dynasties, founded a large number of colonies or cities throughout their Empire.[9] These foundations began as civilian colonies, garrisons of active soldiers or, most frequently, as settlements of retired or reserve soldiers. The particular situations which led to the founding of colonies included the need to protect lines of communication, trade routes or

frontier zones and the desire to halt rebellion.[10] The transportation of the Jews to Lydia and Phrygia fits into this general pattern.

2.1 The authenticity of the letter has been both impugned and defended.[11] We can note the following points in the debate. Firstly, Schalit concluded that the letter was composed in the conventional official Hellenistic form employed by a King writing to an individual.[12] Similarly, Bickerman judged the letter to be authentic because the formulae used were current in the era to which it purports to belong.[13] Secondly, there is nothing unusual in the arrangements which suggests a forgery.[14] Rather it gives the normal procedure followed by the Seleucids when founding a colony.[15] Thirdly, none of the objections which have been raised against authenticity stand up to examination.[16] For instance, Gauger has recently noted the lack of mention of the satraps in Babylonia and Mesopotamia in the letter, the inappropriateness of the resettlement programme as a way of quelling rebellion and the lack of instructions for the transmission of the letter, argung that all these matters suggest that the letter is inauthentic.[17] However, he places too much weight on the letter's silence. We do not know if this was Antiochus' only communication on the subject, if it was his only action to stop the rebellion, or how much need have been spelt out in a letter to an official like Zeuxis.[18] Thus many scholars now think that the letter is authentic, and we can proceed to use it with confidence as evidence for the settlement of Jews in Asia Minor.[19] The following points arise from the letter:

2.2.1 Two thousand Jewish families were sent to Lydia and Phrygia, which means that the total number of people probably exceeded 10,000.[20] They were distributed among an unspecified number of sites, so we cannot estimate the size of any one settlement.

2.2.2 The choice of Jews from Mesopotamia and Babylonia was probably prompted by a number of considerations. The Jews of this region were known [at least later] for their effectiveness as soldiers;[21] Antiochus was in the East at the time; and he knew that the Jews were loyal to his interests,[22] an important quality to seek in prospective colonists. Thus the Jews were to maintain a pro-Seleucid presence at or near various strategically located τόποι and φρούρια in order to establish Seleucid rule in the area and thus hopefully to guarantee the peace.[23]

2.2.3 The colonists were to be allowed "νόμοις ... χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις",[24] and to have a degree of separate organisation, arrangements which would have made the prospect of colonisation much more attractive to the Jews.[25] They were also granted land for homes, farming and viticulture[26] [presumably from tracts in royal possession], very favourable exemptions from tax, and grants

of as much grain as was needed to ensure that the settlements flourished and became permanent. Antiochus seems to have been eager to win the colonists' good will. In addition, these favourable terms probably meant that the Jewish communities concerned began well. This would have had a decisive influence on the character of the communities.

2.2.4 The evidence is contradictory with regard to whether or not these settlers were soldiers, and thus whether their settlements were military colonies. We note that the situation to which they were sent demanded a military presence, that at least some Babylonian Jews were soldiers, that some of the Jews were sent to garrisons and that Antiochus states they were to be guardians [φύλακες] of his interests. They could therefore have been mercenaries sent to Asia Minor to put down the revolt with the understanding that they would then settle there.[27] However, Antiochus does *not* state that they were to be soldiers, nor does he mention a formal military organisation.[28] Further, the number of settlers involved seems to have been insufficient to suppress unrest, the reference to them as guardians of Antiochus' interests does not necessarily indicate any specific military responsibility and the fact that Zeuxis needed to ensure they were free from harassment does not seem to be appropriate for soldiers in fighting units.[29]

There are however two possible factors which suggest that they were military settlers. Antiochus urges Zeuxis to be especially generous "to those engaged in χρεία" which, in the context of showing themselves eager in the Seleucid cause, probably means some sort of military service, although other meanings are possible.[30] Secondly, the colonists were sent to garrisons and "other important places", which were probably the most strategic towns and villages in the area, which required a military presence in a time of trouble.[31] At the very least the fact that they were to live in a rebellious area must have meant that they were able to defend themselves to some extent, even if Zeuxis was to ensure their safety. But we cannot be certain, as some scholars have been,[32] that they formed military colonies of their own.

2.2.5 It is significant that the first large settlement of Jews for which we have evidence in Asia Minor came from Babylonia and Mesopotamia, that is, from another part of the Diaspora. We can suggest that they would have already adjusted to Diaspora life and thus would not have found the issues which faced them there [such as their remoteness from Jerusalem, adjusting to life in a pagan land, the issues of internal organisation] as difficult as new settlers from Palestine would have done. This factor would probably have also led to the early establishment of strong, confident Jewish communities in Asia Minor.

3. The decree of Pergamum.

Ant 14:247–255, a decree of the people of Pergamum, is to be dated in the time of Antiochus VII Sidetes or Antiochus IX Cyzicenus.[33] The decree explains that Jewish envoys had arrived in the city after having received a favourable ruling on the affairs of Hyrcanus I from the Roman Senate. The people of Pergamum stated that they would take care that the Senate's decree was fulfilled and that they would do everything possible on behalf of the Jews. A copy of Pergamum's decree was to be sent to Hyrcanus along with envoys to assure him of "the friendly interest of our people."[34] The decree contains two points of interest for us.

3.1 It is probable that Jews were actually resident in Pergamum at this time. Two generations after this event Cicero mentions that Flaccus seized a small amount of gold destined for Jerusalem from Pergamum. Although this was probably collected from the whole area around Pergamum, it seems likely that some of it came from Jews resident in the city at this time.[35] Thus the envoys travelling from Rome to Jerusalem probably made the detour to Pergamum, not only because it was an important city at this time, but also in order to visit the Jewish community there.[36]

The decree itself suggests that the city of Pergamum would have had a positive attitude towards the Jewish community living in its midst. It would be surprising, though admittedly not impossible, for the city to be positive towards the Jews of Palestine [as the decree shows],[37] yet hostile towards its own Jewish community. Good relations between Greek and Jew in the city seem more plausible. This is perhaps confirmed by the fact that Josephus preserves no later documents from Pergamum. Whilst this would not be significant on its own, taken with the evidence of this decree, it suggests that in the first century BCE the Jewish community in Pergamum had no cause to appeal to the Roman authorities because its relations with the city were good.

3.2 That this line of interpretation is possible is suggested by the mention of Theodorus in the decree. He is not one of the envoys of Hyrcanus, but is the person who was admitted to the council and assembly of Pergamum carrying the letter and decree of the Senate. He requested that a copy of the decree of Pergamum be sent to Hyrcanus along with an envoy from the city and appears to have had a part in obtaining a positive response from the city. Yet his name appears suddenly in the text without introduction, which suggests that he was already known because he was an inhabitant of Pergamum.[38] What is said about him makes it very likely that he was a Jew. He was thus perhaps an important member of the Jewish community of the city, and was sufficiently respected to

be allowed to speak to the council and assembly, and able to convince them to adopt his recommendations which were flattering towards Hyrcanus.[39] Thus we can suggest that the Jewish community in Pergamum at some point during the last three decades of the second century CE [and perhaps in the first century BCE as well] enjoyed good relations in the city.

4. Roman Support for the Privileges of the Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.

Josephus and Philo preserve a number of documents from Roman Emperors, other high officials, or individual cities.[40] This evidence shows that the Roman authorities on a number of occasions granted various privileges to different Jewish communities. These included the right to be organized as a community, to administer their own finances, to observe the Sabbath and to be exempt from duties [such as military service] which conflicted with Jewish Law. This grant of privileges for the Jewish communities was often made in the face of local opposition from the cities in which the Jews lived. Thus Roman support was vital and enabled these Jewish communities to continue as self-supporting communities which observed various Jewish customs. We will now discuss the actual form of this Roman support.

4.1 Was there a Roman "Charter" in favour of the Jews?

One way of explaining the fact that the Romans supported the position of the Jews is to say that Judaism was placed in the formal category of a *religio licita*, and hence that Jews had their special privileges enshrined in a charter.[41] Thus a number of scholars speak of the documents associated with Julius Caesar as a "charter of Jewish rights" or a "Jewish Magna Carta".[42] If this was the case, the privileges of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor would have been enshrined in the charter. However, Rajak has recently shown that this model is inappropriate for the Roman world.[43]

4.1.1 Rajak argues that behind the model of a charter is the concept that the Jews were an intrinsically exclusive group within the homogeneous city, and hence required different treatment from other groups. However, the Jews were not completely alien, and hence did not necessarily require such a charter.[44] In addition, the Hellenistic polis accommodated considerable diversity of population and did not demand uniformity. Thus:

> What Jewish communities needed was not the award of a special status, but, more simply, public backing with muscle behind it. ... For the most part, I would suggest, Jewish *nomoi* were not formally incompatible with city requirements, though they could become contentious if the populace or the officials wanted to make life awkward. ... But it was not in the very nature of the *polis* to exclude such activities and in the normal course of

> events they must have proceeded without question. It is for this reason that it is unsatisfactory to talk of the permanent need for *privilegia* from Rome, while it is right to stress the repeated necessity for outside, ie. Roman help.[45]

Thus to speak of a Jewish charter is inappropriate, both as regards the nature of the Jewish communities and the nature of the city.

4.1.2 An argument sometimes used to support the idea of a charter is that the Hellenistic kings were thought to have established Jewish communities on the basis of just this sort of charter. However, apart from statements in Josephus which do not actually prove the existence of a charter, little can be known of the status of Jews in this period.[46] The permission to live "according to their ancestral laws" was granted by Antiochus III to Jews in Coele–Syria and in Phrygia and Lydia, but this does not amount to a charter, which would require legal precision.[47] In addition, we cannot extrapolate from these two specific situations to formulate conclusions about the terms on which Jews lived in new or established cities. Further, although the Romans inherited this principle of toleration from the Seleucids, it seems that the position of Jewish communities was not clearly defined before Roman rule. At Ephesus, for instance, it was over two generations after the beginning of Roman rule in the area that we first hear of Roman intervention on the question of Jewish status.[48] It seems clear therefore that formal arrangements were not at issue, probably because there had not been any generally understood settlement of the question in the past.[49] The Romans then, did not inherit a "Jewish charter".

4.1.3 It has often been thought that the legislation associated with Julius Caesar formed the "Jewish Magna Carta". However, the documents are less than this and do not add up to an overall definition of Jewish religious liberty.[50] It is important in this regard to consider whether in the *Roman s'*perception, the documents had a general application, or any validity as precedent beyond the specific context in which they were issued. Pliny's correspondence [admittedly somewhat later] shows that Trajan distinguished clearly between universally applicable imperial rulings, and those intended for certain provinces.[51] Although Josephus at times introduces the documents as though they concerned Jewish status universally, none of the texts themselves have an entirely general reference.[52] All are related to particular places and particular issues. What happened in provinces where Jews had not appealed to the authorities was wholly undetermined; we are not able to generalise.[53] Even when we do have evidence for the grant of privileges in a certain number of cities, there is considerable variation in the constituent elements of the grant from city to city. What

we see therefore is the process of appeal and ad hoc decision, rather than the authorities following the predetermined guidelines of a charter.[54] Thus Rome responded to the needs of the moment according to the prevailing political situation, following general principles but making decisions in which the details differed.

It seems clear therefore that Julius Caesar and Augustus had made decisions city by city. It was Claudius who for the first time in 41/42 CE made a sweeping pronouncement applying to the whole empire.[55] Claudius, faced with Greek–Jewish crises in Palestine, Alexandria and perhaps Antioch, formulated a general policy of toleration for Jewish observances throughout the Empire in an attempt to circumvent any planned trouble in other cities.[56] Thus Claudius wrote:

> It is right therefore that Jews throughout the whole world under our sway should also observe the customs of their fathers without let or hindrance.[57]

Yet, even this general grant was of a limited nature. The policy was not spelt out in detail but expressed in general phrases of intent. Indeed Claudius seems to have been stressing his goodwill towards the practice of the Jewish cult but leaving it up to the Greek cities to act in accordance with his will. Thus, when the "Charter" came, it was neither systematic nor precise.[58]

4.2 Why were the cities hostile at times towards the Jewish communities?

It is most likely that there were a number of reasons for the hostility which is sometimes clear in the documents. We should emphasize firstly that relations were not always and everywhere bad, nor were there no Greeks who were well disposed towards the Jews.[59] Josephus unwittingly highlights the tensions that existed, because the decrees he used to prove Roman support for the Jews arose out of these situations. We do not hear directly of harmony between Jewish communities and the cities because no documents would result from such a situation. Yet we cannot assume that such situations did not exist.[60]

4.2.1 In section 5.2, I suggest that the economic problems of the provinces led to unwillingness to allow the export of the Temple tax. This factor seems to have led to tension between the Jewish communities and their cities.

4.2.2 Rajak thinks that the evidence of the decrees, as far as it goes, suggests that they were necessary only because of deliberately engineered attacks on Jewish practices, the attacks themselves being founded on pagan lack of tolerance.[61] For example, Jews were made to appear in court on the Sabbath[62] because it was known that this would cause offence. Simple dislike of non–

conformity was probably the basis of the problem, combined with the apparent oddity of Jewish religious practices. This is suggested by Josephus' version of Nicolas' speech before Agrippa, which although partisan seems credible. In discussing Jewish customs Nicolas states that the Jewish communities were being deprived of their money and being made to appear in court on feast days:

> not because this is required by the legal agreements, but in order to outrage our religion toward which they feel a hatred which – and they know it as well as we do – is undeserved and unauthorized as well.[63]

Thus we can suggest that an important cause for the hostility between Jew and Greek in Asia Minor at this time was a simple dislike and lack of tolerance for the Jews who appeared as different. Jewish monotheism and Jewish customs were distinctive and Jewish religion could not readily be assimilated.[64]

4.2.3 In addition some of the requests of the Jews must have been annoying in themselves. For example, the refusal to appear in court on a certain day would understandably frustrate people, no matter who was the difficult party. Similarly, refusal to serve in the army would be irritating. To a significant extent the harassment the Jews received can be explained by the frustration which these peculiar requests must have caused.[65] The consideration of Jewish religious concerns which was required of the city must therefore have been taxing of the patience and this would have been the case, no matter which group was requesting special consideration.

4.2.4 Jewish communities were dependent on Roman support in the face of hostility from Greek authorities. Thus the Jewish communities were granted privileges by the Romans which exempted them from duties requested or demanded of them by another authority – the Greek city. The privileges granted by the higher power were therefore bound to be disputed by, and the cause of annoyance to, the local authority who would have seen in such intervention a violation of their civic freedom to regulate the internal affairs of the city. This situation would no doubt create a vicious circle in which renewed appeals for Roman intervention would serve to incur further local hostility.[66]

Thus we can conclude that there were a number of reasons for the hostility of the cities in Asia Minor towards their Jewish communities. I will argue later that this hostility probably became less significant from the first century CE onwards. We can understand how the causes of hostility elaborated here could be overcome and thus how peace could prevail. The cities could become used to this odd group in their midst and toleration could grow as the Jewish communities became established. Roman support would become less necessary

and this would engender less resentment. Thus both the hostility and the later peace are readily understandable.

4.3 Why did the Romans support the Jewish communities?

Clearly the Roman authorities, whether Emperors or proconsuls were willing to support Jewish privileges. The question of why the Romans were prepared to support the Jews is a difficult one, mainly because Josephus does not give the explanatory contexts of the documents he cites. But internal evidence and other arguments provide some answers.[67]

4.3.1 As far as we know the Hellenistic monarchies supported the Jews in their Empires.[68] The Romans generally followed the precedent of the status quo ante,[69] and thus we may suggest that in supporting the Jews [albeit in an ad hoc fashion], the Romans were following the pattern which had already been established by their predecessors.[70]

4.3.2 It is important to note the personal nature of many of the transactions mentioned in the documents. They are a part of an exchange of *beneficia*, and are often granted as a result of gratitude or mutual esteem between two leaders.[71] The importance of *beneficia* as a factor in Roman support for the Jews is seen in the relations between Hyrcanus II and Julius Caesar through which Hyrcanus gained a clearly defined role and privileges for the Jews in return for his assistance of and support for Caesar.[72] Another example of this is the friendship between Marcus Agrippa and Herod the Great which enabled the Jews of Ionia to obtain a hearing before Agrippa; the friendship is specifically mentioned by Agrippa as one of the reasons he granted the Jews their request.[73] It is likely that these sorts of personal factors and the diplomacy they made possible were more significant in gaining support for the Jewish communities than any real sympathy for the Jews on the part of the Roman leaders.[74]

4.3.3 Toleration was an important principle for the Roman administration, although of course there were always limits to tolerance. As long as the Jewish communities and their religion were thought to be politically innocuous and morally unobjectionable, and they did not cause trouble as a group, they could be treated with tolerance.[75] Thus Rome was tolerant provided Roman authority was not questioned.[76]

4.3.4 The Jews were not a negligible element in the Empire. Thus the political fidelity and support of the Jews in Palestine and beyond was important.[77] Rome would want to avoid any political unrest or alienation of Jews in Palestine, a strategic part of the Empire, and it could avoid unrest by supporting Jewish privileges throughout their domain.[78] Of course the Jews could lose this support if they themselves became sufficiently troublesome.

4.4 Were the Roman documents effective as a means of supporting Jewish privileges?

It is very difficult to assess the reception the Roman decrees and letters received in the cities of Asia Minor. However, it is clear that Roman directives were sometimes ignored or overlooked by the cities in an attempt to evade their responsibilities. A Milesian citizen told the proconsul that, in spite of the proconsul's previous instructions, the Jews were being hindered in the observance of their own laws.[79] The proconsul replied in favour of the Jews, but the correspondence shows that something like a continuous dispute was going on. At Ephesus, it seems that Jews were both prevented from and fined for keeping the Sabbath around 42 BCE.[80] In 14 BCE the Jews were probably being compelled to appear in court on the Sabbath.[81] Whether the two incidents are part of a continuum of troubles or are isolated incidents is not known. But it seems that in 14 BCE the decree of 42 had been contravened, either consciously or unconsciously.[82]

We should also note that Josephus only presents evidence which is favourable to the Jews. It is likely that some Jewish claims to rights were either rejected by the Romans, or later by the Greek cities. The record has been preserved by Jews, because the documents were valuable to them. They will not have recorded decrees which failed or were totally ignored. In addition, we do not know how the cities reacted to decrees which were passed. They certainly could have chosen to flout them.[83] Thus from the evidence we do have, and from the likelihood that this evidence is one–sided, we can deduce that the decrees were probably not followed at times.

5. Facets of Jewish Identity in Asia Minor as revealed by these documents.

The documents under discussion here are generally viewed solely from the perspective of the political or legal history of the Jews. Whilst these aspects are important, the light the documents also shed on the religious concerns of Jewish communities in Asia Minor is invaluable.[84] They reveal a concern on the part of the communities for a number of factors which are central to Jewish identity.

5.1 The Right of Assembly and The Synagogue.

A prerequisite for Jews wanting to have a communal life was being given the right of assembly. This should not be taken for granted, especially when it is remembered that Julius Caesar forbade most collegia from meeting in Rome.[85] The right to assemble is mentioned several times in documents addressed to Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Thus "Julius Gaius" wrote to the people of

Parium noting that Julius Caesar had explicitly exempted Jewish synagogues in Rome from the ban on collegia. Likewise he permitted the Jews in Parium to assemble and feast in accordance with their tradition.[86] Philo spoke before Gaius Caligula of Augustus' measures to protect Jewish religious liberty. He said:

> When he [Augustus] discovered that the sacred first–fruits were being neglected, he instructed the governors of the provinces in Asia to grant to the Jews alone the right of assembly. He said that their associations were not clubs which had their origins in drunkenness and disorderliness likely to disturb the peace, but were schools of sobriety and justice for people who practised virtue and contributed their annual 'first–fruits' ...[87]

Whilst the passage is clearly Philo's own view of the event, the fact that he does cite a letter of a proconsul of Asia to support his claim later in the same section suggests that he is here drawing upon authentic evidence.[88] We can conclude that some Jewish communities in Asia Minor were granted the right of assembly on occasions when such a grant was necessary.[89]

We also have evidence of permission being granted to build a synagogue. Thus, the people of Halicarnassus passed a decree stating that the Jews "τὰς προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος."[90] Also interesting here is the decree of the proquaestor and propraetor Lucius Antonius in 49 BCE to Sardis. The Jews had approached him asking for:

> a place of their own, in which they decide their affairs and controversies with one another.[91]

This request was duly granted.[92] Further, in a decree of the people of Sardis the Jews were granted a place for prayer and a place to live in.[93] It seems likely that the building envisaged here was a predecessor of the synagogue which has been discovered at Sardis.[94] Finally, a decree of Augustus[95] states that Jewish buildings in the province of Asia were to be safeguarded by the ruling that theft of the Temple tax or of rolls of Scripture from the synagogue[96] should be considered as sacrilege and punished by the confiscation of property.[97]

Thus we can conclude that the Jews in Asia Minor were granted permission, when it was required or had been disputed, to assemble and to build synagogues and that the sanctity of these synagogues was on occasions safeguarded by the Roman authorities.

5.2 The Temple Tax.

A number of the documents mention the Temple tax. This was the payment of a half–shekel [two drachmae or denarii in Josephus' time] probably made

by every male Jew, including freed–slaves and proselytes, between the ages of twenty and fifty. The tax was transported to Jerusalem where it was intended to support public sacrifices and for the city's municipal needs.[98] Jews in this period seem generally to have paid the tax.[99]

5.2.1 The earliest reference to the Temple tax in Asia Minor is found in Ant 14:112–113 where Josephus, quoting from Strabo, describes how Mithridates raided Cos shortly after 88 BCE and seized money deposited by Cleopatra III along with 800 talents belonging to the Jews. Josephus argues that the Jewish money must have been sent there by Jews in Asia Minor because of their fear of Mithridates who was then overrunning the mainland. He writes that since "there is no public money among us except that which is God's", it must be the Temple tax which is meant.[100] Josephus' explanation of the source [of at least some] of the money is more satisfactory than any of the alternatives proposed by modern interpreters.[101] It is thus evidence for the importance of the tax and therefore of Jerusalem and its worship for Jewish communities in Asia Minor in this early period.

5.2.2 In 59 BCE Cicero defended L. Valerius Flaccus against charges of misappropriation of public funds in 62 BCE when he was the Roman governor of Asia.[102] Included in these funds were amounts of Jewish Temple Tax which Flaccus had seized from four cities: a little less than one hundred pounds from Apamea, a little more than twenty pounds from Laodicea, an unknown amount from Adramyttium and a small amount from Pergamum.[103] Marshall has estimated that the one hundred pounds of gold from Apamea was equivalent to about 135,000 drachmae which would give a huge Jewish population if it was the tax for only one year.[104] However, it is much more likely that this amount is the sum total of the tax from a number of communities in the conventus of Apamea. This is suggested by the fact that the four cities mentioned by Cicero were each centres of a regional conventus.[105] Furthermore, it is most likely that the money represents more than one year's contribution. The annual despatch of gold to Jerusalem had probably been interrupted for several years prior to 62 BCE because of the disturbed conditions there.[106] Thus the Asian Jews probably held back the tribute until 62 BCE, which would have made it an unusually large amount.[107] We also know that additional gifts of gold to the Temple were occasionally forwarded with the tax.[108] Thus although it remains impossible to estimate the actual population of the Jewish communities of the four areas involved, we see that large Jewish populations were involved, particularly at Apamea.[109]

The central features of the incident, which Cicero claims to be commonly

agreed by the prosecution, are as follows. Flaccus issued an edict forbidding the export of gold from his province, and then confiscated the gold collected by Asian Jews and intended for the Jerusalem Temple. The money, duly entered in Flaccus' accounts, was deposited with the aerarium. Cicero claims that these facts reflect credit upon Flaccus and not the discredit claimed by the prosecution.[110]

Marshall has shown that treating Flaccus as a villain, as has often been done, is to mis-interpret his actions.[111] His motive in confiscation was not to interfere with Jewish custom, or to steal the money but to put into effect the edictal ban.[112] Flaccus in acting in this way enforced a repeatedly re-enacted ruling of the Senate banning the export of gold and silver from the provinces,[113] which had previously been ignored by Roman officials. The reasons that Flaccus enforced the edict in 62 BCE were probably varied but included reluctance to allow gold to go to a city that had so recently been conquered, the fact that a recent ban on collegia may have meant the synagogue attracted the adverse notice of the Roman authorities [even if the synagogues were explicitly exempted, which is unknown] and the difficult economic situation of Asia Minor at the time, worsened by the recent charge of supporting Pompey's armies.[114] Thus, Asia Minor simply could not afford the drain on gold involved in the Temple tax being transported to Jerusalem. Flaccus acted out of economic necessity, not because of corruption or vindictive hatred of the Jews.[115] When the Jews defied Flaccus' recently promulgated decree he enforced the ban and confiscated the money.

Thus it becomes clear that the Jews of Asia had been caught in an attempt to defy Roman law in order to obey their own religious law. They did not suffer as a result of anti-Jewish sentiment or the corruption of a Roman official, but as a result of their own deliberate disobedience of an edict, which they saw as an unaceptable interference in their religious customs. Their action must have been rooted in conviction and thus shows the strength of their loyalty towards paying the tax and thus towards Jerusalem and its worship. This was a significant facet of their Jewish identity.

5.2.3 We have a number of documents from Asia Minor which relate to the right of the Jewish communities to collect money and to send it to the Temple in Jerusalem without any outside interference. In order to pay the Temple tax various Jewish communities in Asia Minor sought either the explicit permission to do so, or the right to administer their own finance. These documents are to be dated in the time of Augustus; clearly this issue had become particularly controversial at this time. The decrees which we have relate to the cities of

Ephesus and Sardis, and to the province of Asia.[116] The following points arise from these documents.

The documents note that sending the tax to Jerusalem is "κατὰ τὸ πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἔθος."[117] This would perhaps indicate that the Jewish communities concerned had explained to the Roman officials that they were in the habit of sending the tax to Jerusalem; this gives us an indication that it was an established commitment as we would expect. We know that the Romans generally confirmed unobjectionable long-standing practices of conquered peoples.[118] That the Temple tax was an "ancestral custom" suggests that this is the reason the Romans granted permission for the export to continue.

5.2.4 In a decree to the Ephesians, Agrippa stated that anyone who stole the Jews' "ἱερῶν χρημάτων" would be deemed to have despoiled a sanctuary, a right that was generally reserved for pagan temples. If the robbers claimed asylum, they were to be turned over to the Jews.[119] Thus thieves of Jewish property could expect the same treatment as thieves of other sacred property.[120] In another decree to the Jews of Asia, Augustus stated that the Jews sacred money was inviolable and could be sent to Jerusalem, and that anyone stealing it [or the sacred books] would be regarded as sacriligeous. Rather than being "turned over to the Jews", such a person was to be subject to Roman criminal jurisdiction and thus to have his property confiscated to the public treasury of the Romans.[121] We note therefore the willingness to grant the Jews the same safeguards for their "holy funds" as were granted to pagan temples. This is certainly an important privilege.

These arrangements suggest that the Temple tax was a target for robbers prior to transportation to Jerusalem, which in turn implies that a significant amount of money was involved. This is also suggested by a letter to Sardis, in which Gaius Norbanus Flaccus wrote that the Jews were not to be prevented from sending sums of money "however great they may be [ὅσα ἂν ὦσι]."[122] This suggests that one of the reasons the cities objected to Jewish communities sending the tax was that a large amount of money was involved. The concern of the cities was probably to prevent the loss of economic capital from the province rather than to pocket the money themselves.[123] It seems likely that the cities objected, not to the Jews qua Jews sending money to Jerusalem, but to anyone sending money anywhere out of the province.[124]

5.2.5 The documents show that the Jews specifically requested the authorisation granted in the decrees. The first reason for suspecting this [which is applicable throughout section 5] is the fact that, in the period under consideration here, Roman Emperors and other officials generally responded to requests

or petitions from individuals or groups, rather than searching out potential difficulties which they then attempted to pre–empt. Thus, for example, correspondence between the Emperor and provincial governors or cities was almost always initiated by the governors or the cities themselves.[125] The letters we have concerning Jews from various Emperors are clearly of this sort, and thus show the Jews approaching the Emperors for privileges, which in itself indicates the Jewish concern for the matters in dispute. The proceedure involved in this is completely in keeping with what we know of Imperial communication and of the Roman style of government. As far as the issue at hand is concerned, it is very unlikely that Augustus would voluntarily issue an edict about the tax.

Secondly, there are a number of indications in the decrees that the Jewish communities themselves approached the authorities in order to obtain the privileges associated with the tax. Thus in a letter to Ephesus, the proconsul Julius Antonius wrote:

> When I was administering justice in Ephesus ... the Jews dwelling in Asia pointed out to me that Caesar Augustus and Agrippa have permitted them to follow their own laws and customs. ... And they asked that I confirm by my own decision the rights granted by Augustus and Agrippa.[126]

The Jews had thus approached the proconsul asking him to ratify their privileges and, in order to convince him, had referred to permission granted to them by Augustus and Agrippa. It seems they wanted to forestall any attempt to prohibit the export of the tax and thus the community was anticipating rather than actually experiencing difficulty in this regard.[127] Further, in Ant 16:160–161, an introduction to the documents written by Josephus, we read that Jews from Asia and Cyrenaean Libya sent envoys to Augustus to complain about mistreatment and persecution. In the report of the defence of Jewish rights in Ionia by Nicolas of Damascus it is clear that the Jews approached Herod about their grievances and he then convinced Agrippa to listen to their case.[128] In both cases the Temple tax is mentioned. Clearly, these documents provide evidence that the Jews approached the Romans to overcome opposition or to ensure that opposition did not arise. The Jewish communities of Asia Minor [and elsewhere] felt sufficiently committed to the Temple tax to take active measures to ensure that they could pay it. They approached the higher authorities in order to be able to maintain a custom which, in their eyes, was vital.

We thus see in these decrees a strong commitment on the part of the Jewish communities to paying the Temple tax. If it was felt that, because of the large amounts of money involved or because of local hostility, there were likely

to be objections from the local cities to the export of the tax, then the Jews obtained the permission of the Roman administration. The Romans granted this permission, probably because the tax was an ancestral custom of the Jews to which they did not object. They were also willing to grant the privilege of a sanctuary to the place in which the money was stored locally, no doubt at the Jews request.[129]

The Temple tax was connected with the notion that daily sacrifices were to be provided by the entire community of Israel.[130] The payment of the tax by the Jews of the Diaspora was a way for them to be a tangible part of the cult and thus of the worshipping community of Israel. Safrai notes that it gave Diaspora Jews "a real sense of participation in the divine worship offered at Jerusalem."[131] In the concern of the Jews of Asia Minor in this period to pay the tax, we see a strong attachment to the historic land of Israel and to the centrality of the Temple and its worship.[132]

5.3 The Sabbath.

A number of documents preserved by Josephus relate to the Sabbath.[133] It is clear from these documents that on occasions the Roman authorities granted the Jews permission to observe the Sabbath without disturbance and were prepared to protect this privilege from violation.[134] Perhaps this is clearest in a letter of the proconsul Publius Servilius Galba to Miletus in which he says that it was the administration's expressed wish that the Jews be allowed to observe the Sabbath and perform their native rites.[135]

5.3.1 The documents show that the Jews themselves had sought the authorities' permission in order to be able to keep the Sabbath. A letter of a proconsul to Miletus makes it clear that representatives of the Jews of Miletus and of the people of that city appeared before the proconsul to present opposing arguments about Jewish privileges, including observing the Sabbath.[136] From a decree of the people of Sardis we learn that the Jews of that city had appeared before the Council and People and asked that following the restoration of their freedom by the Roman Senate, their privileges in Sardis including the right to observe the Sabbath, might be ratified.[137] The Jews in Ephesus, perhaps after some interference with their right to observe the Sabbath, petitioned the proconsul Marcus Junius Brutus [?] who reaffirmed their privileges.[138] In all of these cases we see Jews seeking to obtain permission to observe the Sabbath from the authorities.[139] This demonstrates the concern of the Jewish communities to protect their Jewish identity, of which keeping the Sabbath was an important part. This concern was such that they sent envoys to the authorities to seek injunctions against any attacks or prohibitions.

5.3.2 At times it is clear that Jewish leaders of Jerusalem had approached the Roman authorities to obtain privileges [including those concerning the Sabbath] for the Jews in Asia Minor. Thus we read that envoys of Hyrcanus II were sent to Dolabella, the governor of Syria, in order to obtain exemption from military service and permission to live in accordance with their native customs, which probably included observing the Sabbath.[140] Likewise we read that an envoy of Hyrcanus delivered a letter from the proconsul Gaius Rabirius to the people of Laodicea, in which the proconsul supported Jewish privileges in the province of Phrygia.[141] The letter also shows that people sent by Hyrcanus had visited Gaius Rabirius, bringing with them:

> documents concerning their nation, to the effect that it shall be lawful for them to observe their Sabbaths and perform their other rites in accordance with their native laws ...[142]

This mediation by Hyrcanus for the Jews of Asia Minor is significant and is clearly one of the reasons the Romans granted the Jews their privileges.[143] It also shows the strong links at this time between Judaea and Asia Minor.

5.3.3 The Jews were granted some exemptions which enabled them to observe the Sabbath as they wished. Thus they were granted exemption from military service at various times. For example, in a letter to Ephesus to be dated in 44/43 BCE, Dolabella the governor of Syria explained that he had granted the Jews in Ephesus the exemption from serving in the army "because they may not bear arms or march on the days of the Sabbath."[144] Secondly, Agrippa wrote to the praetor Silanus stating that the Jews of Ephesus were not to be compelled to appear in court on the Sabbath.[145] Similarly, an edict of Augustus about the Jews in Asia states:

> that they need not give bond (to appear in court) on the Sabbath or on the day of preparation for it [παρασκευῇ] after the ninth hour.[146]

The period on the day before the Sabbath was probably set aside by the Jews for making arrangements for the Sabbath [such as cooking or the lighting of stoves].[147] This exemption from summons to a law court on the Sabbath or the day of preparation protected the religious liberty of the Jews. If they did not attend the court on the stated day, they would lose their case by default.[148] The Jews thus ensured that they could observe the Sabbath fully by making certain that they would not be faced with the difficult choice between the Sabbath and obtaining justice. It seems reasonable to suggest that the Jews had made the point that this extra period of exemption on the day of preparation was also

necesssary if they were to observe the Sabbath as they wanted to.

Clearly, these documents show a strong concern for the proper observance of the Sabbath, an important element in Jewish identity.[149] Although our evidence does not enable us to be specific about exactly how they observed the Sabbath,[150] we can be certain that the Sabbath was important for Jews in Asia Minor in this period, as it was elsewhere.[151]

5.4 Jewish Communities and Military Service.

5.4.1 Jewish communities were not able to observe all their customs unless they were exempt from activities which conflicted with their own law. One important area in which an exemption was sought was military service. In this period the normal method of legionary recruitment was by voluntary enlistment and thus any Jews who held Roman citizenship had only to refrain from coming forward to avoid the difficulties for Jews caused by being in the army.[152] However, in a crisis conscription was used and Jews were then liable for call up. In 49 BCE in just such a crisis the consul L. Lentulus Crus was recruiting in Asia for the senatorial cause.[153] In response to an appeal on the Jews' behalf by Titus Ampius Balbus, one of his legates, he issued an edict exempting "those Jews who are Roman citizens and observe Jewish rites and practise them in Ephesus ..." from military service.[154] The propraetor of Asia, C. Fannius then endorsed Lentulus' decree.[155]

In 43 BCE, by which time the rulings of Lentulus and Fannius had lapsed, the Jews of Asia again faced the possibility of conscription because the Caesarian governor of Syria, P. Cornelius Dolabella, seized Asia from C. Trebonius and civil war became imminent in the East.[156] Hyrcanus II appealed to Dolabella for a continued exemption for the Jews, and this was granted.[157] The exemption was apparently wider than previous ones and covered all Jews in Asia, as Dolabella's letter does not restrict it to those with Roman citizenship.[158]

In the introduction to Nicolas' defence of Jewish rights in Ionia before Marcus Agrippa in 14 BCE, Josephus tells us that Jews were being forced to participate in military service. Agrippa confirmed Jewish rights, without specifying them in detail.[159] It seems therefore that once again difficulties had arisen in this area. However, we are not justified in concluding on the basis of this later evidence, as both Smallwood and Atkinson do, that the exemption from military service for Jews was "apparently made permanent and presumably extended to cover all other Jewish communities."[160] We have evidence of separate ad hoc decisions; they do not imply that a general exemption was granted. Although this is possible, it goes well beyond the evidence we have available.

5.4.2 The documents themselves suggest the reasons why the Jews requested

these exemptions. In the letter mentioned above, written by Dolabella to Ephesus in 43 BCE, we read that Alexander, an envoy of Hyrcanus II, had explained to Dolabella that Jews:

> cannot undertake military service because they may not bear arms or march on the days of the Sabbath; nor can they obtain the native foods to which they are accustomed.[161]

In the earlier decree of Lucius Lentulus written to Ephesus in 49 BCE we read that the Jews are to be exempt from military service "in consideration of their religious scruples [δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα]".[162] This is a vague phrase, but it would probably include the two factors which the Jewish envoy later emphasised to Dolabella. The series of decrees under discussion thus seems to be evidence for the commitment of Jews in Asia to both the Sabbath and the food laws.[163] If [in 43 BCE] it was not just Roman citizens but all Jews in Asia who were granted this exemption, then it cannot have been an easy matter to gain the decision from the authorities, particularly at a time when soldiers were in demand.

5.5 The Food Laws.

We have some indications that observance of the food laws was a significant part of Jewish practice in Asia Minor. Writing to Ephesus in 44 BCE, Dolabella explained [as we have noted above] that one of the factors which hindered Jews from undertaking military service was that in the army they could not obtain the "τροφῶν τῶν πατρίων" to which they were accustomed.[164] In the decree of the people of Sardis we read of definite arrangements that were made for the provision of suitable food. It was decreed:

> that the market–officials of the city shall be charged with the duty of having suitable food for them [the Jews] brought in.[165]

The decree makes it clear that the city had granted specific requests made by the Jews; it seems that the provision of "suitable food" had been asked for by the Jews of Sardis and was thus important to them.[166] They followed ancestral custom with regard to the food laws. It is also significant to note that a Roman official like Dolabella and a city like Sardis were prepared to take cognizance of Jewish dietary requests.[167]

5.6 "To Live According To Their Own Laws".

Often accompanying a decree on a specific matter we find a more general statement of Jewish privileges. Thus in a decree of the people of Ephesus, it is stated that the Jews have asked "that they might observe their Sabbaths and do all those things which are in accordance with their native customs without interference ..." and have been "permitted to do all those things which are in

accordance with their own laws."[168] Similarly, in Augustus' edict to the Jews of Asia in 12 BCE we read that "the Jews may follow their own customs [ἐθισμοῖς] in accordance with the law of their fathers, just as they followed them in the time of Hyrcanus."[169]

As we have found before, it is often clear that the Jewish communities have approached the Roman authorities requesting the decrees which contained the statement of these general privileges. Thus an envoy of Hyrcanus went to Dolabella, and obtained the permission for the Jews "to maintain their native customs and live in accordance with them."[170] Between 46 and 44 BCE Jews from Miletus appeared before the proconsul and asked to be allowed to follow their customs.[171]

In all of this we have to take into consideration the fact that we are using decrees and letters written by non–Jews. It is not legitimate therefore to draw great significance from the actual wording used. However, the evidence is sufficient to suggest that one element of the privileges granted by the Romans to the Jewish communities in Asia Minor was on the one hand that they should not be required to do anything that was contrary to their rights and on the other hand that they should be permitted to live in accordance with "ancestral tradition" or with "their own laws".[172] Admittedly, such general statements are not legally precise and thus their value in a judicial setting is questionable.[173] Yet they do express both the intent of the Jewish communities to follow their traditions and the willingness of the Roman authorities to permit this to happen.

When this is combined with the observation that Jews probably requested these privileges, and with our findings on the synagogue, the Temple tax, the Sabbath, and food laws, we have sufficient evidence to be confident that the Jewish communities in Asia Minor in the period covered by our documents [between 49 BCE and 2 CE] belonged to the mainstream of Jewish life as far as these elements of Jewish identity are concerned.[174] They were anxious that they should be able to obey the commands of the Torah and that the institutions and practices incumbent upon faithful Jewish communities might be sustained.

6. The Following Centuries.

It is noticeable that these decrees cover a fairly limited timescale, with a large number of them coming from the period of the civil war and of the triumvirate. A partial explanation for this is that in a time of political instability in Roman politics, Jewish communities may have suspected that the local cities would take advantage of Roman preoccupation elsewhere and challenge their right to follow certain customs. Thus, fearing they would lose their protection due to Roman neglect, the Jewish communities appealed to Rome at this time to

prevent such an occurrence.[175]

It is also significant that after the turn of the era we hear of no difficulties experienced by Jewish communities in Asia Minor over any matter, from Josephus, from Philo or from any other source. Indeed the contentious issues of the time of Augustus seem to be less sweeping than those of the 40's BCE and concern only the Temple tax and to a lesser extent the Sabbath, which suggests that by this time earlier difficulties had been partially solved. In addition, the edict of Claudius issued in 41–42 CE[176] arose from hostilities in Alexandria, Palestine and perhaps in Syria,[177] with no mention being made of Asia Minor. It thus seems reasonable to suggest that after some troubles in Asia Minor in the 40's BCE and to a lesser extent between 18 BCE and 2 CE, relations in the first century CE between the Jewish communities and their cities improved. Perhaps some sort of modus vivendi was established which satisfied both groups. Whilst this is an argument from silence, we can note that it seems likely that Claudius would have mentioned significant trouble in Asia Minor had it occurred.

An examination of the situation in Asia Minor during the three Jewish uprisings of the first and second century CE is also significant here. It is well known that the Jews of the Diaspora did not to any significant degree support the Jews of Palestine in the war of 66–70 CE. It seems most likely that the Jews of the Diaspora did not at this stage see their status as Jews endangered by the Romans and thus did not want to jeopardize their own favourable position through support of the rebellion. In short, the Diaspora had much to lose and little to gain by supporting the revolt in Palestine.[178] Connected with this and further evidence of the Diaspora's lack of involvement is the fact that the Roman government continued to support the privileged position of the Jews in the Empire after the revolt.[179] Thus, neither Vespasian nor Titus revoked the extensive privileges enjoyed by the Jews in the Diaspora after 70 CE, despite being asked to do so by various cities.[180] The only notable exception to the continued support of the Diaspora was the imposition by Vespasian of the didrachmon tax in favour of Jupiter Capitolinus to be paid to the fiscus Judaicus by every Jew from the age of three to sixty. Whilst this was a source of humiliation and annoyance to the Jews, it did not signify the withdrawal of Roman support, as Vespasian's confirmation of Jewish privileges at Alexandria and Antioch shows.[181] All of this is important in itself, and further evidence which suggests that the Diaspora was not involved in the war of 66–70 CE. It is clear therefore that Jews in Asia Minor took no part in this revolt and that their position was not altered by it.

The Diaspora revolt of 115–117 CE occurred in Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus

and Mesopotamia with no known trouble in Asia Minor. The Jews in the Diaspora communities involved revolted against the local authorities and against Rome, the power which had previously upheld their case against the local communities [especially in Egypt]. This and the geographical spread of the uprisings shows the importance of local factors such as the presence of nationalist or messianic leadership and local grievances or tensions as the causes of the revolt.[182] The lack of evidence for any contemporary hostilities in Asia Minor suggests that completely different local factors prevailed there. Given the range of evidence for the revolt – Dio Cassius, Eusebius, Orosius, inscriptions, papyri and archaeological evidence – we can suggest that the silence about the revolt in Asia Minor is significant.

Hadrian's prohibiton of circumcision would have affected Jewish communities in Asia Minor as it did elsewhere. His successor, Antonin us Pius allowed the Jews to circumcize fellow Jews, restricting the prohibition to non-Jews. We have no evidence that the events of the Bar Kokhba revolt had any effect on Asia Minor, nor that any Jews from there were involved.[183] Subsequent history does not record any adverse treatment of Jewish communities in Asia Minor.[184]

As is often the case, silence can be a deceptive witness. However, the lack of evidence for any trouble after 2 CE, when there was much trouble elsewhere, suggests a modus vivendi between the Jewish communities and the cities had indeed been established in Asia Minor. Thus it seems likely that good relations between Jewish communities and their cities prevailed in Asia Minor from near the beginning of the first century CE onwards.[185] This probability is significant with regard to the character of Judaism in Asia Minor, particularly when we recall that in the same period there were two major periods of revolt in Palestine and in, for example, Alexandria, which in the latter case resulted in the near decimation of the Jewish community there. The situation seems to have been different in Asia Minor.

7. Conclusions.

7.1 We have been able to establish a number of important details about the Jewish communities in Asia Minor. These include the following points. The first communities for which we have evidence were settled by Antiochus III in Lydia and Phrygia on favourable terms which would have helped them to become established. These settlers were from another part of the Diaspora and thus would have already adjusted to a some extent to life outside of Palestine. We know of significant links between Jews in Asia Minor and Jerusalem in the first century BCE.

7.2 We have also seen that Jewish communities in Asia Minor sought and

obtained authorization and support from Rome in their attempts to observe Jewish customs. This support was ad hoc rather than in the form of a universal charter. In effect the privileges which they asked for and were granted enabled them to maintain their "Jewishness" in the face of local hostility. We have sought to give reasons for both the local hostility and the Roman support. If this support had not been forthcoming, the identity of the Jewish communities would have been threatened. Clearly, Rome conferred on the Jewish communities in Asia Minor privileges which established and maintained the vitality of Judaism in the area.

7.3 We have identified and discussed a number of facets of Jewish identity in Asia Minor – a commitment to the synagogue, the Temple tax [and thus to the Temple and its worship], to the Sabbath, to food laws and to living in accordance with their tradition. That Jewish communities sought help from the Roman administration to enable them to continue practising these aspects of their faith, often in the face of some local hostility, shows the strength of their convictions. Our evidence, as far as it goes, thus places the Jewish communities of Asia Minor within the mainstream of Judaism, since these facets [along with other factors such as circumcision, about which our documents are silent] were fundamental to Jewish identity at this time. They were anxious that they should be able to obey the commands of the Torah and that the institutions and practices incumbent upon faithful Jewish communities might be sustained. We are not claiming that the Jewish communities in Asia Minor were "orthodox", for this is a concept of dubious value in the period under discussion.[186] We are claiming that these communities belonged within the fold of Judaism [albeit a fold containing many diverse entities] at this time.

7.4 We have noted that the lack of any evidence for hostility between the Jewish communities and their cities in Asia Minor after 2 CE suggests that some sort of modus vivendi was reached.

Chapter 2.

The Jewish Communities at Sardis and Priene.

1. Introduction.

The city of Sardis, whose history dates from the Prehistoric period, was the capital of ancient Lydia.[1] It became the western capital of the Persian Empire for two centuries, then passed to the Seleucids. Between 281 and 188 BCE Sardis was the capital of Seleucid Asia Minor north of the Taurus, and was thus a centre of royal power and administration. Its importance was in part due to its position on important trade routes, most notably as the terminus of the Royal Road. New inscriptions show that Antiochus III punished Sardis for its support of Achaeus, who had attempted to seize the throne. However, after the intervention of Queen Laodice, Antiochus refounded the city in 213 BCE along Greek lines, Zeuxis being in charge of the operation.[2] In 190 or 189 BCE the Romans defeated Antiochus III and gave Sardis to the Pergamene king. Passing to Rome in 133 BCE, Sardis became part of the province of Asia and [sometime between 90 and 70 BCE] the centre of one of the nine *conventus iuridici.* In the period between 90 BCE and 17 CE the city declined somewhat,[3] but by the Augustan era peace and confidence had returned.[4] In 17 CE a disastrous earthquake devastated the city;[5] reconstruction work went on well into the second century, by which time the city probably had a population of around 100,000. The Severan period was a time of great prosperity and the completion of much building work. The second half of the third century, although troubled elsewhere, seems to have been peaceful and prosperous in Sardis. Under Diocletian the city became the capital of the new province of Lydia and the site of an important state–operated armaments factory and thus a major military centre. Commercial and industrial life continued to flourish until 616 CE, although conditions in the sixth century may have deteriorated.[6] Despite the growing strength of Christianity in Sardis, continuity outweighed change. Large parts of the city were destroyed in 616 CE by the Sassanid king Chosroes II.

2. The literary evidence for Jews in Sardis.

In Obadiah 20 we read of "the exiles of Jerusalem who are in Sepharad." We know that Sardis was called "Sepharad" in Aramaic, as is clear from a Lydian–Aramaic bilingual found in Sardis. The "Sepharad" referred to in Obadiah 20 may well be Sardis therefore, but the identity of the two names is an insufficient basis for certainty, given the lack of any other evidence for Jewish settlers at this early date.[7]

There were probably permanent Jewish residents in Sardis by the end of the third century BCE. We can suggest this from the letter written by Antiochus III around 205 BCE which we discused in Chapter 1, section 2. Two thousand Jewish families were brought from Babylonia and Mesopotamia "to the fortresses and most important places" in Lydia and Phrygia. We know from some recently discovered inscriptions that Sardis was the headquarters of Zeuxis,[8] the satrap in Lydia who was charged with administering the transportation. It seems highly likely therefore that some Jews came to live in Sardis at this time.[9] They were granted very favourable terms by Antiochus, which suggests that the community in Sardis would have become established quickly. If these were the first Jewish residents of Sardis it is significant that they were not from Palestine [at least, not directly], but were from another part of the Diaspora, and thus had already learned to live as a minority in a gentile world. From the first they would probably have been sensitive to the problems and opportunities raised by life in Sardis. It is likely that the community continued to grow throughout the succeeding years as Jews came to settle in Sardis from elsewhere. Indeed, such migration would probably have increased the size of all the Jewish communities in Asia Minor, and is also the probable origin of a number of other Jewish communities which were not founded by the specific acts of rulers.

Josephus also preserves two Roman decrees which concern the Jewish communitey of Sardis. In the first decree probably to be dated in 49 BCE[10] we read that Jews had pointed out to Lucius Antonius, the proquaestor and propraetor, that "from the earliest times [ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] they had an association [σύνοδος] of their own in accordance with their native laws [τοὺς πατρίους νόμους] and a place [τόπος] of their own, in which they decide their affairs and controversies with one another." [Ant 14:235] These rights were confirmed by Lucius Antonius.

Josephus records a decree of the people of Sardis which may be a response to the letter of Lucius Antonius, or is perhaps later.[11] It is worth quoting in full:

> Whereas the Jewish citizens living in our city have continually received many great privileges from the people and have now come before the council and the people and have pleaded that as their laws and freedom have been restored to them by the Roman Senate and people, they may, in accordance with their accepted customs, come together and have a communal life and adjudicate suits among themselves, and that a place be given them in which they may gather together with their wives and children and offer their ancestral prayers and sacrifices[12] to God, it has therefore been decreed by the council and people that permission shall be given them to come together on stated days

> to do those things which are in accordance with their laws, and also that a place shall be set apart by the magistrates for them to build and inhabit, such as they may consider suitable for this purpose, and that the market–officials of the city shall be charged with the duty of having suitable food for them brought in.[13]

The τόπος that was given to them was almost certainly for a synagogue, although it may have been part of a public building rather than an individual structure.[14] We see here a Jewish community of longstanding which, although it may have been restricted and hence asked for restoration of rights, was influential, had considerable autonomy and was able to defend its privileges successfully. The mention of a proper food supply suggests that the community followed the food laws.[15]

Another decree from the early part of Augustus' reign addressed to the magistrates and council of Sardis forbids interference in the collection of the tax for the Jerusalem Temple. [Ant 16:171] The community was obviously faithful with regards to this traditional obligation and had not cut its ties with Jerusalem.[16]

These decrees reveal a community that was granted privileges by the Romans and by the city. They were thus well established, had some autonomy, and their own building of some sort and were in a strong position in the city; an important reason for this was that they could point to the antiquity of their customs, which to the Romans made them more acceptable.[17] They were thus able to follow their traditions, most notably, according to these documents, the Temple tax, food laws and being able to have a communal life. In view of our discussion in Chapter 1, we can therefore suggest that the community belonged to the mainstream of Jewish life in this period.

We do not hear anything of the Jewish community in Sardis in the first century CE. However, "the place" given them by the city was probably destroyed by the major earthquake of 17 CE, when much of the city was damaged.[18] It is likely that the Jews were granted some other area after the earthquake.[19]

3. The Synagogue of Sardis.

3.1 The synagogue at Sardis was discovered in 1962 during excavations of the city, which means that we have first–hand evidence for the Jewish community within the context of a large Greco–Roman city.[20] It is the largest extant synagogue of antiquity. The final publication of the excavations has not yet appeared and the excavators have modified their views considerably as further investigations have proceeded. Therefore the following account must be regarded as tentative and preliminary.

The synagogue was an integral and prominent part of a mammoth structure,

the Sardis bath–gymnasium complex which occupied a very central position on the major thoroughfare of the city. The complex was built as part of the civic centre of the Roman city in the reconstruction programme after the earthquake of 17 CE. The centre of the complex was a palaestra which led into a multi–storied and lavishly decorated "Marble Court", which was probably the Imperial Cult Hall and was dedicated in 211/2 CE. It was the entrance to the baths and gymnasium, these latter buildings being completed by the mid second century at the latest. On the north and south sides of the palaestra were symmetrical halls, each with three large rooms opening into the square via seven arched entrances, and perhaps serving as dressing or exercise facilities for the bathing and gymnastic activities. The south hall was "Stage 1" of what became the synagogue.[21]

3.2 It has been possible to reconstruct the subsequent building history of this structure.[22] Beginning in the late second century CE with building work continuing into the early third century,[23] the south hall was extensively remodelled before it had been completed.[24] Interior walls were removed and old doors blocked, creating a long basilican hall divided into a "nave" and "aisles" by two rows of columns. Three new doors were made in the east wall and a small vestibule was created; an apse with two diagonal passages to the north and three niches was also added at the west end. A floor of polished marble paving stones was installed. The building created closely resembled the usual Roman civil basilica. This was "Stage 2".[25]

It was suggested in 1967 that an inscription read by I. Rabbinowitz as a Hebrew transliteration of "Beros", ie. Verus may point to the co–Emperor Lucius Verus; the [fragmentary] inscription may thus have expressed his approval of the grant of the as yet unfinished basilica to the Jewish community in 166 CE when he probably visited the city to open the whole complex.[26] The building was thought to have been given to the Jewish community because the whole project became a severe drain on funds and this was seen as one way of completing a part of the complex.[27] The alterations which produced "Stage 2" [including closing access to the palaestra on the north side and the reorientation of the building] would then have been carried out by the Jewish community in order to produce a synagogue.

However, Seager has recently noted that "Stage 2" was probably not suitable for a synagogue because it was connected to the palaestra of the gymnasium via the northern passage in the apse.[28] It seems fairly certain then that Stage 2 was a Roman civil basilica and not the synagogue. In addition, Detweiler has suggested that the apse that was added at this stage was originally built

for a tribunal.[29] The plan seems appropriate for a judicial basilica, as does the site. The three large niches in the apse would then have been for statues of the emperor or images of deities.

3.3 By 270 CE[30] the building had been remodelled and had become "Stage 3". The whole structure was 85 by 18m and was probably decorated with mosaics and revetments.[31] It was still structurally attached to the gymnasium complex, but with access only from outside that complex.[32]

There is debate about various aspects of Stage 3. Architecturally the evidence for it is clear – it concerns the marble revetments – but does not illuminate the issue of the usage of the building at this stage. The building as Stage 3 was probably little different from Stage 2.[33] It seems to have had no forecourt, Torah shrine or bema.

Archaeologically, it is difficult to be certain exactly when the building became a synagogue. It is possible that the northern passage in the apse was blocked before the building was remodelled to form Stage 3. If this was the case the building could have been a synagogue as Stage 2, thus sometime before 270 CE.[34] Therefore it is possible that the building became a synagogue sometime between the late second century [the beginning of Stage 2] and 270 CE. Alternatively, the building as Stage 3 could have remained as a judicial basilica for some time before it was used as a synagogue.[35]

3.4 The building was remodelled again sometime between 320 and 360, and became "Stage 4". A porch faced the street, behind which was an atrium–like forecourt, over 20m long.[36] The forecourt had four entrances, three on the east and a fourth between two of the shops. It was colonnaded on all four sides with columns of an elegant design. A later addition was the balustrade of screens which ran from column to column. The columns were short compared with those in the square next door; this suggests that the court was two storied, but no stairway has been found. In fact no cogent evidence for galleries has been found anywhere in the synagogue.[37] The forecourt was open in the centre where there was a fountain in the form of a large marble urn with a vertically fluted body and large volute handles. An inscription listing public fountains at Sardis and their capacities mentions the "Fountain of the Synagogue". If this was the fountain in the middle of the forecourt, then the forecourt itself was a public space, accessible to anyone wishing to use the area.[38]

Marble wall decorations found in the forecourt, including an arched frieze of urns and doves within bands of architectural ornamentation, were added in the fifth century to replace earlier plaster.[39] There was also a basin, probably for ablutions, along one wall of the forecourt.[40] The floor was paved with

stone mosaics laid out in carpet–like panels in complex, multicoloured geometric patterns. Most of these mosaics were installed between 360 and 380 CE.[41] The forecourt probably served as a vestibule and may also have provided space for certain community functions such as public discussions and discourses, announcements, and perhaps also study and instruction.[42]

Three doors led from the forecourt into the main hall which was 59 by 18m and could accommodate over one thousand people judging by modern seating arrangements.[43] The building would have been clearly visible above the shops and colonnades; people passing by would have been able to see the length of the building when the doors were open. It had twelve large piers against the long walls, supporting the wooden roof which was probably about 15m above the floor. A pair of aedicular shrines in re–use, which were fitted with curtains, flanked the central entrance. They were in place when the fourth century mosaics were installed.[44] Both may have been Torah shrines, but perhaps only one served this purpose, with the other being a menorah shrine[45] added for purposes of symmetry. A marble plaque showing a menorah, lulab, shofar and two spirals interpreted as Torah scrolls[46] was found near the southern shrine, as were all of the fragments of Hebrew inscriptions found in the building. These finds confirmed the building's identity as a synagogue.

There were no benches along the walls, which is unusual. At the opposite end from the Torah shrine[s] was a large decorated apse lined with three rows of semi–circular benches. A balustrade across the opening of the apse separated the area of the benches from the rest of the hall. We would expect the Torah shrine to be in this apse, but it points west, in the opposite direction from Jerusalem. Hence the Torah shrine was added at the opposite end of the building.[47] The apse from the earlier building was used through the addition of the benches as a place of honour for elders of the congregation and perhaps for guests. Seventy people could be comfortably seated on the benches. No one seat was more prominent or more distinguished than any other.[48]

In front of the apse was an imposing marble table, an architectural fragment from another structure. It was 2.43 by by 1.23m and weighed over two tons. It is unique in a synagogue as far as is known. Its two supports were both decorated with a Roman eagle clutching a bundle of rods; the latter were probably originally intended as the thunderbolts of Zeus. The eagles, clearly in re–use had had their heads knocked off at some stage.[49] The table itself seems to have been used for reading the Law. A marble slab embedded in the floor shows that the reader faced the marble shrines, Jerusalem and the congregation simultaneously.[50] The table was added after the remodelling of Stage 4, another

structure probably with the same purpose having stood on the spot earlier. It was flanked by pairs of almost life–sized Lydian stone lions in re–use.[51] These lions seem to have been symbolically standing guard, protecting the reading table and its scrolls.[52] Perhaps the lion as a symbol of strength also indicated the power and strength of the Torah, or of the God of the Torah.[53] The apse, table and lions together provided a strong focus at the end of the long hall.

A finely carved elaborate marble menorah bearing the name "Socrates" was found in this area. It was more than a metre wide when intact [only a fragment remains]; Hanfmann and Ramage noted that "the work is highly competent, and the virtuosity of the open work, done principally with the chisel, is outstanding."[54] Eighteen other representations of menorahs or actual menorahs were also found.[55]

In the centre of the main hall there were four stone slabs forming a 2.8m square and added after the mosaics.[56] An inscription in the midst of the slabs mentions Samoe, a "priest and sophodidaskalos";[57] it will be discussed later. The inscription probably marks the place from which he taught. Small posts seem to have stood in the stone slabs and supported an awning–like canopy.[58]

There were elaborate mosaic floors everywhere, except around the forecourt fountain. Most of them can be dated to the middle decades of the fourth century CE by coins found beneath the floor,[59] but some mosaics seem to have been retained from the earlier Stage 3.[60] The mosaics had floral or geometric designs, with no animal or human shapes. Each panel included an inscription giving the name of the donor. One panel prominently placed in the hemicycle of the apse was a finely crafted figurative design showing twining vines growing from a golden urn filled with water. Two peacocks flanking the urn were destroyed in antiquity.

The walls were decorated with at least six different kinds of coloured marble. These revetments took two or three generations to complete; some restoration work occurred still later.[61] The marble formed panels of geometric, floral and animal designs including pomegranates, fish, dolphins, lions, doves and peacocks but no human figures.[62] The wall decorations included many pilaster capitals and fragments of frescos have been found. There were also brightly coloured glass mosaics which used at least twenty different colours on the upper walls. The wooden ceiling was painted.[63]

The overall effect of the colours, shapes, the great space, the luxurious furnishings illuminated with many lamps[64] must have been magnificent and very impressive. The elaborate and ambitious combination must have resulted in an interior of extraordinary splendour.[65] Clearly members of the community had

considerable wealth which they were prepared to use for the decoration of the building.

Architecturally therefore, the Sardis synagogue differed considerably from other synagogues. Whilst it does have features in common with other synagogues [eg. the Torah shrine], it has no close parallel. Its size, location, lack of benches apart from those in the unusual apse, the table, the twin shrines and the marble inlay are all not able. Clearly its style was determined by the local community, by the buildings previous history, and by the local architectural idiom.[66] This building, along with other Diaspora synagogues, suggests that there were no universally established canons of synagogue architecture at this time.[67] The emerging picture of synagogue architecture in the Diaspora and in Palestine is one of a large variety of plans.

3.5 It seems likely that there were no annex rooms associated with the synagogue.[68] If there was a communal kitchen it must have been elsewhere. Guests may have been housed in the lofts above the shops belonging to Jewish merchants, south of the building. Part of the porch of the synagogue was walled off perhaps in the sixth century and then used as an eating place.[69] Thus it is likely that the hall itself had multiple uses, perhaps including several of the functions which at other synagogues [eg Ostia, Dura] occurred in the annex rooms. Worshippers at prayer probably faced the Torah shrine[s] at the east end, whereas discourses and readings were delivered from the structure in the centre of the hall [as is indicated by the Samoe inscription], where the reader could be heard by the greatest number. Perhaps a school also met around this structure.[70] The west end with its benches could have functioned as a tribunal.[71] Kraabel thought that the hall may have been used as a sort of community building, for social and even political gatherings.[72]

A row of shops facing onto the busy street were built against the south wall of the synagogue, probably sometime in the second or third century CE.[73] The upper story of the shops was probably used for storage and/or as living quarters. In their last phase they included paint and dye shops, a glassware shop, a hardware shop and restaurants; in such a central location they must have formed a significant centre. At least in their last phase Jews and Christians lived and worked side by side in the shops.[74] That Jews and Christians shared this complex suggests that Jewish–Christian relations were reasonable. It also shows the degree to which the Jews were economically and socially integrated into the life of the city.[75]

3.6 The building remained in use until the abandonment of the city in 616 CE after the Sassanid attack.[76] Craftsmanship declined in the later years of the

synagogue's life, but no more rapidly in the synagogue than in other parts of the city. This decline was caused by deteriorating economic conditions in the whole of Sardis and thus is not evidence for discriminatory measures against non–Christians.[77] As Seager notes, reasonably ambitious alterations indicating some degree of continuing prosperity were made in the synagogue long after Theodosios II banned the repair of synagogues apart from those buildings in imminent danger of collapse. This law, promulgated in 438 CE apparently was not enforced at Sardis and may not often have been enforced elsewhere.[78]

4. Jewish inscriptions from Sardis.

The synagogue contained over 80 inscriptions, most of which concern gifts of interior decorations and furnishings made in fulfillments of vows.[79] Some of the inscriptions have been published by L. Robert, other have been noted in the annual reports in BASOR or in other places. For the remainder we must await the final publication of the excavators. Unfortunately, some inscriptions have only been published in transliterated form. Five of these inscriptions contain the term θεοσεβής and are discussed in Chapter 7, section 4.4.

Some of the mosaic inscriptions were originally dated between 212 and 250 CE by Robert.[80] However, coins discovered beneath the mosaics date most of them in the mains hall to the middle decades of the fourth century, and those in the forecourt to the second half of the fourth century CE.[81] However, it is possible that during the fourth century renovation, third century inscriptions were carefully saved and reinstalled.[82] Thus, dating the inscriptions is very difficult. The orientation of the mosaics also varies and this seems to be related to dating.

4.1 The great majority of the inscriptions are in Greek. However, a few interesting Hebrew fragments have been found; one which we have already noted may have read "Beros" ie. "Verus".[83] It is unlikely that it points to the granting of the synagogue to the community in 166 CE, as we noted in section 3.2 above. The wall from which the fragment probably fell was built a century and a half after Verus' death.[84] However, Rabinowitz has noted physical evidence that the plaque was cut away from a larger stone and reused in a second location. Thus, it is possible that an earlier inscription was reinstalled in this later wall.[85] This suggests that the Jewish community formally honoured the Co–Emperor, perhaps on his visit to Sardis in 166 CE.[86] We know that the city erected a statue of Verus in the gymnasium in 166 CE;[87] it seems likely that the Jews set up a commemorative inscription honouring Verus at the same time. It could have been installed originally in the community's earlier synagogue and later relocated; such an important inscription would clearly want to be retained by

the community. That the Sardis Jewish community may have honoured the Co-Emperor is significant and is in keeping with the high social status of the later community. Unfortunately, this possibility remains only a tentative suggestion, particularly since the inscription has not yet been published. One other Hebrew inscription reads "Shalom".[88]

4.2 The following inscription was found in the central panel of one of the mosaics:[89]

Αὐρ. Ὀλύμπιος, φυλῆς Λεοντίων, μετὰ τῆς συμβίου κὲ τῶν πεδίων εὐχὴν ἐτέλεσα.[90]

Aurelius Olympios, of the tribe of Leontioi, with my wife and my children, I have fulfilled my vow.

The mention of the "tribe of Leontioi" is very interesting and without parallel in Jewish inscriptions in Greek. It probably refers to a tribe within the Jewish community rather than a tribe within the city.[91] The choice of the name Λεοντίων is also significant. The name "Leontios" occurs regularly in Jewish inscriptions;[92] one example was previously found in Sardis itself.[93] The lion occurs amongst Jewish symbols and is found in the decorations of synagogues.[94] We should also recall here the two pairs of lions at Sardis which guarded the marble table from which the scripture was read. Further a large Lydian lion, [perhaps one of a pair], was found just outside the synagogue forecourt.[95] An unpublished Hebrew graffito from the synagogue reads "ben Leho" – "son of Leo".[96] This is the Latin for lion used as a name – "Leo", but written in Hebrew characters.[97]

Robert suggested that the use of the name of "Leontioi" for a tribe of the Jews at Sardis was an adaptation of the biblical "tribe of Judah", the tribe described as a lion in Gen 49:9.[98] In addition we should note that the tribe of Dan, all of Israel, and Judas Maccabaeus are pictured as lions.[99]

In addition to this "Jewish context" we should note that the lion was a popular image in Lydian and Persian Sardis, as is shown by the number of lion statues found in the excavations.[100] In addition, the lion had been associated with Sardis in Greek literature since Herodotus.[101] For example, Herodotus tells the story of the fall of Sardis at the hands of Cyrus. Meles, an earlier king, had carried the lion borne by his mistress around the acropolis after the Telmessians had decreed that Sardis would be impregnable when the lion had been carried around the walls. However, Meles overlooked one part of the acropolis, thinking it already impregnable. It was at this spot that the troops of Cyrus scalled the walls and took the acropolis.[102] We see here the mythic power of the lion as a symbol in Sardis.[103]

The Jewish use of the lion in the synagogue, the adoption of the names "Leontios" and "Leo" at Sardis and the naming of a tribe of the Jews as "Leontioi" should be viewed against this dual background. It seems that the Jewish community was associating itself with a significant Jewish image – members of the people of Israel as "lions" – but also with an image which was traditionally popular in Sardis. Thus, the lion expressed simultaneously their Jewish identity and their "belongingness" in Sardis.[104] It thus seems to have been ideally suited as an image for just such a Jewish community as is revealed by the synagogue excavations.

Other inscriptions concerned the donation of the marble revetments which decorated the walls. One of these reads:

4.3 [– – –]ς μετὰ τῆς συμβίου μου Ῥηγείνης καὶ τῶν τέκνων μ[ου -- -- -- -- ἔδ]ωκα ἐκ τῶν δωρεῶν τοῦ παντοκράτορος Θ(εο)ῦ τὴν σκούτλωσιν πᾶσαν vac. [τοῦ οἴκο]υ καὶ τὴν ζωγραφίαν.[105]

[So and so] with my wife Regina and my children ... I have given out of the gifts of the Almighty God, the entire revetment of the hall and the paintings.

4.3.1 The term Παντοκράτωρ "the Almighty", "the ruler of all things" is not common as an attribute of the gods in paganism; however it is common in the LXX where it translates שַׁדַּי or צְבָאוֹת.[106] The term continues to be common in later Jewish writings and is found in some inscriptions.[107] It expresses the supremacy of God over all things;[108] it is the "Almighty God" who has given gifts to Regina and her husband, which have enabled them in their turn to be generous in their gift to the synagogue building.[109]

4.3.2 Regina and her husband were responsible for the marble revetments[110] and for the painted decorations – the ζωγραφία.[111] Since the walls were covered with marble revetments, the painting was probably on the wooden ceiling.[112]

4.3.3 The word οἶκος is used in this inscription to designate the main room of the synagogue, as was the case at Acmonia and Phocaea.[113] The word occurs in another fragment, which Robert reunited with another piece: [τὴν σ]κούτ̣λ̣ω̣[σιν -- -- -- ἔδωκ]α εἰς κόσμον τοῦ οἴκ(ου).[114] Another similar inscription has since been found.[115] The term κοσμος is also found at Acmonia[116] and here probably designates the capitals and revetments which decorated the hall.

4.4 We learn quite an amount about some individuals from other inscriptions, despite their fragmentary nature. The following are noteworthy:

[δ δεῖνα β]ουλ. χρυσο[χόος μετὰ τῆ]ς συνβείου Εὐ.. [-- -- ἔδ]ωκα ...[117]

So and so ... member of the council, goldsmith,[118] with my wife Eu..., gave ...

4.5 [Αὐρ. Ἑ]ρμογ[έν]ης Σ]αρδιανὸ[ς Βουλε]υτὴς [χρυσο]χόος vac. [ἐπλήρ]ωσα τ[ὴν εὐχήν].[119]

Aurelius Hermogenes, citizen of Sardis, member of the Council, goldsmith, I have fulfilled my vow.

4.6 Εὐφρόσυ[νο]ς βουλ. ἐπλήρω[σα τὴν εὐχὴν μετὰ τοῦ̄ -- --]ου μου Εὐφροσύνο[υ].[120]

Euphrosynos, member of the Council, I have fulfilled my vow with my ... Euphrosynos.

4.7 The following mosaic inscription was dated to after 270 CE by coins found beneath it.[121] It seems therefore to have been retained during the redecoration which produced Stage 4.[122]

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἀλέ[ξανδ]ρος ὁ κα[ὶ Ἀν]ατόλιος [Σαρδ(ιανὸς)] Βουλ(ευτὴς) [τὸ τρί]τον διαχῶρημα ἐκέντησεν.[123]

Aurelius Alexandros, also called Anatolios, citizen of Sardis, Councillor, mosaicked the third bay.

4.8 Πηγάσιος β(ο)υλ. (ἐ)πλήρωσα τὴν εὐχήν.[124]

Pegasios, member of the Council, I have fulfilled my vow.

The same name occurs in the following inscription:

4.9 [Πη]γάσιος β' Σαρδ(ιανὸς) μ[ετὰ ? - -].[125]

Pegasios, son of Pegasios, citizen of Sardis with ...

4.10 Another fragment simply reads βουλ.[126] – member of the Council.

The following points arise from these and other inscriptions.

4.10.1 Although we know the occupations of comparatively few Jews in Sardis, it is interesting to note that three were goldsmiths,[127] one was probably a marble sculptor, one owned a paint and dye shop [two other Jews seems to have worked for this man], another owned a glass shop, some may have been mosaic workers and others had positions in the provincial administration.[128] Two of the Jewish goldsmiths were sufficiently wealthy to be city councillors, which suggests that they owned gold–smithing establishments and were not simply artisans.[129] It seems likely that the occupations of the Jews were not much different from those of Gentiles.[130]

4.10.2 Some members of the Jewish community were clearly citizens of Sardis.[131] We will discuss Jewish citizenship of cities in Asia Minor in Chapter 9; suffice to note here that the clear mention of citizenship is unusual and testifies to the notable position of the Jewish community in Sardis.

4.10.3 A total of eight Jewish men held the title of "βουλευτής" and were thus members of the city council.[132] One donor to the synagogue was a citizen and council member of nearby Hypaepa.[133] It is noteworthy how regularly the inscriptions stress the status of Jews in the city and in the local and provincial government, rather than simply their status in the Jewish community as is

usually the case elsewhere.[134]

In a democratic city the Council was the key institution. It had considerable executive functions, especially in the sphere of finance, since it had to nominate, co–ordinate and control the members of the various boards of magistrates. The Council also supervised the proper use of gifts presented to the city, the erection of monuments and tombs, public works, the state archives, the granting of citizenship and honours to deserving people, the reception of envoys sent by foreign states and the general maintenance of law and order.[135] It also considered and approved all the measures which were to be referred to the Assembly.[136] By this time the Council rather than the Assembly had become the true governing body of the city, although the Assembly still ratified the Council's decisions.[137] There were 450 council members at Ephesus, but this was probably an unusually large number. At Tymandus there were 50 councillors at one stage.[138] The size of the council therefore seems to have varied according to the size of the city. A councillor was enrolled in the Council [generally for life] by duly appointed Censors. The prerequisites were age, and ownership of property, with ex–magistrates having the right to a seat. With powers of nomination to the magistracy vested in the Council, and with only ex–magistrates generally being council members, the Council became a self–perpetuating permanent body, in which membership was virtually hereditary. Magie writes:

> The result was the formation of a wealthy ruling–class composed of councillors and their families, which, like the Senatorial Order in Rome, held the reins of government and enjoyed both political and social privileges.[139]

It seems therefore that the nine Jews who were councillors belonged to this high social class. They probably had considerable wealth, social status and political power in the city.[140] It is likely that their parents or children did too.

4.11 In addition, other office holders are mentioned. Aurelius Basileides was "apo epitropon" – "former procurator".[141] The title of "Procurator" signified someone in civil administration who was an employee of the Emperor. It was applied to a range of posts including procurators of imperial and senatorial provinces. However, it is most likely that Aurelius Basilieides belonged to the category of procurators of imperial properties. He was thus an official of the provincial governor responsible for collecting revenues due to the imperial treasury and for management of the Emperor's private property in the province, such as landed estates, mines and quarries.[142] Strictly speaking, the procurator was not a public official but a personal agent of the emperor; he was appointed by the Imperial administration.[143] It was clearly a position of significant rank, which would have enabled Aurelius Basileides to influence higher provincial

officials.[144]

4.12 Another mosaic inscription reads "Euche Paulou Kometos" – "the vow of Paulos the Count".[145] After the Constantinian reorganization this title was bestowed upon leading military and civil functionaries.[146] The holders of the title fulfilled a large variety of tasks. The title could also be conferred as an additional honour on the holder of an existing office; the holder retained a privileged status for life.[147] It is significant that a Jew could hold this elevated rank and another indication of the high standing of the Jewish community.[148]

4.13 Two other members of the Jewish community were "boethoi taboulariou" – assistants in the record office or archives.[149] This title is well known and involved a position, not in the management of the city, but in the Roman provincial administration. The record office was the central bureau of the procurator, and assistants in the office included clerks and accountants.[150]

Thus we see how involved members of the Jewish community in Sardis were in important positions in the wider city and in provincial administration. This taken together with the unparalleled size and position of the synagogue and the evidence for Jews and Christians trading and living side by side, gives us a picture of a large, prosperous, highly respected and influential Jewish community of considerable social status, active in civic and political affairs. The community seems to have been integrated into the economic, social, and political life of the city to an unusual degree.[151]

4.14 In total, eleven inscriptions dating from the third to the fifth century CE use the term "*πρόνοια*".[152] Most have not been published, but one donor inscription ends with *ἐκ τῶν δωρεῶν τῆς Προνοίας*.[153] It was probably similar in form to inscription 4.3 which reads "I have given out of the gift of the Almighty God." Another inscription from the mosaics reads:

... [ek t]on tes pronoias domaton ke ton goneon emon kamaton.[154]

... out of the gifts of providence and the toil of my parents.

The donor attributed his ability to be able to donate the mosaic to the gifts of "Providence" and the hard work of his or her parents. The term "providence" seems to have been used in a quasi–liturgical fashion in the Sardis inscriptions, which suggests it was a term which was regularly used in the community.[155] *Πρόνοια* is found in a number of Jewish writings. In SibOr 5:226–7 "Providence" is said to have held Jerusalem – the great city and righteous people – in special place. In 5:323 it is said that "the Providence of God" will utterly destroy Tripolis by the Maeander. Similarly, in IV Macc "Providence" or "Divine Providence" becomes simply another name for God.[156] In III Macc "the Providence of God" becomes a way of speaking of God's action in the

world.[157] Clearly, the term was popular with some Jewish authors. Further, "*πρόνοια*" was a popular term in the pagan thought of the period; thus a number of treatise "On Providence" were produced at this time.[158] In addition, we know of significant philosophers who taught in Sardis from the fourth century CE onwards.[159] The school to which they belonged could trace its philosophical origins back to Neoplatonism; since one of the central tenets of Neoplatonism was "Divine Providence"[160] it is likely that this was a topic discussed by pagans in Sardis.

It is therefore difficult to know whether the Jewish or pagan usage of the term was the stronger influence behind its use by the Jews of Sardis. Perhaps both were equally significant and we have here a term which was shared by Jews and pagans;[161] judging by the Jewish involvement in the city the two groups seem to have been in close contact. Thus we can suggest that the Jews recognised "*πρόνοια*" as a part of their tradition which was also understood by their contemporaries and was thus a good vehicle for communication. The situation seems similar to the Jewish usage of the lion image and the name "Leontios"; Providence was a term which had Jewish roots but which was also very much "at home" in Sardis. By using it, the Jewish community could simultaneously express their Jewish identity and their "belongingness" in the city of Sardis.

4.15 The following inscription was found in the centre of the hall, where it had been inserted after the fourth century mosaics:
"eyche [S]amoe hiereos ke sophodidaskalos."[162]

It is difficult to know what functions Samoe would have fulfilled as a priest. Three other priests are known in Asia Minor, one from Ephesus, one from Corycos and probably one from Aphrodisias.[163] Leon suggested that priests in this period had "a minor part in the cult [of the synagogue], especially that of pronouncing certain benedictions."[164] Brooten notes that a number of inscriptions from Beth–She'arim and elsewhere show a strong concern for the priesthood even in the third and fourth centuries CE.[165] She suggests that in addition to saying the benedictions, a priest in the synagoue was a preferrred reader of the Torah.[166] It is noteworthy that in Sardis it was still regarded as a status worth possessing long after the destruction of the Temple.

The title "sophodidaskalos" found here is unique in synagogue inscriptions. Perhaps it means wise teacher or teacher of wisdom? Or is it the equivalent of Rabbi?[167] It suggests that Samoe was a teacher–scholar for the community. Perhaps he was head of a school of some sort which met around the platform where the inscription was found.[168] Such a school would have been an important

factor in maintaining Jewish traditions. Samoe was probably a man of substantial importance in the community, if the central position of the inscription is any kind of indicator.[169]

That "sophodidaskalos" was the title used is interesting. If, as seems likely, Samoe fulfilled a similar role to a Rabbi,[170] it is noteworthy that he was not *called* "Rabbi". We do have a considerable number of inscriptions which actually use the title of "Rabbi",[171] but our Sardis inscription does not. This strongly suggests that Sardis was well–removed from the Rabbinic sphere of influence, which reinforces the likelihood that local factors were very important in shaping the form and nature of the Jewish community in Sardis, just as such factors had a strong influence on the style of building which the community owned.[172]

4.16 One very important inscription engraved on a plaque was found outside one of the doors of the synagogue, a position to which it may have been moved after the building was abandoned. It read:

"εὕρον κλάσας ἀνάγνωθε φύλαξον."[173]

"Having found and having broken open, read and observe."[174]

The inscription is not a dedication but a motto in what seems to be a kind of formal liturgical language. The inscription could have been part of the base of the Torah shrine,[175] on a pedestal, or perhaps part of the Eagle Table.[176] "κλάσας" may refer to breaking open a seal of a scroll in order to open it, or perhaps to "breaking open a text" by discussing its meaning.[177] The inscription as a whole seems to remind the community of the importance of both studying the Torah, and of observing the commandments found in it.[178] Or perhaps [in addition] the inscription was meant to be read by visitors to the synagogue, and encouraged them to investigate the Torah. In any case, it certainly points to the significance of the Torah for the community.

4.17 Another inscription referred to the marble inlaying of the "nomophylakion" – "the place which protects the Law."[179] Seager thought that the structure must be the Torah shrine.[180] The name used for the structure indicates its purpose rather than reflecting biblical terminology.[181] The name implies that the Torah scrolls were held in great respect as objects of sanctity and had therefore to be protected. This is in keeping with the modification of the synagogue involved in producing Stage 4, which was probably carried out to produce the Torah shrine[s]. These two factors indicate architecturally the importance of the Torah.[182] Thus, the community showed its great respect for the Torah not only by remodelling the building to produce a permanent Torah shrine but also by describing the structure so produced as a "protector" of the scrolls.[183]

4.18 An inscription found in the main hall reads "Κύρι[ε βο]ήθι τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ." The two preceeding lines of the inscription contained the words "ergou" and "eulogia".[184] The verb βοηθέω is common in the LXX,[185] and similar inscriptions to this one from Sardis are found in other synagogues.[186] The inscription seems to express, albeit in a standardised formulae, a reliance on God, who is understood to be "the helper" of the community.

5. Related Issues.

5.1 We must ask how this magnificent building in an unparalleled location became a Jewish synagogue, especially if it had earlier been used as a judicial tribunal. None of the inscriptions deal with the construction of the building.[187] Rather, they relate to its decoration and furnishing, indicating that the community acquired the building after it had been remodelled to some extent.[188] How did they acquire such a building? The following explanations are plausible:

[a] The building may have been replaced by another judicial tribunal, although this has not yet been found. The city could then sell the unused building to the Jewish community.

[b] There may have been a large number of Jews living nearby, as indicated by the Jewish shops in the locality. However, the synagogue was not in the midst of a Jewish quarter since both Jews and Christians owned the shops, at least at the time the synagogue was abandoned. Yet the presence of a number of Jews in the area might have played a part in the transfer of the building.[189]

[c] The inscriptions reveal a politically powerful and influential group, as we noted above. Perhaps this "lobby" convinced the city council [which had a number of Jewish members] to donate the building to the Jews, or to sell it at a reasonable price. Perhaps the city as a whole was favourably disposed to the Jewish community and would have applauded such generosity, or perhaps it was in return for contributions to the city by wealthy Jews.

All the indications are that relations between the city and the Jews were harmonious and friendly and that Jews were "socially acceptable". Certainly the prominent position of the synagogue within the city and the fact that the Jewish community continued to own the building indicates an unusual degree of cooperation and understanding [or at the very least, tolerance] between the Jewish community and the civic authority, over a long period of time.[190] This in turn suggests [though it can do no more than this] that contacts on an individual basis between Jews and Gentiles were friendly.[191]

We have noted that although it is difficult to know exactly when the building became a synagogue, it is likely that this occurred towards the end of the third century. It also seems likely that the community was already prominent within

Sardis by this time, since it is improbable that a less influential community could acquire the building. We have noted that the decrees preserved in Josephus show that even at that stage the community could claim that it had been well established for a long period; it was granted privileges and seems to have been in a strong position. We can therefore suggest that there was a significant degree of continuity over the period from the mid first century BCE to the time the community acquired the synagogue, although the lack of evidence in the interim period means this can only be put forwards as a probable conclusion.[192] We certainly have no evidence to the contrary.

It is highly significant that the building was not converted into a church in the later period. We do know of Christians in the area – the letter in Rev 3:1–6, Melito and the Church which was called "EA" by the excavators, probably built in the last quarter of the fourth century.[193] In the fourth and fifth century Christianity became more prominent in the city with the destruction of some pagan temples.[194] Clearly the synagogue would have made an excellent church; we know that at Ostia a Christian basilica was built over a functioning synagogue in the late fourth or early fifth century.[195] Yet this did not occur at Sardis, nor was the synagogue molested in any discernible way.[196] This suggests that the Jews retained their influence and significance in the city right up until the seventh century, despite the growing power of Christianity.[197] As we noted above, the shops suggest that relations between Christians and Jews were not hostile.[198] In addition, the fact that the Jewish community was able to maintain the building until 616 also shows that it continued to prosper economically.[199] All of this suggests that there was a strong degree of continuity in the Jewish community not only from the first century BCE to the third century CE but also from the third to the seventh century.

5.2 We can see evidence here for the pride and self–confidence of the Jewish community, and a desire to attract others. The forecourt opening onto a busy street was built by the community, and seems to have been designed to be attractive and inviting.[200] The upper walls and roof of the synagogue would have been clearly visible rising above the shops and road colonnades and people walking past would have been able to look directly inside, through the whole length of the building.[201] The community obviously wished to adorn its worship house in the most beautiful way; it must have made a deep impression on visitors. There is no hint of defensiveness; in fact, the building takes maximum advantage of its prime location to put Judaism "on display".[202] The message about the Jewish community communicated by the luxurious building to passers–by must have been very positive, and this seems to have been by design.

We thus gain a picture of a strong, confident community which was endeavouring to attract others to its faith. The community could, after all, have done many things differently, particularly regarding the remodelling of the building. It seems however to have wished to create a synagogue which would attract Gentiles.[203]

5.3 The synagogue contained a number of articles in re–use from other buildings and shrines. We have already mentioned the Roman monument bearing eagles carved in relief and the marble lions which were perhaps originally associated with an image of Cybele.[204] The bold use of Lydian and Roman sculpture in such prominent places in the synagogue means the Jews considered them "Jewish". They seem able to use them to enhance the table from which the Torah was read, not to detract from it through the use of "pagan symbols".

This attitude expressed in the re–use of "pagan symbols" seems to be an extension of the community's attitude when it took over the Roman judicial tribunal. The building's former pagan usage and its continuing attachment to the pagan gymnasium–bath complex did not prevent the community converting the building into an impressive synagogue. We see again the boldness and strength of the community's Judaism.[205]

A number of other earlier pagan monuments and building pieces were built into the piers and walls of the synagogue.[206] It seems likely that all these pieces which were reused in the synagogue in the fourth century phase came from sanctuaries destroyed under Constantine.[207] Some of these objects may have belonged to a sanctuary of Cybele.[208] That these once highly significant statues were made available to the Jewish community, presumably by the city authorities who were closing the temples, is another sign of the influential and powerful position of the Jewish community under Constantine and immediately thereafter.[209] A relief of Artemis and Cybele made in the fifth century BCE was found face down in the Forecourt, where it had been placed by the Jewish builders.[210] Notice the image is face down. Re–use of pagan symbols was carefully done.[211]

5.4 A brief look at the history of the Church at Sardis is helpful. It was one of the recipients of the "Seven Letters" of Revelation, where it is compared unfavourably with the Church of an earlier day [Rev 3:1–6]. Melito was the bishop of Sardis in the latter part of the second century CE. He was a Quartodeciman and we have a complete work of his – the "Peri Pascha" – and a number of other fragments.[212] An investigation of the Peri Pascha against the background of the Jewish community is enlightening.[213] In a prolonged section of the work Israel is reproached for the death of Christ;[214] other Quartodeciman texts and

early examples of *Adversus Iudaeos* literature do not show the same intensity in their attack on Israel as does Melito. This is especially clear in the way he sees the Jews as the sole agents of the crucifixion.[215]

We have noted that the social status and influential position of the Jewish community is evident from the synagogue and its inscriptions. Kraabel has suggested that, faced with this powerful Jewish community, Melito felt forced to mount the prolonged attack which we see in the Peri Pascha. It was a strong attempt on Melito's part to establish and preserve the identity of his community over against the powerful Jews in Sardis.[216] Melito therefore argued that the Jewish λαός had had its day and was now superseded by ἡ ἐκκλησία.[217] Thus there seems to have been a socio–political rather than a theological motivation behind Melito's rhetorical polemic against the Jews.[218] The evidence from the Jewish community certainly helps us to understand the writings of Melito more clearly.

6. The Jewish Community at Priene.

Priene in Ionia was always a relatively small city, its economic growth being hampered by the existence of Miletus just to the south, and by the gradual silting up of its own harbour. It was a planned Hellenistic city laid out on a regular grid–pattern which was retained since the city was never modified by the overlay of Roman buildings.[219] Its culture was strongly Ionian and Greek.[220]

6.1 The city was excavated by a German expedition in 1895–8. They found the synagogue of the Jewish community but incorrectly identified it as a "house church".[221] The building, situated in the "West Gate Street" was a remodelled house, earlier walls being removed when the transformation occurred.[222] From the main street one entered a small lane and then turned into a small forecourt beyond which was the main room, measuring 10 by 14m and entered by a single door. This room contained two rows of columns of which only one base remains. These columns were a later addition; it seems that the synagogue as originally formed was an open room.[223] There was also a single bench along the north wall and a square Torah niche in the east wall, which faces Jerusalem. As Kraabel noted "the niche is the main feature in an otherwise plain room."[224] At the right of the niche there was a marble basin, nearly a metre in diametre and probably used for ablutions. It is likely that rooms associated with the synagogue were also used by the community for its functions and perhaps as a hostel.[225]

Three engravings confirm the identity of the building; a menorah on a stele; a stone with a menorah, two peacocks, a lulab and perhaps an ethrog;[226] and a stone [found in reuse in a nearby church, but almost certainly coming from this building] which depicted a menorah with two rolled up Torah scrolls placed

between the branches and the base of the menorah,[227] a lulab, shofar and ethrog.

Dating the synagogue is difficult. The German excavators dated the remodelled structure no later than the fourth or fifth centuries, but were influenced in this by their identification of it as a house church.[228] The synagogue could well be earlier, but this is uncertain because no further work has been done at the site. Kraabel suggests that a third century CE date might be likely.[229]

6.2 We can note first of all the contrast between this building and the synagogue at Sardis. The synagogue at Priene was small and probably undecorated; no mosaics or frescoes have been found. It was on a side street and was not easily identified as a synagogue. There are none of the signs of obvious prosperity and influence that are to be found at Sardis, although we should note that the city itself was quite small and did not prosper in the period to which the synagogue belongs. The two buildings show clearly the diversity of Judaism in Asia Minor. They also reveal that the local environment had a marked effect on the Jewish communities – in large prosperous Sardis, the Jewish community flourished; in smaller Priene, the Jewish community reflected the conditions of the city.

We have noted that provision for the Torah dominated the room; this suggests that the Torah was very important to the Jewish community. All the objects engraved on stones from the building are traditional Jewish symbols. The basin for ablutions beside the Torah might suggests that the reader of the Torah washed his or her hands before touching the scrolls. Thus, although we know very little about the community, there are some signs which suggest that they belonged within the "mainstream" of Jewish faith and practice of the period.

7. A Synagogue at Miletus?

That Miletus had a Jewish community is clear from Josephus, who records a first century BCE decree which guaranteed the Jewish community certain privileges [Ant 14:244–6], and from an inscription in the theatre which reads: "Τόπος Εἰουδέων τῶν καὶ θεοσεβίου."[230] Early this century von Gerkan identified a building in Miletus as the community's synagogue.[231] It was a small room [18.5 by 11.6m], built on the plan of a basilica, with a peristyle court at the side. Two or three construction periods are evident, the earliest being in the late third or early fourth century CE, although the building's history is complex.[232]

It is far from proved that the building was a synagogue. No Jewish evidence was found in or near the complex, and only half of the main room and less than one–sixth of the courtyard was excavated.[233] It was identified as a synagogue because of its general similarity to the synagogues of Palestine, which

had been studied by Kohl and Watzinger just prior to von Gerkan's discovery of the Miletus building. However, the synagogues at Priene, Sardis and Ostia show that Palestinian building plans were not always reproduced in the Diaspora. The one inscription that was found in the building was on a column and concerned a Poseidon altar, erected at the command of the Didymaean god, Helios Apollo.[235] Von Gerkan thought that the building became a synagogue by adaptation after this altar had been destroyed.[236] However, it seems more reasonable to suggest that the building was a pagan temple throughout its history. There is no positive evidence that it was ever a synagogue. We must agree with Kraabel's conclusion that "the present evidence does not warrant including Miletus in a list of Diaspora synagogue sites."[237]

8. Conclusions.

8.1 The Jewish community at Sardis seems to have been influential, prominent and "at home" in Sardis to a striking degree from the third century CE onwards. This is shown, for example, by their impressive building, their involvement in the city, the adoption of local symbols or ideas – the lion, and the idea of providence, both of which were prominent in Jewish tradition and pagan thought. The community's roots went back to at least circa 200 BCE; the involvement of the Jewish community in the life of the city from the third century CE onwards is therefore understandable – Jews had been in Sardis for a long time and had been able to establish themselves. We can suggest that in the first century BCE the community was also in a secure position, was respected in the city and was granted a number of privileges. There seems therefore to have been a significant degree of continuity over a long period of time.

8.2 Yet the Jews at Sardis flourished as *Jews*. The Torah shrine[s] and table dominated the building; the Torah was to be observed and was also protected, showing the respect in which it was held. Ritual ablutions of some sort were carried out. A number of those who had been successful in the life of the city [and thus became city councillors] made donations in the synagogue, showing their commitment to Judaism. These people seem to have been accepted in the wider city as Jews. The community had not lost its distinctiveness, nor had it abandoned its traditions just because it was well integrated in the city.[238] They maintained their identity while participating in the wider life of the city. Indeed the impression we gain is of a strong, vibrant Jewish community; their involvement in the life of Sardis and their ownership of a building which was part of the baths–gymnasium complex attests a strong assurance and confidence in their Jewish faith.[239] This is highly significant for our view of Judaism in Asia Minor.

8.3 The Jewish community at Priene was small and undistinguished. In looking at the communities at Sardis and Priene we see how different Jewish communities could be; local history and local factors – the length of time the community had been in the city, the arrangements made at its foundation, its wealth and social position, the prosperity of the city itself – are clearly vital. Yet despite their differences, both communities are undeniably Jewish.

Chapter 3.

The Jewish Communities at Acmonia and Eumeneia.

1. Introduction.

1.1 Acmonia was a city of native origin[1] and was situated on the ancient and important Persian Royal Road.[2] The natural strength of the site and the convergence of roads nearby meant that the city was the military centre of the area and had command over the roads and rivers of the locality.[3] It was a city of great wealth and commercial importance, and had a considerable population.[4] In the first century BCE the city had a local government and issued its own coinage, which it continued to do throughout the Principate.[5] Its dignity is shown by the fact that it was the seat of a high priesthood of the Imperial cult and also enjoyed the Neokorate.[6] The city probably had a group of Roman settlers and certainly was quite Romanised.[7]

Surprisingly, it is rarely mentioned in literature of the period, and little is known of its history. Ramsay noted that "peaceful, continuous development and prosperity seem to have been its lot."[8] Acmonia was in the conventus of Apamea and thus it is likely that some of the Jewish gold collected by Flaccus' officials in this conventus in 62 BCE came from Acmonia.[9]

1.2 The city of Eumeneia was founded by Attalus II [159–138 BCE] at the northernmost point of the plain of the Upper Maeander and some 25 miles northwest of Apamea on the route to Western Phrygia in order to strengthen the influence and power of Pergamum in the area. To promote its growth, city rights were conferred upon it at its foundation. Eumeneia seems to have flourished and was able to produce a rich coinage in the Roman era.[10] It was situated on important north–south and west–northeast thoroughfares and this contributed to its prosperity.[11] Under the Roman Empire, the city probably had a garrison and was a place of residence for veterans.[12] It was a leading city in the Apamean conventus[13] and thus, as with Acmonia, the Jewish population probably contributed to the money seized by Flaccus' officials.

Some coins minted under Maximinus [235–238 CE] show a strong link between the cities of Acmonia and Eumeneia, which were about 37 miles apart.[14] These coins are inscribed with the following inscription:
Ἀκμονέων καὶ Εὐμενέων ὁμόνοια.[15]

They also show two goddesses representing the two cities, clasping hands and thus indicating the connection between Acmonia and Eumeneia.[16] ομονοια means "oneness of mind" or "concord".[17] The purpose of the coins was probably:

to create a commercial bond which would promote trade and with it 'concord' between the cities which jointly issued these coins.[18]

2. The Julia Severa Inscription.

The earliest datable inscription from the Jewish community of Acmonia reads:

Τὸν κατασκευασθέ[ν]τα ο[ἶ]κον ὑπὸ Ἰουλίας Σεουήρας Π. Τυρρώνιος Κλάδος ὁ διὰ βίου ἀρχισυνάγωγος καὶ Λούκιος Λουκίου ἀρχισυνάγωγος καὶ Ποπίλιος Ζωτικὸς ἄρχων ἐπεσκεύασαν ἔκ τε τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν συνκαταθεμένων καὶ ἔγραψαν τοὺς τοίχους καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν καὶ ἐποίησαν τὴν τῶν θυρίδων ἀσφάλειαν καὶ τὸν [λυ]πὸν πάντα κόσμον, οὗστινας κα[ὶ] ἡ συναγωγὴ ἐτείμησεν ὅπλῳ ἐπιχρύσῳ διά τε τὴν ἐνάρετον αὐτῶν δ[ι]ά[θ]εσιν καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν συναγωγὴν εὔνοιάν τε καὶ σ[που]δήν.[19]

This building was erected by Julia Severa; P[ublius] Tyrronios Klados, the head for life of the synagogue, and Lucius, son of Lucius, head of the synagogue, and Publius Zotikos, archon, restored it with their own funds and with money which had been deposited, and they donated the [painted] murals for the walls and the ceiling, and they reinforced the windows and made all the rest of the ornamentation, and the synagogue honoured them with a guilded shield on account of their virtuous disposition, goodwill and zeal for the synagogue.

The text deals with the restoration of the synagogue[20] which was originally built by Julia Severa. We know from coinage that she was active in the 50's and 60's,[21] thus suggesting that this inscription is to be dated in the 80's or 90's, giving time for the synagogue to require repairs.[22] It is therefore the earliest synagogue in Asia Minor attested by an inscription.

Julia Severa is well known from numismatic and epigraphic evidence. She was ἀρχιέρεια of the Imperial Cult at Acmonia for at least three terms of office in the reign of Nero and an agonothete.[23] The difficult matter here is to decide if she was a Jew.[24] The fact that she built a synagogue for the Jewish community does not require us to conclude that she was Jewish, for the Gospels record an instance of a centurion building a synagogue for the Jews at Capernaum.[25] Ramsay thought that Julia Severa was a Jew. His evidence was that she was a magistrate with Tyrronios Rapo, which Ramsay took to mean that they were married.[26] Ramsay thought that the name "Tyrronios" was only used by Jews,[27] thus implying that Julia Severa was a Jew.[28] However, nothing indicates that Julia Severa and Tyrronios Rapo were married[29] and the Latin name "Tyrronios" is certainly not always Jewish.[30] We therefore have

no positive evidence to suggest that Julia Severa was a Jew. There are also two items of negative evidence. Firstly, Julia Severa was priestess of a pagan cult. Whilst it is certain that some Jews apostasized from their faith,[31] it is most unlikely that those who had done so would continue to associate with the synagogue, for their apostasy was generally the price for advancement in pagan society which was their goal. The gift of a synagogue by an apostasized Jew is therefore unlikely. Secondly, in the case of an apostasized Jew it is unlikely that the community would either accept the gift of a synagogue or commemorate the benefaction in an inscription marking the restoration of the synagogue.[32]

It is most probable therefore that Julia Severa was not a Jew but a "Gentile sympathizer" – a pagan who was favourably disposed towards the Jews and thus built a synagogue for them.[33] She is best understood as a patroness of the Jewish community.[34] Kraabel writes of Julia Severa:

> She is proof of the attractiveness of Acmonian Judaism to Gentiles in the first century and an example of the powerful protectors enjoyed by some Anatolian communities. The fact that she was also "high–priestess" ... of the entire house of the Theoi Sebastoi did not lead to a rejection of her gifts by the Jews probably since this office was chiefly of social and political importance, still another indication of her standing in the community.[35]

That her philanthropy, interest and benevolent attitude to her Jewish neighbours was remembered and appreciated is shown by this inscription, written a number of years after her gift to the community.

It is also clear as we noted above, that Julia Severa was a very important person in Acmonia, having been priestess of the Imperial cult and an agonothete. Her first husband, Servenius Capito belonged to a family of great distinction. Their son L. Servenius Cornutus entered the Senate under Nero and was legatus to the proconsul of Asia, probably in 73 CE, and also held many other offices;[36] a kinsman, C. Iulius Severus was a consul.[37] Levick describes Julia Severa as being of "aristocratic blood [with] high standing in Acmonia and wealth. ...[She belonged to] a nexus of leading families."[38] Thus she would have been a most distinguished and powerful patroness of the Jewish community and would no doubt have looked after their interests.[39] It seems that in this period the Jewish community in Acmonia had friends in the highest circles of society.[40] This inscription also gives us further insight into the Jewish community of Acmonia.

2.1 The three major contributors to the redecoration all held office in the community.[41] It seems clear that office holders had some responsibility for the synagogue building, whilst this inscription also suggests that to become an office holder required a certain level of prosperity, for clearly they had contributed a considerable amount of their own money to the project.[42]

2.2 We have here an unusually full description of the redecoration and thus of the synagogue itself. The restored synagogue had secure windows, the walls and ceiling were decorated with painted murals and there were other ornaments and decorations. Whilst the decorations were unlikely to have been as elaborate as those of the Sardis synagogue,[43] nor the murals as impressive as those at Dura-Europos,[44] the overall effect in the Acmonian synagogue may well have been very impressive. We do not know what the rest of the ornamentation was, but it could perhaps have included a menorah, a torah-shrine and sculptures such as capitals or friezes.[45]

It is interesting to note here that two marble capitals of Jewish origin have been found at Acmonia.[46] They were decorated with a menorah underneath which there was a Torah scroll viewed end on.[47] The editors of MAMA rightly conclude that the two stones must be from a synagogue, possibly from the "house" described in this inscription.[48] We are reminded here of the marble plaque found in the Sardis synagogue depicting a menorah, lulab, shofar and two spirals interpreted as Torah scrolls by Shiloh.[49] This is the only other known example of the Torah scroll being portrayed in this fashion. Perhaps the stones at Acmonia are part of the decorations mentioned in this inscription. The depiction of a Torah scroll here points to the significance of the Scriptures for this community, a prominent feature of the inscriptions, to which we shall return.

2.3 The community recognised the benefaction of the three office holders by honouring them with a large shield overlaid with gold.[50] The inscription was also written to honour these three for their generosity, and that their contribution might be remembered in the future. Both customs were traditional forms of acknowledgement for benefactors in Greek cities.[51]

2.4 The inscription notes the zeal of the three office holders for the synagogue in glowing terms. Their virtuous [ἐνάρετος] attitude is not shown by a single act but rather is a condition or disposition [διάθεσις] implying that it is continuous. Likewise, the use of εὔνοια [goodwill, favour] and σπουδή [which carries a range of meaning such as zeal, effort, support[52]] imply a continuing state of mind and action. Clearly, the leaders' action in redecorating the synagogue was seen as an expression of a longstanding devotion to the community.

The use of οἰκός at the beginning of the inscription perhaps implies that συναγωγή at the end means not only the building but also the assembly of people. Thus, having noted the repairs carried out by the three office holders, the inscription also records the value of their leadership in the community. Their earnestness and virtuous disposition were expressed in their attitude to

both the building and the welfare of the people who met there.

3. "The Curses Written in Deuteronomy".

It is well known that tombs in Phrygia [and to a lesser extent in Asia Minor generally] were often protected against violation by the use of a fine, paid generally to an heir, the city authorities or a religious group and thus designed to insure the interest of the named group in the prosecution of offenders, and/or a curse formula invoking the vengeance of the offended deity.[53] Jewish inscriptions in Phrygia used both fines and curse formula to protect graves, thus participating in the general concern about grave violation in the area.[54] Lifshitz notes the absence of maledictions in the Greek inscriptions of Jews in Beth Shearim, Palestine, Syria and Europe. He concludes that:

> One is led to think that the maledictions in the Jewish inscriptions of Phrygia result from the influence of Gentiles.[55]

3.1.1 The funerary altar containing the following inscription was found by Ramsay at Uşak in 1914.[56] The square altar came originally from Acmonia[57] and is about five feet high and is "surmounted by a pointed ornament like a conventionalized pine-cone".[58] On one face of the gravestone some domestic objects are represented – a mirror, basket, distaff and spindle and a comb,[59] which are representative of the labour of the two women who are buried in the tomb. These decorations are characteristic of grave stones in part of Lydia, in Phrygia and Bithynia.[60] The principle face of the stone is decorated in the centre with a large crown and is engraved with the following epitaph:

ἔτους τλγ΄· Αὐρ. Φρουγιανὸς Μηνοκρίτου καὶ Αὐρ. Ἰουλιανὴ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Μακαρία μητρὶ καὶ Ἀλεξανδρία θυγατρὶ γλυκυτάτη ζῶντες κατεσκεύασαν μνήμης χάριν· εἰ δέ τις μετὰ τὸ τεθῆναι αὐτοὺς εἴ τις θάψει ἕτερον νεκρὸν ἢ ἀδικήσει λόγῳ ἀγορασίας, ἔσται αὐτῷ αἱ ἀραὶ ἡ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ.

On the left side is engraved:

ἀγορανομία σειτωνεία παραφυλακεία[61] *πάσας ἀρχὰς καὶ λειτουργίας τελέσας καὶ στρατηγήσαντα.*[62]

The year 333 [=248–249 CE]. Aurelios Phrugianus, son of Menocritos and Aurelia Juliana, his wife, have constructed this monument while still living for Makaria, [their] mother and for Alexandria [their] sweetest daughter, in remembrance. If anyone, after their burial, if anyone inters another corpse or causes damage by way of purchase, there shall be on him the curses [or the curse][63] which are written in Deuteronomy.

On the left hand side:

Office of Clerk of the Market, Corn-purchaser, Commander of police, having fulfilled all magistracies and liturgies, and having held the office of Strategos.

The reference to the Book of Deuteronomy makes it certain that the people mentioned in the inscription are Jews.[64]

3.1.2 The following inscription engraved on a quadrangular altar, also comes from Acmonia:

[.....]ιν [ἐξ]ἔσται ἑτέρῳ ἀνῦξαι τὸ κάθετον ἢ μόνον ἐὰν συνβῇ τοῖς παιδίοις αὐτοῦ Δόμνη κ– Ἀλεξανδρία· ἐὰν δὲ γαμηθήσονται ἐξὸν οὐκ ἔσται ἀνῦξαι· ὃς δὲ ἂν τολμήσει ἕτερον ἐπισενένκαι θήσει τὰ ἱερωτάτω ταμίῳ Ἀττικὰς ͵α κ– οὐδὲν ἔλαττον ἔσται τῷ τῆς τυμβωρυχίας ἐνκλήματι ὑπεύθυνος· ἔσται δὲ ἐπικατάρατος ὁ τυοῦτος κ– ὅσαι ἀραὶ ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ εἰσὶν γεγραμμέναι αὐτῷ τε κ– τέκνοις κ– ἐγγόνοις κ– παντὶ τῷ γένει αὐτοῦ γένοιντο.[65]

...It is not lawful for another [person] to open the lair, but only [his] wife for [the burial of] his young children Domne and Alexandria. But if they are married it is not permitted [for the tomb] to be opened. But whoever dares to assault it with another corpse, he will pay to the consecrated treasury 1000 Attic drachmae and nothing less; he will be liable for the accusation of grave robbing. And this man will be accursed and as many curses as are written in Deuteronomy, let them be upon him and [his] children and [his] grandchildren and all his offspring.

3.1.3 These two inscriptions enable us to understand another inscription, first published in 1893.[66] It is engraved on a quadrangular altar [similar to that of 3.1.1 but without the ornamental top], of a type very common in Phrygia in general and Acmonia in particular.[67] It reads:

Ἐγένετο ἔτους· τκη΄. Τ. Φλ. Ἀλέξανδρος ζῶν ἑαυτῷ καὶ Γαιανῇ γυναικὶ τὸ μνημεῖον κατεσκεύασεν μνήμης χάριν, βουλεύσας, ἄρξας, ζήσας καλῶς, μηδένα λοιπήσας· μετὰ δὲ τεθῆναι ἐμὲ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὴν συνβιόν μου Γαιανήν, εἴ τις ἀνύξῃ τὸ μνημῖον, ἔσονται αὐτῷ κατάραι ὅσε ἀνγεγραμμέναι ἰσιν εἰς ὅρασιν καὶ ις ὅλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτῷ καὶ εἰς τέκνα καὶ εἰς βίον· εἴ τις δὲ ἐπιχιρήσῃ ἀνῦξαι, θήσι ις τὸ ταμῖον προστίμου φ΄.

On the other three faces of the same altar are inscribed:

Εἰρηναρχία. Σειτωνία. ––Βουλαρχία. Ἀγορανομία. ––Στρατηγία. Σειτωνία.[68]

Made in 328 [=243–244 CE]. Tiberius Flavius Alexandros built this tomb in his lifetime for himself and his wife Gaiana as a memorial; having been a member of the Council, Archon, having lived an honorable life and grieved nobody. When we are buried, myself Alexandros and my wife Gaiana, if anyone opens the tomb, there will be on him all the curses which are written, on his sight and his whole body and his children and his life; And if anyone attempts to open [it], he will have to pay to the treasury as a fine 500 denari.

Warden of the Peace – Corn Purchaser. President of the Council – Clerk of the

Market. Chief Magistrate – Corn Purchaser.

After discovering 3.1.1 Ramsay realised that "the curses which are written" [in 3.1.3] was an abbreviation for "the curses which are written in Deuteronomy", the phrase which occurs in both 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. Thus the Jewish origin of the present inscription became certain.[69]

3.2 Before examining the reference to Deuteronomy, we will outline what was involved in the titles held by Aurelios Phrugianus [in 3.1.1] and Tiberius Flavius Alexandros [in 3.1.3].[70]

3.2.1 The Ἀγορανόμος was the elected controller of the market who supervised the sale and purchase of commodities.[71] His task could involve the upkeep and sometimes the construction of the market buildings, the collecting of rentals due to the city from shops and stalls, fixing the hours of trading, maintaining the accuracy of the weights and measures in use, guaranteeing the quality of goods offered for sale, seeing that market prices were fair, punishing offenders who used false measures or sold above the fixed price, controlling the rate of exchange used, enforcing currency laws and regulating the hiring of casual labour. Probably his most onerous task was solving the problems of food and oil supply by causing the merchants to sell at reasonable prices or by actually providing the goods for sale himself.[72] Thus although the position was less important and lower in rank than that of [for example] the Grammateus, it was clearly an honourable position, charged with duties of real importance for the life of the city.[73]

3.2.2 The Σιτώνης was the public corn buyer.[74] Originally it was a special position for an emergency situation but became a permanent, almost universal institution of cities in the Roman period.[75] This elected position could involve ensuring that the city had a sufficient supply of corn, which was the staple foodstuff [especially of the poor] but was subject to violent fluctuations of price because of crop failure, transportation problems or political troubles.[76] Corn was sometimes levied from landowners, and most cities drew some rent in corn from public lands. If this, in addition to the home–grown supply proved insufficient, additional requirements had to be purchased in the open market from elsewhere and many cities had special funds for this purpose.[77] In a shortage, richer citizens were expected to give corn or contribute money for its purchase, and a public–spirited sitones often sold corn at below cost price.[78] It was the sitones' task to deal with all these different factors involved in the regular supply of corn. At times it could involve considerable personal expenditure [79] and some sitones are commended for serving at difficult times.[80]

3.2.3 "Παραφύλαξ" was the title given to the commander of the local police.[81]

He had particular responsibility for the protection of a city's rural territory against incursions by brigands and the maintenance of law and order in the countryside and had under his command a body of "frontier–guards".[82] An inscription from Hierapolis attempts to prevent the paraphylax from taking advantage of his position by making requisitions from the villagers, or extorting honours from them against their will, suggesting that the position involved considerable power which could be abused.[83] That the position was an important one is shown by the title being one of those held by officials of high rank.[84]

3.2.4 Originally the Στρατηγός was the general of a garrison, or a person involved in the conduct of military affairs.[85] Gradually the title was transformed so that it designated someone who was a civil official and a member of the governing committee of the Council,[86] and thus in many cases the title holder became one of the principal civil magistrates and leading officials of a city.[87] The various duties of the strategoi could include presiding over the Assembly, administering oaths to their minor colleagues, imposing fines, enforcing the enactments of the Council and Assembly, supervising the public finances along with some other facets of the city's life, announcing the bestowal of honours, arranging for the publication of decrees and proposing measures to the Council or Assembly.[88] The board of strategoi generally had five members.[89] "Strategos" was the most widespread title for these magisterial boards.[90] Clearly, the title involved large responsibility and considerable power in the life of the city.

3.2.5 The verb βουλεύω means to be a member of the Council.[91] In a democratic city the Council was the key institution. In Chapter 2, section 4.10.3 I outlined the key role played by the Council and by Council members in city life. Councillors belonged to the wealthy ruling class and had considerable economic, social and political power. Clearly, our two Jews belonged to such a class and it is possible that their parents and children did too.

3.2.6 The Βούλαρχος was the presiding officer of the Council and probably of the Assembly also.[92] The position involved the calling of meetings, the leadership of negotiations and supervision of the execution of decisions of the Council.[93] When we recall the importance of the Council, it is clear that this office was near to the pinnacle of civic government.

3.2.7 "Ἄρχων" was the general term applied to city–magistrates in the letters addressed to a city by the Emperor or by Roman officials. In a large number of places, as at Acmonia, both archons and strategoi are mentioned, and since it is unlikely that two magisterial boards existed side by side with the same functions, it is probable that the title "archon" was used as a general name for the governing board, the term having lost a specific designation of its own.[94]

This seems to be the case in 3.1.3, where the title "archon" is used in the body of the text, but the title "strategos" is given at the end as one of the specific offices held by Tiberius Flavios Alexandros.

3.2.8 The Εἰρηνάρχης or "Warden of the Peace" was responsible for the maintenance of order and public discipline, the reforming of public morals and the suppression of serious crime in the city.[95] The Eirenarch's duties included the arrest and interrogation of bandits and the compiling of evidence and the giving of testimony before the magistates at trials. They did not have the authority to inflict punishment themselves. Under the Eirenarch's command was a body of "mounted constables" called diogmitae who hunted down brigands and made the actual arrests.[96] Magie writes of the Eirenarch:

> The holder, chosen by the govenor from a list of ten leading citizens submitted by the Council, had evidently a high rank for the title usually appears among those of important officials.[97]

That the governor made the appointment is an indication of its importance. Also telling is the fact that a Jew could hold this office. Clearly Tiberius Flavius Alexandros was in favour with both the city and the Roman governor.

3.2.9 The general expression "πάσας ἀρχὰς καὶ λειτουργίας τελέσας" [3.1.1] covers the minor offices which Aurelios Phrougianos fulfilled without listing them in full.[98] It is difficult to speculate on exactly which other offices are meant. Many offices were too important to be included in this general way.

Both of the inscriptions written by Jews who held office in the city are dated after 212. Thus it is most probable that the people mentioned, or their families, gained Roman citizenship through the Constitutio Antoniniana, the edict of Caracalla granting citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire.[99] Aurelios Phrougianos was probably one of the many newly enfranchised who assumed Caracalla's name Aurelios.[100] We should also note that these inscriptions are to be dated after Severus and Caracalla permitted Jews to hold civic office, whilst only imposing on them those duties which would not conflict with their religion.[101] In the third century CE it was becoming increasingly difficult for cities to find people who were willing and sufficiently wealthy to be able to fulfil local offices. However, although holding office was burdensome, the rank of councillor was still valued in the third century.[102] The tone of the many inscriptions mentioning office holders shows that much honour and prestige was still associated with fulfilling these positions. It seems clear therefore that the two Jews mentioned in these inscriptions were prominent and public spirited citizens of Acmonia whose contribution to the city's life brought them honour and respect.[103]

As we have seen both Aurelios Phrougianos and Titus Flavius Alexandros had held significant offices in the city of Acmonia. Both had taken an active part in the life of their city[104] and it is not unreasonable to suggest that the Jewish community as a whole was also involved in the life of their city.[105] While the inscriptions are both dated in the 240's it is likely that the influence and involvement of the two men and of the Jewish community goes back quite a number of years.

3.3 Ramsay wrote the following about the phrase "the curses which are written in Deuteronomy" which occurs in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and in an abbreviated form in 3.1.3:

> The allusion ... is to the great chapters of curses, Dt 27–29. The curses there written are not specifically against violators of graves, but the same curses as are there written are here invoked against violation. ... The Phrygian Jews were in the habit of adapting to the sepulchral purpose that part of the Law of Moses which they found convenient for their purpose without any regard to its force in its own context.[106]

Kraabel commented further:

> These inscriptions mention curses which accompany the giving of the covenant in Deut, but [the inscriptions] make no direct reference to the covenant itself; the Acmonian curses are not seen as incurred by breaking the covenant, since they are directed to Gentiles [outside the Covenant] as well as to Jews. In these three inscriptions at least, the OT is used as a magic book whose curses have a supernatural protective power.[107]

A close examination of Deut 27–30 suggests that the Jewish community was acting in accord with the intent of the passage rather than disregarding the context, or using the book as "magic".[108]

Deut 27:15–28:68 is an outline of the blessings or curses which will come upon the people as a result of their obedience or disobedience towards the commands of Yahweh.[109] Deut 28 contains interesting material from the perspective of a Diaspora Jew. An expulsion from the land is implied in v32 and expressed in v36. McCarthy notes that although the author is expressing a traditional curse rather than describing events which have been experienced:

> the picture would have been real enough for the remnant left in Samaria after 722 or Judah in 587. For that matter, one supposes that it applied to many Jews exiled and compelled to work at least in part for the benefit of others.[110]

Verses 47–57 seem to assume that the people were indeed faithless.[111] The evils described are no longer threats or possibilities *if* certain conditions are fulfilled; rather the people will certainly experience these woes *because* these conditions have been fulfilled. Exile is a certain future event. Verses 58–68 return to

conditional statements, but again the result of infidelity to the law is exile, an exile dominated by despair and never–ending terror.[112] We will not deal with the implications of this structure for the text–history of the passage;[113] what is of interest is how Diaspora Jews would have interpreted the passage in the Roman period. It would seem to offer an explanation of their predicament. Their present circumstances were a result of disobedience; Yahweh had found their ancestors guilty and had carried out the threatened curses of the Law. The blessings and curses of the passage would thus perhaps produce in the Diaspora Jew the will to obey Yahweh in the present and an internal consent with the message of the book.[114]

Deut 29–30 purports to be an exhortation by Moses to the people.[115] Deut 29:21–27 sees it as certain that future generations will abandon the covenant and that the curses of the previous chapter will come upon the people, who become bewildered. This passage is not, as in the standard curse lists, a mere listing of possible evils. Rather the threats have become horrible realities and the question is asked why they have come about.[116] Thus because of Yahweh's anger he brought upon the land "all the curses written in the book of this law [πάσας τὰς κατάρας τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου]", and scattered the people into other lands [v26–7]. Destruction has thus become not a threat for the future but a characteristic of the present, and not just for individual members of the covenant people [as at 29:19f] but for the whole people.[117]

The pedagogical question and answer schema of v21–24 emphasises this.[118] The catastrophe is assumed and the destruction is placed in the context of the broken covenant and the realized covenantal curse.[119] Thus, as in Deut 28, the passage would speak to people of the Diaspora as an explanation of their current situation.

Whereas Deut 29:22–28 speaks of exile, Deut 30:1–10 reverses the picture. As McCarthy notes, "The nation punished for its infidelity is offered the hope of conversion and return to divine favour."[120] Rather than blessings and curses being thought of as two alternative possibilities dependent on fidelity to the covenant, the good is here thought of as succeeding the evil which has filled the recent past.[121] Thus we can suggest that Deut 30:1–10 would have been of great significance for Diaspora Jews because these verses purport to outline what Yahweh will do *after* the implementation of the curses has resulted in their being "cast out to other lands".[122] Yahweh will have compassion upon his people who will return to him in obedience and experience an inner conversion.[123] The passage is not an exhortation, for it contains no admonitions; rather it

contains simple affirmative propositions and thus is written in the style of a prophetic prediction.[124] The overall effect is hortatory. If fidelity is renewed, the activated curses will end and the blessings, which thus act as an encouragement to repentance and return, will be renewed. One of the blessings is particularly noteworthy for our study:

καὶ δώσει κύριος ὁ θεός σου τὰς ἀρὰς ταύτας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μισοῦντάς σε, οἳ ἐδίωξάν σε.

And the Lord your God will place [or hand over] these curses[125] on your enemies, and on those who hate you, those who have persecuted you.[v7][126]

The meaning is apparent. When the people have returned to Yahweh, one of the blessings he will bestow on them is the transference of the curses of the preceeding chapters from them to their enemies. Thus it seems very probable that it is this verse which lies behind the reference to "the curses of Deuteronomy" in these Acmonian inscriptions. The Acmonian writers of our inscriptions were acting in accordance with this verse, and with the intent of Deut 30:1–10 as a whole in applying the curses of Deut 27–29 to grave violators.[127] This would firstly involve understanding themselves, along with the rest of the Diaspora, as those whose ancestors had been judged and thus scattered from the land of the covenant. Even if their forebears had left voluntarily, this theological understanding would still be cogent. However, it is likely that the founders of the community came from the Exilic community in Babylonia, having been sent to Phrygia by Xerxes at the command of Antiochus III[128] thus making this theological understanding a powerful one for the community. Secondly, it would involve understanding themselves in the present as among those who had returned to the Lord and currently obey him [Deut 30:2].

It is readily understandable therefore that the writers of our inscriptions would interpret Deut 30:7 as being fulfilled in their present situation with the "curses written in Deuteronomy" applying, not as they once did to them [and thus they now live in the Diaspora] but rather to their enemies and persecutors.[129]

All the indications we have of the Jewish community at Acmonia suggest that they were prosperous and at peace with their neighbours. Thus it is probable that the only real "enemies" of the Jews [and of Acmonian pagans for that matter] were those who violated their graves.[130] It is natural then for them to apply Deut 30:7 to these violators, and hence to apply to these same violators the curses of Deut 27–29.

Thus the application of this verse to a funerary context is quite in keeping with the sentiment of the passage. The writer is defining his enemies and

persecutors as those who disturb his grave and is clearly following the explicit encouragement of the verse in asking Yahweh to bring his curses on the violators. The Scripture itself encourages this application of curses against covenant breakers to a new context.

We see therefore that Ramsay's understanding of the Jews as completely disregarding the context of the curses and Kraabel's suggestion that they were treating Deuteronomy as a magic book are mistaken. Rather, the writers of these inscriptions seem to have been sensitive to the meaning of the passage. They were probably acting in accordance with its intent seen as a whole, and thus interpreting it in the light of their own situation in the Diaspora. They were invoking God's curse, as the Deuteronomy text suggests they should, upon grave violators. In fact far from being "magic", Deuteronomy and probably the Septuagint as a whole, was functioning as Scripture for them and thus as an authority and guide in their situation.[131]

3.4 Do we have any other indications from these three inscriptions that their authors applied Deut 30:1–10 to themselves?

It is suggestive that two of the three inscriptions currently under investigation were written by men who were prominent in the city having held a number of important offices, for which the prerequisites were wealth and social standing. In Deut 30, after reading that those scattered among the nations will return to the Lord and obey him [v1–2] we read:

> And he [the Lord] will do you good, and he will make you more numerous than your fathers. ... And the Lord your God will bless you in all the work of your hands, in the offspring of your body and in the offspring of your flocks and in the production of your land because the Lord your God will turn to rejoice over you for good, just as he rejoiced over your fathers.[v5b,9]

That two of the three people who used this curse formula were prominent citizens suggests that they would also have applied the rest of the passage to their current situation of prosperity and thus understood themselves as living under the Lord's blessing. Or to express it another way, could they not argue that their current socio–economic position was a proof of the Lord's blessing [Deut 30:5b,9] and of their obedience, and therefore that Deut 30:1–10 as a whole applied to them? Thus Deut 30:7 could be used with regard to violators of their own graves.

It is likely therefore that this passage contributed strongly to the theological and sociological self–understanding of [at least part of] the Jewish community in this city.[132]

3.5 The following points also arise from these three inscriptions.

3.5.1 The phrase "the curses written in Deuteronomy" is a formulaic way of referring to a large passage of curses.[133] What is significant here is that, despite this being a public inscription, almost certainly set up in a public cemetery,[134] no further details were thought to be needed in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 to ensure that grave violators were deterred. Even in the apparent exception of 3.1.3, the inscription specifies the areas of action of the curses and not what the curses themselves involved.[135] Rather than being specific the inscriptions presume an amount of knowledge on the part of any reader and a great deal of respect for this Book, or perhaps for the God whose curses were written in the Book. This must have been the case or else the inscriptions would offer no form of grave protection at all. The mere mention of "Deuteronomy" is here presumed to be a sufficient deterent. In commenting on grave curses in general Lattimore writes:

> There must have been a widespread belief that such defensive curses would work, that the religious awe of the public in general would correspond to the intense concern felt by those who built the tomb.[136]

Clearly the Book of Deuteronomy must have commanded the "religious awe of the public" for these curses to be effective. This implies a surprising respect for Jewish sacred tradition on the part of ordinary people.[137]

3.5.2 It is important to note that the use of the title Δευτερονόμιον for the fifth book of the Pentateuch is evidence for the use of the Septuagint in the community. The Hebrew title – אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים comes from the first two words of the book, whilst the Greek title comes from Deut 17:18: γράψει ἑαυτῷ τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο εἰς βιβλίον.[138] Thus the use of Δευτερονόμιον in our inscription shows that the Scriptures were read in their Greek translation at Acmonia.[139]

3.5.3 Inscription 3.1.1 is part of a series of funerary altars which all come from Acmonia as Robert has shown. These inscriptions are united by being engraved on altars of the same shape and size which are surmounted by a conventionalized pine–cone, by often being similarly decorated and by all belonging to the first half of the third century CE.[140] Of the four known engraved altars of this type from Acmonia only one is clearly Jewish [3.1.1], whilst the other three are almost certainly of pagan origin.[141] It is interesting to note that here again Jews and pagans have important funerary practices in common. The Jewish grave altar is chronologically at the end of the series, suggesting that Aurelios Phrougianos had adopted this pagan style, rather than the reverse. It is also significant that he had been exceptionally involved in the city's life as had [the non–Jews] Aurelius Basileus Olunpos, another of the men who used this style of

gravestone, who was a city councillor and whose son Aurelius Eutuchianos was a lawyer [*νομικός*] and a member of the decania [*δεκαεννέα*].[142] Thus, perhaps this was one of the styles of gravestone favoured amongst people of social standing and wealth [as suggested by the elaborateness of the monuments] in the city. Hence the Jew Aurelios Phrougianos, who belonged to this group, adopted the funerary style appropriate to his standing in the city.

Both had taken an active part in the life of their city[141] and it is not unreasonable to suggest that the Jewish community as a whole was also involved in the life of their city.[142] While the inscriptions are both dated in the 240's it is likely that the influence and involvement of the two men and of the Jewish community goes back quite a number of years.

See Corrigenda

3.5.4 We may also note here a very interesting inscription of the second century CE from Chalkis in Euboea [off mainland Greece] recently studied by Robert.[143] The epitaph was set up by T. Flavius Amphikles, of whom we know a good deal from other sources and who was the "precocious favourite pupil of Herodes Atticus".[144] Flavius Amphikles, who flourished about the middle of the second century CE, was archon of the Panhellenes, probably from 177 until 189, and claimed descent from consuls. He entered chariots in races of Thespiae, and may have been a citizen of that city as well as of Chalkis. He was a wealthy man who studied rhetoric, was involved in the Second Sophistic and in public affairs. His family was connected with several other notable families, including a great house of Thespiae.[145] The inscription contains the following undoubted quotations of Deut 28:22,28:

τόν τε θεὸς πατάξαι ἀπορίᾳ καὶ πυρετῷ καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῷ καὶ ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ καὶ παραπληξίᾳ καὶ ἀορασίᾳ καὶ ἐκστάσει διανοίας.

God will strike [the person who interferes with the tomb] with poverty, with fever and cold shivers, irritation, blight, derangement, blindness and distraction of mind.[146]

Robert has shown that the wording of the inscription reflects the impression made on Amphikles by Jewish monotheism. Since we know that Amphikles was not a Jew, the evidence suggests that he was a man much influenced by Judaism, even to the extent of suppressing pagan allusions [such as would be offensive to a Judaizer] from the inscription.[147] It could perhaps be argued that Amphikles had simply read Jewish grave inscriptions that contained the passage from the LXX which he used. However, that Amphikles had been influenced by Judaism to the extent of adopting monotheism, and that he used other key ideas from Deut 27:15–28:68, seems to suggest a familiarity with Jewish faith on the one hand and with the whole passage in Deut on the other. Horsley

has noted that the fact that two separate verses from Deut are quoted as if they were a continuum suggests that the LXX material has been mediated indirectly, perhaps via a collection of suitable formulae.[148] Thus we have here new evidence of the influence of Jewish religious thought in the higher spheres of the aristocracy.[149] We should also note that we know from Philo Leg. 282 that there were "Jewish colonies" and thus no doubt synagogues on Euboea.[150]

Neither Robert nor Horsley have asked why Amphikles used this particular passage in Deut in the epitaph. Our previous discussion of the use of this passage at Acmonia suggests an answer to this question. It seems likely that Amphikles obtained his understanding of Deut 27:15–28:68 from one of the Jewish communities on the island; he would probably not have had access to a detailed knowledge of the LXX without some assistance. Horsley's insight that the LXX material has been mediated indirectly also points to this. It seems therefore that a Jewish community known to Amphikles used this passage in Deut in a prominent way in their community life. The most likely explanation for this is that, as we have argued for Acmonia, one of the Jewish communities on Euboea also understood its life in the Diaspora in the light of Deut 30:1–10 and perhaps also applied the curses of Deut 27:15–28:68 against grave violators. Amphikles followed this example and adopted the current belief of a synagogue. Thus, this inscription reinforces our interpretation of the situation at Acmonia by showing that another Jewish community elsewhere had the same sort of theological understanding.

4. The "Children's Children" Curse.

We have a number of examples of what has been called the "children's children" curse because it calls down a curse upon the *τέκνα τέκνων*. It is found in Acmonia and in other places nearby.[151] We have a number of examples of this curse which is generally agreed to be Jewish, as we will show in the next section.

4.1.1 Engraved on a doorstone with six decorated panels is the following inscription:

Ἄμμια Εὐτύχου (Κ)αλιμάχῳ ἀνδρὶ καὶ ἑαυτῇ ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας προικὸς τὸ μνημεῖον κατεσκεύασεν· ἀρὰ δὲ ἔσται εἰς τέκνα τέκνων ἕτερον μὴ τεθῆναι ἢ τὸν ὑόν μο[υ] Εὐτύχην καὶ γυναῖκα αὐ[τ]οῦ.[152]

Ammia [daughter] of Eutyches, prepared the tomb for Kalimachos her husband, and for herself, from her own dowry. The curse will be to the children's children to prevent anyone from burying anybody except my son Eutyches and his wife.

4.1.2 The following inscription, engraved on a decorated doorstone and to be dated in the late second or early third century,[153] is almost certainly from

Acmonia [154]:

Τιβέριος Κλύδιος Ἰουλιανὸς ἑαυτῷ καὶ γυναικὶ μνήμης χάριν καὶ Χελειδὼν τοῖς ἰδίοις θρέψασι μνήμης χάριν. Τὶς δὲ κακῶς ποίσει ταύτῃ τῇ γουντῃ,[155] ἔξει τέκνα τέκνων ἀράν.[156]

Tiberius Claudios Julianos [made this tomb] for himself and for his wife in remembrance, and Cheleidon for her own foster–parents in remembrance. But whoever shall do harm to this grave, he will have the children's children curse.

4.1.3 Another inscription from Acmonia is engraved on an elegantly decorated white marble doorstone:

Γάϊος ἑαυτῷ ζῶν καὶ γυναικ[ὶ Θα]λλούση ζώση κατεσκεύασεν [μνή]μης χάριν. μετὰ τὸ δὲ τοὺς δοῖο τεθῆναι ὃς ἂν ἀνοίξει ἢ καθελεῖ ἢ πολήσει τὸ γουτάριον ἔσται αὐτῷ ἀρὰ ἰς τὸν οἶκον καὶ τέκνα τέκνων.[157]

Gaios himself, whilst alive, and his wife Thallouse, whilst alive, prepared this in remembrance. And when the two are buried, whoever opens or destroys [?] or ploughs the tomb, there will be a curse on him, on [his] house and children's children.

4.1.4 An inscription from Eumeneia likewise contains this formula:

Αὐρήλιος Γάϊος Ἀπ[ελ]λᾶ κατεσκεύασεν τὸ μνημεῖον ἑαυτ[ῷ] καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτ[οῦ] καὶ τῇ μητρὶ καὶ χ[ρη]στῷ φίλῳ Ὀνησίμῳ καὶ τῇ γυνα[ι]κὶ αὐτοῦ· εἰ δέ τις ἐπιχειρήσει ἀνα[σ]κευάσαι τὸν τόπον, ἔστω αὐτῷ κατ[ά]ρα τέκνων τέκ[νοις] καὶ τῷ συμβουλε[ύ]σαντι. ὁ βίος ταῦτα.[158]

Aurelios Gaios son of Apella built this tomb for himself and for his wife and for his mother and for his good friend Onesimos and his wife. If somebody attempts to demolish this plot, may the curse of the children's children be on him and the one who advised [him]. Such is life.

We noted at the beginning of this study the close relationship which existed between the cities of Acmonia and Eumeneia. We see here that the Jewish communities of the two cities shared vocabulary – in this case the children's children curse. It seems likely that the two Jewish communities were in close contact just as the two cities were.

4.1.5 We have two inscriptions from Prymnessos, forty miles east of Acmonia:

Αὐρήλιος Εἰρηναῖος Ἀριστωνύμου ἐπεσκεύασεν τὸ προγο[νικὸν] μνημεῖον ζῶν ἑαυτῷ [καὶ γ]ονεῦσι καὶ Αὐρηλίᾳ Ἀ[μια τ]ῇ ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὶ [καὶ τέκ]νοις Αὐρηλίῳ Πανμ[ένει] καὶ Αὐρηλίῳ Ἀμιανῷ· τίς ἂν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ μνημείῳ κακὸν προσπ[οι]ήσει ἢ ἑτέρου τῶμα [ἐπισκομί]σει ἢ τῆς δο[ύλης μου Κοσμίας] ἀποτεί[σει τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ τα]μείῳ δη[νάρια δισχίλια πεντα]κόσια [καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστω τέκνων

τέκνοις ὑποκα]τάραţ[ος· ‹τούτου› τούτου τὸ ἀντίγραφον ἀπετέθη εἰς τὰ] ἀρχεῖα. Ἀνεικίω Φ[αύστ]ω ἀνθυπά[τ]ῳ.[159]

Aurelios Eirenaios son of Aristonumos repaired the ancestral tomb whilst alive for himself, and for [his] parents, and for Aurelia Amia, his wife and for his children, Aurelios Panmene and Aurelios Amianos. But whoever does damage to this tomb or brings in another corpse except my servant woman Kosmias, he will pay to the consecrated treasury 2500 denaria and he will be subject to the children's children curse. The copy of this has been put into the archives. [Dated when] Aneikios Flaustos [was] proconsul.

That the family is to be buried in the "ancestral tomb" [with the term "ancestors" clearly extending to at least the grandparents of Aurelios Eirenaios], suggests that this Jewish family had lived in the city for at least three generations. The last phrase gives the date of the inscription as 217–218 CE, the year in which Q. Anicius Faustus was proconsul.[160]

4.1.6 The other inscription from Prymnessos is to be dated in the third century CE:[161]

[Α]ὐ[ρ]. Μακεδὼν τῷ [ἰ]δί[ῳ] (θ)ρεπ[τ]ῷ Ζωτι[κῷ] μνήμης χάριν· ὃς ἂν τούτῳ τῷ τ[άφ]ῳ κακῶς π[οιήση ἔστω ὑπ]οκατάρα[τος τέκνοις] τέκνω[ν].[162]

Aurelios Macedon, for Zotikos, his slave bred in his house, for a remembrance. Whoever does damage to this grave, he will be subject to the children's children curse.

4.1.7 In 1940 Dörner published the following text from Acroenus, five miles north west of Prymnessos.

Σ[τ]ερτίνιος Αἰνίας [καὶ ...] .. ΑΣ. [κ]ατ[εσ]κεύασαν τὸ ἡρῶον ἑα[υ]τοῖς καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις καὶ τοῖς [τ]εθρεμένοις· ὃς ἂν δὲ τούτω υ ἡρῴω κακῶς ποιήσει, ὑποκατάρατος ἔστω εἰς τέκνων τέκνα.[163]

Stertinios Ainias and ..... prepared the tomb for themselves and for [their] children and for the slave brought up in their house. But whoever does damage to this tomb, he will be subject to the children's children curse.

Both Dörner and Robert thought that this was without doubt a Jewish inscrip_tion.[164]

4.1.8 A fragmentary inscription from Acmonia may contain this formula, and thus be Jewish:

[μετὰ δὲ τὸ] τοὺς δύο [τεθῆνα]ι ὃς ἂν ἀνορύ[ξει ἐ]κεῖνος [καὶ τέκνα] τέ[κνων---].[165]

4.1.9 The following inscription from Synnada to be dated in the first or second

century CE[166] contains what is probably a variation of the children's children curse.

ἐν τούτω τῶ μνημείω κεῖντα[ι] δύο λ[άρ]νακες· τίς οὖν π̣[ο]τε τὰ ὀστέα σ[κυβλίσε]ι κατάρα αὐ[τῶ γένο]ιτο εἰς ἐγ[γόνων] ἐγγόνους.[167]

In this tomb lie two coffins. Therefore whoever desecrates the bones, let there be on him a curses to [the] descendants' descendants.

Kraabel suggested that this was a variation on the more common "τέκνα τέκνων" formula.[168] ἔγγονος occurs a number of times in the LXX, although we never find the above formula. Such an unusual formula is most likely to be related to the children's children curse, although since it is earlier than any other of the dated inscriptions it is possibly independent. Perhaps the most reasonable explanations is that another Greek translation of the Hebrew text of Exodus 34:7 [see the next section for this text] was current in the area and it read ἔγγονος instead of τέκνον.[169] We know of the existence of a Jewish community at Synnada in this period from an inscription which mentions an archisynagogos.[170] It thus seems likely that 4.1.9 is of Jewish provenance and is a variation of or related to the well–known children's children curse.

4.2 The children's children formula is a most unusual grave curse. Kraabel thought that the element of magic was more obvious here than with the curses which refer to Deuteronomy.[171] We will investigate this claim.

We often find curses which affect children invoked in inscriptions.[172] However, there is only one definitely pagan parallel to the children's children curse formula from nearby, and as we will see this is probably an imitation of the inscriptions given above.[173] Thus, commentators have agreed that this formula is Jewish because, as we will now show, it quotes the LXX.[174]

We note that the curse is regularly abbreviated, for instance to "he will have the children's children curse" [ἐξεῖ τέκνα τέκνων ἀράν 4.1.2 above]. Clearly the curse is so familiar that it may be radically abbreviated.[175]

4.2.1 Although phrases like τοῖς τέκνοις τῶν τέκνων are found in several passages in the LXX,[176] such a phrase is only found in a context of judgement/cursing in Ex 34.

This passage narrates the renewal of the covenant and the self revelation of Yahweh after the incident of the Golden Calf. The narrative relates a theophany in which Yahweh passed by before Moses. We read the following:

καὶ παρῆλθεν κύριος πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινος καὶ δικαιοσύνην διατηρῶν καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος εἰς χιλιάδας, ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ οὐ καθαριεῖ τὸν ἔνοχον ἐπάγων ἀνομίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἐπὶ τέκνα

τέκνων ἐπι τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην γενεάν.
And the Lord passed by before his [Moses'] face and he proclaimed, 'The Lord God merciful and compassionate, patient and very merciful and truthful, and maintaining righteousness and doing mercy for thousands, pardoning lawlessness and offence and sin and he will not clear the guilty, bringing lawless conduct of the fathers upon children and upon children's children until the third and fourth generation.[Ex 34:6–7]

The passage strongly emphasises the mercy of God, yet without abrogating or denying his wrath and judgement.[177] Moberly writes:

> The point is not that the people experience either wrath or mercy, but that both wrath and mercy are in the character of God though it is his mercy which is ultimately predominant in his dealing with his people.[178]

Hence in this passage we find the "children's children" expression in a context which includes judgement for sin. We have both the exact wording used in the inscriptions and a context which makes the passage suitable for use in a funerary setting. It seems that it was this passage in the LXX which was in the writers' minds, thus explaining the very unusual grave curse. The passage seems to be suitable for the use to which it was put by Acmonian Jews, and those nearby.

The wording of the passage in the LXX also makes it appropriate for use in a funerary context. Yahweh will not free or clear the ἔνοχος, a word which means one who is guilty or liable to penalty,[179] and is quite common in burial curses.[180] Yahweh will also bring the ἀνομίας of fathers upon the children's children. ἀνομίας, in this context, lawless conduct or "against the law" and thus wrongdoing or wickedness,[181] is a general term in the LXX, often [as in this case] with no direct connection to a specific injunction.[182] Thus it is a suitable term to apply to grave violation. The agent of judgement envisaged here is Yahweh who acts against the guilty and wicked. In fact the overall intent of the passage is also appropriate for use in these inscriptions. The "credo" of v6–7:

> is not kerygmatic, but descriptive; it is concerned not with God's acts, but with His character. There is no mention of Israel; the spirit is universalistic; the concern is not with Israelite man, but with man as such.[183]

We thus see that it is appropriate to use Ex 34:7 against grave violators in a funerary setting. The children's children curse is not "magical" as Kraabel suggested. Rather, the authors of these inscriptions seem to have been asking Yahweh to judge the violator, who has committed an act of lawlessness, and to

continue the judgement as far as the grand–children of the offender. This is in keeping with Yahweh's revelation of his character in Ex 34:6–7.

4.3 There are numerous other passages in the OT which are dependent upon Ex 34:6–7.[184] Many of these passages are cultic "in the sense of originating in and being used in the formal worship of Israel".[185] Moberly writes:

> All the other OT uses of the elements in Ex 34:6f can be understood as derivative from, and explicitly recalling, the supreme instance of God's revelation.[186]

Thus the rest of the OT has used Ex 34:6f as a liturgical formula, to be extended and revised.[187] It is clear that a tradition as important as Ex 32–34 for its revelation of the character of God and the nature of Israel would naturally be taken up into the worship of the people. Miller notes that the use of these verses in the Psalms:

> assumes a sufficiently long history of tradition to establish it [these verses] as a fundamental liturgical formula on which Israel would draw with some frequency.[188]

Thus we can suggest that, just as Biblical writers [or communities represented by them] adopted this fundamentally important narrative tradition as a part of their worship, so also the Jewish community of Acmonia adopted this passage as a part of their liturgy and thus proclaimed the mercy and judgement of God.[189] The Jewish community was following Scriptural precedent in adopting as part of their worship a passage that had been adopted by many other worshipping communities before them. This would seem to be the most adequate explanation for the fact that the "children's children" curse is used in these inscriptions. It was part of the liturgical usage of the synagogue and thus came to mind in the context of calling on God's judgement upon the sin of grave violation. Although Moberly writes of the use of the passage within Scripture itself, his explanation applies equally to a later Jewish community:

> What would be more natural than to utilize the tradition and to call upon Yahweh as being of the character which he himself had revealed to Moses? ... The adoption of a tradition of fundamental importance into the context of worship is not only a pattern of development readily understandable in itself, but also can be paralleled elsewhere – not least in the history of the Christian church.[190]

We can thus make the important suggestion [although it is no more than this] that the revelation of Yahweh in Ex 34:6–7 was a part of the liturgy of the Jewish community at Acmonia. The fact that we find the curse in a number of communities suggests that the use of this passage in the liturgy was quite widespread. We thus perhaps gain an important insight into the content of

Jewish faith and liturgy in this area.[191]

It could be argued in investigating these inscriptions that someone "chanced upon" the phrase in Ex 34:6–7 and decided that the "children's children curse" had the right ring to it and so used it against grave violators. Others then read the epitaph, thought it appropriate and used it, without any reference to the Biblical context. Hence the argument would go that its use tells us nothing about the faith of the Jewish community. However, we can note firstly that the phrase in itself means little. It does not describe retribution, it refers one to a "curse". This seems to presuppose the text of Ex 34:6–7, especially when it is remembered that most grave curses are very explicit.[192] Secondly, why would someone "chance upon" this particular phrase, out of many Scriptural phrases which seem suitable, and then why should it be repeated so often in different communities? It seems a much better explanation than "chance" to suggest that the phrase was part of the regular liturgy of these Jewish communities and thus that the passage was well known.[193]

We can suggest therefore that Scripture functioned as a revered tradition, as a source book for the worship and faith of the community. It was to Scripture that they turned for revelation of Yahweh's nature, here they turned for the direction and inspiration of their liturgical life.[194]

4.4 We have one occurrence of the children's children curse which is clearly of pagan origin. This inscription from 35 miles east of Sardis is dated to 261-2CE and thus is later than the majority of inscriptions quoted above, and is found in an area of proved Jewish habitation. It ends:

εἰ τις θελήσει σκύβαλλισαι τὸ μνῆμα τοῦτο, ἐξεῖ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα κεχολωμένον καὶ τὴν κυρίαν Ἀναείτιν διά τέκνα τέκνων ἔγονα ἐγόνων.[195]

If someone desecrates this tomb, he will have to deal with the wrathful Apollo and the Lady Anaetis on account of children's children and grandchildren's grandchildren.

It seems likely that the writers of the inscription borrowed the curse formula, known to them from Jewish epitaphs or from Jewish neighbours.[196] In doing so they were showing that a traditional Jewish formula was considered by them as sufficiently potent to ward off grave violators. That pagans used this formula again reveals a close connection between Jews and their neighbours. That this case is some distance west of the other instances of this formula is interesting and suggests that either it was well known or that the writer of the inscription had travelled in the Acmonian region.

4.5 There are some other inscriptions which are perhaps to be related to this curse formula. One of these inscriptions does not explicitly mention a curse,

but clearly implies one. The inscription is from Cabalide in Lycaonia, and ends as follows:

καὶ τῷ ἀδικήσαντι μηδὲ γῆ καρπὸν μηδ[ὲ] θάλασα τέ[κ]να τέκνυς.[197]

And to the one who does harm [to this tomb], no fruit of the land nor sea, to the children's children.

A second inscription is more closely related to our series and is clearly pagan. It is from Oenoanda in Lycia and ends as follows:

ἔσται ἐπάρατος θεοῖς πᾶσιν καὶ πάσαις τέκνα τέκνων.[198]

He will be accursed by all gods and goddesses to the children's children.

No indication of dating has been given. Two other inscriptions are similar but do not actually refer to a curse.[199] The inscriptions are probably not related to the series given above because of the distance of these two sites from Acmonia. It seems best to regard them as independent occurrences of the formula.[200]

5. Other Inscriptions Which Refer to the Septuagint.

5.1.1 The following inscription is from Acmonia:

A. [*ὁ δεῖνα ἑαυτῷ καὶ*] *τῇ συνβίῳ Τροφίμη ἐποίησεν. Τιτέδιος Ἀμέριμνος ἐπισκε[υ]άσας τὸ τοῦ πά[π]που αὐτοῦ μνημεῖον ἔθαψεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα Αὐρ. Ὀνησίμην Εὐελπίστου· ἐξὸν δὲ ἔστε καὶ τὸν ἐπισσκευάσανταν Ἀμέριμνον τεθῆνε ἰς τὸ προγονικὸν [α]ὐτοῦ μνημεῖον· ἐὰν δέ τις ἐπιχει[ρ]ήσει με[τ]ὰ τὸ τεθῆνε τὸν Ἀμέριμ(ν)ον ἕτερόν [τι]να θάψῃ θῇσει ἰς τ[ὸ ταμεῖον *...]*

B. [*ἔι τίς τι]να θάψετο, [χειρὶ] δολί[α] λάβοιτ[ο ἀπρ]οσδόκητον ὁ[ποῖ]ον καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς α[ὐτ]ῶν Ἀμέριμνος· ἐὰν δέ τις αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῇ τούτων τῶν κ[α]ταρῶν, τὸ ἀρᾶς δρέπανον εἰσέλθοι[το] εἰς τὰς οἰκήσις αὐτῶν καὶ μηδίναν ἐνκ[α]ταλείψετο.*[201]

A. ...[Somebody made this tomb for himself] and for his wife Trophime. Titedios Amerimnos, having restored the tomb of his grandfather, buried his wife Aurelia Onesime [daughter] of Euelpistos. Amerimnos who has restored the monument of his ancestors, will have an equal right to be placed here, but if somebody attempts after the burial of Amerimnos, to bury somebody else he will place in the treasury .... denaria.

B. [If somebody] buries somebody else may he receive the treacherous blow of the unexpected sort which their brother Amerimnos [received]. And if one of them is not afraid of these curses, may the sickle of the curse come into their houses and leave no–one behind.

The editors of MAMA concluded that side A was inscribed while Amerimnos was alive and side B after his murder. When Ramsay published this inscription in 1897 he thought it:

> marked the grave of a Jewish Christian; but it would appear that the Church in Acmonia was of a debased type, much influenced by non–Chr. elements.[202]

However in 1914 Ramsay decided that it was definitely a Jewish inscription,[203] being convinced by the occurrence of ἀρᾶς δρέπανον [on which see later], an allusion to the Septuagint. This factor has also convinced Buckler and Calder, Robert and Kraabel.[204]

5.1.2 We find a similar curse formula in another inscription from Acmonia. [ἐὰν δέ τις ἕτερον σῶμα εἰσενέγκῃ, ἔσ]ται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον καὶ τὸ ἀρᾶς δρέπανον εἰς τὸν ὦκον αὐτοῦ [εἰσέλθοιτο καὶ μηδέναν ἐνκαταλείψαιτο.[205] [And whoever introduces another body] he will have to reckon with the highest God and may the sickle of the curse come into his house [and leave no–one behind.]

In 1897 Ramsay thought that this inscription was Jewish because of the use of the phrase τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον – the highest God.[206] However, it does not provide reliable evidence upon which to assess the provenance of this inscription, as we will show in Chapter 6. However, the occurrence of ἀρᾶς δρέπανον does provide proof that this inscription is Jewish, as is agreed by a number of scholars.[207] We have here valuable evidence that both the phrase "the highest God" and the "Eumeneian Formula" [here in a modified form; see Appendix 1] were used by Jews.

5.1.3 These two inscriptions refer to Zechariah 5:1–5, a passage which describes the prophet's sixth vision about continuing lawlessness in the land.[208] In the LXX it reads:

> And I turned and I raised my eyes and saw and behold a flying sickle [δρέπανον πετόμενον]. And he spoke to me, "What do you see?" And I said, "I see a flying sickle, twenty cubits in length and ten cubits in width." And he said to me, "This is the curse which is going out over the face of all the earth, for every thief will be punished with death on this side and every false swearer will be punished with death on the other side. And I will bring it about" says the Lord Almighty. "And it will enter into the house of the thief and into the house of the one who swears falsely by my name and it will come down in the middle of his house and it will destroy it and its timbers and its stones."

It has been noticed that our inscription uses this version of the text found in the LXX and not the version found in the MT.[209] We can note the following differences between the Hebrew text and the LXX:

[i] In the MT the prophet sees a huge flying scroll [מְגִלָּה עָפָה], twenty cubits by ten cubits [30' by 15'] upon which the curse is written.[210] The LXX translates this as δρέπανον πετόμενον – a flying sickle.[211] It is most likely that

the LXX translators read מַגָּל – sickle and not מְגִלָּה – scroll.[212] Our inscription uses *δρέπανον*, showing that the LXX, not the MT was in common use in Acmonia.[213]

[ii] In the MT the curse written upon the flying scroll goes forth against those who steal and who swear falsely, to cut them off from the people and to destroy their houses. The agent who implements the curse is not specified. However, in the LXX the curse is not a written curse, but the action of the sickle itself.[214] The agent is clearly specified and the text thus makes the sickle an appropriate and massive instrument of divine wrath, bringing death to the thief and perjurer.[215]

We see therefore, that this passage is appropriate for use in a curse against tomb violators. The actual wording of the inscriptions from Acmonia – involving the sickle of the curse entering the house and leaving no survivors – is in keeping with the curse in the LXX of Zechariah 5:1–5, where death and destruction result from the sickle's action. The curse in the LXX is against the thief or robber and the person who swore falsely or perjured himself, thus not respecting the holiness of an oath. Hence the passage is suitable for use against someone who has violated the sanctity of the grave.[216]

5.1.4 We have seen that an indubitably Jewish inscription contains the phrase *θεός ὕψιστος* [5.1.2], used of God. Whilst this expression is dealt with in Chapter 6, the following inscription containing this phrase has recently been found near Acmonia:

Ἐπίκτητος ἐπύησεν Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ εὐχήν.[217]

Epiktetos fulfilled his vow to the most high God.

This inscription was found in the same village of Yenice as 5.1.2 above. Drew–Bear's comment is cautious:

> It is thus probable that there existed a Jewish community in this portion of the territory of Akmonia and that our Epiktetos had relations with it.[218]

However, it seems most likely that Epiktetos was in fact a Jew. We have seen that there was a large Jewish population in the area and that they actually used the term "Theos Hypsistos" for Yahweh. There is also no indication of pagan provenance in the inscription. We cannot be certain, but this seems the most reasonable explanation.

Another inscription from Acmonia also uses the expression in question. It is given in Chapter 6, 6.1 where I argue that it provides evidence for "God-worshippers".

5.2 Two other inscriptions are shown to be almost certainly Jewish because of their similarity to the "sickle of the curse" inscriptions above.

5.2.1 The following inscription is from Acmonia:

Ἀμμία Γαΐῳ Οὐιβίῳ Κρίσπῳ καὶ Τύχῃ θρέψασι ζῶσι μνήμης χάριν· μετὰ τ[ὸ τοὺς] (δ)ὺο (τ)εθῆναι ὃς ἂν ἀνορύξ(ῃ) σάρον σιδαροῦν τὸν [ο]ἰκῶνα[219] ξάν(αι)το καὶ τῷ συμβουλεύσαν[τι].[220]

Ammia [made this tomb] for Gaios Ouibios Krispos and for Tyche, her adopted parents as a remembrance. After these two have been buried, whoever breaks open [the tomb] may an iron broom mangle his house and [the same] to the one who advised him.

It is likely that the difficult and unusual phrase – *σάρον σιδαροῦν* – an iron broom[221] is a substitute for the sickle of 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 above, especially in view of the fact that both are said to destroy the house of the offender. Perhaps an iron broom was considered a more appropriate weapon of judgement than a huge sickle, and thus the former replaced the latter in this inscription. Thus, although the allusion is less clear than with the "sickle of the curse", it seems probable that this curse formula was inspired by Zech 5:1–5. We can therefore agree with Kraabel when he calls the present phrase "an imaginative variation of that formula".[222]

5.2.2 An inscription originally published by Weber in 1900[223] and corrected in SEG 6.172, is very similar to 5.2.1. It is from Acmonia and reads:

Φλ. Τευθραντὶς ζῶσα ἑαυτῇ καὶ Ἑρμογένει Ἑρμογένους τῷ ἀνδρι τὸ μνημεῖον κατεσκεύασεν, μετὰ δὲ τὸ τοὺς δύο τεθῆναι εἴ τις ἀνοίσει ἢ ἐπιβουλεύσει, σάρον σιδαροῦν εἰσελθον τὸν οἶκον.[224]

Flavia Teuthrantis herself, whilst alive, and Hermogenes son of Hermogenes [her] husband built the tomb. But after the two have been buried, if anyone opens or causes injury [to the tomb] may the iron broom go into [his] house.

Here the use of *σάρον σιδαροῦν* is again an imaginative variation of Zech 5:1–5. In addition, Kraabel points out the similarity between *εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον* in Zech 5:4 and *εἰσελθον τὸν οἶκον* here. The small changes, involving the deletion of a preposition and a change from future indicative to imperative, with almost equivalent meaning, suggest that the two expressions are related.[225] Thus we see that that the LXX has probably inspired the creation of another Jewish curse formula.

5.3 The following inscription also comes from Acmonia:

ἔτους τλθ΄ Αὐρήλιος Ῥοῦφος Ἑρμῇ ἀδελφῷ καὶ Ῥουφίνῃ ἀνεψιᾷ ταχυμύροις μνήμης χάριν. Αὐρήλιος Ῥοῦφος ἑαυτῷ καὶ γυναικὶ Εὐελπίστῃ καὶ ἀνεψιῷ Παρθενίῳ ἑαυτοῖς ζῶντες κατεσκεύασαν· μετὰ τὸ θεθῆναι αὐτο(ὺ)ς ὃς ἂν ἀνορύξῃ καὶ βαλῖ ἄλλον νεκρὸν ἢ τύνβον πρίατε ἢ γράμμα μιάνι ἐξολέσι ἐκίνου σύνπαν

γένος ἡ Θεοῦ ὀργή· τύνβοις γὰρ δύο τοῦτο τὸ σῆμα ἐπίκιται.[226]
The year of 339 [255–256 CE]. Aurelios Roufos, son of Hermas, brother, and Rufina, cousin who were short–lived, for a remembrance. Aurelios Rufos himself, and [his] wife Euselpiste and cousin Parthenios themselves whilst living built [this]. After we have been buried whoever digs up [this grave] and puts in another corpse or purchases the grave or dishonours this inscription, the anger of God will destroy him utterly with all his offspring; this sign is placed on two graves.

The significant part of the inscription for the determination of its provenance is the curse mentioning the "anger of God". References to judgement in order to deter grave violators are found in Christian and Jewish inscriptions.[227] Related, though distinct is the idea of punishment, or the threat of the anger of God.[228] This is found, for example, in a pagan inscription where a grave violator is threatened with "the great anger of the great Zeus".[229] Likewise in a Christian inscription we read that a grave violator "will have to reckon with the coming anger".[230]

However, those who have studied this inscription from Acmonia recently have agreed that it is Jewish.[231] Although ὀργή is used quite often in the NT with reference to God, it seems to be more prominent in Jewish than in Christian writings.[232] Coming as it does from Acmonia, where we have a series of Jewish inscriptions with no comparative Christian inscriptions from the period,[233] this particular inscription is more likely to be Jewish.

5.4 The following inscription is from Eumeneia:

[ἔρ]ρωσθε. Αὐρ. Γέμελλος Μηνᾶ βουλευτὴς τοῖς γλυκυτάτοις γονεῦσιν Αὐρηλίοις Μηνᾷ β´ τοῦ Φιλίππου βουλευτῇ γεραιῷ καὶ Ἀπφίῳ Ἀρτᾶ, τὰ ἴδια ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων· εἰς ὃ προεκήδευσεν τ[ὸν] ἀδελφὸν Φίλιππον καὶ τὴν πάτραν Κυρίλλαν καὶ τὴν ἐξαδέλφην [μ]ου Παῦλαν· κηδευθήσεται δὲ εἰς αὐτὸ ἥ τε σύντροφος αὐτοῦ Φιλήτη, καὶ εἴ τινι ἑτέρῳ ςῶν συνχωρήσει· ὃς δ'ἂν ἐπιχειρήσει ἕτερον ἐπεισενενκεῖν, λήψεται παρὰ τοῦ ἀθανάτου θεοῦ μάστειγα αἰώνιον.[234]

Be in good health. Aurelios Gemellos, son of Menas, Councillor, for [his] sweetest parents Aurelios Menas Councillor, Geraios, son of Menas, grandson of Philip, and Apphion, daughter of Artas, at his own expense, his own property, in which he previously buried his brother Philip, and his father's sister Kyrilla and his cousin Paula; And there shall be buried in it his foster sister Philete, and any other to whom he shall give permission during his lifetime; but whoever shall attempt to introduce another, he will receive from Immortal God an eternal scourge.

This inscription is to be dated in the third century CE.[235] We will argue in Appendix 1 that the expression ἀθανάτου θεοῦ does not help us in determining the provenance of this inscription. It could be used by either Jews or Christians. Thus we must consider the unique phrase "an eternal scourge".

Scourging is a well attested form of punishment in Judaism.[236] μάστιξ is used for the punishment or cruelty inflicted upon people within the nation of Israel by others.[237] Some passages in the LXX show that God was thought to use the μάστιξ against his people. Thus Job 21:9 writes of the μάστιξ ... παρὰ κυρίου and in Ps 88:33 we read:

ἐπισκέψομαι ἐν ῥάβδῳ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν μάστιξιν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

"I will visit their transgressions with a rod and their sins with scourges."[238]

The verb μαστιγόω is used for punishment following the breaking of the Torah.[239] Matt 10:17, 23:34 imply that the scourge was administered in the synagogue.[240] Apollinarius of Hierapolis, in a tractate against Montanism preserved by Eusebius writes that Orthodox Christians but not Montanists were scourged in the synagogues of the Jews in the late second century CE in Phrygia.[241] Most of Mishnah Tractate Makkoth is dedicated to a discussion of matters concerning scourging, which seems to shows the continuing importance of this form of punishment in Rabbinic circles.[242]

Thus we can say that the scourge was seen as an instrument of God's punishment. It seems most likely that the practice of flogging in the synagogue was a development from this, viz that the synagogue community was carrying out God's punishment. To talk of an eternal whip or scourge is thus an "eschatological transposition" of a reality of the synagogue life,[243] and thus to envisage God carrying out one of his means of punishment upon sinners.[244] In this inscription the punishment for grave violation is for God to use his instrument of retribution – the scourge – forever. This is clearly related to what we know of Jewish practice. On the other hand in Christian writings flogging or scourging appears rarely and then is generally an action of persecutors. Only in Heb 12:6 are we told that μαστιγόω has a place in the Christian community – the Lord chastises everyone he accepts as a son.[245] It seems unlikely therefore, that Christians would write of an "eternal scourge", although we must remember that the LXX was available to Christians as well as to Jews.[246] Thus in view of the frequency with which scourging is mentioned in Jewish as compared with Christian sources, ent that Gemellos was a Jew familiar with the Jewish practice of scourging.

Another factor to bear in mind here is that Gemellos was a city councillor and his father Aurelios Menas was also a city councillor in addition to being a

member of the Gerousia, perhaps at the end of the second century.[247] At this early date Jews are more likely to be in these positions than are Christians since the Jewish community had long been in existence and we also know of other Jews who held such positions in nearby Acmonia and Sardis.[248]

Robert describes this as a luxurious and beautiful monument.[249] In a way which is similar to the two influential Jewish city leaders of Acmonia studied above, Gemellos was a member of an affluent family, which belonged to the higher classes of society. We can also recall here how similar this inscription is to those which mentioned "the sickle of the curse" and the "iron broom" dealt with earlier, which suggests that they are all Jewish.[250] Thus Gemellos is most likely to have been a Jew rather than a Christian. The case is not indisputable but it is clearly the most likely possibility.[251]

6. The Eumeneia Formula.

6.1 The following inscription is from Acmonia:

(A) [Αὐρ. Ἀ]ριστέας [Ἀπολ]λωνίου ἠγόρασεν ἀργὸν τόπον παρὰ Μάρκου Μαθοῦ πη(χέων) ι΄ ἐπὶ ι΄. ἔτει·

Below this was added at a later time in smaller letters:

κατεσκεύασαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ Καλλίστρα[τ]ος μητρὶ καὶ πατρὶ μ. χ.

(B) ὑποσχόμενος τῇ γειτοσύνῃ τῶν πρ[ωτ]οπυλειτῶν ἅρμ[ε]να δικέ[λ]λα[τα] δύο κ[ατ]ὰ μη[να?] καὶ ἀ[γωγὸ]ν ὀρυ[κ]τόν, ἔδωκεν ἐφ' ᾧ κατὰ ἔτος ῥ[ο]δίσωσιν τὴν σύμβ[ι]όν μου Αὐρηλίαν.

(C) [ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐθέλωσιν] ῥοδίσαι κατὰ ἔτος [ἔσ]ται αὐτοῖς πρὸ[ς τὴ]ν δικαιοσύ[νην] τοῦ θεοῦ.[252]

[A] Aurelius Aristeas, son of Apollonius bought fallow land from Marcus Math [i]os, ten cubits wide and ten cubits long.

Below this: His children, Alexander and Callistratos built [this tomb] for their mother and father in remembrance.

[B] promising [it] to the Neighbourhood of the First Gate, and giving [as] implements, two two-pronged forks and a shovel and a digging spade, on the condition that each year they deck with roses [the tomb of] my wife Aurelia.

[C] And if they do not deck [it] with roses each year they will have to reckon with the justice of God.

Ramsay discovered this inscription near Acmonia in 1883, published it fully in 1889, and later wrote in greater detail about it in 1897.[253] He thought that it was a Christian inscription, but only because of its use of a variant of the Eumeneian Formula [ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, on which see Appendix 1] which he had argued in 1883 to be a sure indicator of Christian rather than

pagan provenance.[254] Although the date is partly obliterated, enough remained for Ramsay to set the inscription within the limits of 215–295 CE.[255]

Robert was the first to propose that this inscription was in fact Jewish.[256] We can be confident about this for the following reasons:

6.1.1 We have noted the large Jewish population in the area. This chapter has shown that we have a series of Jewish inscriptions from Acmonia itself, many of which use the LXX. On the other hand we do not have a series of third century CE Christian inscriptions from Acmonia similar to those found at Eumeneia and to a lesser extent, at Apamea.[257] Hence the local context makes it much more likely that our inscription will be Jewish rather than Christian. Clearly to assign it to the Christian community requires some indisputable proof and as Robert notes, and as we will show, "nothing attests a Christian instead of a Jewish character".[258]

6.1.2 The name Μαθοῦ in the inscription as published by Ramsay in 1897 is difficult to accept here because it does not fit into the syllabic pattern of the inscription.[259] The name spans two lines, Μαθ on the first and οῦ on the second. There was ample room on the stone in its original shape [before being chipped] for an iota at the end of the first line and in fact Ramsay had initially given the name as Μαθ[ε?]οῦ.[260] Robert thus suggested that the name was originally Μαθίου, which fits the syllabic pattern. This name has not been listed as an indigenous name in Asia Minor.[261] However, it is a Semitic name and has been found in Jewish inscriptions.[262] It thus seems probable that Mathios was a Jew. In our inscription he sold land to Aurelius Aristeas. It is possible that Aristeas, who wrote the inscription was a Christian and bought the land from a Jew, but it is far more likely in the context of this city, that the two were co–religionists.[263] Thus we have here two Jews, one of whom has a Jewish name.

6.1.3 Is the expression τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ as used in this inscription more likely to be used by a Jew or by a Christian? It is clear that a strong continuity of usage exists between the LXX and the NT with regard to this phrase, with it often meaning the saving activity of God.[264] This is because in both cases the meaning of δικαιοσύνη is very much controlled by the OT usage of the ϱτς word group.[265] However, this continuity of usage is not relevant here because the phrase as used in our inscription does not mean God's saving activity but God's justice.[266] This is clearly seen when we recall that the context here is the threat of God's punishment upon the grave violator, and that the equivalent of this expression in other Acmonian inscriptions is the threat, for example, of having a flying sickle attack one's house.[267] Thus in this inscription God is called upon to uphold "justice" and hence the main strand of meaning of

the phrase in both the LXX and the NT does not lie behind our inscription.[268] Hence our task is to consider whether the meaning of the phrase as "the justice of God" is more prominent in the LXX or the NT. In limiting our investigation in this way we are avoiding the semantic error that Barr has called "illegitimate totality transfer".[269]

In the NT δικαιοσύνη used of God with the meaning of justice is found only in Acts 17:31, which speaks of God's activity as Judge.[270] On the other hand, the word when applied to God, with the meaning of justice, is much more prominent in the LXX. For example, in Ps 49:6 :

καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κριτής ἐστιν.[271]

On some occasions God's δικαιοσύνη clearly involves not only justice but harsh judgement and punishment. Thus in the context of judgement we read in Isa 5:19:

> And the Lord of Hosts will be exalted in judgement and the Holy God will be glorified in δικαιοσύνη.[272]

The important strand of δικαιοσύνη being associated with judgement continues and even intensifies in the Intertestamental literature. Thus in 1 Enoch 14:1 we read:

βίβλος λόγων δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἔλεγξεως ἐγρηγορων τῶν ἀπό τοῦ αἰῶνος.[273]

This is the book of the words of δικαιοσύνης and the chastisement of the eternal Watchers ...

Thus Ziesler states that twelve out of 28 references to God's δικαιοσυνη in this literature have to do with God's activity of judging and law-giving.[274] He concludes:

> There is a distinct tendency for God's righteousness to be legal[275] and for man's to be non-legal. As a complement to this, the 'gracious, saving' category as applied to God, has fallen away.[276]

Thus although the word is used more often in the sense of God's activity in saving his covenant people, in a significant number of cases δικαιοσύνη is used of God with the meaning of "justice".[277] As we have seen, the Septuagintal and Intertestamental usage of δικαιοσύνη with regard to God and meaning justice, does not continue in any significant way in the NT. It is precisely this meaning of the phrase that is to be found in our inscription, strongly indicating that its inspiration comes from Jewish and not Christian sources. We have seen that a number of other inscriptions from the Jewish community of Acmonia quote from or allude to the LXX. This inscription almost certainly belongs in that series.[278]

6.1.4 Having ascertained with a high degree of certainty that this inscription

is Jewish, we are able to learn a considerable amount about the community. [i] The "Neighbourhood of the First Gate"[279] who are here charged with performing the Rosalia and are invested with the ownership of land and implements with which to cultivate it, are most likely a legally constituted burial society or association. Ramsay wrote that:

> According to ancient law, any body of persons might be recognised by the law as having legal standing and rights, if it was organised for some purpose which the law permitted.[280]

Such legal recognition was granted to burial societies. They were community associations which sought to care for the memory of their members after death.[281] Ramsay concluded that the people who lived near the "First Gate" of the city had formed a society

> to which bequests could be left by a legal document, and which therefore must have been legally recognised. ... A bequest to an illegal society would be illegal.[282]

Thus the care and maintenance of the tomb and the ownership of land is committed by this inscription to the charge of the legally constituted society. When it is remembered that a society in this period was united by the worship of a god,[283] it seems indisputable that the "Neighbourhood of the First Gate" was in fact a Jewish burial society, permitted and officially recognised by law. Whilst some societies might have been united merely on account of geography, the common bond here is also that of being Jews.[284]

That there was a legally constituted Jewish burial society in Acmonia, an unusual fact, shows again the accepted and recognised position of the Jewish community in the city.[285] The Jewish community was prepared to use legal methods to enhance and further their standing in the city through the formation of a burial society. They were able to "use the system" successfully to further one of their priorities – ensuring that their members were adequately buried. But they did so as *Jews* – and thus established a Jewish burial society.

[ii] In this inscription the burial society is charged with the responsibility of decking Aurelia's tomb with Roses each year.[286] This is a well known ceremony of Roman origin, particularly common in Northern Italy and usually called the "Rosalia" in Latin.[287] The ceremony was of essentially the same form and character in different parts of the Greek speaking world. The observance of the Rosalia is evidence, not for the dispersion of Italians in, for example, Asia Minor,[288] but for the adoption of this Roman practice by the inhabitants of the area.[289] Hence it gives an indication of the romanisation of the Greek Orient.[290]

There were two distinct forms of the Rosalia; festivals, whose only aim was to welcome the return of spring and summer by banqueting and joyous

celebration;[291] and the Rosalia connected with the dead. Our inscription clearly refers to the second form,[292] which was celebrated at the grave in spring each year, at a date fixed in the bequest or by the family.[293] This Rosalia consisted of decorating the tomb with roses, participating in a solemn banquet and perhaps offering a burnt sacrifice.[294] The gathering was an expression of devotion and a renewal of the memory of the deceased.[295] Hoey describes these Rosalias as:

> joyful reunions with the dead at which their shadowy lives were cheered by the gifts of roses, [and which] had as their aim commemoration at least as much as propitiation.[296]

The festival of the rosalia was generally associated with workers' or tradesmens' collegia.[297] Indeed the collegia were often burial societies.[298] In order to pay for the festival the deceased often left the collegia a bequest[299] or a plot of land or a vineyard,[300] the revenues from which provided the necessary funds.[301] Thus Aurelius Aristeas followed the standard practice in leaving land to the Jewish burial society in order that it might conduct a Rosalia each year.

It seems that in our period the Rosalia was religiously indifferent.[302] In Thrace where the festival was originally linked to the Dionys os cult it survived the decline of the cult, because as Nilsson argued, it was a general celebration which had lost any distinctively religious character.[303] Robert notes that there was nothing in the ceremony that would have offended an "orthodox Jew".[304] The tomb of Aurelius' wife would not have received a sacrifice which seems to have been an optional part of the festival which was clearly specified when it was to be a part of the Rosalia.[305] The ceremony seems therefore to have been one of remembrance of the deceased.

We have another inscription from Acmonia, written in 85 CE, which speaks of a Rosalia.[306] Here the archons of the city and the secretary of the council were charged with providing twelve denarii worth of roses for the tomb of Praxias. Financial provision for this was made in the form of a bequest. A grave banquet was to take place, along with a distribution of money to town members and six freedmen or their descendants.[307] The inscription went on to speak of the maintenance of the tomb, and then called upon Theos Sebastos, "god of the fathers", Zeus Stodmenos, Asklepios the Saviour and Artemis of Ephesus to be overseers, witnesses and guards to ensure that the wishes of the deceased were fulfilled.[308]

Thus we see that the Rosalia was known in the city and it seems likely that the Jewish community had been influenced by their neighbours in their adoption of this festival. They followed local custom in memorializing their dead.[309] Just as the archons and the secretary of the council were made responsible for the

Rosalia in this inscription, so in our Jewish inscription the Jewish association fulfilled the same function. Rather than calling on a number of gods to ensure that the Rosalia was carried out, as Praxias did, the Jewish group invoked "the justice of God". The practice of invoking divine assistance was familiar; the Jewish group invoked their Jewish God, in fact not him personally, but his justice. Thus not only did the Jewish group adopt a practice which was familiar in the city, but they also adopted the same method of ensuring that the Rosalia was fulfilled, although they made the invocation acceptable to their Jewish faith.

[iii] It is interesting to note that the Jewish community as a whole was not mentioned in the inscription; rather a single group of Jews was given the responsibilty of the Rosalia. It seems likely that the association called "The Neighbourhood of the First Gate" was a group within the Jewish community who lived in a certain part of the city, in contrast to Jews who lived elsewhere.[310] We thus gain some idea of the internal organisation of the community and of its size. A parallel here is the Φυλῆς Λεοντίων – the "tribe of Leontii" at Sardis. Robert has argued that this is a tribe within the Jewish community.[311] The Neighbourhood of the First Gate is a similar sort of organisation.

[iv] The threat that "he will have to reckon with the righteousness of God" is the only sanction against a failure on the part of the Jewish association to perform the Rosalia. Robert comments that "it is necessary to believe that it [the threat] had some power".[312] This allows us some insight into the faith of the community for clearly they respected God's justice.

7. Other Inscriptions.

7.1 One of the inscriptions from Acmonia is unfortunately mutilated. We can read the following:

Ὑπὲρ εὐχῆ[ς] πάσῃ τῇ πατρίδι.[313]

For a vow for the whole πατρίδι.

Underneath the text there is a menorah which indicates that this is a Jewish inscription. It seems probable that the stone was part of some sort of object that was donated to the πατρίς by a Jew, or Jews, in fulfillment of the vow. This raises the question of the meaning of πατρίς. There are three possibilities.

[a] The πατρίς could be the Jewish people of Palestine. Although this inscription has not been dated, it is probably after 135 CE and thus it is unlikely [though not impossible] that the Jews of Palestine could be called a "fatherland", which is the meaning the word would have to bear.

[b] The πατρίς could be the Jewish community of Acmonia, and the vow would thus be made with this community as the beneficiaries. πατρίς means a father-

land, country, or simply native town or village.[314] However, other terms are far more appropriate to refer to a community within a city. For instance, πάτρα, which means a body of persons claiming descent from a common ancestor, can be used for a community within a city.[315] Furthermore, if an unambiguous reference to the Jewish community was wanted, it would be better to use συναγωγή or λαός, both of which are used to refer to the Jewish community in Jewish inscriptions.[316]

[c] The πατρίς could be the city of Acmonia as a whole. Josephus consistently uses the term to mean place of residence, or country.[317] Also of interest here is the following passage from Philo:

> [Jews] settle in very many of the most populous countries in Europe and Asia ... and while they hold the Holy City with the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their mother city [μητρόπολιν], yet those which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers and ancestors even further back, are in each case accounted by them to be their fatherland [πατρίδας] in which they were born and reared. ...[318]

There are also a number of inscriptions from the area of Acmonia in which πατρίς clearly refers to the whole city. For example, in Apamea a person was a high priest of Asia and on the council of Asia in Miletus, offices undertaken, we are told, "on behalf of the πατρίς".[319] Likewise in two inscriptions from Acmonia itself people are described as fulfilling offices of the city which was their πατρίς.[320]

Thus in these local inscriptions πατρίς always means "home city" or "native town". It never means one segment of that city; a different word would be used if this was intended. πατρίς is a geographical and not a sociological term. Thus we can be confident that the correct translation of the inscription is:
"For a vow for the whole home city."[321]
Indeed πάση here seems to emphase that it is the whole city that benefits from this vow and not just the Jewish community.[322]

We thus see that at least one Jew of Acmonia, and perhaps a group of Jews, made a gift to the city, probably of some object or some money for construction.[323] Again we see the involvement of Jews in the life of this city, as we did when we investigated those who held public office in Acmonia. Not only this, but the writer of the inscription was prepared to record on a public monument that the city was his or her fatherland or native town. Both these factors show a strong degree of "at homeness".

7.2 The following inscription is unfortunately very fragmentary. Sukenik's suggested reading is:
In Greek: [−−προσευ]χὰς προ[σδέχου] – "Undertake prayers".

In Hebrew: [יה שלום עכ] ישראל ועל ירושלם ועל המקום הזה עד עת [קץ]
"[May there be peace upon] Israel and upon Jerusalem and [upon this place to the time of] the end."[324]

The use of Hebrew in itself is quite striking, particularly since 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 above conclusively shows that the community generally used the LXX.[325] This suggests that the inscription records some sort of formula, perhaps a brief part of the liturgy.[326] The stone appears to have been a building fragment, suggesting that it was part of the *οἰκός* of Julia Severa, or of a later synagogue.[327] A formula or quotation from the liturgy seems quite in place as part of the synagogue structure itself. The suggested reconstruction of the Greek phrase as "Undertake prayers" would fit in well with the stone being part of the door frame of the synagogue.

The retention of Hebrew, even if only in a very small way is significant and perhaps expresses a desire to preserve the traditions of the community. Lifshitz wrote of the limited use of Hebrew at Beth–Shearim:

> The use of Hebrew in the epitaphs is due to the wish to safeguard the tradition, Hebrew being without any doubt considered as the sacred language.[328]

Sukenik's suggested reading for the inscription is also very interesting. It seemsto show that the well-being of Israel and Jerusalem was a priority for the community, particularly if this was an inscription from the synagogue. We can also note that [if the suggested reading is correct] the concern for Jerusalem as the centre of the cult, shown by the persistence in paying the Temple Tax [as revealed in the Flaccus incident], was a continuing facet of the community's faith even after the Temple's destruction.[329]

8. Conclusions.

8.1 It is probable that some of the Jews relocated in Phrygia by Zeuxis around 205 BCE settled in Acmonia and Eumeneia. Some of the Temple Tax collected by Flaccus' officials in 62 BCE from the Apamean conventus almost certainly came from these two cities.

By around 60 CE the Jewish community had its own synagogue thanks to the generosity of their powerful patronness Julia Severa, and by the end of the first century we know of some synagogue leaders who were zealous for the community and its building. We do not have much evidence for the second century[330] but the large number of inscriptions from the third century, along with their nature, suggests that the Jewish community was a significant group in Acmonia throughout the first three centuries of this era.

8.2 Some Jews were clearly wealthy. The two Jewish civic leaders of Acmonia

belonged to the wealthy ruling class of the city. The three synagogue leaders of the first century were well off. However, some of the inscriptions are of a poorer quality, suggesting that there was a broad socio–economic spread within the Jewish community.

8.3 Julia Severa shows that the community in Acmonia was able to gain an important patron~ess in the first century CE. We have a number of indicators which suggest that the Jewish community was accepted in the city and involved in its life to quite some extent. We see that:
[i] Two Jews held a number of significant civic offices and were clearly successful in society and involved in the life of the city.
[ii] Part of the Jewish community established a legally constituted burial society.
[iii] A formulaic reference to the curses written in Deuteronomy was a sufficient deterent to ward off grave violators. Thus, the Jewish tradition seems to have commanded some respect and was acknowledged to be a source of authoritative, powerful curses.
[iv] Julia Severa was a "Gentile sympathizer".[331]

8.4 The Jewish community responded to this acceptance in two main ways:
[i] They worked for the betterment of their city. Members of the Jewish community accepted important positions in the city. That some Jews called Acmonia their "home city" shows that, not only were the Jews accepted, but they also felt very much "at home". The donation of some sort for the "home city" also reveals that Jews made contributions to the city,
[ii] They adopted many local practices and customs. Thus, they decorated their tombs in the local manner, they honoured their own benefactors in the traditional way for the city, they used grave curses to deter violators [which was done by Jews in only a limited number of other places] and they became romanised to some extent.

Thus the Jewish community became acculturated, and seems to have been accepted and "at home", as shown by the attitude of the city to the Jews, and the attitude of the Jews to the city. To a large extent they had identified their interests with those of the city to which they belonged.[332]

8.5 However, we find a number of unambiguous displays of Jewish religious conviction and of Jewish identity. We see this in the following ways:
[i] There was a continuing concern for Jerusalem, as shown by the defiance of the ban on the Temple Tax in 62 BCE, and perhaps also [if Sukenik's reconstruction of 7.2 is correct] the wish that "peace be on Jerusalem" expressed in an inscription. Jerusalem was still the geographical centre of the community's faith.

[ii] Deut 30:1–10 seems to some extent to have shaped the theological and socio-economic understanding of [at least some of] the community. They interpreted their current life in the light of this passage.
[iii] The community may have used Ex 34:6–7, a fundamental tradition in the OT, in their liturgy. This "credo" seems to have remained a primary element in the faith of the community. They also followed the precedent of Scripture in applying this credo afresh in a new context.
[iv] The LXX, whose language and content was well known, was the source for many of the grave inscriptions. These inscriptions invoked God, whose power was relied on to punish violators.
[v] Thus members of the community turned to Scripture as a revered tradition, a source of authority and inspiration, as a reliable guide to the nature of their God and their faith, as a rule for life and as a source book for their liturgical life.[333] It is also noteworthy that the two men who held a number of civic offices referred to Deuteronomy in their grave curses. Thus, although they were involved in the life of the city, Scripture remained an authority for them. We can suggest therefore that Scripture was an important element in reinforcing the religio-ethnic identity of the Jewish community in Acmonia.
[vi] In all of this, Scripture was interpreted by the community to apply to their new situation. Thus the community seems to have understood itself to be living in the time spoken of by Deut 30:1–10, and interpreted their life in the light of that passage. Likewise the children's children curse and the curse of the flying sickle were understood to be present realities, which related to the continuing need of the community. This witnesses to an ongoing tradition of the interpretation of Scripture, which was sensitive to its meaning, yet which "reactualized" Scripture,[334] so that it was relevant in the present context.[335]

Chapter 4.

The Jewish Community At Apamea.

1. Introduction.

The city of Apamea in Phrygia was founded by Antiochus I Soter [280–261] as a part of a scheme to strengthen the Seleucid hold on Asia Minor, to facilitate trade and to protect the highways.[1] It was one of a series of garrison–cities and was built at a point of strategic importance on the Great Southern Highway.[2] Antiochus I Soter founded the city on a plateau on either side of the Marysas River by moving the inhabitants of nearby Celaenai into his newly created city.[3] Celaenai itself was a large and prosperous city with a long history. It had two parts; a trading centre on the plain and a defensive and religious centre on the acropolis above.[4] Under Persian rule, Celaenai became the principal royal seat in Phrygia and a residence of the satraps. After Alexander conquered the city, it was designated as the Greek Capital of Inner Anatolia and Antigonus used it as his chief residence. It was also a Macedonian military centre.[5]

At the beginning of our era Apamea was the second most important market and distribution centre in Asia Minor, with this importance being derived from its geographical location.[6] It was built on the foothills above a rich fertile plain in which five rivers met.[7] It also commanded the cut in the mountain range through which the Southern Highway climbed to the plateau of Central Anatolia, thus making the city the commercial junction through which wealth–laden traffic passed to the East.[8] In addition roads of commercial importance also led to Western Phrygia and into Pisidia.[9] Its position also meant it was a strategic city with regard to defence.[10] Antiochus III used it as a defensive refuge after the battle of Magnesia in 190 BCE and it was here that he signed the treaty in 188 BCE giving up much of Asia Minor to the Romans who entrusted the territory to the kings of Pergamum.[11] They allowed the city to develop as a Greek polis with both a city–council and a gymnasium.[12] In 133 the city passed to Rome, who granted it in 129 to Mithridates V along with the rest of the province of Phrygia. At his death Rome declared it free, but this freedom was probably only nominal. In 88 the city surrendered to Mithridates VI in return for aid to rebuild the city after a recent earthquake.[13] After the defeat of Mithridates in 85, Sulla incorporated Apamea into the Roman province of Asia in 84. Although it twice became part of Cilicia, it became permanently part of Asia in 51 BCE.

Apamea was also a regional centre having under its authority many towns and villages and was the seat of the conventus[14] probably from 133.[15] Dio

Chrysostom's speech at Apamea shows how much the conventus both reflected and increased the importance and prosperity of the city.[16] In the second century CE the name Celaenai reappears on coins during a time of reinvigorated national sentiment encouraged by the Romans. This was also a period of prosperity, which lasted until the mid–third century.[17] Apamea declined to a third rate city in the Byzantine Period.[18]

2. The First Jewish Settlers in Apamea.

It is possible that Antiochus I included Jews among the original settlers of Apamea when he founded the city, since Seleucid kings seem on occasions to have used Jews as an element in the cities they founded.[19] It is almost certain, however, that Apamea was one of the cities in which Zeuxis settled Jews in around 205 BCE, at the instruction of Antiochus III, since Apamea was the most prominent city in Phrygia and the transportation involved sending Jews to Phrygia and Lydia alone.[20] The Jews were settled by Antiochus III on very favourable terms as we noted in Chapter 1. Thus, it is likely that the Jewish community became established quickly in Apamea.

3. Cicero and the Jews of Apamea.

In Chapter 1, section 5.2.2 we discussed the passage from Cicero relating to the Jewish Temple tax seized by Flaccus from Apamea and other centres in 62 BCE. We concluded there that the Jewish population in the city of Apamea must have been large and that Flaccus acted out of economic necessity and not anti–Jewish sentiments. Furthermore, the incident shows that the Jews of Apamea [and elsewhere] were prepared to defy a Roman edict in order to pay their Temple tax to Jerusalem. The tax, a significant feature of Jewish identity, was clearly highly important to the Jewish community in Apamea.

4. The Noah Coins of Apamea.

We have five coins minted in Apamea which bear the scene of Noah and the ark, the earliest of which is to be dated at the end of the second century CE.[21] That it is the Biblical scene of Noah and his wife and not, for instance, Deucalion and Pyrrha is clearly shown by the inscription ΝΩΕ on the side of the ark. These coins are unique in that they are the only coin type known to bear a Biblical scene.[22]

These coins have often been briefly explained as the result of "Jewish influence" in the city.[23] However, this is a very imprecise and vague analysis of the situation which led up to these coins being minted. We will here seek to elucidate more precisely the involvement of the Jewish community in the minting of these coins.[24]

4.1 The coins depict Noah and his wife inside the ark, itself portrayed as a

box with a lid, riding on the waves. Above the ark to the right is a raven and to the left a dove holding an olive branch in its claws. To the left of the ark Noah and his wife are seen, with the latter leading, both standing on dry land with their right arms raised. We can make the following comments about the portrayal of the scene.

4.1.1 The coins juxtapose two successive episodes – the ending of the flood and standing on dry land afterwards.[25] This style of representing a narrative by portraying the principal actors in successive scenes is frequent in antiquity, especially in sarcophagus art.[26] It is, however, unusual on a coin.[27]

4.1.2 The ark is portrayed, not as a boat but as a rectangular box. It is most likely that the engravers followed the model of Greek artists who had already used box–forms to represent boats. Thus in depictions of Danae and Perseus, and of Auge and Telephus, Danae and Auge both floated across the sea in a box.[28]

4.1.3 The two birds symbolize the subsidence of the waters and the end of the flood. They are probably directly inspired by the Biblical account.[29]

4.1.4 Noah and his wife are shown standing outside the ark with one arm upraised. This is the "orans" gesture and symbolizes an attitude of grateful prayer for their salvation.[30] Prayer is repeatedly portrayed in this fashion in Classical and Hellenistic Art.[31] The Jewish community has followed this precedent, as did Christian Art at a later stage.[32]

4.1.5 Our coins bear the profile and inscriptions of five Emperors on the reverse side: Septimius Severus [193–211], Macrin [217–8], Severus Alexander [222–235], Philip [244–9] and [on a recently discovered coin] Trebonianus Gallus [251–3].[33] It seems likely that the coins formed a continuous series, with these five being the representative specimens which have been found to date.[34] The inscriptions on the other side of the coins include the following:

[i] ΕΠΙ ΑΓΩΝΟΘΕΤΟΥ ΑΡΤΕΜΑ. Γ. ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ.[35]

[ii] ΕΠΙ ΠΟ. ΑΙΛ ΤΡΨΦΩΝΟΣ ΙΠΠΙΑΧΙΑΡ. ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ.[36]

[iii] ΕΠ. Μ. ΑΥΡ. ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ. Β. ΑΡΧΙ. ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ.[37]

[iv] ΠΑΡ. ΚΛ. ΑΠΟΛΙΝΑΡΙΟΥ[38]

On the other side of the coins, the inscription "ΝΩΕ" is found; it identifies the scene.[39] However, it s presence probably means that there could have been some ambiguity in the minds of the people of the city as to whom the coin depicted. This possibility is reinforced when we consider that many of the coins of the city portraying for instance, Pan, Hermes, Artemis Ephesia do not name the figure.[40] We will be able to suggest the significance of this later.

4.1.6 The city of Apamea seems to have had an unusual preference for pic-

turesque coins.[41] Thus a coin of Severus portrays the local legend of Athena, Marsyas and the flute which led to a curse falling on Marsyas.[42] Other coins portray the legend of Zeus' birth and a symbolic representation of the four rivers of Apamea.[43] It is also significant that our five Noah coins span a number of years, without significant change.[44] Ramsay thought this implied that "a permanent model existed for engravers to copy".[45] This situation, together with the city's preference for picturesque coins led him to suggest that all were taken from models, probably a painted Stoa or a set of pictures devoted to Apamean legends on some public building in the city. Since the earliest of these picturesque coins is from the reign of Commodus [180–192], he thought the building was erected before his reign.[46]

Confirmatory evidence is provided by the following observations:
[i] Coins are known which appear to portray scenes in a coherent story.[47]
[ii] Such painted Stoaswere common in the Roman period.[48]
[iii] Statues often influenced coin types in Phrygian cities. It seems probable that paintings could have likewise influenced coinage.[49]

If this is correct, then Apamea not only had a Jewish scene on its coins, but also had a Jewish scene as part of its mural of local legends painted on a Stoa or public building. As we have no direct evidence, this must however, remain as only a plausible suggestion.

4.2 The Local Flood Legends.

It is well known that there were a number of flood legends in the ancient world. For example, the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha, the two survivors of a flood caused by Jupiter, often figure in Classical literature.[50] The question thus arises as to whether there were any local Phrygian flood legends which were antecedent to or independent of the Jewish community in Apamea. If so this would have a bearing on our interpretation of the coins.

4.2.1 Iconium in Lycaonia seems to have been the centre of the Nannakos flood tradition. According to Suidas[51] and Zenobius[52] [who wrote at the time of Hadrian], Nannakos the ancient King of Phrygia foresaw the flood which is identified in these sources with Deucalion's flood. He gathered together all his people into the temple and "made supplication with tears". According to Stephanus of Byzantium Nannakos received an oracle that all people would perish when he died. After the resulting flood, the earth was repeopled when Prometheus and Athena fashioned images [εἰκόνες] of mud at Zeus' command. From these images Iconium got its name.[53] In this story Phrygian characters from an original version are probably identified with the Greek heroes, and the framework is provided by the connection with Deucalion's flood.[54] The antiquity

of [at least part of] the legend about Nannakos is shown by the fact that the *Mimes* of Herondas of the third century BCE, include the proverb "Though I weep like Nannakos".[55] Thus we have a number of different versions of an ancient legend about Nannakos, King of Phrygia, who was connected with a flood, which is identified in our sources as Deucalion's flood.[56]

Some have thought that Nannakos, or Annakos as the name is given by Stephanus of Byzantium, was the Biblical Enoch, and thus that this was not a Phrygian but a Jewish flood story.[57] Apart from the similarity of name, both lived for a long time directly before the flood,[58] and while Nannakos foretold the flood, Enoch, according to Jewish tradition, was the author of a book of prophecies saved from destruction by Noah.[59]

However, this suggestion is contradicted by the available evidence. Firstly, that a third century BCE source knew the proverb about Nannakos' tears suggests that at least part of the tradition of a deluge predated known Jewish settlement in the area. Secondly, Nannakos is a genuine Greek name and not a Grecizing of the Semitic Enoch. This is shown by the fact that it occurs in a number of inscriptions from the island of Cos.[60] Thirdly, while Nannakos and Annakos both occur in Anatolia,[61] an inscription shows that Nannakos itself is known as the name of a deified hero or a god in Anatolia. The inscription gives the name of a village as Νονοκοκῶμη – "the village of Nonokos";[62] Nonokos for Nannakos is a common Anatolian vocalisation.[63] This shows that Nannakos is an original Anatolian name and is independent of Enoch and thus of the Jewish community. There is certainly no conclusive indication that the Nannakos tradition was connected with any Jewish community in the area. It was thus most likely to have been a reliable Anatolian tradition.[64]

4.2.2 Ovid tells the story of the Phrygian couple Philemon and Baucis from whom Jupiter and Mercury receive hospitality after being turned away by all the inhabitants of the area. The gods flood the area because of its inhospitality, but Philemon and Baucis are saved by climbing a mountain at the instruction of the gods.[65] Ovid's *Metamorphoses* which include this story was probably written about the turn of the era.[66] The conclusion of the story is that Philemon and Baucis become an oak and a linden tree;[67] added value is to be given to the veracity of the myth as a Phrygian tradition by the way the speaker emphasizes that of these trees, as of other details, he is an eye–witness.[68] In addition, many features such as the trees, the subterranean waters that cause the flood and the resulting lake are in keeping with Anatolian geography.[69] The fact that Ovid pays no special attention to the flood also increases the likelihood that his story is reliable.[70] Fontenrose asserts that "Baucis" is probably a native

Phrygian name and "Philemon", whilst meaning "lover" in Greek, probably translates a native name.[71] Thus as Calder has convincingly shown, we can be sure that here Ovid tells us of a Phrygian flood story and not a flood myth that he decided to locate there.[72]

We can also note here, that again this story is clearly distinguished from the Biblical account. Rain plays no part in the flood which is caused solely by subterranean waters,[73] there is no ark, and Philemon and Baucis are saved by walking up a hill at the suggestion of the gods. Thus, this tradition seems to be independant of the Jewish community in the area.

4.2.3 We find a third Phrygian flood tradition in the writings of Nonnos. Although he wrote around 500 CE, he is a rich source of earlier mythology. The hero of the story is Priasos, later described as "the proud son of Phrygia".[74] Zeus causes torrential rain to fall on Phrygia so that everything is flooded including the house of Priasos, who then migrates to "the Aonian land to escape from the fatal showers of rain" where he mourned his lost land.[75] Zeus finally quieted the storm and drove the waters away, laying bare the cliffs. Priasos returned home and joyfully embraced Zeus who had saved him from destruction "for his pious works".[76] This appears to be another tradition about a flood in Phrygia, here involving a hero who escaped because of his piety.[77]

4.2.4 Plutarch quotes a tale about King Midas and his son Anchouros which is set at Celaenai, the city which later became Apamea.[78] A chasm full of water opened in the earth and engulfed many people and their homes. An oracle instructed the King that if he threw his costliest possession into the chasm, it would close up. Finally, after everything else had failed, Anchouros leaped in on horseback and the chasm closed.[79] The myth arises from local circumstances in the area of Apamea where earthquakes had caused new lakes to appear and where an abundance of underground water, which here causes the flood, flowed from the ground.[80] The tradition is clearly located at Apamea, and shows the existence of a flood story in the actual city.

4.2.5 Thus we have four distinct traditions which mention a flood tradition in Phrygia, although only one locates it more precisely at Apamea. One other tradition is localised some distance away at Iconium, although perhaps close enough to be known in Apamea. Indeed the area itself is geographically suitable, with a large number of lakes, hot springs and frequent earthquakes.[81] We have seen no detailed resemblance between these traditions and the Biblical story, implying that the later did not create the former.

We can thus be confident that in Phrygian legend the area claimed to be the home or refuge of a flood hero of some sort.[82] We can also note that:

[i] Dating is difficult. Ovid lived from 43 BCE to 17 or 18 CE so the story of Philemon and Baucis must be dated then or earlier. Herondas in the third century BCE shows that in his time there was a legend of Nannakos which probably involved a Phrygian flood, although certainty is impossible. It is possible that the Jews who arrived in Apamea around 205 BCE already found a flood tradition associated with the area.[83] By the turn of the era we can be more definite about the existence of such a local tradition.

[ii] Often there is a single flood hero [Nannakos, Priasos, Anchouros] although in Ovid's legend a man and his wife feature.

[iii] No ark is ever mentioned in these traditions. Escape is by flight or ascent up a mountain, in marked contrast to the Deucalion tradition. It is possible that this later tradition was known, although our only reason for thinking so is that the Nannakos tradition has been joined with it. But the most likely place for this to have occurred is in our sources rather than in the Phrygian version itself. The fact that the Ark, integral to the Deucalion tradition, is never mentioned in any of our flood traditions seems to indicate that the Phrygian traditions were originally quite independent of the Deucalion story. But in any case, the word used for "Ark" in the Deucalion story is almost always λάρναξ and not κιβωτός.[84] We will refer to this point again.

4.3 Apamea Kibotos.

Apamea had a second name ἡ κιβωτός, which means box, chest, coffer or ark.[85] This name for Apamea is first mentioned by Strabo around 19 CE,[86] and Pliny and Ptolemy also knew it.[87] In addition the word Κιβωτοί is found on a coin issued under Hadrian, which also bears a representation of five rectangular chests. The coin which shows Marsyas [a local river here portrayed as a god] lying in a rocky cave, above which are five chests, has the inscription Ἀπαμέων Μαρσύας Κιβωτοί – "Of the people of Apamea, Marsyas, Kibotoi".[88] A second coin is similar, but only has two chests depicted on it.[89] It is important to note that κιβώτός is the Septuagint's term for the Ark of Noah.[90] Can we explain these facts?

4.3.1 Ramsay suggested that the name Kibotos was a Gre_cising of a Phrygian name, which Reinach suggested was Kibyza.[91] However, this Phrygian name is unattested for the city, and indeed Celaenai seems to have been the indigenous name.

4.3.2 It is possible that the local flood traditions led the city to adopt the name Kibotos, thus claiming to be the landing place of an ark that survived the flood.[92] However, this is most unlikely. As we have seen, there is no ark in these local traditions, with escape being made on foot. Secondly, in the Deucalion

tradition the ark is called λάρναξ and not κιβωτός, as we noted above. Thus the city is very unlikely to have given itself this name as a result of the local flood traditions.

4.3.3 Head wrote that the name Kibotos arose because the city:

> became a commercial junction where goods arriving by the caravan route from the East were packed in chests to be forwarded to the various seaports, Ephesus, Pergamum etc.[93]

As we have seen the earliest evidence for this name comes from Strabo, in the time of Augustus, and thus belongs to the period of the city's considerable prosperity and importance. In addition the plural "kibotoi" on the coin of Hadrian's time can only mean "chests", which strongly points to Head's interpretation. A city like Apamea is likely to gain some "nickname" because there were numerous cities of that name in the ancient world. Thus, it seems probable that the name was attributed to the city in this period because "chests" became a symbol of the city's economic activity and eventually of the city itself.

4.3.4 However, Ramsay followed by Tscherikower[94] rejected this explanation for the name in favour of the theory that some local legend of a deluge led the Jews of Apamea to regard one of the neighbouring mountains as the resting place of the Ark and that their influence caused the surname to be given to the city.[95] Thus Ramsay wrote that:

> the Jewish element was quite strong enough in Apamea to give the city a by–name derived from the Biblical legend as early as the time of Christ.[96]

Whilst this interpretation is attractive, the coin of Hadrian portraying five "Kibotoi" cannot be explained by this theory. If "Apamea Kibotos" was a short hand for "Apamea, the resting place of the Ark", how can we understand the city depicting five "kibotoi" (which in this case would have to mean "arks") on a coin?[97] Clearly the only satisfactory explanation of the term's origin is with regard to the commercial importance of the city.

4.4 A Proposed Hypothesis.

We can now venture to suggest the following hypothesis to explain the Noah–coins of Apamea.

[i] The city gained the nickname "Kibotos" in or before the time of Strabo because of its economic significance. "Kibotos" at this stage only meant "chest", which was its standard meaning in the ancient world. There was no ark in the local flood legends and if one was known it would have been called a λάρναξ, and thus there would be no reason for it to be connected with the city's name. We have no indication at all that "Kibotos" meant anything other than "chest" before the Jewish re–interpretation of the term.

[ii] The coins clearly imply that the Ark's resting place was associated with Apamea. Sibylline Oracles I/II [see section 5] reflects the local Jewish tradition that the site was the hill of Celaenai behind the city, the place where the Marysas River began. But were the Jews the first to identify this hill with the flood? We recall that Philemon and Baucis fled up a hill to escape the flood. Further, a decisive point against the Jews being the first to make this identification of the hill with the flood is the geography of the area, as was shown by Ramsay.[98] The hill of Celaenai, at 3660' is dominated by Mt Ai-Doghmush, which is only six miles away and 5580' high. Two other mountains, in full view from the city are 6619' and 8013' high. Thus if the Jews had, de novo, chosen a landing site for the Ark it would almost certainly have been one of these lofty, more distant mountains.[99] The fact that the hill of Celaenai was chosen on the coins and in Sibylline Oracles I/II suggests that the local legend of the flood was strongly associated with this local hill from the distant past and thus the Jewish community did not wish to change the location. Perhaps this was the hill up which the Apamean equivalents of Philemon and Baucis were reputed to have climbed.

[iii] The Jews connected the city's name of Kibotos with the "kibotos" they read about in their Septuagint as the vessel in which Noah had endured the flood, and thus they interpreted the city's name to mean "Ark".[100] This reasoning fully explains the Jewish community's action. There is no apparent reason why the Jews should have introduced the Biblical flood story into Apamea without any external cause. But with a pre-existent flood tradition in the area, and their own story using the very word which was the "nickname" of the city, their actions are entirely understandable.[101] The Jewish community also followed the strong local flood tradition in localising the landing of the Ark on the local hill.

The city accepted as their own this different version of the flood story, with escape being made not by fleeing up a hill but by survival in an Ark which later came to rest above the city. For the first time the nickname "Kibotos" had the double meaning of chest and Ark in Apamea. The Ark is uniquely a Jewish contribution, as was the connection of chest, ark and flood. This acceptance of the tradition by the city has as a prerequisite that the Jewish community was already a respected element in the city's population.

[iv] This gave the city's nickname a prestige it had lacked. It is probable that, previous to this time, it was somewhat like "slang". It was now given an ancient significance. It not only testified to the city's commercial importance, but also to the fact that they had famous ancestors – Noah and his wife.[102] Cities were enthusiastic for this sort of aetiology of their names that gave them a link

with antiquity. Apamea would have been especially keen for such an ancient link through their nickname because it was a relatively recent foundation. It achieved this notable advance through the Jewish community. The Jews would be seen by all to add to the prestige of the city.

[v] Part of the acceptance of this tradition by the city involved the portrayal of the scene on coins of the city and probably on a Stoa.[103] Thus the existence of the prestigious link with antiquity was advertised for all to see, including local inhabitants, visitors and all who would receive the city's coinage.

[vi] The city also accepted a new name for the flood heroes – Noah and his wife. This explains why the coin has the name of Noah on it; his name has probably suppressed a local name. Without it being given, the scene would be ambiguous.

[vii] It might be thought that the coins are the result of a small number of those who were responsible for minting coins in Apamea expressing their support for the Jewish community by putting one of their "heroes" on a coin of the city.[104] However, the fact that we have a series of coins over more than fifty years strongly suggests that the Noah story was officially accepted by the city as a whole.[105]

[viii] It is important to note that our coins depict two people – Noah and his wife.[106] This important point has generally been overlooked by commentators on the coins. The Biblical story, and references to it in the OT and NT do not concentrate on two people. Mention is made either of Noah alone[107] or of the whole group of people involved.[108] Noah and his wife are never jointly emphasised. In fact, Noah's wife is quite secondary to his three sons.

The emphasis in Jewish literature of the Intertestamental Period and later, is on Noah as the prime actor in the drama of the flood. Noah's wife, when she is mentioned, functions only as an illustration of an attribute of Noah himself. Thus Philo mentions her but only in the context of Noah's abstinence from sexual intercourse during the flood.[109] In Jubilees she is named as Emzara, but in the actual story she is ignored and plays no part.[110]

This emphasis continues in the portrayal of the flood in Christian art. Here we find an exceedingly standardised depiction of Noah, alone in a box–like Ark, with arms upraised and a dove flying towards him.[111] In one scene on a sarcophagus eight people are depicted;[112] in only one other case – a Christian catacomb in Rome – do we see only Noah and his wife.[113] The important point to note is that the Biblical and Jewish literature and Early Christian Art do not explain why our coin has two people in the Ark, and not Noah alone, or a group of eight. Christian Art and an analysis of the treatment of the Flood

story by writers of this period does however suggest that we should look to influences in the local environment for an explanation.[114]

In the light of our analysis of the local flood stories, the conclusion seems clear. The Jewish community found an already existent legend involving *two* people of equivalent importance who escaped the flood, the Apamean equivalent of Philemon and Baucis. They then identified the two with the heroes from their own tradition, Noah and his wife. Noah's wife remained nameless despite ample room on the coin because their was no name for her in the local Jewish tradition.[115] Yet the influence of the antecedent tradition meant that both appeared on the coin. This seems further evidence that the Jewish community did not create the local legend but rather re–interpreted it and that their version was accepted by the city. But in the process the Jewish community allowed their own tradition in which Noah's wife played a very peripheral role to be influenced by the pre–existent tradition.[116]

[ix] It is difficult to date these developments. They certainly occurred before the end of the second century when the coins were first minted. The connection between Apamea, the Ark/Kibotos and Noah are all present in Sibylline Oracles I/II , which was probably written around the turn of the era.[117] The contribution by the Jewish community to the prestige of the city could possibly date from then. Unfortunately, we cannot be more specific.[118]

4.5 That the city accepted the superimposition of the Jewish version of the story on their own suggests that:

[i] The Jewish community was influential and respected before this time, and probably active in public life.

[ii] The Jewish community was integrated and in no sense marginalised in the city's life. But it was also distinctive, their flood hero having a different name.

[iii] The Jewish community was making a real contribution to the life of the city by adding a prestigious local ancestor.

[iv] The identity of a group is connected with the "hero figures" revered by that community. It is thus apparent that the group identity of both the Jewish community and the city were to some extent connected with the same two figures – Noah and his wife.

[v] It is also significant that the Jewish community accepted a modified significance for Noah's wife from the position she had in their tradition, or in any other Jewish literature known to us. We see here some "give and take". The city accepted the ark and Noah as part of the local flood tradition, whilst the Jewish community accepted a female flood hero, who had a significant place in the city's tradition, as part of their own tradition. Thus they re–interpreted

their tradition in the light of the local story, though of course Noah is still called Noah.[119] This could be called "reciprocal penetration" of traditions.

[vi] The style of the portrayal on the coin is also noteworthy. Although the engraving would probably be done by the city authorities, it is probable that the Jewish community had some say. It is clear that the portrayal followed current artistic styles, for instance in the shape of the ark and in the "orans" gesture when other styles might have been more appropriate to the Biblical account.[120] The Jewish community, however, accepted these current styles.

[vii] The above analysis leads us to conclude that speaking of the city as "sympathizers" with the Jewish community, as Baron does, is inadequate.[121] This implies that there was a strong "us–them" situation, with the city being charitable to its Jewish inhabitants. However, mutual recognition and respect is a much more appropriate description.

5. Sibylline Oracles I/II.

5.1 Whilst it is often difficult to ascertain the provenance of the Sibylline Oracles because of their very nature,[122] there is general agreement that the Jewish substratum of Books I/II were written in Phrygia, probably in Apamea.[123] This is indicated by the following facts:

[i] In I,195–8 Phrygia is said to be the first land to emerge after the flood and the "nurse" of a new humanity.

[ii] In I,261–7 we read:

> There is a certain tall lofty mountain on the dark mainland of Phrygia. It is called Ararat. When all were about to be saved on it, thereupon there was a great heartfelt longing. There the springs of the great river Marsyos had sprung up. In this place the Ark remained on lofty summits when the waters had subsided. ...

The spring which formed the Marsyas river was situated just behind Apamea; clearly, "Ararat" is located there in this passage.[124] Thus the case seems strong that part of Sibylline Oracles I/II is from Phrygia, probably Apamea. It is the only document to have survived from Jews in Asia Minor in this period.

5.2 The book as we have it contains both a Jewish substratum and a Christian redaction. There is general agreement that I,1–323 and II,6–33 are part of a Jewish oracle treating world history in ten generations. I,324–400 is a Christian section dealing with the Incarnation and career of Christ. II,34–347, an account of eschatological crises and the last judgement, is more difficult to assign. Collins thinks that the Christian writer modified the eschatological conclusion of the Jewish work by interpolations, although the extent of the redactor's work is difficult to determine.[125] Although the eschatological passages

are probably substantially Jewish [and thus reveal a concern with the judgement of individuals after death], the difficulty of determining the Jewish sections in II,34–347 means that we cannot use this part of the work as evidence for our study.

5.3 Collins has recently discussed the dating of the Jewish substratum. He notes:

[i] The mention of Rome in the tenth generation in II,18 points to a period when Roman power was consolidated in the Near East and thus to a time after 30 BCE.

[ii] The Jewish substratum contains no reference to the destruction of the temple or of Nero's supposed return, a favourite Sibylline theme. The Christian section in I,387–400 which does mention the destruction of the temple, was probably added to bring the Jewish oracle up to date. Thus, the original oracle probably carried its review of history no later than the time of Augustus. A date around the turn of the era is thus most likely with outer limits of 30 BCE and 70 CE.[126]

5.4 The following aspects of the Jewish substratum are noteworthy for our study.

5.4.1 In I,5–64, the author follows closely the account of Creation and the Fall in the Septuagintal translation of Genesis 1–3, although the drama is heightened in keeping with the genre.[127]

5.4.2 A conspicuous feature of book I/II is the extent of the influence of Homer and Hesiod on the author. For example, the schema of the first five generations is inspired by Hesiod's *Works and Days* 109–174,[128] and there are some verbal parallels, which reflect direct use of Hesiod's *Works and Days* and *Theogony* by the Sibyl.[129] However, whilst the Sibyl has used Hesiod's schema and often his wording, the final composition is still very much the work of the Sibyl. Thus, in Hesiod's *Works and Days* the first generation is a golden, blameless race; in the Sibyl's work this generation "sinned, smitten with folly", and thus Adam tasted death. This disturbs Hesiod's general scheme of a progressive decline.

Thus we see how the Sibyl accepts the scheme of world history and the detailed description of one of the Greek epic poets. Clearly these traditions were for him/her a respected guide to world history. However, the Sibyl is also dependent on Jewish traditions and these are seen to predominate, for instance in the description of the sin of the first generation. We see here then a similar sort of process as was evidently at work behind the Noah coins. The use of Hesiod and indeed of the Sibylline form itself emphasised the common ground between Jew and Gentile in the place of composition of the book, which as we

have seen was probably Apamea.

5.4.3 A large part of the Jewish substratum is devoted to the flood story [I,125–282]. Noah is introduced as the single upright and true man of the abominably wicked fifth generation [I,125–126]. This theme of the righteousness of Noah as unique in his time, is frequent in Biblical and Intertestamental literature.[130]

As in the description of creation, so too here the narrative follows to a large extent the Biblical account. It seems likely that, in locating the landing spot of the Ark as the hill behind Apamea, the author, who was probably from Apamea, was here re–interpreting the local flood tradition(s) in accordance with his Jewish tradition. He was identifying the story he has told with the local flood stories, and identifying Noah with the indigenous flood hero or heroes. The impetus for this re–interpretation, and thus the localisation of the flood story, was probably Apamea's nickname Kibotos. It seems then that the Sibyl was doing much the same thing as we see occurring in the late second century with the coins. It is possible that the Jewish community was at that time following the lead the "Sibyl" provided at the turn of the era.

Thus it seems likely that the Sibyl was aiming his/her work at the city, at those who knew *only* the local flood story. [S]He was identifying for them a new and ancient flood hero. Perhaps the fact that the city did accept this identification,[131] as the coins show, is a sign of the success and acceptance which the Sibyl's work achieved among his/her intended audience.

In the book Noah is portrayed primarily as a preacher of repentance,[132] a feature which is entirely lacking in the Genesis account. In Sibylline Oracles I,128–9 God says to Noah:

Νῶε δέμας θάρσυνον ἐὸν λαοῖσί τε πᾶσιν κήρυξον μετάνοιαν ὅπως σωθῶσιν ἅπαντες.

Noah, embolden yourself and proclaim repentance to all the peoples, so that all may be saved.

There follows in I,150–170 and I,174–198 two sermons preached by Noah.[133]

5.4.3.1 The book is not alone, however, in portraying Noah as a preacher of repentance. In Josephus' account of the flood we read that Noah urged his contemporaries "to come to a better frame of mind and amend their ways" [*ἔπειθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰς πράξεις μεταφέρειν*].[134] Noah's preaching seems to function in Josephus as the ultimate proof of the wickedness of that generation.[135]

In 2 Peter 2:5 Noah is described as *δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα* – a herald or preacher of righteousness.[136] In I Clement 7:6, as part of an exhortation to repentance,

which seeks to show that in generation after generation God has given a place of repentance, we read that "Noah preached repentance and those who obeyed were saved." [Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν καὶ οἱ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν.] Likewise, mention of Noah as a preacher of repentance is found in Theophilus of Antioch,[137] Hippolytus,[138] Methodius,[139] Chrysostom,[140] Clement of Alexandria,[141] Pseudo–Tertullian,[142] and Augustine.[143] Generally the statement is very brief or part of a piece of extended allegorical exegesis, often about repentance and conversion.[144]

In the *Apocalypse of Paul* 50 Noah tells Paul that he addressed his contemporaries saying: "'Repent for a flood of water will come upon you', but they did not cease from their sins until God destroyed them all."[145]

The theme of Noah as a preacher does not occur in any of the Jewish Apocryphal or Pseudepigraphical literature. It is found however in Rabbinic writings. In *Genesis Rabbah* xxx,7 we read: "The Holy One, blessed be He, said: One herald arose for me in the generation of the Flood viz. Noah." In *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* ix,15, as an example of Noah's wisdom we read: "For he said to the people, 'Woe ye foolish ones! Tomorrow a flood will come, so repent.' They answered him, 'If punishments begin, they will begin with your house.' "[146]

We can make the following observations from this survey:

[i] Sibylline Oracles I/II is probably the earliest written record which portrays Noah as a preacher of repentance.

[ii] Nowhere is a long sermon proporting to be preached by Noah preserved, except in the book under examination here.

[iii] In Christian writers the emphasis seems to be on God providing an opportunity for repentance. The theme is used for homiletical purposes in order to promote certain behaviour in the listeners.

[iv] In the few references to this theme in Jewish literature – Josephus and Rabbinic writings – the emphasis is on the wickedness of Noah's contemporaries who refuse to repent. Thus Noah's preaching functions as a foil; their wickedness is proved by the fact that, even when urged to repent, they scorned Noah's words. Thus God's action in judgement was seen to be just.

5.5 Against this background, our account in Sibylline Oracles I/II is seen to be quite unique. We will now investigate the content of Noah's sermons in more detail.

5.5.1 Noah outlines both the ethical values on which judgement is based and the way to avoid destruction.[147] The list of sins given has much in common with the lists of vices frequently found in Jewish literature of this period.[148] Noah, faced with the imminence of the flood, exhorts his hearers to repent. If

they will repent, propitiate God,[149] change their ways of behaviour and live a holy life [I,170], the wrath of God will be averted. However the people sneer at Noah, whereupon he preaches against their wickedness again, describing what will happen to them when the flood comes [l.174–198]. We see therefore, that the work is basically hortatory, and attempts to discourage the sins which lead to condemnation and encourage those of which the author approves. The sermons are concerned with ethics rather than conversion; they do not aim to bring people into the Jewish community, but attempt to encourage a certain form of behaviour.[150] It would seem that the Sibylline Oracle genre was not appropriate for "conversion literature" [for then the pretence of being the Sibyl would be exposed]; but it was an appropriate medium for religious propaganda in which a certain type of lifestyle was encouraged,[151] a lifestyle which was perhaps a precursor to regular involvement with the Jewish community. The use of the Sibylline form and the incorporation of Hesiod is designed to increase the attractiveness of the book for Gentile readers and thus to further this apologetic aim.

5.5.2 The whole structure of I,1–282 is devised to give weight and urgency to the thrust of Noah's preaching.[152] The five generations build up to the judgement, with the imminence of the flood providing the occasion for presenting these crucial ethical values.[153] Thus, according to the structure of the first half of the Jewish substratum, Noah's preaching provides the purpose for the book's composition. Given its probable provenance in Apamea, we can suggest that preaching to the people of Apamea was important to our author.[154]

Indeed, it seems reasonable to suggest that our Phrygian author put two sermons in the mouth of Noah because the Jewish community in Apamea was involved in just such preaching to its generation. Noah is a "preacher of repentance" because the book mirrors the situation in Apamea. It is hard to see any other explanation for such long, detailed and unique sermons.[155]

We have seen that I,261–267 makes it clear that Noah was the Apamean "flood hero", who had probably settled in their city. Perhaps the implication of the sermons was that Noah had preached to their ancestors in the fifth generation; they had not repented and had thus been judged by the flood. Therefore, the generation in Phrygia to whom the Jewish community spoke, probably around the turn of the era, should now repent, stand in awe of the Great God, propitiate him and live a holy life, avoiding the sins of their ancestors, who sneered at Noah rather than responding to his preaching. The book seems to reveal an active concern of the Jewish community to communicate its message to the city.

5.5.3 Whilst Noah fully condemns the wickedness of his generation, his description of the flood contains the following passage:

> Then also the entire world of innumerable men will die. But as for me, how much will I lament, how much will I weep in my wooden house, how many tears will I mingle with the waves?... For if this water commanded by God comes on, ... All will be water, and all things will perish in water. [I,189–192,194]

This passage implies that Noah hoped that people would respond to his preaching and that the flood would be averted. He wept that his generation were not saved, but rather perished.[156] Thus we see another unique feature of the book. Noah not only preaches repentance to his contemporaries, but also is distressed that they do not respond, a feature found nowhere else. We can suggest that this reflects the situation of the Jewish community in Apamea. They sought actively to convince the city to accept the content of their message, which they placed on the lips of Noah and they preached this message with fervour and conviction.

5.6 Thus we can conclude that here we have a document from around the turn of the era, behind which are shared traditions, from the Jewish community, from the local environment, and from Hesiod and Homer, and which seeks to encourage a turning away from an unacceptable lifestyle [as far as the Jewish author was concerned] and the adoption of a holy life – a lifestyle which would perhaps be a precursor to regular involvement with the Jewish community.

6. The Inscriptions From Apamea.

We possess a number of inscription which may come from the Jewish community in Apamea. Apart from one exception, they contain, or are related to the so–called "Eumeneian Formula" and will be dealt with in Appendix 1. We will examine the remaining inscription here.

6.1 Αὐρ. Ῥοῦφος Ἰουλιανοῦ β' ἐποί[ησα τὸ ἡ]ρῷον ἐμαυτῷ κὲ [τῇ συμβίῳ μ]ου Αὐρ. Τατιανῇ. ἰς ὃ ἕτερος οὐ τεθῇ, εἰ δέ τις ἐπιτηδεύσι τὸν νόμον οἶδεν [τ]ῶν Εἰουδέων.[157]

Aurelios Roufos, son and grandson of Iulianos, I have made this grave for myself and for my wife Aurelia Tatiana. Let no–one else be buried here. If however, somebody buries here, he knows the Law of the Jews.

This grave inscription reflects the common Phrygian desire to secure one's grave against grave violators.[158] What is unique here is the form of the grave curse: "he knows the Law of the Jews". In 1897 Ramsay wrote the following with regard to this phrase:

> We recognise there, not the law of Moses, but a regulation agreed upon between the city and the Jewish community for the pro-

tection of Jewish graves.[159]

He later explained his reason for this view. Because the Mosaic Law makes no provision for the protection of graves, it must be some local legal convention agreed with the city protecting Jewish rights that is in view here.[160] However, in 1914 Ramsay changed his interpretation of this phrase. This was due to the discovery of the inscription from nearby Acmonia [given as 3.1.1 in Chapter 3] which ended with the following sentence: "If anyone shall inter another corpse or do injury in the way of purchase, there shall be on him the curses which are written in Deuteronomy."[161] Thus it was clear that in our inscription, which was also to be dated to the third century,[162] the "Law of the Jews" must refer to the Book of Deuteronomy and the protection of the tomb relied on the curses written in Deut 27–29.[163] Thus our findings in Chapter 3, section 3.3 with regard to the use of Deuteronomy by the community at Acmonia seem also to apply to Apamea. A further factor to note here is what is assumed in saying "he knows the Law of the Jews". Our inscription is veiled and seems to presume some knowledge of Deuteronomy on the part of the reader, even if only the knowledge that Deut contained serious curses. More than that however, the inscription presumes that the reader will acknowledge the *validity* of this Jewish Law. This must be the case, or else the inscription would offer no form of grave protection at all. With some inscriptions using Deuteronomy from Acmonia, respect was commanded by the explicit language of the inscription. For example, "May the sickle of curse enter into their house and leave no survivors".[164] But in our case, it is presumed that the mere mention of the "Law" which contains these curses will be a sufficient deterent.[165]

Thus it is assumed here that the population of Apamea will have some knowledge of the Jewish Law. This in itself appears quite remarkable. However, when we combine this with our hypothesis regarding the Noah coins, it becomes understandable. Just as the Jewish flood tradition was accepted by the city, so we see here that at least a part of the Jewish Scriptures were also accepted as valid by the wider community, and their content was to some extent known. This shows again that the city had in large measure recognised the Jewish community and it's traditions.[166]

7. The Council of Laodicea.

The canons preserved from the Council of Laodicea in Phrygia, which probably met in the last half of the fourth century CE, are helpful for our study.[167] The canons clearly concern the situation prevalent in the surrounding area, as is shown by the introduction which reads, "The holy council, gathered together from various provinces of Asia at Laodicea".[168] It was not an international

council and its evidence can be taken to reflect the situation in Phrygia and its capital city Apamea.

7.1 Of interest here is what the canons reveal about the impact of Judaism on the Church and the frequent contact between Jews and Christians. The following canons are noteworthy:

[16] "On the Sabbath the Gospels and other portions of the scripture shall be read aloud."

[29] "Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on the Sabbath, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and as being Christians, shall if possible, do no work on that day. If however, they are found Judaizing they shall be shut out from Christ."

[37] "No one shall accept festal presents from Jews and heretics or keep the festivals with them."

[38] "No one shall accept unleavened bread from the Jews or take part in their profanity."[169]

Canon 16 seems to reveal that some Christians read only the OT on the Sabbath. Canon 29 shows that some Christians observed the Sabbath, at least to some extent. In view of these facts, a realistic rather than an idealistic line is adopted by the Council.[170] Realising that it could not remove all prestige from the Sabbath, probably because of the influence of the Jews, the Council seems to have attempted to give the Sabbath a Christian character. It was to be a normal working day, with only Sunday being a day of rest. In addition, by prescribing the reading of the Gospels on the Sabbath, the Council attempted to ensure that the members of the Christian communities went to their own service and not to the synagogue where only the Old Testament would be read.[171]

Canon 29 also anathematises those who actually "Judaise" [Ἰουδαιζεῖν] by adopting Jewish customs such as the Sabbath. In addition, some attendance at the Jewish synagogue by Christians seems to be implied by the fact that some took part in the Jewish festivals, including accepting festal presents and unleavened bread. Close contact with the synagogue community seems to have been quite normal, with some Christians even attending some Jewish festivals.[172]

We can also note that the evidence of the Council suggests that in the fourth century the Jewish community retained its elements of "Jewishness". By combatting Jewish practices the Council shows that for the Jewish communities in the area the Sabbath was a holy day, the Scriptures were revered and read, and the community observed the Jewish festivals. These features, which were fundamental to Jewish identity, remained intact. The evidence is all the more reliable because it comes from a "hostile" source.[173]

7.2 The attractiveness of Jewish practices to Christians was certainly not unique in this period. Perhaps our best evidence comes from the "Homilies against the Jews" preached by John Chrysostom at Antioch in Syria.[174] The strength, vitality and attractiveness of the Jewish community is perhaps not surprising in Syria. Here daily contact between Christians and Jews was probably unavoidable. Lightstone writes of Antioch:

> the sociology of the Jewish and Christian communities appear to be intertwined .... at the level of common believer [to Chrysostom's consternation]. ... Chrysostom could neither halt the praxis of Judaism among his Gentile Christians nor impede their actual participation in ritual along with the formal Jewish community.[175]

The Council of Laodicea in effect shows us that the situation was very similar in Phrygia, if not in Asia Minor as a whole. Daily contact seems likewise to have been unavoidable here; the Christians were attracted to adopt Jewish practices and participate in Jewish festivals. The strength of the Canons from Laodicea reflect the crisis felt by the Church. It was seen by the Council to be vital to ban formal contacts completely although daily contact could probably never be legislated against.[176] This in itself testifies not only to the attraction of Judaism to outsiders, but also to the strength and vitality of the Jewish communities in the area.

7.3 An important corollary of Canons like these is elaborated by Lightstone. If a group of Christians participated, by regular custom, in the praxis of the synagogue, then it must be that this was with the full knowledge and compliance of the Jewish people. They clearly made no attempt to stop such a practice or the Canons of the Council would have been unnecessary. It is the adoption of Jewish customs by those who intended to remain as good Gentile Christians which is the main issue;[177] conversion to Judaism is not in view. Lightstone's conclusion is worth quoting in full; although he is speaking primarily of the situation at Antioch, the Council of Laodicea shows that the situation was very similar there:

> The data attest to a certain 'fuzziness' in the definition of boundaries in both camps, the Church and the Synagogue. Or to put matters more accurately, their identity structures were not such as to exclude co–celebration and praxis. We deal, then, with a Judaism which apparently recognised in some serious sense a [legitimate] Yahwehism extending beyond the more limited circle of the circumcised, here to Gentile Christians whom, according to Chrysostom, the Jews seemed to welcome at their formal observances in the synagogue.[178]

This is very relevant to our overall findings. If this openness to Christian participation was a feature of Apamean Judaism, as seems likely, then the

Jewish community was extending the principle of reciprocity of traditions to the Christians. Just as in the past they had accepted an alteration of their flood tradition, in return for the city's acceptance, in large measure of their version of the story, so now in the fourth century the Jewish community is accepting the involvement of Christians in their synagogue life. These Christians seem to have acknowledged the validity and efficacy of Jewish rituals and traditions by their very desire to be involved. In return the Jewish community allowed and perhaps encouraged such involvement by those who wished to remain outside their formal group, although of course the Jewish community may have hoped to convert the Christians. We see here once again the principle of mutual acknowledgement and reciprocity, this time with the Christian community.

8. Conclusions.

We have thus been able to draw together from diverse pieces of evidence a picture of the Jewish community at Apamea over a number of centuries. Although the evidence does not always enable us to trace continuities we can say that:

8.1 The community retained its "Jewishness"; over a considerable time period we have evidence that the community was concerned about the Temple Tax, it honoured Scripture as containing its sacred traditions, it observed the Sabbath, it encouraged Gentiles to adopt an acceptable lifestyle as a precursor to regular involvement with the community.

8.2 The community was open to its environment, in both accepting other traditions and in attempting to, and succeeding in, convincing others, whether pagan or Christian, of the validity of its own traditions.

8.3 The community was an influential element in the city, where it was both accepted and respected.

Chapter 5.

The Prominence of Women in Asia Minor.

The investigation of the status of women in Early Judaism has generally begun with an examination of the intertestamental and rabbinic literature. However, this approach is not fruitful for Judaism in Asia Minor because we have only one piece of literature which is probably from the area[1] and it has no relevance to this subject. Thus we must examine the inscriptional evidence available and here Bernadette Brooten's work *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogues: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* [1982] has made major advances. Unfortunately she did not examine the issue from a regional perspective and so did not look at Asia Minor as a specific area.[2]

1. Women Leaders in Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.

The Jewish inscriptions from Asia Minor inform us of the following important women; Rufina the archisynagogos from Smyrna; Theopempte the archisynagogos from Myndus; Jael the prostates from Aphrodisias [whom we will argue was a woman]; and Tation, a women honoured by the synagogue at Phocaea.

1.1 Rufina from Smyrna, Ionia.

Ῥουφεῖνα Ἰουδαία ἀρχισυνάγωγος κατεσκεύασεν τὸ ἐνσόριον τοῖς ἀπελευθέροις καὶ θρέμασιν μηδενὸς ἄλου ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος θάψαι τινά. εἰ δέ τις τολμήσει, δώσει τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ ταμείῳ (δηνάρια) ͵αφ καὶ τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Ἰουδαίων (δηνάρια) ͵α. Ταύτης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον ἀποκεῖται εἰς τὸ ἀρχεῖον.[3]

Rufina, a Jewess, head of the synagogue, built the tomb for her freed slaves and the slaves raised in her house. No one else has the right to bury anyone [here]. If someone should dare to do, he will pay 1500 denars to the sacred treasury and 1000 denars to the Jewish people. A copy of this inscription has been placed in the [public] archives.[4]

This inscription is probably to be dated in the third century CE on the basis of orthography,[5] although Brooten's dating in the second century CE is possible.[6] The Jewess Rufina has built the tomb for her freed slaves and the slaves raised in her house.[7] This sort of care for slaves is not exceptional. Often the lady of the house formed a close bond with her slaves with whom she would be in daily contact.[8]

After studying the meaning of the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος in the NT, rabbinic sources, the Theodosian code, patristic and pagan sources and over thirty inscriptions Brooten concludes that[9] –

[i] the "head of the synagogue was one of the best, if not the best, known titles of synagogue office."[10] Probably he or she was the leading official in the synagogue,

and was held in high esteem, as is shown by the fact that the title–holder was always mentioned first in lists of synagogue officials.[11]

[ii] the archisynagogos seems to have been the spiritual and intellectual leader of the synagogue, responsible for its spiritual direction and regulation, including at times teaching the community and on other occasions inviting some one else to preach. Thus the archisynagogos was a scholarly person learned in the law who supervised the worship.[12]

[iii] more than one archisynagogos could serve at a given time.[13]

[iv] there was no unified practice with regard to selection of the archisynagogos. Some were probably appointed by a council or an individual, some were elected and some inherited the office.[14]

The question now arises as to what the title meant when it was given to a woman. There are only two plausible interpretations – either the title was purely honorific and involved none of the duties outlined above, or a woman with the title fulfilled the same role as a man.[15]

Scholars who have thought the title was honorific have argued along the following lines:

[a] That a woman received the title from her husband, who was also an archisynagogos, and hence the title involved no responsibility for the woman.[16] However, in each of the three occurrences of women archisynagogoi no husband is mentioned, which is most unusual if the title is only held in connection with his office.[17] In the present case, if the title was received from her husband [and we do not know her martial status], we would have expected Rufina to be introduced as "wife of X". Yet in the legal matter of guaranteeing a burial place, Rufina acted in her own name, without the mention of any man. It seems likely therefore that the title she carried was her own.[18]

Further evidence against this interpretation is provided by the fact that in only three out of 22 cases in which a husband bears one of a number of titles, does his wife also bear a title.[19] Further, in the three inscriptions in which the wife of a male archisynagogos is mentioned, the wife does not receive her husband's title.[20] In our present case in which no husband is mentioned, it seems most unlikely that Rufina received the title through a man in a purely honorary sense.[21]

[b] Salomon and Theodore Reinach suggested that in the later period from which our inscription comes, the title was honorific for both men and women; however, in the earlier period, when only men bore the title, it was functional.[22] The logic behind this explanation, first made in 1883 is clear. In 1879 Schürer, in a study of the Jewish community at Rome had concluded that the title "archisynago-

gos" designated a genuine function in the community, compared with the titles of "mother" or "father of the synagogue", which he thought were primarily honorific. An important factor in his argument was that "archisynagogos", up to that point, was used only of a man and hence indicated a genuine role. To Schürer it was "certainly not to be accepted"[23] that women could have an active role. Reinach's dilemma when our inscription about a woman archisynagogos was found in 1880 is obvious, and his solution ingenious. Because women could not hold active positions, this third century CE inscription meant that by this stage the title was honorific for both men and women. However, men had earlier held the title so Reinach postulated a development whereby the title became purely honorific. The evidence for this theory was simply Schürer's conviction [and Reinach's own] that women were never active officials. No sources allude to this development in the title's meaning and no evidence can be given to support it.[24]

[c] Finally, scholars have argued that whilst the title was always functional for a man, it was purely honorific when held by a woman. Often few reasons have been given for this view, apart from the conviction that the community "could hardly have entrusted the actual charge of an office"[25] to a woman. It could be suggested that Rufina received the title in an honorary sense in recognition for some contribution to the community.[26] However, this is unlikely. In the 23 cases in which women were donors to various synagogues[27] only once does a woman bear a title and then probably not as a result of her donation.[28] In one case, a woman built a whole synagogue for the community and although she was honoured by them, she did not receive a title.[29] Thus there seems to be no basis for this interpretation, apart from scholars' conviction that women did not hold an active office.

However, the whole concept of an "honorific title" in the ancient synagogue is questionable. In the ancient sources, there is no indication that any of the titles of synagogue leadership were honorific.[30] Further, in the ancient world honorific titles were those like *clarissima femina* – "distinguished woman" [indicating senatorial rank],[31] or πρώτη γυναικών – "first of women",[32] and not titles that when applied to men involved an office.[33]

Thus the three interpretations which seek to understand "archisynagogos" as an honorary title when held by Rufina seem to be untenable. The inscription does however, give us positive reasons to think that Rufina actively fulfilled the functions of the office outlined above:

[i] Rufina was probably a woman of some administrative and managerial skill. The slaves and freed men and women were probably her daily responsibility.

In making the arrangements for the tomb, she has acted alone and in her own name. We can envisage that her administrative skills were used in the synagogue just as they were in her household.[34]

[ii] Rufina was probably a woman of some education. She has dealt with the legal matters involved in the protection of the tomb and the deposition of a copy of the inscription in the public archives. It is thus not unreasonable to assume that she was capable of teaching and exhorting the community.[35]

[iii] Rufina was a woman of some means, having built a large tomb out of her own wealth.[36] In the ancient world philanthropy and office were strongly connected[37] as were wealth, education and influence. It is likely that wealth was at least a contributing factor towards gaining office in Judaism in the Diaspora.

Thus we can suggest that Rufina was an active "head of the synagogue" in the fullest meaning of the term.[38]

1.2 Theopempte from Myndos, Caria.

[Ἀπὸ Θ]εωπέμπτης [ἀρ]χισυν(αγώγου) κὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς Εὐσεβίου.[39]

[From Th]eopempte, head of the synagogue, and her son Eusebios.[40]

The inscription was dated to the sixth century CE by Theodore Reinach[41] on the basis of orthography, although according to Brooten a fourth or fifth century CE date would also be possible.[42]

The inscription was carved into the top of a quadrangular marble post about one metre high. The post was probably part of a synagogue chancel screen which stood at the front of the synagogue, and thus the inscription commemorated the donation of this structure by Theopempte and her son.[43]

Scholars have again thought that Theopempte held the title archisynagogos in "a purely honorific sense."[44] However, as we have seen, this interpretation does not stand up to examination. Although the inscription does not tell us much about Theopempte we know that she was married but her husband, if he was still alive, took no part in the donation. She had sufficient wealth to make this donation together with her son whose age we do not know but who was probably unmarried. Theopempte was mentioned first and hence was probably primarily responsible for the donation. She was thus an independent, moderately well–to–do lady. Both these factors are positive reasons for us to suggest that like Rufina, Theopempte was an active head of the synagogue.[45]

1.3 Jael from Aphrodisias, Caria.

A long inscription discovered at Aphrodisias in 1977 and published recently is probably to be dated in the early third century CE.[46] It will be discussed in full in Chapter 7, section 4.1. Of interest here are lines 9-10 of face *a* which read:

Ἰαηλ προστάτης σὺν υἱῷ Ἰωσούᾳ ἄρχ(οντι?).

Both Jael and Iosoua are members of the "δεκανία". The name Jael was taken to be a woman's name by Brooten.[47] However, Reynolds takes it to be a man's name and refers to the man named Ἰιηλ or Ἰαηλ [see later] in IV Ezra 10:43 rather than to the woman named Ἰαηλ in Judges 4 and 5.[48] This seems to be primarily because the lists given in the inscription "are otherwise demonstrably and consistently masculine."[49] Reynolds and Tannenbaum do not seek to explain why the lists consist solely of men,[50] a fact which seems strange given the fact that Jewish women are often donors elsewhere.[51] However, as far as "Jael" is concerned, we need to focus on the decany, which is a group within the Jewish community of which s/he is a member, along with 17 or 18 others.[52] It is further defined as "the decany of the students/disciples/sages of the law also known as those who fervently/continually praise God, (who) erected for the relief of suffering in the community at their personal expense (this) memorial (building)."[53] Is it conceivable that one of the members of this group was a woman?

The members of the decany are clearly wealthy enough to make a donation towards the building. As we have already noted, we know of a number of wealthy Jewish women – Rufina, Theopempte and Tation discussed here are good examples. Further, we have suggested that Rufina and Theopempte were women of some education; we should also recall that Rabbinic literature informs us of Beruriah, who is said to have been skilled in rabbinical methods of interpretation and application and to have given opinions on points of law.[54] She is indeed an exceptional woman, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that there were other women like her. Thus a woman could well have been a member of a group that, along with other activities, studied the law. There is thus no a priori reason why "Jael" could not be a woman. Given the 19 women leaders Brooten discusses [see section 1.5], one woman in a significant position in this group is not completely surprising.

A further observation is that when Jews in Aphrodisias did adopt a name from their tradition [and thus from the LXX] they generally chose a name of a significant Jewish person rather than of someone who was relatively unknown. Thus in the inscription from Aphrodisias we find the following names: Βενιαμιν, Ζαχαρίας, Ἰακωβ [three times], Ἰούδας [ten times],[55] Ἰωσῆς [twice], Ἰωσηφ [three times], Μανασῆς, Ῥουβην, Ῥοῦφος, Σαμουηλ [five times], and Συμεών.[56] Thus, we would expect "Ιαηλ" to be named after the person of that name who was most significant in Jewish tradition. This is clearly the woman Jael whose murder of Sisera is described in Judges 4:17–22 and who is praised in Deborah's song

in Judges 5:24–7.[57] The man Jael in IV Ezra 10:43 to whom Reynolds refers is one name in a very long list.

There is also a difficulty concerning the text of IV Ezra. In Judges 4:17f the LXX text reads Ἰαηλ as in our inscription; it there translates יָעֵל. In IV Ezra 10:43 the Hebrew name is given as יָעֵאל. There are a number of translations of this Hebrew name given in the different manuscripts of the LXX. Ιαηλ is found in a number of manuscripts, but we also find Ἰεεηλ, Ἰηλ, Ἐηλ and Ἰεηλ.[58] However, the principal of *lectio difficilior* suggests that the original text did not read Ἰαηλ. We could well understand a copyist supplying this latter name as an easier more familiar reading in place of a name [such as Ἐηλ] which was otherwise unknown to him. The fact that the Hebrew Vorlage in IV Ezra is different from that in Judges 4 reinforces the likelihood that "Ιαηλ" is not the original reading in IV Ezra and that we are in fact dealing with two different names in the LXX. We cannot rule out the possibility that the *Aphrodisias* text of IV Ezra read "Ιαηλ", but the fact that this was probably not the original reading seems to count against Reynold's and Tannenbaum's interpretation. This in turn suggests that "Ιαηλ" in the inscription was probably named after the prominent woman of that name in Judges 4, rather than after a [probably] differently named man in IV Ezra 10:43.[59]

We should also note that the fact that "προστάτης" is the masculine form of the title [cf. προστάτις in Rom 16:2] does not point definitively towards Jael being a man. The masculine form of a title is given a number of times to women about whose gender there can be no question.[60] Thus we are tentatively able to include "Jael" in our list of prominent women in Asia Minor, whilst remembering that the case is not certain.[61]

We must now determine the meaning of Jael's title – προστάτης. The word has two basic meanings in common Greek terminology:[62] one who stands before as the front ranking person, and thus is the leader, president or ruler; or one who stands before and protects as a guardian, champion or patron. Although these meanings are not mutually exclusive, we must decide if one or the other is more likely in the case of Jael.

The title occurs in six inscriptions in which it seems impossible to decide whether "leader" or "patron" is the more appropriate translation.[63] These inscriptions do show that there was often more than one prostates in a community, and that it was a significant position in some synagogues.

In the LXX προστάτης translates שַׂר – chief, ruler, officer[64] פָּקִיד – overseer[65] and פָּקַד – commissioner.[66] Sanabassar, who in I Esdras 6:18 is called the ἔπαρχω or governor, is called the προστάτης of Judaea in I Esdras 2:12, thus

showing that here the term meant leader or ruler. In Sir 45:24 προστάτης is used of Phineas, son of Eleazar and clearly means "leader" or "chief". In 2 Macc 3:4 Simon, a Benjamite is described as προστάτης of the Temple, which in the context means "warden" or "administrator" rather than "patron". Thus in the LXX and in these three intertestamental texts in which the term occurs, προστάτης means "leader" or "ruler" and never "patron".

However, in the writings of Josephus and Philo both meanings of the term are equally prominent and occasionally the term also means "champion". Josephus once uses it in this sense.[67] He uses the term nine times to mean protector or patron,[68] and another nine times to mean leader or ruler.[69] Philo uses the term three times to mean champion,[70] three times to mean ruler or leader,[71] and three times to mean patron or guardian.[72] Thus by the first century CE both main meanings of the term are prevalent.

In the fourth century CE, John Chrysostom in *Adversus Judaeos* Homily six refers to archons and to prostatai of the Jewish community of Antioch. Unfortunately, he gives no information about either group but he does mention the archons first.[73] Grissom thinks that both groups were officers of the council of elders at Antioch,[74] but the lack of details does not help us in the present matter.

The title occurs quite widely in the ancient world.[75] In Asia Minor Magie thinks προστάται were the equivalent of πρυτάνεις, the chief magistrates in the city.[76] προστάτης was also used of the patron of a pagan religious society, who would have defended the groups interests.[77]

It thus seems that we cannot decide between the two possibilities of leader and patron. It is not surprising therefore that scholars have disagreed about the meaning of the term, with Juster[78] and Krauss[79] understanding the title as the equivalent of gerousiarch or president of the council of elders, and Schürer–Vermes–Millar[80] and Frey[81] deciding on patron. Safrai and Stern, and Reynolds and Tannenbaum leave the question open,[82] which seems to be the only possibility here. We can say however that:

[i] In some communities the prostates was probably the most important official [for example at Xenephyris] whilst in others he or she was second or third in rank behind other officials [for example at Antioch behind the archon].

[ii] Sometimes a community had more than one prostates [for example at Xenephyris].

[iii] Nothing indicates that the title was honorary and this has never been suggested.[83] The literary references all imply the προστάτης actively fulfilled a role.[84]

[iv] In our inscription from Aphrodisias, Jael is the first member of the decany to be named. There are two other titles mentioned – archon (?) and archidecanos, but the order implies that Jael is of higher social standing in the community than the other office bearers.[85] She is the only prostates mentioned. Although she has a son, Josua [who was archon [?] of the community], no husband is recorded. The position is thus Jael's in her own right.

All these factors enable us to suggest that, whether she was the patron, or the president or leader of the community, Jael was a prominent leader of the Jewish community at Aphrodisias.[86]

1.4 Tation from Phocaea, Ionia.

Τάτιον Στράτωνος τοῦ Ἐνπέδωνος τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὸν περίβολον τοῦ ὑπαίθρου κατασκευάσασα ἐκ τῶ[ν ἰδ]ίων ἐχαρίσατο τ[οῖς Ἰο]υδαίοις. Ἡ συναγωγὴ ἐ[τείμη]σεν τῶν Ἰουδαίων Τάτιον Σ[τράτ]ωνος τοῦ Ἐνπέδωνος χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ προεδρίᾳ.[87]
Tation, daughter of Straton, son of E[m]pedon, having erected the assembly hall and the enclosure of the open courtyard with her own funds, gave them as a gift to the Jews. The synagogue of the Jews honoured Tation, daughter of Straton, son of E[m]pedon, with a golden crown and the privilege of sitting in the seat of honour.[88]

The text, almost certainly from ancient Phocaea[89] thirty miles north west of Smyrna, is probably to be dated in the third century CE.[90] We know of other individuals who erected a building or gave their own dwellings for use by the community as a synagogue. Parallel examples occur at Stobi,[91] Acmonia,[92] and Capernaum.[93] At Teos in Ionia in the third century CE, P. Rutilius Ioses, the archisynagogos for life and his wife Visinnia Demo rebuilt the synagogue from its foundations with their own funds.[94] We have a number of other inscriptions which tell us of women donating decorations for a synagogue[95] or sharing in such a donation with their husbands,[96] but Tation is unique in being a Jewish woman who donated a whole synagogue building.[97]

The synagogue community wished to mark Tation's generosity by giving her a golden crown and the privilege of sitting in the seat of honour. The bestowal of these honours on a woman is unique in our corpus of Jewish inscriptions.[98]

The presentation of a golden crown [χρυσός στέφανος] was a familiar celebratory honour in the ancient world,[99] which was adopted by the Jewish communities in their inscriptions[100] and in their art.[101] Crowning as a mark of honour is found in the Old Testament,[102] in intertestamental literature,[103] and in the New Testament.[104]

The προεδρία, unique in Jewish inscriptions with this sense,[105] is probably the equivalent of the πρωτοκαθεδρία which is mentioned in the Gospels as the seat

sought after by the Pharisees and the Scribes.[106] It meant that Tation sat in the pre–eminent position in the synagogue.[107] In the Diaspora we find such seats of honour in the synagogues at Dura–Europos, Delos and probably at Ostia.[108] In pagan honorific decrees, whose wording is very similar, the gift of the proedria is mentioned quite frequently.[109] Again in this matter, the synagogue at Phoceca seems to have adopted the current practice of its environment.[110]

Tation is clearly a woman of independent means, with considerable wealth, able to build a synagogue with an open courtyard.[111] She may have been married but no husband is mentioned. Her father Straton apparently had no part in the donation and thus was not honoured; this testifies to Tation's independence.[112]

Thus, the Jewish community at Phocaea honoured a woman, who was able to act independently of any man and who had considerable wealth which she used to erect a synagogue for the community. She was given the privilege of a golden crown and the seat of pre–eminence, both of which were honours of high esteem in Jewish and pagan communities. Although this is an honorific as opposed to a functional position, it clearly shows that Tation was an important and respected person in the community. We have no indication from any other Jewish community in the ancient world that such honours were bestowed on a woman on any other occasion.[113]

1.5 Women received titles in other synagogues in the ancient world. We should note the following evidence:[114] In Crete, Sophia was a *πρεσβυτέρα* and *ἀρχισυναγώγισσα* [IV/V CE]. In Thesbes, Thessaly, Peristeria was an *ἀρχήγισσα* – probably "leader" [or perhaps "founder", Undated]. In Bizye, Thrace, Rebecca was a *πρεσβυτέρα* [IV/V CE]. In Venosa, Southern Italy, three women held the title of *πρεσβυτέρας*, one was a "*μήτηρ*", another a "pateressa" [III–VI CE]. At Venetia, Italy, Coelia Paterna was a "Matri synagogae" [Undated]. In Rome, three women held the title of *μήτηρ συναγωγῆς* [one inscription is undated, two are II/III CE], Sara Ura was a *πρεσβύτις* [elder or aged woman (?), I BCE – III CE] and Gaudentia was a *ἱέρισα* – "priestess" [Undated]. At Oea, Tripolitania, Makaria Mazauzala was a *πρεσβετέρησα* [IV/V CE]. At Tell–el–Yahudiyyeh [Leontopolis], Marin was a *ἱέρισα* – "priestess" [II BCE–I CE]. At Beth She'arim, Maria was a *ἱερείας* – priestess [IV CE]. On Malta, Eulogia was a *πρεσβυτήρα* [IV/V CE].[115]

Thus we have a total of twenty–one women with titles in ancient synagogues. They come from a range of locations, showing that women held significant titles in a number of communities, although the exact reconstruction of what was involved, especially with mother of the synagogue and priestess, is difficult.

We note that five women held titles at Venosa in Italy. We know of 56

inscriptions from this city,[116] which means that 8.9% of the known inscriptions refer to women title–bearers. Brooten comments:

> Although the number five is certainly not high enough to speak of "equal access" for women and men, the concentration of these five inscriptions in one catacomb is striking enough to suggest that the Venosan community may have had a tradition of granting women official functions.[117]

It is also noticeable that Asia Minor has a significant number of Jewish women leaders. Of the seven archisynagogoi known to us in Asia Minor, two were women.[118] In addition, around 3% of the inscriptions from this region mention women title–bearers.[119] Although this is lower than at Venosa, it is significantly higher than in Rome where the figure is 0.94% .[120] We should also note that women in Asia Minor held important positions – two women were ἀρχισυνάγωγος and [probably] one was προστάτης – titles which were only held by a woman in one other place [Crete], albeit in a small sample.

Further, donor inscriptions from synagogues are also a helpful guide. 40.4% of women donors known to us [either by themselves or jointly with husbands] come from Asia Minor, whilst only around 6.3% of inscriptions come from the region.[121] If we look only at the donor inscriptions from Asia Minor, excluding Sardis, four out of 15 inscriptions are by women alone whilst another three are by women with their husbands.[122] Thus a total of 46.6% of donor inscription from Asia Minor [excluding Sardis] mention women. In all of these cases, the name of the wife is given; she is not subsumed under her husband's name.[123] The picture from the recently excavated Sardis synagogue is also interesting. Although the inscriptions are mainly as yet unpublished, we know that of the more than 30 donors to the synagogue, 12 wives are mentioned as co–donors.[124] Thus, around 40% of the donors to this building seem to have been women. All of this suggests a significant degree of public involvement by women in the Jewish communities in Asia Minor.[125]

We should also note that Jewish inscriptions from Asia Minor show that some women played active roles in the public lives of their families. For example, in an inscription from Acmonia we are told that Ammia prepared a tomb for her husband and paid for it out of her own dowry.[126] Two married women were the owners of burial sites at Hierapolis;[127] it was husbands who generally owned burial sites in the city. This suggests that women had independent financial resources;[128] with the close link between wealth and leadership in the ancient world, this evidence reinforces the likelihood that women had significant leadership roles in the Jewish communities in Asia Minor.

We can conclude therefore that although the evidence is limited, women do

seem to have had a significant degree of involvement and leadership in synagogue life in Asia Minor. At least two and probably three women held high office, with only one woman elsewhere being in a similar position.[129] Another woman was very highly honoured. A higher percentage of inscriptions from Asia Minor allude to women donors than is the case in most other areas.[130] Thus the situation is sufficiently different from elsewhere for us to seek an explanation.

In Appendix 2 I discuss the literary sources which provide some help in an attempt to determine the position of women in Early Judaism. It seems clear that some prominent Jewish men – Ben Sira, Philo, Josephus, some Rabbis – held "anti–women" views. However, it would be a serious oversimplification to compile a list of their statements and claim that this represented "the view of women" in this period. This presupposes a monolithic picture of Judaism and ignores the more positive side of the picture – Judith, Pseudo–Philo, TJob – albeit one that is less well represented, a fact which is hardly surprising in itself.[131] Rather the picture is one of a diverse spectrum of attitudes towards and images of women.[132] We can therefore conclude that we need not be totally surprised to discover that there were women leaders in various synagogue communities. One strand of the literature of the period should prepare us for such prominent women. It is also not surprising that the picture across the Jewish world of the time is not uniform – there were a number of prominent women in some areas [Venosa, Asia Minor], very few in others [Palestine]. This seems to reflect the diversity of opinions which is evident in various texts.

It also means that when Jewish communities in Asia Minor appointed women leaders they were following one strand of contemporary Jewish thought [albeit the minority view] rather than going against their Jewish tradition altogether. This is a significant result.

However, this observation does not explain *why* Jews in *Asia Minor* followed the minority view on this subject. Why should some Jewish communities adopt this particular stance? We will now present the evidence provided by inscriptions concerning prominent women in Asia Minor in an attempt to answer this question.

2. Can we explain the prominence of women in Judaism in Asia Minor?

2.1 A number of scholars have noted the prominence of women in the social system of Asia Minor. The most thorough study of this topic was done by Braunstein – *Die politische Wirksamkeit der griechischen Frau*, [Leipzig, 1911], who built on the earlier work of Paris.[133] Following Braunstein,[134] I will deal with the civic titles which women received in Asia Minor. These are a more

helpful indication of women's position in society than is the evidence provided, for example, by praise given to women in inscriptions.[135] However, it could be argued against this approach that since my comparison will be with the position of women in Judaism, I should concentrate here on women's position in the cults of Asia Minor. My reasons for not doing so are twofold. Firstly, women played a valuable and essential role in cults throughout the ancient world; for instance there were numerous priestesses in Greece.[136] Pomeroy notes that "Athena Polias was the patron goddess of Athens and the priestess of Athena Polias was a person of great importance and some influence."[137] Yet this seems not to have significantly affected the social position of women in general.[138] The dignity awarded to a priestess did not lead on to social emancipation for women in general. Thus although we also find priestesses in Asia Minor,[139] and although a number of the women we will discuss held important cultic offices, this does not necessarily explain the prominence of women there. Indeed, there appears to have been no *necessary* connection between the primacy of women in a religious cult, or the prevalence of the worship of goddesses, and the actual political or social status of women.[140] Yet a woman archisynagogos in a Jewish synagogue did have a say in the community's activities. It seems that we should look elsewhere than to the religions of Asia Minor for an explanation. Secondly, the Jewish synagogue in the Diaspora functioned as a whole social system for its members. It was the centre for worship but also for social and educational activities, for festivals and the administration of all aspects of the life of the community including finance and the ownership of property. Indeed, it was "the focus of all Jewish life."[141] The organisation of the Jewish synagogue was to some extent modelled on that of the Greek city or of the collegia,[142] rather than on any form of cult. Thus when we are looking for an explanation of synagogue practice the social system of the city will often be a helpful guide.[143]

I do not claim to have discovered every inscription in which women bear the titles under consideration. I do hope however to be able to point to a significant body of evidence. We should firstly note the predominant bias of past scholarship in this area. The work of Chapot demonstrates the bias with which some scholars have examined the evidence. He clearly could not envisage women actively fulfilling some roles. When they bore a title which could have involved a leadership role, such as gymnasiarch, he claimed that all that was involved was providing the necessary finance; there was no active leadership by a woman. This seems to be one of Chapot's predetermined assumptions.[144] When women did hold titles that could involve real power [as well as honour], Chapot argued that the scope of the office was restricted.

That Chapot reasoned in this way is strongly suggested by his treatment of the title ἵππαρχος. He wrote:

> A Cyzique, l'année était désignée par le nom de l'hipparque, dont le rôle militaire devint forcément nul sous la domination romaine, puisqu'il y eut même des femmes hipparques, et qui ne conserva peut-être que des attributions religieuses.[145]

Thus, although Chapot is probably correct in thinking there was no military role involved with the title, his reasoning is revealing. Since women held the title, its nature was religious – the only role Chapot seems to have been able to envisage for women.

This sort of assumption certainly complicates the treatment of these titles. With a number of the titles considered here I suspect many scholars have, like Chapot, been influenced in their assessments by their presuppositions regarding what women could and could not do in city life.[146] Magie in the standard work on Asia Minor similarly betrays his assumptions. After discussing a number of offices Magie comments:

> In numerous instances the nominal character of many of these offices appears in the choice of incumbents whose chief qualifications were the possession of wealth and a readiness to spend. ... During the imperial period ... women held the office of hipparch (at Cyzicus), stephanephorus, prytanis and demiurge. Their duties were presumably purely honorary, and in those cases in which the title was borne also by the husband it was evidently given to the wife merely as a complement. In what was probably a more active capacity a woman served as dekaprotos at Sillyum in Pamphylia and prehaps as clerk at Tralles.[147]

His comment about the office of gymnasiarch is also revealing:

> Occasionally, as also in certain of the civic offices, a woman assumed the burden of expense and with it the title. In some cases, to be sure, in which her husband also appears as gymnasiarch, it is a question whether this title was not merely honorary.[148]

Magie's assumptions are clear. A woman generally either bore a title in a purely honorary sense or simply provided the money required for the fulfillment of the office; when both husband and wife bore the title, the wife received it as a "complement".

Brooten has recently discussed the concept of "honorific titles".[149] Scholars have generally understood the term to indicate a title which usually designates a function but is given to some people merely as an honour to them personally. However, Brooten shows that this is not the way in which honorific titles were normally used in the ancient world. The actual use of these title falls into two groups; adjectives often in the superlative [such as *clarissimus* or λαμπρότατος] or nouns, often corresponding to a titular adjective [such as *spectabilitas* or

λαμπρότης]. They are titles which *never* denoted an official function at all; they were *only* honorific. They are not titles which when applied to one group of people implied an active role [albeit one which included much honour and prestige] and when applied to another group were purely "honorary". Thus Magie's understanding of a "purely honorary title", such as "gymnasiarch", is questionable.

Brooten also notes that although wives of religious functionaries in the ancient world sometimes received a title because their husbands held a cultic position [for example the wife of a *flamen dialis* was called *flaminica*], the wives also fulfilled a role in the cult along with their husbands.[150] Thus attaining a title through marriage in no way *necessarily* implied that no duties accompanied the title, or that the position was not an active and official one. Thus Magie's understanding that a wife received a title "merely as a complement" with no active role being undertaken is likewise questionable. We will bear this in mind as we investigate the titles women held.

Magie's admission that Menodora at Sillyum probably actively served as dekaprotos is significant. The inscription, which is probably to be dated in the third century CE, reads as follows:

[Ἡ β]ου[λὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος] ἐτείμησεν ἀρχιέρειαν τῶν Σεβαστῶν, ἱέρειαν Δήμητρος καὶ θεῶν πάντων καὶ ἱεροφάντιν τῶν πατρίων θεῶ[ν] καὶ κτιστρίαν καὶ δημιουργ[ὸν] καὶ γυμνασίαρχον ἐλαί[ου θέσει Μ]ηνοδώραν Μεγακλέους τ[ελεσαμ]ένην δεκαπρωτίαν θυγα[τέρα καὶ] ἐγγόνην καὶ ἀπόγονον [ἀρχιερέ]ων καὶ δημιουργῶν [καὶ γυμνασ]ιάρχων ἐλαίου θέσει καὶ δεκαπρώτων ...[151]

Menodora clearly belonged to a highly important family in Sillyum. The phrase "τελεσαμένην δεκαπρωτίαν" strongly suggests that Menodora actively fulfilled this office, as Magie conceded.[152] She was demiourgos and had been gymnasiarch, of which the most notable task, the provision of oil, is mentioned [as it is for the holders of the title from her family]. She was also the daughter and descendant of people who had carried out these three offices. However, her husband is not mentioned at all; the inscription goes on to show that she had children. Likewise no indication is given that "demiourgos" and "gymnasiarchos" were honorary title. They may have been hereditary but this in no way implies that she did not fulfill the tasks involved herself. She almost certainly actively fulfilled the office of "dekaprotos"; the inscription suggests that she was also active as demiourgos and gymnasiarch. We will now discuss what was involved in these three offices.

2.2 Dekaprotos – Δεκάπρωτος.

The dekaprotoi are rare before the end of the second century CE, and may

have begun as a finance–committee of the Council. They became a group of [normally] ten officials chosen from the body of citizens who served for one or more years and were responsible for the collection of the taxes levied on the city by the Roman government. The office also involved an obligation to make up any deficit at the dekaprotoi's expense. The dekaprotoi might be assigned other duties of a financial nature in municipal affairs, such as administration of an endowment or ensuring the payment of interest. The office of the dekaprotoi was an important one which was given to people of high standing.[153] The title occurs outside of Asia Minor and the coastal islands.[154] Menodora is the only woman known to us to have definitely fulfilled this office,[155] and she seems to have done so actively.[156]

2.3 Demiourgos – *Δημιουργός*.

This title, which was especially frequent in cities of the Peloponnese[157] was also found on Rhodes, other islands off the coast of Asia Minor, in Cilicia, Pamphylia and Pisidia. In some of these places the holder of the title was the eponymous official.[158]

Braunstein listed eight instances of women holding this title[159] and two more may now be added.[160] These come from six cities and date from not before the second century BCE to the third century CE. One example from Perge is dated to 78/79 CE.[161]

It is difficult to determine the exact function of the demiourgos in Asia Minor.[162] That it was a position of much honour is shown by it being eponymous at times, and also by the fact that at Anazarbos in Cilicia the Emperor Elagabalus,[163] and at Tarsus the Emperor Severus Alexander,[164] accepted the title. Here some sort of role in a festival was involved. Women were eponymous Demiourgoi, for example, on Samos.[165]

Where the title was not eponymous it involved a magistracy which, whilst not the principal magistracy, was nonetheless significant.[166] At Mallus in Cilicia for example, the title involved holding office as a magistrate, and here a woman held the title.[167] In some cities [for example in Achaia] there were a group of ten Demiourgoi;[168] it seems reasonable to envisage a situation in Asia Minor in which one of these was a woman.

Again, as far as I am aware, no woman held this title outside of Asia Minor and the coastal islands, despite its popularity in other places.

2.4 Gymnasiarch – *Γυμνασίαρχος*.

The gymnasiarch was a very important liturgy.[169] It was the position "which probably affected most widely the communal life of a city",[170] for the gymnasium was the place for both physical and mental development for citizens and

became the centre of the social life of the community. It was thus vital to the life of the city.[171] The gymnasiarch was responsible for the direction of the whole establishment and thus had to provide for both the athletic and intellectual training of citizens. This involved maintenance of the buildings and equipment, heating, lighting, management of the staff of public slaves, the provision of oil, often at the gymnasiarch's own considerable expense, the organisation of both athletic and intellectual contests and the giving of prizes.[172] The gymnasiarch had general control over the intellectual training provided, although he [or she] was often assisted by other magistrates in this area.[173] Thus Levy wrote "Aucun service municipal n'occupe une place plus grande dans les préoccupations des contemporains."[174]

Magie noted that in the period from the fifth century BCE to the fourth century CE we have evidence of either a gymnasium or a gymnasiarch in 130 cities in Asia Minor and the coastal islands.[175] It can be assumed that every city of any importance had at least one gymnasium. The title of gymnasiarch also appears to be universally used in this period.[176]

We learn of 29 women gymnasiarchs from Asia Minor in the inscriptions given by Braunstein.[177] Magie adds a further six[178] to which twelve more may now be added[179] giving a total of 47 instances in Asia Minor and the coastal islands. These come from a total of 23 cities and range from the first to the third centuries CE.[180]

We have instances in which a woman was described as a gymnasiarch whilst her husband was not[181] and also where a woman was a gymnasiarch but her father was not.[182] This suggests that in [at least] some cases women actively fulfilled the liturgy,[183] independently of men and thus in their own right.[184] In some cases husband and wife both held the title.[185] It is possible that they jointly shared the responsibilities or that they did not simultaneously hold the title and thus were both fully active. Further we know that in this period women were able to gain considerable wealth,[186] had access to education,[187] and were often involved in sports.[188] Thus a woman could be well qualified to act as gymnasiarch. It seems most likely therefore that women actively fulfilled this liturgy.[189]

Levy has argued that all that was involved in a woman being a gymnasiarch was the donation of money.[190] However, if this was all that was involved, without any active participation in the running of the gymnasium then it seems strange that the title should be given at all. Such generosity could be noted by the word ἐπίδοσις [benefaction or charitable endowment] or εὐεργεσία [public service, good deed] without the bestowal of an important title. We argued at the beginning

of this section that titles such as this one are unlikely to have been merely "honorary"; some active role which was more than just generosity with money was probably therefore involved.[191]

Indeed, whilst the inscriptions do note that expense was involved, an inscription from Rhegium near Byzantium and to be dated in the first or second century CE, suggests that more than this was involved. Crispina was described as γυμνασιαρχήσασαν πολυτελῶς καὶ καλῶς.[192] Here the addition of καλῶς probably means something like "thoroughly" or "well". It certainly suggests that more than lavish expenditure [πολυτελῶς] was involved. Thus, although we cannot prove that women actively fulfilled this role [which is very difficult to prove for men in any case], the evidence suggests that they did so. At least this seems to me to explain the facts as they stand. Any other hypothesis must account for the facts as well or better.

We do know of two women elsewhere who were gymnasiarchs. One is in Cyrene, probably in the first century CE[193] and the other is in Hermopolis, Egypt in 107 CE.[194]

2.5 Women held other titles in Asia Minor. The following inscription from Phocaea is noteworthy:

Ἡ Τευθαδέων φυλὴ Φλαουίαν, Μόσχο[υ] θυγατέρα, Ἄμμιον, τὴν καλουμένην Ἀρίστιον, ἀρχιέρειαν Ἀσίας ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πρύτανιν, στεφανηφόρον δὶς, καὶ ἱέρειαν τῆς Μασσαλίας, ἀγωνοθέτιν, τὴν Φλαουίου Ἑρμοκράτου γυναῖκα, ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν βίον κοσμ[ιο]τητός τε καὶ ἁγνείας.[195]

Flavia Ammion had three titles apart from her religious offices. Her husband T. Flavius Varus Calvesianus Hermocrates is also known from another inscription; he was "ἀρχιερέα Ἀσίας ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πρύταν[ιν], στεφανηφόρον καὶ ἱερέα τῆς Μασσαλίας δὶς, ἀγωνοθέτην ...[196] It is interesting to note that he is only mentioned by name in the inscription given above and that his titles are not listed there. Further, Flavia Ammion was stephanephoros twice, whilst he only held this office once. These two factors suggest that her titles were not "honorary" and that she had not received them simply as a "complement" because she was Flavius Hermocrates' wife. Thus, although married to a very significant man, she was important in her own right and the titles she carried seem to be her own. She therefore probably actively fulfilled the roles involved. We will now discuss the titles she was given.

2.6 Prytanis – Πρύτανις.

The πρύτανις was the eponymous official in some cities in Asia Minor.[197] The office of πρύτανις dates back to the earliest republican period of Greek history, when the single πρύτανις was the highest magistrate and had wide ranging

powers. As with a number of these individual offices, there was a progressive deprivation of the power of the position in favour of the council and people, who were led by a new group of magistrates. The real power of government and administration was vested with these new magistrates. The πρύτανις then became the eponymous official who retained little political power; instead they were assigned more formal and sacral tasks which could include entertaining honoured guests of the city, making sacrifices on the city's behalf and fulfilling certain tasks on ceremonial occasions. The office which was held for a year, involved considerable expenditure. At times the eponymous office did however retain some of its former power; for example we know of the prytanis being involved in the purchase of property, keeping records and doing restoration work.

Despite the fact that the office of the eponymous prytanis had lost most of its former power, it is clear that it remained a position of very high rank in the city. Thus, as was regularly the case, the prytanis was listed before the strategos in an inscription, despite the fact that the strategos had the actual power of government.[198] In processions the prytanis took second place only to the priest(s) of the deity whose festival it was; he or she walked in front of all other magistrates and priests.[199] The high rank of the single prytanis was likewise shown in this being the eponymous office.

We know of 28 women who held the eponymous prytanis in 8 cities in Asia Minor.[200] It is noteworthy that women were elected to this eponymous position. Although it had lost most [though probably not all] of its political power, it seems to have been a significant position in the city, with a role in the leadership of the city, a "high profile" and a considerable amount of honour.

We know of cases in which a woman held the title, but her father or husband did not.[201] In one case a woman was described as "having been prytanis καλῶς",[202] which seems to suggest that she actively fulfilled the role. In other cases a woman did hold the title along with her husband or other relatives,[203] but this does not necessarily mean that she received the title from them, nor that she did not actively fulfil the position. Levy noted that members of the grand families of a city tended to hold numerous magistracies.[204] Women of these families were part of this trend. However, this does not mean that the women, along with the men, did not actively fulfil the office involved. Robert has noted that women could hold magistracies alone in this period,[205] and this seems to be the case here.

In other cities a number of πρυτάνεις were the magistrates who formed the principal executive committee of the council.[206] In these cities this was generally

the board which actually provided the political and administrative leadership of the city.[207] They would therefore record resolutions of the Council, register new citizens, write and receive letters and announcements of all types in the name of the city, and would probably have a role to play in financial affairs. The board of πρυτάνεις often presented resolutions to the council and in a number of cities the board of πρυτάνεις presided over the meetings of the council and assembly.

In Phocaea the board of prytaneis fulfilled this role;[208] the inscription about Flavia Ammon given above as 2.5, comes from this city. As we argued above, she seems to have actively fulfilled the office. We are not able to determine if the πρύτανις at Thyateira was a single eponymous official or a member of the board of magistrates.[209] Three women held this title in Thyateira; it seems possible that they were members of the board of magistrates.[210]

The title was widely used in the ancient world.[211] However it was never given to a woman outside of Asia Minor and the coastal islands.[212]

2.7 Stephanephoros – Στεφανηφόρος.

This title literally means "the one who has the right of wearing a crown."[213] The stephanephorate probably originated in Miletus where it was of great antiquity.[214] In our period it was the general title for the eponymous official in Phrygia, Caria and Lydia.[215] Magie lists 22 cities in which the title was used in this way.[216] In these cities this title was thus at "the very top of the whole pyramid of offices."[217]

The title and the official position in the city which it conferred, was generally, although not always,[218] bestowed upon someone who was already a magistrate or someone who held a religious office.[219] Thus the eponymous stephanephorate was a formal title of honour and prestige bestowed upon leading citizens in the community. Cities sometimes elected the Emperor or members of his family to the office,[220] which shows the high honour in which it was held. The office normally involved some public appearances, the giving of banquets and very lavish entertainments.[221] It is thus not a position which involved matters of civic government, but it certainly gave the holder a "high profile" and much praise and honour in the city, involving as it did presiding over civic entertainments and representing the city to the outside world. As in the case of a number of other eponymous offices dealt with here [the eponymous prytanis, demiourgos and hipparchos], the fact that a year should be named after a woman is noteworthy. Thus although the position involved more honour than power, its significance should not be underestimated.[222]

Braunstein lists 26 inscriptions in which a woman in Asia Minor held the

eponymous stephanephorate.[223] Seven of these inscriptionsconcern one woman from Aphrodisias; we learn that she bore the title sixteen times in all.[224] Magie lists nine further women sho held the title[225] to which eight more can now be added,[226] giving a total of 37 women. These are found in 17 different cities in Asia Minor including the coastal islands. The inscriptions date from the second century BCE to the third century CE, although they are more frequent in the Common Era.[227]

In an inscription of the second century BCE from Sardis we learn that Menophila held the title of eponymous stephanephoros. She is depicted, along with two attendants, on the stele; also visible is a wreath along with other objects. The inscription in her honour states "ὁ δ[ά]φ̄ περὶ κρατὶ φορηθεὶς ἀρχὰν μανύει – the wreath worn about the head signifies public office."[228] This seems to indicate that Menophila herself wore the crown involved with the office; it seems likely that other aspects of the position – for example, presiding at banquets – were also performed by her.

An inscription of the first century CE from Priene informs us that Phile held the title of eponymous stephanephoros.[229] She had also built a reservoir and an aqueduct for the city. As Reynolds–Tannenbaum point out, it is possible that she received the title as a reward for her donation.[230] Phile's husband is named, but he does not hold any title in the inscription; it is also clear that Phile made the donation by herself. It thus seems most likely that the title Phile held was her own and that she fulfilled the role of stephanephoros herself.[231]

In a number of other cases it can be shown that a woman has not simply received this title from a man. Thus in some cases the father of a woman is known but has no title[232] or the husband similarly has no title.[233] In other cases however both husband and wife hold the title,[234] or both father and daughter.[235] In one case from Thyatira, a woman's father, husband and son all hold the stephenephorate along with her. Clearly this was a prominent and honourable family in the city.[236] But in these cases it is probable that the woman held the title on her own account, since in many cases a woman held the title independently of any man.[237]

Often the title was not eponymous, another title holder fulfilling this role in these cities. In this situation the title of stephanephoros probably involved the bestowal of honours to a slightly lesser extent, but still involved considerable expense. Women held the title without being eponymous in 15 inscriptions in nine cities.[238] In an inscription from Heracleia Salbace it is noted that Tate had held the stephanephorate λαμπρῶς – magnificently. Robert notes that she had fulfilled the functions involved herself. She also paid 2340 denarii, the *summa*

honoraria associated with the position.[239]

The title was very rare outside of Asia Minor,[240] although it was given to men at least once in Rome[241] and once in Athens.[242] But only in Asia Minor did women hold this position which involved much prestige and considerable financial outlay.

2.8 Agonothetis – Ἀγωνοθέτις.

This position, which could be as costly a liturgy as being the gymnasiarch, involved responsibility for the athletic contests and other spectacles such as competitions in music and drama which were connected with the festivals and games of the city. These contests were probably the most important feature of such occasions in the eyes of the public.[243] The agonothete had "to enroll the various contestants, to organize and conduct the events and to award the prizes."[244] When, as often happened, the money from the city was insufficient to maintain the splendour of the occasion, the agonothete had personally to provide the necessary amount. However, there was far more that a public-spirited agonothete might undertake, such as providing lavish hospitality for the competitors, serving refreshments to the audience, or even distributing money and wine to all, slaves included, for the duration of the festival. Despite the expense, it was a position that people were willing to fulfil.[245]

Braunstein lists twelve inscriptions in which women in Asia Minor bore this title[246] to which Magie added three[247] and a further three may now be added[248] giving a total of eighteen. These come from fourteen cities and are to be dated from the first to the third century CE.

Again women held the title in their own right[249] though it was sometimes also held by other family members.[250] Jones thinks that at times the title could be hereditary in the family of the founder of a particular festival.[251]

In an inscription from Thyatira, Julia is described as – "ἀγωνοθετήσασαν λαμπρῶς καὶ πολυδαπάνως" – "having been agonothete with magnificence and at great expense."[252] Such praise suggests that Julia did all that a man who held this office would have done.

The title was widely used in the ancient world.[253] In Sparta one woman is recorded as being an agonothete[254] although Braunstein regards the reading as dubious.[255] We will now discuss the other titles women held in Asia Minor.

2.9 Hipparchos – Ἵππαρχης.

This title is mainly found in the city of Cyzicus in Phrygia, although it also occurs in Lycia and elsewhere.[256] In Cyzicus, at least in the first two centuries CE it was the title for the eponymous magistrate.[257] The title literally means "master of the horse."[258] It was used, however, as a title of honour, as is shown

by it being bestowed upon the Emperor Gaius[259] and on the god Poseidon[260] at Cyzicus. It could have involved some civil authority and would definitely have involved the provision of money for some civic activities.[261] Since it was eponymous it was the highest civic office at Cyzicus.[262]

Braunstein lists four inscriptions in which women held this title;[263] one more inscription is now known.[264] These all come from Cyzicus. When a father is mentioned, he does not bear the title.[265] In some inscriptions no man is mentioned in association with the woman hipparchos.[266] No woman held this title outside of Asia Minor.

2.10 Gerousia – *Γερουσία.*

The gerousia was probably an aristocratic society of elders centred on the gymnasium.[267] Whilst these societies enjoyed both political and religious influence,[268] they were primarily social societies without any administrative involvement in the life of the city.[269] An inscription from Sebaste in Phrygia and dated to 99CE records the admission of 71 people to the gerousia. Three of the people named are women[270] and come from a prominent family. Paris suggested that this explained the exceptional privilege of admission to the gerousia being given to them.[271] In an inscription from Heracleia Salbace, Tate who had been gymnasiarch and stephanephoros was described as the first woman honoured with admission in the college of the very sacred geraioi.[272]

We know of two other women outside of Asia Minor who were honoured in this regard. On Thasos the gerousia honoured Flavia Vibia Sabina, who was "mother of the gerousia" and was described as "the only and the first of all those who participated in the same honours as the members of the gerousia."[273] We do not know if she was a member of the gerousia herself. Finally at Thessalonica, in the third century CE a woman was "*γερουσιάρχισσα*" – probably president of the Gerousia.[274] Clearly, the number of women honoured in this way was very limited; four come from Asia Minor, two [of whom probably only one was a member of the gerousia] come from elsewhere.

2.11 Strategoi – *Στρατηγός.*

We discussed this title in Chapter 3, section 3.2.4. We noted that it was the most frequent name given to the magisterial board of a city, and involved large responsibility and considerable power.

In Aegiale on the island of Amorgos an inscription has been found in which the Strategoi and the Dekaprotoi together proposed a piece of legislation to the council. One of the Strategoi was a woman.[275] Although this is the only known case, it is notable that a woman could attain this leading position in a city.[276]

2.12 Panegyriarch – Πανηγυριάρχης.

In some cities the festivals were under the general supervision of a panegyriarch, who probably had similar financial and organisational responsibilities to an agonothete and perhaps may have just been an alternative name for that office although both titles are found in the some cities.[277] In these cases the panegyriarch was probably the director of the whole festival, whilst the agonothete directed particular contests.[278]

In an inscription from Cnidus a woman bore this title.[279] She is described as παν̣ηγυριαρχήσασας φιλοτειμῶς καὶ ἐπιφανῶς – "having been panegyriarch with public spirit and distinction." This seems to indicate that she filled the position actively. No other instances of a woman holding the title are known, although it does occur elsewhere.[280]

2.13 Lyciarch – Λυκιάρχισσα **and Asiarch** – Ἀσιάρχης– **Women as officials of the Federations.**

In Asia Minor a number of federations of cities were formed; for instance the Lycian League and the Commonalty or Federation of Asia or of Galatia. These Federations had responsibility for the annual ceremonies of the imperial cult, the care of the temple of this cult and the celebration of games in honour of deified emperors. They also discussed matters of general interest concerning the administration of the province, thus safeguarding the interests of the cities against the excesses of imperial officials.[281] The leaders of these federations held various titles – Lyciarchs, Asiarchs and Galatiarchs.[282] The Lyciarch was the presiding officer of the Federation of Lycia and it was an office that was highly prized as being the pinnacle of a federal career.[283] The League also had a high priest [archiereus] who was also a high ranking official.[284]

In inscriptions we find four archiereiai [high priestess] of Lycia and two female "Λυκιάρχισσαι".[285] Jameson writes:

> it would be natural to assume that the women so designated actually served the offices concerned. Yet many scholars, with one notable exception[286] have been reluctant to accept the notion. It is therefore usually assumed that the ladies in question sport such titles with reference to offices held by their husbands.[287]

However, Jameson shows that in only two cases out of the six does the husband hold the corresponding title, and both are in the case of priestesses. Thus in the two cases in which women carry the title of "Lyciarchissa" the husband does not hold the corresponding title of Lyciarch.[288] It seems likely therefore that two women held this very important position in the Lycian League in their own right.

We also find one woman with the title of "Asiarch", which was the foremost

title in Asia and was probably given to benefactors.[289] However, her husband was also an Asiarch and it is possible she received the title through him.[290] The occurrence of both husband and wife being Pontarchs in another inscription is probably to be similarly explained.[291]

This brings to a close our discussion of the various titles held by women in Asia Minor.[292] We have suggested throughout that women held these titles in their own right, and actively fulfilled the tasks involved. It has been difficult to prove this point, but it seems to me that the evidence points strongly in this direction. Any other hypothesis must account for the evidence as well or better.

We are able to conclude that although there are a very few exceptional cases elsewhere,[293] the prominence of women in social and political life as shown by the titles they held, has been confined to Asia Minor and the coastal islands. Thus Ramsay wrote:

> The honours and influence which belonged to women in the cities of Asia Minor form one of the most remarkable features in the history of the country.[294]

Similarly, Delling noted that:

> Many women in Asia Minor held public positions, which elsewhere were only held by men. Thus we must acknowledge that the political activity of women in Asia Minor was especially well developed.[295]

We are also able to make the following comments:

[i] The prominence of women is not uniform across the whole of Asia Minor.[296] The phenomenon is most noticeable on the West Coast especially in Caria and Ionia, less noticeable on the Southern Coast, very infrequent in the north of Asia Minor [Bithynia and Pontus] and does not occur at all, as far as I know, in the regions of Galatia and Cappadocia.

[ii] Many of these women leaders probably belonged to the wealthy classes for considerable wealth was required before one became for instance, a gymnasiarch. It is clear that the rich had a virtual monopoly on the sort of offices which are likely to be recorded in inscriptions.[297] In addition, social standing was vital in gaining office,[298] and the fulfillment of office involved hon_our and prestige.

However, when we remember that only a small proportion of inscriptions are preserved, it seems likely that we are dealing with a significantly large group of wealthy[299] and prominent women. It is also significant that the women concerned had the freedom to use their wealth as they saw fit.[300]

[iii] We should note that there are some titles which women did not receive in

Asia Minor, such as "ταμίας" – treasurer, and "ἀστυνόμος" – city guardian, who cared for the fabric of the city. Some titles were also given only infrequently to exceptional women [eg strategos]. We cannot argue for anything like the equality of men and women; there were limits to the responsibilites given to women by a city.

We noted in section 1 that Jewish communities in Asia Minor seem to have followed the "minority view" with regard to the position of women by accepting women in leadership positions. We can now suggest why they adopted this particular strand in their tradition. The evidence suggests that this prominence of women was due to the influence of the environment on the synagogue communities. The fact that women were prominent in political and social life led to the Jewish communities adopting a minority strand in their tradition and thus to the appointment of women leaders in the synagogues.[301]

This interpretation is underscored by the fact that our three [or four, if we are able to include Jael] prominent Jewish women occurred in Ionia and Caria, the two regions in which women's leadership in the community was most noticeable and widespread. We are also able to cite the following parallels from the same localities as the Jewish women leaders:

[i] In Smyrna, where Rufina was archisynagogos we know of three women who held the eponymous stephanephoros[302] and one woman who was an agonothete.[303]

[ii] In Phocaea, where Tation was honoured by the synagogue we find one woman who was prytanis, twice stephanephoros and agonothete.[304] Here we are able to recognise a great similarity between the bestowal of the stephanephorate by the city and the honouring of Tation with a golden crown and with the proedria. Both involved a position of prestige given to a leading woman of some means. It is possible that the synagogue community at Phocaea had the honour of the Stephanephoros in mind when it made its award to Tation.

[iii] We have no record of women leaders in the city of Myndos, the home of Theopempte.

[iv] In Aphrodisias where Jael was perhaps a woman prostates we know of one woman who was both the eponymous stephanephoros and gymnasiarch,[305] another who held the title of stephanephoros 16 times in all,[306] and six other women who were the eponymous stephanephoros.[307]

These parallels seem to make our interpretation very plausible.

3. Conclusions.

3.1 This study has hopefully shown the value of inscriptional evidence for the study of Jewish women. In this particular field its value is enhanced by

the fact that it enables us to overcome one of the main problems in the study of women in antiquity – that virtually all our literary evidence comes from men.[308] These literary sources thus tell us how men saw women, not how women saw themselves.[309] In addition, they may only reflect the theory of the age with regard to women and not the actual practice.[310] However, many of our inscriptions were written by women about themselves, are non–polemical and are about actual events. Thus they shed a whole new light on our topic.

3.2 We might conclude from our Jewish inscriptions that this phenomenon of women's leadership in the synagogues of Asia Minor is only an aberration found in a few communities. However we must recall the problem of inscriptional evidence. Apamea and its environs had a Jewish population sufficient to donate one hundred pounds of gold in Temple tax; this represents a Jewish population of many thousands in the vicinity of Apamea.[311] Yet we have only very few inscriptions from Apameian Jews.[312] Likewise, before the discovery of the inscription from Aphrodisias, we could only guess that there was a community of Jews there. Now we know there were over 120 people involved in the community. Clearly the existence of three [or four] known women leaders in Asia Minor makes it possible to postulate that there were in fact many more.

3.3 We cannot show that women in all the synagogues of Asia Minor were honoured with a respect and prominence they did not have elsewhere. What we are able to do however, is to add another dimension to the emerging picture of the diversity of Judaism in Asia Minor. Just as some communities were prominent in their cities, others less so; just as some were prosperous compared to others, so also at least some Jewish communities in Asia Minor gave an unusually prominent place to women.

3.4 We have shown that this is an area in which the local environment influenced the practice of the synagogue.[313] We have also mentioned the effect of the environment on the Jewish communities with regard to the bestowal of honours. Other matters are dealt with elsewhere in this study.[314] It seems that local factors were a strong formative influence on the Jewish communities.[315]

Chapter 6.

Theos Hypsistos and Sabazios – Syncretism in Judaism in Asia Minor?

1. Theos Hypsistos – The Problem.

There are a number of inscriptions from Asia Minor and elsewhere, in which we find Ὕψιστος "the Highest" or Θεὸς Ὕψιστος "the Highest God". The word Ὕψιστος is used of Yahweh in the Septuagint, the NT, in Jewish Pseudepigrapha and by other Jewish authors. However, it is also used in classical literature and inscriptions of pagan divinities, most frequently of Zeus.

The problem with the inscriptions is therefore to discover when the term is used by Jews to refer to Yahweh and when it is used by pagans to refer to a pagan divinity. Scholars have also thought it was used by "Judaising pagans", and thus indicated Jewish influence.[1]

In fact at the hands of Franz Cumont the body of evidence to be examined here gave rise to a complex and influential theory of syncretism involving Judaism in Asia Minor. He argued that the title Θεὸς Ὕψιστος, whilst being used of Yahweh, was used of Zeus under Jewish influence. Similarly, in Asia Minor "Theos Hypsistos" was used in inscriptions by both Jews and pagans [who had adopted some Jewish beliefs], as the name of the God of Israel. Associations of the cult of "Theos Hypsistos" were formed by these people, especially in Asia Minor, associations which adopted some but not all of the practices of the synagogue.[2] Further, again under Jewish influence, "Theos Hypsistos" was used of the deity Sabazios. This, with other evidence led Cumont to believe that the two deities were identified in certain thiasoi. Thus groups which worshipped Θεὸς Ὕψιστος in fact represented a fusion of the two cults – Yahweh and Sabazios.[3] All this occurred in Asia Minor where Sabazios was thought to have originated, where "Theos Hypsistos" occurs particularly frequently as a title, and where many Jews were known to have lived.[4] Thus it was thought that Jews in Asia Minor were highly syncretistic and that in this area a "mixing" of Judaism with paganism was particularly prevalent.[5] A number of others followed Cumont in adopting this opinion.[6]

2. The Pagan Use of Ὕψιστος.

Ὕψιστος was used quite widely in the ancient world. It is well known that in the time of the Roman Empire there was a distinct trend towards monotheism and thus towards the worship of one god as the supreme deity. This trend was prepared for by Greek philosophy and promoted by the influence of Oriental religions, and was widespread even where there was no Jewish influence.[7] In addition under the Roman Empire, in parallel with the reality of Emperors with

almost universal powers, some local gods were thought of as the supreme rulers of the universe.[8] Local gods seemed insufficient; to be worth honouring they needed to have world–wide authority. It was natural therefore that the epithet "the Highest" should be used by pagans to indicate that the god to whom they were referring was, in their eyes, the most important god. Thus the epithet Hypsistos, or the name Theos Hypsistos was used of pagan deities throughout the Roman Empire.[9] Ζεὺς Ὕψιστος.[10] The cult of "Zeus Hypsistos" was fully recognised in some places. For example, we know of a temple of Zeus Hypsistos at Thebes, a precinct at Iasos, a priest at Mylasa and a cult association at Edessa.[11] In dedications to Zeus Hypsistos he is sometimes called "Theos Hypsistos" or simply "Hypsistos". Thus Nock mentions votive inscriptions from a cult at Athens in which we find Διὶ ὑψίστῳ three times, Θεῷ ὑψίστῳ twice and ὑψίστῳ eight times.[12] Clearly the three titles are treated as equivalents in this case. Thus "Hypsistos" by itself or "Theos Hypsistos" could be used for Zeus.[13] It seems that with the trend towards monotheism, the god Zeus Hypsistos could gradually come to be given the general, elevated but more colourless title Θεὸς ὕψιστος.[14] Nock, in the fundamental study of this subject, concludes that where Zeus Hypsistos and "Theos Hypsistos" occur side by side, the Zeus form was the earlier and "Theos Hypsistos" may be an unofficial synonym for him.[15]

2.2 However, dedications or inscriptions to "Theos Hypsistos" are sometimes clearly to deities other than Zeus, or are made to an unnamed pagan deity who was worshipped under this general name. Nock points out that:

> A dedication was addressed to the gods and not to the public, and therefore there was not in antiquity that need, which a modern man might feel, for the avoidance of ambiguity; circumlocutions were used which were intelligible only to the dedicant ... or the god was not named at all.[16]

It was thus not important to the dedicant that others understood exactly to which god he was referring. Hence the same title can be used for a number of different gods. For example in Syria "Theos Hypsistos" [and also "Zeus Hypsistos"[17]] was used to refer to the local Baal of a region, who was often a mountain god.[18] In Lydia, "Thea Hypsiste" was used for some form of the Mother goddess.[19] In Egypt, Hypsistos was used as an epithet of Isis.[20] Further examples could be given. Clearly, "Theos Hypsistos" or "Hypsistos" can designate a whole range of exalted deities.[21]

3. The Jewish Use of Ὕψιστος.

3.1 In the LXX, ὕψιστος occurs over 110 times, particularly in the Psalms. Apart from a few topographical references, it is always used to denote Yahweh, and is generally the translation of "עֶלְיוֹן" or "עֶלְי".[22] Whilst there was no

one standardised form of usage of ὕψιστος in the LXX, it occurs most frequently in the phrase ὁ ὕψιστος – "the Most High" and quite often in the phrases ὁ Θεός ὁ ὕψιστος [on occasions without the articles] and Κύριος ὁ ὕψιστος.[23] Hypsistos is found particularly frequently in some of the later writings of the LXX. Thus, after Κύριος it is the most common divine name used in Ben Sirach.

3.2 Hypsistos occurs quite often in various books of the Pseudepigrapha, often simply as "ὕψιστος".[24] Thus it is found particularly frequently in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. For example, in the TAsh. 5:4 we read:

τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐξεζήτησα κατὰ πᾶσαν ἰσχύν μου.[25]

The usage of "Hypsistos" in Joseph and Aseneth is very interesting. Theos Hypsistos occurs as a title for God when pagans are addressed by Jews, or by the "heavenly man". Thus the heavenly man pronounces a blessing on the seven virgins:

εὐλογήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὕψιστος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον.[26]

The title also occurs when pagans are speaking to Jews of Yahweh. Thus in 8:2 Aseneth greets Joseph:

χαίρος κύριε εὐλογημένε τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ὑψιστῳ.[27]

Thus Hypsistos was clearly considered appropriate in such a context, as a name for God which could be put in the mouth of pagans in Jewish literature. The equivalent expression to υψιστος is also found in Pseudepigrapha written in languages other than Greek.[28] Thus the Jewish Pseudepigrapha show that "Hypsistos" [and its equivalents] was used as a way of designating Yahweh in the Intertestamental period.

3.3 Philo uses ὕψιστος, although quite rarely. Often he is simply quoting the LXX;[29] he does not use the term much when writing freely. The following passages are noteworthy.

3.3.1 In L.A. III.82, Philo seems anxious to guard against a polytheistic or syncretistic interpretation of the phrase "the Most High" in Gen 14:18, and also betrays an awareness that other gods are called "the Most High":

> For he [Melchizedek] is priest of the Most High [τοῦ γὰρ ὑψίστου ἐστὶν ἱερεύς[30]] not that there is any other not Most High – for God being One "is in heaven above and on earth beneath and there is none besides Him." [Deut 4:39]

3.3.2 In Leg. 278 Agrippa writes to Gaius:

> I was born, as you know, a Jew. Jerusalem is my home where stands the holy Temple of the Most High God.

Philo uses similar wording in Flac. 46, likewise addressed to non–Jews. Thus, as we saw with Joseph and Aseneth, "the Most High God" was a name for Yahweh which was considered as appropriate when addressing non–Jews.

3.3.3 Philo, in reporting the orders of both Julius Caesar and Augustus with respect to Jewish sacrifices refers to the Jewish God as "the Most High God".[31] Schürer thought that the term ὁ ὕψιστος Θεός served the Roman authorities as a way to describe the Jewish God.[32] However, Philo does not profess to quote the Emperors verbally and it is probable that he is using language which he thought was acceptable. It is not therefore evidence that the Roman authorities used the term as an official designation for Yahweh, and there is no other evidence from the period to suggest this. In addition, in view of the term's use for other deities outlined above, there is no sense in which it can be thought of as an official designation for Yahweh in his people's dealings with foreign rulers.[33]

Philo is therefore generally cautious about the use of the term and is anxious to avoid misunderstanding. The title was perhaps too "loaded" with meaning for pagan readers for Philo to use it freely. Indeed in view of the pagan usage outlined above the term would not even imply monotheism for a pagan reader. It would rather simply suggest the creation of a hierarchy in their pantheon. This must have limited its usefulness for a writer like Philo. Yet he does use it when speaking to non–Jews of the Jewish God, or when he wants to have non–Jews, whose words he purports to give, refer to Yahweh in a comprehensible way.

3.4 Josephus uses the term only when quoting Augustus' decree in favour of the Jews. Augustus writes:

> the Jews may follow their own customs ... just as they followed them in the time of Hyrcanus, high priest of the Most High God [ἀρχιερέως Θεοῦ ὑψίστου], ...[34]

Although the evidence is very limited, we can suggest that Josephus also regarded the term as one which was prone to encourage misunderstanding and syncretism, and thus had too many overtones in his society for him to use it freely.

Thus we have seen that the term Hypsistos is found to a significant degree in some Jewish writings. We have noted that, for some authors, it was regarded as a term which would be readily understood by pagans and could be used in the mouth of pagans to refer to Yahweh. For Philo [and perhaps for Josephus] it was also a title which had to be used with care because of the danger of misunderstanding.[35]

4. Yahweh and the Pagan Usage of Ὕψιστος – Identity or Influence?

4.1 It has been claimed that "Hypsistos" was the name for Yahweh in Asia Minor. Thus Cumont, in referring to a bas–relief in which Cybele was shown along with "Theos Hypsistos" wrote:

> Theos Hypsistos, that is to say, the god of Israel.[36]

However, we have seen that many gods received the title "Theos Hypsistos". Definite proof is required that Yahweh is meant, and this is highly unlikely in this case when Cybele is also shown on the relief.[37]

In a similar way, Nilsson wrote as follows:

> That Zeus was the highest God, suggests that the Jewish God was identified with him and that he [the Jewish God] was to be called Ζεὺς Ὕψιστος.[38]

This sort of custom, Nilsson argued, began principally in inland Asia Minor where Jewish influence was thought to have been considerable.[39] Thus, dedications to "Zeus Hypsistos" would be made by Jews, who understood that they were making dedications to Yahweh. However, that Zeus was given the epithet "Hypsistos" and that Yahweh was called "Theos Hypsistos" does not imply a relationship between them. We can explain the parallel usage of the epithet quite satisfactorily through the popularity of belief in the "Highest god" on the one hand and the Biblical usage of the term on the other, without proposing any relationship between the two gods.[40] We have no evidence that Zeus Hypsistos and Yahweh [=Theos Hypsistos] were related as Nilsson suggests.

4.2 Some scholars have claimed that whilst in the majority of cases "Hypsistos" was used of a pagan deity, *this particular title* was used because of "Jewish influence". Anderson wrote:

> The title of "the Most High God" was borrowed by the Phrygian and other native religions from Judaism, which exercised a profound influence on them. They still remained pagan, but the absorption of Biblical ideas paved the way for the rapid progress of Christianity in Asia Minor.[41]

However, this claim is highly unlikely. We noted above the trend towards monotheism, which meant that a number of different gods were thought of as the Supreme deity or the "Highest god", quite independently of Jewish influence. The frequency of the title "Theos Hypsistos" in non–Jewish contexts reflects this tendency to concentrate powers in the hands of one exalted deity. Thus there is sufficient reason for pagans to use "Hypsistos" of any god, and sufficient usage in clearly non–Jewish circles, for there to be no need to suggest that Jewish influence was involved.

Further, there is also no reason to think that the use of the title by a pagan

would suggest to another passer-by that the dedicator was a "Judaizer". "Hypsistos" was a vague title and thus it would not be clear which "god" was being referred to.[42] Thus "Jewish influence" would not have been an explanation for the use of the epithet in the period of its use; neither is it required now to explain its popularity.[43]

However, it is important to note the particular popularity of the epithet "Hypsistos" in Asia Minor, especially in Phrygia and Lydia.[44] Was it popular there because of the significant Jewish population in the area, and thus because of "Jewish influence"?

It has been noted by a number of scholars that in Asia Minor, particularly in Phrygia and Lydia, the trend towards monotheism with its concentration of powers in the hands of one deity, appears to have been particularly prevalent. Thus in Asia Minor in the Imperial period there is a noticeable popularity of vague, abstract and almost anonymous divine titles such as Θεὸς Ὅσιος καὶ Δίκαιος or Ὅσιον καὶ Δίκαιον or simply Θεῖον. It seems that a quasi-philosophical notion of divinity was popular. Robert claimed that this was:

> a powerful, original and complex religious movement in Phrygia and its neighbouring regions.[45]

This religious movement was clearly pagan, and does not seem to have itself been influenced by Judaism.[46] Another feature of pagan piety is indicated by the occurrence of the terms ἄγγελος, ἀγγελικός or Θεῖος ἀγγελικός in inscriptions which come from Stratoniceia in Caria and elsewhere in Lydia and Phyrgia.[47] It seems that here the deity was considered as so remote that a "messenger" or intermediary, sometimes considered as a deity himself, was required to intercede for his worshippers and thus bridge the gap between the divine and the human. Certainly, the trend towards a more abstract notion of the deity is clear in these inscriptions.[48] In a religious atmosphere in which dedications to such abstract deities as these are found, and in which mediation between the god and his worshippers was felt to be necessary, the dissemination and particular popularity of dedications to "Theos Hypsistos" in Asia Minor can be explained without any recourse to "Jewish influence". This local trend is therefore sufficient explanation of the observed phenomenon and thus "Jewish influence" is not required to explain it.[49]

5. "Theos Hypsistos" in Jewish Inscriptions.

Given the usage of the term outlined above, an inscription using "Theos Hypsistos" is to be regarded as Jewish only if there are clear signs of Jewish provenance and no indications that it might be pagan.[50] In this section we will discuss all the known "Theos Hypsistos" inscriptions which are Jewish in order

to gain a complete picture of the use of the term in both Asia Minor and the Dispora.[51]

5.1 A proseuche built at Alexandria in the second century BCE was dedicated "[Θε]ῶι ὑψίστωι".[52] This wording was repeated in an inscription of the second or first century BCE from Athribis in Egypt,[53] and probably in another [fragmentary] inscription from Leontopolis.[54]

5.2 Two Jewish inscriptions from the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century BCE which use "Theos Hypsistos" come from the island of Rheneia, the burial place of the inhabitants of Delos. These almost identical inscriptions are prayers which call upon the Highest God to revenge the untimely murder of two Jewish girls, Heraclea and Marthina. The inscriptions are shown to be Jewish by their repeated allusions to the LXX.[55] Clearly, in these two inscriptions ὁ Θεός ὁ ὕψιστος is derived directly from the LXX.

5.3 A number of other inscriptions from Delos use "Theos Hypsistos". They come from a building, first excavated in 1912–1913 and constructed in the first half of the first century BCE,[56] which has been claimed to be the synagogue of Delos. However, much of the debate about the identity of the building centres around whether or not these crucial inscriptions are Jewish. The inscriptions are:

Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ Λυσίμαχος ἐπὶ προσευχῆι.[57]
"Agathocles and Lysimachos, in fulfilment of prayer."

Ζωσᾶς Παρίος Θεῶι Ὑψίστωι εὐχήν.[58]
"Zosas of Paros, to the Highest God, in fulfillment of a vow."

Λαωδίκη Θεῶι Ὑψίστωι σωθεῖσα ταῖς ὑφ' αὐτοῦ θαραπήαις εὐχήν.[59]
"Laodice to the Highest God, who cured her of her infirmities, in fulfillment of a vow."

Λυσίμαχος ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ Θεῶ Ὑψίστω χαριστήριον.[60]
"Lysimachos, in his own name, to the Highest God, a thank offering."

Ὑψίστῳ εὐχὴν Μαρκία.[61]
"To the Most High, Marcia in fulfillment of a vow."

In 1970 Bruneau, who had recently excavated part of the site, argued that these inscriptions were Jewish and that the building was in fact a synagogue. All the arguments cannot be given in detail here.[62] However, the following points are noteworthy.

5.3.1 Whilst the dedications to "Theos Hypsistos" could be to Zeus Hypsistos, [or some other deity, although it is important to note that they are all to "Theos

Hypsistos" and never to "Zeus Hypsistos"] we know from the two inscriptions from Rheneia that Jews on Delos did call Yahweh "Theos Hypsistos". This is precisely the "further evidence" which is required to identify any Theos Hypsistos inscriptions as Jewish.[63] Further, it is unlikely that this is a sanctuary of Zeus, because "Zeus Hypsistos" had his own sanctuary on Mount Cynthus on Delos.[64] Thus it seems very probable that "Theos Hypsistos" here means Yahweh, for this is a current title used by Jews on Delos.

5.3.2 Whilst ἐπὶ προσευχῆι without the article probably means "in fulfilment of [a] prayer" rather than "in the synagogue", as Mazur pointed out,[65] προσευχή remains almost exclusively a Jewish term. Robert thus asked how one explains the term προσευχή [even if it does not designate the building] apart from the Jewish cult?[66] Clearly, this is also a major point against those who do not consider the building a synagogue.

5.3.3 There is nothing in the architecture of the building which would make it exceptional as a synagogue; the orientation towards the east, the three entrances, the seat for the synagogue leader and the well are all important features of synagogue buildings and are also divergent from common practice on Delos.[67]

Bruneau claims therefore, that the convergence of evidence allows the identification as a synagogue to be assured.[68] We can thus be almost completely certain that the building was a synagogue; this view has gained considerable recent support.[69] Hence, we can have the same degree of confidence that the dedications to "Theos Hypsistos" are Jewish.

5.4 Sherwin–White has recently investigated the evidence for the Jewish community on the island of Cos.[70] The following is one of four Jewish inscriptions:

Θέανος Θεῶ Ὑψίστῳ εὐχήν.[71]

Sherwin–White notes that "Theos Hypsistos" is unlikely to denote a pagan deity in this case for three reasons.

[a] There is no evidence that the epithet "Hypsistos" was used to denote other gods on Cos, despite a large number of inscriptions.[72]

[b] The dedication is precisely paralleled by the series of dedications to "Theos Hypsistos" from the synagogue on Delos.

[c] We know that a Jewish community existed on Cos.[73]

Thus, Sherwin–White concludes that "Theos Hypsistos" was in this case the God of the Jews and that Theanus was a Jew or a "Judaising Greek", a conclusion which has been accepted by recent scholars.[74] Clearly we cannot decide between these two possibilities, although the first is more likely, given the Jewish population on the island and our findings in section 6 below.

5.5 We have previously discussed the following undated inscription from

Acmonia, Phrygia:

[ἐὰν δέ τις ἕτερον σῶμα εἰσενέγκῃ, ἔσ]ται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον καὶ τὸ ἀράς δρέπανον εἰς τὸν ὦκον αὐτοῦ [εἰσέλθοιτο καὶμηδέναν ἐνκαταλείψαιτο].[75]

[And whoever introduces another body], he will have to reckon with the Highest God and may the sickle of the curse come into his house [and leave no-one behind.]

The phrase ἀράς δρέπανον is an allusion to the LXX of Zech 5:1–5, and it is generally agreed therefore that the inscription is Jewish.[76] The inscription also contains the phrase τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον, and thus shows that some Jews in Phrygia used this expression to refer to Yahweh.[77]

5.6 The following inscription has been found recently near Acmonia:

Ἐβίκτητος ἐπύησεν Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ εὐχήν.[78]

Epiktetos fulfilled his vow to the Most High God.

This inscription was found in the village of Yenice where CIJ 767, cited above as 5.5 was also found. Drew–Bear's comment is cautious:

> It is thus probable that there existed a Jewish community in this portion of the territory of Akmonia and that our Epiktetos had relations with it.[79]

However, it seems most likely that Epiktetos was in fact a Jew. We know of large Jewish communities in the area and also that they actually used the term "Theos Hypsistos" for Yahweh. There is also no indication of pagan provenance in the inscription. We cannot be certain, but this seems the most reasonable explanation.

5.7 A manumission document from Gorgippia in the Bosporos Kingdom and dated to 41 CE begins θεῶι ὑψίστωι παντοκράτορι εὐλογητῷ, and ends with the oath formula ὑπὸ Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, "under Zeus, Ge, Helios". The manumission took place [ἐν] τῆι προσευχῆ.[80]

The opening formula strongly suggests that this is a Jewish inscription, παντοκράτωρ and εὐλογητός being common in Jewish literature and only very rarely used by pagans.[81] The oath formula is a common pagan formula. Schürer–Vermes–Millar note however, that the Elephantine papyri show that observing Jews might make use of pagan oath formulae, and argue that in this case of a manumission, its use could well have been a legal necessity.[82] They are satisfied that it is therefore a Jewish inscription, and this is confirmed by the manumission taking place in the προσευχή.[83] There are three other inscriptions, in which the same opening formula either occurs or can be confidently restored.[84] All three are from Gorgippia and are clearly related. An inscription from nearby

Panticapaeum, dated to 306 CE is almost certainly Jewish. It is a dedication to Θεός Ὕψιστος ἐπήκοος and records the building of a προσευχή.[85] Thus in these five inscriptions we see "Theos Hypsistos" almost certainly used by Jews of Yahweh.

5.8 The following undated inscription was found at Sibidunda in Pisidia and published in 1960:

Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ καὶ Ἁγείᾳ Καταφυγῇ Ἀρτίμας υἱὸς Ἀρτίμου Μομμίου καὶ Μαρκίας ὁ αὐτὸς κτίστης ἀνέστησεν καὶ τὸν θυμιατιστηρον κά(λ)κεον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.[86]

To the Most High God (who is) also the Holy Refuge, Artemas son of Artemas Mommios and Markias, the same founder, set up also the bronze incense burner out of his own (wealth).

Robert has shown that this is a Jewish inscription. He writes:

> In the religious texts of antiquity, it is in the Septuagint alone that καταφύγη appears and that God is the Refuge.[87]

It seems therefore that this inscription has been inspired by the LXX, and that "Theos Hypsistos" here is Yahweh. The epithet ἁγία is also consonant with it being a Jewish inscription.[88] It is interesting that the object which was dedicated by Artemas was a censer for the use of incense.[89]

5.9 A newly discovered inscription to be dated in the late second or third century CE, from Kaleciuk, north–east of Ankara reads:

Τῷ μεγάλῳ Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ καὶ Ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ τοῖς Ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ Ἀνγέλοις καὶ τῇ προσκυνητῇ αὐτοῦ προσευχῇ τὰ ὧδε ἔργα γείνεται.[90]

The works here set forth are for the Great and Most High God of Heaven and for his holy angels and for his venerable house of prayer.

There is a continuing debate about the religious background of this inscription. We should note the following points:

[a] The article is unusual with Theos Hypsistos in dedications. It is found in many of the occurrences of Hypsistos in the LXX [although Ben Sira is an exception] and in some Jewish inscriptions.[91]

[b] The epithet Ἐπουράνιος is found in non–Jewish inscriptions, but is also used in the LXX, although rarely.[92]

[c] The expression ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι is found in Jewish sources[93] and in patristic Greek.[94]

[d] προσευχή is characteristically used to describe a place of prayer in Jewish inscriptions, as we have noted previously.[95]

[e] We note the absence of specifically polytheistic elements.

Sheppard tentatively assigned the inscription to a form of Syrian pagan-

ism which had borrowed from Judaism, although he wrongly thought that the expression "holy angels" was not found in Jewish sources.[96] However, Robert thinks that it is Jewish because of the various expressions contained in the inscription. Other scholars agree with this verdict;[97] thus the inscription can be included among Jewish inscriptions using Theos Hypsistos with a high degree of certainty.

5.10 This inscription, probably to be dated in the first century CE, from Kayakent in North Galatia has also been published recently:

δύναμις Ὑψιστοῦ[98]

The power of the Most High.

Mitchell writes of this inscription:

> The allusion to the power of the Almighty is typically Jewish. Compare the frequent allusions in the Psalms to ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις.[99]

Although a Jewish provenance is not the only possibility, it remains the most likely one for this inscription.[100]

6. Inscriptions in which Jewish influence can be detected behind the use of "Theos Hypsistos".

We have seen that Jews used the title "Theos Hypsistos" for Yahweh in both literary sources and in inscriptions. We have rejected the view that Jewish influence was required to explain the popularity of the epithet "Hypsistos" in pagan inscriptions. However, we need now to consider the possiblity that in at least some cases, however few they may be, the epithet "Hypsistos" was used precisely because of the influence of Jews. Here the Noah coins are a good example. Nock comments in this regard:

> We may further grant that a term might spread from Jews and Judaizers and then go to wider circles on its own merits, as at Apamea in Phrygia the type of Noah's ark found its way onto civic coinage.[101]

Did such influence in fact occur with regard to the epithet "Hypsistos"? It is extremely difficult to tell. If a pagan used the term because of Jewish influence, but made a dedication to a pagan deity, we will be unable to discern Jewish influence in the background.[102] It is thus likely that there will be a number of cases in which such influence will go undetected.

However, we will probably have more chance of detecting Jewish influence if the dedicator of an inscription had regular contact with the Jewish community and thus comes into the category of a "sympathizer" or "God-worshipper". Thus, if we can see that the use of a pagan term is only purely formulaic, that predominantly Jewish terms are used, including Theos Hypsistos, and if we

know of Jewish communities in the area, we can at least suggest that here the dedicator has been influenced to a significant degree by Judaism, and is perhaps a "God–worshipper".[103]

6.1 A second inscription containing the term "Theos Hypsistos" has recently been found near Acmonia [cf. 5.6 above].

Ἀγαθῇ Τύχ[η]· Αὐρ. Τατις Ὀνησίμου χαλκέος σύνβιος σὺν τῷ συμβίῳ Ὀνησίμῳ Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέ[θ]ησαν.[104]

With good fortune. Aurelia Tatis, spouse of Onesimos the blacksmith, set up (this monument) along with her spouse Onesimos, to the most high God, at their own expense.

It is unlikely that this inscription is Jewish, beginning as it does with a common pagan formula. In view of the size and influence of the Jewish community at Acmonia and in nearby Apamea, and also of the fact that Jews at Acmonia did call their God "Theos Hypsistos" [as 5.5 and 5.6 show] it seems reasonable to suggest that Aurelia Tatis and Onesimus had some links with the Jewish community. They still repeat a pagan formula, yet make a dedication using a common Jewish name for Yahweh. It is likely therefore that they had had sufficient contact with the Jewish synagogue in the area to make a dedication to the Jewish God using current terminology.[105] They seem to fit the category of "God–worshippers" although of course this cannot be proved.[106]

6.2 Schürer discusses a series of inscriptions to be dated to the beginning of the third century CE from Tanais in the Bosphoros Kingdom. Some of the inscriptions give lists of the εἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον – "the adopted associates worshipping the Highest God".[107] These new members of the cult are placed under the guidance of πρεσβύτεροι.[108] Other inscriptions dedicated to "Theos Hypsistos" at Tanais show that there were a number of σύνοδοι devoted to the cult of "Theos Hypsistos", which the above ἀδελφοί had just joined.[109] They appear to be autonomous groups which catered for a range of the needs of their members.

Investigation of these groups shows that they adopted both Jewish and Greek features.[110] Schürer thought that the groups were not Jewish, primarily because they had ἱερεις, which he took to imply sacrificial worhip,[111] and because some of the stones bore a representation of an eagle.[112] However, subsequent work has shown that neither point is decisive.[113] Goodenough has pointed to five of the inscriptions which describe the setting up of seemingly autonomous groups of "newly received brethren".[114] These seem strange in a Jewish context. Newly arrived Jews would be able to join the existing σύνοδοι; it seems therefore that some sort of conversion is involved here. In addition, Goodenough pointed out

that many of the inscriptions begin with Ἀγαθῇι Τύχηι. He thought that this phrase had no reference to the goddess Tyche, but was a common talismanic formula and simply meant "luck".[115] It is difficult to know if the formula is significant, but no Jewish use of it is known.

It seems therefore that unambiguous evidence which points to a Jewish origin for these inscriptions is lacking. Nor is a συναγωγή or προσευχή as such mentioned. However the convergence of a number of factors which suggest that Jewish influence *could have been* involved ["Θεὸς Ὕψιστος", "σεβόμενοι ...", personal names] is surely not fortuitous. Thus it seems that these groups were influenced by both Judaism and paganism, and on the border between the two.[116] This is probably another instance in which pagans used the term "Theos Hypsistos" because of the influence of Jews.[117]

6.3 Finally we should note that Patristic literature informs us about the Ὑψιστιανοῖς who worshipped the Highest God and observed some Jewish and some pagan customs. They were known in parts of Asia Minor and elsewhere. They will be discussed more fully in Chapter 7 section 4.9; suffice to note here that they were similar to the groups from Tanais and probably called their God "Θεὸς Ὕψιστος" because of Jewish influence.

7. Sabazios and Judaism.

We need now to discuss the supposed connection between Sabazios and Judaism.

Sabazios was a Phrygian–Thracian god, whose syncretistic cult was widely disseminated around the Mediterranean. He was identified with Zeus and later with Jupiter and there was a link between Dionysius and Sabazios which was perhaps of secondary importance.[118] In Asia Minor he was probably originally a fertility god, and became the protector of country people and ruled over their daily lives and souls. He thus approached the character of a universal god and it was logical that he should be thought of as a manifestation of Zeus.[119]

7.1 Cumont was the first to propose that, particularly in Asia Minor, there was widespread syncretism between the Sabazios cult and Judaism,[120] to the extent that Sabazios was identified with Yahweh in Asia Minor,[121] where Jewish monotheism had been strongly influenced by paganism. His opinion has been widely accepted.[122]

The evidence upon which these claims are based must be examined. Cumont argued along the following lines.

7.1.1 Valerius Maximus is often understood to have said that Jews who worshipped Jupiter Sabazios were expelled from Rome by Cornelius Hispalus, the praetor peregrinus in 139 BCE.[123] It was understood that Hispalus had

actually expelled Jewish–Sabazios sectarians whose rites had offended public order and decency and who had come to Rome from Asia Minor.[124]

However, the passage in Valerius Maximus used as evidence here actually falls in the middle of a long lacuna. In a recent study of the three manuscript traditions of the two epitomists used to supply an outline of what was originally said by Valerius Maximus, Lane has shown that only one tenth century CE manuscript actually implies Sabazios worship by the Jews. Lane suggests that the original text of Valerius Maximus mentioned three expulsions by Cornelius Hispalus – [i] of the Chaldeans, [ii] of the Sabazios worshippers and [iii] of the Jews. One manuscript tradition mentions only [i] and [ii], a second only [i] and [iii]. Lane suggests that a later scribe copying a manuscript of the first tradition also had before him a representative of the second tradition and thus introduced the Jews into the first manuscript tradition in such a way as to describe them as Sabazios worshippers. The original text, as witnessed to by the other two traditions, almost certainly did not say this.[125] Thus, we can suggest that according to the original text, Jews were expelled and so were Sabazios worshippers, but there was no connection between the two groups. Lane notes:

> this piece of evidence for a conflation of [the] Sabazios–cult with Judaism in antiquity, given its dependence only on a tenth century manuscript of a late antique epitomator of Valerius Maximus, ... is a very unsure base on which to make any statements concerning syncretism.[126]

Yet this passage was the keystone of Cumont's argument.[127] That his text of Valerius Maximus was almost certainly incorrect clearly greatly weakens his case.[128]

7.1.2 It was also argued that the mention of Jews who worshipped Jupiter Sabazios was not based on a fortuitous assonance with "Sabaoth" or more likely "Sabbath", but that *Jews* had identified their god with Sabazios. Thus the supposed note in Valerius Maximus was not a simple error of popular etymology committed by the Romans, but was an identification made by Phrygian [or perhaps Thracian] Jews, since this was where Sabazios originated.[129] However, with the evidence of Valerius Maximus shown to be unreliable on textual ground, there is no evidence that *Jews* identified Yahweh with Sabazios simply because of the similarity with the word "Sabaoth" or "Sabbath". Popular etymology is thus the most likely explanation for the very limited and solely *pagan* identification of the two gods.[130]

7.1.3 The third century CE tomb of Vincentius in the Praetextatus catacomb in Rome is an example of the syncretism of the Sabazios cult. One scene

portrays an *angelus bonus*, and several paintings show a banquet, one of which carries the inscription:

.... manduce, bibe, lude et veni ad me.[131]

.... Eat, drink, relax and come to me.

It was claimed by Cumont that the presence of the angel was due to Jewish influence and that the paintings and the inscription reflect Jewish belief in a messianic banquet. Since Vincentius was a priest of Sabazios, it was argued that the tombs show a connection between Sabazios and Judaism.[132] However, belief in angels was not restricted to Judaism,[133] the inscription quoted above is purely hedonistic rather than referring to a messianic banquet,[134] and in any case such banquets were common in religions other than Judaism.[135] The tomb provides no evidence for a connection between Judaism and Sabazios. Rather, the murals probably represent a late and sophisticated form of Sabazios worship.[136]

7.1.4 An association of Sabazios worshippers made a dedication to Θεός Ὕψιστος as is shown by an inscription from Pirot in Macedonia.[137] Scholars who thought that "Theos Hypsistos" was always Yahweh have thus seen this as providing a link between Judaism and Sabazios.[138] However, as we have shown above, a number of pagan deities could be given the epithet "Hypsistos" and it is thus highly likely that in this instance Sabazios is being called "the Highest God" by some of his worshippers. It is not at all surprising that Sabazios should receive this epithet in view of his identification with Zeus, and in view of the fact that Sabazios himself was thought of in some places in terms approaching those appropriate for a universal god.[139] No Jewish influence is involved here.

7.1.5 We do know of an amulet which bears the inscription Ἰαὼ Σαβαὼθ, along with the sort of figures often found on votive hands dedicated to Sabazios.[140] Whilst it is more likely that this amulet was made by a pagan than by a Jew, we do know in any case that Jews often employed symbols used in the cults of pagan gods.[141] The amulet is therefore not necessarily evidence that Jews were involved in Sabazios worship.[142]

7.1.6 We thus have seen that none of the arguments put forward by Cumont are convincing.[143] In addition, Kraabel has shown the complete lack of any evidence from Sardis which suggests that Jews there were connected with the Sabazios cult.[144] Melito of Sardis would surely have attacked the Jews there for any syncretism with Sabazios, and yet he does not. None of the more than eighty Jewish inscriptions from Sardis show any knowledge of Sabazios. Yet we know that Sabazios was worshipped in Sardis from the fourth century BCE through to the second century CE, and almost certainly later as well.[145] Other aspects of this thesis suggest that the Jewish communities in Asia Minor

strongly retained their identity. Thus, there is a lack of any firm evidence connecting Judaism and Sabazios worship in Asia Minor, and we also know of factors which strongly suggest that such a connection never in fact existed.

8. Conclusions.

8.1 We have seen that scholars like Cumont and Nilsson have argued that Judaism in Asia Minor was at times a strange mixture of Judaism and paganism.[146] These arguments have been mainly based on the supposed link between Yahweh and Zeus [or other gods who were also called "Hypsistos"] and Sabazios. We have shown that both of these connections are unfounded. No evidence has arisen from this study to suggest that Judaism in Asia Minor was syncretistic or had been compromised with paganism. This is a very important finding.[147]

8.2 We have also seen that in a very limited number of cases, two of which were in Asia Minor, pagans or pagan groups used the title "Hypsistos" because of Jewish influence. It is likely that there were more cases like this, but it is exceedingly difficult to demonstrate that Jewish influence did in fact occur.

A.D.Nock noted that we are on a "religious frontier" when we examine the use of "Υψιστος".[148] This explains the difficulty we have had identifying the provenance of some inscriptions and determining when "Jewish influence" has occurred. Those who are on the frontier between the two groups will be difficult to recognize. However, perhaps the most important thing for us here is that the frontier existed. In an albeit limited number of cases Jews and pagans shared the same religious vocabulary.

8.3 We need to ask why some Jews used "Theos Hypsistos" in both literature and in inscriptions? Clearly, the title belonged to Jewish tradition as is shown by its frequency in the LXX and in other Jewish literature. In addition, its use was in keeping with the trend of the period to exalt one's god to a supreme position. Thus the term suited both Yahweh and the religious environment in which the Jews lived and so Jewish [and to a limited extent Christian] writers used it themselves and put it in the mouths of pagans who recognised Yahweh, as Joseph and Aseneth clearly shows. For Jews the term was appropriate and suitable.

However, an important question regarding the use of Hypsistos is asked by Nock:

> Would it suggest him (Yahweh) to anyone except a Jew or a Judaizer?[149]

The answer is clearly no. There were many "Highest gods" and a pagan hearer or reader would understand the referent of the term to be the deity he or she considered to be supreme, if in fact he or she considered any deity in this

position. They would not think of Yahweh.

Some scholars have clearly misunderstood this. Burchard, in commenting on the use of the term in Joseph and Aseneth writes;

> In a polytheistic environment it sounded both inviting and exclusive (eg against *Zeus Hypsistos*);[150]

However, the primary effect of the term on pagans who were reading or hearing Jewish literature must have been to mislead them. They would recognise, not Yahweh, but the deity they thought to be the Highest god. This might well be Zeus, who as we have seen was often called "Theos Hypsistos", or some other deity. If pagans had a good knowledge of Judaism, they would indeed understand that Yahweh was being referred to. But the "occasional hearer" would not make this inference. The term would not even imply monotheism for a pagan. It would simply suggest the creation of a hierarchy in their pantheon.[151] The term was thus not easily understood by pagans with the meaning intended by Jews.[152] This situation is of course different from a Jewish author using the term in the mouth of a pagan, in literature intended for Jews. In this genre the term was indeed appropriate. But for a pagan reader the term was ambiguous and misleading. This situation explains the reticence to use the term which we found in both Josephus and Philo.

8.4 Another important finding emerges from our study. Just as significant as the use of the title in inscriptions by Jews for Yahweh is the fact that its use seems to have declined during the period under investigation here. Although these inscriptions are often difficult to date, it seems that the majority of occurrences of the title are found in the second century BCE to the first century CE, when in fact the bulk of Jewish inscriptions come from after this period.[153] After the first century CE, the term seems only to have been used in areas which had a large Jewish population [Acmonia, although the two inscriptions from this site are undated and thus could be earlier], or in groups where its use had become traditional [Gorgippia, where the first occurrence is in 41 CE, the second in 67 CE, and the third at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century].[154]

We can suggest therefore that probably in both Asia Minor and elsewhere, the syncretistic dangers of the title were recognised and it was avoided.[155] The fact that it misled pagans meant that it ceased to be used on inscriptions which were essentially public documents. Its continued use would have involved too great a danger of pagan neighbours losing sight of the distinctive identity of the Jewish community. It is perhaps also possible that the syncretistic dangers of the title meant that its use threatened the internal identity of the Jewish

communities, that is, members of the community could themselves be confused or misled by the term.

With this in mind, there are two possible explanations for the early use of the title. Firstly, the pagan use of the title may have been much greater from the second century CE onwards than it was in the second or first century BCE.[156] The possibility of pagans misunderstanding the term would therefore be less in the early period. Certainly, the trend towards monotheism which we mentioned earlier intensified as time progressed. Secondly, in the early period it seems likely that the Jewish communities were often comparative new–comers in the Diaspora, and perhaps were not so concerned about "external identity", [that is, who pagans thought they were] nor involved to such an extent with their neighbours. Thus they were not so sensitive to the religious language of Gentiles around them.[157]

Again, this is in keeping with what we found in our investigation of Philo and Josephus' use of the term. The dangers of misunderstanding were too great for authors who wrote with pagans in view to use the term freely; the same situation seems to have applied for Jewish communities in the Diaspora. Thus, despite the fact that the term was strongly rooted in the tradition of Biblical and Intertestamental literature, the use of the term seems to have declined markedly in Jewish communities in the Diaspora because of its use in their environment.

Chapter 7.

"God-worshippers" in Asia Minor.

1. Introduction.

In this chapter I will examine the evidence for the "God-worshippers" in Asia Minor.[1] They are to be understood as a group of pagans who attended the synagogue regularly, adopted some Jewish customs such as Sabbath observance and food laws, but who were not circumcised and thus were not full members of the Jewish community in the way that proselytes were.[2] I will argue that the God-worshippers were a distinct and well-defined group of Gentiles who had a regular relationship with the synagogues; they were a middle group between dis-interested or hostile Gentiles, and Gentiles who had become proselytes.[3]

I will argue that the term θεοσεβής, which is used in Jewish literature, predominantly to designate a Jew as "pious" or "devout", is found in some inscriptions from Asia Minor as a term designating Gentile God-worshippers. The other terms which are generally taken to refer to this group – σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν and metuens – are not found in inscriptions in Asia Minor. However, the fact that four terms have generally been understood to refer to this group of Gentiles involved in the synagogue has led to much scholarly imprecision and debate. It is necessary therefore briefly to review the way in which scholars have interpreted these four terms before we look in detail at the use of θεοσεβής in Asia Minor.

1.1 In 1877 Bernays suggested that three expressions found in a range of literature [and in the case of the last term also in inscriptions] – σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν and metuens – were "technical terms" denoting Gentiles on the fringe of Judaism.[4] Other scholars adopted Bernays' view and added a fourth "technical term" – θεοσεβής. The concept of a God-worshipper was built up as a montage of these four terms.[5] Thus the meaning of any one term has often been regarded as the sum total of the four.

Lake and Feldman both cast doubt on the interpretation which saw these four expressions as technical terms for Gentile God-worshippers. They showed that the most natural meaning of the terms was simply "religious" or "devout" and that they could thus be applied to people of any belief. Whilst they could denote Gentile God-worshippers, the terms were normally applied to Jews; the meaning of the terms was to be discovered from the context.[6] As far as θεοσεβής is concerned, this means that it cannot *a priori* be regarded as a technical term for God-worshippers; a detailed investigation of its usage in literature and in inscriptions must be undertaken. A corollary is that this one term must be

examined as a distinct linguistic entity without importing into its occurrences the meanings associated with the other three terms. This will be our approach here.[7] Two other issues need to be addressed at this stage.

1.2 We should note first of all that the discussion of these four terms as "technical terms" for God–worshippers has assumed that these terms were either *always* technical terms or were *never* used in this way. Thus some scholars have argued that they always applied to Gentile God–worshippers, others that they were always applied only to Jews. Underlying this treatment of the material is an assumption that Judaism was monolithic, and thus that it was always and everywhere of roughly the same nature. However, we now know that Judaism in Asia Minor was a diversified entity.[8] Communities in different areas had quite different characteristics. There is therefore no *a priori* reason why the term θεοσεβής could not be used in one place to mean "God–worshipper" and in another as an epithet of a pious Jew. Our examination will proceed with this in mind.[9]

1.3 Inconsistency in the use of terminology has been a problem in this area. Here I will use two terms.[10] Firstly, "God–worshipper" for those who were regularly involved in the life of the synagogue. This implies a regular relationship with the Jewish community [albeit probably with a range of degrees of affiliation] rather than simply the adoption of Jewish customs. Secondly, "Sympathizers" for those who were favourably disposed towards Judaism and/or Jewish communities and perhaps followed some Jewish customs but did not actually adopt a regular relationship with the synagogue community.[11]

2. The pagan and Jewish use of Θεοσεβής.

2.1 θεοσεβής in the pagan world.

θεοσεβής is found in literary sources from the time of Herodotus with the meaning of "pious" or "devout". It distinguishes true piety from superstition, with θεοσεβής being regarded as one of the old particularly important virtues.[12] Thus Herodotus wrote of the Egyptians:

θεοσεβέες δὲ περισσῶς ἐόντες μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμοισι τοιοῖσιδε χρέωνται. –

"They are beyond measure religious, more than any other nation, and these are among their customs .."[13]

A marble stele of unknown provenance, but now in the Bursa Museum and so probably from Asia Minor, was published by Pfuhl and Möbius in 1979. A man lying on a couch, a seated woman and a boy pouring a libation on an altar are depicted on the stone. It is thus clearly pagan. It also has the following inscription:

Ἐπιθέρσῃ τῷ θεοσέβῃ κ(α)ὶ Θεοκτίστῃ τὰ τέκνα Μαγκιανὸς καὶ Ἐπιθέρσης μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐκ τῶν εἰδείων μνήμης χάριν.[14]

This is therefore a clearly pagan example of θεοσεβής in an inscription. Terms related to θεοσεβής also occur in pagan inscriptions. In an inscription from Istropolis to be dated around 100 BCE we read: προαγόμενος εἰς τὸ θεοσεβεῖν ὡς ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ πρῶτον μὲν ἐτείμησεν τοὺς θεούς ...[15] This inscription shows that θεοσεβεῖν does not reveal whether the "θεός" in question is to be thought of as singular or, as in this case, plural.[16] Simon notes that this inscription:

> bezeichnet ... völlig unabhängig von jüd. Einfluss θεοσεβεῖν als eine dem Alter besonders angemessene Tugend.[17]

Although θεοσεβής [and related terms] is comparatively rare in pagan sources, that it was used makes it unlikely [though not impossible] that it was also a *Jewish technical term* for God–worshippers.[18] Further, it also means that the occurrence of θεοσεβής in an inscription is not sufficient to prove that the person concerned was linked with the Jewish community [and thus was a Jew or a God–worshipper]. The inscription could be pagan. We should note however that εὐσεβής is much more common in pagan inscriptions than θεοσεβής.[19] Thus the use of θεοσεβής in an inscription does establish the suspicion that the author had some contact with a Jewish community, but its use in pagan sources means that each individual case must be investigated to ascertain its provenance and significance.[20]

2.2 θεοσεβής **in Jewish literary sources.**

The adjective θεοσεβής is rare in the LXX, being used only seven times. In Ex 18:21 the judges to be appointed by Moses are to be ἄνδρας δυνατοὺς, θεοσεβεῖς, ἄνδρας δικαίους μισοῦντας ὑπερηφανίαν. – "able men fearing God, righteous men who hate pride." Job is referred to as θεοσεβής three times.[21] The term is used along with ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος and ἄκακος to show the excellence of Job's faith and character. In Judith 11:17 we read a description of Judith's religious attitude – "ἡ δούλη σου θεοσεβής ἐστιν καὶ θεραπεύουσα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ – your servant is devout and serves the Lord of heaven day and night." In IV Macc Abraham is described as θεοσεβής and the mother of the martyrs is described as ἡ ἱερὰ καὶ θεοσεβὴς.[22]

Thus the term is used in the LXX of particular people in Israel to describe their character and has a strong ethical flavour.[23] The related term θεοσέβεια – "reverence for God" occurs only 7 times in the LXX and is regarded as an attribute of the faithful people of Yahweh.[24]

Philo uses θεοσεβής only once – the "multitude" proclaim that θεοσεβής is ἐπαινετόν [praiseworthy] but their actions do not conform to their words.[25] He

uses θεοσέβεια nine times, preferring to use εὐσέβεια which was a far more common term in the Graeco–Roman world. Yet clearly θεοσέβεια was a significant concept for Philo. Abraham is said to possess what Philo describes as "the virtue of θεοσέβεια".[26] θεοσέβεια is "that fairest possession",[27] "the perfect good",[28] and "the greatest of the virtues".[29] Philo thus uses the term with reference to the true, that is, the Jewish religion.[30]

Josephus, who does not use θεοσέβεια, uses θεοσεβής six times. David is described as "φύσει δικαίῳ καὶ θεοσεβεῖ καὶ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ἰσχυρῶς φυλάσσοντι – by nature a righteous and Godfearing man and one who strictly observed the laws of his fathers."[31] In Ant 12:284 the dying Mattathias charged his sons that those who are δίκαιος καὶ θεοσεβής are to be joined to the ranks of the Maccabees. In Ant 14:308 Mark Anthony writing to Hyrcanus stated that he was aware of the latter's "obliging and pious [θεοσεβής] nature".

In Ant 20:189–196 Josephus relates the incident concerning the wall built in the Temple precinct in Jerusalem to obscure the view of King Agrippa II after the latter had constructed a dining room from which to observe the activities of the Temple. When Agrippa and the procurator ordered that the offending wall should be pulled down, twelve of the "eminent men" of Jerusalem appealed to Nero. He sided with the twelve, and Josephus explains :

> In this he showed favour to his wife Poppaea, who was θεοσεβής, and who pleaded on behalf of the Jews.[32]

This passage has often been understood to say that Poppaea was a "God–worshipper" in the technical sense.[33] However, we have seen that θεοσεβής can simply be an adjective describing someone as "relig_ious".[34] On linguistic grounds there is no justification for claiming that Poppaea was a "Judaizer" or "God–worshipper". In addition, all we know of Poppaea makes it unlikely that she had leanings towards Judaism. She was promiscuous, she instigated the murders of Agrippina and Octavia in order to become empress herself, she was involved with astrology and she surely could not have repudiated idolatry without some mention of it coming to us.

The text of Josephus therefore makes good sense if we understand θεοσεβής to mean that Poppaea was "religious" and thus convinced Nero that other people's religious scruples should be respected. It does not indicate any interest in Judaism as a religion. Poppaea's supposed "Jewish tendencies" are baseless.[35]

In CAp 2:140 we read:

> Had Apion been asked who, in his opinion, were the wisest and most θεοσεβεῖς of all the Egyptians, he would undoubtedly make the admission 'the priests'.

Here θεοσεβής clearly means "devout" or "religious". As with Poppaea, no connotation of adoption of Jewish practices is involved. Clearly θεοσεβής can be used by Jews of pagans to describe their general piety just as it can be used by pagans of themselves.

θεοσεβής occurs a number of times in *Joseph and Aseneth.* Joseph is described as a "ἀνὴρ θεοσεβὴς καὶ σώφρων καὶ παρθένος".[36] In this work θεοσεβής has an ethical flavour and distinguishes Jews who worship the only God and live rightly from others.[37] In fact "ἀνήρ θεοσεβής" is used as a designation for a Jew as opposed to a Gentile. For example in JosAsen 8:5 we read that it is not fitting for an "ἀνὴρ θεοσεβὴς", who blesses the living God with his mouth, to kiss a "γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν" [strange woman] who blesses dead and dumb idols with her mouth.[38] The term thus approaches a title for "the true follower of Yahweh" ie. the Jew. In the rest of the Pseudepigrapha the term's use is limited and it is applied only to members of Israel.[39] We can summarize our findings from our examination of Jewish literary sources:

2.2.1 θεοσεβής can be used of pagans like Poppaea or Egyptian priests to mean that they are "devout" or "religious", without implying any particular interest in or involvement with Judaism.

2.2.2 In the LXX, Philo, Josephus and the Pseudepigrapha θεοσεβής is generally used of Jews. It denotes their piety and devout faithfulness to Yahweh. It distinguishes them from the uncircumcised.[40]

2.2.3 Jews in the hellenistic world at times called themselves "θεοσεβής" in their literature, probably because it was a term intelligible to others, yet distinct from the more common εὐσεβής. We would also expect Jews to use θεοσεβής of themselves in grave inscriptions.[41]

2.2.4 In the literary sources Jews do not seem to call Gentiles who were involved in synagogue life "θεοσεβής". To some extent this is perhaps due to our lack of literature which describes synagogue life in detail.[42]

3. "God–worshippers" in Literary Sources?

Our investigation of the Jewish literary usage of θεοσεβής has uncovered no evidence which suggests the term was used in these sources for the group of Gentiles whom we have called "God–worshippers". In this section I will discuss other indications from Jewish and classical literature which suggests that the "God–worshippers" did in fact exist.[43]

In Ant 14:110 Josephus writes:

> But no one need wonder that there was so much wealth in our temple, πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τὸν Θεόν, even those from Asia and Europe have been contributing to it for a very long time.

The exact translation of the middle clause has been debated. It should read either "all the Jews throughout the habitable world and those who worshipped God",[44] or "all the Jews worshipping God throughout the world."[45] Marcus has argued that the first translation is correct for two reasons:

[i] It is supported by the rules of Greek grammar, which we can assume Josephus would have followed. If Josephus had intended to identify the σεβόμενοι with the Jews he should have written "τῶν ... Ιουδαίων τῶν σεβομένων ...". However, one could argue that the omission of the τῶν before σεβομένων indicates that the participle belongs with τῶν Ιουδαίων. But Marcus noted:

> in good Greek when two different classes are associated in some activity or state, the article is omitted before the noun which designates the second of the two classes.[46]

[ii] The first translation also makes better sense of the rest of the passage. If the second translation is accepted the next phrase – "even those from Asia and Europe" – would have to be taken to refer to Jews and is therefore a repetition since this group is included amongst those Jews who are living "throughout the world". However, according to the first translation this additional phrase refers to "worshippers of God", and emphasizes that these people live not only in neighbouring Syria and Egypt, but even in far away Asia and Europe.[47]

Hence, in this passage Josephus seems to be referring to Jews and to Gentile worshippers of God who make a contribution to the Temple. This interpretation of the passage has commanded widespread support.[48] That Gentiles made contributions to the Temple [perhaps they paid the equivalent of the Temple tax] implies that they were involved to some significant degree in the life of the synagogue.[49]

Other passages, although difficult to interpret, probably refer to Gentile God–worshippers. In BJ 7:45 Josephus writes of the Jews that "they were constantly attracting to their religious ceremonies multitudes of Greeks, and these they had in some measure incorporated with themselves [κἀκείνους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοῖραν αὑτῶν πεποίηντο]." Finn notes that μοῖραν is used by Josephus to denote sharing in fate, lot or destiny.[50] This passage implies at least:

> some kind of [undisclosed] status which distinguished these synagogue adherents from other Gentiles.[51]

In CAp 2:123 Josephus writes:

> Many of them [the Greeks] have agreed to adopt our laws; of whom some have remained faithful, while others, lacking the necessary endurance, have again seceded.

It is possible that those who "adopted Jewish laws" became proselytes, although if this was the case one could expect Josephus to make this clear as

he does elsewhere.[52] It is likely therefore that this passage refers to God-worshippers.[53]

As Finn notes, Josephus was writing apologetic history and it is possible that he invented these "philo-semites" to further his strategy.[54] However, such creativity is unlikely because Philo confirms Josephus' picture in a fragment of his *Quaestiones in Exodum.* In 2.2, commenting upon Ex 22:21 Philo speaks of Gentiles[55] who were circumcised of the passions of the soul, reject polytheism and worship the one true God. The passage makes it clear, as Finn notes, that for Philo these Gentiles "had standing in the Jewish community, however difficult to categorize legally."[56] It seems clear that these Gentiles fit into the group we have called God-worshippers.

The fourteenth Satire of Juvenal provides very interesting evidence for our investigation. Whilst arguing that parental example was vital in education, Juvenal made the following comment:

> Some who have had a father who reveres the Sabbath [metuentem sabbata], worship nothing but the clouds, and the divinity of the heavens, and see no difference between eating swine's flesh, from which their father abstained, and that of man; and in time they take to circumcision. Having been wont to flout the laws of Rome, they learn and practice and revere the Jewish law [Iudaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius], and all that Moses handed down in his secret tome, forbidding to point out the way to any not worshipping the same rites, and conducting none but the circumcised to the desired fountain. For all which the father was to blame, who gave up every seventh day to idleness, keeping it apart from all the concerns of life.[57]

The father seems to fit clearly into the category of a "God-worshipper". He has adopted monotheism, along with some Jewish practices such as Sabbath observance and abstention from pork.[58] That he observes the Sabbath suggests he is a regular attender at the synagogue, as does the comment that he worships "nothing but the clouds and the divinity of the heavens". Juvenal's comments are clearly based on observation of a person and perhaps a group which has engaged his attention. The Satire relies on the father and the son [and other people mentioned in the work] being recognizable and well-known types of figures.[59] His denunciation would have been meaningless were it not directed against a situation prevalent in Juvenal's day.[60] It seems clear therefore that the "God-worshipping" father was reasonably common.[61]

An early second century CE passage from Epictetus is also interesting here:

> Why, then do you call yourself a Stoic, why do you deceive the multitude, why do you act the part of a Jew, when you are a Greek? Do you not see in what sense men are severally called Jew, Syrian or Egyptian? For example, whenever we see a man

> halting between two faiths, we are in the habit of saying, 'He is not a Jew, he is only acting the part'. But when he adopts the attitude of mind of the man who has been baptized and has made his choice, then he both is a Jew in fact and is also called one.[62]

Epictetus seems to be aware of the person who is not a Jew but acts the part of a Jew, not prepared to make the decisive move of conversion, but carrying out some of the requirements of Judaism. He is also aware that such a person sometimes becomes a proselyte.[63] The first state of this person – not being a Jew but acting the part, which perhaps includes synagogue attendance along with other things – probably corresponds to the category of God-worshipper. Again, such a person seems to be well known to Epictetus.[64]

We can conclude therefore that the evidence of Jewish and classical literature shows that there were Gentiles in a variety of places who, although they did not become proselytes, observed some Jewish practices or accepted some Jewish beliefs and were in some sort of regular relationship with the synagogue. We are justified therefore in calling these people "God-worshippers". That the evidence comes both from Jewish authors and from "outside observers" reinforces the credibility of both strands of evidence. Thus, although the examination of the term "θεοσεβής" in Jewish literature did not reveal any God-worshippers who were given that designation, we can conclude that the group existed although often described by other terms. We can also note that there is no "technical term" for God-worshippers in the above literature. We will now look at the inscriptions from Asia Minor to see if the God-worshippers have left any trace there.

4. θεοσεβής in Jewish inscriptions from Asia Minor and Elsewhere.

We have seen that θεοσεβής was used of Jews in Jewish literature to mean "religious" or "pious". It was also used by classical authors of pagans with a similar meaning. It has been claimed that in some inscriptions θεοσεβής is used by Jews to designate the group we have called Gentile "God-worshippers". However, other scholars have stated that θεοσεβής in these inscriptions is used of Jews with the meaning of "pious", in the same way as it is in Jewish literature. We will now examine these inscriptions.[65]

4.1 The most significant piece of evidence in this regard is the chance find of a stele at Aphrodisias in 1976. It has been fully discussed by Reynolds and Tannenbaum.[66] The large stele is inscribed on two faces in different hands, with additions to both faces by another hand or hands. The stele is clearly Jewish, as is shown by the many biblical names and the word προσήλυτος as a status-designation. It seems likely that the texts on faces *a* and *b* belong

together and are both to be dated to the early third century.[67] The inscription shows that the members of a group within the synagogue called the "decany" [which is listed on face *a*], were the initiators and major donors to a memorial building, which was probably a soup–kitchen of some kind. Those named on face *b* [the first line of which is missing], seem also to have contributed to the building.[68] Face *a* lists the members of the decany – 13 born Jews, three people described as *προσήλυτος* and two as *θεοσεβής*.[69] Face *b* contains two lists. The upper list contains a considerable number of people with Jewish names and thus seems to be a list of Jews by birth, who whilst not being members of the decany, were also contributors to the project. The second list is introduced by the heading "*Καὶ ὅσοι θεοσεβῖς* – As many as are theosebeis."[70] There are 52 people listed under this heading, compared with over 69 Jews in the other two lists.[71] Of the 63 names given in the list of *θεοσεβεῖς* [this number includes patronymics], none are Jewish and only two have Jewish connections.[72] One other name may be Semitic, two are Greco–Roman names popular among Jews and the rest are Gentile names.[73] This contrasts with the other two lists, in which well over half the names are biblical or are names strongly favoured by Jews.[74] It seems very hard to avoid the conclusion that the *θεοσεβεῖς* are not Jews by birth. Since nearly all have Gentile names, they are surely Gentiles.[75] Clearly, the 52 *θεοσεβεῖς* on face *b* are involved with a project which has been instigated by a Jewish "decany" and is strongly supported by other Jews. Two of the *θεοσεβεῖς* belong to the decany which is devoted [though not exclusively] to study and prayer. The conclusion that they are Gentile "God–worshippers" seems unavoidable.[76] They are attached in some definite way to the Jewish community as a distinct, separate and formal category of people who are neither Jews nor proselytes. They have all been allowed to belong, seemingly as enrolled members of a subsection of the whole community. We now know that at least at Aphrodsias there was a group of Gentile God–worshippers involved with the Jewish community who are given the title *θεοσεβεῖς*.[77]

This is confirmed by the observation that the *θεοσεβεῖς* are inferior in status in the synagogue community to the Jews, as is shown by the fact that the two *θεοσεβεῖς* in the decany are found towards the end of the list, which is clearly ranked according to status. In addition, the list of *θεοσεβεῖς* on face *b* is given after the list of Jews. This is not because of the social standing of the *θεοσεβεῖς*, since the first nine are city–councillors. The *θεοσεβεῖς* are therefore different from and inferior to the Jews. This must be because they are not full members of the Jewish community in the way born Jews and proselytes are. The inscription therefore provides clear evidence for a group of Gentiles who belong to the

synagogue, although in an inferior way compared with proselytes.[78] Clearly, they are Gentile "God–worshippers".

Reynolds and Tannenbaum ask the question of what the God–worshippers at Aphrodisias do? They belong to the synagogue community, and thus almost certainly attend the synagogue and are part of the services. From the inscription we learn that some θεοσεβεῖς make donations to projects.[79] Two θεοσεβεῖς are part of the decany and thus study the law and pray and take part in initiating charitable activities. The trade designations of five of them are interesting. There is one ἰκονο(ποιός) or ἰκονο(γράφος) – scuptor or a painter of pictures with images; a λατύ(πος) – stone cutter or carver; an ἀθλη(τής ?) – athlete; a πύ(κτης)? – boxer; and a ἰσικιάριος – seller/producer of mincemeat. In all of these cases we cannot tell if the God–worshippers' trade caused the persons involved to break Jewish law.[80] Reynolds and Tannenbaum conclude with regard to this question:

> We can in all five cases simply observe that it is possible, and that no such problem arises in connection with the trade–designations of the list of Jews. This suggests that God–fearers may be in some way free of laws that bind Jews, but it hardly proves it.[81]

Further, we note that there were nine βουλ(ευτής) – city–councillors among the θεοσεβεῖς. Did they attend public pagan sacrifices? We do not know. Thus, although the inscription is informative, it does not solve the problem of what God–worshippers actually did and did not do.[82] The following points also arise from this inscription:

4.1.1 It seems reasonable to suggest that the three proselytes listed among the Jews were once themselves God–worshippers.[83] This would suggest that some, though few, God–worshippers went on to become proselytes, and that the number of God–worshippers in some ancient synagogues was considerably greater than the number of proselytes. The scarcity of proselytes could be explained by the fact that conversion was a risky step to take, in view of Roman laws against circumcision beginning at the time of Hadrian.[84]

4.1.2 It is interesting that nine God–worshippers are βουλ(ευτής) – city councillors, who are placed at the beginning of the list as befits their importance.[85] They must have owned sufficient property to qualify as councillors.[86] They are men who are simultaneously able to fulfil the role of a city councillor and are also accepted by and involved in this Jewish organisation. That there appears to be no difficulty for the councillors in identifying themselves openly with a Jewish group, itself highly significant,[87] suggests that no great loss of social status was incurred through involvement with the Jewish community in this way.[88]

This implies that the Jewish community was a well–established and accepted group of good standing within the city.[89] It also shows that [at least] some of those committed to the Jewish community as God–worshippers continued to be involved in the city.

4.1.3 The inscription sheds new light on the other occurrences of the term *θεοσεβής*. As we have seen it is here a special "label" for a separate and distinct group of Gentiles associated with the Jewish community. This is precisely the sense of the term which has been disputed by those who wished to see it as a description used to stress the piety of Jews.[90] Clearly, here it does designate Gentiles associated in a definite way with the synagogue.[91] Thus, although this inscription cannot be used to dictate the meaning of *θεοσεβής* in other Jewish inscriptions [since it could still be used to refer to a Jew as "pious"], it considerably strengthens the case for seeing *θεοσεβής* as a designation for a "God–worshipper". Other inscriptions will be examined with this in mind.

4.2 The following inscription from Panticapaeum on the north coast of the Black Sea was first published in 1935.[92]

– – – ΚΑ – – *κου ἀφίημι ἐπὶ τῆς προευχῆς Ἐλπία[ν ἐμ]α[υ]τῆς θρεπτ[ῆν?]*[93] *ὅπως ἐστὶν ἀπαρενόχλητος καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος ἀπὸ παντὸς κληρονόμου χωρὶς τοῦ προσκαρτερεῖν τῇ προσευχῇ ἐπιτροπευούσης τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ θεὸν σέβων.*[94]

... I set free in the synagogue Elpias the son[?] of my slave bred in my house; he shall remain undisturbed and unassailable by any of my heirs except for [his duty] to visit the synagogue regularly; the protection [of his freedom] is accepted by the community of the Jews *καὶ θεὸν σέβων.*[95]

The inscription, which is probably to be dated to the first century CE,[96] is one of four very similar emancipation inscriptions from the city which all state that the ex–slave is to continue to visit the synagogue and that his or her protection against re-enslavement is provided by the synagogue. However, the other three inscriptions end with *συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.*[97]

With regard to the current inscription, the main question is how *συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ θεὸν σέβων* should be understood. It has been suggested that *καὶ θεὸν σέβων* should be linked with *χωρὶς τοῦ προσκαρτερεῖν τῇ προσευχῇ* but this seems grammatically unlikely considering the structure of the sentence.[98] If the text is left as it stands the only possibility seems to be that the last three words are a postscript of some sort which does not cohere at all with the rest of the text.[99] For in the other three inscriptions of this series, what is required of the ex–slave is expressed in the middle section of the inscription. Any extra requirement, such as "worshipping God", was never expressed right at the end,

where such an injunction does not fit the sense and where the synagogue itself is normally mentioned. However, that the words form an unrelated postscript seems highly unlikely,[100] particularly since they are not in a different hand. It seems most reasonable to suggest that the last three words actually belong with the immediately preceeding phrase – τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. The inscription can be read in this way if we emend it to θεο(ν)σεβῶν instead of θεὸν σέβων. The two genitives [Ιουδαιων and θεοσεβων] then fit together, and the end of the inscription becomes comprehensible. Although the ν was definitely engraved on the stone, it is possible that the stonemason was unfamiliar with the word "θεοσεβῶν" since it is comparatively rare in non–Jewish usage, and therefore regarded it as two words, the first lacking ν.[101]

We should therefore read Ἰουδαίων καὶ θεοσεβῶν.[102] But how should we translate θεοσεβῶν? "The synagogue of the Jews [who are] also pious [or worshippers of God]", or as "The synagogue of the Jews and God–worshippers"? Does the Jewish community here ascribe to itself an honorary epithet, or does the synagogue contain two groups – Jews and Gentile God–worshippers?[103] This inscription as a whole and the other three inscriptions suggest that the second interpretation is correct. Elpias and the other three ex–slaves are required by the inscriptions to attend the synagogue. It is reasonable to suggest that a Jew or a proselyte would attend the synagogue without compulsion, or at least without the kind of powerful compulsion provided by these inscriptions which are legal documents. It is likely therefore that Elpias and the other three ex–slaves were not Jews and thus were not circumcised; our inscription seems to require Elpias to become a "God–worshipper" – a Gentile who attended the synagogue. Although such compulsion with regard to people becoming God–worshippers is unrecorded elsewhere, it seems the most likely interpretation. Since we know of four ex–slaves who were compelled in this way, it seems likely that Elpias was required to join an established group of God–worshippers, some of whom perhaps joined voluntarily. This would explain the title of the synagogue – "of the Jews and God–worshippers".[104]

Therefore, rather than the Jews proclaiming their own piety, the inscription shows us that "God–worshippers" were an officially recognized and active group in this synagogue and that they were considered as part of the synagogue *by* the synagogue.[105] That the group's name formed part of the official title of the synagogue shows that they were in some sense members of the synagogue,[106] [albeit in a subsidary sense in that they are not part of the Ἰουδαίων], and that this was with the full agreement of the community. The Aphrodisias inscription, which implies a very similar state of affairs in a different Jewish

community, confirms the likelihood of this interpretation of the Panticapaeum inscription. Clearly in Panticapaeum the two groups associated together in worship and probably also in the many other activities of the synagogue, the centre of Diaspora Jewish life.

4.3 The following inscription was found at Tralles in Caria:

Καπετωλῖνα ἡ ἀξιόλογ(ος) καὶ θεοσεβ(ής)[107] π(οήσασα) τὸ πᾶμ βάθρο[ν] ἐσκούτλωσα τ[ὸν] (ἀ)ναβασμὸν ὑπ[ὲρ] εὐχῆς ἐκ τῆς Λ [και ?] πεδίων τε καὶ ἐγγόνων. Εὐλογία.[108]

I, Capitolina, worthy and θεοσεβ(ής), I have made all the platform[109] and the inlaying[110] of the stairs in fulfilment of a vow for myself and my children and my grandchildren. Blessings.

The inscription is to be dated in the third century CE.[111] Robert recognized that this inscription, previously published in CIG and interpreted by Groag as a Christian inscription,[112] concerned a Jewish building. This was for two reasons. Firstly, θεοσεβής is found in Jewish [and some pagan] inscriptions but not as far as we know in Christian inscriptions in this period.[113] Secondly, Εὐλογία is very common in Jewish inscriptions.[114]

It therefore seems most likely that the building structures mentioned were to be found in the synagogue at Tralles.[115] We know from Josephus that there was a Jewish community in this city.[116] The question is therefore if θεοσεβής, here applied to Capitolina, means she was a Jew or a "God–worshipper".[117]

We know of Capitolina from another inscription from Tralles, which informs us that she was part of an important family.[118] Her full name was Claudia Capitolina and she was the daughter [or sister] of the consul Claudius Capitolinus Bassus who was proconsul of Asia. She married T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes who had been a senator [συγκλητικός] in Rome and, like his grandfather before him, was priest for life of Zeus Larasios in Tralles. This office would have led him, along with his wife, to be permanently resident in Tralles. His grandfather was also twice Asiarch [a position also held by his uncle] and was given the title "πρῶτου Ασίας". His father was a consul and his brother a senator. Capitolina and T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes had two sons who both received the honorable title "ὁ κρατίστος", and may well have gone on to be Senators themselves. There was clearly considerable wealth in the family.[119]

We see therefore that Capitolina came from a distinguished background and married into a family of similarly high standing. That she was herself distinguished is shown by the use of ἀξιόλογος. It is also clear that she was not a Jew by birth. Robert argued that she was a proselyte, but if this was the case the Jewish community in a synagogue inscription would surely have proudly proclaimed the fact when such an important person was involved.[120] If she

was a Gentile, she would not be regarded as "θεοσεβής" by the Jews [and thus would not be able to use the title] unless she was considerably involved in the synagogue.[121] It seems therefore that to receive the title Capitolina must have been a regular attender at the synagogue; we conclude that θεοσεβής here means "God–worshipper". Indeed this seems to accord well with the facts. We could understand why Capitolina would want to remain as a God–worshipper; it could be difficult for a person of her distinguished status to become a proselyte. That she was regularly involved in the synagogue is confirmed by the use of Εὐλογία at the end of the inscription. Capitolina seems to have composed the inscription, and we can suggest that she ends it with a Jewish blessing she has learnt through attendance at the synagogue.[122]

We thus see that there was a "God–worshipper" in the Jewish community at Tralles who also belonged to the highest echelons of society.[123] This again illustrates the attraction and influence of Judaism and the Jewish community, and suggests that the Jewish community at Tralles in this period was well respected.

4.4 These two inscriptions were found in the centre panels of mosaics in the forecourt of the Sardis synagogue:

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Εὐλόγιος θεοσεβὴς εὐχὴν ἐτέλεσα.[124]
Aurelios Eulogios, Theosebes, I have fulfilled my vow.

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Πολύιππος θεοσεβὴς εὐξάμενος ἐπλήρωσα.[125]
Aurelios Polyippos, Theosebes, having made a vow, I have fulfilled it.

A third inscription, broken at the left but complete at the right, for which the original position has not been specified, reads simply [– θ]εοσεβοῦς.[126] Two other inscriptions have not as yet been fully published. One, found in the forecourt mentions a "Eutychides Theosebes".[127] Another inscription has only been published in an English translation. It reads "Aurelios Hermogenes, citizen of Sardis, pious, from the gifts of Providence, I made the seven-branched candlestick."[128] Here "pious" almost certainly translates θεοσεβής, which is the translation of this term invariably adopted by the excavators of Sardis.[129]

4.4.1 All of these inscriptions probably come from the fourth stage of the synagogue and thus are to be dated after 320 CE, although we must await their final publication before we can be certain.[130] Robert, who published three of these inscriptions, argued that the epithet θεοσεβής was always applied to Jews and not to Gentile God–worshippers.[131] With regard to the first two inscriptions he made two basic points:

4.4.1.1 The fact that the inscriptions are found in the synagogue rules out

the possibility that Eulogios and Polyippos were not actually members of that community.[132]

4.4.1.2 When θεοσεβής is found in other inscriptions it applies to Jews and not Gentiles.[133]

However, his second point has now been invalidated by the recently discovered Aphrodisias inscription, and by the Panticapaeum inscription, of which Robert was not aware in 1964. In addition, Robert does not support his first point and it is far from self–evident. If Julia Severa, a pagan sympathizer at Acmonia, could donate a whole synagogue and be acknowledged for her generosity in an inscription,[134] there appears to be nothing to prevent a "God–worshipper" from making a donation for the decoration of the synagogue and being commemorated for this in an inscription. The God–worshippers are a group of Gentiles who regularly attended the synagogue; one could well understand such a person making a vow to pay for part of the fabric of the synagogue as a way of testifying to their dedication to the community.[135] The community would understandably be keen to commemorate the gift. Robert overlooks this point. In addition, the Aphrodisias and Panticapaeum inscriptions show that in some sense God–worshippers were members of the Jewish community. The synagogue is therefore the natural place for them to make donations.

4.4.2 Other considerations relating to the synagogue itself and the Sardis Jewish community suggest that θεοσεβής is used here to designate a Gentile God–worshipper:

4.4.2.1 A number of members of the Sardis synagogue community were involved in the city's life. There are also several indications that the community commanded much respect in the city.[136] It would seem reasonable to suggest that this Jewish community would attract the interest of Gentiles who wanted to find out more about the group of Jews who played a prominent part in their city. One would not therefore be surprised if a group of Gentiles regularly visited the synagogue and adopted some of its practices; such a group could well be called "God–worshippers."

4.4.2.2 Gentiles may well have visited the synagogue forecourt regularly if the fountain found there was the public fountain mentioned in an inscription.[137] It would be understandable if some Gentiles in the forecourt had conversed with Jews about Judaism, ventured into the synagogue itself and thus gradually became involved in its life without becoming proselytes.

4.4.2.3 The excavators emphasized that the synagogue building seemed to be designed as a "show piece" for Judaism. The forecourt, the decorations, the mosaics, the vast space would have attracted the interest and admiration

of visitors. It was a building intent on communicating a message about the grandeur and splendour of the Jewish faith and the Jewish community. It would not be surprising if the message was communicated effectively through this medium to at least some Gentiles who then became involved in the synagogue's life.[138]

These considerations create the strong probability that the term θεοσεβής designates a Gentile God-worshipper at Sardis. However, it is also clear that the term could mean "pious", which would indicate that the donors were Jews. The name of the first donor, Eulogios, could well be that of a Jew, although this is not necessarily the case.[139] We cannot be certain either way, although in my opinion, the former interpretation, particularly in view of the involvement of the Sardis community in the city and the respect it commanded there, seems much more likely.[140]

4.5 There are a number of inscriptions on the seats of the theatre of the Roman period in Miletus.[141] One inscription in the fifth row from the front reads:

Τόπος Εἰουδέων τῶν καὶ θεοσεβίον.[142]

The inscription is to be dated to the Imperial period, probably in the second century or the beginning of the third century CE.[143] θεοσεβής is normally found in the singular or as a personal name.[144] The form used here – θεοσεβίον – is to be understood as the name of a group, analogous to group names like "Λεοντίοι" [which occurs in the synagogue at Sardis], "Eusebii" or "Eutropii".[145] This inscription poses a considerable problem of interpretation. There are three possibilities.

4.5.1 If θεοσεβής is taken as a term designating *Gentiles* who are associated with the synagogue then we have a contradiction in terms – "Jews who are also God-worshippers [= Gentiles]".[146] However, we have seen that θεοσεβής can be used of a Jew to mean "devout" or "pious", and it could be used here as a proper name with that sense. If the text is read as it stands therefore, this must be the meaning, and we should translate it as –
"Place of the Jews who are also called the Pious Ones".[147]

"τῶν καὶ" would then be a form of the sterotyped formula "ὁ καὶ" which is used for double names.[148]

4.5.2 It was first suggested by Schürer that the stone mason made a mistake and that the text should read καὶ τῶν instead of τῶν καὶ. We would thus translate the phrase as:
"Place of the Jews and those who are called God-worshippers."[149]

Lifshitz has recently noted that according to 4.5.1 above, the whole Jewish group declared its piety in the theatre. He regards this as strange and inappropriate in this purely pagan context.[150] However, he thinks the inscription was probably written by the theatre management and not by the Jewish community, and this seems reasonable.[151] Yet the Greeks would hardly think the Jews more devout than themselves and thus would be unlikely to denote the Jews as "pious" when no one else in the theatre was given this epithet.[152] Thus, it is unlikely that the theatre management thought the inscription designated the Jews as pious. It is more reasonable to suggest that they understood the inscription to refer to two groups – the Jews and "The Pious" or "God–worshipping Ones"; that is, they understood the second term as an additional name. The Jewish community would have suggested this wording [and its meaning] to the theatre authorities, with the inscription containing the normal term the Jews used for Gentile God–worshippers. The authorities agreed to write the inscription in this way, but the stone mason made a mistake in the execution of the inscription.

Many scholars have objected to this line of interpretation on the grounds that it emends a text which is able to be interpreted satisfactorily as it stands.[153] Robert has noted that it also involves "Judaizing heathens" [as he calls God–worshippers] sitting with the Jews, which he thought unlikely.[154] However, such a view is dependent on the assumption that Jewish gatherings consisted exclusively of Jews.[155] Whilst we know that uncircumcised Gentiles were not full members of the synagogue, the inscriptions from Aphrodisias and Panticapaeum suggest that Gentiles could be regularly associated with the synagogue and thus could presumably sit with Jews in the theatre.[156] However, that this interpretation involves an emendation to the text remains a difficulty.

4.5.3 In 1975 Hommel proposed a new line of interpretation. He thought, on the basis of Acts, that "*θεοσεβίοι*" was a technical term designating God–worshippers. He claimed that our inscription belongs to the category of "synthetic relative clauses" and that in this type of clause the second noun functions by delimiting the first noun in order to avoid confusion. Thus the inscription can be translated:
"Platz [nicht der Juden schlechthin, sondern nur] derjenigen Juden, die auch die Gottesfürchtigen genannt werden."[157]

It therefore refers to the group of *Ἰουδαῖοι* who are further defined or designated by calling them "*θεοσεβίοι*". Since "*θεοσεβίοι*" means "God–worshippers", the inscription means the seats were reserved specifically and only for a group of [Gentile] God–worshippers who could occasionally be called "Jews". The

seats were not for Jews themselves.[158] However, three problems arise for this interpretation:

[a] The only evidence that "God–worshippers" were ever called "Ἰουδαῖοι" comes from Cassius Dio. He states that the title Ἰουδαῖοι applies not only to the inhabitants of Judaea "but it applies also to all the rest of mankind, although of alien race, who affect [ζηλοῦσι] their customs [τὰ νόμιμα]".[159] Whilst this shows that an outsider could call God–worshippers [or sympathizers ?] "Jews" [and thus perhaps the theatre management could too] it begs the question of whether the God–worshippers would have called *themselves* Ἰουδαῖοι [even with the qualification of θεοσεβίοι], which is what the theatre inscription implies as Hommel understands it. If they were regularly involved in the synagogue they would know they could not call themselves Ἰουδαῖοι, for God–worshippers are nowhere called "Jews" in Jewish sources.[160]

[b] Hommel decided on the incorrect basis of Lucan usage of different terms, that θεοσεβής meant "God–worshipper" not "pious". However, we cannot rule out either meaning in advance on the basis of the usage of different terms.

[c] His interpretation is based on classifying this inscription as a "synthetic relative clause".[161] Only in this way can the second term be understood to delimit the first. In our inscription [as it stands] it seems just as likely that the second term explains the first and does not delimit it [which would then make it a parathetic relative clause]; thus it would be translated as "Jews who are called the pious ones", ie. 4.5.1 above.

Hommel's interpretation is therefore unconvincing.[162] We are left then with options 4.5.1 and 4.5.2. Rajak has recently suggested that, in the light of the clear evidence for God–worshippers provided by the Aphrodisias inscription, Schürer's emendation to the inscription gains in appeal. She notes:

> Although the Greek, taken as it stands, is incorrectly formulated for this meaning, it is not unusual to find ungrammatical constructions, improper idioms and simple errors of word transposition in this kind of provincial notice.[163]

Clearly with the evidence from Aphrodisias and also Panticapaeum in view, the possibility that the text should be emended and hence that God–worshippers are meant here at Miletus becomes much stronger. It is significant to note that most of those who decided against the emendation were not aware of the Panticapaeum inscription nor, of course, of the new evidence from Aphrodisias, and thus knew of no thoroughly convincing epigraphical evidence for God–worshippers.

In addition, Lifshitz's argument that a reference to the "piety" of the Jews is very strange in the context of the theatre is compelling and has not been

refuted. This argues strongly against interpretation 4.5.1 and thus suggests that the theatre management understood the term as a designation of a group of Gentile "God–worshippers". There is therefore the strong probability [though not certainty[164]] that interpretation 4.5.2 is correct.

There is the strong likelihood therefore that here two groups – Jews and God–worshippers - were grouped together by the theatre management and allocated the privilege of special seats. Both groups would be regular, prominent and respected [as befits those with the privilege of reserved seats and fine fifth row seats at that] among the theatre audiences.[165] That both groups enjoyed official recognition and respect in the city, and thus were granted this privilege is highly significant in terms of the acceptance granted to them within the city and their own integration into city life.[166] It further suggests that the "God–worshippers" were involved in the synagogue since they are in a definite relationship with the Jews and are regarded as belonging with the Jewish community by the theatre management, and thus presumably by the Jewish community itself.[167]

4.6 The following inscription was found on a rectangular column from Deliler, east of Philadelphia, Lydia:

[T]ῇ ἁγιοτ[άτῃ σ]υναγωγῇ τῶν Ἑβραίων Εὐστάθιος ὁ θεοσεβὴς ὑπὲρ μνίας τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἑρμοφίλου τὸν μασκαύλην ἀνέθηκα ἅμα τῇ νύμφ(η) μου Ἀθανασίᾳ.[168]

To the most holy synagogue of the Hebrews, Eustathios[169] θεοσεβὴς, in remembrance of my brother Hermophilos, I have dedicated together with my bride [sister in law?] Athanasia, the wash–basin.

The inscription is to be dated to the third century CE.[170] Here again we must decide the meaning of ὁ θεοσεβής as applied to Eustathios in the inscription. Is he "the pious one", or is he a God–worshipper?

Vermes and Millar note that the inscription implies a possible contrast between Eustathios and the "Hebraioi".[171] Although this is possible, "the most holy synagogue of the Hebrews" could simply be the title of the synagogue as it is elsewhere, rather than a way of implying a distinction between Eustathios and the synagogue.[172] Further, it is common for Jews to mention the synagogue in inscriptions which commemorated donations.[173] That Eustathios does so here is not significant. The point is therefore suggestive but not decisive.

Just such a decisive point seems to be made however by the way in which the two other people mentioned are referred to. If Eustathios was a Gentile God–worshipper then his brother Hermophilos would similarly be of non–Jewish birth. In a dedication written in the synagogue in remembrance of Hermophilos one would expect him to be described as a proselyte or a God–worshipper. It is after all unlikely that Eustathios, if he were a God–worshipper, would make

a dedication *in the synagogue* in memory of his brother, if Hermophilos himself had no connection at all with the synagogue. Yet Hermophilos receives no epithet. That Athanasia also receives no epithet is significant. It seems unlikely [though of course not impossible] that one God-worshipper would make a dedication to the synagogue in memory of a Gentile who had no regular connection with the synagogue [even if he was his brother] in conjunction with another Gentile who likewise had no connection with the synagogue. It seems much more likely, that all three were Jews, and that θεοσεβής records the noteworthy piety of Eusthatios. As we have seen this usage is in keeping with that found in Jewish literature.[174]

4.7 The Altar of a God–worshipper?

This inscription does not use the term θεοσεβής but can be conveniently discussed here. An altar 48cm high, with an inscription to be dated in the second century CE[175] was found at Pergamum in 1912–13 but was not published until 1956. The inscription read as follows.

At the top of the altar: Θεὸς Κύριος ὁ ὢν εἰς ἀεί.

At the bottom: Ζώπυρος τῶ(ι) Κυρίωι τὸν βωμὸν καὶ τὴν φω[ι]τοφόρον μετα τοῦ φλογοῦχου.[176]

God (is the) Lord (the one) who is forever.[177]

Zopyros (dedicated) to the Lord the bomos and the lantern–stand with the lantern.

We should note the following points about this inscription:

4.7.1 The name of the deity is given merely as ὁ Κύριος in the second half of the inscription. This points distinctly to Judaism, where "Κύριος" by itself is used as a name for God, although there are some rare parallels outside of Jewish usage.[178]

4.7.2 When the title "Θεὸς Κύριος" is considered along with the expression ὁ ὢν εἰς ἀεί it is clear that the whole clause is hardly able to be derived from Greek religious usage.[179] Most of the parallels to ὁ ὢν are from Hellenistic Judaism.[180] It thus seems highly likely that Zopyros made the dedication to the Jewish God.[181]

4.7.3 The erection of a lantern is quite compatible with Judaism, although lamps were also used in connection with the Imperial cult and other pagan cults.[182]

4.7.4 What was the bomos used for ? It is possible that it designates an altar which was used for some sort of sacrifice.[183] We know that for Jews of this period sacrificial worship was normally limited to Jerusalem,[184] and thus Bickerman argued that a bomos at Pergamum must have been used by a "God–

fearer". He thought that Jews encouraged Gentile "God–fearers" to worship Yahweh in the way that was natural for them, that is with sacrifices.[185]

However, it seems more plausible to suggest that the bomos was in fact a base [as the term can be translated] for the lantern.[186] That the inscription mentions a lantern and a lantern stand makes it very likely that the lantern stand was affixed to the base. Alternatively, it is possible that the base was used for burning incense,[187] or that the base did not have any practical use, but may simply have been a gift which carried the inscription describing Zopyros' other gifts.

Thus, in view of the fact that it is likely that the bomos was a base of some sort, it seems best to suggest that Zopyros was a Jew,[188] rather than that he was a God–worshipper who used the bomos for a sacrifice.[189] We certainly do not have decisive evidence to classify him as a God–worshipper.[190]

4.8 Patristic literature informs us of two very interesting groups in this regard. Cyril of Alexandria writing at the beginning of the fifth century refers briefly to a group in Phoenicia and Palestine who call themselves "Θεοσεβεῖς". He reports that they worship the Highest God [Ὕψιστος Θεός] who was beyond the stars, but that they also accepted the existence of other gods; they adopted customs from both Judaism and paganism whilst belonging to neither.[191] This group appears to be similar to a religious community which existed in Cappadocia in the fourth century and called itself the Ὑψιστιανοῖς. Both Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nysa[192] tell us, albeit briefly, about them. They followed some Jewish practices, whilst adopting some others of non–Jewish origin. Thus we are told that they rejected images and sacrifices, kept the Jewish sabbath and some food laws, whilst dismissing circumcision. They also honoured [τιμάω] the fire and light, and called the only God Παντοκράτωρ, but did not regard him as father of all.[193]

What is of interest to us in these groups is the mix of Jewish and non–Jewish beliefs and practices. It seems likely that these groups were formed by some God–worshippers [who in the case of the first group continued to call themselves by the name they were known by among the Jews] from the synagogues in these areas, who, after borrowing from Judaism and heathenism, formed their own autonomous groups.[194] They can thus be included amongst the probable evidence for God–worshippers.

5. Conclusions.

5.1 We have seen that God–worshippers, who are mentioned in Josephus, Philo, Juvenal and Epictetus, can be detected in inscriptions. Although θεοσεβής at times is probably an epithet given to a Jew [for example at Deliler [4.6]], we do

have cases where it certainly or almost certainly refers to Gentiles [whether in a group or as individuals] who were in a regular relationship with the synagogue. This is certainly the case at Aphrodisias [4.1], almost certainly at Panticapaeum [4.2] and Tralles [4.3]. In other cases [Sardis [4.4] and Miletus [4.5]] this is a strong probability.[195]

5.2 The literary sources which mention God–worshippers suggest that they were a well–known group at Rome [eg Juvenal] and elsewhere [Josephus and Philo]. However, our inscriptional evidence for God–worshippers comes predominantly from Asia Minor.[196] This may simply be a result of the nature of inscriptional evidence.

5.3 However, it may be more significant than this. That God–worshippers existed in some synagogues in Asia Minor suggests that these synagogues were attractive places, as were the Jewish communities which worshipped there. Their beliefs and practices were appealing. These communities had not withdrawn into themselves, but were open to Gentiles learning about Judaism.[197] This is in keeping with conclusions reached in earlier Chapters [and see further in Chapter 9] about the distinctive involvement of some Jewish communities in Asia Minor in their cities, the respect granted to them, and their willingness to be influenced by their environment.

All of this suggests that the geographical spread of the inscriptional evidence is heavily weighted towards Asia Minor because here, more than elsewhere, Jewish communities were interacting with Gentiles in their cities, with the result that Gentiles were attracted to what they saw as inviting and appealing communities.

5.4 That θεοσεβής was almost certainly used of *Jews* in some places in Asia Minor [eg Deliler] and of *Gentiles* in others [eg Aphrodisias], reinforces our initial view that Judaism in Asia Minor was not a monolithic entity.

5.5 It seems clear from the inscriptions that in at least some synagogues there was a form of membership in the synagogue available to Gentiles who chose to adopt some Jewish customs and regularly attended the synagogue. The evidence from Aphrodisias and Panticapaeum suggests that for God–worshippers there was a definite sense of belonging; they were not simply observers or casual attenders. That they were an integral and distinct part of the synagogue is shown by the fact that the name of the synagogue could be "of the Jews and God–worshippers". Thus, whilst they were members of lesser standing, not being full members of the synagogue as proselytes were, God–worshippers nonetheless seem to have had a definite and formal place in the organisation of synagogue life. It seems likely that by giving a positive position in the synagogue

to Gentiles, Jewish communities were encouraging others to join the ranks of the θεοσεβής. We cannot assume that this was the situation everywhere; small Jewish communities made up of recently arrived members for example might not have welcomed God–worshippers, or might not have welcomed them into some form of membership. However, we do know of at least some synagogues where Gentile God–worshippers were members of the community.[198]

The inscriptions have not enabled us to specify exactly what being a God–worshipper in Asia Minor entailed, beyond the general aspects of belonging to and regular involvement in, the synagogue. In view of the diversity of Judaism in Asia Minor, it seems likely that there was a range of affiliation, involvement and practice covered by the term "θεοσεβής". It thus perhaps meant different things in different communities,[199] although there was probably a core of common practice, including attendance at the synagogue, and observance of some Jewish customs.[200]

5.6 Our inscriptional evidence for God–worshippers is to be dated from the first to the fourth century CE.[201] In Chapter 1 we have attempted to show that Jewish communities in Asia Minor were probably little effected by the three revolts between 70 and 135 CE, and that continuity of conditions seems to have prevailed. If this is correct, it means that later evidence [as the majority of it is in this case] is relevant for the earlier period, and this is probably the case here. We should also note that if the events of 70 to 135 CE did have any effect in Asia Minor it would probably have been to decrease the ranks of God–worshippers in the later period. We can therefore be moderately confident that there were a significant number of God–worshippers in at least some of the synagogues in Asia Minor in the first four centuries CE.[202]

5.7 Kraabel has recently questioned the existence of the "God–fearers" as a sub–class of Gentiles associated with the synagogue.[203] However, his basic assumption is that the "God–fearers" should have left some trace in the evidence provided by excavated synagogues. We can note however:

5.7.1 The Aphrodisias inscription is precisely the sort of evidence Kraabel required.[204]

5.7.2 Kraabel does not ask what sort of evidence the "God–fearers" [as traditionally understood] would have left in the synagogue. Most of our synagogue inscriptions relate to donations and it seems unlikely that "God–fearers" would regularly be donors in large numbers. Building remains are unlikely to reveal any trace. In requiring archaeology to provide evidence for "God–fearers", Kraabel does not face the issue of the nature of the archaeological evidence.[205]

5.7.3 Kraabel states that in synagogue inscriptions θεοσεβής is an epithet used

of Jews.[206] This is however far from true. In his article "The Disappearance of the God–Fearers",[207] he does not discuss the inscriptional evidence from Pantipacaeum, Tralles or Miletus.

5.7.4 Kraabel does not deal with literary references in Juvenal, Epictetus, Josephus and Philo which, at the least, suggest that the phenomenon of the "God–fearer" was well known.[208]

As Vermes and Millar note "it is clearly premature to proclaim the 'disappearance' of the 'God–fearers'."[209]

Chapter 8.

Water Sources in the Synagogues of Asia Minor.

In this chapter I will present the evidence concerning washbasins and sources of water in the synagogues of Asia Minor and elsewhere. I will then propose a hypothesis which accounts for the evidence.

1.1 A fountain was found in the centre of the forecourt of the Sardis synagogue. It was a large marble urn 80cm in diameter with a vertically fluted body and large volute handles and was fed by a complicated water supply system capable of delivering up to 42 litres per second, although a valve fitted to the pipe could control the flow or cut it off altogether. The forecourt was created between 320 and 360 CE and the fountain can be dated to the second half of the fourth century by coins found in association with it.[1]

An inscription from Sardis lists the public fountains in the city, which are either named or located in relation to some local feature. Along with "'the fountain opposite to the gymnasium of the Elders", "the fountain opposite the Attis confraternity hall flowing into the precinct of Zeus" and a number of others is

συναγωγῆ[ς κρήνη –.][2]
"the fountain of the synagogue".

Buckler and Robinson thought the inscription was to be dated around 200 CE.[3] It seems clear that the area containing the synagogue's fountain was a public space, since the fountain is found in this list. However, it is not certain that this fountain was the one actually found in the forecourt of the synagogue at Sardis, since the forecourt is almost certainly to be dated in the fourth century. It is possible that the fountain mentioned in the inscription was from a previous synagogue in Sardis which has not been discovered, or that prior to the construction of the excavated synagogue's forecourt there had been a different Jewish water supply system, or finally that this inscription has not been dated correctly.[4]

A trough–like marble basin which stood on a 73cm high marble pedestal was also found in the forecourt of the synagogue. It was positioned against the east side of a southern partition wall and was not connected to the water pipes.[5] That a fountain and a wash basin were to be found in the forecourt is interesting. It suggests that the fountain was built to be aesthetically pleasing and perhaps [depending on the date of the inscription] also as a public water supply. The wash basin would then have been for ablutions, presumably of the

hands only and not of the feet given the height of the basin. The fountain could of course have also been used for ablutions.[6]

1.2. The only other synagogue which has been identified in Asia Minor is the small converted house, probably to be dated in the third century,[7] which served the Jewish community at Priene. In the main room and to the right of the Torah niche a marble basin which was nearly a metre in diameter was found. This position is noteworthy. If it was used for ablutions before prayer by all who entered the room one would expect to find it in the small forecourt.[8] Its position beside the Torah niche [if this was its original position] suggests it was used for the washing of the hands before touching the scrolls of Scripture, which were after all the most sacred ritual object.[9]

1.3. The following inscription was found inscribed on a rectangular column at Deliler, east of Philadelphia. We have previously discussed its significance with regard to "God–worshippers",[10] but it is also relevant here:

Τ[ῇ] ἁγιοτ[άτῃ σ]υναγωγῇ τῶν Ἑβραίων Εὐστάθιος ὁ θεοσεβὴς ὑπὲρ μνίας τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἑρμοφίλου τὸν μασκαύλην ἀνέθηκα ἅμα τῇ νύμφ[ῃ] μου Ἀθανασίᾳ.[11]

To the most holy synagogue of the Hebrews, Eustathios the pious one, in remembrance of my brother Hermophilos, have dedicated together with my bride [sister in law?] Athanasia, the wash–basin.

It is to be dated to the third century CE.[12] Scholars are agreed that μασκαυλης, which is only known from this inscription is a translation of the Hebrew term which occurs in the Talmud with the meaning of washbasin.[13] The straight–sided marble rectangular column on which the dedication was inscribed was 80cm high, and 33 by 37cm at the base. It served as the base for the washbasin which was thus of larger dimensions than the column itself.[14] Again, the basin must have served for washing the hands only and not the feet, judging by its height.

1.4. The following inscription comes from Side:

[Ἐ]πὶ Λεοντίου πρεσβ[υτέρου] καὶ συγ[οστάτου] [κ]αὶ φροντιστοῦ, υἱοῦ Ἰακὼβ ἄρχ[ων] καὶ συγ[οστάτου] ἐγένετον ἡ κρήνη σὺν τῷ μεσαύλῳ ἰνδ[ικτίονι] γ', μη[νὶ] ς'.[15]

In the time of Leontios, elder and controller of the weight of money and curator [of the synagogue], son of Jacob, archon and controller of the weight of money, the fountain in the colonnaded courtyard[16] was installed; the third year of the indiction, the sixth month.

The inscription is to be dated in the fifth century CE.[17] Bean, who first published the inscription thought that it was Christian.[18] However, in a detailed

investigation Robert showed that it was Jewish and this provenance has been accepted by others.[19] Of significance here is the fact that the inscription commemorates the installation of a fountain in a courtyard, probably under the direction of Leontios.[20] The situation seems to be parallel to that at Sardis; it seems likely that the fountain would have been aesthetically pleasing but also that it was used for ablutions.[21]

2.1 Wash–basins and other facilities for the provision of water are found in *synagogues* outside of Asia Minor. This comparative evidence is not readily available elsewhere,[22] and so will be outlined briefly here, firstly for the Diaspora and then for Palestine.

2.1.1 The synagogue at Delos, which was constructed in the first half of the first century BCE and continued in use until the third century CE contained a well.[23] It was 2 by 6.4 metres and extended below the room which was in front of the synagogue prayer hall; access was from the next door room.[24] Although there are many cisterns or wells on Delos, this is one of only two into which a person could descend.[25] That this well was accessible suggests it was used for some sort of ritual ablutions in which one needed to descend into a volume of water. Bruneau thus suggested that it was used for ritual immersion.[26] In addition the original excavators of the synagogue found a rectangular basin of blue marble in the room which led into the prayer hall,[27] which was probably therefore used for the washing of hands. Bruneau found a fragment of another blue marble basin in the debris which had accumulated in the well.[28]

2.1.2 The first synagogue at Dura–Europos was constructed between 165 and 200 CE. Into the north east corner of the floor of the peristyle courtyard, which was directly in front of the prayer hall, was set a shallow stone basin, a fragment of which was discovered in the excavations.[29] The second synagogue on the site, which was finished in 244–5 CE, probably also had a wash–basin. The drainage system discovered in the building suggests that a basin was set into the northwest corner of the open courtyard [which again led into the prayer hall]. The basin itself was not found.[30] That the first and probably the second basins were both set at ground level suggests they were used for washing both hands and feet.

2.1.3 At Stobi the second synagogue on the site, built above the "Polycharmos Synagogue" in the early fourth century CE, was linked to the "House of Psalms", an elaborate complex of rooms, fountains, courts and mosaic pavements, which are probably of Jewish origin.[31] It is not known if the fountains were used for ritual ablutions, although this is possible.[32] Thus, in five of the six diaspora synagogues which have been systematically excavated there have

been found some sort of provision for water.[33]

2.1.4 Two basins were found in a side room of the sixth century CE synagogue at Nara [Hammam Lif] in Tunisia. Goodenough thought that those who attended the synagogue service first washed their hands in either of these basins.[34]

2.1.5 A papyrus dated to 113 CE from Arsinoe in Middle Egypt, is an account of the water system for the city presented to the auditor by four administrators of the supply. Among the users of the water are two Jewish prayer houses:
ἀρχόντων Ἰ[ου]δαίων προσευχῆς Θηβαίων μηνιαιω[ν] [δρ.] ρκη· ... εὐχειου ὁμοιως ... [35]
From the archontes of the synagogue of the Theban Jews[36] 128 dr monthly ... From the place of prayer likewise [128dr monthly] ...

An interesting feature of the papyri is the fact that the baths of Severianus pay 72dr 18ob per month and various fountains only 36dr 9ob.[37] The rate is clearly set according to the category to which the consumer belongs, but is also related to the average consumption, a fountain paying less than the baths. But why do the synagogues pay so much? We must conclude that they used a great deal of water. It is possible that the members of the respective Jewish communities obtained their daily water supply from the synagogues and that there were boarding houses of some sort connected with the synagogues.[38] However, it also seems very probable that much water was used in the synagogues themselves. Ablutions would then be the most likely cause of the use of significant quantities of water there.[39]

2.2 The following evidence from Palestine can also be briefly noted.

2.2.1 **Wash–basins.**

Three limestone lavers, each with a capacity of 60 litres, were discovered in the synagogue of Capernaum.[40] It is thought that they had been situated near the entrance of the synagogue.[41] In one corner of the narthex of the synagogue at En–Gedi was found a large, built–in laver basin and nearby a stone bowl and a pottery jar evidently used in connection with the basin.[42] The excavators of the synagogue at Beth Alpha found stone vessels not far from the courtyard. Sukenik thought that one of the vessels would have been situated on a fixed stand outside the north wall of the vestibule which was between the synagogue's prayer hall and courtyard.[43] Kohl and Watzinger noted fragments of a stone flat–bottomed basin immediately in front of the synagogue at Gush Halav.[44] At Jassud–Hamma'le a water basin, 90 by 100cm was found in the northwest corner of a building that was most likely a synagogue.[45] At Gaza, two large marble basins found by the excavators may have originally stood in the centre

of the synagogue courtyard.[46] Foundations for some sort of water vessel were found in the centre of the courtyard in front of the synagogue at Beth Alpha.[47] Finally, Safrai and Stern note that one of the Palestinian fragments in the genizah published in 1973 reads:

> Therefore the men of old set up in the courtyards of synagogues whole sinks to sanctify the hands and the feet.[48]

2.2.2 Fountains or Pools.

In the courtyard in front of the adjoining narthex of the synagogue at Na'aran the excavators found a square pool or fountain.[49] At Gerasa there may have been a fountain in the centre of the synagogue court since stone channels for water pipes were found. However it is not certain that this building was a synagogue.[50] The synagogue of Theodotus in Jerusalem, which provided accomodation for pilgrims and visitors is known from a pre–70 CE inscription which also mentions τὰ χρησ[τ]ήρια τῶν ὑδάτων – "the water installation", which, along with lodgings, was provided for visitors.[51] It is likely that the water was for the daily needs of lodgers,[52] although as Deissmann suggests, it probably was also used for ablutions in the synagogue itself.[53]

2.2.3 Cisterns.

Two rock–cut cisterns have been found under the mosaic pavement of the court which provided passage from the terrace outside to the main prayer hall in the synagogue at Beth–She'arim. The position of the cisterns suggests that the water was poured into a small basin so that it could be used by those entering the prayer hall.[54] The synagogue at Japhia seems to have made use of at least one of the cisterns which were found underneath the pavement of the prayer hall.[55] There were several plastered cisterns flanking the apse of one of the two synagogues found in Hammath Tiberias.[56] No mikvaoth were found in any of these three synagogues. This suggests that the water from the cisterns was poured into a basin of some sort for the washing of hands and feet.

2.2.4 Mikvaoth, with or without cisterns, associated with synagogues.

A building complex close to the synagogue at Chorozin included three subterranean chambers, one of which was a cistern for storing water and another possibly a mikvah.[57] At Herodium a mikvah was added by the Zealots in front of an assembly hall that has been identified by some scholars as a synagogue.[58] At Masada two mikvaoth were found, one of which was near to a building which has been identified as a synagogue, although this attribution remains controversial.[59] To my knowledge, these are the only mikvaoth which are actu-

ally or possibly connected with a synagogue building and thus are of concern here. A number of other mikvaoth have been discovered in areas of Jewish habitation; however, our interest here is not with water sources in general, but rather an investigation of water sources found in connection with synagogues. We will therefore not discuss the evidence for other mikvaoth.[60]

Thus in 11 out of 36 buildings which have been validated as synagogues[61] some sort of water source has been found. In four other places, where the remains of a synagogue are less clear, such sources have been discovered.[62] We should recall that the excavation of synagogues has often been partial; this means that in some places water sources which were present in antiquity will not have been discovered.[63]

2.2.5 A related matter that is significant here is that of the situation of the synagogue in a town. Rabbinic literature prescribes that they should be built on the highest site in the town, but it seems that this was not always observed in Babylon, and it is very questionable if it applied in the Diaspora.[64] On the other hand we do have some evidence which suggests that synagogues were at times built by preference in the proximity of water. There is no evidence for this in Rabbinic literature, but we know of the following evidence:

[a] In Ant 14:256–8, a decree of the people of Halicarnassus,[65] the Jews of the city were granted permission to "build places of prayer [τὰς προσευχὰς] near the sea in accordance with their native custom. [κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἦθος.]"[66]

[b] In Acts 16:13 we are told that Paul and Silas went to the riverside at Philippi where they thought there would be a synagogue [οὗ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι]. This suggests they were familiar with the custom of siting synagogues near water.

[c] A papyrus of the late second century BCE from Arsinoe–Crocodilopolis mentions a synagogue which was by a canal.[67]

[d] Synagogues were built by water or the sea at Delos, Aegina, Capernaum, Naro, Caesarea and Gush Halav.[68] When considered with points [a] – [c], this evidence would seem to be significant.

It seems likely in view of the evidence presented for wash basins, cisterns etc, that synagogues were, on occasions when it was possible, sited by rivers, canals or the seashore so that water did not need to be provided within the synagogue itself. Worshippers would be able to use the water available in the area.[69] What does this obvious concern for water sources tell us?

3. This body of evidence, which has rarely been examined in detail, provides helpful insight into synagogue life in Asia Minor and elsewhere. Clearly the provision of water in a synagogue complex, whether it be via a fountain, or a

cistern, and whether it be used in a washbasin or a mikvah, shows a concern for ablutions and thus for purity. Where the information is known, the water source was generally to be found in the forecourt or entrance way to the prayer hall of the synagogue. We can suggest therefore that Jews in Asia Minor and elsewhere washed their hands [and sometimes their feet as well] before entering the prayer hall of the synagogue, and thus before prayer.

We know that purity was one of the very strong concerns across the spectrum of Judaism in the period under consideration. It was a significant facet of Jewish identity and affected virtually all spheres of Jewish life.[70] The evidence for wash basins and water-sources from synagogues and inscriptions in Asia Minor presented above [limited though it may be] shows that Judaism in this area shared in the general concern for purity. The evidence in fact shows how general and widespread this concern was. We can therefore suggest that in this matter of purity Jewish communities in Asia Minor belonged within the mainstream of Jewish life. Like Jewish communities elsewhere, Jews in Asia Minor carried out ablutions before entering the synagogue. This finding is important in itself. We have previously discussed the evidence for the related matter of food laws in Asia Minor and have shown that in this area too there is evidence that Jewish communities in Asia Minor shared the general concern for purity and for observance of ancestral traditions.[71] The concern for purity shown by the presence of these water sources is particularly significant in view of the nature of our evidence for Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Since we have mainly inscriptional and archaeological data, it is difficult to discover details about the faith and practice of these Jewish communities. However, we here have evidence which suggests that both communities whose synagogues have been excavated and two other communities known from inscriptions seem to have observed some purity rules. We can suspect that many other communities in Asia Minor similarly observed some purity rules.[72] This suggests that these communities likewise observed other features of Jewish identity, such as circumcision, for which we have no direct evidence. This therefore complements our findings concerning the strong retention of Jewish identity which we have noted previously in the course of this thesis.

3.1 There are a number of texts which confirm our suggestion made from the position of the water sources in the synagogue; that is, that the particular reason for carrying out ablutions before entering the synagogue was that the hands were to be washed before prayer. Since the synagogue was the prayer-house of the community, ablutions were carried out before entering. The texts which allude to hand washing prior to prayer are the following:

Letter of Aristeas 305–6:

> Following the custom of all the Jews, they [the translators] washed their hands in the sea in the course of their prayers to God, and then proceeded to the reading and explication of each point. I asked this question: 'What is their purpose in washing their hands while saying their prayers?' They explained that it is evidence that they have done no evil, for all activity takes place by means of the hands.[73]

Sibylline Oracles III. 591–3:

> At dawn they [the Jews] lift up holy arms toward heaven, from their beds, always sanctifying their flesh[74] with water, and they honour only the Immortal who always rules, ...[75]

Judith 12:7–9:

> She [Judith] remained in the camp for three days, going out each night into the valley of Bethulia and bathing in the spring. When she came up from the spring she prayed the Lord, the God of Israel, to prosper her undertaking to restore her people. Then she returned to the camp purified...

The following passage from Tosefta Berakot suggests that someone who was impure would try to undergo some sort of ritual ablutions before reciting the Shema':

> Wer durch Samenerguß unrein geworden ist und kein Wasser zum Baden hat, darf das Schma' rezitieren, lasst es aber seine Ohren nicht horen und spricht weder vorher noch nachher eine Benediktion. [Das sind] Worte des R. Me'ir. Aber die Gelehrten sagen: Er darf das Schma' rezitieren, es seine Ohren horen lassen und die Benediktion vorher und nachher sprechen.[76]

However, it is not until Amoraic times that we find a clear reference to this custom in Rabbinic literature.[77] BT Tractate Berakoth states that some Rabbis washed their hands prior to reading the Shema' and prayer:

> Rab washed his hands, read the Shema', put on the Tefillin and then offered his prayers. ... One who is digging a cavity for a corpse ..., when the time of reading the Shema' arrives, he ascends, washes his hands, puts on the Tefillin, reads the Shema' and offers his prayers. ... R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: Whoever has evacuation, washes his hands, lays Tefillin, reads the Shema', and offers his prayers, the Scriptures ascribe to him as though he had erected an altar and brought a sacrifice thereon; as it is written, 'I will wash my hands in cleanliness; so will I compass thine altar, O Lord.' [Ps 26:6] Rabbah said to him: Does not the master think that it is as though he had bathed his whole body? [Yes] for it is written, 'I will wash [in cleanliness]', not simply 'I will cause [mine hands] to be washed.'[78]

It seems therefore that washing the hands is a symbolic act which signifies the cleansing of the person concerned. LetAris and BT Tractate Berakot take it

that pure hands mean the whole person is pure and therefore has done no evil. In Sibylline Oracles some part of the body is washed to sanctify the person and make their arms "holy". Judith however has the opportunity of bathing before prayer in order to purify herself. The evidence suggests therefore that washing, whether actually of the whole body or symbolically through washing the hands, was an act of purification before approaching Yahweh in prayer.[79]

3.2 We should take careful note of the dating of our evidence from the Diaspora. The earliest evidence for washbasins and water facilities in the Diaspora comes from Delos [first half of the first century BCE], Arsinoe [113 CE] Dura-Europos [c.165–200 CE], Sardis [the fountain probably c.200 CE], Priene and Deliler [both probably third century CE]. Synagogues were situated by water in Egypt in the late second century BCE and at Halicarnassus in the late first century BCE.

The evidence for washing hands before prayer is also quite early – the Letter of Aristeas, Judith and Sibylline Oracles III in particular. The synagogue at Delos [and the Theodotus inscription from Jerusalem] show that water facilities were to be found in some synagogues prior to 70 CE. Likewise some synagogues were built by water in this period. Thus, we have evidence that before the destruction of the Temple, water facilities were used in some synagogues as people entered the synagogue because they were going there to pray. It is probable that this was the case in Jewish communities in Asia Minor before 70 CE but we have no evidence to substantiate this.

4. Other Matters.

4.1 We have noted that there are different types of water facilites at different synagogues – basins suitable for washing hands only or hands and feet, fountains, cisterns and mikvaoth. It is helpful to observe that in the Jewish literature washing of only the hands and feet is sometimes required before entering the Tabernacle or Temple, whilst at other times washing of the whole body is specified.

In Ex 30:17–21 Yahweh instructs Moses to make a laver so that Aaron and his sons can wash their hands and feet when they enter the tent of meeting or come near the altar.[80] However in Lev 16:4 the priest is required to bathe his whole body before dressing to enter the holy place.[81] The Testament of Levi 9:11 requires the following:

> Before you enter the sanctuary [τά ἅγια] bathe [λούου], while you are sacrificing wash [νίπτου] and again when the sacrifice is concluded, wash [νίπτου].[82]

Would a group that was concerned with ablutions before entering their prayer

hall require immersion, or the washing of hands and feet? It seems from the above texts that it could be a matter of debate. Although the use of a hand basin is far simpler than the use of a mikvah, we can well understand that some synagogues had basins for washing hands and perhaps feet, whilst others had mikvaoth close by.[83] This seems to be another matter upon which there was a diversity of practice in different Jewish communities.

4.2 We have previously noted the presence of Gentile God–worshippers in synagogues in Asia Minor. It is difficult to know how these Gentiles stood vis–a–vis purity concerns. We know they adopted some Jewish practices, so it is reasonable to suggest that provided they likewise washed their hands on entry into the synagogues, they would have been regarded as acceptable synagogue participants.[84]

Chapter 9.

Jewish Community and Greek City in Asia Minor.

In this chapter I will examine the relationship between the Jewish communities in Asia Minor and the cities in which they lived. I will discuss the evidence concerning Jews being citizens of their city, or Roman citizens, and for Jews being actively involved in different facets of the life of their city.

1. What was the constitutional position of Jewish communities in Asia Minor? Did they posses Greek citizenship as a body, and how were they organised?

The investigation of the civic rights of the Jewish communities in the Diaspora in general and in Asia Minor in particular is difficult and much debated. Due to differences in founding and development of the various Diaspora communities, the position of the Jews in communities outside Asia Minor does not help us in the examination of the civic position of Jews in Asia Minor itself. Thus other evidence will be discussed only as it is relevant to Asia Minor.

1.1 In Ant 12:119 Josephus states that Seleucus Nicator [d. 280 BCE] granted the Jews citizenship [πολιτεία] in the cities he founded in Asia, Lower Syria and Antioch and gave them equal privileges [ἰσοτίμος] with the Macedonian and Greek settlers.[1] They still possessed this citizenship in Josephus own day. Similarly in CAp 2:39 Josephus claims that:

> Our Jewish residents in Antioch [οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν κατοικοῦντες] are called Antiochenes, having been granted rights of citizenship [πολιτείαν] by its founder, Seleucus. Similarly, those at Ephesus and throughout the rest of Ionia bear the same name as the indigenous citizens [τοῖς αὐθιγενέσι πολίταις ὁμωνυμοῦσιν], a right which they received from the Diadochi.

However, as Tcherikover has pointed out, it is uncertain whether Josephus' claims regarding citizenship in Seleucid foundations should be accepted. Firstly, we have no independent confirmation of the claim. Secondly, in Ant 12:120 Josephus endeavours to strengthen his argument about citizenship, perhaps because he realized it was questionable. However, his attempt to do so - by stating that Jews in Antioch could receive money in lieu of foreign oil - is weak. It need imply no more than that Jews had permission to use municipal oil together with citizens, rather than that they were citizens themselves. Thirdly, in BJ 7:110 Josephus speaks of the δικαιώματα of the Jews in Antioch being inscribed on bronze tablets. The use of this term is surprising since it could refer simply to the privileges of an immigrant community rather than to citizenship. It therefore tends to cast doubt on the claims of the Ant 12:119 and CAp 2:39.[2] However, whilst these points cast some doubt on the matter, they do not actually disprove Josephus's claim.

In Ant 16:160-1 Josephus again refers to the Hellenistic kings. He states that the Jews of Asia and Cyrenaean Libya had been granted ἰσονομία by "the kings". After the Greeks took their sacred monies, the Jews sent envoys to Augustus who granted them ἰσοτέλεια. "ἰσονομία" is a political ideal, and the exact implications of the term remain unclear. "ἰσοτέλεια" denotes the privilege granted to metics whereby they became subject to the same taxation as citizens.[3] If Josephus is using the term in its technical sense, then it does not suggest that the Jews had citizenship rights. However, it is not clear if Augustus' grant applied to the Jews of Asia or only to those of Cyrenaean Libya, and thus the passage does not clarify the actual position in Asia.[4]

1.2. Josephus gives two accounts of a dispute in 14 BCE between the Jews of Ionia and their cities which was heard by Marcus Agrippa. The two accounts differ and so will be examined in turn. In Ant 12:125-6 we read:

> And we know that Marcus Agrippa had a similar view concerning the Jews, for when the Ionians agitated against them and petitioned Agrippa ἵνα τῆς πολιτείας ἣν αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν Ἀντίοχος ὁ Σελεύκου υἱωνός, ὁ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν Θεὸς λεγόμενος, μόνοι μετέχωσιν, and claimed that, if the Jews were to be their συγγενεῖς, they should worship the Ionians' gods, the matter was brought to trial and the Jews won the right to use their own customs, their advocate being Nicolas of Damascus; for Agrippa gave his opinion that it was not lawful for him to make a new rule.

This passage is difficult to interpret. Josephus' report of the outcome of the dispute seems quite straight forward - Agrippa decided to confirm the status quo and thus allowed the Jews to follow their own customs. This would suggest that the Ionians had disputed these customs [perhaps the privilege of sending the Temple tax or of not appearing in court on the Sabbath] and that they were the centre of the trouble.

However, the beginning of the report is somewhat different, and seems to relate to citizenship. A crucial matter here is who "τῆς πολιτείας ἣν αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν" refers to, ie. who is meant by "αὐτοῖς". There are two possibilities. Firstly, it could refer to the Jews, in which case the Jews currently had the citizenship but were exempt from worshipping the Ionians' gods. The Ionians were saying to Agrippa that since the Jews did not worship the city's gods they should be deprived of their citizenship. Secondly, it could refer to the Greeks. In this case the Jews were asking for or claiming citizenship which had been given to the Greeks alone by Antiochus II Theos. Yet the Jews had also asked to be exempt from worshipping the city's gods, and the Greeks objected to giving the Jews the privilege of citizenship without its obligations. However, against this possibility is the fact that the evidence for Antiochus II granting a democratic

constitution to the cities of Asia, as is required by this interpretation, is very slender.[5]

Thus "αὐτοῖς" probably refers to the Jews and the passage therefore claims that the Jews received citizenship rights from Antiochus II Theos, and implies that they were also exempt from the city's cult.[6] However, this still leaves the difference between the beginning and the end of the report; it starts by asking that the Jews should be deprived of their citizenship and ends with a confirmation of the status quo, which is said to be the privilege of following their own customs, with no mention being made of citizenship. One would at the very least expect the conclusion of the account to include a confirmation of citizenship rights, since [according to the beginning of the passage] this was the matter under dispute.

A possible solution to this difficulty is provided by examining Josephus' other account of the incident in Ant 16:27-61.[7] In this report the Jews [not the Ionians] approach Herod and Agrippa and complain of mistreatment - viz having to appear in court on holy days, being deprived of the Temple tax, and being forced to do military service and civic duties despite exemptions granted by the Romans. Nicolas spoke on behalf of the Jews and concentrated on the Roman's willingness to allow people to follow their own traditions, and the current difficulties the Jews in Ionia were having in doing this due to local opposition. He made no mention of the Jews in Ionia having citizenship, nor did he ask for this. His request was that Agrippa might confirm the Jewish privilege of being able to follow their own customs.

There follows a short account of the to and fro between the Jews and the Greeks after Nicolas' speech.[8] Agrippa sided with the Jews and agreed to their request. We read in Ant 16:60 that:

> he was ready to grant the Jews all they might ask for ... And since they asked that the rights which they had formerly received should not be annulled, he would confirm their right to continue to observe their own customs without suffering mistreatment.

This is therefore a coherent account concerning the confirmation of Jewish privileges by Agrippa, with no mention being made of citizenship. It therefore agrees with the end of the account in Ant 12:125-6, but not with the beginning of that passage. This means that the report in Ant 12:125 that the Jews were granted citizenship by Antiochus II Theos cannot be accepted with confidence. It does not disprove the report, but we cannot say that the claim was justified.[9]

1.3 We have two passages in Josephus which relate to the Jewish communities in Sardis. In 49 BCE Lucius Antonius, the proquaestor and propraetor wrote to Sardis stating that he had agreed to some requests of the Jewish community

there.[10] The text is uncertain, but he refers to the Jews as either Ιουδαιοι πολιται ἡμέτεροι or ὑμέτεροι, thus as either Roman citizens or citizens of Sardis. There seems to be no sure way of deciding between these two options, although the second reading is perhaps more likely.[11]

This passage as a whole raises the related matter of the organisational form of the Jewish community at Sardis. The details of the letter suggest that the Jewish community in Sardis was organised as a πολίτευμα. The term can denote a normal Greek city, or the entirety of the inhabitants of a locality, or a quasi-autonomous community of aliens with the right of residence in a city, and the right of managing their own judicial and religious affairs.[12] It is in this last sense that the term applies to Jewish communities. The politeuma was a form of organisation whereby a group of aliens could be incorporated into a city without making them citizens. Thus it would allow the Jewish community to have official standing in a city without losing its identity, and without being faced with the dilemma of participation in the city's religious observances. It also means that where we have evidence for a politeuma we can conclude the Jewish community concerned did not possess the citizenship of the city as a body.

The actual term "πολίτευμα" is found in LetAris 310 with respect to the Alexandrian Jewish community. The civic status of the Jewish community in Alexandria is a complex matter which need not be discussed here in detail. Suffice to note that the "Letter of Claudius" seems to establish that the Jewish community as a whole did not possess Greek citzenship, but rather lived "in a city not their own [ἐν ἀλλοτρία πόλει]."[13] It seems likely that LetAris is correct and that the Jewish community was organised as a politeuma.

The term also occurs in two Jewish inscriptions from Berenice in Cyrenaica, one probably to be dated in the Augustan era, the other in 24 CE. Here again it seems clear that the Jews did not possess citizenship as a group.[14]

Ant 14:235 [discussed above] suggests that the Jewish community at Sardis was organised as a politeuma. The community had stated that from the earliest time they had had a σύνοδος of their own and a τόπος in which they decided their own affairs. The use of σύνοδος indicates that they had their own jurisdiction.[15] Further evidence is provided by an undated decree of the people of Sardis given in Ant 14:259-261. The Jewish community had approached the council and people and asked for a confirmation of their privileges. They asked that:

> in accordance with their accepted customs, [they may] come together and have a communal life and adjudicate suits among themselves [συνάγωνται καὶ πολιτεύωνται καὶ διαδικάζωνται πρὸς αὑτούς], and that a place be given them in which they may gather

> together with their wives and children and offer their ancestral prayers and sacrifices to God. ...

Their request was granted. Again, the privileges mentioned are those which constitute a politeuma.[16] However, the fact that the term is not actually used means we cannot be certain that the Jewish community was a politeuma, although this seems likely.

There is debate about one section of Ant 14:259. The decree begins "ἐπεὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἰουδαῖοι πολῖται ..." Tarn suggested that this was a contradiction in terms and that πολῖται was an interpolation.[17] However, other scholars who have thought the Jewish community in Sardis was organised as a politeuma, have suggested that members of a politeuma within the polis may have been called "πολῖται".[18] However, even if Jews described fellow members of a politeuma as πολῖται,[19] it seems very doubtful that the city of Sardis would use the term of the Jewish community [especially along with κατοικέω] unless all the Jews were citizens of the city, and we have no secure evidence which indicates this.[20] It seems reasonable to suggest that πολῖται is an interpolation and thus does not provide evidence for Jewish citizenship.

Thus, it seems likely, though not certain, that the Jewish community at Sardis was organised as a politeuma and did not possess Greek citizenship as a body. More than this we cannot say.

1.4 On the basis of the probability that Jewish politeumata existed at Alexandria, Berenice and probably at Antioch and Sardis,[21] some scholars have thought that this was the general constitutional form of organisation for Diaspora Jewish communities.[22] However, this generalisation cannot be justified. The communities where we have evidence for politeumata were long-established large communities. Smaller communities, or those with a shorter history probably had a different organisational form. The fact that there was no "Jewish charter" until Claudius, as we noted in Chapter 1, means that arrangements were governed by ad hoc local decisions. There are no grounds therefore for thinking that Jewish communities were everywhere organised as politeumata.[23]

1.5 Two other terms are found in inscriptions from Asia Minor which have some bearing on the issue of the constitutional position of the Jewish communites. In an inscription of the Roman period from Hierapolis it is stated that a fine is to be paid "τῇ κατοικίᾳ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων."[24] A κατοικία can be a separate settlement, or a group of residents within a foreign city; the latter is the sense here.[25] The members of such a group would have the right of residence and some independence.[26]

Secondly, in an inscription from Nysa we read "τὸν τόπον... τῶι λαῶι καὶ

τῇ συνόδωι τ[ῶν περὶ] Δωσίθεον Θεογένου."[27] The double description of the group indicates that the "people" formed an association which was grouped around Dositheus.[28] We can suggest therefore that the Jewish community at Nysa formed a σύνοδος of some sort which was recognized by the city. This does not however allow us to make any statement with regard to the group about citizenship, although it does suggest they had a measure of autonomy.

We note the different forms of internal organisation adopted by these communites at Sardis, Hierapolis and Nysa. This raises the possibility that other communities adopted other forms of settlement and organisation. In any case we are not able to make generalizations.

We conclude therefore that the case for the possession of citizenship rights by Jewish communities in Asia Minor is not proved.[29] The evidence from Josephus on citizenship does not solve the matter. The evidence does suggest that the Jewish communites at Sardis and Hierapolis were organised as independent units of foreign people with rights of residence and some autonomy.

This does not however mean that no Jews were citizens of their cities in Asia Minor. According to Acts, Paul was a citizen of Tarsus,[30] and it is likely that the Jews involved in the gymnasium at Iasos and perhaps Hypaepa became citizens of their cities.[31] We know that a number of Jews in Sardis from the third century onwards were Σαρδιανοί; one Jew from Corycos was also described as Κωρυκιώτου.[32] The inscriptions show that possession of the citizenship of Sardis at this date was still worthy of note and thus an honour which only a certain number of Jews possessed.[33]

2. A further important area is the possession of Roman citizenship by Jews in Asia Minor. Roman citizenship could be gained through an individual grant, through purchase, through discharge after serving as an auxiliary and through formal manumission.[34]

2.1 The earliest evidence in this regard is provided by a series of documents preserved by Josephus concerning exemption from military service, discussed in Chapter 1, Section 5.4. In 49 BCE the consul L. Lentulus Crus released "those Jews who are Roman citizens [πολίτας Ῥωμαίων Ἰουδαίους] and observe Jewish rites and practise them in Ephesus" from military service [Ant 14:228]. That the exemption applied to Jews with Roman citizenship is stated in related letters or statements in Ant 14:232,234,237,240. Ant 14:231 implies that the exemption covered all Jewish Roman citizens in Asia.[35] This number of documents strongly suggests that the restriction to Jews with Roman citizenship goes back to the Roman authorities themselves.[36]

The difficult matter is to know how many Jews were able to claim this

exemption. Smallwood thought:

> The number of Jews affected must have been infinitesimally small, and the exemption can have made no appreciable difference to the war effort. But the significance of Lentulus' action lies in the principle of toleration which it embodied, and the fact that he considered it worth while to secure the goodwill of the large and influential Jewish communities in Asia by a gesture of sympathy towards their religion.[37]

However, others take the documents to imply that a significant number of Jews possessed Roman citizenship.[38] Smallwood's view does raise the question of whether the consul would have been concerned with a "gesture of sympathy" at a time when he needed to raise two legions of soldiers for the senatorial cause. And in any case for a "gesture" to be meaningful it must have some impact, which it probably would not have had if an "infinitesimally small" number of people were involved. Clearly, the matter cannot be decided, but it does raise the possibility that a significant number of Jews in Asia were Roman citizens at this time.[39]

We do have some evidence that individual Jews in Asia Minor were Roman citizens. Prior to 212 or 214 CE [on which see section 2.2] we know [according to Acts] of Paul, citizen of Tarsus and a Roman citizen,[40] Π. Τυρρώνιος Κλάδος, the archisynagogos for life at Acmonia,[41] and Μ(ᾶρκος) Ἀρ(ήλιος) Μούσσιος, a priest from Ephesus.[42] In an undated inscription we learn of Λούκιος Λόλλιος Ἰοῦσστος, secretary of the Jewish community in Smyrna.[43] We do not know how any of these men gained Roman citizenship.

2.2 In the Constitutio Antoniniana of 212 or 214 Caracalla gave Roman citizenship to all [or nearly all] free inhabitants of the empire.[44] All Jews who were free would have been included in this grant.[45] Although we have no direct evidence on the matter, it seems probable that Jews who became Roman citizens retained their religious liberty and were exempted from the duties of citizenship which conflicted with their religion.[46]

3. We must conclude therefore that we know of very few Jews in Asia Minor who had local citizenship; the situation is similar as regards Roman citizenship prior to 212 or 214 CE. However, this does not mean that members of various Jewish communities were not involved in city life. We have evidence that despite their lack of citizenship, some Jews and some Jewish communities were integrated to quite some degree into city life and took an active part in their city's affairs.

3.1 We have some evidence of Jews being what may be called "good residents" of their city. In an inscription from Smyrna written in the time of Hadrian [117-138 CE] we read of a list of people who had made donations to

the city for public works. Among them is a group called "οἱ ποτὲ Ἰουδαῖοι" who gave 10,000 drachmae, a small amount in the context.[47] The phrase has generally been translated as "the former Jews"; that is people who had apostatized in the interests of obtaining citizenship and were now advertising their rise in the social scale.[48] However, Kraabel has shown that a political explanation of the inscription is much more likely than a religious one. The phrase should be translated as "the former Judaeans" signifying that the donors were people who had come originally from Judaea. This seems likely, especially since the citizens of Smyrna who set up the monument would have chosen the exact wording. Thus the group of Jews, who were perhaps an association of some sort, were, in donating the money, doing their civic duty as residents of Smyrna. In a time when Jews in Egypt, Cyrenaica and Cyprus had revolted against their Gentile neighbours and those in Palestine had fought a full scale war against Rome some Jews in Smyrna showed a completely different attitude in demonstrating that they were loyal and benevolent members of their city.[49]

We have previously noted that in Acmonia, some Jews made a donation of some sort to the city and in doing so called Acmonia their πατρίς - their "home city" or "native town". The donation shows the Jews' involvement in the life of the city, and the term used indicates a strong degree of "at homeness".[50]

We have discussed the seating inscription of the Imperial age from the theatre at Miletus which reads "Τόπος Ἰουδέων τῶν καὶ Θεοσεβίων,[51] and shows that there was a group of seats in the theatre reserved for Jews [and as we have argued, probably for "God-worshippers" as well]. Clearly, some Jews regularly attended the theatre, which was a centre of the cultural life of the city where speeches, choral dances and dramatic performances could all be enjoyed.[52] In addition, that the Jews enjoyed the privilege of reserved seats [and fine fifth row seats at that] shows that they were prominent and respected members of the theatre audiences. That the Jews enjoyed this sort of official recognition and respect in the city shows the acceptance granted to them in Miletus and their own integration into the city and its cultural life.

There appears to have been a similar situation in Aphrodisias where two seating inscriptions [perhaps to be dated in the sixth century CE] have been found in the odeum. They read: "Τόπος Βενέτων Ἑβρέων τῶν παλειῶν, and Τόπος Ἑβρέων.[53] Thus, some Jews had reserved seats. The odeum was a small theatre or roofed hall for musical competitions recitations and other gatherings such as philosophical disputations. They were often richly decorated and we know of a number in Asia Minor.[54] Jews appear to have regularly participated in this part of the social and cultural life of the city of Aphrodisias.

In a decree of Augustus to be dated in 12 BCE and addressed to the Jews of Asia we read:

> As for the resolution which was offered by them in my honour concerning the piety which I show to all men, and on behalf of Gaius Marcius Censorinus, I order that it and the present edict be set up in the most conspicuous (part of the temple) assigned to me by the federation of Asia in Ancyra. [Ant 16:165][55]

It seems [if the passage is authentic] that some Jews of Asia had passed a resolution concerning Augustus. In this way they had shown themselves to be loyal supporters of the Emperor; Augustus appropriately acknowledged their action.[56]

A Hebrew inscription discovered in the Sardis synagogue suggests that the Jewish community formally honoured the co-Emperor Lucius Verus, perhaps during a visit to the city in 166 CE. Unfortunately, this possibility remains only a tentative suggestion.[57] However, the evidence from Sardis as a whole suggests the Jewish community was actively involved in the life of the city. The synagogue was an integral and prominent part of the bath-gymnasium complex. The lion symbol and the term "*πρόνοια*", both significant in the city as a whole, were probably adopted by the Jewish community precisely because of their usage in Sardis. Through these two elements, the Jewish community expressed their "at homeness" in the city. These facts, taken with the involvement of Jews in the city council and other inscriptional evidence [see section 3.3 below], suggest that the Jewish community was a respected and integrated element in the city, active in civic and political affairs.

At Apamea, the city accepted a new name for a flood "hero" because of the influence of the Jewish community and this was portrayed on the city's coinage. The Jewish community also contributed a new and prestigeous significance for the city's name *Κιβωτός*; the Jewish community also accepted a new prominence for Noah's wife. We therefore see some "give and take" between the city and the Jewish community. Clearly the Jewish community was influential, respected and integrated into the life of the city.[58]

Thus we have some evidence which suggests that members of the Jewish communities in Asia Minor were "good residents" of their cities who actively participated in cultural and civic life.[59]

3.2 We have some very interesting information from inscriptions about Jews who were ephebes or involved in the gymnasium. Ephebes were youths who were engaged for a year or more in training in the gymnasium, in activities which included military and athletic exercises as well as intellectual and cultural development.[60] The gymnasium was the centre of the social life of the city

and education in the gymnasium was a normal prerequisite for Greek citizenship. Thus the ephebate was highly valued and there were strong incentives for parents to enter their sons in the gymnasium.[61]

At Iasos an ephebe list from the beginning of the Imperial period includes a Jew named "Ἰούδας Εὐόδου" - Ioudas son of Euodos. Others mentioned in the list might also be Jewish. Clearly in this city some Jews were involved in the gymnasium.[62]

An inscription probably to be dated in the late second century CE from Hypaepa, south of Sardis reads- "Ἰουδα[ἰ]ων νεωτέρων" – "Of younger Jews".[63] The "Neoteroi" were probably the equivalent of the "Neoi", and therefore were an association of young men.[64] The ephebate of one or two years was often followed by membership of the "young men" who formed a group primarily devoted to gymnastic exercise, but who also played a role in political and public life.[65]

The inscription thus suggests that a group of Jews formed a Jewish "association of young men" in the gymnasium. The inscription might then have been a public marker, perhaps designating the place of the Jewish neoteroi in the local palaestra, or a gift made by the group.[66] It is important to note that the group were called the "*Jewish* younger men". This emphasises that they retained their Jewish identity, and did not become completely associated with other neoteroi.

If this interpretation is correct, then it suggests that involvement in the gymnasium was compatible with remaining a practising Jew and did not mean automatic apostasy. Whilst some compromise was probably made by Jews who wished to be involved in the gymnasium, the fact that the group was publicly known as the "*Jewish* younger men" suggests that some concessions had been gained by the Jewish community, although we have no direct evidence for this.[67] In addition, that in Sardis we find such a close topographical relationship between the synagogue and the gymnasium suggests a marked change of attitude towards the gymnasium compared with that prevalent, for example, in 1 Maccabees. Did the Jewish communities at Sardis, Hypaepa and Iasos [and elsewhere perhaps] see the gymnasium in terms which were less black and white than had the Maccabees before them? If this was the case, perhaps it was because of the self-assurance and strength of these Jewish communities, characteristics which are so clearly visible in the Sardis community.[68] This possibility, combined with possible concessions granted by the city to Jews seems to explain how Jews could remain Jews [as they seem to have done at Hypaepa] and be involved in the gymnasium, the centre of social life of the city.[69]

3.3 We have some evidence that from the third century CE Jews in Asia Minor held local offices in their cities.

We have noted previously that from the third century on eight men held the title βουλευτής at Sardis, and another was a citizen and councillor in nearby Hypaepa. In addition, we learn of a "former procurator", a count and two assistants in the record office at Sardis, all positions in the Roman provincial administration.[70] Two men in Acmonia held a range of important positions in the city in the mid third century CE.[71] An undated funerary inscription from Corycos, Cilicia informs us that Aurelios Eusanbations Menandros was a member of the city council.[72] In a fifth century CE inscription from Side two Jews, Leontios and his father Jacob bear the title συγ., which can only be an abbreviation for συγοστάτης.[73] The office involved control of the weight of money and of precious metal in the city and was a modest but responsible position. Although the title was not used widely, it does occur in a number of different cities and is more frequent in the documents of the later Empire.[74] It is interesting that it was a position that was passed on from a Jewish father to his son.[75]

Finally at Ephesus a Jew whose name can perhaps be restored as Ἰουλίος held the title of ἀρχιατρός which probably designates an offical doctor.[76] Such officially recognised public physicians were paid by the city and their principal task was to give medical attention to citizens. They could charge fees, but were also expected to treat those who could not pay.[77] These official doctors were granted immunity from civic office by Vespasian,[78] but Antoninius Pius limited the number of doctors to whom the cities might grant exemption to ten for a metropolis, seven for a conventus centre and five for ordinary cities, evidently because people had been evading office through taking up the medical profession.[79] In an inscription such as the one under discussion from Ephesus to be dated after Antoninius Pius, it is probable that ἀρχιατρός designated one of these publicly recognised doctors.[80] This is made more likely by a series of inscriptions from Ephesus to be date in the late second or third century CE which show that ἀρχιατρόι were involved in annual medical competitions in such areas as surgery, instruments and an unprepared problem set by examiners. The inscriptions also show that ἀρχιατρόι were members of the local "museum" or university, and gave instruction in medicine. The fact that "ἀρχιατρός" in this series of inscriptions from Ephesus almost certainly means an official public doctor who was granted immunity, strongly suggests that the Jew Ἰουλίος held this office.[81]

Thus, we can conclude that some Jews in Asia Minor held significant offices

in their cities.[82] We also have evidence for a number of Jews who held significant positions in government or civic life in Egypt in the Ptolemaic period, and some under the early Empire.[83] We know of a Jew in Cyrene who held a civic office before 200 CE;[84] according to Malalas, a Jew named Asabinus was a council member at Antioch in Syria around 190 CE.[85] At Jaffa in the time of Trajan a Jew held the position of agoranomos.[86] Some cases of Jews holding office outside of Asia Minor after 200 CE are also known.[87] Thus the situation in Asia Minor was not exceptional, although that a number of office holders are known in Asia Minor after 200 CE does suggest that the members of some Jewish communities [notably in Acmonia and Sardis] were considerably involved in the life of their cities at this time.

We should note here that according to the Digest of Justinian, Severus and Caracalla [sometime between 198 and 211] permitted "those who profess the Jewish religion" to hold city offices [honores], but only imposed on them those obligations which would not conflict with their religion.[88] However, we know that in the third century the holding of municipal office became a burden to be avoided because of the heavy financial cost involved. There had been some unwillingness to serve in earlier periods, but it was not until the latter part of the second century CE that it became a more widespread problem.[89] From this time on a number of different classes of people [eg. public doctors, veterans] sought and gained immunity from holding office.[90] Severus and Caracalla's enactment concerning Jews was probably motivated by a desire to increase the number of people who could take on the burden of office.

Whilst people sought to evade magistracies and liturgies because of the expenditure involved, Jones notes that the rank of councillor was still valued in the third century, probably because of the social prestige which continued to be associated with office and the legal privileges councillors were entitled to.[91] Whilst holding office was more of an obligation to be fulfilled than an honour to be keenly contested, it remained a method of social advancement and a duty which bestowed prestige.[92] Thus office holders continued to receive rewards for their public spiritedness [even it it was coerced], such as inscription which praised their efforts.

That Jews held magistracies in the third century CE in Asia Minor can be seen against this background.[93] Aware of the difficulties facing many cities, Severus and Caracalla widened the circle of those eligible by including the Jews and at the same time exempted them from aspects of office that might have given Jews grounds to refuse such positions. That this law was enacted suggests that there were sufficient Jews in the eastern Mediterranean who could meet

the property qualification and thus were eligible for office and that it was thus worthwhile for the authorities to enable them to hold office.[94] Therefore the fact that Jews did hold office shows that some individuals had gained wealth, social advancement and some standing within their city. This suggests that by the beginning of the third century there was a significant number of Jews who had, or who might be given, local citizenship in Asia Minor [a prerequisite for holding office], a possibility which the Sardis inscriptions with their number of Σαρδιανοί has made all the more likely. We cannot say whether the members of the Jewish communities as a whole obtained local citizenship, or if as before, Jews gained such citizenship as individuals.[95]

3.4 Related to this is the evidence we have of important non-Jews acting as patrons or being involved in the Jewish communities in Asia Minor. We know that around the middle of the first century CE the Gentile Julia Severa built a synagogue for the Jewish community at Acmonia.[96] She was a very important person in the city, having been high priestess of the Imperial cult in the city for at least three terms. She also belonged to a nexus of leading families and had connections with influential people. That she built the Jewish community a synagogue shows that she was also a patroness of this community. Clearly she was a distinguished and powerful friend in the highest circles of society. The Jewish community welcomed and accepted her friendship.

The new inscription from Aphrodisias probably to be dated in the early third century CE lists nine city councillors who are the first names in a list of "θεοσεβῖς" which, as we have argued, almost certainly means "God-worshippers". Although not proselytes, they were people who were involved in the synagogue community and also held important positions in the city. They show the measure of acceptance achieved by this Jewish community in the higher levels of society at Aphrodisias. That these city councillors were prepared to identify themselves openly as God-worshippers suggests that no significant loss of status was incurred by doing so and thus that the Jewish community was a well established and accepted group with good standing in the city.[97]

3.5 Another indication that Jewish communities in Asia Minor participated in the life of the wider city is provided by the evidence that they were influenced by the customs of their local city. In a number of areas we can see that Jews did certain things or adopted a particular practice because of the influence of their environment. By itself, this evidence would be unreliable; one could well understand if over a period of time even a highly insular and inward-looking community adopted some local practices. However, taken with the above evidence of involvement in the city, the following points indicate that the

Jewish communities were integrated into the life of their cities to a significant extent.

The clearest example of this influence is provided by the position of women in Judaism in Asia Minor, which I discussed in Chapter 5. I suggested there that some Jewish communities in Asia Minor adopted one strand of their tradition with regard to women because of the precedent of prominent women in the cities of Asia Minor. We have previously pointed out other areas in which environmental influence is evident. We can note the following here. In 80-90 CE three synagogue officials at Acmonia were honoured with a large golden shield; the honour of the golden crown and the proedria was given to Tation at Phocaea in the third century CE. Both these forms of honouring benefactors were common in the ancient world. The practice of using grave curses on Jewish tombstones in Asia Minor, and the manner of decoration of gravestones in Phrygia were both adopted from the environment. In Acmonia in the third century CE some Jews formed a burial society and adopted the practise of the Rosalia, thus following local customs. As was the case elsewhere in the Diaspora, the organisational form of the Jewish communities tended to imitate the structures of the Greek city.[98] We should also note that although we do know of some Jews who had Jewish names, the majority of Jews in Asia Minor had Greek or to a lesser extent Roman names.[99]

3.6 We have a very interesting late second or third century CE inscription from Hierapolis, which states that Publius Aelius Glykon had prepared a tomb for himself and for his wife and children. The inscription also states that he had bequeathed a sum of money to the most honourable president of the guild of the purple–dyers [τῇ σεμνοτάτῃ προεδρίᾳ τῶν πορφυροβάφων] so that, from the interest of the money, they could decorate his grave annually with a wreath on the Festival of Passover [ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἀζύμων]. In addition, he left money to the guild of the carpet–weavers [τῷ συνε[δρίῳ τῶν] καιροδαπισ[τ]ῶν] so that the grave might be similarly decorated on the Festival of Pentecost [ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ πεντηκο[στῆς]].[100] Clearly Aelius Glykon was a Jew since the festival of ἀζύμα can only refer to the Passover.[101]

We can note first of all that Aelius Glykon has adopted the local custom of decorating a grave with a wreath, a practice which is attested in Hierapolis by pagan inscriptions.[102] Similarly, the arrangements for ensuring that this is carried out – the bequest of a sum of money to a guild – is regularly encountered in the pagan inscriptions of the city.[103] Thus, these are further example of a Jew being influenced by the environment.

Scholars disagree about the character of the two guilds mentioned in this

inscription. Ziebarth, Ramsay, Krauss, Hengel, Hemer and Applebaum thought the guilds were Jewish.[104] Cichorius and Kraabel thought that these guilds had both Gentile and Jewish members.[105] Judeich noted that the inscription does not state that Aelius Glykon was a member of either guild;[106] he suggested that the guilds were purely pagan. Thus a Jew had been able to secure the services of these guilds to decorate his grave.[107] On the evidence available we are probably unable to decide this issue. However, the possible interpretations are all interesting as regards the investigation conducted here. If the guilds were Jewish, it means that the community at Hierapolis had adopted a local form of organisation, since the trade guilds are very common in the city.[108] If the guilds contained both Jewish and Gentile members, then it shows that Jews were an accepted part of such groups. If Judeich's view is correct, it shows that Aelius Glykon was able to induce two Gentile guilds to agree to decorate his grave in perpetuity on the days he requested. These last two possibilities therefore involve a significant degree of integration into the life of the city on the part of either one Jew or a number of Jews. All three interpretations suggest that Jews participated in the life of the wider city; it is only the degree of that involvement which is debated. Yet note that whichever possibility is correct, Aelius Glykon asked that the graves be decorated on two *Jewish* festivals. Jewish identity seems to have been retained.[109]

3.7 Finally, we should recall here our findings of Chapter 7, where we concluded that a group of "God–worshippers" existed in at least some synagogues in Asia Minor. This suggests that the Jewish communities concerned had not withdrawn into themselves, but were open to Gentiles attending the synagogue and learning about Judaism. Perhaps some Jews were on sufficiently close terms with Gentile neighbours to be able to attract their interest in their Jewish community and its faith. This is in keeping with the involvement of some Jewish communities in the life of their cities, the respect granted to them and their openness to their environment.

4. Conclusions.

4.1 We should recall two relevant findings of Chapter 1 at this point. Jewish communities in Asia Minor and elsewhere were granted significant privileges by the Roman authorities, privileges such as being able to send the Temple tax to Jerusalem, to observe the Sabbath, and to follow their own laws. However, these Jewish privileges were also challenged or withdrawn by the local cities at various times. Although there were reasons for the actions of the local cities, there seems to have been a significant amount of hostility between the cities and the Jewish communities, at least from 49 BCE to 2 CE. We further noted

that the silence of our sources about any tensions after this date suggests that a modus vivendi was reached between the cities and the Jewish communities.

That such a modus vivendi was reached in some places in the first century CE or shortly thereafter is suggested by some of the evidence presented in this thesis. In the 60's CE the distinguished Gentile Julia Severa was a patroness of the Jewish community at Acmonia; her contribution was positively recalled in the 80's or 90's. Some time between 30 BCE and 70 CE the author of the Jewish substratum of SibOr I/II who was probably from Apamea reinterpreted the local flood traditions in accordance with Jewish tradition. In doing so s/he was probably building a bridge between the Jewish community and the city, which suggests [although it does no more than this] that relationships between the Jewish community and the city were good. According to Acts, Jews were able to influence Gentiles to oppose Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium and Lystra.[110] This is perhaps a further indication that Jew–Gentile relations were reasonable in these cities. In the time of Hadrian when there were Jewish revolts elsewhere in the Diaspora and in Palestine, some Jews in Smyrna probably showed themselves to be loyal and benevolent residents of their city. In addition, the evidence for positive relations between various cities and their Jewish communities from the second and third century CE onwards is quite strong. These clues suggest that the lack of any mention of hostility in the literary sources between the cities in Asia Minor and their Jewish communities from 2 CE onwards is indeed significant and that some sort of peace was arrived at. Although it is quite likely that the way peace was worked out varied in different places and occurred at different times, we can suggest that at least in some cities a modus vivendi was reached between the city and the Jewish community, perhaps sometime in the first century CE, and in any case probably before the Diaspora revolt of 115–117 CE. We can thus suggest that in many cities in Asia Minor a tradition of tolerance and positive interaction was established between the city and its Jewish community.

4.2 We have also shown that we have no convincing evidence which suggests that Jewish communities in Asia Minor possessed Greek citizenship as a body. However, some Jews in Asia Minor did become citizens, although we do not know the arrangements under which this occurred. The vital matter for the Jewish communities in Asia Minor in the first century BCE was not citizenship, but gaining and retaining the privileges which enabled them to live according to Jewish tradition.

4.3 The evidence discussed in this chapter shows that some Jewish communities in Asia Minor were involved in the life of their city and were influenced

by that society to a large degree. This will be commented upon further in our overall conclusions.

Conclusions.

It is not my intention to reiterate here the conclusions reached at the end of each chapter. However, some more general comments are appropriate.

1. Many scholars have thought that Jewish communities in the Diaspora formed tightly–knit, introverted groups. Faced with a hostile environment, the Jews formed exclusive communities in order to retain their Jewish identity.[1] However, this view is questionable with regard to Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Despite the fact that the evidence is often fragmentary and spans a wide time period, we can suggest that although Jewish communities did not have local citizenship as a body, many members of the communities were involved to a significant degree in city life, and some Jewish communities [most notably at Sardis and Apamea] were influential and respected in their cities. Gentiles were also involved in some of the Jewish communities, most notably as "God–worshippers" or as patrons. In addition, the extent to which some Jewish communities were influenced by the customs and practices of their environment indicates a degree of integration within the city. The Jewish communities we have studied seem to have belonged in the cities in which they lived. They were a part of the social networks of the city and shared in many of the characteristics of everyday life.

It is also to be noted that despite close relationships with the pagan environment, Jewish identity seems to have been strongly retained in Asia Minor.[2] Thus, we have noted that the Jewish community in Acmonia turned to the LXX as an authoritative guide for their community's life and faith and perhaps for the direction and inspiration of their liturgy. An inscription in the Sardis synagogue probably reminded the community of the importance of studying the Torah. In both the Sardis and Priene synagogues provision for the Torah dominated the room. At Apamea the "hero" of the Jewish community, who was accepted by the city, was a figure drawn from Jewish tradition. At Aphrodisias there was probably a group within the Jewish community dedicated to the study of the Law and to prayer. Thus, we get some indication of the importance of the Scriptures in these communities. We also have evidence that in the first century BCE Jewish communities in Asia Minor were committed to paying the Temple tax and through this showed that Jerusalem and its worship remained the geographical focus of their faith. Decrees in Josephus also show a strong concern on the part of various Jewish communities to be able to observe the Sabbath, to live according to their native customs, to follow the food laws and to be exempt from any requirements, such as military service, which would conflict with following their customs. In addition, we have suggested that there

was a concern for purity in at least some Jewish communities in Asia Minor. We have also noted the lack of evidence for syncretism on the part of these Jewish communities. Thus we can suggest that the "Jewishness" of these communities was maintained. A degree of integration did not mean the abandonment of an active attention to Jewish tradition or of Jewish distinctiveness. It was as *Jews* that members of these communities were involved in and a part of the life of the cities in which they lived.[3]

We should note that the evidence for what may be called "Jewish identity" begins in the first century BCE with the Temple tax and continues through to the fourth century CE and later with the Sardis material. The evidence for "integration" begins most clearly in the mid first century CE with Julia Severa at Acmonia, and continues throughout the period under consideration. Thus, although there were almost certainly regional variations, we can suggest that these communities remained *Jewish* [for which the evidence is earlier] whilst becoming more integrated into city life as the first and second century CE proceeded. From the second century CE onwards we have clear evidence for both integration in the city and retention of Jewish identity.

2. It is noticeable that authors who see Jewish communities as aloof and exclusive base their view to a significant degree on the evidence of a number of classical authors who accuse the Jews of exclusiveness and of living in self–imposed segregation.[4] However, we must ask how well these classical authors knew Jewish communities not only in Rome and Judaea, but also in Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt?[5] Further, some of these classical authors had their own presuppositions, such as an antipathy against Oriental religions and a general prejudice against "barbarians".[6] The evidence of classical authors must therefore be used with great care when speaking of the Diaspora as a whole, or when discussing a specific geographical area such as Asia Minor. This study suggests that epigraphical and archaeological evidence adds another important dimension to the total picture of Diaspora Judaism. I am not claiming that the evidence of classical authors is incorrect; rather we must recognize that it is tendentious and incomplete.

3. We should note the significant extent of diversity in Jewish communities in Asia Minor, perhaps most clearly illustrated by the differences between the communities at Sardis and Priene.[7] Thus it seems that local factors – the date at which communities were founded, the circumstances under which they developed, the attitude of the local city, the size of the community – probably provided a strong formative influence on Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Distinct local and regional Jewish traditions seem to have developed. However,

despite this diversity, the evidence studied here suggests that significant features of Jewish identity were retained in the various communities, as we noted in section 1 above. In comparison with Palestinian Jewish communities, these Diaspora communities can thus be seen as equally worthy and legitimate but distinctive heirs of Old Testament faith.

4. This study raises a number of issues and questions in relation to New Testament interpretation which I hope to pursue further in subsequent work. Thus the studies contained in this thesis have some bearing on a number of separate NT issues. We may note the issues of the significance of the "God-worshippers" in early Christianity, the position of women in early Christian communities, the realtionship between Jew and Gentile, particularly in Pauline theology, the use of "θεὸς ὕψιστος" in the NT and the "loyalty" motif in Rom 13:1–7 and 1 Peter 2:13–17.[8]

Other matters relevant to NT interpretation and to the history of the early Church which arise from this thesis can best be raised as questions. What further light is shed on Paul's mission and theology by seeing him in relation to Jewish communities in Asia Minor? Paul travelled extensively in Asia Minor, he founded significant churches there, and it is thus to be hoped that his own thought and development will be further illuminated by seeing him against a more clearly defined and deliniated background. In addition we can ask what further understanding of other NT books and early Christian writers can be gained by seeing them against this background? I think for instance of 1 Peter, Revelation and the letters of Ignatius. What new questions can be asked of the Pauline corpus and of the NT in general in the light of this study? What questions does the evidence presented here pose for accepted viewpoints of NT interpretation? What implications are there for the nature of early Christian communities if the converted Jews in those groups came from the sort of Jewish communities discussed in this thesis? Further, Christian communities in some cities would have developed under the shadow of some of the Jewish communities investigated here [for example, at Sardis]. What significance does this have for our understanding of these Christian communities? It is to be hoped therefore that this study will stimulate further research into both early Judaism and early Christianity.

Appendix 1.

The Eumeneian Formula – Jewish and Christian?

In Chapter 3 I examined inscriptions in which certain formulae indicated a Jewish provenance. I will discuss here a group of inscriptions in which it is difficult to determine the religious provenance because of the "neutrality" of the language.

1. In and around the area of Eumeneia in Southern Phrygia we find a particular grave curse in frequent use – ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν – "he will have to reckon with God". This has been called the "Eumeneian Formula". [It will hereafter be abbreviated to EF; when the formula occurs without any expansions or variations, it will be called the simple EF.][1] Its use clearly originated in the area of Eumeneia and Apamea[2] and later spread to Eastern Phrygia and appears sporadically further afield.[3] The earliest undated inscription probably comes from the first quarter of the third century,[4] whilst the dated EF inscriptions from Eumeneia and environs range from 246–273 CE.[5] In the fourth century CE the EF was replaced in Eastern Phrygia by one of two other formulae.[6] In 1939 Calder knew of 47 examples from Eumeneia and Apamea alone,[7] and the number has increased since then.

The expression "πρὸς τὸν θεόν" is in itself ambiguous. It is not clear from the formula alone whether a pagan god, Yahweh, or the Christian God is intended.[8] There have been various attempts to determine the religious background of the formula.

1.1 In 1878 Kaibel suggested that the formula might be Christian,[9] and its use by Christians was subsequently independently argued by Duchesne[10] and Ramsay.[11] Ramsay thought that inscriptions containing ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα θεόν, or other biblical variations of the simple EF were definitely Christian, and thus decided that the simple EF itself [πρὸς τὸν θεόν] "must be reckoned as Christian".[12]

It does seem that a number of these inscriptions using the EF are indisputably Christian. The reliable identifying elements are the following:
[i] One formula reads ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν *, interpreted by Ramsay as Χριστόν, or Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.[13]
[ii] The occurrence of a clearly Christian word or symbol; for example the word ΙΧΘΥΣ,[14] or Χριστιανόι[15] or the symbol of the fish.[16] In addition Ramsay recorded an inscription with the EF in which Metrodoros the ἐπίσκοπος is mentioned,[17] and a recently published inscription using the formula and dated to the early fourth century CE, contains a cross.[18]

[iii] Clear allusions to passages in the NT; for example one inscription reads: ἔσ[ται] αὐτῶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ νῦν καὶ τῶ παντὶ αἰῶνι καὶ μὴ τύχυτο τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπανγελίας.[19]
He shall have to reckon with God, both now and in all eternity and may he have no part in God's promise.

This is probably an allusion to passages such as Acts 13:32, 26:6.[20]

Commentators have regarded the use of κοιμητήριον [literally "sleeping room"] when used to describe the grave as being "practically confined to Christian use".[21] However, this word is used in epitaphs of both Christians and Jews.[22] Thus for example, we have two Jewish inscriptions from Athens which use the word.[23] Creaghen and Raubitschek write that this word "signifies a Christian burial. If it is used also on Jewish stones, this only indicates a Christian influence."[24] Even if they are right, and the influence is from Christian to Jew and not the reverse [which is certainly questionable[25]] then the word cannot be used as a definite indicator of Christianity. Clearly, in our inscriptions in which it is so difficult to determine the provenance, it is not reliable at all.[26]

Thus we have three categories of "identifying elements" which show that quite a number of inscriptions from the area are definitely Christian. These inscriptions are of great importance. Apart from the Roman catacombs, these Phrygian inscriptions form the only group of pre–Constantinian Christian epitaphs.[27] There are of course "Christian" epitaphs from elsewhere in this period, but those responsible for their erection allowed no trace of their faith to appear on a public memorial.[28] Thus we have no way of identifying their epitaphs; they are identical to those of their pagan neighbours.[29] In fact many of the inscriptions presently under investigation which are identifiable as Christian would "in no respect jar ... on the most susceptible of pagans."[30] Clearly part of the EF's value was its subtlety.

1.2 In 1895 Cumont attempted to show that the formula was *exclusively Christian* and thus not used by pagans at all.[31] Calder subsequently argued that the formula was devised by Christians as one which offended neither their own conscience nor the prejudice of their pagan neighbours.[32] There are however, some indubitably pagan uses of the formula outside Phrygia. This formula occurs in an inscription from Kabalide near Cibyra close to the coast in Lycia: ἔστω αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἡλιων κὲ Σελήνην.[33]

There are seven examples of the following formula, all from Termessos in Pisidia.[34]
ἔσται δὲ (καὶ ἔσται) αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς κατοιχομένους.[35]

However, as Calder and Robert have noted, whilst these inscriptions are of linguistic interest, they do not have any relevance to the use of the formula at Eumeneia, Apamea and Acmonia.[36] In Asia Minor there is a "strong individuality of the form, style and decoration of the monuments of each small district."[37] This rules out comparisons over large distances, such as between Phrygia and the Lycian coast. Thus with the lack of pagan inscriptions using the EF from the area of Phrygia itself, we must conclude that the formula was limited to Christians and [as we hope to show] Jews.[38]

1.3 An examination of the work of scholars mentioned thus far shows that generally they were concerned with establishing a Christian *or* a pagan origin for these inscriptions. Cumont, the first to argue for an exclusively Christian provenance, did not consider a Jewish provenance at all. Whilst he could show that some of the inscriptions were definitely Christian,[39] he made the invalid inference that because some were Christian, therefore all must be, on the basis that Christian elsewhere [eg in Rome and Syria] used characteristic expressions, and hence concluded that the EF must be the characteristic identifier of Christian inscriptions in this area.[40] But showing that some were Christian is quite different from proving that all were. His only other argument was that the variants of and additions to the simple EF – such as the "living God" or references to God's justice or greatness – were based on the Bible.[41] Yet he did not show, as indeed it cannot be shown, that these were exclusively NT ideas. Clearly the possibility of Jewish provenance was not in his mind.

In fact Cumont thought that, although Jews were numerous in Asia Minor at one time, they were largely absorbed into the Church from its foundation. Hence the number of Jews was greatly reduced and the likelihood of any of the inscriptions being Jewish was negligible.[42] This presupposition was important in his attempt to show that all the inscriptions using the EF were Christian.[43]

Ramsay acknowledged that inscription 2.1 below was Jewish, although his grounds for doing so were other than its use of the EF.[44] Although he did consider the possibility of Jewish origin for one other inscription containing the EF,[45] he generally regarded it as a sure sign of Christianity, even to the extent of proposing that two inscriptions showed that Jews [recognised by their names] had become Christians and thus adopted the Christian EF.[46]

In 1914 Ramsay made a revealing comment with regard to the reception which greeted his [very limited, at least at the time to which he was referring] attempts to identify Jewish inscriptions:

> My suggestion that they [some inscriptions] were perhaps Jewish was received with scepticism; and it was considered that I was

> suspecting Jewish influence without any justification or sound reason.[47]

He thus shows that scholarship as a whole at this time was not aware of Jewish communities in the area and certainly not open to identifying Jewish inscriptions. This tendency continued with Calder. In 1924 he wrote that he saw his task as seeking to discover Christian inscriptions. He wrote:

> their tombstones can only be identified by their slight but significant deviations from pagan types; often the deviation amounts merely to the selection and emphasis of pagan forms which served a Christian purpose. The onus of proof is in every case on the Christian epigraphist.[48]

Clearly the possibility that inscriptions might be Jewish was not in view. Jews had much in common with pagans [for example, in the way they decorated their graves and in the use of grave curses] and they too could make minor but significant changes to show their faith. The possibility of a Jewish provenance for some of the inscriptions containing the EF was, however, suggested by Calder in 1939. After showing in MAMA VI that the Jews of Acmonia were known from a number of inscriptions, he agreed with Ramsay's earlier verdict that the inscription given below as 2.1 which contained the EF with "Theos" altered to "Theos Hypsistos", an allusion to the LXX, was Jewish. He went on to write:

> the use by a Jew of the Eumeneian ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ... θεόν in this one instance raises the question whether in other localities, including Eumeneia and Apamea, we should not attribute individual examples of the formula to Jews. The question must, I think, be answered in the affirmative; there is no inherent difficulty in the adoption and adaptation by Jews here and there of a formula containing the name of the Christian God. But such exceptions should only be allowed on definite evidence or strong presumption of Jewish origin.[49]

Thus Calder established the "working hypothesis" that the EF was Christian unless it was proved to be Jewish by unequivocal evidence, and that if the Jews did use the formula, they did so in imitation of the Christians.[50] Yet even in this article his focus remained firmly on the Christians. He showed that when the formula was developed more fully it was only in the direction of more "definite expression of Christian sentiment".[51] He noted that we do not find the tendency to substitute the name of Apollo or Men for "the god". Whilst this argument counts against the use of the formula by pagans, it does not in any way rule out extensive Jewish use of the formula. Clearly by "Christian" sentiment Calder meant "not pagan" sentiment.[52] The dispute continued to be over Christian *or* pagan provenance.[53] The point of this extended treatment is clear; earlier investigators could very easily have identified Jewish inscriptions as Christian.

2. Before examining individual inscriptions, we should note the following

points:

[i] The large Jewish population in this area of Phrygia in general is attested as early as Cicero, and the continuing strength of the Jewish communities is shown by the Apamean coins and the inscriptions studied in Chapter 3, many of which were identified as Jewish only after the EF had been assumed to be Christian. Thus in the third century a Jewish provenance is just as likely, if not more likely, than a Christian provenance.[54]

[ii] Calder's criteria for identifying Jewish inscriptions were strict.[55] However, he gave no reason for his assessment that the formula was originally Christian, a matter to which we will return. At this stage it would seem advisable to keep an open mind on the issue, and thus to grant that Jewish usage of the formula could actually be more numerous than Christian. The criteria we will use is to see if a word or phrase is much more common in Jewish than in Christian writings or if there is some other important factor which indicates Jewish rather than Christian provenance.[56] Admittedly the examination will often lead to probability rather than certainty, but such is the nature of the evidence.

A case for Jewish provenance can be made for the following inscriptions:

2.1 We have already argued that this inscription [given in Chapter 3 as 5.1.2] is Jewish. It is repeated here for completeness:

[ἐὰν δέ τις ἕτερον σῶμα εἰσενέγκῃ, ἔσ]ται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὕψιστον καὶ τὸ ἀρᾶς δρέπανον εἰς τὸν ὦκον αὐτοῦ [εἰσέλθοιτο καὶ μηδέναν ἐνκαταλείψαιτο.[57]

Here the EF is expanded by use of the expression "the highest God", an epithet used of God in the LXX.

2.2 Similarly, we argued in Chapter 3, section 6 that an inscription from Acmonia which ends with this variation of the EF, is Jewish:

[ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐθέλωσιν] ῥοδίσαι κατὰ ἔτος [ἔσ]ται αὐτοῖς πρὸ[ς τὴ]ν δικαιοσύ[νην] τοῦ θεοῦ.[58]

2.3 The following inscription is from Apamea:

Αὐρ. Ζώσιμος ἐπύησα τὸ ἡρῶον Αὐρηλίᾳ Συνκλητικῇ τῇ καὶ Τατια τῇ συνβίῳ μου εἰς ὃ καὶ αὐτὸς τεθήσομαι καὶ Αὐρ. Φλαυία Σκύμνου τῇ πενθερᾷ μου δώρου χάριν, μηδενὶ δὲ ἑτέρῳ ἐξὸν εἶνε τεθῆναι· εἰ δέ τις ἐπιτηδεύσει, θήσει ἰς τὸ ἱερώτατον ταμεῖον *β, καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ πὸς τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ. τεθήσεται μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ[?] Δημητριανός[?]--[59]

Aurelia Zosimos made the tomb for Aurelia Sunkletike Tatia, my wife, with whom also I myself will be buried and Aurelia Flavia, daughter of Skymnos my mother in law, for a gift of honour; no other one except [these] is to be

buried here. But if someone will be taken care of [here] he will pay to the consecrated treasury 2000 denarii and he will have to reckon with the hand of God. Demetriane will also be buried here.

Neither Ramsay, nor the editors of MAMA VI commented on this variation of the EF.[60] The hand of Yahweh is spoken of more than 200 times in the OT. Lohse writes that "the reference is always to God's activity by which He shows Himself mighty in creation and work."[61] The phrase is often used in the context of judgement and power, which is the sense implied in our inscription.[62] In the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha there are a significant number of references to "the hand of God".[63]

It is interesting to note that we have images of the divine hand recorded in Jewish art. The mosaic floor of the Beth Alpha synagogue shows God's hand above the scene of Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac, with an inscription saying "Lay not ...",[64] and in two scenes from the mid–third century CE Dura–Europos synagogue we see the hand of God at the top of the painting.[65] Thus the hand of God seems to have been an important concept in Judaism of this period as it was in the OT and LXX.

Lohse writes that "In the NT reference is made to God's hand only where OT sayings are adduced or OT usage adopted."[66] The emphasis is mainly on God's hand bringing help and protection;[67] there are only four references to God's hand in judgement.[68] In addition, the precise phrase "the hand of God" does not occur in the NT. The expression is thus comparatively rare, and does not go beyond the content of OT statements about the hand of God.[69]

In the Post–Apostolic Fathers reference to God's hand occurs in OT quotations or with the adoption of OT expressions. Creation is the work of God's hands,[70] God's hand intervenes in the life of man to punish[71] but also to heal[72] and to protect.[73]

Thus the expression is much more common in the OT and its limited use in the NT and later Christian writings are all derived from the OT. Although we can never rule out Christian use of the OT, it seems much more likely that the inscription derives from the Jewish community at Apamea rather than from the Christian Church.[74]

Another important indication of provenance is given by the fact that Aurelia Tatia is called Συνκλητικός – of senatorial rank.[75] Ramsay thought that she was called Synkletike originally as an epithet, but kept it almost as a personal name in her married life. It shows that she was a person of high birth and of senatorial family.[76] In addition, Aurelia Tatia's mother was Aurelia Flavia, herself daughter of Skymnos. Both Ramsay and the editors of MAMA thought

that this may be the Skymnos who was grandson of Demetrios, named on coins of Pius and Marcus.[77] The occurrence of the name Demetria or Demetriane at the end of the inscription favours this interpretation. This also dates the inscription to around 240–250 CE.[78] Clearly Aurelia Tatia was an important person, from a distinguished family of high rank. Kraabel notes that:

> a person of such rank and status is probably to be associated not with the Christians but with the long-established Jewish community, either as a Jew by birth or as a Gentile sympathizer.[79]

In Chapter 4 we argued that the Jewish community at Apamea was large and influential, judging by the amount of gold seized by Flaccus, and their acceptance by and influence in the city, as shown by the Noah coins. It seems likely therefore that this inscription is Jewish.

2.4 The following inscription comes from Eumeneia:

[τὸ ἡρῷον καὶ] τὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ βωμὸν κατεσκεύασεν Αὐρ. Ζωτικὸς β' τοῦ Παπ[ί]ου Εὐμενεὺς ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Αὐρηλίᾳ Ἀπφίῳ καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Ἀ[μ]μια[ν]ῷ κα[ὶ εἰ] τιν[ὶ ἀλλ]ῳ α[ὐτ]ὸς ϛῶν [συγχω]ρήσει· οὐδενὶ δ[ὲ ἀ]λλῳ ἐξὸν ἔσται θεῖναι τινὰ· εἰ δέ τις ἐπιχειρήσει, εἰσοίσει ἰς τὴν Εὐμενέων βουλὴν προστείμου (δηνάρια) ͵αφ καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ μέγα ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ.[80]

Aurelios Zotikos, son of Zotikos, son of Papios, citizen of Eumeneia, built the tomb and the altar upon it for himself and for his wife Aurelia Apphion and for his brother Aurelios Ammianus and for any one else he himself, whilst living, agrees to; no-one else is allowed to be placed here; but if anyone attempts to, he will pay to the council of Eumeneia a fine of 1500 denarii and he will have to reckon with the great name of God.

The provenance of this inscription depends on our assessment of the phrase, "the great name of God". The name of Yahweh is of primary importance in the OT.[81] Thus in 2 Kg 7:25–6 we read:

... κύριε παντοκράτωρ θεὲ τοῦ Ισραηλ· καὶ νῦν καθὼς ἐλάλησας, μεγαλυνθείη τὸ ὄνομα σου ἕως αἰῶνος.[82]

As in this verse there are many passages in which, for example, an action is done "for your name" or "in your name" with the meaning being simply "for God". There are over fifty references in the LXX to "the name of the Lord", whilst there are over twenty passages similar to Ex 20:7, which reads – "*τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ σου.*" In addition there are seven passages where we find the phrase "the name of God" or a variation of this phrase. For example, in Dan 2:20 we read "*τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ.*"[83] We find the expression "the great name" used of God in seven passages. Thus:

μέγα τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ.[84]

Thus, although the exact expression μέγα ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ does not occur in the LXX, God's name is described as great and references to the name of the Lord or of God are quite common.[85]

There is a great reticence in Philo and in Rabbinic literature to use God's actual name, with the Rabbis replacing it with " ☐ ׳ ".[86] Josephus speaks of "the name of God"[87] and shows a fear of uttering God's actual name.[88] The Pseudepigraphic literature, following the LXX, often refers to the name of God.[89] An interesting passage which shows the increased importance attributed to the name of God is Jubilees 36:7:

> And now I will make you swear by the great oath – because there is not an oath which is greater than it, by the glorious and honoured and great and splendid and amazing and mighty name which created heaven and earth and everything together – that you will fear him [God] and worship him.

The NT usage is very interesting. The most common expression is "the name of Jesus Christ" [or variations of this phrase], which is particularly common in Acts and occurs over thirty times in all.[90] Also common is "the name of the Lord" where Κύριος often, but not always refers to Christ.[91] The phrase "the name of God" occurs only four times. In Rom 2:24 Paul quotes from Isa 52:5 about the name of God being blasphemed among the nations and two other passage use the phrase in connection with βλασφημέω.[92] In Rev 3:12 we read that "the name of my God" will be written upon the one who conquers. Hence, on the basis of the NT evidence, when Christians referred to "the name", we would expect them generally to mean "the name of Jesus Christ" or "the name of the Lord" rather than "the great name of God". We could argue here that the EF almost always refers to *God* and not to *the Lord*.[93] Thus Christians reverted to a less common form of reference for God or Jesus Christ in order to leave the form of the EF intact.

We should note that an interest in the "name of God" is found in the cult of Serapis. For example, an inscription dedicated to Serapis from Ephesus begins Μέγα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ.[94] Whilst this adds further to the uncertainty about the religious background of this inscription, we should note the lack of pagan attestation of the Eumeneian formula. Thus, although this inscription could possibly be either Christian or pagan, it is more likely to have been Jewish judging by the frequency with which expressions similar to "the great name of God" occur in Jewish writings and the frequency with which Jewish inscriptions from the area recall the language of the LXX.[95]

3. There are a number of inscriptions where the decision between assigning them to a Jewish or a Christian provenance is very difficult. We will argue that

the two communities seem to have shared a good deal of common vocabulary and in the absence of a clearly Christian or Jewish word, a menorah or a cross these third century inscriptions are difficult to identify.[96] Thus the following inscriptions fall into a grey area between the two classifications. It is in fact possible, if not likely, that some of the inscriptions in each of these groups are Jewish and some Christian. Certainly, since some of the expansions of the simple EF are Christian and some Jewish, it seems most plausible that some of the more ambiguous variations come from both communities as well. In any event, the following inscriptions cannot, as has often been done, be taken as a certain indicator of Christian provenance.[97] On the other hand these inscriptions cannot be proved to be Jewish.[98] I will seek to show that they could belong to either community.

3.1 The "apocalyptic" emphasis or reference to Judgement in various expansions of the formula could be either Jewish or Christian.[99] The possibility [although no more than that] of these texts being Jewish is reinforced by the close parallel with the third century Jewish inscriptions from Nicomedia, Bithynia, studied by Robert.[100] These inscriptions use the phrase ἔξει κρίσιν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Robert has shown that references to Judgement were the common property of Jews and Christians in the Roman Empire.[101] An inscription from Apamea ends with the following phrase:

ἔστε αὐτῶ πὸς τὸν κριτὴν θεόν.[102]

God is described as "The Judge" in a number of passages in the LXX. For example in Ps 74:8 we read ὁ Θεὸς κριτής ἐστιν.[103] A number of other passages include this concept; for example when God is called upon to Judge between people,[104] or when God says, "I will judge you, O house of Israel".[105] In the NT, although Jesus takes on the role of Judge,[106] the idea of God as Judge is also found a number of times.[107] The exact expression which occurs in our inscription is not found however; nor are the parallels as close as with the LXX.

Thus we are unable to decide between a Jewish and a Christian provenance, and no other facets of the inscription guide us here. Clearly it could be either. Thus Calder is wrong in asserting that this inscription "may confidently be treated as Christian".[108] Perhaps the strongest indication of provenance is the evidence presented in Chapter 4 concerning the Jewish community in Apamea, which we saw was large and influential. This inscription is more likely to be Jewish than Christian. More than this we cannot say.

3.2 The following inscription is from Apamea:

Ἔτους τμγ′ μ(ηνὸς) θ′ κ.′ Αὐρ. Ἀρτέμ[ᾶς Ἀρτεμᾶ?] ἐποίησα τὸ ἡρῶον ἐμαυτῷ [καὶ τῇ γυναικί] μου Ταπίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις μ[ου· εἰς ὃ ἕτερος] οὐ τεθήσεται· εἰ δέ

τις ἐπι[τηδεύσει, ἔσ]ται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ἀθάνα[τον θεόν].[109]
The year 343, the ninth month, the 20th day [258–259 CE]. Aurelios Artemas, son of Artemas [?] made this tomb for himself and for my wife Tatia and for my children. Another [body] is not to be buried [here]. But if someone else is taken care of [here] he will have to reckon with the immortal God.

A decision about the provenance of this inscription depends on our assessment of the expression ἀθάνατος θεός. It does not occur in the NT, although ἀθανασία is used of God in 1 Tim 6:16. ἀθάνατος is used a number of times in the Apocrypha when, for example, the soul or righteousness is described.[110] In Sibylline Oracle III, the earliest Jewish Oracle, God is called "the Immortal".[111] In Sibylline Oracle I, probably written in Phrygia, God is called the "Immortal Creator" and the "Immortal Saviour King".[112] A similar usage to the Apocrypha is found in the Early Fathers,[113] although Jesus is also described as immortal in Diog 9:2, a usage which became more frequent in later patristics.[114] According to Athenagoras in his Apology, written around 177 CE, ἀθάνατος is the character of the θεῖος[115] and the word is also used of God, for example by Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius and Pseudo–Dionysius.[116]

Thus it is difficult to decide if the expression is more likely to be Jewish or Christian, although the Jewish evidence appears to be a little stronger. Again no decision is possible.[117]

3.3 In one inscription from nearby Pisidian Antioch [which was actually in Phrygia] we find the EF with the variation τό μέγεθος τοῦ θεοῦ.[118] The phrase μέγεθος τοῦ θεοῦ, or expressions like it occur rarely in Jewish writings. In the LXX μέγεθος is used twice to describe the greatness of God's arm[119] and elsewhere in the LXX it is used of man, of his soul, of creatures and of objects.[120] In Philo Spec. 1.293 we find τό τοῦ Θεοῦ μέγεθος. There are references to God's majesty in the "Life of Adam and Eve [Vita]" 27:1, and in the Testament of Levi 3:9 we read:
So when the Lord looks upon us we all tremble. Even the heavens and earth and the abysses tremble before the presence of his majesty. [τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ.]

Thus Charlesworth writes that in general:

> Most pseudepigrapha, in contrast to earlier Jewish writings, are characterized by an increasing claim that God is thoroughly majestic and transcendent.[121]

μέγεθος is used only once in the NT in Eph 1:19, where we read of the surpassing μέγεθος of God's power for the believer. Ignatius describes Christianity as μέγεθους in 1 Rom 3:3, and calls on the Church at Smyrna to recover their

μέγεθος The word is also used of the Martyrdom of Polycarp.[122]

Thus the evidence seems insufficient to decide between a Jewish and Christian provenance, although Jewish provenance is again slighty more probable judging by usage.[123]

3.4 An inscription from Eumeneia includes the following variation of the EF:
ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα θεὸν καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ κριαμῷ ἡμέρᾳ.[124]
He will have to reckon with the living God both now and in the day of Judgement.

We have noted above that references to Judgement can be either Jewish or Christian and clearly this applies to this variant as well.[125]

3.5 In the case of two inscriptions we must argue for more caution than has been the case. Firstly, the following inscription is from Apamea:
ἔτους τλή. Αἴλιος Παγχάριος ὁ καὶ Ζωτικὸς κατεσκεύασεν τὸ ἡρῶον ζῶν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυνεκὶ αὐτοῦ Αἰλίᾳ Ἀταλάντῃ καὶ τέκνοις. εἰ δέ τις ἐπιτηδεύσει ἕτερος, ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τ[ὸν] θεόν, καὶ δώσει ἰς τὸ ταμεῖον δην. φ.[126]
The year 338 [253–254 CE]. Aelios Pancharios, also called Zotikos, prepared in his lifetime this tomb for himself and for his wife, Aelia Atalanta and for his children. But if someone else be taken care off [here], he will have to reckon with God and will have to give to the public treasury 500 denarii.

Ramsay thought that this inscription was probably Jewish, but solely on the basis of the name Παγχάριος, which at that time was only known in a Jewish inscription from Rome.[127] He also thought that Aelius Pancharios became a Christian and took the baptismal name of Zotikos. This was apparently based on two lines of argument. Firstly, for Ramsay the EF was a sure sign of Christian, and not of Jewish provenance. Secondly, Zotikos, [which means "full of life, alive"] was according to Ramsay "taken into common use among Christians".[128] He also thought that the occurrence of another name by which a person was known was a sure sign of Christianity.[129] However, we should note that:

[i] Although Pancharios is found twice amongst the Jews of Rome,[130] it is also found in a pagan inscription from Acmonia.[131] This latter inscription clearly provides the more proximate background, which means that the name's usage by Jews of Rome is not relevant here. Although we are not arguing for a pagan provenance for the present inscription, clearly either a Jew or a Christian of Acmonia could use the name, which was not connected with any particular religious group.

[ii] The name Zotikos was used by Jews, for example at Rome, Hierapolis and

Aphrodisias.[132]

[iii] Jews sometimes used an additional name. Thus for example, at nearby Hierapolis, Marcus Aurelios Alexander was surnamed Asaph.[133] This practice is not confined to the Christians, as Ramsay thought.

[iv] We will argue below that the simple EF can be either Jewish or Christian.

Hence I do not think we have grounds for saying that this is a Jewish or a Christian inscription; nor can we say that it gives us evidence for a Jew who converted to Christianity, as Ramsay thought. Perhaps the only reliable indication here once again is the context. We know of the large and influential Jewish community at Apamea through the money seized by Flaccus, the Noah coins and the inscription mentioning "the Law of the Jews". [See Chapter 4.] Our knowledge of Christianity is by comparison, far less. Thus in 253 an inscription is more likely to be Jewish than Christian. Beyond this strong probablility we cannot go.

3.6 The second inscription containing the simple EF about which more caution is needed was also thought by Ramsay to be Jewish [or Jewish Christian] on the sole basis of the name Μαρία.[134] Whilst this name was used by Jews,[135] it was also used by Christians.[136] Thus there are no grounds for assigning a provenance to this inscription.[137]

3.7 The phrase ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα θεὸν occurs in a number of inscriptions.[138] Whilst God is described as "the living God" a number of times in the NT,[139] the phrase is also used in the LXX and in Intertestamental literature.[140] In addition, we find in the OT and Jewish Intertestamental literature a strong tradition of polemic against worshipping gods of "stone", which are not gods but lifeless idols.[141] Thus we have no grounds for assuming, as has often been done,[142] that this phrase is a reliable indicator of Christian provenance. It is as likely to be Jewish as Christian.[143]

3.8 Finally, there seems to be no way of showing that the simple EF [ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν] is either Jewish or Christian.[144] Given that Jews expanded the formula, there seems to be no reason why they could not have used the simple formula as well. It is certainly possible that some inscriptions using the simple EF are Jewish and some are Christian.

In fact the inscriptions themselves give us an indication that the formula was ambiguous with regard to provenance. We mentioned above that two inscriptions which contain the simple EF can be shown to be Christian, one because of the word Ἰχθύς, the other because of the symbol of the fish.[145] If the simple EF was a certain indicator to Christians that the epitaph was written by another Christian, then why should these additional "identifiers" be added? It

is unlikely that they were included for the benefit of pagans, because a pagan would probably not know to interpret either the word or the symbol as an indicator of Christianity, especially since the fish was not an exclusively Christian symbol in any case.[146] Therefore the word or symbol was probably added to the stone for the benefit of Christians, to enable them to identify the grave as one belonging to a fellow believer. If, as seems clear, the formula was not used by pagans in the area, then the most reasonable explanation is that the identifiers enabled Christians to distinguish between Christian and Jewish users of the formula. Indeed, why add a concealing symbol, if the Christianity of the deceased was already crystal clear to those who would understand the symbol?[147] Thus these two cases seem to suggest that the simple EF was used by both Jews and Christians.

Two third century inscriptions from Eumeneia written by city councillors and including the simple EF were judged to be Christian by Ramsay and deserve mention here.[148] We have argued in Chapter 3, section 5.4 that another city councillor of this city was in fact Jewish. In view of the number of Jews involved in leadership in their cities[149] it seems likely that these two councillors were in fact Jews. This cannot be proved, but it is also unwise to claim that they were Christians, when this view is based only on the disputable grounds of the simple EF.[150]

3.9 We conclude therefore, that with a large number of these inscriptions we must be content to make no decision between Jewish and Christian provenance. This is the approach taken to some extent, by some recent investigators. Waelkens writes that the EF is normally "a proof of Christianity or of Judaism".[151] Similarly, in the most recent treatment of the subject, Tabbernee is reticent to assign a number of inscriptions to either a Jewish or a Christian provenance.[152] However, it is important to note that for some scholars, the EF remains a sure proof of Christianity, unless an inscription is indubitably Jewish. Thus, Robert describes the Christian character of an inscription with the simple EF as "certain".[153] Sheppard likewise works with the assumption that the EF is always Christian.[154] However, when positive additional proof of Christianity is lacking, it seems very likely that an inscription could be either Jewish or Christian.

4. In view of this probable situation we need to comment on the origin of the formula. The following views have been expressed on this matter.

4.1 Some scholars have suggested that the Christians adopted an originally pagan formula.[155] However, in view of the lack of any indisputably pagan examples from the area, this is unlikely.

4.2 Calder was certain that the formula was devised by Christians, as a formula which offended neither their own conscience nor the prejudices of their pagan neighbours.[156] Occasionally Jews adopted and adapted the formula.[157] He went on to suggest why the Christians' devised the formula – he thought that it was the "Orthodox" response to the Montanist movement. This view is based on the evidence provided by the so–called "Christians for Christians" inscriptions [hereafter referred to as Chr–Chr] which we need to review.

This unique series of inscriptions, which are claimed to be pre–Constantinian, are confined to the Upper Tembris Valley, thirty miles north of Eumeneia.[158] These inscriptions declared that not only the deceased but also the surviving dedicators were Christians. Calder[159] argued that by including the stereotyped formula Χρηστιανοὶ Χρηστιανοῖς[160] on their gravestones, these Christians contradicted the universal practice of the Church in this period. They were in fundamental disagreement with their fellow Christians in Central Phrygia and elsewhere in the Roman Empire, on the question of professing their faith.[161] Calder suggested that these epitaphs are those of a Montanist community:

> Regarded as the monuments of a sect which looked on profession as a duty not to be evaded, and martyrdom as a prize to be coveted, they begin to be intelligible.[162]

These inscriptions do reflect a very different school of thought from that which produced the EF, which is so inoffensive. This situation led Calder to suggest that the EF was the "Orthodox" response to the open profession of the Montanist Chr–Chr epitaphs.[163] The Montanists proclaimed their faith on their gravestones, so the "Orthodox" responded by giving an indication of their faith, albeit in a veiled fashion.[164]

However, Tabbernee has recently shown how tenuous the evidence is which allows these Chr–Chr inscriptions to be dated in the pre–Constantinian era. Only one inscription is dated and here the date is only partially visible.[165] It thus seems likely that these inscriptions come from the fourth century, when open profession of Christianity was not provocative, thus removing any obvious link with Montanism.[166] Thus it seems probable that the fourth century Chr–Chr inscriptions cannot be the decisive factor in the appearance of the third century EF.

4.3 Ramsay, in commenting on 2.1 above, [which he attributed with some certainty to the Jewish community of Acmonia] wrote:

> It suggests that either the formula ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν was adopted by the Christians from the Jews, or that it arose among both simultaneously in the third century, which would suggest relations not wholly unfriendly between them.[167]

He thus suggested two different possibilities; that the Christians adopted the formula from the Jews, or that it arose simulataneously.[168] Robert has strongly agreed with this second possibility,[169] and Kraabel commented positively on it.[170]

4.4 Kraabel has suggested that Jewish use of the formula antedates Christian usage, and thus that the formula originated among Jews,[171] thus adopting Ramsay's first suggestion.[172] We need only recall the large Jewish population at Apamea and Acmonia to realise that it is likely that the Jewish community at Eumeneia was probably established much earlier than the Christian community [perhaps by Zeuxis around 205 BCE] and that the former was larger than the latter for a very long time. This possibility is reinforced by the "concord" between the cities of Eumeneia and Acmonia.[173] Sheppard, although insisting that the EF is Christian and that it only gains a "Jewish flavour" at times, suggested that the Jews of Acmonia were a likely source of inspiration for the Eumeneian Christians in their use of the EF.[174] It seems just as likely that Jews at Eumeneia were the originators of and inspiration for the formula.

Clearly we cannot decide on the basis of the evidence at hand whether Jews or Christians first used the formula, or whether it arose independently at the same time in both communities. We simply do not know enough about the two groups, although the size and influence of the Jewish communities in the area suggest that the formula was begun by them and then adapted by Christians.

However, what is important here is that, no matter who developed the formula first, within a very short time, both Jews and Christians were using the formula on their graves. There was no objection on either side to the other sharing in the formula. This suggests there was considerable contact between the two groups.[175]

5. We have two inscriptions from Eumeneia which refer to a person called Roube. They are relevant here because one contains the EF and because they both reveal contact between the Christian and Jewish communties. This is significant reinforcement for our view that the EF was shared by the two communities. Although the first inscription was discovered in 1884, an accurate reading of the text was not achieved until 1926.[176] It is a long epitaph of Gaius, a lawyer, who also permitted his wife and children to be buried in the tomb, and most unusually, since graves were generally strictly reserved for the family, allowed Roube and a friend [whose name is lost] to be buried there too.[177] The other inscription, discovered two kilometres away from the first, was written by Lycidas and describes how he built a tomb in which his sisters were to be buried. The inscription ends with a variant of the EF – "εἴ τις δὲ ἕτερον θήσει,

ἔστε αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἄνγελον τὸν Ῥουβῆδος – If anyone inters another, he will have to reckon with God and the Angel of Roube."[178]

Robert has recently reviewed the opinions of those who have examined the Gaius inscription.[179] The following points made by him are important here:

[i] The name Roube is Jewish, and along with similar names, is only found in the Jewish onomasticon.[180]

[ii] Robert accepted the reading of Buckler and Calder,[181] who were the first to decipher the chi–rho monogram on the stone. Roube is described as Ῥούβῃ μεγάλοιο Θ[εο]ῦ Χρ[ιστοῦ] θεράποντι. Therefore Roube was judged to be a Christian.[182]

[iii] Buckler and Calder had established a new reading towards the end of the inscription. They read the line, "the righteous at all times point the way to resurrection". This statement of faith was made by Gaius, who thus was also a Christian.[183]

Hence Robert concluded that Roube was a Christian convert from the synagogue. He wrote:

> It appears to me that we have here contact between the Christians of Eumeneia and one of those flourishing Jewish communities of Phrygia.[184]

5.1 We should note how vital the chi–rho monogram is here. The statement, "the righteous at all times point the way to resurrection" could as easily be Jewish as Christian. "The righteous", although found as a designation for a group of people in the NT,[185] is common as a title in Jewish literature.[186] Likewise the resurrection is not solely a Christian belief.[187] Further, a Jew could well call himself a "servant of the Great God". In fact, θεράπων is only used in the NT once and then of Moses in Heb 3:5, where Moses the servant is contrasted with Christ the Son.[188] It is however, a common word in the LXX.

Thus were it not for the chi–rho monogram, the inscription could arguably be Jewish.[189] Unfortunately, the reading of the monogram is disputed. Sheppard notes that the traces now visible are not reconcilable with the way the monogram was depicted at this date. He does say however, that the stone has weathered since Buckler, Calder and Cox read the monogram in 1926.[190] But, given that the monogram was on the stone, it remains likely that Gaius was a Christian and thus that the highly respected Roube was also, it being unlikely that a Jew and a Christian would be buried in the same tomb, or that a Christian [Gaius] would describe a Jew so favourably. Given Roube's Jewish name, it is therefore likely that he was a Jewish convert to Christianity.

5.2 What is equally interesting here is the amount of Jewish influence evident

in the inscription. It seems likely that Roube, in becoming a Christian had transmitted a good deal of his Jewish belief to his Christian friend Gaius. We have already noted that belief in the resurrection, the terms "the righteous" and "the servant of the Great God" are all expressions which are common in both Judaism and Christianity, with the latter two more common in Judaism. Other points of Jewish influence have been identified by Sheppard. Firstly, the inscription uses numerology,[191] a well known feature of Jewish apocalyptic literature.[192] Secondly, one section of the inscription strongly recalls the ideas of Ecclesiastes 9:2, 7–10.[193] Thirdly, the inscription uses "*δυνάμεων θεός*", one of the standard Greek versions of the Hebrew liturgical phrase "Lord of Hosts". Thus, although Roube had probably become a Christian, it seems that he had also transmitted [or strengthened] a significant element of Jewish belief and expression in the Eumeneian Christian community. It seems that, although the Christians converted a Jew, the Christian community as a whole was influenced by Jewish ideas. In short, the two communities probably shared a lot of common ground, a conclusion which fits in well with the findings from our study of the EF.

5.3 The second inscription has been studied by Robert.[194] Its importance here is two–fold:

[i] That the care of the tomb was partially invested [using the EF] with "God and the Angel of Roube" shows the great respect in which Roube was held in the area. Clearly he had made a marked impression and was a leading figure,[195] and the angel of this admired man was feared.[196] This inscription reinforces the commendation that Roube received in the first inscription. This becomes even more striking when it is recalled that Roube was probably a convert from Judaism. He had risen quickly in the ranks of the Church, to a place of prominence and importance.

[ii] The Christian community seems to have accepted Jewish views on angels. Although there are Christian inscriptions which mention angels,[197] Robert notes that Christian angelology was a legacy from Judaism.[198] Thus for example, in 1 Enoch 100:5 we read:

> He [the Most High] will set a guard of holy angels over all the righteous and holy ones and they shall keep them as the apple of the eye until all evil and all sin are brought to an end.[199]

Given the prominence of angelology in Judaism, this is the most likely explanation for this variant of the EF.[200] We see again the influence of Judaism on the Christians of Eumeneia, probably mediated through the convert Roube.[201] These two inscriptions therefore show that the Jewish and Christian communi-

ties had some views and practices in common. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that relations between the two communities were good. Two groups which share common ground can often be very hostile towards each other. This evidence does suggest, however, that there was communication between the two groups, as shown by one group accepting the ideas of the other. This reinforces our view that the EF [used in the second inscription discussed here by a Christian, but with a Jewish "flavour"] was substantially shared between the two communities.

Appendix 2.

Women in Early Judaism according to the literary sources.

In this appendix I will briefly consider the position of women in the various forms of Judaism of our period. Is the prominence of women in Jewish communities in Asia Minor which we discussed in Chapter 5 section 1, compatible with the evidence of the Jewish literary corpus? Further, does anything in this corpus enable us to explain the prominence of women we have found?

The position of women in Israelite life as reflected in the OT is a complex area of investigation. However, we can note that a woman's primary role was as a wife and mother; family and domestic life was considered normative for a decent woman. Only in this role was she regularly accorded status and honour.[1] Women were barred from any part in the cult.[2] However, we learn of a number of exceptional women in the OT, who succeeded to varying degrees in the male domain of political and social life.[3] They often play crucial roles in the realisation of the destiny of the people, but are rarely major characters.[4] Their significance should not be overlooked. Exum comments:

> Within the admittedly patriarchal context of the biblical literature, we find strong countercurrents of affirmation of women: stories that show women's courage, strength, faith, ingenuity, talents, dignity and worth. Such stories undermine patriarchal assumptions and temper patriarchal biases, often challenging the very patriarchal structures that dominate the narrative landscape.[5]

Yet the possibility of regular female participation in public or political affairs in what remained a male–centred and male–dominated society was almost completely excluded. The periodic exceptions made the regular state of affairs even more manifest.[6]

It is difficult to deal with the subject of women in Judaism in the Intertestamental period, and this for two reasons. Firstly, as Brooten has recently noted,[7] there remains much historical study to be done in this area. Secondly, much of the work that has been done has sought to provide a foundation for a study of the position of women in Early Christianity. This has often led to an overly negative assessment of the Jewish material, against which Jesus is judged to be a great innovator.[8]

In my opinion, what emerges from an investigation of the Intertestamental literature is a varigated picture which contains a large spectrum of views. We find that some authors held strong "anti–women views" whilst others [admittedly a minority] seem to give women a higher profile than in their sources. I will seek to present these different strands of opinion.

Trenchard in a recent study has concluded that Ben Sira was personnally negative towards women. Whilst a good wife is praised, her quality is assessed by Ben Sira in terms of her relationship and value to her husband; she is not evaluated in her own right.[9] Although he recognises the honoured status of motherhood, he never treats a mother independently from her husband.[10] In some passages Ben Sira's alterations of or supplements to traditional material show that his view of women was lower than that of the OT.[11] He negatively exceeds the OT in his characterisation of the bad wife, in order to darken the portrayal.[12] His negative bias against women is particularly clear in his discussion of daughters, whom he regards as less significant and far more troublesome that sons.[13] It seems therefore that Ben Sira was personally negative towards women; his editing of material shows that he does not simply reflect his heritage and environment but that this is his own view. This means that we would be unwise to see him as providing a representative view on women. The "general view" towards women at the time [if indeed such existed] could have been significantly different.[14]

Both versions of *The Life of Adam and Eve* assert that sin and death entered the human race through Eve. In ApMos 32:1-2 we read:

> Then Eve rose and went out and fell on the ground and said, 'I have sinned, O God; I have sinned, O Father of all; I have sinned against you, I have sinned against your chosen angels, I have sinned against the cherubim, I have sinned against your stedfast throne; I have sinned, Lord, I have sinned much; I have sinned before you, and all sin in creation has come about through me.'[15]

In the book, Eve is deceived a second time by Satan.[16] Eve's prayers are not heard by God; Adam must pray to the Lord for Eve and then Eve is helped.[17]

Eve's responsibility for sin is increased in other Intertestamental books. In II Enoch 30:17-18 we read that God "created for him (Adam) a wife so that death might come [to him] by his wife."[18] However, we should also note that roughly equal responsibility for sin is apportioned in some books,[19] whilst Adam alone is mentioned as responsible for sin in other literature, with no mention being made of Eve.[20] Although the significance of this is difficult to assess, there is a marked difference in these passages from ApMos 32:1–2 or LAE 18:1.

There are other negative features of the treatment of women in these sources. For example, women are treated as inherently evil and the root cause of sexual promiscuity;[21] they should therefore live secluded lives.[22]

It is well known that women had a very low status at Qumran. Although some members of the community were probably married,[23] the evidence suggests that women existed on the margins of community life.[24] The Temple Scroll[25]

made no provision for impure women to live in the Temple city; it is likely that the document does not permit women to live there at all.[26]

Josephus, despite some positive statements, has a strong male bias. It is summed up in this statement from Contra Apion: "The woman, says the Law, is in all things inferior to the man."[27]

Philo seems to have thought of women as categorically inferior to men.[28] For instance, he thought that the female is "nothing else than an imperfect male"[29] and in his discussion of the Creation story his view is that "good" qualities are those associated with the male and "bad" qualities those associated with the female.[30]

We are not able to discuss in detail the status of women as it is revealed in Rabbinic writings. However, the following points are relevant to our study.

[i] Rabbinic Judaism was itself no monolithic entity. Thus we can detect a variety of opinions about women and their roles.[31]

[ii] The position of women in the Mishnah is defined wholly in relationship to men. Neusner notes:

> Mishnah does not imagine that men live apart from women or that women exist outside of relationship and therefore control of men. Mishnah is a man's document and imagines a man's world. Women have rights, protected by men and Heaven alike. But these rights pertain specifically to women's relationship to men as fathers or husbands.[32]

Thus, because it envisages a man's world in which women are "anomalous", [and therefore excluded from the centres of holiness] as Neusner notes, the points at which Mishnah is concerned about women are those points of transfer of a women from one man to another. Mishnah seeks to create and regulate an ordered world at these times of change. Thus women are assigned to man's domain and Mishnah reflects this.[33]

[iii] Positive statements are found: "It was taught: He who has no wife dwells without good, without help, without joy, without blessing and without atonement."[34] A good wife was highly valued, but generally in terms of what she did in the domestic sphere.[35] It is clear that the role of women was generally limited to the home where she was wife and mother. Only here did she have a positive and appreciated role and a spiritual significance.[36] However, we should also note that according to Mishnah, a woman can be the ultimate owner of land, although the husband enjoys the usufruct. Neusner comments that this means that "a woman's status in this system is not utterly lacking a measure of autonomy, dignity and control of her own affairs."[37]

[iv] The many negative statements about women in Rabbinic literature are well

known, especially the thrice repeated "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who has not made me a woman."[38] With regard to the restriction of women we may note:

[a] Women were exempted from fulfilling some of the positive precepts of the Torah, especially those connected with a certain time.[39] However, some laws [such as those concerning menstruation and childbirth] applied exclusively to women. In Tannaitic times women did not normally obey the call to read in the synagogue.[40]

[b] The rabbis did not expect women to be studying Torah, although it was not forbidden.[41]

[c] Normally a woman would receive no formal education since this was largely limited to study of the Torah. Generally a woman was married at 12 or 13 so there was little opportunity for instruction. However, some daughters of upper class families were given some education.[42]

[d] In only a very few specific situations, which also applied to a Gentile slave, was a woman able to act as a witness.[43]

[e] There were no official leadership roles that women could assume, although sometimes they would maintain their husband's business.[44]

[f] Women were regularly grouped with slaves and minors. Jeremias writes: "Like a non–Jewish slave and a child under age, a woman has over her a man who is her master."[45]

Whilst some exception to the above restrictions did occur, particularly among the ruling class and the poor,[46] Montefiore rightly summarizes the situation:

> Women were on the whole, regarded as inferior to men in mind, in function and status.[47]

Turning now to positive presentations of women, we note firstly the wise and devout heroine Judith. In Judith 8:29 we read the following commendation, expressed by a man:

> This is not the first time that you have given proof of your wisdom. Throughout your life we have all recognised your good sense and the soundness of your judgement.

With beauty, wisdom and cunning as her weapons, Judith saves the nation; she then goes on to advise the army and lead the people in praise in a song which describes her acts [16:4–12]. God can achieve his purposes through a woman whom the world considers as weak [16:6–7]. Throughout the book Judith does not follow the dictates of a male dominated society.[48]

There is a significant interest in women in the Testament of Job.[49] Job's first wife is named as Sitidos and is the principal actor in TJob 21–26. Her strenuous

efforts to obtain bread for Job are described; she goes to the extent of having her hair cut off in public [a great humiliation] and giving it to Satan in order to obtain bread; in this episode Satan deceives Sitis through his disguise as a man [22–23]. She then becomes Satan's means of access to Job in order to torment him, but Job foils Satan in his deception [26–27]. Sitidos also makes a long speech which is an expansion of Job 2:9 in the LXX.[50] A long lament for her is given in 25:1–8. After a brief appearance and a vision in 39–40 she dies and the upoar of lamentation over her is said to have reached throughout the world [40:9]. We should note that, although Sitidos is portrayed as a sympathetic woman who is loyal and sincere in her efforts to help her husband, she is clearly shown to be spiritually blind. She does not see where evil powers lie in wait, nor does she see what God is doing. Although this is significant, we should recall that in TJob it is only Job himself who has spiritual insight, apart from his three exceptional daughters in the end section of the book. Even kings are shown to be lacking in understanding.[51]

In the MT of Job 42:14–15, Job's three daughters are named; it is stated that they were given an inheritance along with their brothers and that "in all the land there were no women so fair as Job's daughters." This leads to a distinct section of TJob in which their inheritance is outlined. It is described as "an inheritance better than that of your seven brothers" [46:4], and consists of multicoloured cords from heaven. It was through these same cords that God is said to have cured Job of his sickness. Each of the daughters donned the cords and their hearts changed so that they "no longer regarded worldly things." Each speaks in the dialect of the angels, archons and cherubim and praises God. One has "The Spirit" inscribed on her garment, whilst the other two have the hymns or prayers they composed written down. The reader is referred to "The Hymns of Kasia" where the composition "The Creation of the Heavens" may be found and to "The Prayers of Amaltheia's Horn" where "The Paternal Splendour" may be found [TJob 48–50]. Nereus, Job's brother describes the hymns the three daughters uttered as "the magnificent things of God" [51:4]. Job makes additional gifts to his three daughters who then have a vision [which is restricted to the three] of the gleaming chariots which had come for Job's soul. The three daughters went ahead of the chariots singing hymns to God [52:3–12]. Clearly these three daughters are portrayed as highly esteemed visionaries. They are given a higher religious status that the men in the book; they take the lead in spiritual matters and become superior to men. [52] Van der Horst comments that Job's daughters "play such a leading role in the final chapters as to reduce Job and his sons to the status of supernumerary actors."[53]

There are some passages in the LAB of Pseudo–Philo which portrary women positively.[54] In a unique passage "our mother Tamar" is portrayed as a virtuous example of someone unwilling to have intercourse with gentiles [9:5–6]. Deborah is introduced as the person the Lord sent the people after they had fasted and sought to be reconciled to God [30:4–5, cf. Judges 4:4]. Deborah then utters a speech which is in the form of a prophetic oracle; she reviews past history and states that because of God's covenant, he will hand over the people's enemies into their hands [30:5–7]. The account of Jael's murder of Sisera is considerably elaborated, partly through elements drawn from the story of Judith.[55] Jael is described as a very beautiful woman who prays three times asking for God to be mindful of the people's plight and for a sign that he will aid Jael. After God grants the sign, Jael murders Sisera and is praised by Barak [31:3–9 cf. Judges 4:17–22]. Much more is made of Jael's act and of her piety than in Judges. She has become a woman of action combined with trusting prayer. The story of Deborah continues and is much lengthened; it ends with her farewell speech and an account of her death, for which there is no parallel in Judges. The account begins in the following noteworthy way:

> Listen now, my people. Behold I am warning you as a woman of God and am enlightening you as one from the female race; and obey me like your mother and heed my words as people who will also die. Behold I am going today on the way of all flesh ... [33:1–2]

She went on to urge faithfulness to the Lord because repentance after death was impossible. The people wept together and said:

> Behold now, Mother, you will die, and to whom do you commend your sons whom you are leaving? Pray therefore for us, and after your departure your soul will be mindful of us forever. [33:4][56]

Deborah again urges faithfulness and then dies and is mourned for seventy days. The people uttered the following lamentation:

> Behold there has perished a mother for Israel, and the holy one who exercised leadership in the house of Jacob. She firmed up the fence about her generation, and her generation will grieve over her. [33:6]

Clearly, Deborah is portrayed as a great leader who is a public spokeswoman of the Lord. Such farewell speeches with or without an added lamentation are given in Pseudo–Philo by a select few – Moses [19:1–16], Joshua [24:1–6] and Kenaz [28:6–10]. Only with Deborah and Kenaz is there no precedent for the passage in the OT.[57]

The story of Jephthah's daughter is greatly expanded and used to show God's punishment of a wicked vow [39:10]. Jephthah's daughter, who is named

as Seila, utters a speech in which she encourages faithfulness to a vow, and interprets her act of sacrifice by alluding to Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac [40:2–3]. She then goes and laments with her companions and we are told:

> The Lord thought of her by night and said ... 'And I have seen that the virgin is wise in contrast to her father and perceptive in contrast to all the wise men who are here. And now let her life be given at his request, and her death will be precious before me always, and she will go away and fall into the bosom of her mothers[58]. [40:4]

Seila's moving lament is given [40:5–7]; her father then fulfils his vow and we are told that the children of Israel [cf. Judges 11:40 – the daughters of Israel] established an annual lamentation for Seila [40:8]. Again much is made of the faith and example of a woman; that she is described by God as wiser than not only her father [who had himself just saved Israel] but also all the wise men is significant.[59]

The position of women in the fifth century BCE Jewish colony at Elephantine in Egypt is noteworthy.[60] We know most about their legal position. Women enjoyed full equality in the field of the law of property and obligations, could be involved in litigation, shared the burden of taxation, and had an equal power of dissolution of marriage.[61]

We should also recall that some women played a notable part in public life under the Hasmonean and Herodian regimes; we know of women such as Alexandra, Mariamne and the proselyte Queen Helena of Adiabene. In addition, documents from the Cave of Letters of the Bar Kokhba finds inform us of Babata, who undertook a number of important litigations and supervised her considerable property.[62]

Philo writes about the Therapeutae, an Essene–like Egyptian ascetic group who shared a common life.[63] Women were fully fledged members of the group although they were separated from the men of the synagogue and did not have the right to speak. Every seventh week there was a sacred fast day in which women were fully involved.[64]

It seems clear therefore that some prominent Jewish men – Ben Sira, Philo, Josephus and some Rabbis – held "anti–women" views. However, it would be a serious oversimplification to compile a list of their statements and claim that this represented "the view of women" in this period. This presupposes a monolithic picture of Judaism and ignores the other side of the picture – Judith, Pseudo–Philo, TJob – albeit one that is less well represented, a fact which is hardly surprising. What we find then is a diversity of opinion which cover a spectrum ranging from "anti–women" views to authors or communities which

had a positive image of women who featured in their traditions, or allowed women to play a part in their community.

Finally the important issue of the scope and extent of Rabbinic influence over or interest in Diaspora Judaism and more particularly Judaism in Asia Minor must be raised here. Does the fact that Rabbinic literature generally confines a woman's role to that of wife and mother mean that women could not have been active leaders in the synagogues of Asia Minor?

[a] We know that the Patriarch had apostoli – travelling rabbis who did journey to the West.[65] It has been assumed that the Western Diaspora was administered or controlled by the apostoloi, and thus by the Patriarch.[66] However, Neusner writes:

> The kind of institution that would have been necessary to enforce Tannaitic legislation over the entire Jewish people is nowhere in evidence in Tannaitic literature itself ... In order to exert day–to–day authority over Jews from Spain to Afghanistan, the patriarch would have needed an international political institution of enormous size with vast funds and enjoying widespread recognition. The apostolate we know about was not congruent to such needs.[67]

It seems unlikely therefore that there was any strong central control in Judaism that extended into the Diaspora, at least before the mid–third century, and probably not until much later.

[b] A Talmudic text states that "the wines and baths of Perugitha" contributed to the apostasy of the Ten Tribes of Israel.[68] Perugitha was thought to be Phrygia in Asia Minor, and thus an indication that the Rabbis thought Phrygian Judaism, and Judaism in Asia Minor in general, apostate.[69] However, Perugitha is a town of the Galilee near Tiberias.[70] In fact, the Rabbis say very little about Asia Minor. Kraabel writes:

> The issues and agenda of the rabbinic texts were not those of the Diaspora communities further west; indeed within that substantial achievement called rabbinic Judaism there appears to be little concern for the Greek–speaking Jews of western Asia Minor, Greece or Italy, not to mention Spain and North Africa.[71] ... Even the meaning of the term "Asia" in the literary evidence is unclear sometimes it designates what we have been calling Asia (Minor), sometimes a single city, sometimes a non–Anatolian location.[72]

[c] We should also note that the few inscriptions from the Diaspora which mention a "Rabbi" suggest that the Rabbis did not control the synagogues of the Diaspora.[73]

Thus it is unwise to seek to establish the position of women in the Diaspora or in Asia Minor, by an examination of Rabbinic writings.[74] Likewise,

claiming that all women's titles in the Diaspora synagogues were honorary because Rabbinic Judaism did not allow women leaders is also erroneous. These writings only reflect the situation in areas in which the Rabbinic influence and interest was strong. We can not consider Rabbinic Judaism as the norm which represents Jewish thought and practice for the whole Graeco–Roman world throughout this period. In Asia Minor a form of Judaism which was more in keeping with the local context developed.[75]

Footnotes.
Introduction.

[1] This is seen most clearly by consulting Delling 1975, p32–45 (on Diaspora Judaism and inscriptions and papyri), where the vast majority of references are to general works or those on Rome and Egypt.

[2] Meeks 1983, p34. Note that I am not arguing for an either–or situation (either Palestinian or Diaspora Judaism) but a both–and. This is particularly the case since the neat compartmentalization of Judaism into two distinct areas is no longer tenable.

[3] See in general Johnson 1975, p77–145.

[4] Graetz 1886, p329–346.

[5] Ramsay 1897, p647–51, 667–76; 1902a, p19–33,92–109; 1904b, p130–33,142–157,420–2; 1907, p169–186,255–9; 1914b, p353–369.

[6] Levy 1900, p183–8; Pilcher 1903, p225–33,250–8; Schürer 1909, 3, p12–23; Juster 1914, 1, p188–94; Krauss 1922, p229–239; Leclercq 1928 in DACL VIII, i, col 76–81; Kittel 1944, col 10–20; Tcherikover 1961, p287–9. Other studies dealt with a more specialised area; for example one particular community.

[7] Further studies by Kraabel are also very helpful, although I do not always agree with him as will become clear. Note the following studies; Kraabel 1969, p81–93; 1978, p13–33; 1979a, p477-510; 1981a, p79–91; 1982, p445–464; 1983, p178–190.

[8] Cohen 1969, Hebrew with English summary; Saltman 1971; [a study which is rather unsatisfactory; see Johnson 1975, p98–100.]; Roth–Gerson 1972, Hebrew with English summary; Blanchetière 1974, p367–82; 1984, p41–59; Safrai and Stern 1974, p143–157; Ovadiah 1978, p857–66; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p17–36.

[9] In addition, some of the views expressed in these works are dubious in my opinion, as will become clear as they are examined in subsequent chapters.

[10] Oehler 1909, p296–301.

[11] Robert BE 1954, p101–104, no 24. On CIJ Vol 1 see Robert 1937a, p73–86 = 1946, p90–108 and see now CIJ^2 by Lifshitz. See also Lifshitz 1967, p20–38.

[12] See particularly Robert 1950, p249–253; 1958b, p36–47; 1960b, p381–439; 1964, p37–58.

[13] Other Jewish communities could have been studied in this way, for example the communities at Ephesus and Hierapolis. However, because of considerations of length, pertinent evidence from these communities has been included where relevant in chapters 1, and 5 to 9.

[14] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, Vol 3.1, p17–36.

[15] An historical note may be appropriate here. I began this thesis with a view to investigating the Jewish communities in Asia Minor in the first part of this work and then going on to discuss Paul's mission and theology in the light

of this evidence. However, as the study proceeded, it became clear that the investigation of Jewish communities in Asia Minor warranted a complete study in its own right.

[16] The debate between Sanders and Neusner over methodology is instructive here. [See Neusner 1978, p177–191; [also 1984, p195–203]; Sanders 1980, p65–79; on methodology see also Smith 1980, p1–25.] Neusner argues that, despite Sanders attention to methodology and his critique of earlier research into Judaism by NT scholars [see Sanders 1977, p33–59], Sanders investigated Palestinian Judaism with the issues and agenda established by Pauline Studies. Thus, Neusner argues, Sanders did not investigate the material in its own right but rather in the light of a distinct and separate set of questions which neither arose from nor were natural to the material itself. Sanders replied that the matters he discussed were thoroughly traditional Jewish interests. The debate certainly shows the importance of investigating motifs and patterns which are germane and central to the evidence itself.

[17] Because of the nature of the evidence I concentrate on Jewish praxis and such areas as relationships with non–Jews rather than on topics such as election, law, obedience and atonement, which are inaccessible given the evidence available. Note however, the importance of "praxis" in Judaism; see Aune 1976, p1–10.

Chapter 1.

[1] Note the exception of the prohibition of circumcision under Hadrian; see note 183. The troubles under Caligula did not amount to planned persecution; see Rajak 1984, p107.

[2] On the actual composition of these letters and their translation into Greek in Rome see Abbott and Johnson 1926, p239; Millar 1977, p219–229.

[3] Moehring 1975, p124–158.

[4] Rajak 1984, p109; 1985b, p19–20; see also Smallwood 1981, p558.

[5] Recent authors who accept the authenticity of the decrees include: Tcherikover 1961, p306; Schalit 1971, col 260; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1973, 1, p52–3 n19; Stern 1973, p192–9; Safrai and Stern 1974, p477; Millar 1977, p252,321; Goldenberg 1979, p615 and n12; Bickermann 1980a, p4, 27 n8; 1980b, p65; Rabello 1981, p682; 1984, p1289–90; Saulnier 1981, p162 n2; Smallwood 1981, p558–560; Feldman 1984a, p805; Roddaz 1984, p458; cf. Alexander 1984, p588; Attridge 1984, p226 is undecided on the issue. Note however, that many difficulties remain with the text, particularly regarding personal names and dating.

[6] There are a number of other documents which show that there were Jewish communities in a number of cities in Asia Minor, but offer little further information. They will be dealt with as relevant. See 1 Macc 15:25; Philo, Leg. 281–2; Acts 2:9–11; 13:14; 14:1; 16:14; 18:19,24–6; 21:39; Rev 2:9; 3:9. The first report of a Jew in Asia Minor comes from Clearchus writing around 300 BCE. He relates that when Aristotle was in Asia Minor he met with a Jew from Coele–Syria who "not only spoke Greek but had the soul of a Greek"; see Stern 1974, no 15. However, it is generally agreed that the account of the meeting is legendary; see Lewy 1938, p205–28; Tcherikover 1961, p287; Stern 1974, p47; Safrai and Stern 1976, p1110–1. Even if the report does contain an historical reminiscence, it would only suggest that a Jew visited Asia Minor, not that there were Jewish settlements there in the fourth century BCE; see Silberschlag 1933, p75–7; Tcherikover 1961, p287; cf. for example Oesterley 1935, p126; Saltman 1971, p26.

[7] See Ant 12:147, and on the date, Cohen 1978, p5.

[8] Zeuxis is known from several inscriptions and from passages in Polybius; see Tcherikover 1961, p501 n1; Robert 1964, p9–14; Hanfmann 1983, p111–2; Gauger 1977, p108–114. On the rebellion see Schalit 1960, p289; Wilhelm 1974, p51. Josephus is mistaken in placing the decree after Antiochus' conquest of Coele–Syria in 201–198 BCE, thus making it appear that the transportation and settlement occurred after the conquest when in fact they preceeded it; see Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p766.

[9] See Cohen 1978, p2; Tarn and Griffiths 1952, p126.

[10] Cohen 1978, p4–7,87–89; Rostovtzeff 1941, p491f.

[11] For a review of the debate about the letter see Schalit 1960, p290–292; Marcus in Josephus, Vol 7, p744–751, 764–766; Gauger 1977, p33–52.

[12] Schalit 1960, p292–304, 317–318; he discusses structure, style, general contents, the appeal to ancestral authority, and the vocabulary. See also Welles

1934, pxxxvii–l; Murphy–O'Connor 1976, p403–404.

[13] See Bickermann 1980a, p37. For example, the title "Father" was particular to the Seleucid hierarchy and the formula of greeting used in the letter was current in the era of Antiochus III but fell into disuse in the generation after his death. See further Bickermann 1947, p137–41; cf. Alexander 1984, p585–6; Gauger 1977, p88–133,143–5.

[14] See Cohen 1978, p32 [on the use of non–Macedonian colonists], p47 [on the grant of a site for a home and land for cultivation], p63–64 [on tax and tribute exemption], p66–69 [on the tenure conditions of the land]. See also Wilhelm 1974, p49; Schalit 1960, p304–310; Tcherikover 1961, p288.

[15] See Cohen 1978, p6,30–31; Rostovtzeff 1941, p492.

[16] This is an important point. Positive arguments alone [ie that the letter follows the conventions with regard to form and content] cannot establish authenticity, since a fabricator could follow decrees known to him. However, with the lack of cogent objections to authenticity, the positive evidence becomes significant.

[17] Gauger 1977, p53–66.

[18] Gauger's other arguments [see 1977, p23–151] are likewise unconvincing. Firstly, he does not allow sufficiently for the incompleteness of our knowledge, particularly with regard to how colonies were established and the exact formulae used in writing letters of this sort. [See in general Alexander 1984, p585–6.] This is particularly significant with regard to how much Antiochus would have decided himself, and how much he would have left to Zeuxis, and also with regard to the use of πατήρ and the "I" style. Further, note that Antiochus could have known more about Jewish piety and its political consequences than Gauger allows for. Secondly, Gauger claims that the document was forged in Asia Minor in the first century BCE to emphasize the loyalty of the Jews in the face of anti–Jewish sentiment. However, a document stressing the loyalty of the Jews to the *local city* would have been more effective than one stressing their loyalty to the higher authority. For the hostility the Jews faced in Asia Minor was from the local city and was partly caused by the support the Jews enjoyed from the higher authorities of the time. Clearly, a document showing the loyalty of the Jews towards the city would have been far more suitable in the situation Gauger envisages. Further the document's claims seem very modest. In the face of anti–Jewish sentiment a claim to a grant of citizenship would probably have had more significance than the present document. Finally, the degree to which the document is stylistically in keeping with other Seleucid documents is striking if it is a forgery. Other arguments against authenticity [most notably those of Willrich] have been refuted by Tcherikover 1961, p287–8; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p766. Holleaux [1920, p23] noted that one of the principal reasons that critics have doubted the authenticity of the decree is that it has the pagan ruler speak of "τὸν θεόν". He suggested that the difficulty can be overcome by the emendation of "θεόν" to "θεῖον". See also Meyer 1925, p25 n2; Cohen 1978, p6 and n22; cf. Schalit 1960, p299–302; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p78 n a; Gauger 1977, p69–70.

[19] The authenticity of the letter has been impugned by Schubart 1920, p343; Willrich 1924, p21–23; Niese 1914, p574–575; Gauger 1977, p23–151. Its authenticity is supported by Graetz 1886, p329–331; Ramsay 1900, p191; Pilcher 1903, p230; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p764–766; Holleaux 1920, p23; Meyer 1925, ii, p25 n2; Rostovtzeff, CAH, 7, p180; Kittel 1944, col 11; Ricciotti 1958, p172; Schalit 1960, p289f; Tcherikover 1961, p287–288, p501 n60; Robert 1964,

p12; Hanfmann 1972, p4; Stern 1973, p194; Blanchetière 1974, p371; 1984, p47; Safrai and Stern 1974, p468–70; Wilhelm 1974, p51; Hengel 1974, 1, p16, 263; Applebaum 1979, p134–135; Bickermann 1980a, p17f; 1980b, p70; Smallwood 1981, p121; Kraabel 1983, p179; 1986, p152; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p17 n33.

[20] Cohen 1978, p7.

[21] Thus Herod the Great used Babylonian Jews when he established a colony in Batanaea; see Ant 17:23–31; see further in Schalit 1960, p297–298, 309–310; Tcherikover 1961, p288. The Ptolemies made extensive use of Jews in their army; see note 163 below.

[22] Antiochus states that the Jews will be loyal "because of their piety to God." The connection between piety and loyalty is outlined by Schalit 1960, p298–302; cf. Gauger 1977, p67–82. The piety of different peoples and individuals is often mentioned in documents of this type; see Welles 1934 no 26, l 14, p125–129, no 66 l 11; no 67 l 12; Holleaux 1920, p22–23.

[23] Schalit 1960, p289, 298; Cohen 1978, p25.

[24] Rostovtzeff 1941, p1067 notes that Hellenistic rulers found in the territories they conquered well–established civil law which they generally accepted in its entirety, introducing only slight changes. Thus Antiochus III's attitude to the Jews on this point is in keeping with the general tolerance and liberality of the Hellenistic authorities. See also Schalit 1960, p301, 316; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p755–756. Note also that in the two decrees in Ant 12:138–144 [on their authenticity, see Bickermann 1980b, p44–85; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p751–764], Antiochus III allowed the Jews of Judaea to be governed in accordance with their own laws.

[25] There are variant readings in the text at this point, making it unclear whether Antiochus personally promised that they could live by their own laws, or Zeuxis was to promise this. See Gauger 1977, p50–1; Cohen 1978, p7. Whether the colonies had real internal autonomy or not is unclear; the letter did not specify a grant of *αὐτονομία* or *ἐλευθερία*.

[26] See Safrai and Stern 1974, p468–9.

[27] Cohen 1978, p8.

[28] Cf. Applebaum 1979, p134; Hengel 1974, 1, p16,263; 2, p187.

[29] Cohen 1978, p8.

[30] See Cohen 1978, p8–9. Schalit 1960, p311–316 interprets the phrase as meaning religious duties and thus as referring to priests and Levites; see also Safrai and Stern 1974, p468–70.

[31] Cohen 1978, p8–9; Gauger 1977, p41–2.

[32] Those who see the settlements as military colonies include Rostovtzeff CAH, 7, p180; Schalit 1960, p297–298; Broughton 1938a, 4, p633; Parkes 1934, p6; Applebaum 1979, p134; cf. Bickermann 1980b, p84; Gauger 1977, p41–2.

[33] See Hatzfield 1907, p9–10; Josephus Vol 7, p582 n a; who date the document to the time of Antiochus VII Sidetes; Juster 1914, 1, p135; Reinach 1899, p164–

165; Stern 1973, p195; Fischer 1974, p90; date it in the time of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus. On the decree see also Ritschl 1873, p609–10; Moehring 1984, p896; Rajak 1981, p78–9; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1973, 1, p204–5. On its authenticity see Hatzfeld 1907, p9–10; Bickermann 1980a, p43 n41; Reinach 1899, p164.

[34] The relationship between the decree and the senatus consultum given in Ant 13:259–266 is difficult to ascertain; see Hatzfeld 1907, p8–9; Reinach 1899, p166–171; Rajak 1981, p79; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p18.

[35] See section 5.2.2.

[36] Hatzfeld [1907, p11–12] suggested that the envoys would have travelled from Italy to Actium, then to Athens and on to Ephesus or Miletus. From there they would have had to go on a detour north to Pergamum. He suggests three reasons for the detour. Firstly, the Senate might have instructed them to go to the city in order to create friendly relations between Pergamum and the Jewish state as a check against any ambitions of the Seleucid monarch. Secondly, the Jewish envoys might have wanted to inform the Attalids of the trading privileges which they had gained from Rome. Thirdly, in order to visit the Jews in Pergamum. On the later evidence for the Jewish community at Pergamum see Ovadiah 1978, p857–8; see also Chapter 7, section 4.7.

[37] Ant 14:253–255. Note that Pergamum was adopting the view of the Roman Senate; they would therefore have needed a good reason to oppose the envoy's request. The decree provides the only evidence for a friendship between the Jews and the people of Pergamum in the time of Abraham. It is possible that the remark was added by a Jewish redactor, although Hatzfeld suggested that since Pergamum was a comparatively young city, its people would be happy to accept the suggestion of a friendship which went back to antiquity, and thus that the Jews could have told the city of the friendship; see Hatzfeld 1907, p12–13; cf. Reinach 1899, p164. That such a claim was perhaps made could show the influence of the Jewish community in Pergamum. In any case, the claim is not evidence that the decree as a whole is inauthentic.

[38] An inscription from Pergamum to be dated between 150 and 50 BCE mentions a prytanis named Kratippus; this suggest that the decree in Jospehus is correctly located at Pergamum; see Wilhelm 1905, p238. Thus, even if the senatus consultum has been inserted into the Pergamene decree by mistake [see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p18], Theodorus was probably a resident of Pergamum since Kratippus is known there.

[39] See Hatzfeld 1907, p12–13; Gauger 1977, p175; on the name Θεοδωρος which was often used by Jews see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p101; and for example Lifshitz 1967, nos 1,2,38,53,67,93.

[40] The documents are to be found in Ant 14:186–267,306–323, 16:160–178 and in Philo, Leg. 311–316. We should recall here that Josephus was writing an apologetic work, and that one of his reasons for citing these decrees was to convince his readership of "the friendliness of the Romans" towards the Jewish people; see Ant 14:267; also 14:186. On this in general see Smith 1956, p74–5; Moehring 1975, p155–8; Cohen 1979, p152–6,236–42; Rajak 1983, p224–8; Attridge 1984, p210–227; Bartlett 1985, p80–6.

[41] Note that the term *religio licita*, meaning an incorporated body with an authorized cult, originated with Tertullian; see Saulnier 1981, p161 n1; Smallwood 1981, p135–136.

[42] See Juster 1914, 1, p214,217,223–224,232,245,338; Tcherikover 1961, p306; Grant 1973, p59; Applebaum 1979, p186; Rabello 1980, p692,695; Smallwood 1981, p124,128,135–136; Saulnier 1981, p192; Roddaz 1984, p456.

[43] I am dependent on Rajak 1984, p107–23 for this section. Her work was to some extent anticipated by Safrai and Stern 1974, p456–60, as Rajak herself noted in 1985b, p34 n13.

[44] Rajak 1984, p107,122. For the involvement of Jews in the life of their cities see Chapter 9, section 3.

[45] Rajak 1984, p107; cf. for example, Tcherikover 1961, p305–306. Note that Emperor worship was not compulsory in this period; see Whittaker 1984, p209. Pliny, probably for the first time, used Emperor worship to differentiate between true Christians and victims of blackmail. But there was still no imperial decree to exact uniformity in the matter until Decius. Gaius Caligula's attempts to force the Imperial cult on the Jews in Jerusalem was exceptional. Cf. Rabello 1980, p692; Tcherikover 1961, p305. Perhaps the most important question here therefore is that of the worship of the city's gods. I do not intend to imply that Jews would not *at times* be asked to take part in the cult of the city's gods; see for example Ant 12:125–126. But it was not always the case that Jews would be in the situation where they would be faced with pressure to worship these gods and thus they did not need *permanent* privileges. It is only when one assumes that bad relations existed generally that one imagines the cities constantly raising the issue of reverence for the gods, or other such dilemmas the Jews could have faced.

[46] See Chapter 9, section 1.

[47] Ant 12:138–144,147–153.

[48] See for example Ant 14:228–230.

[49] Rajak 1984, p108–109.

[50] Rajak 1984, p109–110. This is not to deny that Julius Caesar had a very favourable attitude towards the Jews; see Holmes 1923, p507–509; Graetz 1946, 2, p76; Büchler 1956, p1–23; Saulnier 1981, p169–180; see also Ant 14:143–144,190–222; Suetonius, *Divius Iulius* 84–85. Note also decrees written during Julius Caesar's reign in Ant 14:241–243, 244–246, which probably show that his positive attitude had "filtered down" to areas in Asia Minor.

[51] See Pliny *Ep.* x,66,1–2.

[52] See Ant 14:215,221,224–227,228,306–323; 16:162f; all limited in scope.

[53] See Rajak 1984, p115 for a discussion of Ant 19:283, which ascribes a policy of general tolerance to Augustus.

[54] Rajak 1984, p112; see also Saulnier 1981, p192; cf. Rabello 1980, p703–713. An interesting example of this is Philo, Leg. 155–8 in which Philo refers, not to any legislation of Augustus, but to his *lack* of action against Jewish customs in Rome. This ad hoc process would also explain the peculiar geographical selection of the documents. The one area in which the Roman authorities may actually have formulated a general policy was that of the Temple tax; see Philo, Leg. 311–316, which speaks of Jews everywhere being allowed to send money to Jerusalem. That this one area was singled out may be a consequence of Julius

Caesar's exemption of Jews from his general ban on collegia; see Ant 14:216; Rajak 1985b, p23. However, this provision would not be sufficient for us to speak of a charter.

[55] See Ant 19:286–291; see also Ant 19:299–311; Rajak 1984, p115; Millar 1966, p161; Juster 1914, 1, p151,234.

[56] Smallwood 1981, p247.

[57] Ant 19:290; see Millar 1966, p160–162 for other general edicts. Quotations from Jospehus are generally from the LCL translations.

[58] Rajak 1984, p115. Rajak does not consider the passage in Philo, Leg. 161, in which Philo states that after the downfall of Sejanus in 31 CE, Tiberius instructed governors throughout the Empire "to change nothing already sanctioned by custom, but to regard as a sacred trust both the Jews themselves, ... and their Laws." The incident is reported very vaguely by Philo, but it appears that the trouble Sejanus had been plotting was limited to Rome. Thus it seems surprising that the Emperor would have written to governors throughout the Empire. Note however that the letter is specific to a situation of crisis and does not contain a "charter" of Jewish rights.

[59] See for example Chapter 7.

[60] Some scholars overlook this point and think that there was continual enmity between the Jews and their cities; see for example Ramsay 1904b, p142–157; Hemer 1986, p66. Rajak also tends to overgeneralize the situation. Having pointed out that the decrees are specific to each city and do not form part of a universal charter she generalizes from particular instances of hostility and writes: "In the face of such overwhelming hostility such tenuous support as the *acta* were intended to supply can have been of little avail." [Rajak 1984, p120, see also p118,122.] Yet whilst we can say that trouble occurred in certain cities at certain times, and that the bias of Josephus and his sources means that it probably occurred elsewhere on other occasions as well, we cannot say that there was "overwhelming hostility".

[61] Rajak 1984, p122–123.

[62] See Ant 16:163,168; see also Ant 14:244–6,262–4.

[63] Ant 16:45.

[64] This is shown by the Ionians' claim that if the Jews really belonged to their community, they should honour the gods of the city, see Ant 12:125–6; see also CAp 2:65. Lack of tolerance and dislike is particularly understandable if the Jews had been resident in some areas of Asia Minor for a comparatively short period of time. Even if the communities had been established at an earlier date [as some communities had in Lydia and Phrygia], if they grew substantially in the first century BCE this would likewise cause tension.

[65] See Blanchetière 1974, p377.

[66] See Parkes 1934, p24; Schalit 1960, p317; Tcherikover 1961, p373; Juster 1914, 1, p218 and n3; Goldenberg 1979, p418; Rajak 1984, p118. The hostility that arose from Roman support is clearly seen in Ant 14:241–243; see also Ant 14:262–264. There must have been some initial problem for the Jewish communities to appeal to Rome in the first instance. Thus, this explanation is not

sufficient in itself but is complementary to 4.2.1 – 4.2.3. It is important to recall the limited nature of our evidence. We only hear of situations where there was the need for Roman support and thus a decree or letter was necessary. We can suggest that there were occasions in various cities when the Jews were granted freedom to do as they wished without outside direction or encouragement. Thus when Juster [1914, 1, p218–9 n3] wrote that one did not see the cities spontaneously granting liberties to the Jews he overlooked the limited nature of our evidence. Note too that the decrees are sometimes evidence for the concern of the Jewish communities to remain observant at a time of change rather than for actual harrassment or intolerance; see for example Ant 14:259–261.

[67] Scholars have often written of a dichotomy between privileges for and persecution of the Jews. Thus, either the Romans granted the Jews certain privileges [such as being able to observe the Sabbath], or they, perhaps unwittingly, persecuted them through not granting exemptions. There was no other alternative. [See for example Juster 1914, 1, p213; Goldenberg 1979, p420; Smallwood 1981, p124; Roddaz 1984, p457.] This view was linked to the presupposition that a Jewish charter existed; such a charter, it was argued, was the way the Romans avoided persecuting the Jews. However, our discussion of a charter has shown that this involves a wrong understanding of the nature of the polis and of the Jewish community. There was no need to grant the Jews *permanent* privileges. Hence we cannot answer the question of why the Roman supported the Jews by saying they did so to avoid the only other alternative, which was persecution.

[68] For what is known of the situation under the Seleucids in Asia Minor, see section 2. Antiochus IV Epiphanes was of course the exception here.

[69] Abbott and Johnson 1926, p74; Juster 1914, 1, p214.

[70] Saulnier 1981, p187; Rabello 1980, p692; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p747; Tcherikover 1961, p306.

[71] See Safrai and Stern 1974, p457; Rajak 1984, p116; On the Emperor's role in this see Millar 1983, p77–78,84. This link with beneficia does tend to impart a degree of impermanence or instability to the privileges granted.

[72] Smallwood 1981, p37–42,135; Juster 1914, 1, p219; Rabello 1980, p692; Ant 14:127–139,192–193, 301–322.

[73] Ant 16:29,60; see Roddaz 1984, p450–463; Juster 1914, 1, p217 n4; see also Ant 19:286–291.

[74] See Roddaz 1984, p462.

[75] Juster 1914, 1, p213,221; Rabello 1980, p696; Smallwood 1981, p124; Saulnier 1984, p194–195; cf. Rajak 1985b, p28–9. See for example Ant 16:60 in which this is made explicit.

[76] See Roddaz 1984, p462. For a discussion of the Roman reaction to the revolt of 66–70 CE see section 6.

[77] Büchler 1956, p2–5,22–23; Saulnier 1981, p195. That Rome recognised the link between Jews in Palestine and in the Diaspora is seen clearly in the role Hyrcanus II was able to play on behalf of the Jews in Asia Minor; see section 5.3.2.

[78] Juster 1914, 1, p220; Rabello 1980, p692.

[79] Ant 14:244–246.

[80] Ant 14:262–264; on the date see note 133.

[81] Ant 16:167–168.

[82] See Rajak 1984, p119; Roddaz 1984, p460.

[83] A fine was specified at Halicarnassus [Ant 14:258] for those who hindered the Jews, but we do not know if it was actually imposed. See Rabello 1980, p682; Rajak 1984, p119–120,122.

[84] This aspect is often ignored; see for example the studies of Moehring 1975, p134–158 and Saulnier 1981, p161–198, both of whom fail to mention it.

[85] See the letter to Parium in Ant 14:213–216; Suetonius, *Divius Iulius* 42; Smallwood 1970, p205,236–237.

[86] Ant 14:213–216; "θίασοι" is the term used. Whilst the Roman authorities seem to have classified synagogues as collegia [but see Safrai and Stern 1974, p502], it seems likely that synagogue communities actually differed from collegia in some significant respects; see the discussions in Juster 1914, 1, p413–424; La Piana 1927, p348–51; Marshall 1975b, p149–50; Smallwood 1981, p133–6; Meeks 1983, p35–6.

[87] Philo, Leg. 311–312; see Smallwood 1970, p308–309; Rajak 1984, p114.

[88] For the letter see Leg. 315–316. That Augustus discovered that the first-fruits were being neglected is highly unlikely. It is much more reasonable to think that some Jews in Asia petitioned Augustus about the matter and that he responded to the request.

[89] It is likely that this grant only needed to be made after some dispute had arisen. For the Jews in Rome being granted similar rights by Augustus see Philo, Leg. 155–6.

[90] Ant 14:256–258. The translation proposed by Reinach - "faire des prières" is less likely. On synagogues being near the sea, see Chapter 8.

[91] Ant 14:235. Notice that the Jews had approached the authorities about this matter.

[92] Note the grant of internal jurisdiction at Sardis; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p204; Büchler 1956, p10. This is the only known grant like this in Asia Minor and it is possible that it was unique in the region; cf. Tcherikover 1961, p304. Ziebarth [1896, p128] compares the situation with that in Alexandria; see Ant 14:117. There are indications in the NT that other Jewish communities were able to administer justice according to their own law, at least on some matters; see 2 Cor 11:24; Acts 9:2; 22:19; 26:11 and especially Acts 18:12–16.

[93] Ant 14:259–261; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p450. The decree is undated and it is difficult to know how it relates to Ant 14:235.

[94] See Chapter 2.

[95] Ant 16:162–165; Smallwood 1981, p135; see the discussion of this measure in section 5.2.

[96] The term used was "σαββάτειον", which means a house in which the Sabbath service was held; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p914; Zeitlin 1964–5, p161–163.

[97] We have no actual evidence for the violation of the sanctity of a Jewish synagogue in Asia Minor; for this occurring in Alexandria in the riots of 38 CE, see Smallwood 1981, p235–246.

[98] See Philo, Spec. 1.77–78; Leg. 156; Josephus BJ 7:218; Ant 14:110–112, 18:312–313; Matt 17:24; Mishnah Shek. passim; See also Juster 1914, 1, p377; Safrai and Stern 1974, p188–191; 1976, p880–1; Smallwood 1956, p2; 1981, p124–125, 373; Liver 1963, p173–198; cf. Mandell 1984, p223–32.

[99] Safrai and Stern 1974, p189; see also Ant 14:110; Smallwood 1981, p125 n18,19. For Jews outside Asia Minor paying the tax see Ant 14:112; 16:160, 169–170; 18:312–313.

[100] Ant 14:113. Smallwood [1981, p125] and Marcus [Josephus Vol 7, p506 n a] suggested that 80 is meant rather than 800, since the latter is the huge sum of 4,800,000 drachmae. Note however, that the gold probably included voluntary gifts for the Temple, and personal funds and perhaps even the entire community funds of a number of Asian Jewish communities sent to Cos for "safe keeping". See also Stern 1974, p274; Reinach 1888, p204–7; Marshall 1975b, p147–8.

[101] For discussion of the passage see Stern 1974, p273–4; Sherwin–White 1976, p183 n3; Safrai and Stern 1976, p718; Smallwood 1981, p125. On the Jews on Cos see Sherwin–White 1976, p183–8.

[102] Cicero, Pro Flacco 28.66–69; Text in Stern 1974, no 68; on the passage in general see Wardy 1979, p596–609.

[103] See Marshall 1975b, p146 n25 on Adramyttium.

[104] Marshall 1975b, p146 n27; Reinach [1895, p240 n68] thought the gold from Apamea represented 75,000 drachmae; cf. his earlier estimate in Babelon 1891, p178; see also Kittel 1944, col 11.

[105] Marshall 1975b, p148. See also Safrai and Stern 1974, p143; Ramsay 1897, p667. It is possible that it was the Roman officials who collected the gold from the Jewish communities within each conventus and brought it to the centre.

[106] Marshall 1975b, p147. For example, the siege by Aretas in 65–64 BCE, and by Pompey in 63 BCE.

[107] This would also partially explain Flaccus' unusual interest in the money; cf. Kraabel 1968, p119.

[108] See for example, Ant 18:312; BJ 5:205.

[109] In the Apamean conventus, we know of Jewish communities in Acmonia and Eumeneia apart from Apamea; close by were the Jewish communities at Synnada and Dokimion; see Chapters 3 and 4. Money from other nearby areas might also have been involved.

[110] Pro Flacco 28.68.

[111] Marshall 1975b, p143. See for example, Baron 1952, 1, p215; Juster 1914, 1, p379–380; Saltman 1971, p44.

[112] Marshall 1975b, p143; Macdonald in Cicero Vol X [LCL], p517 note c. The Jewish communities seem not to have had a formal right to send the tax at this time. The silence of Philo and Josephus about any such prior grant is hard to explain had one been made; see Marshall 1975b, p144–145; cf. Smallwood 1981, p126. The sending of such money was probably the customary practice, which was normally unopposed despite the Senate's ban. It was thus tolerated by the Romans but not established on any formal legal basis.

[113] Most recently re-enacted in 63 BCE. See Pro Flacco 28,67.

[114] Marshall 1975b, p148–154.

[115] Marshall 1975b, p148–154; Macdonald in Cicero Vol X [LCL], p519 note a; Pilcher 1903, p230.

[116] *Ephesus* – Ant 16:167–168 [23–21 or 16–13 BCE]; Ant 16:172–173 [Between 9 and 2 BCE]; Philo, Leg. 315–316 [18–12 BCE]; *Sardis* – Ant 16:171 [18–12 BCE]; *Asia* – Ant 16:162–165 [12 BCE or 2 BCE – 2 CE]; Ant 16:166 [18–16 BCE [?]]. Note also *Cyrene* in Ant 16:169–170. For the date of each decree see the footnotes below which relate to that document. See also Juster 1914, 1, p377–385.

[117] Ant 16:171; see also Ant 16:168,173; Philo, Leg. 315.

[118] See Abbott and Johnson 1926, p43–6; Tcherikover 1961, p49,83; Safrai and Stern 1974, p420.

[119] Ant 16:168; Marcus Agrippa was in the Orient from 23 to 21 and 16 to 13 BCE. The letter is to be dated to one of these two periods; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p156; Atkinson 1958, p305,320 [who favour the first period]. Cf. Roddaz 1984, p459–460; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p119 n47 who prefer the later period.

[120] Atkinson 1958, p320; Juster 1914, 1, p368; Tcherkover 1961, p308.

[121] Ant 16:162–5. On the differences between this decree and that in Ant 16:167–8 see Juster 1914, 1, p382–383. On Gaius Marcius Censorinus, mentioned in this decree see Magie 1950, p1581; Bowerstock 1964, p207–210. This edict is perhaps to be dated in 12 BCE when G. Marcius Censorinus was probably in the East [not as proconsul] [see Safrai and Stern 1974, p146; Atkinson 1958, p320,326; Bowerstock 1964, p207–208; Rajak 1984, p113 n23] and not between 2 BCE and 2 CE [see Safrai and Stern 1974, p459; Josephus Vol 8, p273 n d; Magie 1950, p1581; Juster 1914, 1, p151; Saulnier 1981, p184 and n110; Smallwood 1970, p310 but see also Zeitlin 1964–5, p163]. For discussions of whether Augustus' decree was to be set up in Ancyra or Pergamum see Josephus Vol 8, p274 n a; Atkinson 1958, p320; Bowerstock 1964, p207; Saulnier 1981, p184 n110. Augustus refers to Julius Caesar's attitude to the Jews in this decree; see Ant 16:162. On the *commentarii* available as sources of information to the Emperor see Millar 1977, p259–272.

[122] Ant 16:171. Men named Gaius Norbanus Flaccus held consulships in 38 and 24 BCE; it is a matter of debate as to whether the proconsul of Asia was the first or second of these men, there being no documentary evidence to help decide the issue. Magie [1950, p1580] and Saulnier [1981, p183 and n104] think that he was the first consul and thus proconsul between 31 and 27 BCE. [Against this view see Rajak 1984, p114 n24. On this man see Broughton 1952, 2, p390; Syme 1979, p267.] However, Safrai and Stern [1974, p146,478]; Juster

[1914, 1, p150]; Atkinson [1958, p319–323]; Smallwood [1970, p309–310]; Millar [1966, p161]; Rajak [1984, p114,n24]; think it was the second consul and this seems preferable. Atkinson [1958, p319–323] therefore dates his proconsulship and hence this decree to 18/17 or 17/16 BCE. Rajak [1984, p114 n24] dates the decree between 17 and 13 BCE, but probably after Nicolas' defence of the Jews of Ionia in 14 BCE. Millar [1966, p161] dates it soon after 12 BCE. In any case the Caesar mentioned is Augustus. In Leg. 315, Philo preserves a letter addressed by Norbanus Flaccus to Ephesus. On the differences between the letters in Josephus and Philo see Juster 1914, 1, p149–150 n7.

[123] See Marshall 1975b, p148; Saulnier 1981, p188 n126; Tcherikover 1961, p308, 373–4; Parkes 1934, p19–20; Juster 1914, 1, p380 n2; Büchler 1956, p9–10.

[124] We should also recall the large amount of Temple tax seized by Flaccus. See also Ant 16:166. Two documents mention that Jewish communities were prevented from sending the Temple tax to Jerusalem because the city claimed the Jewish community owed taxes; see Ant 16:45 [Jews in Ionia], Ant 16:169–170 [Jews in Cyrene, which is perhaps to be dated to 13 BCE; see Saulnier 1981, p184 n108]. This is also mentioned in Ant 16:160–1, Josephus' introduction to the documents. He states that Augustus granted ἰσοτέλεια to the Jews in Asia and Cyrenaean Libya after a dispute. Applebaum thinks that in the case of Cyrene, the heart of the matter was a dispute about the status of the Jews as citizens or non–citizens. [See Applebaum 1964, p297–301; 1979, p183–185; Saulnier 1981, p187–188.] The Jews were probably privileged aliens but the city wanted to impose on them the tax paid by metics. Thus the Temple tax was seized in an attempt to get the Jewish communities to pay a tax, the imposition of which the Jews thought was illegal. Augustus' decision on equality of taxation would then be a confirmation of their prior status. However, it is difficult to know if the outcome Josephus describes applied to Asian Jews as well. Our only other evidence comes from Ant 16:45 which mentions that taxes were imposed on the Jews in Ionia; the context implies that they were not justified and so the situation may be related to that in Cyrenaean Libya. Yet the rest of Nicolas' speech concerns privileges and not status; cf. Ant 12:125 and the discussion in Chapter 9, section 1. This means we cannot know what the reason for the imposition of the tax was. Thus in Asia Minor it is possible [though no more than possible] that one of the reasons the Temple tax was confiscated on occasions was due to disputes over civic status and thus the claim that the money was due as a tax owing to the city.

[125] See Millar 1966, p156,166; 1977, p208,213f,313f; see also Abbott and Johnson 1926, p185–6,237–9; Rajak 1984, p118; 1985b, p23; Levick 1985, p6f. See some example of rare unsolicited communication from the Emperor in Millar 1977, p319–21; Talbert 1984, p402. Since Roman authorities tended to respond to difficulty the term "Roman administration" is misleading; see Millar 1966, p166.

[126] Ant 16:172–173. Opinions differ as to the date of this decree; it is between 9 and 2 BCE; see Magie 1950, p1581; Atkinson 1958, p327; Safrai and Stern 1974, p147; Smallwood 1981, p142. Julius Antonius, mentioned in the decree, was the son of Mark Antony and Fulvia, born around 43 BCE, consul in 10 BCE, and put to death in 2 BCE. What is known about him is given in Atkinson 1958, p327; on which see Robert, BE 1959, p176–177 no 108.

[127] Smallwood 1981, p142; Juster 1914, 1, p241 n1.

[128] Ant 16:27–61; see also Ant 16:169–170 concerning Cyrene.

[129] See Ant 16:168,162–5. The proconsul Publius Servilius Galba wrote to Mile-

tus saying he had heard that "you are attacking the Jews and forbid them to observe their Sabbaths, perform their native rites καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι in accordance with their custom." [Ant 14:244–6. Juster notes that Miletus had no civic institutions under Roman rule until 46 BCE. Since the letter was written to the magistrates, council and people of Miletus, this is the only indication of dating; see Juster 1914, 1, p147 n1; Moehring 1975, p137; cf. Holleaux 1918, p16 n1. Some scholars propose to emend Publius Servilius Galba to P. Servilius Isauricus, the latter being proconsul in 46 BCE; see Broughton 1952, 2, p298; Saulnier 1981, p172 and n49. The text as it stands is very difficult.] Büchler [1956, p5] thought that the reference to τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι – "can only refer to the delivery of the tithes of the produce of the land" to Jerusalem. Safrai and Stern 1974, p201–202 accepted Büchler's view; see also Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p581 n a. A number of decrees allow the high priest to collect dues; see Ant 14:194–195,199,202–203,208; Büchler 1956, p1–23. The decree from Miletus could thus suggest that the high priests were allowed to receive dues from outside Judaea as well. However, we must recall that the letter was written by the proconsul. It is therefore difficult to argue that the wording reflects actual Jewish usage and thus is evidence for Jews sending tithes to Jerusalem. καρπός, used at times in the LXX to mean first-fruits, could simply refer to Jewish money here. Alternatively, the decree could imply that the Jews had been unable to obtain or sell the food they required, in which case this would be another example of Jews in Asia Minor being concerned about food laws; see section 5.5.

[130] Liver 1963, p190.

[131] Safrai and Stern 1974, p190; see also Roth-Gerson 1972, English summary, p6.

[132] See also Schalit 1971, col 261. We have very little specific evidence concerning pilgrimage to Jerusalem by Jews in Asia Minor. The Jews from various parts of Asia Minor mentioned in Acts 2:9–10 were probably not pilgrims, but had become residents in Jerusalem [see Haenchen 1971, p168 n7], although it is possible that such Jews originally came to Jerusalem on pilgrimage. In any case they show some sort of contact existed between communities in Asia Minor and Palestine. However, it is likely that Jews from Asia Minor, like Jews elsewhere, did go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. On the pilgrimage in general see Safrai 1975, p53–62; Safrai and Stern 1974, 191–204; 1976, p898–904; CIJ 1404.

[133] The documents are found in Josephus in the following passages: *Parium in Mysia* – Ant 14:213–216; 46 BCE [but see note 139 below]. *Ephesus* – Ant 14:225–227, 43 BCE; Ant 14:262–264, perhaps to be dated to 42 BCE. [See Safrai and Stern 1974, p144; Marcus Junius Brutus was active in Asia Minor early in 42 BCE when he was preparing for war against Antony and Octavian; see Broughton 1952, 2, p346–7. It is not however certain that he is mentioned in the text. See Josephus Vol 7, p590 n a; Ritschl 1873, p613–4; Juster 1914, 1, p148 n12.]; Ant 16:167–168, 23/21 or 16/13 BCE. *Laodicea* – Ant 14:241–243. The document mentions an envoy of Hyrcanus and this could be either Hyrcanus I, or Hyrcanus II [in which case the decree could be dated to c.45 as Juster [1914, 1, p146–7] suggests.] It is possible that as Hyrcanus appears without the title of ethnarch, it may be Hyrcanus I who is meant. He maintained friendly diplomatic relations with Pergamum [see Ant 14:247–255] which means that such intervention in the affairs of the Pergamene kingdom by Hyrcanus I is by no means impossible. See Safrai and Stern 1974, p477; see also Josephus Vol 7, p577 n e; Goldenberg 1979, p416 n15; Syme 1979, p639–640; Reinach 1899, p165–166; cf. Homolle 1882, p611–612; Saulnier 1981, p172–173, who dates the decree to 48/47 BCE.] *Miletus* – Ant 14:244–246, 46–44 BCE. [See Moehring

1975, p135; Juster 1914, 1, p147 n1; Saulnier 1981, p172 n49.] *Halicarnassus* – Ant 14:256–258, 44–48 BCE. [See Safrai and Stern 1974, p145,938 cf. Moehring 1975, p135; Goldenberg 1979, p417.] *Sardis* – Ant 14:259–261, date uncertain. [See Josephus Vol 7, p586 n e; Bickerman 1958, p151 n39. General decree to the Jews in *Asia* – Ant 16:162–165, 12 BCE. On the Jews in *Rome* and the Sabbath see Philo, Leg. 158; Smallwood 1970, p242; Goldenberg 1979, p418.

[134] Goldenberg 1979, p415,418.

[135] Ant 14:244–246; see also Ant 14:256–8,262–4.

[136] Ant 14:244–246.

[137] Ant 14:259–261.

[138] Ant 14:262–264; the assembly of Ephesus confirmed these privileges. On the name of the proconsul see note 133.

[139] In Ant 14:213–4, a letter to the people of Parium [note that the island of Paros might be meant, see Marcus, Josephus Vol 7, p561 n f], Julius Gaius the praetor states that the Jews had been forbidden to χρήματα εἰς σύνδειπνα καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ εἰσφέρειν and had appealed to him. It is possible that the σύνδειπνα were community meals held on the Sabbath; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p204; 1979, p805–806; cf. CPJ 139. Ant 14:214 implies that such meals occurred in the Jewish communities in Rome. This would then be another example of a Jewish community seeking to ensure that they could observe the Sabbath as they wished.

[140] Ant 14:223–227; [44 BCE, see Josephus Vol 7, p567 n f.] The envoys of Hyrcanus were probably sent to Dolabella after they had visited the Senate in Rome and obtained recognition for Hyrcanus, see Ant 14:217–222.

[141] Hyrcanus I could be meant, see note 133 above.

[142] Ant 14:241–242. The text shows a double involvement of the envoys from Hyrcanus. The emendation of the corrupted name in the text to Rabirius was suggested by Homolle 1882, p608–612 on the basis of an inscription [cf. Ritschl 1873, p612]; see also Broughton 1952, 2, p481.

[143] See section 4.3.2; also Saulnier 1981, p193. The Roman authorities, in accepting the efforts of envoys of Hyrcanus on behalf of the Jews in Asia Minor, seem to have recognised the solidarity between Palestine and the Jewish Diaspora; see Saulnier 1981, p194; Juster 1914, 1, p216 n3; cf. Rabello 1980, p713.

[144] Ant 14:226; see further in section 5.4. It is also noted in the letter that the governors before Dolabella had similarly granted this exemption on the grounds of the need to observe the Sabbath, suggesting that it was an established privilege. See also Ant 14:228–230,231–2,234,236,240. On the decree in Ant 14:225–227, see Goldenberg 1979, p431–433.

[145] Ant 16:167–168; dated to 23/21 or 16/13 BCE. See note 119.

[146] Ant 16:163; perhaps to be dated in 12 BCE; see note 121. The "day of preparation" is mentioned in Mt 27:62; Mk 15:42; Lk 23:54; Jn 19:31; and see Zeitlin 1951–52, p252–255; 1964–5, p161.

[147] Safrai and Stern 1976; p806.

[148] Smallwood 1981, p135.

[149] See Goldenberg 1979, p424.

[150] On the Sabbath see Goldenberg 1979, p422–429; Mann 1914, p434–56,498–532; Safrai and Stern 1976, p804–7; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p424–7,447–54,467–75; 1986, 3.1, p140–2. Goldenberg [1979, p422–9] notes that all the varieties of Jewish opinion shared a common concern for the proper observance of the Sabbath which was based on reading the Scriptures. However, different Jewish groups or individuals [Palestinian sources, Qumran, Philo etc] differed in the way that they observed the Sabbath. Thus we cannot make any generalisations on the basis of other evidence about how Jews in Asia Minor would have actually observed the Sabbath.

[151] The frequency of names such as "Sambathios" and "Sabbathai" among Jews in Egypt and elsewhere suggests that these Jews observed the Sabbath. Note also the frequency of such names among Egyptians, which, as Tcherikover argues, suggests that at least one of the parents of the people so named adopted the custom of observing the Sabbath. This likewise suggests that Jews in the areas concerned faithfully observed the Sabbath; see CPJ, 3, p43–87,110–116,189–191. See CPJ 3, p46-56 for a discussion of four inscriptions from Asia Minor of interest here. One from Thyateira mentions a Sambatheion; see CIJ 752. The relations of the "Sambatheion" to Judaism is far from clear but the term is probably another name for a synagogue as it is is Ant 16:164. It is not necessary to argue that the synagogue community concerned was syncretistic or less than "orthodox" since a burial place was in the vicinity of the building. As Tcherikover [CPJ 3, p46] pointed out, the Sambatheion was not built near the sarcophagus but the sarcophagus in the vicinity of the Sambatheion. The Jewish community could not prevent Fabius Zosimos from building a grave nearby. On this inscription see Kraabel 1968, p160–191; Safrai and Stern 1974, p151; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p19. Two inscriptions from Cilicia shows the existence of a community of worshippers of a god called Σαββᾶτιστής; see Hicks 1891, p233–6, no 16,17; Sokolowski 1955, no 80. Another inscription from Lydia concerns a deity called "Σαβαθικός". These clearly pagan inscriptions seem to come from gentile groups influenced by Jewish ideas of the Sabbath; see Johnson 1984, p1604; Cumont 1904, p65; Nilsson 1950, p638–9; Bickerman 1958, p154; CPJ 3, p46–7; Kraabel 1968, p191–6. They probably therefore testify to the influence of Jewish communities in the areas concerned. On Jewish communities in Cilicia see MAMA III, 205,222,237,262, 295,344,440,448, 607,679; CIJ 925; Bean and Mitford 1962, p206–7, no 30; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p33–4.

[152] Smallwood 1981, p127. Early in the first century BCE Marius had replaced conscription by voluntary enlistment. The decrees reported by Josephus on this subject are in considerable confusion. We have several documents or parts of documents [Ant 14:228–232,234,236–240] together with two reports from Lentulus' staff. [Ant 14:229,238–239; see Juster 1914, 1, p142–146; Safrai and Stern 1974, p458; Saulnier 1981, p164–167,196.] The decrees quoted or paraphrased in Ant 14:228,234,240 exempt Jews in Ephesus, whilst the letter from Lentulus' legate to Ephesus reporting his appeal to the propaetor of Asia [Fannius, see Magie 1950, p1256 n76, Ant 14:230] states that the exemption covers "the Jews of Asia". This is also implied in a decree of Delos, Ant 14:231–232; see Smallwood 1981, p127 n24; see also Ant 14:204.

[153] Juster 1914, 1, p142; Cichorius 1922, p135; Saulnier 1981, p167–168; Ros-

tovtzeff 1941, p989–94,1576 n93. L. Lentulus raised two legions in Asia, which would mean 10,000 to 12,000 men. On L. Lentulus see Broughton 1952, 2, p256,276; on his council see Suolahti 1958, p152–63.

[154] Ant 14:228. That Jews sought an exemption from fighting in the army in some cases does not mean that they found it contrary to their religious principles to serve in the army at all times and under any circumstances; see Rajak 1984, p116 n33.

[155] That the exemption applied to Jews who were Roman citizens is stated in Ant 14:231, 234, 236, 240; see further in Chapter 9, section 2.

[156] Smallwood 1981, p128; Saulnier 1981, p180–182. Dolabella was governor of Syria, not of Asia as Josephus says. He did however kill the governor of Asia and later committed suicide at Laodiceia. On Dolabella see Broughton 1952, 2, p317,344; Magie 1950, p402,419–421,1272 n47–50; Robert 1954, p103; Rostovtzeff 1941, p1063; Syme 1979, p369. Safrai and Stern [1974, p458] date the letter to 44 BCE; Juster 1914, 1, p146 and Marcus, Josephus Vol 7, p568 n a to 43 BCE.

[157] Ant 14:223–227. [Note again the involvement of Hyrcanus in ensuring the continued liberty of Jewish communities in Asia Minor.] The reference to a prior exemption from military service suggests that the decree of L. Lentulus, written in 49 BCE, is authentic.

[158] Smallwood 1981, p128; Büchler 1956, p10 n1; cf. Safrai and Stern 1974, p458–9; Tcherikover 1961, p510 n43.

[159] Ant 16:28,60–61.

[160] Smallwood 1981, p137; see also Atkinson 1959, p254; cf. Applebaum 1971, p181. Smallwood's view that a universal exemption existed forces her to assume that it was temporarily withdrawn from the Jewish community in Rome in 19 CE, thus enabling the Romans to conscript 4000 Jews to serve in Sardinia as one punishment for Jewish proselytism. [See Ant 18:84; Smallwood 1981, p207–208.] However, it seems more reasonable to conclude that the Jews in Rome had never been officially granted an exemption from military service.

[161] Ant 14:226; cf. Ant 18:84; 13:251–253.

[162] Ant 14:228; see also Ant 14:232,237. In addition to the Sabbath and food laws, Smallwood [1981, p137 n62], Atkinson [1959, p254] and Applebaum [1971, p181] think that it was the cult of the Roman military standards in particular which necessitated the exemption of the Jews from military service; see also Saulnier 1981, p168–169; cf. the unlikely interpretation in Graetz 1886, p335–9.

[163] See Graetz 1886, p346. Whilst Jews in a Jewish armed unit could probably compel a commander to consider Jewish needs and hence let them observe [for example] the Sabbath [see Ant 13:251–3], individual Jews in the Roman army would have to obey orders or face punishment. See Tcherikover 1961, p510 n44. This is probably the underlying reason why Jews asked for exemption from mobilization in the Roman army [where they would be called up as individuals] whilst Jews perhaps served in Jewish "units" in Seleucid and Ptolemaic armies. On Jews in Persian garrisons and in the Ptolemaic forces in Egypt and Cyrenaica see CAp 1:186–189,2:49–52; Parkes 1934, p10; Smallwood 1981, p221–223; Safrai and Stern 1974, p421–430,702; Tcherikover 1961, p279–284,300–301,308,334–335; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p41–3. cf. Kasher

1978, p57–67; Applebaum [in Safrai and Stern 1974, p423,429] thinks that at least some Jewish groups in the Ptolemaic army served under the terms of a written agreement which safeguarded their freedom of religious practice. See also Goldenberg 1979, p432; Saulnier 1981, p169 n32. On Jewish mercenaries serving under the Seleucids and Jewish military settlers in that era see Josephus Ant 13:135–142; 1 Macc 11:45–51; Safrai and Stern 1974, p431f. Antiochus III's letter to Zeuxis [see section 2 above] suggests a general readiness on the part of the Seleucids to grant Jews recognition of their rights to practice their religion, which could perhaps include those in the Seleucid armies. For a discussion of the evidence for Jews serving in the Roman army [all from outside of Asia Minor] see Applebaum 1971, p181–4. See also CIJ 79,640,920.

[164] Ant 14:225–227; see Juster 1914, 1, p361.

[165] Ant 14:261; the date is uncertain; see Josephus Vol 7, p586 n e; Juster 1914, 1, p148.

[166] Ant 14:260. See Hanfmann 1967, p13; Kraabel 1983, p179. Saulnier suggests that since the text mentions the agoranomos, it might be a matter of him authorising some Jews to come and sell their products in the market; see Saulnier 1981, p189 n133. On the dietary laws in this period see Grant 1980, p302–4.

[167] See also note 129 above in this regard. An interesting indication concerning Jewish food laws comes from Pompei. According to Applebaum [in Safrai and Stern 1976, p722], the words "kosher fish sauce" and "kosher fish pickle" were inscribed on amphorae found there, indicating that these relishes were made in accordance with Jewish dietary laws. In this regard see also Chapter 8, in which I argue that purity was an important consideration for at least some Jewish communities in Asia Minor, as it was elsewhere.

[168] Ant 14:262–264.

[169] Ant 16:162–165. Note also the similar wording in Ant 14:213–216, 225–227, 235, 241–243, 244–246, 256–258, 259–261, 16:172–173. The concern to follow tradition is not confined to Judaism; see the example of the followers of the Persian Zeus at Sardis in Robert 1975a, p306–330; New Docs 1976, p23.

[170] Ant 14:225–227, a letter addressed to Ephesus in 43 BCE.

[171] Ant 14:244–246. Explicit requests by Jewish communities are noted in Ant 14:213–216, 235, 241–243, 259–261, 262–264, 16:172–173.

[172] On this expression see Tcherikover 1961, p82–84; Safrai and Stern 1974, p145. Note that the general Roman policy towards subject peoples was to confirm existing rights; see for example Arrian 1.18.2; 7.20.1. Whilst the phraselogy was fairly standardised, the exact meaning for each of the groups involved would vary. See also Ant 12:142,147–153; Schalit 1969, p426–34.

[173] See Rajak 1984, p115–116; 1985b, p24.

[174] The only other matter upon which the documents throw some light is the observance of festivals by Jewish communities in Asia Minor. The people of Halicarnassus stated in a decree about the Jews that "their sacred service to God and their customary festivals [ἑορταὶ, used in the LXX] and religious gatherings shall be carried on." [Ant 14:257–258; undated]. Likewise, Julius Gaius, in writing to the people of Parium stated that "Similarly do I forbid

other religious societies but permit these people [the Jews] alone to assemble and feast [ἑστιασθαι] in accordance with their native customs and ordinances." [Ant 14:213–216; 46 BCE.] Little can be made of such general expressions by themselves, but they seem to indicate that Jewish communities in Asia Minor observed the Jewish festivals. This possibility is confirmed by Humann et al 1898, no 342=CIJ 777, a Jewish inscription from Hierapolis which mentions the feasts of Passover and Pentecost. A number of the names of Jews at Aphrodisias refer to Festivals; this suggests that the community there observed the Jewish festivals; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p96. For evidence from elsewhere concerning Jewish festivals see CPJ 3, no 452a; Lüderitz 1983, no 71; CIJ 725; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3,1 p144 n26.

[175] Rajak 1984, p118.

[176] Ant 19:289–291.

[177] See Ant 19:279 and also 19:300–312. Jews in Asia Minor would probably have been threatened by Caligula's demands that all people observe the Emperor cult, but fortunately his reign was short and Claudius restored the former situation; see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1973, 1, p394–7; 1986, 3.1, p121–2.

[178] Moehring 1984, p870 n12, p907 n140; Kraabel 1983, p182; Smallwood 1981, p364. The royal family of Adiabene provided the only recorded help for the revolt from the Diaspora; see BJ 2:520,5:474,6:356–357. Help was however, hoped for from Jews across the Euphrates; see BJ 1:5, 2:388–389, 6:343, and some perhaps eventuated; see Cassius Dio lxvi.4.3, in Stern 1980, no 430; see also Cohen 1979, p252 n26; cf. Moehring 1984, p870 n12; Smallwood 1981, p356–357; Juster 1914, 1, p225. It is possible that more help was forthcoming than Josephus was prepared to admit.

[179] Juster 1914, 1, p225,246; Smallwood 1956, p5; 1981, p356–357; Moehring 1984, p928,935;

[180] See BJ 7:100–111; Ant 12:119–24; see Moehring 1984, p928; p935 n45. On tension between Jew and Greek in this period see Smallwood 1981, p357–371. The events after the war also show a lack of vindictiveness on the part of Rome. The distinction between Jewish political nationalism and the religious privileges of the Diaspora was clearly maintained by the Roman administration.

[181] See previous note. On the tax see BJ 7:218; Dio Cassius 66.7.2 in Stern 1979, no 430; Suetonius in Stern 1979, no 320, p129–131; Ginsburg 1930–31, p281–91; Juster 1914, 2, p282–286; Smallwood 1956, p3–5; 1981, p371–376,515–6; CPJ 1, p80–88; 2, p108–36,204–8; Thompson 1982, p329–42; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p58; cf. Mandell 1984, p223–32. Cohen [1979, p252 n26] takes the imposition of the tax upon all Jews in the empire to be proof that all were involved, to some extent in the revolt. However, this is unlikely. The tax was a ready source of revenue for Vespasian and, with the Temple destroyed and the city of Jerusalem a defeated centre, the Romans probably could not allow the Jews of the Diaspora to keep sending the money there; see also Smallwood 1956, p2; Mandell 1984, p231–2. The imposition of the tax was also a way of expressing Roman disapproval for the revolt to the Jew of Palestine and of reminding the Diaspora of the destruction of the Temple. On Domitian and the tax see Thompson 1983, p329–42; cf. Smallwood 1956, p4,10; 1981, p376–378; Domitian did not alter the religious liberty of the Jews, [cf. his action against "Judaizers"] but exacted the tax with vigour; see Smallwood 1956, p11; 1981, p383–384. Nerva relaxed the application of the tax; see Dio Cassius, Stern 1979, no 436.

[182] Gentile shrines seem to have been one of the targets of the Jews, which shows how serious the deterioration in Jewish–Gentile relations was; see Smallwood 1981, p398–399; Kasher 1976a, p147. On the revolt see CPJ 2, p225–60; Fuks 1961, p98–104; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1973, 1, p529–34; Kasher 1976a, p147–58; Smallwood 1981, p389–421; Rajak 1983, p8. On possible trouble in Palestine at this time see Applebaum 1976, p18; Smallwood 1981, p421–427. Blanchetière [1974, p374] notes that Jews in Asia Minor were not involved in the revolt of 115–117 CE. Yet there seems to be no question of Jews in Asia Minor being numerically unable to mount a revolt in this period.

[183] On the revolt and Hadrian's ban see Bowersock 1980, p131–141; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1973, 1, p534–557, 1986, 3.1, p123–4; Applebaum 1976, p1f; 1984, p35–41; Juster 1914, 1, p226,264–266; Smallwood 1959b, p334–47; 1961, p93–6; 1981, p467–73. Blanchetière [1984, p55] and Roth–Gerson [1972, English summary p2] note the lack of evidence for Jews in Asia Minor being involved in any of the Jewish revolts.

[184] Apart from Hadrian's ban on circumcision, and the continuing prohibition of proselytism, we have no evidence for restrictions being placed on Jewish communities before Constantine; see Rabello 1980, p673; Gager 1973, p89–101. Christian Emperors who were unfavourably inclined towards the Jews did not abolish existing rights, but sought to prevent any expansion of Judaism. For the evidence see Cohen 1976, p1–29; Rabello 1980, p673,685; Smallwood 1981, p499f; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p124–5.

[185] See also Blanchetière 1974, p377; Safrai and Stern 1974, p443 and n9 [although the view expressed there is based to some extent on an incorrect assessment of Julia Severa]. We can understand ways in which the causes of hostility elaborated in section 4.2 could be overcome and thus how peace could prevail; see section 4.2.4.

[186] See the instructive debate in McEleney 1973, p19–42; 1978, p83–8; Aune 1976, p1–10; Grabbe 1977, p149–53.

Chapter 2.

[1] On the city in general see especially Hanfmann 1983, p1–16,109f; [references to the articles in this book are given under the name of the editor Hanfmann, apart from the two articles by Seager [=1983, p168–78] and Kraabel [=1983, p178–90]; Mitten 1966, 38–68; Foss 1976, p1–27; Stillwell et al 1976, p808–10.

[2] Hanfmann 1964, p34; 1983, p110–113; Hanfmann thought that this refounding may have included some Jewish veterans from Mesopotamia; see Hanfmann 1983, p113,117, 260 n22.

[3] See Hanfmann 1983, p109–119,213.

[4] Hanfmann 1983, p125–8.

[5] Hanfmann 1983, p141–8.

[6] Hanfmann 1983, p191f; Foss 1976, p10–13,17 .

[7] On the Lydian–Aramaic bilingual see Cook 1917, p80; Torrey 1917–18, p186–8; Donner and Röllig 1962, 1, no 260; 1964, 2, p305–6; Neiman 1963, p128–9. The issue is left open by Seager 1974, p43; 1981a, p178; Mellink in IDB, 4, p272–3; EJ 14, col 876–7; Hemer 1976, p37; 1986, p134–6,150; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p20–1; The following are convinced that Sepharad in Obadiah 20 is Sardis: Kraabel 1968, p198–9; 1969, p81 and n2; 1979a, p484; 1983, p178; Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1970, p317–8; Hanfmann 1972, p3–4; Saltman 1971, p23; Safrai and Stern 1974, p432; Wilken 1976, p54; Foss 1976, p29; Stillwell et al 1976, p808; Pedley 1972, p85; Blanchetière 1984, p45.

[8] See Robert 1964, p9–15; Hanfmann 1983, p110–3.

[9] See Wilken 1976, p54; Kraabel 1983, p179; Hanfmann 1983, p135; Robert 1962, p282 n1.

[10] Date in Juster 1914, 1, p143–5; see also Noakes 1975, p244.

[11] See Bickermann 1958, p151 n39; Josephus Vol 7, p586 note e; see also Juster 1914, 1, p148; Noakes 1975, p244.

[12] This probably refers to offerings in general, but see Bickermann 1958, 151.

[13] Ant 14:259–61; translation form Loeb Classical Library.

[14] On τόπος as a synagogue see Nock 1936, p45–6; Krauss 1922, p24–5; Hanfmann 1983, p118.

[15] See Chapter 1, section 5.5 Kraabel [1983, p183–4] noted that one could conclude from the decrees preserved by Josephus that Sardis Jews were a strange group which had to be protected by the authorities. However, "part of Josephus' purpose is to stress the long–held rights of Jewish communities and the protection of those rights by the authorities. The result is to underemphasize

the Jews as accepted members of a city's society." [Kraabel 1983, p183; see also Kraabel 1978, p18 and n5.] Archaeological evidence adds to the picture considerably. The problem is that the date of the archaeological evidence is much later and the situation could have altered considerably in the interim, as Kraabel notes. On the decree see further in Chapter 9, section 1.3.

[16] On the decree and its date see Chapter 1, section 5.2 and note 122.

[17] See Noakes 1975, p245. The evidence of these decrees suggests that the Jewish community at Sardis was organised as a politeuma, but does not prove the point; see Chapter 9, section 1.3. It is clear that the community had a degree of autonomy in any case.

[18] On the earthquake see Hanfmann 1983, p141–3.

[19] It is likely therefore that there were two predecessors of the present synagogue; see Kraabel 1983, p179.

[20] The synagogue has been written about extensively; see Wischnitzer 1964, p10–11; Mitten 1966, p63–6 Goodenough 1953–68, 12, p191–5; Kraabel 1968, p198–249; 1971, p77–85; 1979a, p483–8; 1981c, p230–1; 1983, p178–90; Shiloh 1968, p54–7; Hanfmann 1963, p38–48; 1964, p30–44; 1965, p17–21; 1966, p34–45; 1967, p9–50,60–2; 1968, p23–32; 1970, p45–53; 1971, p12–18 1972, sv Index and in particular p113–9,128–40,191–7, 216–9,234–7,242–7,284–91; 1974, p52; 1975, p54–5,87–90; Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1970b, p317–9; EJ 14, col 876–8; Seager 1972, p425–35; 1974, p41–64; 1975, p149–93; 1981a, p178–184; 1983, p168–77; Ramage 1972, p20–23,33–39 Greenewalt 1973, p26–7,30–1; 1976, p67; Safrai and Stern 1974, p448–9,477–80: Hengel 1975b, p134; Johnson 1975, p83; Noakes 1975, p245; Gutmann 1975, pxiv–xv; Wilken 1976, p53–5; Foss 1976, p29–31,41–2; Stillwell et al 1976, p809; Ovadiah 1978, p861–3; Shanks 1979, p169–75; SEG 33.1025; Brooten 1982, p124–5; Hemer 1986, p137; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p21–2; Georgi 1987, p371,375,403–4. The most reliable datings are given by Seager 1983, p168–77; Kraabel 1983, p178–90.

[21] See Hanfmann 1972, p294–5; 1983, p148–161; Seager 1972, p430–1. The palaestra was not completed before the mid third century CE.

[22] See Seager 1972, p425–35.

[23] Seager 1983, p172–3.

[24] Stage 1 had no floor, and some of its foundations were not completed; see Seager 1972, p429,432.

[25] See Seager 1972, p431–2; 1983, p172.

[26] See Hanfmann 1967, p25; the inscription is given in Hanfmann 1963, p43–4; see also Hanfmann 1972, p219. For what is known of Lucius' journey at this time see Barnes 1967, p71–2. Direct proof of a visit exists only for Ephesus.

[27] Hanfmann 1967, p25; Seager 1972, p432. Kraabel [1971, p83 n31] suggested that the Jewish community received the building as a gift in return for financial assistance in rebuilding after the earthquake.

[28] Seager 1983, p282 n30.

[29] See Hanfmann 1967, p23–5; Seager 1972, p432.

[30] Dating in Seager 1983, p173.

[31] See Kraabel 1979a, p485; Hanfmann 1971, p15.

[32] Hanfmann [1975, p55] notes the difference between this situation – the synagogue as a part of the bath–gymnasium complex [albeit an independent part] and the attitude of the Maccabees towards the gymnasium. However, he also notes that the gymnasium had also changed to some extent by the later period and that social, educational and religious pursuits began to overshadow athletics there. See further in Chapter 9, section 3.2. For the possibility that a part of the Metroon of the Athenian Agora became a synagogue, see Kraabel 1979a, p506–8.

[33] See Seager 1983, p172–3.

[34] See Kraabel 1983, p188. Seager's reason for denying that the building as Stage 2 was at any point a synagogue seems to be simply this connection [via the northern passage in the apse] to the gymnasium which was part of Stage 2; see Seager 1983, p282 n30. However, it would be quite possible for the Jewish community to block the passage [perhaps by adding a locked door] and thus use the building as a whole.

[35] See Seager 1983, p172. The evidence on the building's usage is as follows:

[a] The alterations to form Stage 4 were definitely carried out by the Jewish community; this means that the community owned the building as Stage 3, even if only for a very short period before they carried out the remodelling. But clearly they could have alterred it after an extensive period of usage.

[b] Nothing in what is known of Stage 3 argues against it being a synagogue. The apse passage to the gymnasium was blocked in creating this stage.

[c] Kraabel believes that the most likely time for the building to have been given over to the Jews as a synagogue was before Constantine I and thus probably during the third century CE. On this view, since Stage 3 was created in 270 CE, the building could have become a synagogue either as Stage 2, before 270, or as Stage 3 after that date. Kraabel [1983, p179] thought that the building "was turned into a synagogue in the third century if not before." Foss 1976, p21,36 favours a date in the second half of the third century.

[d] Some of the donor inscriptions from the revetments were originally thought to date from 212–240 CE, but only because of the number of Jewish donors who were named "Aurelius". [See Robert 1964, p40; we should note that this is not a definite indication of date.] If some of these donor inscriptions found in Stage 4 had survived from Stage 3 [or even earlier as we will argue for the "Verus" inscription] then Stage 3 was a synagogue for quite some time. However, Seager [1983, p173] notes that the revetments are later than the mosaics,

which have themselves now been firmly dated to the fourth century CE. These donor inscriptions could predate the mosaics if [a] upper portions of the wall decorations were left intact whilst the lower decorations were replaced at some stage or [b] donor plaques from an earlier period were removed from the wall and reinstalled in the fourth century remodelling. Clearly, we cannot be certain on this whole question prior to the final publication.

[36] For the dating see Hanfmann 1983, p193–4,286; Seager 1983, p173 and on Stage 4 see Seager 1972, p425,432–4. The renovation of the building which produced Stage 4 in the fourth century was part of a general renovation of parts of the city which occcurred at this time; it may have been necessitated by an earthquake or by floods; see Seager 1972, p433 n31; Hanfmann 1983, p191.

[37] Women either prayed together with the men or were excluded entirely. No evidence remains of physical means to separate men and women in the main hall. It is also hard to see where a portable partition would have been located. See Seager in Gutmann 1975, p156–7; Seager 1983, p170–1; Brooten 1982, p124–5; cf. Shanks 1979, p173. Seager 1974, p48; 1981a, p184 notes in this regard that twelve of the dedicatory inscriptions from the synagogue mention a wife as co–donor. This argues strongly in favour of women being present in the hall during the services; with there being no evidence for a partition, it seems most likely that women were fully involved in the life of the community; see further in general in Chapter 5.

[38] On the fountain see Hanfmann 1968, p29–31 and Chapter 8, section 1.1.

[39] See Hanfmann 1972, p284 fig 212; Seager 1981a, p182; Seager 1983, p169.

[40] See Chapter 8, section 1.1

[41] Seager 1983, p173; Ramage 1972, p39.

[42] Seager 1983, p169.

[43] Scott and Hanfmann [in Stillwell et al 1976, p809] estimated that the Jewish community may have numbered between 5,000 and 10,000 but do not give a time period for their estimate.

[44] Seager 1981a, p184.

[45] Shanks 1979, p171; Seager 1983, p170; Hanfmann 1972, p135. The synagogue at Eshtemoa had a central niche which probably housed the Torah shrine, with two smaller niches on either side which may have contained menorahs; see Hachlili 1976, p43. See also Hachlili 1976, p48 for mosaics from Palestinian synagogues which show niches flanked by menorahs. Thus, although the Sardis shrines are unique, it would not be surprising to have the Torah and a menorah in prominent positions. We should also note that Torah shrines depicted in mosaics often resemble the Sardis structures; see Seager 1983, p170.

[46] See Shiloh 1968, p54–7.

[47] Note that the addition of the two shrines seems to be in accordance with the change in orientation [whereby Torah shrines were built in the Jerusalem

facing wall so that the Torah was permanently housed there rather than being brought in during each service] which occurred in a number of synagogues in the third and fourth century CE. [The comparable Torah shrine added at Ostia is a similar indication of the same trend; see Kraabel 1979a, p498.] At Sardis the entrance could not be changed, so a forecourt was constructed making an attractive entrance and enabling a shrine to be built against an inner wall. Thus it seems likely that the changes which produced Stage 4 were undertaken in order to facilitate the building of the shrine[s] for the scrolls, with the resultant emphasis on the directionality of worship. However, Seager also notes that at Sardis there seems to have been multiple foci – the shrines, the table and the central platform. The matter of orientation is therefore complex.

[48] See Seager 1981a, p182–3; Hanfmann 1968, p26–8. Georgi's suggestion [1987, p403–4] that dramatic preformances took place in front of the apse seems unlikely, particularly in view of the fact that the Jewish community were not themselves responsible for the apse, but inherited it from the earlier building.

[49] The eagles and the table belong to the late Hellenistic or early Roman period. Hanfmann and Ramage [1978, p148–9] suggest that the eagles may have stood at the ends of the apse of Stage 2, when the building was a civil basilica. The eagles would then have been readily available for re–use.

[50] See Hanfmann 1964, p34–6; Seager 1975, p159–160; 1972, p434; Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p148–9 no 217.

[51] The lions are to be dated between 450 and 350 BCE; see Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p63–5 no 25.

[52] Shanks 1979, p172; see also Kraeling 1979, p218–9.

[53] See Goodenough 1953–68, 7, p55,85. He notes on p85 that "it would now seem that the various lions guarding the Torah shrine are there to protect the sacred scrolls and to indicate the ferocious but saving power of the God of the Torah." It is difficult to follow Goodenough's other conclusions about the lion however; see also Nock 1972, p914–5.

[54] Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p151 no 226; they date it to the fourth century CE; see also Hanfmann 1964, p36–8; Seager 1981a, p181.

[55] See Seager 1983, p171 and the list on p170; see also the two copper menorahs described in Waldbaum 1983, p103 and also p20. An inscription mentions the dedication of a "heptamuxion" [menorah] by Aurelius Hermogenes who was probably a goldsmith; see Hanfmann 1964, p38; 1967, p27; and now the fuller English translation in Waldbaum 1983, p20 no 43. It is not known if this was an actual menorah or a representation of one, but the fact that the dedicator may have been a goldsmith suggests that he made a menorah and perhaps that it was gilded. The same term is found in a Jewish inscription from Side; see van Buren 1908, p195–7; Lifshitz 1967, no 36. On the menorah in general see Goodenough 1953–68, 4, p71–98; Foerster 1974, p191–6; Chiat 1982, p347–8. For a menorah from Pergamum, perhaps originally from a synagogue see Goodenough 1953–68, 3, fig 877.

[56] Seager 1972, p434; Hanfmann 1966, p44–5.

[57] Seager 1981a, p183; see section 4.15.

[58] Seager 1983, p170; Hanfmann 1966, p44–5.

[59] Hanfmann 1967, p27,36; 1970, p47; Seager 1983, p173. On the mosaics in general see Hanfmann 1967, p32–46.

[60] The mosaic in Bay 3 is probably to be dated to shortly after 270 CE; see Ramage 1972, p39; Hanfmann 1967, p38.

[61] Seager 1983, p174.

[62] See Hanfmann 1972, p174.

[63] On the wall decoration see Hanfmann 1967, p46–50; Ramage 1972, p20. Seager 1983, p175 thought the synagogue probably had other adornments such as wall hangings and vessels of metal or glass which were removed before the building was abandoned. For other small finds and furnishings see Seager 1983, p175–7. They include a very interesting late Hellenistic lamp found beneath the level of the synagogue floor and inscribed "The Good Light"; a "grillos" gem; perhaps the "poor box" of the synagogue; and 20 large round marble offering trays mentioned in Hanfmann 1972, p291. These trays may give some indication of the number of Jews who worshipped in the building. We know that the ceiling was painted from an inscription; see Hanfmann 1964, p34.

[64] Evidence of bronze and clay lamps was found; see Seager 1983, p175.

[65] Hanfmann 1967, p50; Shanks 1979, p173–5.

[66] Seager 1983, p177.

[67] Seager 1983, p177; see also Meyers in IDB Supplement, p844.

[68] It was originally thought that one of the rooms behind the apse [called BE–A by the excavators] was used by the Jewish community as an annex because of an inscription which probably read εὐλογητό[ς ὁ Θεός]. [See Robert BE 1968, p517–8, no 478; Hanfmann 1965, p26. Robert prefers this reading to εὐλογητό[ς ὁ λαός] suggested at one stage by the excavators [see Hanfmann 1967, p10; also EJ 14, p878]; on the rooms in question see Hanfmann 1967, p10–21; 1972, p147,188.] A passage cut through the walls between "BE–B" and the chamber south of the apse was thought to have provided access to this group of rooms; see Hanfmann 1967, p18. However, it is now thought that the passage was cut by road builders who occupied the site after 660 CE; see Seager 1983, p174. Thus there was probably no connection between this room and the synagogue before 616 CE; see Greenewalt 1973, p26. The inscription is now assumed to have been Christian; see Hanfmann 1983, p150, 285 n19. There is similarly no evidence that room BE–B ever belonged to the synagogue; see Greenewalt 1973, p26.

[69] Seager 1975, p153.

[70] Kraabel 1968, p226; Seager 1975, p161.

[71] Kraabel 1968, p226; Seager 1975, p161.

[72] Kraabel 1968, p226; 1983, p188.

[73] On the shops see especially Hanfmann 1963, p49–51; 1964, p45–7; 1965, p19–29; 1968, p16–22; 1970, p44; 1983, p161–7,192,210; Foss 1976, p16,42–3. On the date of construction see Greenewalt 1976, p67.

[74] See Hanfmann 1974, p52; 1983, p165–6. Four Jews are known from the shops – Jacob, who was also a presbyter in the synagogue [see Hanfmann 1983, p165; inscription in Robert 1964, p57; see Robert 1958b, p41–3 on the title]; Sabbatios, Theoktistos [see Hanfmann 1963, p51; Robert 1964, p57]; and John [see Hanfmann 1983, p166].

[75] Seager 1975, p155; Seager 1981a, p184.

[76] On the later history of Jews in the area see Foss 1976, p156 n80, 172 n42.

[77] Seager 1983, p174; Foss 1976, p42.

[78] Seager 1983, p174.

[79] Seager 1983, p171. For earlier inscriptions from Sardis see CIJ 750 [=Buckler and Robinson 1932, no 187, on which see Robert 1964, p38 n6] probably to be dated in the sixth century CE, and the fountain inscription CIJ 751, on which see Chapter 8, section 1.1.

[80] Robert 1964, p37–47; he dated the revetments between 175 and 212 CE; see Robert 1964, p53; subsequent work has shown this to be unlikely.

[81] See Seager 1972, p426 n11,433–4; 1983, p173. Some mosaics seems to be earlier; see inscription 4.7.

[82] Seager 1972, p434 n33.

[83] The inscription is given in Hanfmann 1963, p43–4.

[84] Seager 1983, p171.

[85] Rabinowitz's opinion is noted by Seager 1983, p282 n25.

[86] See Kraabel 1971, p79; 1983, p179; Seager 1983, p171; Hanfmann 1983, p286 n26; see also note 26 above. For similar action by other Jewish communities see Chapter 9, section 3.1 and note 57, 59 there.

[87] See Hanfmann 1972, p33; 1983, p145.

[88] See Hanfmann 1963, p44; Robert 1964, p57; Seager 1983, p171. Kraabel [1971, p80 n17] refers to further very fragmentary inscriptions which may have been in Hebrew. On "Shalom" which is quite common in Jewish inscriptions

see Dinkler 1974, p121–44; and further in Chapter 3, section 7.2. For another Hebrew inscription see the next section.

[89] Comparable donor inscriptions have been found elsewhere, for example at Apamea in Syria, see Lifshitz 1967, no 38–56.

[90] Robert 1964, p45–6 no 4; Lifshitz 1967, no 19. On the theophoric pagan name Olympios, see Robert 1964, p46 n2 and CPJ 1, p29. The Jewish use of such names is not unusual. See for example Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p99 no 17,19.

[91] See Robert 1964, p46; Kraabel [1983, p184] expresses some doubt about this and wonders if it refers to the Jews as a whole within the city. [On this theory see also Chapter 9, note 29.] If this was the case however, we would expect it to be mentioned more than once in the inscriptions. Applebaum [in Safrai and Stern 1974, p480] thought the name might refer to a guild of goldsmiths who were presumably part of the Jewish community. Other known tribes in the city include the Masneis, Tmolis, Pelopis and Dionysias; see Hanfmann 1983, p94,111,133,147. Robert [1964, p47] notes that the name "Leontioi" is similar to other group names of the third and fourth century, such as Eusebii, Eutropii, Eugenii. Lifshitz [1967, p27–8] thinks φυλή refers to a family and not a tribe; see Zech 12:12–14. The reference to a "tribe of Judah" seems more convincing however. Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p36 think it might refer to an association. In any case it still remains to explain the particular importance of "the lion" in the synagogue.

[92] Robert 1958b, p42 n7 gives nine examples, one of which [from Side] is given in Chapter 8, section 1.4; see also Lifshitz 1965, p526–7; Chiat 1982, p133; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p6 line 21; p102.

[93] See Robert BE, 1954, p102. Another Jew in Sardis may have been called Leontios; see Hanfmann 1964, p38 n12.

[94] See Goodenough 1953–68, 7, p29–37,78–86; see also Robert 1964, p46 n6; and Lifshitz 1967, p62. Lions are found in a number of Palestinian synagogues, often in prominent positions; for example at Nabratein A a depiction of two lions decorated the elaborate aedicula; see Chiat 1982, p43. See also Chiat 1982, p30 [Kefar Bar'ama]; p69 ['Ammudim]; p76 [Japhia]; p94 [Capernaum]; p100 [Chorozin]; p109 [Hammat Tiberias B]; p125 [Beth Alpha]; p141 [Rehov]; p185 [Gaza]; p245 [Ma'on]; p276 ['En–Natosh]; p277 [Khirbet Zamimra]; p310 [Hammat Gadara]. Five of the lions are in relief, seven in mosaics and three are three–dimensional, giving a total of 15; see Chiat 1982, p346. This compares with eight eagles, five peacocks, 22 shofars, 17 lulabs and 55 menorahs in the synagogues listed by Chiat; see Chiat 1982, p346–8. In the Diaspora lions are found at Dura–Europos and Hamman Lif [see Goodenough 1953–68, 7, p32–3; on the lions at Dura–Europos see especially Kraeling 1979, p218–9]. Goodenough [1953–68, 7, p29–37] also refers to other lions, for instance, on Jewish gold glasses, tombs and amulets. The depiction of lions in a synagogue is therefore by no means unusual. However, both the prominent position of the lions and the "tribe of Leontioi" inscription suggest that the lion was a very significant image/symbol for the Sardis community.

[95] Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p68 no 31. They describe it as "easily the most impressive and monumental of all Sardian lions." One lion-head spout was found in the synagogue, which may suggest that this provided run-off for rain water from the roof; see Hanfmann 1963, p46. A lion was also featured on one of the pilaster capitals; see Hanfmann 1963, p33, fig 34.

[96] Kraabel 1983, p184.

[97] Kraabel 1983, p184-5.

[98] Robert 1964, p47; see also Hanfmann 1972, p138.

[99] See Deut 33:22; Nu 23:24,24:9; Mic 5:8; 1 Macc 3:4-5. In IV Ezra 11:37-12:34 the Messiah is depicted as a lion who judges and destroys the ungodly, but delivers the faithful. References to the lion are frequently found in the OT, Pseudepigrapha and Rabbinic literature; see Goodenough 1953-68, 7, p79-85; TDNT 4, p251-3.

[100] Twenty-two lions have been catalogued; see Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p20-3,34; see also Kraabel 1983, p184. No Hellenistic or Roman examples of lion statuary have been discovered as yet, although some earlier lions were reused in this period.

[101] On the lion in general see Goodenough 1953-68, 7, p37-78.

[102] See Pedley 1972, no 116; see also no 88.

[103] We also hear of a gold lion made by Croseus; see Pedley 1972, no 98,99.

[104] See Kraabel 1983, p184.

[105] Robert 1964, p48-9 no 7; Lifshitz 1967 no20; see also Hanfmann 1972, p118.

[106] See Hatch and Redpath, p1053-4; in the LXX see for example, 2 Kg 7:8; Am 3:13; Zech 1:3.

[107] In the Apocrypha see Jud 4:13,8:13,16:5,17; 2 Macc 1:25,5:20; 3 Macc 2:2,6,18; Wis 7:25. In the Pseudepigrapha see for example LetAris 185; SibOr 1:66,2:330; HelSynPr 2:1; TSol 3:5,6:8. It is also found in four Jewish inscriptions from Gorgippia; see Chapter 6, section 5.7. On the term see Bousset-Gressmann 1926, p312 n2; Marcus 1931-2. p100-1; TDNT 3, p914-5; Kraabel 1978, p25. Note that Josephus does not use the term and Philo uses it only twice; see TDNT 3, p914. It is also found in the NT, most notably in Rev; see TDNT 3, p915; it is also used in the [probably] Christian inscription from Iconium given in Oehler 1909, p300 no 79.

[108] See TDNT 3, 915. On δωρεά, which is often used in the LXX [see Hatch and Redpath p358], see TDNT 2, p167. In the NT the δωρεά of God is usually the Spirit, see Dunn 1969-70, p349-51. On the δόμα of God in Jewish literature see for example Ecc 3:13, 5:18; LetAris 224; JosAsen 12:12.

[109] The idea expressed in the phrase ἐκ τῶν δωρεῶν τοῦ θεοῦ is found in Christian and Jewish epigraphy; see Robert 1964, p49 n2,3. It is found in CIJ 722, and

the Latin equivalent in CIJ 671; see now also the possibly Jewish inscription from Aphrodisias in Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p136 no 9.

[110] The term σκούτλωσις is well known in inscriptions. It was derived from the Latin *scutula* – little shield – and came to mean marble revetments in general; see Cameron 1931, p257; Robert 1937b, p410 n3; 1957, p362 n1; 1964, p50–1; Hanfmann 1972, p174. The term is found in another fragment from the synagogue; see Robert 1964, p50 n8; also Hanfmann 1967, p27; given in 4.3.3 below.

[111] The synagogue was also painted at Acmonia; see Chapter 3, section 2. The Jew Eudoxios was a painter – ζωγράφος – at Rome; see CIJ 109. Perhaps there were Jews in Sardis who had also learnt this profession. The verb is applied to a donor's decoration of the amphitheatre at Berenice; see Lüderitz 1983, no 70; and Chapter 9 note 54.

[112] The upper walls might have been painted rather than covered with revetments; see Seager 1981a, p180.

[113] See Chapter 3, section 2 and Chapter 5, section 1.4.

[114] Robert 1964, p50–2 no 8 and 8b.

[115] It is given in Hanfmann 1970, p50; 1972, p265 and states that [Hipp]asios the second, citizen of Sardis, gave the marble panelling "eis ton kosmon tou oikou." See also Hanfmann 1967, p27, who comments that "oikos" is used throughout the synagogue as a name for the building.

[116] Chapter 3, section 2.

[117] Robert 1964, p54–5 no 13; Lifshitz 1967, no22. The English translation of this inscription with other fragments added is given in Waldbaum 1983, p20 no 40. We must await the final publication for the full Greek text.

[118] There were at least three Jewish goldsmiths in Sardis; see Waldbaum 1983, p20. We know of other Jewish goldsmiths, for example at Hauran [CIJ 865]; Beth Shearim [CIJ 1006]; Aphrodisias [Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p6 line 9, p119]; see Juster 1914, 2, p308 n4; Robert 1964, p55.

[119] Robert 1964, p55 no 14; Lifshitz 1967, no23; New Docs 1978, p55; see also Waldbaum 1983, p20 no 42.

[120] Robert 1964, p55 no 15; Lifshitz 1967, no 24.

[121] Hanfmann 1971, p15; Ramage 1972, p39.

[122] See Hanfmann 1967, p38.

[123] Text in Robert BE 1968, p517, no 478; see also Hanfmann 1967, p29; 1972, p191. From this inscription we learn that the synagogue was divided up into seven διαχώρημα or bays; see Hanfmann 1967, p24. The inscription shows that these bays were countered from west to east. On κέντειν used for a mosaic

see Robert 1958b, p49 n9; it was also used in another inscription from the synagogue noted in Hanfmann 1967, p29.

[124] Robert 1964, p55 no 16; Lifshitz 1967, no 25.

[125] Robert 1964, p55 no 17; Lifshitz 1967, no 26.

[126] Robert 1964, p56 no 18.

[127] See Waldbaum 1983, p20.

[128] See Hanfmann 1983, p165–6; 1967, p32.

[129] See Waldbaum 1983, p20.

[130] See Kraabel 1983, p185. Interesting comparative material is provided by the Aphrodisias inscription. It seems that in that city also the occupations of the Jews and of the θεοσεβεῖς were not much different from that of Gentiles; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p116–123,127–8. For a discussion of the occupations of other Jews in Asia Minor see Safrai and Stern 1976, p715–19.

[131] Robert 1964, p56 n3 notes that other fragments include part of this word. Seager 1983, p171 notes that donor's names are "often" followed by "Σαρδ."

[132] Seager 1983, p171. For other Jews in Asia Minor who held public office see Chapter 3, section 3 and Chapter 9.

[133] Seager 1983, p171. The two cities were quite close geographically; the contact between the two Jewish commuities revealed by the donation shows that at least some Jewish communities were in contact with neighbouring groups. There may have been contact between the Jewish communities at Aphrodisias and Perge; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p43.

[134] See Kraabel 1983, p183.

[135] Magie 1950, p58,642; in general see Chapot 1904, p195–201.

[136] Jones 1940, p164; Magie 1950, p58,642,1506 n33.

[137] Jones 1940, p171; Magie 1950, p115,603,640.

[138] Magie 1950, p1505 n31.

[139] Magie 1950, p641.

[140] Robert 1964, p56; Foss 1976, p30; Kraabel 1983, p184; Waldraum [1983, p20, quoting Kroll] notes that city councillors "belong to the highest social and economic rank of Sardis."

[141] See Hanfmann 1967, p32. On other former office holders see Millar 1983, p94–5.

[142] Magie 1950, p446,490,541,567–9,681; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p17–20; OCD, p882; Millar 1964, p185–7; 1977, p180–1; Jones 1964, p435,790–1; Brunt

1983, p52–55; Levick 1985, p16–18,55–60. Procurators probably had some legal powers within the boundaries of the estates they managed; see Millar 1964, p185.

[143] Magie 1950, p490,578. An imperial freedman was often appointed to the office.

[144] See Kraabel 1971, p84. The fact that a procurator was accused of extortion suggests that he occupied a position of sufficient power to enable him to exact money; see Magie 1950, p563,1419 n66.

[145] Hanfmann 1972, p305; Ramage 1972, p20.

[146] On the title see OCD, p272; Millar 1977, p61,117–9; Jones 1964, p104–5,526; Ramage 1972, p20; Hanfmann 1972, p305. The title began as a simple designation of the fact that a man had accompanied the Emperor on a journey. In the first half of the fourth century CE it became a title. The title was often followed by an area in the genitive, of which a large number are known; see Jones 1964, p1489. It is noticeable that Paulos' title is not qualified in this way.

[147] Foss 1976, p30; Jones 1964, p526.

[148] The title "Comes" is found in four Palestinian synagogue inscriptions; from Sepphoris [see CIJ 991; Lifshitz 1967, no 74]; from Apollonia [see Chiat 1982, p166]; from near to Khaiffa [see CIJ 883] and from Hammat Gadara [see Chiat 1982, p310]. Chiat [1982, p311–2] thinks that the title in these instances "denoted officials or civilians of some standing, usually heads of town councils." These are perhaps officials of predominantly Jewish towns, and so are somewhat different from the Jewish "comes" in Sardis. Note also that "Lectorius the comes" in the early fifth century in Minorca was probably a Jew; see Hunt 1982, p121; Jones 1964, p948.

[149] Hanfmann 1967, p32.

[150] Magie 1950, p568–9. The accountants were often slaves, but there is no indication that either of the Jews who held this position were slaves.

[151] On Jews holding office after 200 CE see Chapter 9, section 3.3. I argue there that although holding office was burdensome from the third century CE onwards, it remained prestigeous to do so. On the integration of the Sardis Jewish community in the city see Mitten 1966, p65; Kraabel 1968, p9–10; 1983, p178; Seager 1974, p43,50; 1975, p154–5; 1981a, p184; Gutmann 1975, p xiv–xv; Foss 1976, p29–30. Another fragmentary inscription from the synagogue reads [ὁ ἀξιολογ]ώτατος; see Robert 1964, p56, no 19. Robert thinks it involves a position in the life of the city. At Teos the archisynagogos for life Π(όπλιος) Ῥουτ(ίλιος) Ἰωσῆς was described as ὁ ἀξιολογώτατος; see Robert 1940, p27–8; Capitolina, who was probably a God-worshipper who belonged to the synagogue of Tralles, was also described as ἀξιολογ(ωτάτη) or ἀξιόλογ(ος); see Chapter 7, section 4.3. At Aphrodisias the Jew Theodotos was probably a former employee of the Emperor's court which would have given him substantial social prestige; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p42–3.

[152] See Kraabel 1983, p185. I am dependent on Kraabel for a description of these inscriptions.

[153] Text in Robert BE 1965, p158 no 359; see also Robert 1964, p58.

[154] Text [transliterated] in Hanfmann 1967, p32; and see the note in Robert BE 1968, p517 no 478.

[155] The term seems to occurs in only one other synagogue inscription which is from Olbia; there πρόνοια applies to human forethought rather than divine providence as at Sardis; see Lifshitz 1967, no 11; CIJ 682.

[156] IV Macc 9:24,13:19,17:22.

[157] III Macc 4:21,5:30; see also Wis 14:3,17:2; II Macc 4:6; Dan 6:19; LetAris 201; and Marcus 1931–2, p105. On Josephus' use of the term see Attridge 1984, p218–9. The verb προνοεῖν is also used in the LXX. See in general TDNT IV, p1009–1017.

[158] Kraabel 1983, p185–6; Wallis 1972, p142,146.

[159] See Foss 1976, p22–7.

[160] See Jones 1982, p267–8; Wallis 1972, p149–50.

[161] Kraabel [1983, p186] suggests that Jews and pagans may have had a technical philosophical vocabulary in common. He goes on to propose a "coalition" of Jews and pagans against the Christians in Sardis, which would explain the Jews being able to retain the synagogue even under aggressively pro–Christian emperors. Although this is possible it seems to go beyond the evidence.

[162] Inscription [transliterated] in Hanfmann 1967, p29; part of it is given in Greek in Robert BE 1968, p517 no 478.

[163] See CIJ 746, as read by Robert 1960b, p381–4; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p5, a line 27, [see also p10]; CIJ 785.

[164] Leon 1960, p192.

[165] Brooten 1982, p98; she lists the priests known from synagogue inscriptions in Brooten 1982, p95–8,249 n73.

[166] Brooten 1982, p90–99.

[167] See Seager 1983, p170; Hanfmann 1972, p180; Kraabel 1983, p183.

[168] Hanfmann 1967, p29. Samoe would have taught in Greek, judging by the predominence of that language in the inscriptions.

[169] See Kraabel 1968, p222–6.

[170] Kraabel 1983, p189 notes that Samoe was probably "the closest thing that Sardis had to a Rabbi." For a discussion of similar titles in inscriptions see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p30–1.

[171] See Cohen 1981–82, p1–17; and see now also van der Horst 1987, p102–6. Note that CIJ 1414=Cohen 1981–82, no 53 is the epitaph of a Rabbi from Phrygia buried in Jerusalem. He is the only Rabbi from Asia Minor known from inscriptions.

[172] See further in Appendix 2. The inscription is probably to be dated after 429, and thus after the time when the patriarchy had been surpressed in Palestine. It is therefore not evidence for strong ties between the Jewish community at Sardis and the patriarchate; see Kraabel 1983, p183.

[173] Greek text in Kraabel 1968, p232; transliterated in Hanfmann 1967, p27–9; see also 1972, fig 87.

[174] Translation from Seager 1983, p171; Kraabel 1983, p189.

[175] Hanfmann 1967, p27–9; 1972, p120.

[176] Kraabel 1983, p189.

[177] Kraabel 1983, p189.

[178] Hanfmann 1972, p120; *φύλάσσω* often means "to observe the commandments" in the LXX; see TDNT 9, p237–9.

[179] Text from Kraabel 1983, p189; see also Hanfmann 1983, fig 275.

[180] Seager 1981a, p183; 1983, p171.

[181] Kraabel 1983, p189.

[182] Kraabel [1983, p189] thinks this indicates the *increasing* importance of the Scriptures. However, it does not imply that Scripture was less significant for the community before the shrines were built. What it does show is that at this point the community felt the need for a particular architectural arrangement for the scrolls – that they be stored on the wall closest to Jerusalem. Thus, rather that being in a mobile shrine, the community, in keeping with other Jewish communities of the period, decided to have a permanent structure for the scrolls. This does not indicate that the Scripture was less significant before this change occurred.

[183] See Kraabel 1983, p189.

[184] See Robert BE 1968, p517 no 478; Hanfmann 1967, p18 n23a. Late graffiti scratched on a plaster wall of a passage behind the apse [and thus not connected with the synagogue] include a number of similar phrases; eg "*κύρι βοήθι*"; see Foss 1976, p41,158 n109. The graffito include crosses and are clearly Christian. A similar graffiti published in Hanfmann 1967, p18 n23a [=Robert BE 1968, p517 no 478] found in one of these rooms behind the apse may also be Christian. Jews and Christians seems therefore to have shared this invocation.

[185] See TDNT 1, p628–9; and for example Gen 49:25; 1 Kg 7:12; Ps 43:27, 108:26; Is 50:9; see also TJos 1:5; TBen 3:5.

[186] Similar expressions in Lifshitz 1967, no 64 [from Caesaria]; no 77a [Scythopolis]; the related Θεὸς βοήθει is found in Lifshitz 1967, no 70 [Ascalon]; no 84 [Lapethos]; no 89, 90 [Alexandria]; and see now Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p5 a line 1, p26. Cf. no 61 [Dmer]; CIJ 864; see also Robert 1964, p45 n2; van der Horst 1987, p102–3. Other [generally brief] inscriptions not commented upon previously in this chapter are Hanfmann 1963, p42 – the name "Eilasiou"; Hanfmann 1964, p32; [see also 1972, p128], – late fourth or early fifth century dedication of two brothers, Synphoros and Stratoneikianos Flavioi, found in the apse; Hanfmann 1967, p27 – a donor gave the decoration for a "περιμασχαλον", a term which has not been explained; Hanfmann 1967, p32 – inscription by the "son of Marcus" on a balustrade rail; Robert 1964, p53 n2; Lifshitz 1967, no 27 – a restoration and a vow by Ἱππασίος; see also Hanfmann 1967, p27; Robert 1964, p54 no 10–12 – dedications made by different family members; see also Waldbaum 1983, p20 no 41.

[187] See Hanfmann 1967, p23–5.

[188] Inscriptions concerning extensive rebuilding work might not have been preserved, although this seems somewhat unlikely.

[189] Seager 1983, p168. In the last period of occupation the nearest dwelling in the "House of Bronzes" area may have belonged to a high church official. Applebaum in Safrai and Stern 1974, p479 is incorrect when he thinks the Jewish shops prove the existence of a "distinct Jewish quarter". There were also Christian shop owners.

[190] Seager 1974, p43; 1975, p155.

[191] Kraabel 1983, p185.

[192] See Johnson 1975, p100 n63; Safrai and Stern 1974, p479.

[193] Hanfmann 1983, p196–9.

[194] Hanfmann 1983, p194.

[195] See Moe 1977, p148–57.

[196] Hanfmann 1983, p194,210.

[197] See Kraabel 1983, p179–80,187, who notes that the Christians in Sardis were probably divided into factions in the fifth century.

[198] Kraabel 1983, p187.

[199] Mitten 1966, p65; Foss 1976, p31.

[200] If the fountain was a public one, which is possible, then the forecourt was accessible to all; see Chapter 8, section 1.1.

[201] Seager 1983, p168.

[202] Kraabel 1981a, p81; 1983, p188; see also Foss 1976, p29. Kraabel points to

the comparison with the Dura synagogue which, although lavishly decorated was not easily identifiable behind a complex of other rooms.

[203] Kraabel in Hanfmann 1983, p188. I will argue in Chapter 7, section 4.4 that the building and thus the community succeeded in attracting Gentiles; this probability is shown by the fact that five donors bear the title "θεοσεβής", which probably means "God–worshipper".

[204] Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p64.

[205] It is interesting to note that the heads of the eagles had been knocked off, although we do not know at what stage this was done. Perhaps the eagle as a symbol of Rome was too obvious in such a prominent position. The appropriation of pagan imagery was thus discriminating. The eagle is also a biblical image and common in Jewish art [see for example, the list in Chiat 1982, p346], so this probably gave it meaning and hence was the reason it was re–used here.

[206] Mitten 1968, p51–2; Hanfmann 1972, p129,133–7,139; Seager 1981a, p181–2; Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, Index s.v. "Synagogue".

[207] Seager 1983, p282 n35; Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p38, who note objections to this view.

[208] Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p33,38.

[209] Seager 1983, p176; Hanfmann 1975, p89–90. Hanfmann suggests that this shows the tolerant attitude of the Christian authorities. This is possible, although the Jewish community may have been too influential to deny them their wishes. Note that matching pieces from a set of architectural ornaments from some older monument were found reused in the synagogue and in an early Christian church; see Seager 1974, p52. Thus these stones were available to both Jews and Christians. That they were available to Christians in this post–Constantinian period is not surprising; that Jews were able to use stones from the same building is noteworthy.

[210] Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p58–60; Seager 1983, p176; Hanfmann 1972, p234.

[211] There is some evidence that the faces on sculptures were mutilated prior to reuse; see Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, p38. Clearly the influence of the Jewish community and their openness to Gentile culture means that views of the separateness of Jews in Asia Minor expressed by Ramsay and others are untenable; see Ramsay 1897, p660f; see also Kraabel 1968, p244–5.

[212] See the texts in Hall 1979. On Melito see Werner 1966, p199–210; Kraabel 1971, p77–85; 1983, p179,186–7; Hanfmann 1975, p54–5; Noakes 1975, p244–9; Wilken 1976, p53–69; Hall 1979, p xi–xlv; further references can be found in these works. On Christianity in Sardis see Johnson 1961, p81–90; Hanfmann 1983, p191–204; Foss 1976, p30–4.

[213] Kraabel [1971, p77–85] and Noakes [1975, p144–9, presented in 1971], considered the Peri Pascha against this background, apparently independently.

[214] See text in Hall 1979, section 72–99.

[215] Kraabel 1971, p82–3. Noakes 1975, p246–9 compares Melito and Justin; see also Wilken 1976, p56–7.

[216] Kraabel 1971, p84; Foss 1976, p31. Wilken 1976, p53–69 attempted to interpret Melito's understanding of the "Akedah Isaac" against the background of the Jewish community. Melito's treatment of this subject similarly suggests a polemical attitude towards the strong Jewish community in the city on Melito's part.

[217] Noakes 1975, p248–9; see also Wilken 1976, p56–7,67–8; Hanfmann 1983, p192.

[218] Kraabel 1971, p84. Note however that those who were Quartodecimans [and thus followed at least some Jewish practices] may have wished to avoid any suspicion of being thorough–going "Judaizers" and therefore may have become involved in anti–Jewish polemic; see Werner 1966, p205. This might be an additional general factor here, but does not explain the particular intensity of Melito. Note also that Jewish influence is evident in the Peri Pascha [see Hall 1979, p xxvii]. Melito may have been influenced by the Jewish community whilst also being highly polemical towards them. However, he might have inherited much of his thought from earlier Christian generations. Noakes [1975, p246] sees evidence in Melito for mutual antagonism between the Jewish and Christian communities in Sardis. However, whilst Melito was antagonistic towards the Jews, it is impossible to say from this what the attitude of the Jews towards the Christians was. The mix of Jewish and Christian owners of the shops and the canons of the Council of Laodicea [see Chapter 4, section 7], both at a later date, suggest that Jewish–Christian relations on a personal level may have been reasonable.

The relatively small size and peripheral location of the fourth century Church called "EA" by the excavators, indicates that the size and means of the Christian community at this time were limited compared with the Sardis Jewish community; see Hanfmann 1983, p203. Note however, that the existence of this church [the earliest datable church known in Western Asia Minor] may be due to the Christian community at Sardis being larger than in other places, a fact which Buchwald relates to the large Jewish community; see Hanfmann, 1983, p203.

[219] Kraabel 1979a, p491; on the city see Stillwell et al 1976, p737–9; Bean 1966, p197–219; Akurgal 1985, p185–206.

[220] Kraabel 1981, p80.

[221] See Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p480–1; Kraabel 1979a, p489. It was first identified as a synagogue by Schultze 1922, p135–7 and independently by Sukenik 1934, p34f.

[222] On the earlier house see Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p287, Abb. 301.

[223] Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p480–1; Tafel XXI, House XXIV; see also Kraabel 1968, p24–5. On the synagogue see also Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p77;

Ovadiah 1978, p859–60; Shanks 1979, p45; Levine 1981, p165–6; Brooten 1982, p125; Kraabel 1983, p182; Kleiner in RE, Supp IX, 1962, col 1221. No mention is made of the synagogue in Schede 1964.

[224] Kraabel 1981a, p82. On niches and Torah arks in general see Hachlili 1976, p43–53.

[225] See Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p77; Kraabel 1983, p182.

[226] The stone is given in Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p481, Abb. 586. Goodenough 1953–68, 3, fig 882; see also Kraabel 1979a, p490. Similarly decorated stones were found near Sarona in Tiberius, another in Tiberius itself, on a tomb in a Jewish catacomb in Rome and on an ossuary in Spain; see Foerster 1974, p196; Chiat 1982, p112. Because of the shapes of the engraved objects at Priene Kraabel thought that at least one of the engravings was done by a gentile who did not understand what was to be symbolised. This suggests that the community included no skilled masons, but that it could afford to employ one.

[227] See Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p475 Abb. 582. Goodenough 1953–68, 3, fig 878. The only similar representations of the Torah scrolls were found at Sardis and probably at Nareh; see Shiloh 1968, p54–7.

[228] See Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p480, who dated it on the basis of the fact that the "niche for the clergy" [actually for the Torah] could only seat one person; see also Kraabel 1979a, p490.

[229] Kraabel 1981a, p79. There is no proof for the existence of the synagogue in the Hellenistic period when the city was at its zenith, although one may well have existed then; see Levine 1981, p165. Harris [1976, p93–4 and Plate 1] thought he detected a menorah scratched on one of the walls of the gymnasium at Priene, along with many names. He thus thought that Jews and Greeks shared in the activities of the stadium and gymnasium. However, the graffito looks more like a fir–tree than a menorah as Rajak [1985a, p269] notes. Certainly its identification as a menorah is far from obvious.

[230] See CIJ 748 and Chapter 7, section 4.5. On the city see Stillwell et al 1976, p578–82; Bean 1966, p219–30; Akurgal 1985, p206–222.

[231] See von Gerkan 1921, p177–81; Kleiner 1968, p56–9.

[232] See Levine 1981, p165; Kraabel 1979a, p489.

[233] Kraabel 1979a, p489. No further excavation has been done at the site since 1922 to aid the identification, as I discovered on a visit to the site in March 1986.

[234] See von Gerkan 1921, p177,181; Kleiner 1968, p56; see also Levine 1981, p165.

[235] von Gerkan 1921, p180–1; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p78.

[236] von Gerkan 1921, p180–1. The following agreed with von Gerkan's identification: Sukenik 1934, p40–2; Kittel 1944, col 12–13; Robert 1958b, p45 n4;

Avi-Yonah in EJ Vol 15, p599; Ovadiah 1978, p860–1; Smallwood 1981, p509. Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p78 left the question open. Publications of the German excavators of Miletus continue to refer to the building as a synagogue; see Kleiner 1968, p56–9; 1970, p20. No further proof has been offered apart from the similarity to Palestinian synagogues.

[237] Kraabel 1979a, p489; see also Brooten 1982, p125.

[238] Some authors seem not to think it possible that a Jewish community could be both distinctively Jewish and integrated into their local city. Thus Sevenster [1975, p75] wrote:

> It was specifically these aspirations to wealth and power that inevitably must induce the Jews to relinquish their ancestral faith and to adapt themselves to their surroundings.

See on this further in the conclusions to this thesis.

[239] See Kraabel 1968, p9–10; 1969, p87. Kraabel [1978, p32] also notes:

> At Sardis at least, proximity appears to have produced clarity, and the enjoyment of a gentile culture did not automatically produce capitulation to "paganism"; the Jews are strong and self-confident, they have a firm grasp on their Judaism and they express it in their building, their inscriptions and even in their iconography. And that may have happened because there were so many pagans so very close nearby! Ancient religions may coalesce in art and literature, but that is a very different thing from what might happen between self-conscious and specific religious communities.

Some writers have thought that the Sardis Jewish community was highly hellenized; see Shanks 1979, p174; Mitten 1966, p64; Noakes 1975, p245; Foss 1976, p28. However, Hengel [1980, p51; see also Meeks 1983, p33] notes that Hellenization is a very vague and disputed term. He identifies four different components of hellenization [Hengel 1980, p60–1]: close professional contacts; the physical mixing of populations through mixed marriages; the adoption of Greek language and culture by orientals; the complete assimilation of "orientalized" Greeks and "Hellenized" orientals. At Sardis there were close professional contacts between Jews and Gentiles and the Jews had adopted the Greek language and [in a discriminating way] Greek culture. We have no evidence for mixed marriages [cf. Acts 16:1–3] and complete assimilation does not seem to have occured. We must therefore be very careful about speaking of Sardis Jews as "Hellenized".

Chapter 3.

[1] Ramsay 1897, p625–626; Broughton 1938a, p701; Carrington 1976, p56–7.

[2] Calder 1925, p8–11; Levick 1967, p10.

[3] Magie 1950, p999 n36; Jones 1971, p60.

[4] Ramsay 1897, p622,625; Jones 1971, p71.

[5] Jones 1971, p71.

[6] Ramsay 1897, p625,627. The latter was probably from the third century CE.

[7] Robert 1975b, p158.

[8] Ramsay 1897, p625.

[9] Magie 1950, p1245 n19; Jones 1971, p71; Robert 1975b, p153–155. On the gold see Chapter 1, section 5.2.2.

[10] Ramsay 1897, p355–356,366; Cohen 1978, p10.

[11] Ritterling 1927, p30–31.

[12] Magie 1950, p126.

[13] Ramsay 1897, p364–365; Jones 1971, p71.

[14] Karwiese 1971, p42.

[15] Text from Robert 1975b, p155, with a photo of the coin. Another inscription from a coin belonging to the same type is given by Karwiese 1971, p42. Neither city had such a link with any other city, as far as we know; see Karwiese 1971, p40.

[16] Karwiese 1971, p42.

[17] Liddell and Scott, p42. Magie [1950, p1500 n23a] knew of 74 cities in Asia Minor which entered into a "concord" in this way, in 96 different combinations.

[18] Magie 1950, p639; cf, Karwiese 1971, p42; and in general see Sheppard 1975, p156–179. The close relationship which existed between these two cities is also indicated by an inscription in which Hermas from Acmonia is described as a citizen of both Acmonia and Eumeneia; see Ramsay 1897, no 238.

[19] MAMA VI, 264 gives an improved Greek text, which is followed here. It was ignored by Frey in CIJ 766 but followed by subsequent commentators; See Robert 1958b, p41 n1; Lifshitz 1967, p34 no 33; Brooten 1982, p158, no 6. The earlier text is given by Reinach 1888, p225 no 13; Ramsay 1897, p649, n359; 1901b, p272; [see also 1902b, p270]; Cagnat and Besnier 1902, no95; Oehler 1909, p298 no 65; Juster 1914, p430 n5; Krauss 1922, p232 no 64; IGR IV.655.

[20] The inscription uses the term οἰκός. Robert [1958b, p41 n1, 46–7; 1964, p57; BE 1969, p430] understood it to mean "assembly room" as in CIJ 738 from Phocaea. Lifshitz [1967, p35] thought the whole building was involved,

a meaning which the term frequently carries elsewhere. In either case the donation was a substantial one.

[21] Ramsay 1897, p639.

[22] Schürer 1909, p21; Lifshitz 1967, p36; Kraabel 1968, p43; cf. Ramsay 1897, p650.

[23] See Schürer 1909, p20; MAMA VI,263; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p31 [where further references are given]. That ἀρχ. on the coins is an abbreviation of ἀρχιερέων not ἀρχόντων is supported by Ramsay 1897, no 550; cf. p639.

[24] The following thought she was a Jew: Ramsay 1897, p650–11,673; Oehler 1909, p535; Juster 1914, p430 n5; Ford 1966, p148; Jones 1971, p71; Bruce 1984, p7; Blanchetière 1974, p379; the list could be extended.

[25] Luke 7:5.

[26] Ramsay 1897, p 639. This would be a second marriage for Julia Severa.

[27] Ramsay 1897, p673.

[28] Applebaum in Safrai and Stern 1974, p443 agrees with Ramsay here.

[29] MAMA VI, p48.

[30] On the name Tyrronios, which occurs in other inscriptions from Acmonia [for example MAMA VI,264, 265] and nearby Sebaste, see Robert 1938, p181–182; and especially Robert 1975, p159 and n29.

[31] The most notorious example was Tiberius Julius Alexander, Philo's nephew; see Smallwood 1981, p258–9.

[32] See Kraabel 1982, p456.

[33] This is in agreement with Schürer 1909, 3, p20–1; Groag 1919, col 947–8; Walton 1929, p45; Baron 1952, p24; Lifshitz 1967, p35–6; Kraabel 1968, p74–9; Safrai and Stern 1974, p150,937; [cf. p443 where Applebaum thinks she was a Jew]; Stern 1980, p6,382; Brooten 1982, p144; Robert BE 1983, p82; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p31; cf. Kraemer 1986a, p196–7.

[34] Horsley in New Docs 1976, p61 defines a patronness as a woman who provides "financial benefaction or social protection". The many statements made about Jewish apostasy and syncretism on the basis of Julia Severa are therefore misguided; see for example Wilson 1958, p13–14; Oesterley 1935, p128–9; see also Bruce 1984, p7.

[35] Kraabel 1968, p78–9.

[36] Ramsay 1897, p639,648–51; Walton 1929, p44–5.

[37] Levick 1967, p106–107.

[38] Levick 1967, p106–107; see also Reinach 1888, p225–6; Ramsay 1897, p673; Schürer 1909, p20; Mitchell 1974, p34–8. Her wealth is clearly shown by the fact that she could construct the synagogue for the community.

[39] Lifshitz 1967, p35 and n4.

[40] Schürer 1909, p20–21.

[41] Krauss 1922, p310. On the office of archisynagogos see Chapter 5 section 1.1. On "ἀρχισυνάγωγος διά βίου" see Brooten 1982, p25; Schürer 1909, 3, p87 n42; Oehler 1909, p530. There were generally several archons in the community who formed a council charged with administering the affairs of the community. See Juster 1914, p443–447; Krauss 1922, p146–149; Robert 1958b, p40 n2, p41.

[42] Publius Tyrronius Klados bears the tria nomina of a Roman citizen [see Robert 1940, p28] another indication that he was probably wealthy. For other Jewish Roman citizens see Chapter 9, section 2.

[43] See Chapter 2. The term used for the murals – κόσμος – also occurs in a similar context in an inscription from the Sardis synagogue; see Robert 1964, p52.

[44] On the Dura–Europos synagogue see Goodenough 1953–68, Vol 9–11; Bickermann 1965, p127–151; Perkins 1973; Gutmann 1973; Hopkins 1979; Kraeling 1979; Shanks 1979, p78–96; Kraabel 1979a, p481–3; Levine 1981, p172–7. γράφω used here of the murals implies paintings; see Robert 1964, p51.

[45] On the menorah see especially Goodenough 1953–68, 4, p71–98; The latter two possibilities are suggested by Robert as included in the meaning of the word κόσμος at Sardis. See Robert 1964, p52.

[46] MAMA VI, 347.

[47] That it is a Torah scroll is confirmed by Robert BE 1939, p512; and BE 1954, p103.

[48] Confirmed by Robert BE 1939, p512; 1975b, p159 and n24.

[49] Shiloh 1968, p54–57.

[50] See Liddell and Scott, p674,1240.

[51] See Lifshitz 1967, p36. On the custom of large shields as an acknowledgement of a benefaction see Robert 1958b, p41 n1. Compare this practice with the right to sit on the prohedria and to wear the golden crown bestowed upon Tatia at Myndos, Caria [see Chapter 5, section 1.4].

[52] Liddell and Scott, p1630–1.

[53] Ramsay 1888, p256–257; 1895a, p98–99; Cumont 1895, p252; Arkwright 1911, p269–275; Parrot 1939, p103–139; Calder 1939a, p16,20; Lattimore 1942, p108–118; MAMA VII, pxxxiii–xxxvi; Carrington 1976, p260–281; Robert 1978a, p267–8; Feissel 1980, p462–463. The sums specified vary from 250 to 20,000 denarii; see Arkwright 1911, p269 n5, and on fines in particular see Iluk 1979, p279–286; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p141–2. Fines for grave violation were quite common in Italy and the East in general; see the list in Liebenam 1900, p43–53. Curses outside of Asia Minor generally invoke worldly misfortune rather than the wrath of a diety. In Phrygia the curses often concerned the insertion of a stranger's body in a tomb. It seems that people there thought an illegal intruder denied the rightful owner of the grave of some benefit; see Ramsay 1895a, p98–101; Calder 1922, p323f.

[54] Lattimore 1942, p109–117; see also Kraemer 1986a, p194. Jewish inscriptions elsewhere in Asia Minor used fines to deter violation; see for example CIJ 741,757, 775,776,788,791.

[55] Lifshitz 1965, p535; See also Parrot 1939, p60; Kraabel 1968, p67; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p106. This participation in the general concern for the grave often makes it difficult to determine if an inscription is Jewish or not. On this problem see CPJ, I, pxvii–xx; Kraemer 1986a, p187–92,194.

[56] Ramsay 1914b, p358.

[57] Ramsay [1914b, p360] thought it came from Blaundos. However, Calder and Buckler in MAMA VI p116, showed that it came from Acmonia, followed by Robert 1955, p250–251; Gibson 1978, p106. Bruce 1984, p6 still attributes it to Blaundos.

[58] Ramsay 1914b, p358.

[59] Robert 1940, p249.

[60] Robert 1940, p249 and n1. See Noack 1894, p315–334; Joubin 1894, p181–3, for illustrations of similar grave–reliefs from Dorylaion; see also Gibson 1978, p1.

[61] Ramsay and Frey incorrectly read these as datives; corrected by Calder and Buckler.

[62] Text from MAMA VI, 335a; also in Robert 1955, p249; partially correct in Ramsay 1914b, p358 n2; CIJ 760. We have other examples of enumerating the offices held by a person in this way. See Ramsay 1897, p564 n2; Cumont 1913, n135; Robert, 1955, p253 and n4.

[63] Robert notes that it could be either singular or plural, ἔσται and ἡ being singular and αἱ, ἀραὶ and γεγραμμέναι being plural. αἱ and γεγραμμέναι could be phonetical transcriptions of the singular [because of the frequent confusion between ἡ and αἱ] but ἀραὶ is necessarily the plural. It is thus either "the curse", in which case it is a collection of curses regarded as a single curse, or "the curses". See Robert 1955, p249f and n4.

[64] Ramsay 1914b, p361.

[65] Text in MAMA VI 335. For another fine in Attic drachmae see Ramsay 1897, no 321.

[66] Legrand and Chamonard 1893, p263–264 n48; who published the inscription without comment.

[67] Ramsay 1914b, p362. Drew–Bear has recently republished another inscription from Acmonia, which is written on a similar stone, surmounted by a pine cone. [See Drew–Bear 1978, p84–87, no 20; and see further in 3.5.3 below.] He suggests that "Iousta" whose name appears on the stone, might have been a Jew because the name and its male equivalent, are well known among Jews, because other Jewish inscriptions in the area are inscribed on similar stones, and because of the number of Jews in Acmonia. The evidence is not sufficient to make Jewish provenance anything more than a possibility however, as noted by Robert, BE 1979, no 520 and SEG 28.1081.

[68] Text from Robert 1955, p253. Translation based on Frey CIJ 770 and Ramsay 1914b, p362.

[69] Ramsay 1914b, p362–363. In 1897 [p653] Ramsay had noted how different this inscription was from the usual Phrygian type and commented that it might have arisen through "Jewish influence". See also CIJ 2, p25; cf. New Docs 1976, p101; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p66.

[70] It was quite common for one person to hold a number of different magistracies or liturgies in his or her lifetime; see for example Ramsay 1883, no 25; 1895a, no 88; Sterrett 1883, no 10. For other Jews who held public office see Chapter 9, section 3.3.

[71] Magie 1950, p645–6; Levy 1901, p365–367; Chapot 1904, p248–9; Liddell and Scott, p13; Ramsay 1895a, p70; Liebenam 1900, p362–365; Robert 1938, p289–91. A list of agoranomoi is given in Liebenam 1900, p539–542. This list includes a number from Acmonia, of which Ramsay 1897 no 462 and 552 describe people who have a similar range of titles to the two people under consideration here. Occasionally there was a board consisting of two or three members to fulfill this office.

[72] Magie 1950, p61,645,849,n33; Jones 1940, p215–217,255. The most crucial question was the supply of corn; most cities appointed special corn–buyers [see section 3.2.2] and thus relieved the agoranomos of this facet of his job. In smaller cities the task of the astynomi, a board responsible for the care of roads and bridges, for drainage and water supply probably devolved upon the agoranomos. See Jones 1940, p213–215.

[73] Magie 1950, p60. We know of another Jewish agoranomos at Jaffa in the time of Trajan; see Kaplan 1963–64, p113.

[74] This title occurs in 3.1.1 and twice in 3.1.3, indicating that Tiberius Flavios Alexandros held the position twice. In the inscriptions σειτωνεία means "the office of σιτώνης". On the title see Magie 1950, p646; Liddell and Scott, p1603; Liebenam 1900, p368–370; Levy 1901, p365.

[75] Jones 1940, p217.

[76] Jones 1940, p217; Ramsay 1895a, p40,70; Magie 1950, p646. On the corn market see Broughton 1938b, p55–57.

[77] On such a fund at Delos see Larsen 1938, p344–348.

[78] Jones 1940, p218.

[79] For example, an inscription from Lagina notes that a considerable sum was not paid back to the sitones. See Diehl and Cousin 1887, p31–32 n45; also Ramsay 1895a, p333 no 146.

[80] Jones 1940, p218; Magie 1950, p646,849 n33. We are informed about a number of Jewish sitologoi by a papyri from the Fayŭm, dated to 101/102 CE; see CPJ no 428.

[81] παραφυλακεία means to serve as a παραφύλαξ, see Liddell and Scott, p1320. On the title see Anderson 1897, p412; Levy 1899, p284; Magie 1950, p988 n25.

[82] On the tasks of the paraphylax see Magie 1950, p647,1515–1516 n47; Jones

1940, p212; Robert 1938, p99–104,340; Reinach 1906, p90–92 no 7.

[83] Anderson 1897, p411–413.

[84] Magie 1950, p647; Jones 1940, p212.

[85] On the title see Jones 1940, p105; Magie 1950, p60,844 n29; Chapot 1904, p240–3. See also Chapter 5, section 2.11.

[86] Jones 1940, p46,163; Magie 1950, p60.

[87] Levy 1899, p269; Magie 1950, p134,1508 n36. Magie notes that we have evidence for strategoi in 113 cities in the Roman period in Asia Minor, 103 of these being in the province of Asia [which included Acmonia]. See Liebenam 1900, p558–564 for a listing of strategoi.

[88] Liebenam 1900, p286–288; Magie 1950, p135,644,844–846 n29, 1006–1007 n47.

[89] Levy 1899, p270 n1; Magie 1950, p644; cf. Chapot 1904, p241.

[90] Magie 1950, p643. The name and title of a strategos, frequently the chairman of the board, often appear on the bronze coinage issued by a city. See Magie 1950, p644.

[91] Liddell and Scott, p325.

[92] On the title see Magie 1950, p642; Jones 1940, p179,341 n45; Chapot 1904, p201–3. The position was generally held for a limited period, although in at least one instance a person was Boularch for life; see Magie 1950, p642.

[93] Liebenam 1900, p246–247; Levy 1895, p225.

[94] On the title see Levy 1899, p268–269; Magie 1950, p644,1509 n37; Ramsay 1897, p600 n472. "Archon" may in places identify a particular magistracy.

[95] On the title see Liebenam 1900, p358; Jones 1940, p212; Magie 1950, p647; Chapot 1904, p260–2. For a list of Eirenarchs see Jones 1940, p349 n2.

[96] Jones 1940, p212–213; Magie 1950, p647.

[97] Magie 1950, p647; see also Levy 1899, p282,287.

[98] See very similar expressions in Robert 1938, p548; 1946, p33; Paris and Holleaux 1885, p76 no 6; SEG 2.653. On the blurring of any distinction between magistracies and liturgies in this period see Magie 1950, p651; Jones 1940, p167.

[99] On the Constitutio Antoniniana see Chapter 9, section 2.2.

[100] See also CIJ 606, 618, 760, 761, 764, 774–776, 778–780, 788, 795, 798; and further in Chapter 9, section 2.2.

[101] See Chapter 9, section 3.3.

[102] See Chapter 9, section 3.3.

[103] A helpful analogy here may be with civic office today. Many positions,

while being demanding in terms of commitment and time [and hence avoided by many] none the less carry with them a certain amount of honour and prestige. Although an office was burdensome, office holders were still warmly commended in inscriptions. Something done under some duress can still be applauded by the city.

[104] Robert 1964, p56.

[105] The other possibility, that the community had very little to do with the city, leaving it all to these two men seems unlikely. The adoption of Greek methods of honouring benefactors [in inscription 2] and the general sharing of funerary vocabulary and style seems to argue against this.

[106] Ramsay, 1914b, p361–362; see also Frey CIJ 2, p25. Cf. Bruce 1984, p6. We will see later that the passage involved is Deut 27:15–30:10.

[107] Kraabel 1968, p82. He thought Deut 30 was also included in the passage in question.

[108] We know that there was considerable Jewish involvement in magic in this period; see for example TJud 23; TJob 47:11; PrJacob [and see Charlesworth 2, p717–8]; TSol [and see Charlesworth 2, p943–54]; Acts 19:13–20; CIJ 717; and see now Simon 1986, p339–68; Smith 1986, p455–62; Alexander in Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p342–379; see also Pétridès 1905, p88–90; van Lennep 1870, p20; CIJ 743; Kraabel 1968, p56–59 for magical amulets which perhaps show Jewish influence; see also Robert 1981, p5–27. However, that the authors of our inscriptions were acting in accordance with Deut 27–30, as we hope to show, suggests that magic was not involved in these particular cases.

[109] On Deut 27:15–26 see particularly Buis 1967, p478–479; Wallis 1974, p47–63; Bellefontaine 1975, p51–59. The blessings and curses were a regular part of the structure of treaties found in a wide range of ancient documents. [See McCarthy 1981, p2,6 and passim; Hillers 1964, p6–29.] Their use in Deut strongly suggests that the central portion of the book is patterned in accordance with the covenants found in the treaty form of literature. [See Weinfeld 1972, p83f; Levenson 1975, p208; McCarthy 1981, p172–173,185–187.]

[110] McCarthy 1981, p177. This does not mean however, that the passage is necessarily post–exilic. The theme of exile was common in treaty curses. See Weinfeld 1972, p127; Hillers 1964, p33–34; Levenson 1975, p208 and n18.

[111] McCarthy 1981, p178.

[112] von Rad 1966, p176.

[113] On this see Hillers 1964, p30–40; Levenson 1975, p208–212; McCarthy 1981, p178–181. The study of treaty curses has called into question the analysis of the passage by some scholars, who sought to identify early and late traditions. However, treaty curses, and thus this passage, include much repetition and change in style and person, which are therefore not to be taken as indicators of different redactors. See especially Weinfeld 1972, p128–129.

[114] On the passage functioning in this way see McCarthy 1981, p187. It is to be noted that Deut 28 is composed very largely of curses, emphasising the dangers of infidelity, with the blessings being merely a formal and short counterpart to the curses. Mayes writes: "The preponderance of the latter [curses] and the relatively insignificant place assigned to the blessings undoubtedly reflects the

Mesopotamian treaty tradition in which the curses play this remarkable role." [Mayes 1979, p351]. See also Hillers 1964, p6,33; McCarthy 1981, p173–176. Thus to summarize the chapter [as our inscriptions do, although they include Deut 27 and 29 as well] as "curses" is quite in keeping with its content.

[115] For the similarities between Deut 29 and ancient Near Eastern treaties see Weinfeld 1972, p110f. For suggestions about the text history and dating of the chapter see especially Nicholson 1967, p21–22,35–36; McCarthy 1981, p174 n32, 194–205. It is however, the text as it stands in the LXX which is important for our study here.

[116] Levenson 1975, p208; McCarthy 1981, p201.

[117] Mayes 1979, p359,365–366; von Rad 1966, p180.

[118] This schema also occurs in Jer 22:8f and 1 Kings 9:8f. On the schema see Long 1971, p131.

[119] See Long 1971, p131,134.

[120] McCarthy 1981, p201.

[121] Mayes 1979, p368.

[122] von Rad 1966, p183; Driver 1902, p328; Mayes 1979, p368.

[123] Levenson 1975, p208; Le Déaut 1981, p181.

[124] von Rad 1966, p183.

[125] It is clear from Deut 30:1 that "these curses" are those in Deut 27–29. See Driver 1902, p330.

[126] Cf. Deut 7:15. On Deut 30:3–4 – the gathering of the dispersed, see Widengren 1984, p227–45; Mendecki 1985, p267–71.

[127] Deut 29:20 is interesting. Here "the curses written in this book" are said to fall upon the idolator who has turned away from Yahweh. This verse could perhaps be taken as an encouragement to Acmonian Jews to apply the curses of Deut 27–29 to grave violators. However, the passage is more likely to be interpreted by them as an explanation for their present situation – viz their ancestors became idolators. In addition, against its use for grave violation are the facts that the passage is explicitly addressed to individuals within Israel, and that the situation in the Diaspora is not presupposed until Deut 29:22f. On this verse see Weinfeld 1972, p106–107,109.

[128] See Chapter 1, section 2.

[129] Philo in Praem. 127–172 follows Deut 28–30 quite closely, but includes some expansions. After describing curses which will come upon those who disregard the holy laws he then interprets Deut 30:1–10 to refer to "those who a little while ago [πρό μικρόν] were scattered in Greece and the outside world." [165] They will pass from exile to the land of Israel. His treatment of the passage suggests that he understood Deut 30:7 to mean that God will turn the curses against the enemies of these people scattered throughout the world [169]. We see therefore that another Diaspora Jew probably understood Deut 30:1–10 to be significant for his situation, and thus interpreted it along the lines we have

suggested, although without reference to grave violation and in keeping with Philo's own thought. This suggests that our view is plausible. Philo also alludes to Deut 30:4 in Praem. 115; see also Conf. 197; Som. 2:175.

[130] We therefore find pagan curse and fine formula against grave violators in Acmonia; see for example Ramsay 1897, nos 574,576,592. Grave violation was clearly very common in antiquity; see in general Brown 1931, p1–29. On Jewish–Gentile relations in Asia Minor see Chapter 9.

[131] It is interesting to note that the Qumran community in 1QS 2:11–18 made direct use of the curses in Deut 29:18–20a, invoking them against those in the community who had become backsliders through idol worship. The Deut text, which itself deals with those who forsake the covenant by serving other gods, is not quoted word for word but is consciously changed and extended by the Qumran author to fit the current ways of thought in the community. Thus another Jewish community made use of the Deuteronomy text and adapted it for current needs, albeit at an earlier date and in a more direct way. Clearly the Qumran author also used the passage appropriately, and without any magical sense. On this text at Qumran see Laubscher 1980, p49–55.

A number of inscriptions known to us either quote from Scripture [with varying degrees of accuracy] or are heavily dependent on Biblical ideas and thus show the significance of Scripture for other Jewish communities in this period. In the first category see the Hebrew lamentation from Egypt in Klein–Franke 1983, p80–4, which is a collection of quotations from the OT [see on the date Schwartz 1984, p141–2]; CIJ 629 from Tarente; CIJ 821–823 from Palmyra; the Samaritan inscription from Thessalonica which quotes a Greek translation of Nu 6:22–7 in the Samaritan Pentateuch [see Lifshitz and Schiby 1968, p368–74= CIJ 693a]. CIJ 201 quotes from the LXX; CIJ 370 from Aquila's translation; see also CIJ 86. On the accuracy of quotation and copying from Scripture in Jewish and Christian circles see J.A.Sanders 1981, p373–94. An inscription [which is shown to be Jewish by a menorah] from Iznik–Nicaea is heavily dependent on Ps 135:25. The inscription is given in Schneider 1943, no 68; see also Robert BE 1946–7, no 189. For other examples of dependency on Biblical ideas see CIJ 725 from Delos; Lifshitz 1965, p535 on the inscriptions from Beth Shearim; Lifshitz 1968, p377–8 on CIJ 693b from Thessalonica which is dependent on Ps 45:8,12; Petrie 1906, p124 no 6 line 7, [from Phrygia] echoes Gen 3:19 and may be Jewish.

Another indication of the importance of the Scriptures for a Jewish community in Asia Minor is given by the new Aphrodisias inscription. If Reynolds and Tannenbaum are correct, the society responsible for initiating the building was called the "decany of the students/disciples/sages of the law, also known as those who fervently/continually praise God." The decany therefore was probably dedicated to the study of Scripture and to prayer, although they seem to be involved in other activities [such as the "soup kitchen"] as well. See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p30–41,125.

[132] If we have been able to show satisfactorily that our authors understood their situation in Acmonia in the light of Deut 30:1–10, and thus applied the curses of Deut 27–29 to grave violators, then it seems consistent with this to suggest that their faith also included the other theological factors outlined in Deut 30:1–10; viz [i] a hope for return to the land of the covenant [v3–5a]; we have very little evidence for this, but the Hebrew inscription presented in section 7.2 might give some indication here. [ii] a circumcision of the heart, in order that love of the Lord might be with all of the heart and soul [v6] [on this verse see Le Déaut 1981, p178–205], and [iii] a continuing obedience of the commands of the Lord.

[v8,10]

[133] 3.1.3 contains the rather cryptic phrase ὅσε ἀνγεγραμμέναι ἰσιν without specifying which book was in the writer's mind. Although this phrase is similar to the one that is generally used when allusions to Scripture are made in the NT or the Fathers [see Arndt and Gingrich p166–7], the phrase [or one very like it] occurs a number of times in Deut 28–30 [see Deut 28:58,61; 29:19,20; 30:10]. Thus the writer of the inscription probably used this formula as an abbreviated form of reference to these chapters because the passage itself provided the precedent for such a usage.

[134] There is no indication that a Jewish cemetery existed at Acmonia. According to Kunzl [1981, p474] we know of Jewish cemeteries outside of Palestine in Rome, South Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Malta and Carthage; none are known in Asia Minor.

[135] The curses are specified in other inscriptions from Acmonia however. We can note that the four areas of curses specified in 3.1.3 – on the grave violator's eyes, his body, his children and his life – are particularly prevalent in Deut 28. See for example Deut 28:25–9,53–7. Thus although the author of 3.1.3 did not specify which "book" the curses could be found in, Deut. was clearly in his mind. See Robert 1963a, p325–7 for an inscription from Iasos on an intruder with similar curses, but without any relation to Deut.

[136] Lattimore 1942, p109; see also Parrot 1939, p197.

[137] The situation in Apamea is comparable, although actual official recognition of some Jewish traditions [especially the Noah story] seems to have occurred there; see chapter 4.

[138] See Swete 1902, p214–215.

[139] See section 5.1.3 for further evidence on this issue.

[140] Robert 1955, p255. Although decorations such as a pine cone are found [though rarely] elsewhere, this group of altars from Acmonia form a distinctly different series. See Robert 1955, p253 n1. One of the altars is also to be found in Wiegand 1911, p291–294. See also note 67 above.

[141] Robert [1955, p253 n6] notes that the pine cone is clearly not characteristic of a worshipper of Attis, which is one suggestion of its significance.

[142] Robert 1955, p248.

[143] See Robert 1978a, p245–252; and the summary in Robert BE 1979, no 352; The text is also given in New Docs 1978, no 96.

[144] Jones 1970, p242.

[145] On Amphikles, his notable wife and daughter see Jones 1970, p223–255, which must be read in conjunction with the corrections made in Jones 1980, p377–379; and Robert 1978a, p251–252.

[146] Translation from New Docs 1978, p124. Robert [1978a, p249–50] has shown that other features in the inscription are to be attributed to Deut 28; for example the use of ἐπικατάρατος and εὐλογοῖτο.

[147] Robert 1978a, p247–9; New Docs 1978, p124; Jones 1980, p377–378.

[148] New Docs 1978, p124.

[149] This in itself is very interesting; see New Docs 1978, p124; Robert 1978a, p252; see further on "Judaizers" and "God–worshippers" in Chapter 7.

[150] For other Jewish communities in Greece and the islands, see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p64–9.

[151] Ramsay thus once called the curse the "Acmonian formula"; see Ramsay 1897, p499.

[152] Text from MAMA VI 287; also in Ramsay 1897, p653, n565 and incompletely in CIG 3861 and CIG Vol III, p1094; CIJ 763. Note that Ammia had built this tomb for her husband from her own dowry, showing that she had substantial independent means. This economic position of a woman in Asia Minor is significant; see further in Chapter 5.

[153] Kraabel 1968, p84.

[154] Keil and Premerstein 1911, p137.

[155] γουντη is an enigmatic word only found at Acmonia [Kubinska 1968, p154]. According to Ramsay it is not Semitic, Hebrew, Greek or Latin and may perhaps be Phrygian in origin [See Ramsay 1914b, p369 n2; Kubinska 1968, p154]. Neumann has argued that it is derived from a Hittite word, but Robert [1965, p97] regards the parallels he suggests as curious, and the logic of the argument unconvincing. The word, and the related γουτάριον [see 4.1.3] evidently means the grave or some part or accessory thereof. See Keil and Premerstein 1911, p137; Ramsay 1914b, p369 n2; Frey CIJ 2, p29; MAMA VI, p101.

[156] Text in Keil and Premerstein 1911, p137 no 255. The text in CIJ 767 is incomplete.

[157] Text from MAMA VI 277. An incomplete text is given in Ramsay 1897, p654 n566; IGR iv 638; CIJ 765. Robert regards this inscription as "without doubt a Jewish epitaph"; see Robert BE 1939, p511.

[158] Text in Paris 1884, p233 no 1; Ramsay 1897 p385 n231; CIJ 761; Sheppard 1979, p174. Ramsay thought it was perhaps Jewish [see Ramsay 1897, p676]. Calder 1939a, p18 suspected it of being Jewish or Christian, but treated it as pagan. However, it is almost certainly Jewish, belonging as it does to this series, the full extent of which was not apparent when they wrote. Robert [1960b, p390 n8] is convinced that this inscription is Jewish or "Judaising". The following points about this inscription are noteworthy:

[i] The inscription allows for the burial of a friend and his wife in the family tomb. This was an unusual practice amongst pagans [see Calder 1939a, p18] although it appears to have been a more frequent practice amongst Christians [Ramsay 1897, p529,531–3]. This inscription shows that burial of a friend in the family tomb was also practised by Jews. [See also Ramsay 1897, no 232, an inscription which certainly reveals Jewish influence in which two friends are buried in the family tomb. On this inscription see Appendix 1, section 5. Servants are granted permission to be buried in the family tomb in 4.1.5 and 4.1.7 below. See generally on this topic Parrot 1939, p125.]

[ii] The name Onesimos, although found in the NT [Col 4:9; Phlm 10.] and in a Christian inscription in the area [MAMA IV, 32, from Afion Karahisar; see also Ramsay 1897, p489], is a very common name, especially for slaves. [Arndt and Gingrich, p570; Ramsay 1897, p493.] It is found in pagan inscriptions from, for example, Acmonia [MAMA VI, 246,292,294,306], Tymandos [MAMA IV, 257], and from the Upper Tembris Valley [MAMA VI, 365], all situated near to Eumeneia. Thus the name is not an indicator of a Christian, nor of a Jew. [Sheppard 1979, p175, failed to consider how common the name was in considering that it was "strongly suggestive of Christianity".]

[iii] The expression "such is life" expresses a common sentiment in grave epitaphs, namely that all have to die [see Lattimore 1942, p250–6]. A well known formula expressing this thought, and shared by Jews, Christians and pagans is θάρσει οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος – "Fear not, nobody is immortal" [see Simon 1936, p188–206; Cavalin 1974, p167]. The phrase which occurs here acknowledges that death comes to all and shows that the Jew who wrote this inscription shared one of the general views on death of his time. Cavalin [1974, p170 n17] thinks this is perhaps an expression of "a pagan kind of disillusion". He compares it with "Alas" at Beth Shearim [in CIJ 1148,1151,1156]; however, both expressions seem to indicate the tragedy of death rather than disillusionment.

[159] Text in MAMA IV 27. The reading of much of the second half of this inscription is unfortunately conjectural. However, enough remains for the suggested readings to be accepted. The review of MAMA IV by P Roussel [BE 1934, p247] does not mention MAMA IV nos 27,28 or 84 which we argue here are Jewish.

[160] MAMA IV, p10.

[161] MAMA IV, p10.

[162] Text in MAMA IV 28. Although part of this text is missing, it seems most likely that the restoration given here is correct. See Kraabel 1968, p85.

[163] Text in Dörner 1940, p132 no 12.

[164] Dörner 1940, p132; Robert BE 1941, p260.

[165] Text in MAMA VI 323; see also Kraabel 1968, p84.

[166] MAMA IV 84. This is therefore probably the earliest datable inscription in the series.

[167] Text in MAMA IV 84.

[168] Kraabel 1968, p85.

[169] This is possible since נֵכֶד [which is used in the MT of Ex 34:7] can be translated by ἔκγονος as is shown by the LXX of Isa 49:15.

[170] Text in MAMA IV 90, and CIJ 759.

[171] Kraabel 1968, p82.

[172] For example, an inscription from the nearby Upper Tembris Valley reads "Whoever brings a heavy hand [against this tomb] may he [die and] leave his children orphaned, his house bereft and his life deserted". See Gibson

1978, p38 no 15; see also MAMA VII, pxxxv; Kraabel 1968, p82. On curses against children see Lattimore 1942, p112–114, especially p114 n187; Parrot 1939, p118,134–135.

[173] The phrase τέκνων τέκνοις occurs in a first century BCE inscription from Triostomo, but in the context of the grave builder guaranteeing burial in the tomb to his "children" and "children's children". Thus, this does not provide a background for the present investigation. The text is given in Arkwright 1911, p273 n29; Parrot 1939, p111. See also Arkwright 1911, p270 n10.

[174] See especially Ramsay 1914b, p364; Robert BE 1939, p511; Kraabel 1968, p85–86.

[175] Ramsay 1914b, p364,369, complains of the grammar of this inscription. Kraabel notes that it is not faulty grammar "but the familiarity of the curse formula which prompts a lapidary terseness." [Kraabel 1968, p84 n1] Robert [1965, p96–8] discusses this and other abbreviated imprecations. We note also the consistency of formulation of the curse, which suggests that the abbreviation is a standard one.

[176] See Ex 10:2; Joel 1:3; Jos 22:24,27; Prov 17:6. In Gen 45:10 בְּנֵךָ בְּנֵי is translated as οἱ υἱοί τῶν υἱῶν σου, and thus is not relevant here. See TDOT 2, p150.

[177] On this verse see especially Freedman 1960, p154; Beyerlin 1965, p137–138; Moberly 1983, p86. Dentan [1963, p39] describes it as a "credo". For a summary of the form–critical analysis of the passage by various commentators see Dentan 1963, p36–37, and his own view p39–51. The punishment of children and children's children in the text is "a reflection of ancient legal practice in which all the members of a household were regarded as implicated in the guilt incurred by any one of their number" [Clements 1972, p124]. "To the third and fourth generation" is a Semitic idiom denoting continuity and is not to be understood in an arithmetic sense [see Cole 1973, p156].

[178] Moberly 1983, p87; see also Dentan 1964, p36; Goitein 1956, p7.

[179] Liddell and Scott, p572; TDNT II, p828.

[180] TDNT II, p828.

[181] Liddell and Scott, p146; TDNT IV, p1085.

[182] TDNT IV, p1085.

[183] Dentan 1963, p48.

[184] At least part of the passage is quoted in Nu 14:18; Neh 9:17,31; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 111:4; 145:8; Jonah 4:2; Joel 2:13; Nah 1:3. It is echoed in Ex 20:5 [=Dt 5:9f]; Dt 7:9f; 2 Chr 30:9b; Jer 30:11b; 32:18; 46:28b. On these passages see Scharbert 1957, p132–133; Dentan 1964, p34 n3,n4, p38–39. Some of these passages only quote or allude to the first half of the passage. On this see Dentan 1963, p35; Scharbert 1957, p130f. We note the influence of the first part of Ex 34:6–7 on Ps 103 and the Book of Jonah; see Dentan 1963, p50. The passage [or part of it] was quoted or alluded to in the Pseudepigrapha; see JosAsen 11:10; HelSynPr 2:3, 4:2–3; see also 4 Ezra 7:132–8; TIsaac 1:8, 2:1,26. It was also quoted in Patristic literature; see for example Irenaeus *Haer.* 4.20.8.

[185] Moberly 1983, p129–130; see also Beyerlin 1965, p138; Dentan 1964, p37–39,49. Scharbert 1957, p130, calls it a "confession formula".

[186] Moberly 1983, p130. See also Scharbert 1957, p131; Dentan 1963, p34,36. Note that the "children's children" expression occurs only in Ex 34:6, indicating that it is this passage that is alluded to in our inscription.

[187] Beyerlin 1965, p138; Stoebe 1952, p249–250.

[188] Miller 1981, p330.

[189] On Jewish liturgy and prayer see Charlesworth 2, p671–97; Charlesworth 1986, p411–36. In the new inscription for Aphrodisias we learn of a ψαλμο(λογος); see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p9,46. Another psalm–singer is known in a recently discovered inscription from Rome; see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p81. The holder of this office presumably had a part in the general liturgical activity of the synagogue community. The extant Hellenistic Synagogue Prayers do not quote Ex 34:6–7, but Prayer 4:2–3 [see Funk 1905, 1, p428] seems to echo Ex 34:6 strongly. See also note 191. There were probably many variations in the liturgy of different Diaspora communities.

[190] Moberly 1983, p130.

[191] We have significant evidence from an earlier period than that of our inscriptions, that another Jewish community did in fact utilize Ex 34:6–7 in their praise and worship. Miller has analysed the affinities between inscriptions found at Khirbet el Qom and Khirbet Beit Lei [dating from the time of the Divided Monarchy and the Exile], and the Biblical Psalms. Although the inscriptions are not quotations from the Psalms, they belong to the mode of speech and understanding represented there. Miller identifies in these inscriptions "the use of traditional credal or liturgical formulae as a basis for praise or petition." [Miller 1981, p330.] In inscription B there are important affinities with Ex 34:6–7. We note the repetition of the name of Yahweh, the use of the title "gracious" and other linguistic affinities. Miller writes of Ex 34:6–7 that:

> an ancient liturgical formula, which describes the primal nature and character of God, becomes the basis for trusting in Yahweh and praising him and for calling on his help. ... We have an instance of creative re–use or reformulation of the traditional material to serve a new purpose. ... The one or ones responsible for the prayer of Inscription B are wholly dependent upon this confessional formula [Ex 34:6–7] but exercise a significant freedom in drawing upon it. [Miller 1981, p330–1]

We note the parallel with our present series of inscriptions, and in fact with all the quotations or allusions to the LXX dealt with in this chapter. It is most likely that the process of inner–biblical reinterpretation shown, for example, in the re–use of Ex 34:6–7 in Scripture itself has played a part in inspiring both communities to utilise Scripture in their liturgy and inscriptions.

Fishbane has analysed both inner and extra–biblical use of Torah – "whereby an authoritative pronouncement–text was either re–formed or reformulated by later tradition in the light of their ideologies and concerns." [Fishbane 1977, p281] Thus we see "the reuse, transformation, readaptation or blending of transmitted teaching having an authoritative aspect." [p286] The Acmonian community, and the communities behind the inscriptions dealt with by Miller, stood in this tradition of the use of Scripture. They likewise adapted for their

current situation what they saw as an authoritative text.

[192] See the inscriptions given in 5.2 below.

[193] The use of the passage in the liturgical activity of another community, as shown in note 191 above, reinforces this possibility.

[194] This supplements our findings in 3.3 above.

[195] Text in Herrmann 1962, p59, no54.

[196] Kraabel 1968, p86.

[197] Text in Heberdey and Kalinka 1896, no 22.

[198] Text in Heberdey and Kalinka 1896, no 74; also in Robert 1965, p97.

[199] The two inscriptions are given in Robert 1978a, p280–3, one is from the plain of Karayuk in Southern Phrygia, the other from Isbarta in Pisidia [in Robert 1978a, p283]. Thus both are some distance from Acmonia.

[200] These may perhaps be further instances of pagans adapting a Jewish curse formula, although they seem to be too far from Acmonia for this. They seem rather to witness to the prevalence of curses relating to children in a funerary context.

[201] Text from MAMA VI, 316; The texts in Legrand and Chamonard 1893, p271 no 60; Ramsay 1897, p565 no 465,466; CIJ 768 are incomplete. MAMA VI,316 shows that inscription A does not end with the "Eumeneian Formula" as Ramsay had suggested. See on this aspect of the inscription Robert 1960b, p400 n1; Kraabel 1968, p87.

[202] Ramsay 1897, p566. He thought that the name Amerimnos, which literally means "free from care" was more likely to be Christian than Jewish, but this seems unconvincing. Although the word occurs in Matt 28:;14 and 1 Cor 7:32, it is also found, along with its cognates, in Jewish writings; for example Wis 6:15; 7:23. See TDNT 4, p593.

[203] Ramsay 1914b, p363.

[204] Buckler and Calder in MAMA VI, p111; Robert 1960b, p399–400, p400 n1; Kraabel 1968, p87.

[205] Text in Ramsay 1897, p652 no 563; CIJ 769;

[206] See Ramsay 1897, p652–653; see also Schürer 1897, p213.

[207] See Buckler and Calder, MAMA VI, p111; Kittel 1944, col 16–17; Robert 1960b, p399–400; 1975b, p159; Lifshitz 1961, p404; 1965, p536; Kraabel 1968, p62; Drew–Bear 1976, p248; New Docs 1976, p25,101; Schürer –Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p31; cf. Sheppard 1979, p173–174 and Schepelern 1929, p87 and n359.

[208] The following have thought that the curse goes back to Zech 5:1–5: MAMA VI, p111; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p31. Kittel 1944, col 15; Robert 1960b, p399; Kraabel 1968, p87–88;

[209] MAMA VI, p111; Kittel 1944, col 15; Lifshitz 1965, p536; Robert 1975b,

p159. On the use of the LXX see also 3.5.2 above; note that Hebrew was perhaps used in part of the liturgy; see 7.2 below.

[210] The belief in the power of a written curse is seen in passages like Nu 5:23–28. On this passage in Zech see especially Brichto 1963, p69.

[211] δρέπανον means sickle, reaping hook, pruning knife, curved sword or scimitar. [see Liddell and Scott, p449] In the LXX it generally means a harvesting instrument; eg Is 2:4; 18:5; Mi 4:3; Deut 16:9; 1 Ki 13:20,21.

[212] This was suggested by Mitchell et al 1912, p171, and later by Björck 1938, p43 n1 [who does not however recognise that the inscription is Jewish]; Kittel 1944, col 15, who is followed by Kraabel 1968, p88. See also Robert 1960b, p399.

[213] This point was first made by Kittel 1944, col 15. Lifshitz [1965, p532f] shows how widespread was the familiarity with Greek even in Beth Shearim. Even with the families of the Rabbis one cannot say that Hebrew was the spoken language in the era when the Beth Shearim cemetery was in use. Note however, that the use of Greek does not necessarily imply the renunciation of Jewish religious belief and tradition. Lifshitz shows that although the community of Beth Shearim used Greek the inscriptions give evidence of what he regards was an "orthodox" faith. In general see Lieberman 1965, p1f; Solin 1983, p702f; Safrai and Stern 1976, p1040–1060.

[214] This is similar to Joel 3:13 in the MT and LXX [Joel 4:13] where the sickle [δρέπανον] becomes an instrument of judgement; see Kittel 1944, col 15; Robert 1960b, p399 n6; Kraabel 1968, p88 n2. It is possible that this verse in Joel inspired the translation of the Hebrew "scroll" by the Greek "sickle" in the LXX; see Kittel 1944, col 15; cf. Lifshitz 1965, p536.

[215] That the emphasis is on the sickle, [and not the curse as in the MT] as the agent of judgement is shown by v4 where the LXX reads καὶ ἐξοίσω αὐτό with αὐτό referring to the neuter δρέπανον and not the feminine ἀρά. It is thus the sickle itself which destroys the house of the thief and perjurer, not the curse [as in the MT]. The LXX also intensifies the penalty meted out. In the MT the thief and perjurer are said to be "purged out" or "cleared out" from the people. [It is the Ni phal form of the verb נקה; for its possible meaning in this passage see Mitchell et al 1912, p171.] There is no mention of their death [see Baldwin 1972, p127]. However, the LXX is explicit: "πᾶς ὁ κλέπτης ... ἕως θανάτου ἐκδικηθήσεται." – "Every thief..... will be punished with death." Clearly the penalty is considerably increased.

[216] Kraabel [1968, p87] argues that the curse in the LXX is directed against thieves, whilst the inscription specifically mentions grave violation by the burial of someone not in the family, rather than violation by the theft of valuables. He suggests that the curse here was borrowed from the epitaph of someone who had used it [with more knowledge of Zech 5:1–5] against tomb *robbery* or that it was used with little familiarity or concern for the original context. However, Kittel [1944, col 15] commented that the use of the grave by someone else was tantamount to stealing the grave *itself* from the rightful owner. Thus the focus in the inscription is not on stealing objects in the grave, but the grave itself. Further, a more important point than the small distinction between grave robbery and violation seems to be that the allusion in the inscription is to a passage in Scripture about judgement of a crime via a curse. In this wider sense also the use of Zech 5:1–5 is appropriate in a funerary context.

[217] Text in Drew–Bear 1976, p248; New Docs 1976, p25.

[218] Drew–Bear 1976, p248.

[219] The word is clearly a synonym for house. Zingerle [1923, p63–65] suggests that the word is ξενωνα, which he claims is a Phrygian correlative of οἶκος. This is accepted in SEG 6.171.

[220] Text in Ramsay 1897, p567 no 654; Zingerle 1923, p63 no 3; SEG 6.171; CIJ 762.

[221] Ramsay [1914b, p364] translated the expression as "iron broom"; Frey [CIJ 762] as "double–edged sword"; Kraabel [1968, p89] suggested that σορόν – "coffin" [found in the LXX, for example in Gen 50:26; Job 21:32] should be read and thus translated the sentence as "whoever shall dig up [the] coffin may an iron [weapon ?] raze his house". Liddell and Scott [p1585] considered the reading of these two words as dubious, but Robert [1960b, p400 n3] claimed that the reading was clearly attested, which makes Kraabel's emendation unwise. The most obvious translation – an "iron broom" – seems therefore to be the best. Lattimore [1942, p115] agrees with Ramsay's translation. σάρον is not found in the LXX, but is found in inscriptions. σιδαροῦν, generally found as σιδήριον is a common word for iron, both in the LXX and in inscriptions.

[222] Kraabel 1968, p90. We have noted that domestic objects were often portrayed on tombstones; Kraabel suggested that the image of an "iron broom" may owe something to this practice. See a different [but questionable] explanation in Lifshitz 1965, p535–536.

[223] Weber 1900, p467.

[224] Text from Weber 1900, p467 corrected by SEG 6.172. The inscription is considered as Jewish by Robert BE 1954, p103.

[225] Kraabel 1968, p90.

[226] Text in MAMA VI, 325; Robert 1960b, p407. Legrand and Chamonard 1893, p273, no 63; and Ramsay 1897, p615, no 526 only recorded the first half of the inscription and thus do not comment upon its background.

[227] Robert 1960b, p401–406.

[228] Robert 1960b, p406–407.

[229] From Achaie Phthiotide, IG IX 2,106; Quoted by Robert 1960b, p407 with other examples.

[230] From Rome, given by Robert 1960b, p407 n2, with other examples.

[231] MAMA VI, 325; Robert BE 1939, p511; 1960b, p407; 1975b, p159 n27; Kraabel 1968, p91; Cohen 1976, p120 and n103.

[232] It occurs eight times in the NT, but over 200 times in the LXX. See Moulton and Geden; TDNT 5, p409 n194. The "anger of God" [or "of the Lord"] is referred to often in the Pseudepigrapha; see ApZeph 12; Sib Or 3:632; 4:159–70; 5:76; TIsaac 4:54; TLevi 6:11; TReub 4:4; LAE [Vita] 15–6,49; PrMan 5,13; 1 En 89:33; 99:16; 101:3; Jub 15:34; cf. LetAris 254. See in general TDNT 5, p412–6; cf. Ign. Eph 11:2; Shep. Hermas Vis. 1.3.1. This inscription uses

ἐξολέσι; ἐξολεθρεύω is used only once in the NT [in Acts 3:23, a quote from the LXX of Deut 18:19], but is very common in the LXX, being used over 220 times. [See Hatch and Redpath p497–499 and for example, Ps 142:12.] Thus the usage of this related verb is predominantly Jewish, rather than pagan or Christian. It suggests Jewish provenance here; see MAMA VI, p114; Kraabel 1968, p91.

[233] On the scarcity of Christian inscriptions at Acmonia, see Robert 1960b, p409–10; Sheppard 1979, p174.

[234] Text in Ramsay 1897, p520 no 361; CIG 3891; Robert 1960b, p436. The translation given here is based on Ramsay 1888, p424.

[235] Robert 1960b, p439 n4.

[236] Juster 1914, 2, p161–162.

[237] III Ki 12:11,14; II Chr 10:11,14; Ps 72:4; Jer 6:7; Isa 50:6; Sir 23:11, 28:17; II Macc 7:1,37; IV Macc 6:3,6.

[238] See also Ps 38:10; 90:10; II Macc 9:11. Scourging is also used for the punishment for horses [Prov 26:3, Nah 3:2], figuratively for the scourge of the tongue [Job 5:21, Sir 26:6] and of punishment for correction [Prov 19:29, Sir 22:6, 23:6].

[239] Deut 25:2f; Ant 4:238,248. See TDNT IV, p515.

[240] See Kraabel 1968, p69.

[241] See Eusebius HE 5.16.12.

[242] See Mishnah Makk. 1:1–3; 3:1–15; also San 1:2; and see Kraabel 1968, p69; IDB IV, p245; TDNT IV, p516.

[243] Robert 1960b, p438.

[244] Lifshitz 1965, p537 rightly comments that this inscription is the only evidence for this eschatological transposition of scourging. We do however, have sufficient evidence for the use of the scourge in the synagogue and of the mention of the scourge in the LXX to ascribe this transformation to the synagogue.

[245] One part of the passion predictions is that Jesus will be flogged by the Gentiles [Matt 20:19, Mk 10:34; Lk 18:32]. In Acts Paul is almost flogged by the Roman commander in Jerusalem [Acts 22:24–5] and some of the heroes of faith in Hebrews 11 are said to have been flogged [Heb 11:36].

[246] Robert [1960b, p438] thus thought that this inscription was not at all typical of Christian epitaphs. Note that the following authors considered the inscription as Christian: Cumont 1895, p276 no 146; Schultze 1922, p467; Parrot 1939, p133; Lattimore 1942, p111. Ramsay 1888, p424–425 and 1897, p520–521 argued for its Christian [or probable Christian] character on the basis of the names Philip, Kyrille and Paula, and the concluding formula, about which he wrote that it "seems on the whole to be Christian" [1897, p520]. However, the name Φιλίππος is found in CIJ 334, Κυρυλλᾶ in CIJ 310 and "Paula" is probably found in CIJ 524, all from Rome; see also CIJ 562 from Naples. "Κυρίλλος" is found in CIJ 922 from Jaffa and "Κύρυλλος" in the new Aphrodisias inscription; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p102. These names therefore provide no guide to provenance. Ramsay himself seemed uncertain of the provenance of the concluding formula.

[247] See Ramsay 1897, p520. He wondered if "Geraios" meant presbyter in the Church. This possibility is refuted by Robert in 1960b, p436 n2.

[248] See section 3.2 above, and Chapter 9, section 3.3.

[249] Robert 1960b, p436,439.

[250] See Robert 1960b, p438–439.

[251] Robert 1960b, p438; Kraabel 1968, p69. Sheppard 1979, p175, thought that the inscription was "almost certainly Jewish".

[252] Text from Laum 1914, II, p134–135 no 174. Also in Ramsay 1889, p24–25; 1897, p562–564 no.455–457; Perdrizet 1900, p302.

[253] Ramsay 1889, p23–26; 1897, p562–564.

[254] Ramsay 1883, p400; 1888, p406. The following authors followed Ramsay in assigning the inscription to a Christian provenance: Cumont 1895, p277 no 164; Perdrizet 1900, p302; Schepelern 1929, p84,87; Nilsson 1920, col 1114.

[255] Ramsay 1897, p563; Robert 1960b, p409 n5;

[256] Robert 1960b, p409–412; see also BE 1954, p103.

[257] The only Acmonian inscription from this period which might be Christian uses the simple Eumeneian Formula [MAMA VI, 336]; I will argue in Appendix 1 that it could be Jewish; see also note 233. The inscriptions mentioned in Ramsay 1897, p562–568 are either late or only possibly of Christian provenance. MAMA VI, 340 is of the ninth century.

[258] Robert 1960b, p410. In publishing the inscription Ramsay wrote of a pre–Constantinian "Christian benefit and burial society" which he believed was implied by the phrase "Neighbourhood of the First Gate" [see Ramsay 1897, p563; also 1888, p404; 1889, p25]. That it should be an officially recognised and openly Christian association [as seems to be implied in its very existence] in the third century CE would be surprising, and a sufficient impetus to challenge the idea that the inscription was Christian [see Robert 1960b, p410 n3]. As we shall see it is much more likely that it was a Jewish association.

[259] Robert 1960b, p410.

[260] Ramsay 1889, p24; cf 1897, p562 n2.

[261] Robert 1960b, p411 n1; 1963b, Index; note however, that the name Μαθιας has been found in the Upper Tembris Valley, approximately 30 km north of Acmonia. Robert thinks this is probably the same name; see Robert 1960b, p411 and n2,3.

[262] CIJ 1275 from Jerusalem; Μαθᾶς is found in CIJ 1061 from Beth Shearim.

[263] Robert 1960b, p412.

[264] On the continuity between OT and NT see for example Hill 1967, p161; Dunn 1983, p105; see also Dodd 1935, p58; Bultmann 1964, p12–16; Kraabel 1968, p112–113; Kasemann 1969, p172; and most recently Soards 1985, p104–109.

[265] Hill 1967, p198–199; Ziesler 1972, p67–69.

[266] δικαιοσύνη with the meaning of "justice" is one of the meanings that is prominent in Classical literature. Thus Dodd writes "the Greek tended to think of 'righteousness' in terms of 'justice'." [Dodd 1935, p43] However, in Classical literature the word had a range of meanings from the observance of strict law and justice to a term for virtue. See Dodd 1935, p42–43; Liddell and Scott, p429; Hill 1967, p102–103, 108–109, 153; Käsemann 1969, p174; Ziesler 1972, p47–51.

[267] Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 above.

[268] The phrase is translated as "the justice of God" by Ramsay 1888, p406.

[269] Barr 1961, p218; see also Thiselton 1979, p84.

[270] In Rev 19:11, the righteousness of the Rider, clearly Christ, is seen in judging and in waging war. 2 Peter 1:1 is either about God's saving righteousness, or more plausibly, refers to God's just government of the Christian community. James 1:20 refers to the righteousness that God desires in man [see Ziesler 1972, p135]. The justice of rulers and kings is spoken of in Heb 11:33. See Hill 1967, p159; Ziesler 1972, p130.

[271] See also Dt 33:21; Jud 5:11; Ps 9:5, 94:9, 98:4, 118:7,62,75,106,138,142, 144,160,164,172. See TDNT 2, p196; Dodd 1935, p43–48; Kasemann 1969, p172–174.

[272] See also Jud 5:11; and Ziesler 1972, p40–41.

[273] Text in Denis, De Jonge 1970.

[274] Ziesler 1972, p75. The references are 1 Bar 4:13; PssSol 2:15, 4:24, 8:24,25,26, 9:4,5; Wis 5:18, 12:16; 1 En 13:10, 14:1.

[275] By this Ziesler means related to the activity of judging.

[276] Ziesler 1972, p85; see also p94–95.

[277] TDNT 2, p196.

[278] This is in agreement with Robert 1960b, p409–412; 1978a, p268 n148; Kraabel 1968, p109–114; Safrai and Stern 1974, p484. Sheppard 1979, p174 describes the inscription as having a "Jewish flavour"; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p31–2 as "almost certainly emanating from a Jewish milieu."

[279] On γειτοσύνη see Robert 1960b, p410 n1; MAMA VII, 301. Vattioni [1977, p28–9] has sought to emend the text to πρωτοπολειτῶν – "Neighbourhood of the First Citizens", rather than "of the First Gate". He cites some parallels for the emendation. However, we have sufficient parallels for the concept of a residential quarter named after and situated near a gate to make such a textual emendation on a secure reading unnecessary. See SEG 27, no 893; Robert BE 1978, no 469.

[280] Ramsay 1888, p404; see also Kraabel 1968, p114.

[281] On burial societies see Dill 1905, p256–263.

[282] Ramsay 1888, p407–408.

[283] See Dill 1905, p263.

[284] Kraabel 1968, p114. Ramsay 1888, p408–409, argued for a Christian burial society, thinking that the inscription was Christian. The inscription raises the question of whether or not there was a Jewish quarter in the city. This seems to be the clear implication of the inscription; but this does not mean that all the Jews of the city lived there, that only Jews lived there, nor that they were forced to live there. In fact, the prominent position held by some Jews in the city and the recognition given to them, argues against all three assumptions. This is evidence however, for some sort of Jewish area in the city – viz an area near the "First Gate" in which the Jews were at least a majority. [See Robert 1960b, p410,412; 1975b, p159; Seston 1967, p289 n2; Drew–Bear 1978, p86.] Such an area is similar to the Jewish quarter in ancient Rome, outside the busy Capuan Gate. [Ramsay 1888, p409; Robert 1960b, p412 n1. At Side the areas of the city are named in a similar way, see Robert 1958b, p23 n3; see also Seston 1967, p289 n2.]

[285] Kraabel 1968, p114. The society may have dealt with matters other than those concerned with burial. The fact that there was a Jewish burial society does not however, mean that there was a particular Jewish cemetery. No indication of such a cemetery has been found. See note 134. We know very little about Jewish burial societies in this period; see the discussion in Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p29–30 who note the probable example from Beth She'arim, but seem unaware of the inscription under discussion here. The rarity of Jewish burial societies highlights the notable position of the Jewish community at Acmonia. See also the possible example in CPJ 138.

[286] The custom of laying flowers on a tomb goes back at least to the fifth century BCE, and is mentioned more in Latin than in Greek epitaphs; see Lattimore 1942, p129; Nilsson 1951b, p313–314.

[287] Robert 1950, p92; Nilsson 1920, col 1111; Collart 1931, p58.

[288] As Perderizet 1900, p303; Nilsson 1951a, p121 and Collart 1931, p58 argue.

[289] Robert 1937, p244 n3.

[290] Fink et al, 1940, p119; Robert 1950, p92; 1975b, p158.

[291] See Hoey 1937, p28–35; Nilsson 1920, col 1111; 1951b, p312; On the "Rosalia Signorium" celebrated by the garrison at Dura–Europos, see Hoey 1937, p15–35; Fink et al 1940, p115–120; Latte 1960, p343.

[292] Collart 1930, p388 describes the Rosalia as "the festival of the dead par excellence".

[293] The date varied in different regions depending on when roses were in bloom. See Perdrizet 1900, p300; Wissowa 1912, p434; Laum 1914, p83 n1.

[294] Lattimore 1942, p137–138; Frankel 1890, p264–6; Perdrizet 1900, p300; Nilsson 1920, col 1114; Seyrig 1928, p275–7; Laum 1914, p85; Robert 1937, p244. For a different interpretation of the Rosalia see Picard and Avezou 1914, p47–62 refuted in Collart 1931, p60–69; Lemerle 1936, p341–2; Lattimore 1942, p138–139.

[295] Nilsson 1951b, p314; 1957, p66; Lattimore 1942, p138,140.

[296] Hoey 1937, p24.

[297] Collart 1930, p387 and n3; examples in Laum 1914, p87.

[298] Nilsson 1951b, p316–319.

[299] See Laum 1914, II no 202, Lattimore 1942, p137.

[300] SEG 31, 1679; Collart 1930, p388.

[301] See Perdrizet 1900, p302; Magie 1950, p589, 1448 n59.

[302] Nilsson 1920, col 1112–1114; 1951a, p121,122.

[303] See note 302. Lattimore [1942, p140] writes that the language of many of the inscriptions suggests that the Rosalia had descended to the level of formality and lacked deep significance.

[304] Robert 1960b, p412. Mishnah Ohol. 2:4 states that grave stones convey uncleanness. [See also Ohol. 17:1–18:6 on grave areas.] However, it seems unlikely that rabbinic regulations were enforced in Asia Minor and we cannot use rabbinic evidence to prescribe what Jews could or could not do in the Diaspora. The evidence from Asia Minor itself is more reliable; see further in Appendix 2.

[305] ἀπόκαυσις or παράκαυσις are used in the inscriptions when a sacrifice of some sort is involved; see Lemerle 1936, p341–2 and n3.

[306] Text in IGR iv, 661; Cumont 1913, p150–155, no 133; Laum 1914, II no 173.

[307] See Cumont 1913, p155; Broughton 1938a, p771; Laum 1914, I p86.

[308] Text in Laum 1914, II no 173.

[309] Kraabel 1968, p113. Following local custom here thus involved the adoption of a Roman festival. [On the romanisation of Acmonia see Robert 1955, p251 n4; 1975b, p158; also Drew-Bear 1978, p86.] Names do not provide a very safe guide to romanisation at this date, but it is interesting to note that the head for life of the synagogue in the first century CE had the Latin name Tyrronios; see section 2 above. On the name Tyrronios see footnote 30. We know of other Jews who had Latin names. See for example Marcus Mussius at Ephesus [see Robert 1960b, p384]; note also the name "Procla" on a lead coffin in Cilicia, although the coffin may not be Jewish; see Ussishkin 1977, p215–8.

[310] Kraabel 1968, p114.

[311] Robert 1964, p45–47; Kraabel 1968, p114; see Chapter 2, section 4.

[312] Robert 1960b, p412.

[313] Text in Ramsay 1897, p651 no 561; Oehler 1909, p298 no 66; Krauss 1922, p233; CIJ 771; Lifshitz 1967, p36 no 34.

[314] Liddell and Scott, p1349; see also NIDNTT 1, p616.

[315] Liddell and Scott, p1348. πατριά – clan, people, tribe would also be appropriate; see TDNT 5, p1015–9.

[316] See for example CIJ 754; Lifshitz 1967, no 32,100; no 31, from Caria describes some building work as being "for the laos", which clearly means the Jewish community.

[317] See Rengstorf Concordance III, p360.

[318] Flacc. 46 [mentioned by Kittel 1944, col 14; Ramsay 1897, p652 n2.] Although Philo is not necessarily representing the view of Jews in Asia Minor, this is a strong indicator of how the term was used by Jews.

[319] MAMA VI, 182.

[320] MAMA VI, 261,266. The word is also used in MAMA VI, 40,41,98,105,115, 261,371. In MAMA VI, 73,79,381 someone is said to take civic office upon himself for the patris. See also Legrand and Chamonard 1893, no 83,84. Cumont 1913, p156 no 134; SEG 2, 653; IGR IV, 1230. Also significant here is the epitaph of Aviricus, bishop of Hierapolis which states that any grave violator will pay 2000 gold coins to the Roman treasury and 1000 gold coins to the "excellent πατρίδι of Hierapolis". [Text in Ramsay 1897, p722–3; see also Ramsay 1888, p265; Duchesne 1883, p9.]

[321] This is the meaning favoured by Ramsay 1897, p652; Oehler 1909, p534; Kittel 1944, col 13.

[322] Those who have thought that the Jewish community in Acmonia was meant [See Lifshitz 1967, p36; Krauss 1922, p233; Frey in CIJ 771 [who quoted Krauss]] have given πατρίς a meaning which it never carries.

[323] For other Jews in Asia Minor who made donations to their city see Chapter 9, section 3.

[324] Text only in MAMA VI 334. No date has been given for this inscription. Robert 1975b, p159 agrees that the text is a benediction. See the similar inscriptions in Hebrew in CIJ 974; CIJ 973; cf. also CIJ 1175,1391 and further in Dinkler 1974, p130 n37, p133 and n50. [Cf. the Greek Samaritan inscription from Ramat Aviv in Chiat 1982, p166.] These inscriptions reinforce the likelihood of Sukenik's suggested reading, although it remains only probable.

[325] The only other Jewish communities in Asia Minor where Hebrew has been discovered in inscriptions are Sardis and Smyrna. Robert reports that five or six short texts in Hebrew have been discovered at Sardis, of which one gives the word "Shalom" [Robert 1964, p57]; see also Chapter 2, section 4. We still await their publication. An inscription from Smyrna ends with "Shalom" in Hebrew [CIJ 739]. [CIJ 756a, lost before it was published, might have contained Hebrew script from a later period.] On "Shalom" in Jewish inscriptions see Dinkler 1974, p121–44; Cavalin 1974, p169 n6. Robert notes that even at Tiberius in Palestine "the majority of the inscriptions ... are in Greek. ... There is only one Hebrew word, Shalom, peace." [Robert 1964, p57 n2. See also Lifshitz 1965, p520–538 on Greek spoken at Beth–Shearim; in general see Lieberman 1965, p1f.] Thus the rarity of Hebrew inscriptions in Asia Minor is not unusual. But see now the Hebrew lamentation from Egypt dated by Klein–Franke [1983, p80–84] between the second and fifth century CE; see on the date however Schwartz 1984, p141–2.

[326] See MAMA VI 334, for the suggestions of Sukenik on this; cf. Kittel 1944, col 15. Klein–Franke 1983, p84 thinks that the Hebrew papyrus found in Egypt was written in Hebrew rather than Greek because it was a prayer, although we should note that Jews in Asia Minor probably generally prayed in Greek as well. But the use of some small amount of Hebrew in the liturgy is still quite possible. See also SEG 32.1485 for a Jewish liturgical inscription [?] from Sidon which may have belonged to a synagogue. On praying in Greek in Palestine see Lieberman 1967, p29–37 and in general Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p142–4.

[327] See MAMA VI 334; Robert BE 1939, p511.

[328] Lifshitz 1965, p537–538; see also Dinkler 1974, p135.

[329] For other Jewish evidence from the area see [i] a menorah engraved on a stone from Dokimion in Ramsay 1897 no 691; [ii] a grave inscription dated to 257–8 CE from Diokleia in Ramsay 1897 no 562=CIJ 764; [iii] a grave inscription of Agapetos from Acmonia, which may be Christian or Jewish, in MAMA VI, 339 and see MAMA VI, p xvii.

[330] See however 4.1.9; it is also likely that some of the undated inscriptions dealt with here belong to the second century.

[331] We will present evidence for other such Gentiles in the area in Chapter 6, section 6.1.

[332] We thus see how misguided Ramsay's comment [1902a, p26] was: "The Jews never merged themselves in the Hellenic unity. They always remained outside of it, a really alien body." Cf. Ramsay 1897, p651.

[333] This conclusion conflicts with the comment of Parkes [1934, p ix] when he writes of Hellenised Jews that "at best [they] knew them [the Scriptures] but slightly".

[334] The expression is from Fishbane 1977, p300. It could perhaps be thought that the use of Scripture by the Jewish community was merely formal, comparable to the use of the Bible in quotations etc. in a post-Christian society. However, the extent of the use of the LXX and particularly the fact that it is interpreted so as to apply to the current situation of the community argue against this.

[335] Ramsay [1897, p674–676], in a section entitled "Fate of the Phrygian Jews", through a lack of awareness of the features mentioned in this section, came to the conclusion that these Jews became completely assimilated into the surrounding people, with many adopting Christianity. Sheppard [1979, p169] accepted [as Ramsay had] the interpretation of Neubauer that "Perugitha", mentioned in the anecdote "The wine of Perugitha and the waters of Diomsith cut off the Ten Tribes from Israel", was Phrygia. However, it is definitely a town of Galilee near Tiberius [See Kraabel 1982, p450; Appendix 2]. Thus Sheppard's inference that these communities were less than truly Jewish is invalid.

Chapter 4.

[1] Cohen 1978, p88. The city was named by Antiochus after his mother Apama.

[2] Ramsay 1897, p421; Magie 1950, p125f; Cohen 1978, p38.

[3] Ramsay 1897, p421; Broughton 1938a, p697.

[4] Ramsay 1897, p412–414. Celaenai's history goes back at least to the Lydian period; many legends are also associated with the site. See Ramsay 1897, p414–418; Leclercq 1924, col 2507; Tscherikower 1927, p32.

[5] Magie 1950, p125; Ramsay 1897, p419–421; Jones 1940, p43; Tscherikower 1927, p155. This means that there were a number of Hellenes in Apamea who had been shifted from Celeanai. Cf. Ramsay 1897, p421.

[6] Hirschfeld 1894, col 2664–5; Imhoof–Blumer 1901, p211; Leclercq 1924, col 2500; Magie 1950, p126. The most important evidence here is Strabo xii,8,15; He writes that Apamea was "A great emporium of Asia ... and ranks second only to Ephesus."

[7] Hogarth 1888 p343–349; Ramsay 1897, p397–409; Magie 1950, p125.

[8] Head 1906, pxxxii; Magie 1950, p40.

[9] Ramsay 1897, p396 n2; Magie 1950, p125. Because of this commercial importance, the city had an association of resident Romans from the first century BCE who were probably involved in business; see Broughton 1938a, p546–547,881; Ramsay 1897, p425.

[10] Hogarth 1888, p343; Leclercq 1924, col 2501.

[11] Ramsay 1897, p422; Magie 1950, p19,126.

[12] Magie 1950, p19,126.

[13] Broughton 1938a, p513; Magie 1950, p126.

[14] Ramsay 1897, p427,447–450; Magie 1950, p383; see also Pliny N.H. V,106.

[15] Magie 1950, p1060 n41; Ramsay dates the conventus from 84 BCE see 1897, p427.

[16] Dio Chrysostom xxxv; he says "The best indication of your strength is the amount of your taxes, for I think that as the best draught animals are those that draw the most, so the cities that pay the most are likely to be the best." On this see Ramsay 1897, p428–9; Broughton 1938a, p740–741, 768.

[17] Ramsay 1897, p430–431; Leclercq 1924, col 2507.

[18] Ramsay 1897, p445.

[19] Ramsay 1897, p668; Reinach 1913, p214–5; Meshorer 1981, p38. See Ant 12:119; 16:160–1; CAp 2:39, on which see Chapter 9, section 1.1.

[20] See Ant 12:147–153; Robert 1962, p282 n1; and Chapter 1, section 2.

[21] See Head 1906, p101 n82; 1911, p667, fig 313; Macdonald 1901, p480 n21; Meshorer 1981, p38–39; see also Madden 1866, p194-8; Goodenough 1953–68, 3, fig 700; Kindler 1971, p24–27.

[22] Calder 1922, p209; Meshorer 1981, p38.

[23] See Babelon 1891, p176; Schürer 1904, p94; 1909, p18; Juster 1914, 1, p191 n19; Schalit in EJ 3, 747; Lietzmann 1938, p143; Malten 1939, p188; Schmidtke 1950, col 601; Klauser 1961, p143; Safrai 1974, p150; Meeks 1983, p210 n228; Lewis 1984, p231; Den Boeft and Bremmer 1985, p117. See also the longer treatments in Madden 1866; Reinach 1913; Kindler 1971.

[24] At this early date it is unlikely that the coins could be a result of Christian influence as Madden 1866, p207-13 argued. [See also Ramsay 1882b, p342.] Madden did not consider the possibility of Jewish influence. Schürer 1892, p54; 1909, p19; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p120 argue against Christian influence.

[25] Grabar 1951, p12, points out the similarity of this style of narrative illustration to that of the Dura synagogue paintings, which were produced only a few decades later. This is at a time before the most ancient illustrations of the Old Testament by Christians. He concludes that there was a Jewish figurative religious art of this era. [see Grabar 1951, p10,14; also Lietzmann 1938, p143–144; Fink 1955, p4,9,14,104; Klauser 1961, p142–143. Strauss 1966, p134–136, n28 has desputed this.] Dinkler 1953, p324, rightly urges caution due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence.

[26] Babelon 1891, p181.

[27] Goodenough 1953-68, 2, p120.

[28] Ramsay 1897, p670; Reinach 1913, p239; Leclercq 1924, col 2514; Fink 1954, p4 and plates 1–3; Meshorer 1981, p38. In the Mosaic of the Church or Synagogue at Mopsuestia in Cilicia the Ark of Noah is also depicted as a box, this time with four legs. See Levine 1981, p186–187; Ovadiah 1978, p846–8.

[29] See Madden 1866, p204–5; cf. SibOr I,242–56.

[30] Ramsay 1897, p670; Grabar 1951, p11; Meshorer 1981, p38.

[31] Fink 1955, p4; Klauser 1961, p142; Strauss 1966, p135, n28; Toynbee 1967, p316.

[32] Fink 1955, plates 10f; Toynbee 1967, p316.

[33] See Meshorer 1981, p38.

[34] Grabar 1951, p11.

[35] Text in Babelon 1891, p181; Svoronos 1976, p49.

[36] Text in Kindler 1971, p26.

[37] Text in Babelon 1891, p181; Macdonald 1901, p480 no.21; Kindler 1971, p24–5; see also Madden 1866, p198; Pilcher 1903, p225–6. That Alexander was a Jew [as argued by Ramsay 1897, p672; Pilcher 1903, p250–3; Leclercq 1924, col 2513; Grabar 1951, p12] is highly unlikely, since he was high priest of the city. Although some Jews did apostasize, we can only postulate that

this occurred in cases where there is explicit evidence, which is lacking in this case. The explanation offered below fully accounts for the scene on the coins. A number of different coin types were also also minted under the surveillance of these officials. See Reinach 1913, p237–238.

[38] Text in Meshorer 1981, p38. The inscription on the fifth coin is given in Leclercq 1924, col 2518.

[39] Νῶε is the form of the name found in the Septuagint and in the greater number of later Christian authors, see Babelon 1891, p175; Reinach 1913, p176; Goodenough 1953, p129; Meshorer 1981, p39.

[40] See Head 1906, p75f; 1911, p666–667.

[41] Schultze 1922, p455.

[42] Ramsay 1897, p431–432. A coin of Commodos shows part of the same scene. On "local types" on coinage see Carrington 1976, p287–90.

[43] Ramsay 1897, p432 and plates 1 and 5. The coins of Apamea bear a wide range of deities; for example, Dionysos, Athena and Artemis. See Ramsay 1897, p434–436; Head 1911, p666–667. Thus the depiction of Noah is but one Jewish scene among many very different scenes.

[44] Grabar 1951, p11; Klauser 1961, p142.

[45] Ramsay 1897, p432. The coins show sufficient variations to suggest that they are not all cast from the same die. See Ramsay 1897, p669.

[46] Ramsay 1897, p432–433. He has been followed by Head 1906, pxxxix; 1911, p666; Leclercq 1924, col 2511; Grabar 1951, p13; Dinkler 1953, p324; Kindler 1971, p29; Kraabel 1983, p181. See other, less convincing explanations in Schultze 1922, p455; Grabar 1951, p12–13.

[47] For example, the story of Rheia and her son Zeus. See Ramsay 1897, p432–433.

[48] For example, at Thyatira. See Ramsay 1897, p433.

[49] Ramsay 1897, p433.

[50] See for example, Ovid, *Metam* i, 125–415; Apollodorus, *Biblio.* I,7,2. See Frazer 1919, p146–159.

[51] Suidas s.v. Νάννακος.

[52] Zenobius *Cent*; vi,10 in Leutsch 1839, I, p164; Nannakos is also mentioned by Apostolius *Cent*; xv,100 in Leutsch 1839, II, p655; and by Macarius *Cent*; ii,23; viii,4 in Leutsch 1839, II, p146.

[53] See Stephanus Byzantium s.v. Ἰκόνιον. The text is also to be found in Schürer 1909, p19–20 and Fontenrose 1945, p116, n95.

[54] Fontenrose 1945, p110,113.

[55] See Nairn 1904, p31: *Mimes* III l.10; see also Dossin 1963, p336. [Carrington 1976, p59 sees the story as pre-Phrygian.] Herondas thus shows that Nannakos

not Annakos was the original name; see Stern 1974, p452.

[56] Ramsay 1907, p319–321; Malten 1939, p187; Scherling 1935, col 1680–1.

[57] See Madden 1866, p211–2; Pilcher 1903, p255; Babelon 1891, p180; Schürer 1904, p94; 1909, p19–20; Frazer 1919, p156, n1; Leclercq 1924, col 2511; Bousset, 1926, p493, n1; Kittel 1944, col 15–16. The full evidence was not available to most of these authors.

[58] Nannakos for 300 years, Enoch for 365 years.

[59] Calder 1924a, p30. Note that the points of agreement between the stories of Enoch and Nannakos are not substantial.

[60] See Paton and Hicks 1891, no 10 c51; no 160. The name is also found on Delos; see Reinach 1913, p5.

[61] Calder 1924a, p31; cf. Ramsay 1907, p320.

[62] Calder 1924a, p31f. Calder noted that villages on the temple estates in Asia Minor were often called "the village of" the god whose property they were.

[63] Calder 1924a, p31.

[64] Calder 1924a, p32; 1924b, p113; Reinach 1913, p5–6; see also Scherling 1935, col 1681; Stern I, p452–3; cf. Krauss JE I, p662; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p30 [who do not note Calder's article [1924a].]

[65] Ovid *Metam* viii, 618–724. This is the only source for the story except for the summary in Lactantius. For a detailed analysis see Malten 1939, p176–206; Fontenrose 1945, p93–119.

[66] Calder 1922, p207.

[67] Thus the story is an aetiological myth and tells how a shrine with two trees beside a lake in Asia Minor, at which Jupiter and Mercury were worshipped, came to be established. See Calder 1922, p207.

[68] *Metam* viii, 620,719. Calder 1922, p208, notes that in only one other story in the *Metamorphoses*, itself from the interior of Asia Minor, does Ovid emphasize the veracity of the story to such an extent.

[69] Calder 1922, p208–211; Fontenrose 1945, p104,119.

[70] Malten 1939, p187; Fontenrose 1945, p93.

[71] Fontenrose 1945, p118.

[72] Calder 1922, p208–211. Fontenrose [1945, p113] concurs: "We have no reason to doubt that there really was a place in Phrygia where the trees were to be seen." Calder [1922, p210–1; see also 1930, p88] also attempts to locate the tale at Lake Trogitis and provides a historical situation in which Ovid could have learnt of the myth.

[73] It is significant to note here that in the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha in the *Metamorphoses*, the water comes from both torrents of rain and subterranean springs. We thus see that the Phrygian story is distinguished from the Greek

version. See Calder 1922, p209.

[74] Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* 37, 649.

[75] Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* 13, 529.

[76] Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* 13, 522–545.

[77] Malten 1939, p187, n5; Fontenrose 1945, p105;

[78] Plutarch, *Parall*, 5. It also occurs in Stobee, see Reinach 1913, p12–14.

[79] See Reinach 1913, p12–14; 1915, p326–328; Calder 1922, p209.

[80] Ramsay 1897, p415, 672; Reinach 1913, p10–12.

[81] Ramsay 1897, p415, 672; Reinach 1913, p7–12; Fontenrose 1945, p105.

[82] Fontenrose 1945, p105. Babelon 1891, p176f has argued that the Phrygian flood legend was derived from the Jews. He has been followed by Schürer 1909, p19; and Leclercq 1924, col 2510; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p29–30. However, we should note that although he is correct in stating that the name "Kibotos" [see section 4.3] was never attributed to the city of Celaenai and thus is not known in the area prior to the Jews' arrival, his argument that Nannakos was the Enoch of the Bible does not stand and he ignores the other three indigenous flood legends of Phrygia [Philemon and Baucis, Priasos and Anchorous] which were not created by the Jews.

[83] Fontenrose 1945, p105.

[84] See for instance Nonnos, *Dionysiaca* iii,209f; vi,367f; Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* I, vii,2; Lucian, *De Dea Syria* 12; Plutarch, *De Sollertia Animalium* 13; Hellanikos fr 117 in Jacoby 1957, I, p135. Latin versions of the story likewise use a word for a small vessel or boat for Deucalion's ark; see Ovid, *Metam* i, 313f [ratis is used]; the Second Vatican Mythographer, *Myth* II,75 [navicula, See Bode 1834]. Note however, that Lucian in *Timon* iii uses κιβωτός for Deucalion's ark. It is interesting to note that Josephus uses λάρναξ for the Ark of Noah [see Ant 1:77,78,90,92] and not the κιβωτός of the Septuagint [cf. Philo *Plant.* 43] which he does however use for the Ark of the Covenant [see for example Ant 3:134]. This is probably under the influence of the story of Deucalion in classical authors, which Josephus clearly knew. [see Lewis 1968, p78 n4; and in general Feldman 1984a, p794–5.] It is possible that the translators of the Septuagint used the unusual word for the Ark – κιβωτός – precisely to distinguish the story from the Greek myth of Deucalion.

[85] Liddell and Scott record no instance in which κιβωτός meant "ark" except in Jewish and Christian writings.

[86] Strabo writes Ἀπάμεα ἡ Κιβωτὸς λεγομένη [Strabo xii,8,13]

[87] Pliny [23–79 CE] N.H. V,106; Ptolemy [fl.127–148 CE] v,2,17.

[88] Head 1906, p96, no 155 and Pl xi,10. Also in Imhoof–Blumer 1901, p211, no19 and Pl 7,12.

[89] Imhoof–Blumer 1901, p212, no 20 and Pl 7,13.

[90] See Hatch and Redpath; Lewis 1968, p87; 1984, p230. It is also used for the ark of the covenant and for the Torah shrine. See also the inscription from the Ostia synagogue in which the "κειβωτός for the holy law" is mentioned; see AE 1967, no 77; Kraabel 1979a, p499; EJ 12, p1509. The term is used four times in the NT.

[91] Ramsay 1897, p671; Reinach 1913, p17–19; see also Schultze 1922, p456, n2; Malten 1939, p188.

[92] See Babelon 1891, p174–175; Leclercq 1924, col 2509.

[93] Head 1911, p666; see also Madden 1866 p210; Hirschfeld 1894, col 2664–5; Imhoof–Blumer 1901, p211; Reinach 1913, p18; Magie 1950, p984, n20; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p120.

[94] Ramsay 1897, p671f; Tscherikower 1927, p32; cf. Schürer 1909, p19.

[95] Magie 1950, p984, n20.

[96] Ramsay 1897, p671; also Pilcher 1903, p255–8.

[97] Magie 1950, p984, n20; also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3, p29.

[98] Ramsay 1897, p671.

[99] Ramsay 1897, p671. This became obvious to me on a visit to the site in April 1986.

[100] Magie 1950, p984, n20; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p120. Gen 8:4 describes the Ark as landing on Mt Ararat, but does not locate this mountain.

[101] See Malten 1939, p188 for a similar point and also Strauss 1966, p135, n28.

[102] The localisation of the Nannakos legend at Iconium in Stephanus of Byzantium had this sort of significance for that city.

[103] Coins in this period often reflected *local* legends rather than more generally accepted sagas; see Carrington 1976, p287–90.

[104] See Baron 1952, 2, p24. The coins were minted under the surveillance of the officials whose names appear on the coins – for instance an agonothete and a high priest. See Schürer 1904, p94; 1909, p19; Grabar 1951, p12; and in general Levy 1901, p362–4. On the people who supervised mints see Head 1911, p lxvii–lxxii. It might be possible that some of the supervisors of minting were Jews, as is suggested [and refuted] by Kraabel 1983, p181. However, none of those listed on the coins known to us seem to have been Jews; it is also unlikely that all the others mint–masters over a period of fifty years were Jews.

[105] Cumont [1906, p65] thought that Noah had been raised near to the rank of "patron" of Apamea. The conclusion reached in the text is confirmed by Robert. After discussing the myths associated with "heroes" who appear on the coins of Acmonia, he comments [1975b, p187] "Ces mythes ont à Akmonia comme en d'autres villes une consécration officielle par leur représentation sur les monnaies ... Les types sont alors d'une grande variété et sont comme un miroir de la vie de la cité." On a similar situation at Sardis see Hanfmann 1983, p145–6.

[106] Geffcken 1902, p49, thought the coins depicted Noah and the Sibyl, and is followed by Collins 1983a, p331; 1984b p377. The Sibyl is regarded as Noah's daughter-in-law in SibOr Prol 33; SibOr 1,287-90, 3,827 cf. 1,205,277; see Nikiprowetzky 1970, p44f. However, the coins seem to follow the Biblical account [for example, in the matter of the two birds [Gen 8:6-12]] whilst SibOr 1 is more closely related to Babylonian traditions; [see Collins 1983a, p340 n1; Rzach 1923 col 2148.] Thus, although it is possible that the woman is the Sibyl it seems more likely that the coins are inspired directly by the Biblical text rather than by Sib Or I/II [on which see section 5] and thus that the woman is Noah's wife. In addition if the woman was the Sibyl she would surely be named as such on the coins [for which there is room]. The fact that she is not named suggests that she is Noah's wife, and had no name in the tradition. This is the general opinion of scholars; see Juster 1914, 1, p191 n19; Stichel 1979, p87; Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3, p29.

[107] See Gen 5:30-10:1; Ez 14:14,20; Is 54:9, I Chr 1:4, Matt 24:38; Lu 17:27; Heb 11:7.

[108] See Gen 7:13; I Peter 3:20,21; II Peter 2:5.

[109] Philo, Quest Gen ii,49.

[110] She is named in Jub 4:33; the story continues in Jub 5 and 7. This trend is also found in Tobit 4:12; I Enoch 67:1-3; Sir 44:17; II Esdras 3:11; Ant 1:75-112. [She is not named in these sources.] See Lewis 1968, p10-81. Of the Rabbinic writings Lewis [1968, p124] writes: "Likewise the rabbis only briefly mentioned Noah's wife and do not regard her as at all important."

[111] See Hooyman 1958, p113-114; Klauser 1961, p142; Franke 1973, p172; Kotzsche-Breitenbruch 1976, p51-4; Lewis 1984, p224; Fink 1955, Pl 6-52. Franke 1973, p174, sees the depiction of Noah alone as part of the tendency toward individualisation in the Church of this period. Noah became a symbol to the church of one facet of its life; see Hooyman 1958, p114-5.

[112] This is the Trier sarcophagus; see Fink 1955, Pl 53.

[113] In Chamber B of the newly discovered catacomb on the Via Latina; see Kotzsche-Breitenbruch 1976, p51-4, pl 4a; Stichel 1979, p87.

[114] Lewis [1984, p238], after examining the treatment of Noah and the flood in Jewish, Christian and Muslim traditions writes that "the treatment given to the story within each tradition was determined in large part by the setting and concern of the individual writers ... and the flood story helps us to understand these concerns."

[115] See note 110. She is also named as Naamah in one passage in Rabbinic literature; see Lewis 1968, p124. In the late Christian, *Book of Adam and Eve* III,i she is called Haikal, the daughter of Abaraz; see further Stichel 1979, p54-88.

[116] Stichel 1979, p87 thinks that the depiction of Noah and his wife together emphasises that Noah and his wife were equally righteous. This does not explain why on this rare occasion Noah's wife should be featured.

[117] See section 5.3.

[118] Fontenrose 1945, p104. Reinach 1913, p19, thought that the coins of Had-

rian's time with five chests were minted to explain the city's nickname; no mention is made of the "ark" on these coins. Thus it is possible that at this date the meaning of Kibotos as ark had not yet been officially adopted by the city, although Sibylline Oracles I/II would suggest that it was known. He would suggest the mid second century as a date for these developments. However, "kibotos" could have had the dual meaning of "ark" and "chest" at this time, with there being no need to mention *both* meanings on one coin.

[119] It is significant that the Christian community at Rome seems generally to have resisted embarking on this sort of re-interpretative process. Although the Deucalion and Pyrrha story was probably known to them, their representation of the flood story, as we stated above, generally shows Noah alone; in only one case do we see only Noah and his wife. This suggests a difference between the Roman Christians and the Jewish community of Apamea with regard to their relationship to their environment.

[120] For instance, a more boat-like ark, and kneeling in prayer.

[121] Baron 1952, II, p24. He also implies that the city officials involved in minting the coins were somehow half-pagan and half-Jewish which is to misunderstand the situation. See also Johnson 1961, p82-3.

[122] On the Sibylline Oracles see recently Collins 1984b, p357-81; 1987, p441-6; Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3.1, p617-32.

[123] Geffcken 1902, p50; Rzach 1923, col 2152; Collins 1983a, p332; 1984a, p192; 1984b, p378. It is generally recognized that Books I and II, which are not separated in the MSS, constitute a unit; see Geffcken 1902, p47; Bousset 1906, p273; Kurfess 1941, p151.

[124] Ararat is generally identified with a mountain in Armenia; see Ant 1:90; Julius Africanus [c. 190-250 CE] records that some people located Ararat in Phrygia, although he himself placed it in Parthia. See Reinach 1913, p179-180, who also quotes the text of Africanus. Leclercq suggested a textual alteration for I,261, which presently reads μελαίνης [dark]. He suggested it was originally κελαινῆς which seems quite likely, particularly since the name "Celaenai" was probably forgotten in later centuries. Kraabel 1968, p122 accepts Leclercq's reading.

[125] Collins assigns as Jewish II,154-176, 214-237; as Christian II,34-55, 149-53, 177-186, 190-192, 238-251, 264, 311; whilst the remainder can only be classified as "probably Jewish". See Collins 1983a, p330; 1984b, p376-9; also Geffcken 1902, p47-48, 51-52; Rzach 1923, col 2146, 2149; Kurfess 1941, p160f. In II, 56-148 we have a direct extract from the Jewish Pseudo-Phocylides l.5-69, 76-79. This passage "preaches a kind of universally valid ethic that could be assented to by any right minded man in antiquity" [van der Horst 1978, p64]. However, it is probable that the passage was interpolated by the Christian redactor and was not originally part of the Jewish work. [van der Horst 1978, p84; Collins 1983a, p330.] This is indicated by the fact that it is only in one group of manuscripts and is part of a large Christian section.

[126] Collins 1983a, p331; see also Collins 1987, p442. [He refutes the view of Geffcken 1902, p49 [shared by Rzach 1923, col 2151], who argued for a date in the third century CE.] See also Kurfess 1941, p161-2; 1956, p152. Ramsay 1897, p670 dates the book to the Imperial Period; Bousset 1911, p398 dates it to before 70 C E. The Christian redaction should probably be dated no later than 150 CE; see Collins 1983a, p332; Kurfess 1941, p162,165. There is nothing

to indicate the provenance of this redaction. The fact that book I/II is not cited by Christian authors of the first three centuries [see Harnack 1896, II i, p582; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p645], does not seem to be of critical significance with regard to the date of the Jewish substratum. That it was probably used by book VIII [perhaps from Egypt and to be dated between 175 and 195] shows that it did circulate to some extent.

[127] Rzach 1923, col 2146; Kurfess 1941, p152; Collins 1983a, p334.

[128] The scheme of ten generations has a complex background. See Collins 1984a, p192.

[129] Rzach 1912, p144f; 1923, col 2148f; Kurfess 1956, p147–153.

[130] Lewis 1968, p7,21–22,46; VanderKam 1980, p13–32. See for example, Ez 14:14,20; Sir 44:17; Wis 10:4–6.

[131] We noted above that it is difficult to determine when this acceptance occurred.

[132] Briefly mentioned by Rzach 1923, col 2147; Kurfess 1956, p151; Nikiprowetzky 1970, p46; and others.

[133] On I,184–8, similar to the older III,402–9, see Rzach 1923, col 2148; Kurfess 1941, p155–6.

[134] Jos Ant 1:74. For references to Noah as a preacher of repentance see Lewis 1968, p37 n6; Ginzberg 1909f, 5, p174, n19.

[135] See Jos Ant 1:99.

[136] On this passage see especially Dalton 1965, p154. See also 1 Pet 3:20 which may imply that Noah preached to his contemporaries.

[137] Theophilus of Antioch iii,19.

[138] Hippolytus, *Fragments from commentaries* II/III

[139] Methodius, *Conv decem virg.* 10,3.

[140] Chrysostom, In *Ep I Thess* c.4 hom 8.2.

[141] Clement, *Strom* i,21,135.

[142] Pseudo–Tertullian, *Comen ad Marc* iii,2.

[143] Augustine, *De catechesis*, 32.

[144] See Lewis 1968, p102–103.

[145] Text in Hennecke II, p794. In the late Christian *Book of Adam and Eve* III,ii,iv, we read that "Noah preached repeatedly to the children of Cain saying 'The flood will come and destroy you if we [sic] do not repent.'"

[146] See also BT Sanhedrin 108 a–b; on these passages see Ginzberg 1909f, I, p153; V, p174 n19; Lewis 1968, p135. See another late text in Nikiprowetzky 1970, p46 n5.

[147] See 1,150–152, 174–180.

[148] See Lewis 1968, p20–21; Collins 1983a, p339 note o; 1984a, p192.

[149] Lines 164–8, state that judgement will come unless men "propitiate God [ἱλάξησθε] and repent [μετάνοιαν]". In classical usage ιλασκομαι meant to placate the deity through a cultic act; see TDNT 3, p314; NIDNTT 3, p149. It is only used 12 times in the LXX and sometimes simply involves prayer; see Ps 24:11; 2 Chr 6:30. In Sib Or III,624–9 it is made clear that "propitiating God" involves sacrifice, probably because this needed to be made clear to a pagan audience in view of the breadth of meaning of ἱλάσκομαι. If the use of this verb had involved sacrifice for the author of Sib Or I/II it seems reasonable to suggest that this would have been made explicit. It is likely therefore that to "propitiate God" here involved prayer. On the term see especially Dodd 1935, p82–95.

[150] Circumcision, food laws etc are therefore not in view. This is a "pre–mission document", as is appropriate for the genre, rather than a "mission document", which would exhort readers to undertake conversion.

[151] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p617–8,627–8. The ethics encouraged by Noah's exhortation differ from the later Noachian laws, on which see Collins 1983b, p144; on ethics in Diaspora Judaism see Collins 1983b, p137–74.

[152] Collins 1984a, p192, writes "the overview of history provides a framework for ethical teaching."

[153] Collins 1984a, p192; 1984b, p378–9.

[154] A comparison with Jub 7:20–39, appealed to by commentators on 2 Pet 2:5 as a parallel to Sib Or I,125f [see for example Windisch 1930, p94; Schelke 1970, p208, n1.] is helpful here. In Jubilees, Noah after the flood exhorts his grandsons to be righteous and therefore avoid a judgement similar to the flood. This is therefore addressed to the Jewish community. By contrast, the addressees in Sib Or 1 are not Noah's family but his contemporaries; the sermon is thus aimed at "outsiders".

[155] Thus Lewis 1968, p34 writes that "The material [about Noah] from the Sibylline Oracles shows us the way an unknown Jew would present the flood to a heathen audience in pleading for belief in monotheism."

[156] We may note here the parallel with Nannakos who wept because his people were to perish in the flood; see 4.2.1.

[157] Text in CIJ 774; Ramsay 1897, no 399 bis; 1914b, p364 n ix.

[158] See Chapter 3, section 3 and note 53 there.

[159] Ramsay 1897, p668; see also 1895b, p273; 1904, p154; Pilcher 1903, p232.

[160] Ramsay 1914b, p365.

[161] Ramsay 1914b, p358; now in CIJ 760; MAMA VI, 335a.

[162] Juster 1914, p191 n19; Kraabel 1968, p124.

[163] Ramsay 1914b, p361; Lifshitz 1961, p404 n25. Schultze 1922, p454; Leclercq 1924, col 2508; Klauser 1961, p143; Blanchetière 1974, p376 are not aware that

Ramsay had changed his mind and thus repeat his 1897 explanation of the inscription.

[164] MAMA VI,316; see further in Chapter 3, section 5.1.1.

[165] The fact that there are pagan parallels to this form of inscription [see Schürer 1909, 3, p95 n66] does not invalidate our argument. Such parallels alone do not explain how the inscription would deter violators. There is no evidence to suggest that the inscriptions containing these grave curses were from "Jewish cemeteries" or other places where it could be thought that the inscriptions would address only Jews. The only indication we have from Asia Minor of anything like a Jewish cemetery is the inscription from Tlos in which Ptolemaeus built a burial place for the Jews in the city; see Hula 1893, p99–102; CIJ 757, revised in TAM II.2, no 612.] But this might only be a grave for those in the community who could not afford their own.

[166] The help that the Noah coins give us in interpreting this inscription has been missed by commentators. It is interesting to note that Den Boeft and Bremmer [1985, p117] suggest that the Martyrdom of Pionius implies that pagan listeners to Pionius in Smyrna would have known who Noah was and would have had a considerable knowledge of Judaism.

[167] For the date see Hefele 1876, p296; Labriolle 1952, p528.

[168] Hefele 1876, p299.

[169] Text in Hefele 1876, p302–319.

[170] Labriolle 1952, p531–532, sees this as characteristic of the Council as a whole.

[171] Simon 1986, p323–5, 329–30; Kraabel 1968, p138; cf. Hefele 1876, p311.

[172] For the evidence that Jews in Asia Minor observed the Jewish festivals, see Chapter 1 note 174. We should also note here the third century CE Martyrdom of Pionius 13:1, in which Pionius is reported to say "I understand also that the Jews have been inviting some of you to their synagogues." The context suggest that Pionius is referring to Christians, [although pagans may also be in view], as Den Boeft and Bremmer [1985, p117] note; see also Hilhorst 1982, p93–4. This suggests that the problem addressed by the Council of Laodicea in the fourth century was not a new one, and that it was quite widespread. Simon [1986, p361, 367; see also p504 n143] regards canons 35 and 36 of the Council, which refer to the worship of angels and to magic and phylacteries as another reference to Christian contact with Jews, although they do not explicitly mention Jews. However, the concern with angels was not restricted to Judaism [see Chapter 6, 7.1.3] and the term φυλακτηρία can simply mean "amulet" and thus may have no connection with Judaism; see Barb 1963, p107; Kraabel 1985, p239.

[173] Kraabel 1985, p232–41 has argued that the references in these canons to "the Jews" are really to certain Christian groups which followed Jewish practices and that no "fellowship" [see Parkes 1934, p176] between Jews and Christians actually occurred. Kraabel thinks that the Council was really trying to assert the orthodox position on the dating of Easter. [Cf. Kraabel's treatment in 1983, p181–2, in which he followed Parkes' view.] However, we should note:

[a] If this was the intention of the Council, it is strange that it is not explicitly mentioned. One reads a lot into the text to be able to say that it is addressed

to Christians who follow the Jewish date of Easter and that canon 37 and 38 actually mean "You should change the date of Easter so it is in accordance with the Orthodox date". These canons seem rather to refer to actual contact with Jews.

[b] Whilst some Jewish communities in the area were definitely strong [eg at Acmonia, Apamea, Sardis], this does not mean they would necessarily have no contact with the Christians. Indeed self-confident Jewish communties might well be more prepared to be open to Christians than weaker Jewish communities. [cf. Kraabel p240] Kraabel overlooks the evidence of the Eumeneian Formula [see Appendix 1] which suggests that Christians and Jews shared this formula, and thus had some dealings with each other.

[c] Kraabel also overlooks the local nature of the Council. It was dominated by local concerns; in an area where Jewish communities were strong the more general situation in the church at the time is not relevant and cannot be used to explain who "the Jews" were.

[d] Kraabel does not explain Canon 38 which refers to accepting unleavened bread from "the Jews". [In this period either leavened or unleavened bread was used in the eucharist; see Cabrol DACL i,2 col 3254-60.] The canon suggests that what is involved is Christians accepting *Jewish* bread at the Passover; if the bread were from other Christians they would probably be called *"Judaizers"* [see Canon 29] and not *"Jews"*. In an area of significant Jewish population, it seems most likely that Jews are meant.

Thus, it is unlikely that the Canons do not refer to actual Jews. Christian involvement in Jewish synagogues seems the most reasonable interpretation.

[174] See Simon 1948, p379-381; Meeks and Wilken 1978, p19-36,83f; Parkes 1934, p163-166; Lightstone 1984, p126f. The Apostolic Canons from Syria in the fourth century include similar canons against entering a synagogue or involvement in Jewish festivals. See canons 64-65,70,71. On these see Parkes 1934, p176. The fourth century Council of Elvira in Spain also adopted some strong canons which reveal close contacts between Jews and Christians. See Parkes 1934, p174-175; and in general Cohen 1976, p3-4.

[175] Lightstone 1984, p131. See also Kraabel 1968, p139.

[176] Wilken 1976, p74; Kittel 1944, col 16.

[177] See Lightstone 1984, p126.

[178] Lightstone 1984, p136.

Chapter 5.

[1] Sibylline Oracles I/II; see Chapter 4, section 5.

[2] See also Kraemer 1986a, p183–7 for a helpful survey of the study of Jewish women; and Kraemer 1986b, p85–101 for a study of the evidence for Jewish women in Egypt and Rome from non–literary sources.

[3] Text in Reinach 1883, p161; CIJ 741; IGR IV.1452.

[4] For this translation see Brooten 1982, p5. On fines in inscriptions from Asia Minor see Chapter 3, section 3. On the Jewish community at Smyrna see Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p79-81; Smallwood 1981, p508; Brooten 1982, p11; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p19–20; Chapter 9, section 3.1

[5] See Reinach 1883, p162; Krauss 1922, p230; Leclercq 1928, col253; Cadoux 1938, p402.

[6] Brooten 1982, p5. The inscription serves to advise the public of the ownership of the tomb; see Reinach 1883, p166.

[7] The θρέμ[μ]ασιν were probably infants who had been exposed or abandoned whom Rufina had taken into her household and raised. See Leclercq 1928, col 253; cf. also Pembroke 1965, p225. Rufina may have converted the freed slaves. Kraemer [1986a, p195–6] suggests that Rufina may not have been born to Jewish parents; the term Ἰουδαία is sometimes used with this meaning.

[8] See Leclercq 1928, col 253; Pomeroy 1975, p71,130.

[9] Brooten 1982, p5–33. The title does occur in a pagan context although it is rare; see New Docs 1976, no 5.

[10] Brooten 1982, p27.

[11] Brooten 1982, p29; see also Baron 1942, p103; Cohen 1980, p25.

[12] See Brooten 1982, p16–17, 28. This is in agreement with Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p435 who think that the archisynagogos was supervisor of all that was involved in the synagogue services. Safrai and Stern 1974, p492 call the archisynagogos a "scholarly authority". See also Ginzberg 1902, p86; Juster 1914, p450–2; Baron 1942, p103; Ricciotti 1958, p175–6; Fiorenza 1983, p250.

[13] Brooten 1982, p27; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p435.

[14] Brooten 1982, p26; see also Safrai and Stern 1974, p934. The fact that the office could be inherited [see CIJ 584, 1404] probably explains the unique occurrence of a child of three being archisynagogos at Venosa, see CIJ 587; also Baron 1942, p105; Juster 1914, p453. The child would probably become active at a specified age. The inscription does not mean the the title was generally symbolic; see Cohen 1980, p29 n9.

Along with other leaders the archisynagogos shared some responsibility for the building and restoration of the synagogue and for finances; see CIJ 744,756,-766; Brooten 1982, p21,29. Some have thought the supervision of general community affairs was also involved in the office; see for example Rappaport 1971, 3, col 335–6. However, this is more likely to have been in the hands of

the archons.

[15] See the very unlikely suggestion of Ovadiah 1978, p858.

[16] This view was put forward by Krauss 1922, p118; Frey CIJ, 1, pxcix; Baron 1952, p413 n 22; Bandy 1963, p227–8.

[17] For the other two women see section 1.2 and 1.5 [=Sophia from Crete].

[18] See Brooten 1982, p7; Kraemer 1986a, p196.

[19] CIJ 166, 619d; and now Kraemer 1985b, p431–8; see also Brooten 1982, p9–10; Irvin 1980, p79.

[20] See CIJ 265,553,744. Even if the titles were shared, this would not necessarily mean that the wife fulfilled no function.

[21] Note that Goodenough [1953–68, 2, p80] wrote of Krauss, one of the proponents of this view:

> Krauss decided a priori that since such a title could not have been given to a woman, she must have had it by reflection from her husband, on the analogy, appparently, that in Germany wives are addressed by their husband's titles. It seems to me that difficult problems cannot be solved quite so easily.

[22] Reinach 1883; p165; 1886, p241; Reinach 1901, p2.

[23] Quoted in Reinach 1883, p165.

[24] See Brooten 1982, p30–1. The two Reinachs were followed by others; for example see Ramsay 1897, p650; 1942, p257; Petzl 1982, p134.

[25] Baron 1942, 1, p97; 3, p17. He supports the claim by passages from Rabbinic literature and from Philo, but neither source necessarily describes the situation in Asia Minor. [See Appendix 2.] Others who adopt this interpretation include: Ginzberg 1902, p86; Oehler 1909, p531; Schecter 1896, p317; Juster 1914, p453; Cadoux 1938, p402; Rappaport 1971, 3, col 335–6; Swidler 1976, p93; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p435.

[26] See Kraabel 1968, p47, who refutes the suggestion.

[27] See Brooten 1982 p157–161.

[28] CIJ 756; see section 1.2. If she had received the title as a result of her donation, then her son Eusebios would probably also share the title, but he does not.

[29] CIJ 738, see section 1.4.

[30] See Brooten 1982 p7–10.

[31] Brooten 1982, p8. On *clarissima femina* see Raepsaet–Charlier 1981, p189–212.

[32] See New Docs 1976, No 25 bis for an inscription dated to 2 BCE from Assos in which a woman bears this honorary title.

[33] See Brooten 1982, p8; see also Kraemer 1985b, p437–8.

[34] We know that women exercised control over slaves; see Pomeroy 1975, p130.

[35] See Brooten 1982, p32. On this facet of the role of the archisynagogos see for example Luke 13:14.

[36] The apparent wealth of a woman should not be thought of as unusual. CIJ 740,762,763 record women building tombs for their families or doing other work out of their own means. Women were often donors to the synagogue; see Brooten 1982, p157–64; also Cohen 1980, p24. A woman known to us from the writings at Qumran held the titles to various properties [see Loewe 1966, p34]. In addition, numerous women in the ancient world acted on their own initiative and with independence as is shown by inscriptions and papyri. Horsley writes: "Women who could own property and who were involved in financial transactions are known commonly enough." [New Docs 1977, p28.] See also the references given in note 299.

[37] See Brooten 1982, p32–3,142.

[38] See Kraabel 1968, p43,7; Cohen 1980, p26; Irvin 1980, p78; Brooten 1982, p30–33; Fiorenza 1983, p250; Kant 1987, p698.

[39] Text in Reinach 1901, p1; CIJ 756.

[40] Goodenough [1953–68, 2, p79] thought Theopempte was a man – Theopemptes, overlooking the genitive form and translating αυτης as "his". There is only one other inscription from this community, unfortunately lost before it was recorded; see CIJ 756a. However, 1 Macc 15:23 shows that Jews lived in Myndos at the end of the second century BCE.

[41] Reinach 1901, p1.

[42] Brooten 1982, p13.

[43] See Reinach 1901, p4; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p79; Brooten 1982, p13–14.

[44] Reinach 1901, p2.

[45] See Cohen 1980, p26; Brooten 1982, p32–3.

[46] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p19–22. A late fourth or fifth century CE date is possible but seems unlikely.

[47] Brooten 1982, p151; see also note 61 below.

[48] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p101; cf. also IV Ezra 10:26.

[49] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p101.

[50] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p23; the lists are male apart from the disputed case of Jael.

[51] Brooten 1982, p157–165.

[52] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p29.

[53] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p28–41. The building was probably a "soup kitchen" of some sort.

[54] The sources are conveniently collected by Goodblatt 1975, p68–85; see also Moore 1927, 2, p128–9. Goodblatt notes that the identification of Beruriah with the daughter of Ḥananyah ben Teradyon and the wife of Me'ir is a late Babylonian elaboration. Goodblatt also argues that the traditions which ascribes to Beruriah an advanced rabbinic education are from Sassanian Babylonia rather than Roman Palestine. In either case the tradition still shows that a woman could be thought to be well educated within a Jewish community, whether it was in Palestine or in Babylonia.

[55] We recall the significance of Judas Maccabees.

[56] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p93–105; See further in the Index of CIJ^2, 1; Lifshitz 1967; see also Cohen 1976, p97–128; Tcherikover 1961, p523 n4; Applebaum 1961, p35–6. Other names were favoured as the equivalents of or having a resemblance to well-known Jewish names; for example Θεόδοτος and Θεόδωρος as the equivalents of Jonathan and Nathaniel; see Reynold–Tannenbaum 1987, p101. The popularity of Biblical names at Aphrodisias is thus very noticeable compared with other Jewish communities. Note also the name Δεββωρά in CIJ 772, revised in MAMA IV.202, from Apollonia in Asia Minor.

[57] On the woman Jael see Williams 1982, p72–5; Gottlieb 1981, p197–200; Brenner 1985, p118–21. There are passages about Jael in literature of the Roman period; see Ps–Philo 31:3–9, 32:12; Josephus Ant 5:208–9, calls her Ἰάλη and writes of Jael's glory after her murder of 'Sisares'.

[58] See the variants given in Brooke and McLean 1935, p628. The reading favoured by the Rahlfs edition is Ἰιηλ.

[59] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p101 also compare the name to the masculine name in IV Ezra 10:26. This reads יעיאל and is translated as Ἰαηλ in the majority of the manuscripts, with Ἰαειηλ, Ἰειηλ, Ἀιειηλ and Ἰαιηλ also being found; see Brooke and McLean 1935, p626–7. It is very unlikely that Ιαηλ is original. Thus Kraemer comments in a personal letter dated 8/6/87 "The manuscript evidence for the reading Iael is quite problematic."

[60] See for example section 1.1, 1.2 above, cf. CIJ^2 731c, in which a woman bears the title ἀρχισυναγώγισσα. On προστάτις see now Montevecchi 1981, p103–115.

[61] The name is taken to be that of a woman by Brooten 1982, p151; Rajak 1985a, p255; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p25–6; all writing before the inscription was published however.

[62] See Liddell and Scott, p1526–7; Montevecchi 1981, p103–106; Safrai and Stern 1974, p497.

[63] The inscriptions are CPJ 3, 1441 from Xenephyris [dated between 143 and 117 BCE] which dates an inscription to the time when Theodoros and Archillion were "προστάντων"; CPJ 2, 149 from Alexandria, dated 10 BCE, the prostates of a loan society; CPJ 1, p101–2, n26, a letter written in Hebrew around 400 CE at Oxyrhynchos which includes a Hebrew transliteration of the term "prostates", and thus shows that the Greek term was well established in a time when Hebrew was being revived in the community; CIJ 100 and 365 from Rome; and the

recently discovered SEG 29.969, from Naples.

[64] 1 Chr 27:31, 29:6; 2 Chr 8:10; see Hatch and Redpath.

[65] 2 Chr 24:11.

[66] 2 Chr 24:11.

[67] BJ 2:135.

[68] See also Ant 14:157,444; Josephus vol 8, p76 note a.

[69] For example BJ 1:633; Ant 7:376.

[70] For example, Spec. I,337.

[71] For example Abr. 221.

[72] For example Virt. 155.

[73] For the text see PG XLVIII, Section V, 887 of Homily 6.

[74] Grissom 1978, p185; see also Safrai and Stern 1974, p485.

[75] See for example, the indexes of SEG 26–33.

[76] Magie 1950 p59; on πρυτάνεις see section 2.6.

[77] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p41.

[78] Juster 1914, 1, p442–3.

[79] Krauss 1922, p145,245.

[80] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p102.

[81] See CIJ, 1, pxciv–xcv. He relies on the situation in Greek collegia to make this assessment.

[82] Safrai and Stern 1974 p496–7; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p41. Samouel, the ἀρχιδ[έκανος?] was probably the president of the decany. However, this does not determine the meaning of προστάτης. The archidecanos could be either a patron–like figure, with the more active leadership of the group being in the hands of the προστάτης, or the opposite could be the case. The fact that Jael was listed first does not seem to help decide the matter. This is the only occurrence of ἀρχιδέκανος, which makes it of little help in determining the meaning of προστάτης.

[83] See Frey in CIJ, 1, pxciv–xcv.

[84] If the προστάτης of the loan society was its patron then he would probably have provided surety for the group. Likewise the patron of a community would represent the groups interest to the wider society; see CIJ, 1, p xciv–xcv. If the term meant leader or president, then the prostates would probably have been the director of the community's affairs. If this interpretation is correct, the prostates, would fulfil the role carried out elsewhere by other officials; eg the gerousiarch.

[85] See Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, p43.

[86] Note that in Rom 16:2 Phoebe is described as being a προστάτις, the rare feminine form of προστάτης. In view of the fact that "προστάτης" involved an office in the synagogue, it is likely that Paul used the feminine form in Romans as a title. Translations such as "helper" [RSV] are inadequate; it is better translated as "patron" or "leader". Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, p718; on the passage see Fiorenza 1978, p157–8.

[87] Text in Reinach 1886, p236f; CIJ 738; IGR IV.1327; Krauss 1922, p231.

[88] Translation based on Brooten 1982, p157 no 3. I have however, followed Robert's comment [BE 1960, no 216], when he notes that a genitive following the name of a woman is normally her father, not her husband; see also Kraemer 1986a, p197.

[89] See Reinach 1886, p238.

[90] See Safrai and Stern 1974, p151; Brooten 1982, p157 no3. On the term οἰκός used here see Chapter 3 note 20.

[91] CIJ 694 where Claudius Tiberius Polycharmos gave part of his house as a synagogue; on this see especially Hengel 1975b, p110–148.

[92] See Chapter 3, section 2.

[93] See Luke 7:5 for the gift of a synagogue to the community by a centurion.

[94] An improved reading of this inscription was given by Robert 1940, p27–8; and BE 1954, p102; see also Lifshitz 1967, no 16; cf. CIJ 744.

[95] See Brooten 1982, p157–61. For example, Juliana at Hamman Lif in Africa donated money for a mosaic; see Brooten 1982, p161 no22; also Oehler 1909, p535 no252. Note also Capitolina a "God–worshipper" from Tralles was responsible for a platform and the inlaying work on the stairs; see Chapter 7, section 4.3.

[96] See Brooten 1982, p161–4.

[97] Kraemer 1986a, p197 suggest that Tation might have been a non–Jew. However, if this inscription was mounted on the outside of the synagogue [which seems likely given its contents] then the phrases mentioning "the Jews" are understandable and do not suggest that Tation was not Jewish.

[98] See Brooten 1982 p157–164.

[99] Kraabel 1968, p48; Saltman 1971 p48 n3; New Docs 1976, p111; Danker 1982, p467f; see for example Ant 14:304,313; see also Forbes 1933, p54–5; Reynolds 1982, no 4.12; 5.26, 29.11–12;

[100] At Berenice, Cyrenaica a crown of olives was presented to a man; see Lüderitz 1983, no 70 line 17; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p143; another occasion is recorded in Lüderitz 1983, no 71, line 23. See also CIJ 777 from Hierapolis; on which see Ramsay 1902a, p98–100; and a golden crown in the fragmentary inscription given in CIJ 1450. Serapion son of Jason was crowned with a golden crown by the Samaritians on Delos, see inscription 1 in Bruneau 1982, p469–71; a further case in inscription 2 in Bruneau 1982, p471–5. See also Philo Leg. 133;

Flacc. 48; Oehler 1909, p533–4; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p103–4.

[101] See Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p17 on a painting in a Roman Jewish catacomb which includes a crown. See also Goodenough, 1953–58, 7, p148–71.

[102] 2 Sam 12:30; 1 Chr 20:2; SongSol 3:11; Ps 8:5.

[103] Judith 15:13; Sira 40:2; 3 Enoch 12:3–13:2, 18:1–25; TLevi 8:2; TBen 4:1; TJud 15:3; OdesSol 9:8–11; JosAsen 5:5, 21:5; 4 Ezra 2:43–5; Ant 3:172; 17:197.

[104] In Heb 2:7 [which quotes the LXX of Ps 8:5] 2:9; Rev 4:4,10; 14:14; see also Rev 2:10, 6:2, 9:7, 12:1; James 1:12; 1 Peter 5:4.

[105] See Reinach 1886, p240; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p447 n98. προεδρία occurs with a different meaning in CIJ 777 from Hierapolis.

[106] See Mark 12:39; Luke 11:43. On the identification see Reinach 1886, p240. The seat of honour mentioned in James 2:2,3 was probably similar.

[107] See Reinach 1886, p240; Krauss 1922, p164.

[108] On Dura–Europos see Chapter 3, note 44; on Delos see Chapter 6, section 5.3; on Ostia see Shanks 1979, p168; Kraabel 1979a, p498; cf. Squarciapino 1963, p198. Similar seats for one person are also found at Hammath Tiberius, En-Gedi, Chorazin and perhaps Capernaum. See Sukenik 1934, p58–61; Brooten 1982 p143; Chiat 1982, p336. It is to be noted that the Qumran community according to both their own writings [see IQS 6:8–9, IQSa 2:17–22] and to Philo [Quod. 81] had a hierarchical seating order in their assembly. See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p447–8 n 78.

[109] See Reinach 1886, p239–40; Leclercq 1928, col 251; Kraabel 1968, p48; New Docs 1976, p111. These seats are a very noticeable feature in the theatre, where they were often reserved for priests and officials of the city; see Bieber 1961, p70; specific examples are Priene, Pompei and Athens. [See Bieber 1961, p108–110,172–4,214 respectively.]

[110] It is possible that the reference to the προεδρία made by the Jews at Phocaea was primarily due to the terms usage by other Jews. However, in view of its uniqueness in Jewish inscriptions the primary influence was probably from the environment. On this issue in general see Tcherikover 1961, p348–9.

[111] See Saltman 1971, p48.

[112] Krauss' supposition [1922, p231] that Tation's father and grandfather had been honoured by the community is unlikely; we would expect such honours to be mentioned here. Horsley [New Docs 1976, p111] comments that "wealthy women benefactors are by no means unheard of in the Roman period". He gives an example from Kyme in Asia Minor. Other examples are given in New Docs 1976, no 25 bis, New Docs 1977, no 61 [from Tlos] no 16 [from Tomis].

[113] In Chapter 3, section 2 we discussed the first century CE inscription from Acmonia which tells us that Julia Severa erected a synagogue for the Jewish community there. We concluded that she was not Jew, but a "Gentile sympathiser" and patroness of the community. Other evidence enabled us to conclude that she was a distinguished and honoured leader in the city. Whilst she was not Jewish, she does show that the Jewish community at Acmonia was willing to accept a distinguished woman as their patroness. Compare also Acts 13:50

where prominent women [εὐσχήμων] and leading men of Pisidian Antioch were incited by the Jews to expel Paul and Barnabas from the area; cf. also Acts 14:5.

[114] The references for these inscriptions can be conveniently found in Brooten 1982; see the Index; and see note 115.

[115] See Kraemer 1985b, p431–8.

[116] CIJ 569–619, 619a–619e.

[117] Brooten 1982, p44.

[118] See Brooten 1982, p229 n87.

[119] Using CIJ, Robert's review of CIJ in BE 1954, p102–4 and the Sardis inscriptions in Robert 1964, p37–58 to give a rough guide to the number of inscription from Asia Minor. This results in three inscription which refer to women leaders out of a total of 101.

[120] Five inscriptions out of 532 [= CIJ 1–523,35a,732a,733a–733g].

[121] See Brooten 1982, p157–162 for 38 of the inscriptions concerned. The Sardis synagogue has yielded twelve new dedicatory inscriptions in which wives are co–donors; see Seager 1981a, p184. Three of these have been published and are listed by Brooten, but the other nine can be added to the total. This gives 19 women donors from Asia Minor out of a total of 47. 101 inscriptions out of a total of 1614 [using CIJ and CIJ^2, Vol 1 as a rough guide] come from Asia Minor. Women were often donors to their cities in Asia Minor, either alone or with their husband; see Chapot 1904, p159–60. For joint benefactions see for example Hicks 1890a, p126; Radet 1887, p478–9; SEG 28.869.

[122] The donor inscriptions from Asia Minor, excluding Sardis are given in Lifshitz 1967, no 12–16,28–37; those concerning women are also given in Brooten 1982, p157–62, no 3–6,24,28,29.

[123] The one published exception is from Sardis, see Lifshitz 1967, no 19.

[124] The number of donor inscriptions as "more than 30" is given in Kraabel 1983, p184. Seager [1981a, p184; 1974, p48] notes that twelve of the dedicatory inscriptions mention wives as co–donors. The published inscriptions from Sardis are in Lifshitz 1967 no 17–27; those referring to women are nos 19,20,22. Only in the fourth century CE synagogue at Apamea, Syria do we find a higher percentage of women donors. Nineteen dedicatory inscriptions were found in this synagogue [see Lifshitz 1967, no 38–56], nine of which were provided by women and another five by a man [or men] and a woman [or women] together. Two further inscriptions contain donations on behalf of women. Thus 16 out of 19 inscriptions mention women; see Brooten 1982, p143.

[125] Kraemer 1986a, p198.

[126] CIJ 763=Chapter 3, 4.1.1; see also CIJ 762=Chapter 3, 5.2.1.

[127] CIJ 775,776; see SEG 33.492 for similar ownership by a [non–Jewish] woman in Macedonia.

[128] See Kraemer 1986a, p194–5; Kraemer also points to MAMA 6,335=Chapter

3, 3.1.2 in which the legal right to bury anyone else in a tomb is vested in two daughters.

[129] This was Sophia on Crete; see Bandy 1963, p227–8.

[130] Kraemer in a recent study [published after the first draft of this Chapter was completed], notes with regard to Asia Minor that "It would seem that women played considerable public roles within the Jewish community, perhaps even to a degree rarely documented elsewhere." [Kraemer 1986a, p198–9.] She goes on to support Saltman's hypothesis [1971, p47f] that there were two different waves of Jewish immigration into Asia Minor in order to explain the prominence of women. However, there is no real evidence for Saltman's view, as Johnson [1975, p98–100] noted. Further the notable women come from coastal areas [even Aphrodisias is only roughly 80 miles from the coast], whereas Saltman's thesis suggests they should come from central Anatolia. Kraemer does not deal with the evidence presented in section 2, which seems to explain the evidence better. Some other scholars have noted this prominence of women in Judaism in Asia Minor; see for example Ramsay 1897, p673; Kraabel 1968, p43f; Saltman 1971, p47–52; Johnson 1978, p99.

[131] Brooten [1981b, p284] comments: "das antike Judentum bei näherem Hinsehen sich immer mehr als eine aüsserst differenzierte Grösse erweist, wo 'frauenfreundliche' wie 'frauenfeindliche' Tendenzen gleichermassen vorhanden waren."

[132] Note also Segal's comment [1979, p135] that there are indications "that the status of women in Jewish society may have been the subject of debate in the stormy centuries before and during the emergence of Christianity."

[133] P. Paris *Quatenus Feminae Res Publicas in Asia Minore, Romanis Imperantibus Attigerint.* Paris: Burdigale, 1891; which I have been unable to consult. Paris has however, written on this subject elsewhere; see Paris 1883, p452–6; 1885, p339. Other authors have commented upon the prominence of women in Asia Minor [though generally briefly]; see Ramsay 1897, p673; Levy 1899, p257, 1901, p369–71; Liebenam 1900, p285; Chapot 1904, p158–63; Cadoux 1938, p28, 403; Magie 1950, p1518 n50; Saltman 1956, p179–80; Robert BE 1959, p237; BE 1972, p427–8; Kraabel 1968, p42–50; Jameson 1980, p847; Witherington 1980b, p18, 28; Clark 1982, p258; Fiorenza 1983, p249.

[134] Braunstein 1911, p11. The topic does not seem to have been dealt with in detail since then however; cf. the bibliography in Pomeroy 1984b, p315–372.

[135] On praise given to women see Deismann 1927, p314–5; Lattimore 1942, p299–300; Lefkowitz and Fant 1982, p157–60; for an example from Pisidia see Robert BE 1973, no 475. The present investigation is conducted on narrow lines. Thus I do not investigate the question of the legal status of women in Asia Minor, nor do I seek to explain in detail how it was that the women discussed here were able to have an increased role in their cities; on this see the helpful study by van Bremen 1983, p223–242.

[136] See Hardy 1970, p265–7; Pomeroy 1975, p75–8.

[137] Pomeroy 1975, p75. The priestesses in the widespread cult of Isis, however, performed a role subsidiary to the male priests. See Kee 1980, p91; Kraemer 1983, p132. See Pomeroy 1975, p219–223 on Isis and women in general.

[138] The study of women in Greece and Rome is a growing area which cannot be dealt with in detail here. Some recent work has emphasised our lack of

knowledge [see Walcot 1984, p38–9] and the importance of avoiding generalisations [see Cameron 1980, p60–68]. Thus, for example, Harvey [1984, p46] has recently noted that "the seclusion of women in classical Athens, accepted by many, was probably an upper class phenomenon; women's life in the countryside must have differed from life in the city." Other helpful treatments with regard to the general area discussed here are found in Pomeroy 1984a; Marshall 1975a, p109–127; Cameron 1980, p60–8; Gould 1980, p38–59; MacMullen 1980, p208–218; Cabanes 1983, p201–209; Kraemer 1983, p127–139.

[139] See Cadoux 1938, p28; Fiorenza 1983, p249; and for instance CIG 3508; there were very important priestesses of Artemis; see Taylor 1933, p253–4.

[140] See Pomeroy 1973, p133, p226; Kraemer 1983, p131.

[141] Baron 1942, p89. See also Juster 1914, 1, p457–8; Smallwood 1981, p133; Kraabel 1983, p188.

[142] See Chapter 1, note 86.

[143] We should note that city life in Asia Minor developed spontaneously as various tribal confederations adopted an urban way of life rather than under the influence of central governments. Thus we do not find uniformity in the titles used for civic officials. [See Braunstein 1911, p25; Jones 1940, p46–7; Magie 1950 p59; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p56–7,72–4,77. The Romans neither attempted nor desired to secure uniformity in municipal government.] In different cities the same function can be performed by people who bear different titles. Such officers were generally either elected by the Assembly of citizens or recommended by the Council of the city. [See Magie 1950, p58.]

[144] His main justification for this view was that "certaines liturgies pouvaient en effet présenter quelque danger pour la femme, au point de vue des moeurs." See Chapot 1904, p161; on Chapot's view see also Marshall 1975a, p124.

[145] Chapot 1904, p237.

[146] See for example Levy 1895, p242 with regard to women gymnasiarchs. See also Abbott and Johnson 1926, p79. Gardner 1986, p264 has recently repeated this view, but simply assumes it and presents no arguments in favour of such an interpretation.

[147] Magie 1950, p649. Magie also discusses in this context instances of office holding by a deity, but these seem to be a quite different from those where a woman holds office.

[148] Magie 1950, p653; cf. Jones 1940, p175. See on Magie's view Marshall 1975a, p124–5. We note the striking parallel with the scholarly discussions of women ἀρχισυνάγωγοι noted in section 1.1.

[149] Brooten 1982, p7–10.

[150] Brooten 1982, p8–9.

[151] IGR III,802; [see also III,801]. Dating in Turner 1936, p13 n16. The inscription goes on to say that Menodora served as demiourgos in the name of her son and gymnasiarch in the name of her daughter.

[152] She is also described as κτίστριαν, the feminine of κτίστης – founder, which

is very interesting. On Menodora see also van Bremen 1983, p223.

[153] See Turner 1936, p7-19; Ramsay 1895a, p63–4; Braunstein 1911, p58; Magie 1950, p648. Abbott and Johnson 1926 p94–5; Levy 1901, p352; Chapot 1904, p272–3; OCD, p315.

[154] See Magie 1950, p1517, n48; Turner 1936, p7–19.

[155] Turner 1936, p17 n5 notes that there may perhaps have been δεκάπροτη in the Fayum in Egypt.

[156] Note van Bremen's comment [1983, p225] which applies to all the titles investigated here: "Women appear to have rendered the same social, political and financial services to their cities as their male fellow citizens and they were honoured for these services in much the same way. Women thus seem to have encroached upon the traditionally sacrosanct, male dominated sphere of public life and city politics."

[157] See Magie 1950, p835 n20.

[158] Magie 1950, p643,835 n20; Jones 1940 p46–7, p311 n62; Liebenam 1900, p553. On eponymous magistracies in general see Levy 1899, p271–2; Liebenam 1900, p284–5; Magie 1950, p58-9; Gschnitzer 1973, col 744–5.

[159] Braunstein 1911, p56.

[160] IGR III.794; SEG I.393. See Magie 1950, p1507,1518.

[161] IGR III.794.

[162] See Schoeffer 1901, col 2856–62. Murakawa 1957, p385–415 has surveyed the twofold meaning of the term – craftsman and magistrate – in inscriptions from the fifth century BCE and earlier. Unfortunately this does not aid us in determining the meaning of the term in the later period in Asia Minor.

[163] See Braunstein 1911, p56; Ramsay 1882a, p143.

[164] See Magie 1950, p1508 n34.

[165] See SEG 1.393; IGR IV.984. On the eponymous demiourgos see Schoeffer 1901, col 2860.

[166] See Jones 1940, p311 n62.

[167] See Ramsay 1882a, p143; Liddell and Scott, p386.

[168] See Schoeffer 1901, col 2862.

[169] It is to be noted that by the beginning of this era there was no real antithesis between a public office like a magistracy and a liturgy since both had come to involve personal service and the expenditure of money. See Magie 1950, p852 n35; Jones 1940, p167, 175–6; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p79. In this period liturgies were also elective rather than compulsorily imposed as they had been; see Jones 1940, p167.

[170] Magie 1950, p61.

[171] See Jones 1940, p220. The gymnasium was a very elaborate centre and included not only places for exercise, but baths, lecture halls, rooms for general conversation and sometimes even a library. See Jones 1940, p220–4; Magie 1950, p62; Cohen 1978,p36–7.

[172] See Jones 1940, p221–5; Levy 1901, p368–71; New Docs 1977, no 82; Harris 1976, p75,78–9,86.

[173] See Jones 1940,p222. The curriculum included reading, musical skills, comedy, tragedy, verse and song writing, general knowledge as well as running, wrestling, boxing and military exercises. The only surviving record of girls competitions give an indication of their curriculum – it included epic, elegy, reading and singing. Some gymnasia had resident professors of rhetoric, teachers of literature or were visited by itinerant sophists. See Jones 1940 p222–5.

[174] Levy 1901, p368.

[175] See Magie 1950, p852 n36.

[176] See Braunstein 1911, p35; see indexes of L'Institut Fernand Courby 1972–1975; Marcillet–Jaubert 1979; 1983.

[177] Braunstein 1911, p29–30; Robert [1960a, p285–98] has shown that in three inscriptions from Mytilene, Lesbos, Julia Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus was given the title γυμνασίαρχον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. This means that she had made a foundation, the interest from which was to pay for the expenses of the gymnasium. This is therefore a special case of a women gymnasiarch; see also Robert BE 1983, no 84. On the supposed women's gymnasium at Dorylaeum see note 189 below.

[178] Magie 1950, p1522 n55.

[179] See Keil 1939, p120 no 3, see Robert BE 1944, p225 no 161; Robert 1954, no 64, no 67; no 68; 1960b, p598 no 3; p599 no 4; BE 1956, p152 n213; BE 1967, p552 no 623; SEG 17.575; SEG 31.958.959; Keil and Maresch 1960, col 91–2 no 17. One woman was a gymnasiarchos four times. See Robert BE 1956, p152 n213.

[180] Casarico [1982, p117–123] recently listed the women gymnasiarchs known to him. Unfortunately he overlooked a number of inscriptions and his numbers 39–41 concern the same person; see also the review in Robert BE 1983, no 84.

[181] See Robert BE 1955, p263 n202.

[182] See Reinach 1906, p241–3 no 141; CIG 2714,3953c; Keil–Maresch 1960, no 17.

[183] See notes 181, 182 above.

[184] See Braunstein 1911, p28.

[185] Paris 1885, p338–40, no 21,22; Robert 1960b, p598 no 3; see also Casarico 1982, p123.

[186] See Parvey 1974, p119; Pomeroy 1975, p162–3,198.

[187] See Jones 1940 p222–3; Pomeroy 1975, p137, p170–4; 1977, p51–68; Swidler

1976, p18–20; Tetlow 1980, p18; New Docs 1977, p56 no16, Clark 1981, p199–200.

[188] See Swidler 1976 p14–15, Pomeroy 1975, p137; cf. on earlier treatments see Lämmer 1981, p16–23.

[189] See Robert BE 1948, p201 n229. Note that in two inscriptions from Attaleia a woman is described as γυμνασιαρχήσασαν γέραιων καὶ νέων καὶ παίδων ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν; see Robert BE 1948, n229; SEG 2.696; cf. Forbes 1933, p22,31. This suggests that the woman involved actively fulfilled the office. An inscription from Dorylaeum in Phrygia describes a woman as γυμνασίαρχος τῶν γυναικῶν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων. A number of scholars have included her in the list of women gymnasiarchs and see this as a gymnasium for women; see Levy 1901, p370; Braunstein 1911, p29; Magie 1950, p1521 n55; Casarico 1982, p122. However, Robert [BE 1983, p84] has shown that γυμνασιαρχειν here has the sense of "to make the distribution of oil". It was used in the same sense in some latin inscriptions. However, we have no reason to think that the verb [which is found in some of the inscriptions discussed here] always meant "to distribute oil" rather than "to hold office as gymnasiarch".

[190] See Levy 1901, p370–1; see also Forbes 1933, p22,31.

[191] See Braunstein 1911, p35. For the use of εὐεργέσια for example, in this way see SEG 30.1640. See also εὐεργέτις used of a women who was also "demiourgos" in IGR IV.984.

[192] Robert 1960b, p599 no 4; see also p598 no 3.

[193] CIG 5132=SEG 9.58; see Braunstein 1911, p29.

[194] See Frank 1938, 2, p684–5. The evidence comes from a papyrus and from a letter written by Pliny to Trajan, which both probably deal with the same person. Note that the status of women in Egypt and Cyrene was probably somewhat higher than the situation elsewhere; see Préaux 1959, p127–175; Swidler 1976, p5–7; Tetlow 1980 p5–6; Witherington 1981, p20; Pomeroy 1975, p126–9, 225; 1984a; Sumner 1909, p123–5. Casarico [1982, p123] confirms that the phenomenon is almost completely limited to Asia Minor.

[195] IGR IV.1325.

[196] IGR IV.1323.

[197] See Gschnitzer 1973, col 738–46 for a discussion of those cities in which it was eponymous; see also Chapot 1904, p162 n1; Robert 1955, p289; On the title see also Liebenam 1900, p291; Chapot 1904, p209,236–7,239; Braunstein 1911, p49–50; Jones 1940, p46–7.

[198] See Gschnitzer 1973, col 743; see also IGR IV.1167.

[199] Robert 1937b, p19 n1.

[200] Braunstein [1911, p47–9] did not distinguish between the eponymous and non–eponymous prytanis in his list. Thirteen of the inscriptions he lists [from Ephesus, Heracleia Salbace, Mytilene, Notium, Pergamum and Theira] are eponymous. To these may be addded IGR IV.1687; Hepding 1910, p450 no 31: Heberdey 1915, p85–86;=JOAI 18, 1915, Beibl 85; Robert BE 1944, p225 no 161=Keil 1939, p120 no 3; 1954, p117 no 27; p173 no 66; [on the prytanis

at Heracleia Salbace being eponymous see Gschnitzer 1973, col 736]; Keil and Maresch 1960, col 91–2, no 17 [three women listed]; Knibbe 1968–70, col 64–5, no 6; Robert BE 1976, no 585; SEG 27.743; SEG 28.857; SEG 29.1112 [and see SEG 16.721]; SEG 33.936=Knibbe et al 1981–2, p146 no 160. See also Magie 1950, p1507 n34, 1518,1519 and Gschnitzer 1973, col 745 for some of these references.

[201] See Clerc 1886, p404–6; Knibbe 1968–70, col 64–5 no 6; Keil and Maresch 1960, col 91–2 no 17; In this last inscription the title of eponymous prytanis is carried by three women in a family tree but not by any of the men mentioned. The title of prytanis passes down the female side of the tree, occurring every second generation, ie it goes from grandmother to daughter. This could be coincidence or it could be an interesting form of hereditary. That none of the men held the title suggests that the women held it in their own right.

[202] See Hepding 1910, p450 no 31.

[203] See for example Paris 1885, p338–9; Robert 1954, p173 no 66.

[204] Levy 1899, p265.

[205] Robert BE 1959, no 343.

[206] Jones 1940, p46–6; Magie 1950, p643, 825 n21, 1507 n34.

[207] See Gschnitzer 1973, col 783–90, who also discussed their relationship to the strategoi. The board of the prytaneis was one of the new group of magistrates which replaced the earlier single officials.

[208] See Hiller von Gaertringen 1906, no 64; Gschnitzer 1973, col 786. In Phocaea the prytanis seems originally to have been eponymous, but in the Imperial period became the title for members of the non–eponymous board of magistrates; see Gschnitzer 1973, col 733,780. Braunstein [1911, p49–50] stated that a woman would not have been able to perform the active functions involved in leading the Council. However, this was simply one of his presuppositions and is not self–evident.

[209] See Gschnitzer 1973, col 736.

[210] Braunstein 1911, p49 liststwo women; the other is found in Keil and Premerstein 1911, no 47=IGR IV.1232. Husbands also held the title in two of these three inscriptions; see IGR IV.1232,1238.

[211] See Gschnitzer 1973, col 730–816.

[212] See Braunstein 1911, p50; Gschnitzer 1973, col 745. A detailed search was made of Marcellet–Jaubert 1972–5;1979;1983; and SEG 26–33.

[213] Liddell and Scott, p1642.

[214] Jones 1940, p47.

[215] Jones 1940, p46.

[216] Magie 1950, p836 n23, p1006 n45, p1507 n34.

[217] MacMullen 1980, p213.

[218] See Hiller von Gaertringen 1906, no 208.

[219] See Cadoux 1938, p195. Often in our inscriptions the woman is also a prytanis or a gymnasiarch. Many have thought that the eponymous stephanephorate was a priestly official [eg Braunstein 1911 p52]. However this is the case in only a few cities [eg at Bargylia]; see Magie 1950, p839 n23.

[220] For instance, Miletus elected Augustus to the office in 17/16 BCE, Priene elected Germanicus in 17/18 CE and Gaius in 40/41 CE; see Magie 1950, p470,498,515 respectively.

[221] Magie 1950, p643; Robert 1938, p134; Levy 1899, p259 n2. Jones 1940, p234–5 describes the lavish scale such entertainments could reach. See also Ramsay 1897, p56–8; Liebenam 1900, p347–8. There was considerable expense involved in most positions in the city; see Levy 1899, p257–66.

[222] See MacMullen 1980, p213. MacMullen [1980, p215] notes how difficult it is to determine exactly what was done by some of these title holders and comments: "It was the deference secured forever from one's fellow citizens through one's being, for only a day, or for only a few days in a year, at the head of the parade or in front of crowds and thereafter known by a new title and memorialized in stone in the forum. Rewards of this sort were had ... quite as much through titular elevation as through the direct reponsibility for executive decisions and quite as fully [though nowhere near so often] by women as by men."

[223] Braunstein 1911, p53–4. Braunstein also lists the coin given in Head 1892, p250 no 132; however IGR IV.1393 mentions the same woman.

[224] See Reinach 1906, p241f; Braunstein 1911, p53 n1. It was not unusual for a person to hold a position a number of times; see Levy 1899, p263.

[225] Magie 1950, p1507 n34, 1518 n50.

[226] Keil and Premerstein 1911, No 165; Ins Magnesia 158 [see Casarico 1982, p117f]; Robert 1938, p128–134; SEG 30.1349,1354; SEG 31.939; SEG 33.851. Petzl 1982, p65–6, no 201;

[227] See Magie 1950, p649; Braunstein 1911, p53–55. Before the first century CE the title was given to women at Sardis and Priene.

[228] Buckler and Robinson 1932, p108–9, no 111.

[229] Hiller von Gaertringen 1906, no 208.

[230] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p71 n130. Some women made donations to public works but did not receive a title; see for example Lefkowitz and Fant 1982, no 165. It is therefore possible that Phile received the title for some other reason.

[231] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p71 n130 think that Phile held the title "presumably in an honorary capacity." They do not explain why this should be so; we have shown earlier that the concept of "honorary" titles is suspect when used to explain the titles women held.

[232] LBW 1630, 1634; Reinach 1906, p273 n168; Robert 1938, p128–135

[233] Robert BE 1955, p263 no 202 [non–eponymous stephaneporate].

[234] LBW 1592,1612; Paris 1885, p338–40, no21–2; Hicks 1890a, p126; Keil and Premerstein 1911, No 165.

[235] CIG 2714.

[236] Foucart 1887 p101–4.

[237] See Magie 1950, p1518 n50.

[238] Ten are given in Braunstein 1911, p54–5; see now also Keil and Premerstein 1911, no 58; Robert 1954, p172–3 no 64, p173 no 66, p174 no 67 [a new reading of CIG 3953c], p175 no 68;

[239] Robert 1954, p174–5, no 67.

[240] Its rarity is shown by the fact that it does not occur outside Asia Minor in the inscriptions reviewed by Robert from 1938–1977; [see L'Institut Fernand Courby 1972–1975; Marcillet-Jaubert 1979; 1983] nor in SEG 26–33. See also the list in Liebenam 1900, p556–8.

[241] IG 14.1020.

[242] IG 3.1280a. Braunstein 1911, p55–6 thought that this title applied to a woman, Matrona, in this long inscription which includes many names. However it reads "Τυχαρὼ Φίλωνος ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν στεφανηφόρος Ματρώνα ἱέρεια Αφροδείτης ..." In the inscription, titles are consistently given after the names. Here the title stephanephoros applies to the man above – T. Philonos; Matrona is the priestess of Aphrodites. The title is also found in some writers, for example Dionysius Halicarnassus; see Liddell and Scott, p1642.

[243] Magie 1950, p653.

[244] Magie 1950, p653; see also p167.

[245] Jones 1940, p234; Harris 1976, 75–76; Liebenam 1900, p373–4; Chapot 1904, p276.

[246] Braunstein 1911, p35–6.

[247] Magie 1950, p1523 n57.

[248] Robert BE 1956, p152 no 213; BE 1972, p498 n522; Robert 1960b, p598 no 3.

[249] See IGR IV.1183.1542; this is noted by Liebenam 1900, p374.

[250] See Paris 1885 p338–9; Foucart 1887 p101–4; Radet 1887, p478–9; CIG 3489.

[251] Jones 1940, p234.

[252] Clerc 1886, p410–11; see also CIG 3508 from Thyatira in which a woman was agonothetis three times. Also note that Pomeroy [1982, p118–9] argues that the involvement of nude male athletes in an event would not necessarily have been a deterent to women being present at competitions, and by implication to women being active as agononthetes.

[253] Braunstein 1911, p37 and L'Institut Fernand Courby 1972–1975; Marcillet-Jaubert 1979; 1983; Liebenam 1900, p542–5.

[254] See CIG 1444; Braunstein 1911, p36–7.

[255] Braunstein 1911, p36. If a woman had held this liturgy in Sparta, it would not be surprising because women seem to have been freer and richer in Sparta than in some other places; see Pomeroy 1975, p35–9, 130; Swidler 1976, p8. Note that one of the women who held the title of agonothete was Julia Severa from Acmonia; see note 113.

[256] Magie 1950 p1382 n35; Liebenam 1900, p554.

[257] Magie 1950, p511; Jones 1940 p174; Robert BE 1972, p427–8 notes that the title was eponymous only in Cyzicus.

[258] Jones 1940, p174.

[259] Magie 1950, p511.

[260] Magie 1950, p839, n24.

[261] See Braunstein 1911, p57.

[262] Magie 1950, p511; see also Sève 1981, p193 and n12.

[263] Braunstein 1911, p57.

[264] Robert BE 1972, p427–8 no287.

[265] See CIG 3665=IGR IV.154.

[266] See Mordtmann 1881, no 4,10; Robert BE 1972, no 287.

[267] Jones 1940, p226.

[268] Jones 1940, p226; Magie 1950, p63; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p77.

[269] Jones 1940, p353 n31; Magie 1950, p63; Braunstein 1911, p51; Levy 1895, p231–50; Ramsay 1895a, p110–114; Liebenam 1900, p565–6.

[270] See Paris 1883, p452–6; Ramsay 1897, p602–3 no 475; Braunstein 1911, p50–51; Magie 1950, p859 n38; IGR IV.690.

[271] Paris 1883 p452. Levy 1895, p242 thought the title was honorific, but does not state why this should be so. There seems no reason why it should be honorific apart from the presupposition that women could not be involved in the gerousia.

[272] Robert 1954, p174 n67.

[273] Robert 1954, p174–5.

[274] Robert 1954, p175 and n3.

[275] See Braunstein 1911, p57; IG 12,7.409.

[276] Magie 1950, p649 writes that no woman "seems to have held such an office as that of councillor, strategos, agoranomos or treasurer, the duties of which were presumably regarded as requiring the services of men". However, he has overlooked this one case of a woman strategos. This seems to be an exceptional case however.

[277] See Liddell and Scott, p1297; Magie 1950, p653, p1522 n57.

[278] See Braunstein 1911, p38; Chapot 1904, p275–6.

[279] CIG 2653.

[280] Braunstein 1911, p38.

[281] Abbott and Johnson 1926, p162–76.

[282] See Magie 1950, p1601–1612.

[283] See Magie 1950, p1388–9; Jameson 1980, p843–4.

[284] See Jameson 1980, p844–5; Probably the Lyciarch and archiereus were not identical although this is much debated. See Jameson 1980, p845–7; Magie 1950, p1389.

[285] See Magie 1950 p1611–2 for references; see also Taylor 1933, p259.

[286] Braunstein 1911, p45.

[287] Jameson 1980, p847.

[288] See Jameson 1980, p847–8. This is definitely the first marriage for M. Aurelia Chrysion Nemesa and not the second [with the wife carrying over the title from the first marriage] as some scholars have argued in an attempt to explain away the title. See IGR III,583,584; Magie 1950, p1612. In IGR III,592 the unmarried archiereia's father has no title and she is described as "ἀρχιερατεύσασαν τῶν Σεβαστῶν" "which suggests perhaps that she actually did hold the office." [Jameson 1980, p848.]

[289] See Magie 1950 p449–50. Taylor 1933 p256 gives an alternative explanation.

[290] See IGR IV,1481; Chapot 1904, p470 n4 thought there was a stone cutter's error and that the wife had been high priestess rather than Asiarch. Twenty three women also received the title of archiereia of Asia, see Magie 1950 p1603; it is possible that they received this title from their husbands who are often known to have been archiereus of Asia. [See Magie 1950 p1300 n61; Taylor 1933 p259.] This does not mean however, that the high–priestess did not have a part to play, along with her husband, in the cult.

[291] IGR III.97. See Magie 1950, p1608; Braunstein 1911, p46–7. Likewise in Macedonia, "the wife of a Macedoniarch became high–priestess, or she was Macedoniarchissa, her husband high–priest." [MacMullen 1980, p214.]

[292] Two women in Asia Minor received the title οἰκονόμισσα – women stewards of estates; see Robert 1965, p106–8 who argues that the women concerned actively fulfilled this role. I have not included in the text the title ἄρχων because it occurs only in the coastal islands and once in Histria. ἄρχων generally designates a magistracy of some sort in keeping with the basic meaning of the term. [See

Liddell and Scott, p254; Magie 1950, p1509 n37.] Roman officials used the term to designate city magistrates in Asia Minor, although sometimes the people so addressed called themselves by different titles such as prytaneis or strategoi [see Magie 1950, p644]. In nine inscriptions we find women with the title ἄρχων or its feminine equivalent of ἀρχίς [See Braunstein p42 for six ἀρχίς from Tenos; for one from Syros see IG XII.5.688=Pleket 1981a, no 23; one from Thasos in Robert BE 1960 p189, n322; one from Histria, Pleket 1981a, no 2.] In his treatment of "Archontät", Braunstein [1911, p42–5] includes both those with the title ἄρχων as above and those who are called ἀρχείνη [IG XII,5,655=Pleket 1981a, no 25 from Syros] ἀρχεῖτιν [IG XII.8.526 from Thasos; on which see Séve 1981, p191–3] and ἀρχηίδος [BCH 20, p719 from Delphi] all of which can be alternative titles for "priestess" and which are probably therefore not relevant to our enquiry here. A woman may have held the influential position of γραμματεύς at Tralles; see Sterrett 1888, no 390; Magie 1950, p1519 n50. Unfortunately the stone is fragmentary and we cannot be certain that the women named – Aurlia Euphrosune – actually held the office mentioned on the next line because we do not know the line length. That the office is attributed to her is the most likely possibility however. MacMullen [1980, p213, see below] attributes this office to a woman at Tralles on the basis of numismatic evidence. Magie [1950, p645] describes the clerk during the Roman period as "the most important of the individual officials" in the city's administration. The clerk was responsible for many of the details of the administration of the city, such as storing and publishing records, the distribution of money, management of income, erecting statues and presenting, along with magisterial boards, resolutions to the Assembly. [See Magie 1950, p645, cf. p60; Levy 1899, p267; Ramsay 1895a, p66–7; Jones 1940, p238–9.] For a woman *consularem* in Pisidia see Robert BE 1973 p183 n473. Plutarch, [See Moralia III, 263c cf. 257e; see also Tetlow 1980, p11] described a woman in Phrygia who administered the government of her city state and did so "excellently".

I have not examined here the evidence about women in Asia Minor which comes from coins, apart from that included by Braunstein. MacMullen [1980, p213] summarizes the results of Harl's Yale Dissertation in the following way:

> What sort of posts did women hold and in what proportion to men? He [Harl] produces 17 women in 13 cities where 214 men are also named on coins. The larger the city [Pergamon, Tralles, Laodicea, Smyrna], the fewer the women relative to the men... As to the positions held, they are of the highest that municipal politics afforded: stephanephoros at Attuda for instance... Other notables: Secunda, prytaneus of Cymae; Pedia Secund, epimeletes of Eucarpia; Flavia Asclepia, strategos of Germe; Cosconia of Smyrna, Stephanephoros and daughter of the populace; Marcia Aurelia Glaucia, grammateus of Tralles and so forth. It should be pointed out that, despite local variations in title, these are all eponymous magistracies, giving a date to each year, representing the city to the world and so constituting the very top of the whole pyramid of offices.

Thus the evidence from coins complements our findings here.

[293] We have found one gymnasiarch in Egypt and another in Cyrene, one agonothete in Sparta, one archon in Histria and another on Thasos [see note 292]; two women were honoured by the gerousia [one as "president" (?)], one in Thessalonica, the other on Thasos.

[294] Ramsay 1904b, p67. See also p161, 457, 403, 415; and Ramsay 1906a, p137,

186–8.

[295] Delling 1931, p10. Liebenam [1900, p285] also thought women actively fulfilled these roles. He notes "wie häufig das weibliche Geschlecht sur Mitarbeit an kommunalen Angelegenheiten berufen wurde ..." See also Braunstein 1911, p64f; Casarico 1982, p123.

[296] Asia Minior itself was not a unity. Elliot [1981, p61] writes:

> This diverse topography reinforced and was paralleled by a diversity of peoples and cultures marked by different origins, ethnic roots, languages, customs, religions and political histories. What D. Magie said of the province of Galatia is in general applicable to all these provinces taken together; it is "a fantastic conglomeration of territ ories" whose inhabitants "were as varied as the districts of which the province was composed."

[297] See Jones 1940, p168; MacMullen 1980, p216; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p86–7,142–3; Sheppard 1975, p58; van Bremen 1983, p233.

[298] Marshall 1975a, p125.

[299] On the general economic activity of women see van Bremen 1983, p223–243; Mohler 1932, p114,116; Parvey 1974, p119; Pomeroy 1975, p130–1,162–3,198–9; MacMullen 1980 p210–211; Clark 1981, p206.

[300] We should note that from the third century onwards the holding of municipal office became a burden to be avoided because of the heavy financial cost involved. Different classes of people then sought and gained immunity from holding office; see Chapter 9, section 3.3. It might therefore be argued that just as Jews were permitted to hold city office by Severus and Caracalla, so too women were now included in the expanded group of those called upon to serve in this way. This would suggest that the evidence for women holding office shows them carrying a burden rather than the receiving honour. For this view see Jones 1940, p175; see also van Bremen 1983, p226. We should however note two facets of the evidence. Firstly, we know of a number of women who held office well before the third century CE. It would be difficult to argue that in the first century BCE or the first century CE the women who held office did so because they were the only ones willing to serve. Secondly, I argue in Chapter 9, section 3.3 that although people sought to evade office in the third century CE the holding of office still bestowed prestige. Thus, office holders continued to recieve rewards for their public–spiritedness, such as inscriptions which praised their efforts.

[301] See a similar explanation in Ramsay 1904b, p66; 1906a, p187; Kraabel 1968, p49–50.

[302] CIG 3150; CIG 3173=IGR IV.1393b [the same woman is mentioned as Stephanephoros in 83 CE in a coin given in Head 1893, p250 no 132]; Petzl 1982, p65–6, no 201.

[303] LBW 5.

[304] CIG 3415=IGR IV,1325.

[305] Reinach 1906, p241–3 no 141.

[306] See Reinach 1906, p241f.

[307] See Braunstein 1911, p53.

[308] See Pomeroy 1975, px. We have some lyric poetry written by women.

[309] See Henry 1979, p39–40; Clark 1982, p256.

[310] See Irvin 1980, p76; Cohen 1980, p24.

[311] See Chapter 1, section 5.2.2.

[312] See Chapter 4, section 6 and Appendix 1. Kittel 1944, p11 has other examples of the chance nature of inscriptional evidence.

[313] We thus have another instance which illustrates Kraabel's argument [see Kraabel 1981a, especially p79,87–8] that the kind of Judaism at each centre he studied was heavily influenced by the local situation. He does not, however, mention the prominence of women in this article. We have not discussed in this chapter the age of the Jewish communities we have been considering. We know that around 205 BCE Antiochus III transported 2000 Jewish families from Parthia to centres in Lydia and Phrygia [Ant 12.147–53; and see Chapter 1, section 2.] There may have been settlements around the southern coast by the mid–second century BCE [see 1 Macc 15:23; Smallwood 1981, p121]. By the first century BCE we know of Jewish communities in a number of settlements from the evidence of Josephus, Philo, and Cicero [see Chapter 1.] Thus the communities in view here had probably been established long enough for them to have been influenced by the local [positive] attitudes towards women.

[314] See particularly Chapter 9, section 3.5.

[315] We can note here that various Christian communities in Asia Minor accorded a prominent place to women; note particularly the leading role played by women in Montanism and the importance of Thecla in *The Acts of Paul and Thecla.* See more generally Fiorenza 1983, p245–250. Although this area is beyond the confines of our study, we can note that it seems likely that the practice of the environment affected Christian communities in this regard as it had the synagogues before them. This suggestion seems to be confirmed by the fact that women did not play a significant role in Montanism in North Africa.

Chapter 6.

[1] See New Docs 1976, p25 for a statement of the problem.

[2] Cumont 1906, p73; 1913, p67–68; 1929, p99.

[3] Cumont 1897, p6–7; 1916, col 446–448; 1929, p99–103; Nilsson 1950, p637.

[4] The Noah coins from Apamea are often taken as additional evidence for syncretism here; see for example Cumont 1897, p6 and n5; Nilsson 1950, p637 n1. However, whilst they show the influence of the Jewish community in one city, it is noticeable that this influence served to introduce *Jewish* figures as "heroes" of the city. The coins do not show that the Jewish community was syncretistic.

[5] See for example Cumont 1929, p100–101; and Nilsson 1950, p639; Widengren 1961, p64.

[6] See for example Nilsson 1950, p636–640; and Hengel 1974, 1, p263. See also the comments in Lane 1979, p35; Tatscheva–Hitova 1977, p297–300; Kraabel 1983, p185.

[7] See Schürer 1897, p214; Cook 1925, II, ii, p889; Robert 1958a, p118–119; Nilsson 1963, p106–115; Smallwood 1970, p241; Tatscheva–Hitova 1978, p1228; Simon 1981a, p498; 1981b, col 1069. This trend should more correctly be called a trend towards henotheism – worship of one god amongst others, as the supreme god; see Nock 1936, p65. We should also note that it was only a 'trend' and that polytheism was still very much a reality. However, Krill [1978, p41] writes that by the reign of Severus Alexander [222–235 CE] "individual cults came to be regarded [under Neo–Pythagorean and Neo–Platonic influence] as expressions of a truth proper to all religions. Each was but a different version of a single supreme god."

[8] See Bickerman 1958, p154–158 and the examples given there.

[9] See especially Cook 1925, II, ii, p868–890; Nock 1936, p56–59. Robert 1958a, p112–121 notes a tendency towards anonymity of the divinity which increased the usage of epithets like "Hypsistos" [in place of a name like Zeus] and "Megas".

[10] Nock 1936, p55; Nilsson 1963, p116; Aupert and Masson 1979, p380.

[11] See Nock 1936, p59. For a list of inscriptions mentioning Zeus Hypsistos or Theos Hypsistos see Cook 1925, II ii, p876–890, summarized in Nock 1936, p56–59. See additions in Cook 1940, III, ii, p1162–1164; see also Kraabel 1969, p88–91; Cormack 1974, p51–5; Tatscheva–Hitova 1977, p274–90; 1983, p190–215; Peppers 1980, p173–5. We should also note here that, in keeping with the process of identification of indigenous deities with gods of the Greek pantheon, many local deities were given the name Zeus, and thus 'Zeus Hypsistos', along with other local epithets; see Nock 1936, p71–72; Simon 1981a, p495. For literary references to Zeus Hypsistos see Schürer 1897, p209; Cumont 1897, p2 n1; Bertram TDNT, 8, p614–615.

[12] Nock 1936, p55–6; see also Cook 1925, II ii, p876–877; Bruneau 1970, p487.

[13] 'Theos Hypsistos' in dedications is sometimes identified as Zeus by the depiction of an eagle, one of the common symbols for Zeus; see Cook 1925, II ii, p882; examples of this include dedications from Athens, Lesbos and Thyatira;

see Schürer 1897, p212–214.

[14] Schürer 1897, p214.

[15] Nock 1936, p59. The native Greek cult to 'Zeus Hypsistos' is first known in Macedonia in the first half of the second century BCE; see Nock 1936, p60–61. We should also note here that Hypsistos does not occur in the ancient list of epithets of Zeus given by Aristides, or in other such ancient lists. The epithet also ceased to be used in literary works at an early stage; see Nock 1936, p64; Simon 1981a, p495. That it was not an ancient epithet of Zeus led some scholars, along with other considerations, to look for the origin of its use for Zeus among Semitic cults. On this see section 4.

[16] Nock 1936, p61.

[17] Nock [1936, p59] recalls that from the Hellenistic period "Zeus was at times almost a descriptive term meaning 'chief god' rather than the personal name of a traditional Greek divine character."

[18] We have a series of inscriptions from Palmyra in Syria in which 'Zeus Hypsistos', here the local Baal, is treated in a way that comes close to monotheism; see Schürer 1897, p214; Cook 1925, II ii, p885–886; Seyrig 1933, p248–52.

[19] Nock 1936, p62–63; Robert 1958a, p119 n60.

[20] See New Docs 1976, p28 and the references given there.

[21] Other deities include Sabazios, Men, Attis, Poseidon, Eshmun, Eshmun–Melkart and perhaps Helios; See on this Cumont 1897, p1 n2, 3 n1; 1929, p99; Cook 1925, II ii, p889; Gressmann 1925, p18–19; Colpe 1967, col 1291–1292; Hall 1978, p265; Tacheva–Hitova 1983, p212–5. For a recently discovered pagan inscription of interest containing "Theos Hypsistos" see New Docs 1977 no 12. In view of the widespread usage of Hypsistos the following comment in Arndt and Gingrich, p850 is misleading: "'God Most High' belongs above all to the religious speech of the Jews." Often in inscriptions it is impossible to tell which pagan deity is meant, for example see a dedication to 'Theos Hypsistos' in Robert 1937b, p287–288; and similarly the dedication in Robert 1958a, p112–119. At times the deity is seen to be rather remote, and thus does not have any other name. Kraabel compares 'Hypsistos' with the epithet ἐπήκοος, 'who listens to prayer', which is regularly applied to a number of deities in inscriptions; see Kraabel 1968, p107–108; 1969, p93 n49. Hypsistos is fundamentally different from 'epēkoos' however, in that it does occur as a name for various gods – 'Zeus Hypsistos' is called simply 'Hypsistos' at Athens, Yahweh is called 'Hypsistos' – and thus it is not simply an attribute of a whole range of deities [although Hypsistos is this as well]. On the epithet "epēkoos" see Avi–Yonah 1959, p5–7; Versnel 1981, p34–37; and CIJ 1432.

[22] See Bertram, TDNT 8, p617; Schürer 1897, p214–215.

[23] Hypsistos also occurs in some different combinations, sometimes without the article. See Gen 14:22; Esther 8:13; III Macc 6:2; I Es 9:46; Si 16:5, 47:8, 50:14,15. The various forms of course generally reflect the Hebrew text, although in Ben Sirach Hypsistos is used to translate 'El', Yahweh or other Hebrew terms; Bertram TDNT 8, p618. On its use in the LXX in general see Schürer 1897, p214–215; Simon 1981a, p496–502. On the interesting usage in Daniel and Sibylline Oracles see Simon 1981a, p496–7.

[24] See Sib Or 2:177,245 [which show the use of the title in Judaism in Asia Minor] 3:519,574,580,719. LAE 15:3; 28:1; TAb 9:2,3,8; 14:9; PhEPoet in Eusebius PE 9,24,1.; EzekTrag in Eusebius PE 9,29.14.; The Fragment of Aeschylus line 15. 'Hypsistos' also occurs in the Greek portions of 1 Enoch in 9:3, 10:1, 98:7, 99:3,10, 100:4, 101:1,6. The equivalent term occurs elsewhere in 1 Enoch in the Hebrew or Aramaic text; see for example 1 Enoch 46:7, 94:8.

[25] Text from De Jonge 1978, p140; See also TSim 2:5, 6:7; TLevi 3:10, 4:1,2, 5:1,7, 16:3, 18:7; TJud 24:4; TIss 2:5; TNaph 2:3; TGad 3:1, 5:4; TAsh 2:6,7:2; TJos 1:4,6, 3:10, 9:3, 10:3; TBenj 4:5, 9:2.

[26] JosAsen 17:5; see also 8:10, 14:7, 15:7 [twice], 23:10; cf. 9:1.

[27] See also 21:3,4.

[28] See Charlesworth 1, p521. For example "altissmus" occurs 68 times in 4 Ezra. On the usage of equivalent terms elsewhere see Hengel 1974, 2, p199 n261; Charlesworth 2, p729 and Index. For further references to Hypsistos or its equivalents see Strack – Billerbeck 1924, 2, p99–100.

[29] See L.A. III,24; Post. 89; Plant. 59; Ebr. 105; Cong. 58; Mut. 202.

[30] See Gen 14:18, Note that Philo drops "Theos" from the LXX [ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου], perhaps because the text as it stands would suggest that one God amongst others was being refered to. He leaves "Hypsistos" as the name for God, which is not open to a syncretistic interpretation to the same degree. On this passage in Philo see Simon 1981a, p499–500.

[31] Leg. 157,317.

[32] Schürer 1897, p216.

[33] See Nock 1936, p67 n74; Hengel 1974, 2, p201 n265; [cf. 1975a, p37 n43] Celsus and Julian both used 'Theos Hypsistos' to refer to the Jewish God; references in Cumont 1916, col 446. Both of these authors were familiar with biblical usage and are thus not evidence that 'Theos Hypsistos' was an official Roman designation for Yahweh; see Nock 1936, p66–67.

[34] Ant 16:163.

[35] It occurs nine times in the NT as a name for God; see Bertram TDNT, 8, p619–620; Simon 1981a, p502–503. On the very limited use of Hypsistos in Early Christian writings see Simon 1981a, p503–508; and for example 1 Clem 29:2 [quoting Deut 32:8], 45:7, 52:3 [quoting Ps 50:14]. Christian inscriptions occasionally use Hypsistos of God; see for example New Docs 1978 no 76, p89; improved by Robert BE 1979, no 363.

[36] Cumont 1911, p227 n30. Similarly in Cumont 1929, p99 he wrote "En Asia Mineure, 'Hypsistos' est l'appellation qu'on employait pour designer le dieu d'Israel." See also Cumont 1912, p165. Others have accepted his view; see Keil 1923, p263; Laumonier 1934, p337; Nilsson 1963, p111; Pouilloux 1976, p151; Fellmann 1981, p319.

[37] Unfortunately the equation that Θεός Ὕψιστος is always equivalent to Yahweh has found its way into some reference works. Thus *IGR* describes Θεος Υψιστος as 'Deus Judaeorum' in two inscriptions, one from Mytilene, Lesbos, and the other from Nacolea, Phrygia. [IGR IV.47,542] Cumont is taken as the authority

for this identification. In the case of the inscription from Lesbos, Cook [1925 II,ii, p882] showed that it was Zeus who was meant. [but cf. *IGR* IV.1176,1606 etc.]

[38] Nilsson 1950, p637.

[39] Nilsson 1950, p637; see also 1960a, p180.

[40] Such a relationship would be very unlikely in any case. Whilst we know that Yahweh was identified with other gods by some Jews [for example with Zeus Olympius by the "Hellenists" in 167BCE; see Hengel 1974, 1, p287; and with Zeus or Jove in the Letter of Aristeas 16] this occurred very rarely, as far as we know. It is most unlikely that on private dedications or inscriptions practising Jews would call Yahweh "Zeus Hypsistos", or any other god for that matter. That the eighty inscriptions from the Sardis synagogue contain no dedications to any pagan god, and no signs of syncretism seems to be strong evidence against any such identification. We need positive evidence from Asia Minor to suggest that Jews worshipped a pagan god, and this is lacking. See Kraabel 1978, p13–33; Johnson 1984, p1607. Note however, that if a pagan were to call Yahweh "Zeus Hypsistos" in a [clearly pagan] dedication we would, of course, never know that this was who was meant.

[41] Anderson 1906, p211. Note the apologetic motive here. [For this see also Cumont 1897, p8; Cook 1925, II,ii, p889–890.] On Jewish influence as the main cause for the popularity of 'Theos Hypsistos' as a title see Schürer 1897, p217 [but see also p214]; Cumont 1906, p73 where he described 'Zeus Hypsistos' as a 'Judaizing Zeus'; Keil 1923, p263; Clemen 1924, p60; Cook 1925, II,ii, p889; Kittel 1944, col 16; Wilson 1958, p13; Safrai and Stern 1974, p157; 1976, p712; Sanie 1978, p1108,1111–1112; In this regard, Kraabel [1968, p87] rightly pointed out that "the assumed connection between υψιστος and Diaspora Judaism is a commonplace of our discipline." See also the review in Tatscheva-Hitova 1977, p271–4. Sheppard [1980–81, p94] has recently sought to modify the basic "Jewish influence" theory. He writes [in reaction to Kraabel 1969, p81–93]:

> I should prefer to see at least the Lydian and Phrygian Theos Hypsistos inscriptions as a further example of the borrowing of half-understood Jewish terms by pagans.

Thus, according to Sheppard, pagans [mis-]appropriated borrowed Jewish language, but the factor behind the pagan use of the term was still the Jewish use of Hypsistos. We will see below that the pagan use of the term can be satisfactorily explained from within paganism.

[42] See Nock 1936, p66–67. Cook 1925, II,ii, p890 writes: "Hypsistos was a title that any honest man could use with a clear conscience."

[43] A number of scholars have thought that the epithet 'Hypsistos' did not necessarily imply Jewish influence. Thus see Nock 1936, p64–69; Robert 1958a, p119 and n60; Lifshitz 1964, p160; Kraabel 1968, p87–93; Johnson 1968, p548; 1984, p1606–1607; Pippidi 1974, p265; Carrington 1976, p185–6; Drew-Bear 1976, p248; 1978, p42; Sherwin-White 1976, p187; New Docs 1976, p26; Lane 1976, 3, p94; Tatscheva-Hitova 1977, p292,295–300; 1983, p203–4,211–5; Bernard 1983, p111.

[44] See for example Hall 1978, p267.

[45] Robert 1958a, p118–119; see also OMS II, 1969, p1359; 1971, p617. For

a pagan dedication to "Θεῷ Ὑψίστῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ Θεῷ Ἐπιφανεῖ" which also shows that the title "Theos Hypsistos" was part of the trend involving the popularity of abstract divine titles, see Robert 1958a, p111–120. On "Hosios and Dikaios", and other similar divine titles, see Cumont 1896, II, p172 no 548; Korte 1900, p431–4; Buckler, Calder and Cox 1925, p161–162 no 150; Nock 1936, p68; Robert, 1946, p59 n2; 1955, p95–96,106–107; 1960b, p438; 1962, p387 n2; OMS II, 1969, p1358–1360 and plate 27; BE 1972, no 468; 1978a, p268–269; Kraabel 1968, p83; Carrington 1976, p315–20, who gives a list of monuments on p321-323; Drew-Bear 1976, p249,262–264 and especially n68; 1978, p41 no 8; Petzl 1978b, p268 no 14; Pleket 1981b, p188–189; Sheppard 1980–81, p87–92. Related to this popularity of abstract notions of divinity is the series of "confession inscriptions" in which the dedicator confesses to some deed done against the deity. See Nock 1936, p66–67; Drew-Bear 1976, p260–265; This is one aspect of what has been called "the Lydian–Phrygian mentality", which involved remote deities and a strict piety and ethics; see Kraabel 1968, p82–84; 1978, p26–27; Nock 1972, p65–67; Pleket 1981b, p156, 178–181.

[46] See Pleket 1981b, p188–189, who comments that despite "Justice" playing an important role in Jewish piety, it would be unwise to attribute the prominence of "Justice" to Jewish influence. He favours the theory of independent development rather than borrowing. Cf. Robert 1978a, p268; Sheppard 1980–81, p98.

[47] See Robert 1958a, p120–122 [and the references given there]; 1971, p613–4; Sokolowski 1960, p226; Johnson 1968, p548–549; Kraabel 1969, p83–84; Sheppard 1980–81, p77–101. Some of the inscriptions are dedications to Zeus Hypsistos.

[48] Carrington 1976, p315–6; Sheppard 1980–81, p77–101 argues that although one cannot speak of Jewish influence in the case of this group of inscriptions which mention "angels", they can best be explained as the borrowing from Judaism of religious terminology which remained largely misunderstood.

[49] It is noticeable that this local trend was not recognised by early scholars in this field such as Cumont. They sought a local factor to explain the frequency of the occurrence of the epithet Hypsistos and fastened upon Jewish influence. The popularity of abstract divine titles is a far more convincing explanation.

[50] See in this regard Plassart 1914, p529–530; Kraabel 1968, p97. A sufficient indication that a "Theos Hypsistos" inscription is pagan would be the occurrence of a dedication to Zeus Hypsistos in the area. In this case "Theos Hypsistos" would probably be another name for Zeus; see Aupert and Masson 1979, p382 n70.

[51] Kraabel 1969, p81–93 restricted himself solely to inscriptions from Western Asia Minor and thus failed to give a complete rounded picture of the use of the title.

[52] CPJ III, 1433.

[53] CPJ III, 1443. See also Schürer 1897, p216; Cook 1925, II ii, p889; Schepelern 1929, p191 n359.

[54] Bernard 1983, p107–111; now in SEG 33.1326; unknown to Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986. Some have thought that an inscription from the Fayŭm in Egypt which begins Θεῶι μεγάλῳ μεγάλῳ ὑψίστῳ, [CPJ 1532] was Jewish; see Ruben-

sohn 1913, p163 no 10; Frey CIJ 2, p440. However, the expression μεγαλω μεγαλω is used in Egyptian cults and thus is almost certainly not Jewish; see CPJ III, p164.

[55] Texts in Deissmann 1965, p414–415; he describes the stones fully and summarizes the debate about them, p413–424; see also Plassart 1914, p532–533; Cumont 1916, col 446–447; New Docs 1976, p29; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p70.

[56] See Plassart 1914, p532; for a discussion of the dating of the building see Bruneau 1970, p491–3; 1982, p495–9.

[57] Text in CIJ 726; First century BCE. This inscription was found in a nearby building, but probably came originally from the synagogue; see Bruneau 1982, p499–502.

[58] Text in CIJ 727; First – second century CE.

[59] Text in CIJ 728; First century BCE.

[60] Text in CIJ 729; First century BCE.

[61] Text in CIJ 730; First – second century CE. For the texts of these inscriptions see also Plassart 1914, p526–528; Lifshitz 1967, no 3–7; Bruneau 1970, p484 [where the dates given above can be found].

[62] See Plassart 1914, p523–534, for the case put forward originally that the building was a synagogue. This was originally challenged by Mazur 1935, p15–24.

[63] The evidence of the Rheneia inscriptions was taken to be very important by Lifshitz [1967, p16], even before the work of Bruneau. Sukenik 1949, p21–22 does not mention the Rheneia inscriptions in deciding that the building was not a synagogue; nor does Shanks 1979, p44, yet they are a vital part of the evidence.

[64] On Zeus Hypsistos on Delos see Bruneau 1970, p240–241; Cook 1940, III ii, p1162. On the sanctuary on Mt Cynthus see Bruneau and Ducat 1965, p150–2. The sanctuary is dated not before the first century BCE; even if it was built after the synagogue it is unlikely that both sanctuaries were for "Zeus Hypsistos", who was probably a local Baal rather than the Greek Zeus.

[65] See Mazur 1935, p21; see also Wischnitzer 1964, p11. Plassart 1914, p529–530, thought it meant "in the synagogue". The phrase occurs in one of the new Samaritian inscriptions from Delos; see Bruneau 1982, p474–5, who notes that it is the equivalent of εὐχή.

[66] Robert 1958b, p44 n7; see also Nock 1936, p65; Bruneau 1970, p475,488; 1982, p499; Lifshitz 1967, p16; SEG 32.810; Robert BE 1983, no 281, who writes of 'the exclusive Jewish use of the term proseuche'. cf. Sukenik 1949, p21–2 who thought that because προσευχή probably did not mean 'synagogue' here, the inscriptions were therefore not Jewish; see also Wischnitzer 1964, p11; Shanks 1979, p44. and note 83 below. One pagan inscription does use the term proseuche to mean house of prayer, but this is probably because of Jewish influence; see Sheppard 1980–81, p96; Robert OMS 1969, p1611; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p440 n61. The term is also found in later Christian sources; see Gutmann 1975, pxxv note 5.

[67] See Bruneau 1982, p490–1. We would not expect any Jewish symbols at this early date; see Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p73.

[68] Mazur [1935, p21] and others have argued that the lead on top of the columns on which the inscriptions were written was used to attach representations of parts of the body which had been healed by 'Theos Hypsistos'. This was a pagan practice which showed that the building was not a synagogue. [See on this Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p71–5; 13, p215.] However, Bruneau points out that in the sanctuary of Zeus in Athens [to which Mazur [1935, p21] refers] a *plaque* always carries the dedication with an *engraved image* of the healed organ. He argues that it would be very peculiar to have a representation of the healed organ on a quadrangular column such as the ones found in Delos. [see Bruneau 1970, p487; Shanks 1979, p178 n13 is thus incorrect in thinking that Bruneau was unaware of the lead on the top of the columns. See the critical comments on Shank's work in Bruneau 1982, p494–495; Robert BE 1983, no 281.] Further, we may note that we can but guess at what was on the top of the columns, if anything at all. It may have been a menorah or another Jewish symbol. Thus, the positive points made in the text for the building being a synagogue are more compelling than speculation about what was on the columns. Cf. Sukenik 1949, p22 who is sure that figures were fastened on to the columns; see also Wischnitzer 1964, p11.

We should also note that a number of small lamps, decorated with pagan designs such as a figure of Minerva and a bust of Jupiter, were found in the building. [See Plassart 1914, p531–532]. Mazur [1935, p15f] thought these lamps were significant; see also Bruneau 1970, p492; Shanks 1979, p44. It is to be noted that Mazur wrote in 1935, before the work of Goodenough, or the excavations at Sardis. It is now extremely difficult to say that a certain object with an apparently pagan design could not have been used by Jews. Further, after Goodenough's work, one can well understand that Jews could disregard 'pagan symbols' on lamps, or chose to interpret them as something amenable to Judaism, particularly if they were the only lamps available.

[69] That the building was a synagogue has been accepted recently by Plassart 1973, p12; Hengel 1974, 2, p201 n265; Sherwin–White 1976, p188; Horsley in New Docs 1976, p27; Aupert and Masson 1978, p381; Kunzl 1981, p464; Levine 1981, p166; Kraabel 1978, p17; 1979a, p491–4; 1984, p44–46; 1985, p220–224; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p70–71; Kant 1987, p707–8. Those who accepted it as a synagogue before Bruneau's work include Kittel 1944, col 16; Frey in CIJ 726–731; Goodenough 1956–57, p224; Lifshitz 1967, p16; see also Bruneau and Ducat 1965, p127. Gutmann 1975, pxi and Safrai and Stern 1976, p706 n7 are uncertain. Two Samaritan inscriptions (one probably to be dated in the first half of the second century BCE, the other between 150 and 50 BCE) have been discovered recently 100 yards from the synagogue. However, the evidence from Josephus [Ant 14:213–6; 231–2; cf 1 Macc 15:15–24] and the care taken to define the Samaritan group in the inscriptions make it likely that the synagogue under discussion here is Jewish rather than Samaritan. On these inscriptions see Bruneau 1982, p465–88; Kraabel 1984, p44–46; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p70–71.

[70] Literary evidence for the Jewish community on Cos includes 1 Macc 15:16–24; Ant 14:112–113; see Sherwin–White 1976, p183–185,187–8; 1978, p138,249–250.

[71] Paton and Hick, 1891, no 63; Sherwin–White 1976, p187; 1978, p458; to be dated in the first or second century CE. The name Theanus is only found in this inscription on Cos; see Sherwin–White 1978, p458.

[72] Zeus Megistus is known, but there is no evidence for a cult of Zeus Hypsistos on Cos, and no reason to associate 'Theos Hypsistos' with Zeus Megistus. See Sherwin–White 1976, p187 n18.

[73] See note 70.

[74] Sherwin–White 1976, p188; see also Robert BE 1977, no 332; SEG 26, no 949; Horsley in New Docs 1976, p25–26, who wonders if Theanus was a 'God–fearer'; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p69.

[75] See Chapter 3 section 5.1.2.

[76] See Chapter 3 note 207.

[77] Kraabel [1968, p88] notes the very deliberate arrangement of articles, noun and adjective in the inscription, which is unparalleled in other Anatolian Hypsistos texts. He writes [Kraabel 1968, p92]:

> the phrasing is deliberate, surely self–conscious; the dedicant seems to be asserting that in the face of all the deities given the title ὕψιστος, his god, the God of the Jews, is in fact *the highest god* .

This is not always the case with Jewish inscriptions which use Theos Hypsistos however.

[78] Text in Drew–Bear 1976, p248; New Docs 1976, p25.

[79] Drew–Bear 1976, p248.

[80] Text in IOSPE II no 400; CIJ 690; CIRB 1123.

[81] See Schürer 1897, p204–206; Lifshitz 1964, p160–161. παντοκράτωρ θεός is found in a Sardis synagogue inscription; see Chapter 2, section 4.3. 7. However, it is also used of pagan deities such as Hermes and Isis; see Kraabel 1978, p25; Goodenough 1956–57, p221. Nock [1936, p65] writes that εὐλογητός "has no chance of being Greek". For εὐλογία in Jewish inscriptions see CIJ 1537, 1538; and on this term see Robert 1978a, p249 n47 and especially Pleket 1981b, p183–189.

[82] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p37. The following also think this is a Jewish inscription: Nilsson 1950, p637; Lifshitz 1964, p159–161; Safrai and Stern 1974, p156; Robert BE 1965, no 283; Kant 1987, p684 n81. [cf Siegert 1973, p145 n5; New Docs 1976, p27; Rajak 1985a, p259 who are uncertain.] Similar legal necessity seems to be evident in a papyri of 101CE from Apollonia in which a Jew, Soteles, in reporting the death of his son, took an oath in the name of the Emperor; see CPJ no 427. It seems the use of the formula was legally required of Soteles.

[83] Note however, that 'proseuche' does not necessarily imply a Jewish origin for the inscription; see Rajak 1985a, p259, and the inscription given in Sheppard 1980–81, p96; The inscription quoted by Sheppard seems to be the only known pagan use of the term proseuche to mean a 'place of prayer'. Robert commented on this pagan inscription:

> It seems to me difficult not to see in the use of the term προσευχή a Judaising [judaisante] influence, which is not surprising on the

coast of the Pontus. ... [Robert, OMS III, 1969, p1611, first published in RA 1936]

See also note 66 above. Schürer [1897, p204–205] argued that the inscription read ἀνέθηκεν τῆι προσευχῆι and not ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ. Thus following pagan custom, the slave was dedicated *to* the proseuche and not *in* it. This, with the pagan oath formula, led Schürer to conclude that the inscription was not Jewish but was strongly influence by Jewish ideas. However Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p37 are satisfied that the ἐν should be read in the inscription. Plassart 1914, p530 n2 thought that the inscription was probably not Jewish; see also Deissmann 1965, p321–322 Lake and Cadbury 1933, 5, p90–94.

[84] See CIJ², no 690a=CIRB 1126, dated to 67 CE; ISOPE II, no 401=CIJ I no 78*=CIRB 1125, end of second or beginning of the third century CE; and see now SEG 32.790.

[85] See IGR I no 873=Weinrich 1912, no.117.

[86] Text in Bean 1960, no 122; improved by Robert BE 1961, no 750; SEG 19.852. Artemas had probably set up other dedications, and hence is described as "the same founder".

[87] Robert BE 1965, no 412. For καταφυγὴ in the LXX see for example Ex 17:15; Ps 9:9; 17:2; 31:7; 70:3; 143:2; Jer 16:19 II Macc 10:28.

[88] For ἅγιος in the LXX see Hatch and Redpath p12–15; Robert [BE 1965, no 412] thinks that 'Holy Refuge' has been personified here.

[89] Robert refuted the view of Lifshitz [1964, p160 n6] that "Ἁγεία Καταφυγῇ" was a Greek translation of the Roman divinity "Sancta Tutela".

[90] Text in Mitchell 1982, no 209B; translation from Sheppard 1980–81, p94 no 11.

[91] See Hatch and Redpath, p1420–1421; Sheppard 1980–81, p94; cf. 5.5 above.

[92] See Ps 67:15; II Macc 3:39; III Macc 6:28; 7:6; IV Macc 4:11.

[93] Jones 1982, p268; SEG 31, no 1080; see Job 5:1; Tobit 11:14; and also Mk 8:38; Lk 9:26; Acts 10:22. cf. Sheppard 1980–81, p96.

[94] Sheppard 1980–81, p96.

[95] See notes 66 and 83 above.

[96] Sheppard 1980–81, p96–97.

[97] Robert BE 1983, no 434; see also SEG 31.1080; Kant 1987, p707–8. Mitchell [1982, p178] thinks that the word proseuche indicates a Jewish provenance; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p35 think it is 'probably Jewish'. Note also that Mitchell 1982 provides further evidence for Jews in North Galatia. See no 133; no 246; nos 509–512. See also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p35. With these known Jewish inscriptions from the area, the likelihood is increased that 5.9 and 5.10 are also Jewish.

[98] Text in Mitchell 1982, no 141.

[99] Mitchell 1982, p45. For δύναμις in the LXX see Hatch and Redpath, p350–353; TDNT 2, p290–299; and for example III Kings 18:15; IV Kings 3:14; 19:20; Ps 67:28; Wis 6:3; Sir 46:5; III Macc 7:9. See also Lk 1:35.

[100] The epithet δύναμις was applied to pagan deities, for example, to Men; see Lane 1971, I, no 83; 1976, III, p79 and n62. It is possible that Men was also called Θεός Ὕψιστος in one inscription; see Lane 1976, III, p94–5. See further in general TDNT II, p289. Thus we cannot be certain that the inscription is Jewish, although this remains the most likely possibility. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p35 think it "may be Jewish". On this inscription see also SEG 32.1263.

There are a number of other inscriptions in which the term Θεός Ὕψιστος is found but which have not been included in the text because we cannot be certain of their religious provenance. They include the following:

[a] An inscription from the Sinai; see New Docs 1976, p26; SEG 26.1697;

[b] An inscription from Thessalonica in Cook 1940, III ii, p1163 may be Jewish; see the views expressed in Plassart 1914, p529 n5; Nock 1936, p65; Colpe 1967, col 1292.

[c] Two recently published inscriptions from Aphrodisias contain no indication that they are Jews h rather than pagan; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p138–9, no 11,12. The presence of a number of Jews and God–worshippers in the city does however make the possibility of Jewish provenance quite strong.

[d] Some of the 18 inscriptions from Cyprus which mention Theos Hypsistos may be Jewish; see Aupert and Masson 1979, p380–1; Mitford 1946, p34–6. None mention Zeus; the deity may alternatively be Adonis, Melkart or a pagan healing deity. For Jews on the island see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p68.

[e] Some inscriptions have been thought to be Jewish, but later investigations have shown this to be incorrect. See for example the two inscriptions from Miletus in OGI 755,756, discussed in Nock 1936 p67 n75. Robert [1968, p594–598] showed them to be pagan because one of the people mentioned in both inscriptions was known from a third inscription to have consulted Apollo at Didymus and also to be a worshipper of Serapis. Siegert 1973, p159 n2 still thinks the inscriptions Jewish.

[101] Nock 1936, p63; cf. note 4 above.

[102] This difficulty is often admitted [see Cumont 1897, p3; Hengel 1974, 2, p200 n264] and is the root of the problem which led to the [in our view incorrect] attempts to find Jewish influence in the majority of the Hypsistos inscriptions. That such influence of Jews on Gentiles occurred is often accepted. See for example Oesterley 1935, p121,130; Kraabel 1978, p32. Cumont 1911, p62–66 rightly pointed to the magical texts in this regard. Literary evidence concerning proselytism, the number of pagans who adopted some Jewish practices and the general [though often sceptical or scornful] note that was taken of Jewish communities is important evidence here. On Jewish influence on Gentile piety see Robert 1978a, p249 n47, 268, where Robert does not exclude the possibility of the influence of Jewish vocabulary on pagan dedications using eulogia. Pleket likewise discusses eulogia/eulogein in Lydian and Phrygian inscriptions and concludes that in view of the pagan usage of these terms, they were probably not borrowed from Jewish communities, but that independent development occurred in both Judaism and pagan religions. See Pleket 1981b, p184–189.

The same word was used by different groups because:

> it was *the* non-secularized Greek word for "praise" and moreover, a term which had been used in situations of great awe and respect for the god. .... [Thus] the Jews were part of the latter tradition ["the praise of the god"] but they are not to be held responsible for the use of the word in non-Jewish circles. [Pleket 1981b, p187,189]

Pleket therefore comes to a very similar conclusion with regard to the independent use of important terms in Judaism and in paganism as we do in this chapter. Sheppard [1980-1, p77-101] with regard to some terms current in paganism argues for the misappropriation of Jewish religious language rather than real Jewish influence on pagans.

[103] Nock 1936, p67 thought that Jewish influence was sometimes a contributory factor in the use of "Hypsistos" [but was not all-important]. See also Johnson 1968, p548; OCD p536; cf. Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3.1, p169. We are not arguing against the authors cited above [note 43 above] who denied that Jewish influence was generally involved in the usage of Hypsistos. They were not arguing that Jewish influence was *never* a factor in the use of the term. Kraabel [1969, p87-93], who has rightly rejected the idea of Jewish influence in most cases, has gone too far and rejected Jewish influence completely. He discussed only the inscription given in 5.5 above, and thus did not give a rounded picture of the Jewish use of the title; see also the comments of Robert, BE 1970, no 153; also compare Kraabel 1968, p107-108. Further knowledge can also change our findings; see for example Bickerman 1958, p157 cf. New Docs 1976, p28.

The investigation of "Jewish influence" in this area has been severely hampered by the work of scholars like Cumont who drew in evidence from diverse sources, without proper regard for the geographical or historical integrity of the material, or for the distinctiveness of different cults [although of course in some cases this was limited]. Cumont thus sought to prove that "Jewish influence" had occurred in widely separated bodies of evidence. See Cumont 1897, p1-15.

[104] Text in Drew-Bear 1976, p249.

[105] It is possible, though unlikely, that they are using the name they adopted from the Jews for a pagan deity. Note that on some occasions Jews seem to have used pagan formulae; see 5.7 above. However, no Jewish usage of "Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ" is known.

[106] Drew-Bear 1976, p249, does not suggest any contact between the Jewish community and Aurelia Tatis and Onesimos. He writes that the stone "provides another instance of the interest manifested even by the humble people of Phrygia in quasi-philosophical, abstract notions of divinity." [Drew-Bear 1976, p249] In this case it seems more reasonable to suggest that the large local Jewish community was the cause of the interest in "Theos Hypsistos", who here is Yahweh. Kraemer 1986a, p198 thinks that "the dedication is as likely to be Jewish as not." She also points out that in the inscription a woman is the primary dedicator of a votive inscription. This recalls the prominent position of pagan and Jewish women in Asia Minor, on which see Chapter 5. It is possible that "Theos Hypsistos" is used in SEG 6.266 from Apamea because of the influence of the local Jewish community; cf. Kraabel 1968, p102-3.

[107] IOSPE II, no 449,450,452,456.

[108] IOSPE II, no 452,456; see Schürer 1897, p208.

[109] IOSPE II, no 445,446,447,448,453 etc.

[110] Schürer 1897, p217–9,221,225. On the name Sabbatios which occurs in these inscriptions see Tcherikover in CPJ, 3, p43–56; Kraabel 1978, p28–29.

[111] Schürer 1897, p220.

[112] Schürer 1897, p220. Drawings of some of the stones are given in Goodenough 1956–57, p234–238.

[113] On eagles in a Jewish context see Goodenough 1956–7, p228–44. On priest in Diaspora communities see most recently Brooten 1982, p95–98, p249 n73; also Goodenough 1956–57, p226–228.

[114] Goodenough 1956–57, p232–233.

[115] Goodenough 1956–57, p225–226.

[116] Schürer had originally suggested this, although his reasoning was incorrect as we have noted; see Schürer 1897, p221,225. His conclusion was accepted by Cumont 1897, p1–3; Nock 1936, p63.

[117] Bertram cites these inscriptions as "the clearest instance of the use of the Hypsistos title in syncretistic Judaism." [TDNT, 8, p619] However, these groups, whilst influenced by Judaism, seem not to belong inside the Jewish fold. They are autonomous units, which appear to have been independent of any synagogue community and to be some distance from Jewish faith and practice. These inscriptions cannot be rightly called an example of syncretistic Judaism; see also Taceva-Hitova 1978, p142; Safrai and Stern 1974, p157. For a pagan cult of Zeus Hypsistos in Palmyra which may show signs of Jewish influence, one of which was perhaps the use of the title Hypsistos, see Seyrig 1933, p248–53; TDNT VIII, p618.

[118] For a discussion of the characteristics of Sabazios, his worship, the iconography of the cult and its geographical extent see Dodds 1940, p172–6; Johnson 1968, p542–550; 1984, p1583–1601; Widengren 1961, p62–64; Picard 1961, p129–176; Carrington 1976, p158–220,309-14; Tatscheva-Hitova 1978, p1217–1230; 1983, p162–89; Lane 1980, p9–33; Fellmann 1981, p316–340. Sabazios was also associated with a number of other deities; see Lane 1980, p18–19; Johnson 1984, p1600 and for example Herrmann 1962, p50 no 45; See also the recent collection of evidence for the Sabazios cult in Vermaseren 1983 and Lane 1985. Carrington [1976, p158f] argues that the cult was of purely Thracian origin.

[119] Cook 1914, I, p390–403; Tatscheva-Hitova 1978, p1225–1228; Johnson 1978, p98–100; 1984, p1599,1602.

[120] Cumont 1897, p5–7; 1906, p63–79; 1910, p55–60; 1911, p64–65; 1929, p102–104. Cumont also [1911, p226 n24] described Sabazios as "as much Jewish as Phrygian".

[121] The connection with Asia Minor was apparently made for the following reasons:

[a] Sabazios was thought to be a Phrygian god in origin [although a Thracian origin is also possible] and was known to be very popular in Asia Minor.

[b] It was generally [and rightly] accepted that Antiochus III had settled 2000 Jewish families in Phrygia and Lydia in 205 BCE, thus showing that there was a considerable Jewish population in Asia Minor at an early date, when little was known about Jewish communities in Thrace.

[c] The Noah coins from Apamea were [rightly] interpreted as evidence that, in places, the Jewish communities in Asia Minor were influential, and in contact with their pagan neighbours.

[d] Another factor was the attempt to explain the early and rapid success of Christianity in Asia Minor. That Jews there were 'syncretistic' [and so less attached to Jewish tradition] would, scholars thought, make them more receptive to Christian preaching. If 'Jewish–pagan' groups existed, which were interested in, but not committed to, the Jewish law, it was thought they would easily be converted to a law-free Gospel. [See Cumont 1897, p8; Schürer 1897, p225; Nock 1936, p64 for views expressed along these lines.]

Therefore the most natural place for syncretism between Judaism and Sabazios to begin was thought to be Asia Minor. See for example Cumont 1897, p6; and see Bickerman 1958, p144–151 for a link with Pergamum.

[122] See for example Weinrich 1912, p43–4; Keil 1923, p263–264; Oesterley 1935, p119–158; Nock 1936, p63; Janne 1937, p40–3; Kittel 1944, col 16; Baron 1952, II, p224–5; Wilson 1958, p11–13; Avi–Yonah 1959, p5; Picard 1961, p146; Widengren 1961, p64; Colpe 1967, col 1292; Blanchetière 1974, p380–1; cf. 1984, p57; Sanie 1978, p1109; Fellmann 1981, p318; Simon 1981a, p634–8. Note that these authors do not all make explicit the link with Asia Minor. Cumont's view has been thoroughly critised by Johnson 1984, p1602–1607; cf. Johnson 1961, p82–3.

[123] Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* I,3,2; Texts in Stern 1974, I, p358 no 147a, 147b; Lane 1985, p47 no 12. That Sabazios was identified with Jupiter explains the suggestion that Jews were expelled for the worship of 'Jupiter Sabazios'.

[124] Cumont 1906, p66f; Nilsson 1950, p636–640; Bickermann [1958, p146 n25] also lists Reitzenstein, Gressman and Fink in this regard.

[125] Lane 1979, p35–37. The similarity of Sabazios to Sabaoth and Sabbath, and the similarity of phraselogy in the two manuscript traditions may have misled the scribe at this point. Jamar [1909, p227f] anticipated the work of Lane to some extent. Cumont [1910, p55–60], in response to Jamar, tried unconvincingly to defend the manuscript in which Jews worshipped Jupiter Sabazios.

[126] Lane 1979, p37. See also Johnson 1978, p98–99; 1984, p1602–1603; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 3.1, p74–5. Note that in Plutarch [Stern no 258] Yahweh is identified with Dionysius. Since Dionysius was identified with Sabazios, Sabazios could have been equated with Yahweh in this way. This is purely in the eyes of pagans, however. It certainly is to be asked how much pagans like Plutarch really knew about the Jews apart from a few obvious customs like food laws and celebration of the Sabbath. Plutarch reflects the understanding of one Gentile observer rather than what Jews themselves believed and practiced; see Kraabel 1978, p29; Jamar 1909, p229. Thus, even if the text of Valerius Maximus does imply that Jews worshipped Jupiter Sabazios, this is far more likely to have been a pagan view rather than a reflection of reality.

[127] See Cumont 1906, p66–67; 1910, p55–60.

[128] It seems that without the text of Valerius Maximus, very little would have been made of the rest of the "evidence" we will discuss. Carrington (1976, p183–8) writing before Lane's work saw this text as the only evidence for such syncretism; see also Johnson 1968, p542–550. Note that Fellmann 1981, p317 and Aziza 1981, p50 still refer to Valerius Maximus as evidence for the mixing of the Jewish cult with Sabazios.

[129] See Cumont 1906, p66; Nilsson 1950, p636; 1960a, p178–179. Cf. Bickerman 1958, p149; Schürer 1909, 3, p58–59; Stern 1974, p359.

[130] See Johnson 1968, p547; 1978, p97–98; 1984, p1603–4. Cumont's only literary evidence for the identification is from Plutarch [see note 126 above], that Tacitus [Hist v.5] also knew of the identification of Yahweh and Dionysius, but dismissed it, and that Lydus identified the Chaldean "Θεός Ἰαώ", Sabazios and Sabaoth; see Cumont 1897, p6; 1906, p66 n4. Lydus wrote in the sixth century CE but his work probably draws on first century BCE to second century CE sources; see OCD p630. However, this is not evidence that *Jews* identified Yahweh and Sabazios. On Lydus see Jamar 1906, p230–2.

[131] See Goodenough 1953–1965, 2, p45–50, 3, fig 839–843; Johnson 1984, p1604–1605; Lane 1985, p31–32 no 65 and plate 27. On the tomb see also Oesterley 1935, p149–157; Nilsson 1950, p640; 1960a, p176–181; Nock 1972, p885–886.

[132] Cumont 1897, p4–5; 1906, p72–79; 1929, p102–103; Oesterley 1935, p155–157; Widengren 1961, p64; Gressmann 1925, p17–18.

[133] See Jamar 1906, p243–246; Sokolowski 1960, p225–9; Carrington 1976, p186–7; Sheppard 1980–81, p77–101 and especially p80 n7. The epithet αγγελος was applied, for example to Zeus, Hecate–Artemis and Hermes. Jewish influence may have played a part in the emergence of the importance of angels in religions in Asia Minor, but this was only one of several different influences.

[134] Johnson 1984, p1606; see also Nock 1972, p886, who sees it as combining present hedonism with the expectation of judgement and a future heavenly banquet; see also Nilsson 1960a, p181.

[135] Johnson 1978, p102–103; Jamar 1906, p248–50.

[136] Goodenough 1953–65, 2, p49–50; Johnson 1968, p548; see further Nock 1972, p886.

[137] Text in Lane 1985, p3 no 6; see also Johnson 1968, p548; Tatscheva–Hitova 1977, p285–6; 1978, p1218–1219. The evidence is however insufficient to speak of the "identification" of Sabazios with "Theos Hypsistos" as does Fellmann 1981, p319.

[138] See Cumont 1897, p3–4; 1906, p67; Oesterley 1935, p148–149; Nilsson 1963, p111; Fellmann 1981, p319.

[139] Johnson 1984, p1597,1602,1606; see also Carrington 1976, p186. Sabazios was often identified with Zeus, and thus some scholars who thought that the Jewish God was called Zeus Hypsistos or Hypsistos, concluded in this way that Sabazios was to be identified with Yahweh. See Nilsson 1960a, p180. However, there is no reason to think that Yahweh was identified with Zeus Hypsistos in Asia Minor.

[140] See Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p267, 3, fig 1139.

[141] Johnson 1968, p548; 1984, p1606; and in general Goodenough 1953–68.

[142] Thus Johnson [1968, p548] is incorrect in citing this as one of the few instances of "Jewish–Sabazios syncretism". More than the use of symbols associated with Sabazios is required to prove this. This amulet joins the passage from Lydus [note 130 above] to provide the very small amount of evidence that pagans equated Sabazios and Yahweh. This identification is in itself neither unusual nor significant, and is probably based on popular etymology as we noted in section 7.1.2.

[143] See Johnson 1968, p550; 1984, p1602–1607; Jamar 1906, p227–52; Carrington 1976, p183–8; Tacheva–Hitova 1983, p189; Lane 1979, p37; cf. Smallwood 1981, p129 n31. Cumont's work has been highly influential because of his stature as a scholar. Thus it is worth noting other arguments he put forward in this regard:

[a] That in certain districts of Phrygia, Jews became predominant, if not in number then at least in influence. [Cumont 1906, p64] The only evidence he cites is the Noah coins in Apamea. He overlooks the fact that these coins are but one type among many; they are thus evidence for Jewish influence in this one city, but do not provide evidence that this influence was 'predominate'.

[b] That Jews in Asia Minor accommodated their traditions with the beliefs of pagans who surrounded them to a large extent. [Cumont 1906, p64–65; see also Cumont 1910, p60.] The only evidence he cites for this is an inscription to Zeus Hypsistos which portrays a festival of some sort. But clearly this is not Jewish. He also ignores all the evidence which suggests that Jewish identity was strongly retained.

[c] That Sabazios was described as *πανκοίρανος*, 'lord of all', in an inscription from Nicomedia, and that this recalled the Biblical term *παντοκράτωρ*, thus showing a connection between Yahweh and Sabazios. [Cumont 1906, p68–69] However, the epithet is now thought to have been either *Παγισαρανω* [see Şahin and Schwerthein 1977, p260–261; Lane 1985, p10 n23] or *Πατισαρανω* [Robert 1978b, p432–437]. Neither epithet is attested elsewhere. Clearly nothing can be made of it in this regard. For further comments on Cumont's other arguments see Jamar 1906, p;236–43; Kraabel 1978, p27–33; Carrington 1976, p184–9. Note that there is also no link between the Sambatheion [see CIJ 752] and Sabazios; seeKraabel 1968, p168–181.

[144] Kraabel 1978, p29–33.

[145] Texts in Johnson 1968, p542f = Lane 1985 no 30; Robert 1975a, p306–330 = New Docs 1976 no 3, p21–23 = Lane 1985, no 31. This second inscription, discovered in 1974 is very interesting. According to Robert it is a copy made in the mid second century CE of a cultic regulation issued in the fourth century BCE. It forbids the religious functionaries of the Persian Zeus from participating in the mysteries of Sabazios, of Agdistis or of Ma. This suggests that the cult of Sabazios had invited syncretism for a very long time, and that the pagan officials of the Persian Zeus were aware of this and attempted to resist it. [See Robert 1975a, p306–330; New Docs 1976, p21–23; Kraabel 1978, p31] Yet in the city with a potentially syncretistic Sabazios cult, the Jewish community appear to have had nothing to do with Sabazios.

[146] See notes 5 and 6 above.

[147] This is not to deny that some individual Jews probably apostasized; see for example Tiberius Julius Alexander in Smallwood 1981, p257–9; Goodenough 1962, p3–4; and perhaps Μόσχος Μοσχίωνος Ἰουδαῖος from Oropos, Boetia, on whom see Robert BE 1956, no 121; Bruneau 1982, p479. Perhaps also the man from Jerusalem who made a contribution to Dionysios at Iasus; see Robert 1946, p101. Theories of syncretism have also been based on CIJ 752, but these are not convincing; see Chapter 1 note 151.

[148] Nock 1936, p65.

[149] Nock 1936, p66.

[150] Burchard in Charlesworth, 2, p211 note 8f.

[151] See Simon 1981a, p498.

[152] Dodd 1935, p13. Bertram [TDNT, 8, p618] misunderstands the term when he writes:

> But in the age of Hellenism the title becomes the instrument of a self–depiction of Judaism adapted to the ends of apologetic and propaganda.

See also Colpe 1967, col 1291. We recall that Theos Hypsistos was not an official designation for Yahweh; see 3.3.3 above.

[153] Hengel [1974, 2, p201 n265] seems to have been one of the few people who have recognised the implications of the dating of these inscriptions. He notes briefly that in the Roman period "the phrase fell into the background because of the danger of a syncretistic misunderstanding, so the term does not appear at all in the inscriptions in Rome." See also Kraabel 1979a, p492.

[154] Inscription 5.9 is also an exception to this general observations; thus it can only be put forward as a probable interpretation of the data. The declining usage of the term also helps to explain the difficulty we had in finding cases where "Jewish influence" was decisive in the pagan usage of the term. If Jewish use of the term declined, then clearly the instances of "Jewish influence" behind the term's pagan use will too.

[155] See Tatscheva–Hitova 1977, p300; Kraabel 1979a, p492.

[156] A systematic investigation of the dating of the many pagan occurrences of the term has never been undertaken as far as I am aware.

[157] Compare Kraabel 1979a, p492.

Chapter 7.

[1] The term normally used in this regard is "God-fearer". However it is not appropriate when looking at Jewish source because the term translated as "God-fearer" – φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν – occurs only in Acts and is not found in Jewish sources from Asia Minor. The more appropriate term "God-worshipper" – a translation of θεοσεβής – the term which *is* used by Jews in Asia Minor – has been recently adopted by Rajak 1985a, p255. The group used to be called "half-proselytes" or "semi-proselytes". [See Strack-Billerbeck 1924, II, p715-720; Levi 1906, p29, 1907,p 58; Juster 1914, 1, p274-90.] However, these terms are unsuitable because in Jewish eyes a person was either a Jew or a Gentile; one could not be half way between; see Moore 1927, I, p326-7; Lake 1933, p76-77; Leon 1960, p253; Siegert 1973, p163. Simon [1981a, p465; 1981b, col 1064-5] still uses the term and defends its use.

[2] This understanding of the group is undisputed; see for example Lake 1933 p74-77; Braude 1940, p136-8; Thraede 1959, p96-8; Kuhn and Stegeman 1962, col 1260; Romaniuk 1964 p72; Zeitlin 1974, p416-7; Every 1975, p46-8. The "God-worshippers" have played a vital role in the *scholarly sensus receptus* of how Christianity spread in the Gentile world; see for example Juster 1914, 1, p277.

[3] The issue of proselytism will not be addressed here. On proselytism see Levy 1905, p1-9; 1906, p1-31; 1907, p56-61; Juster 1914, 1, p253-74; Lake 1933, p77-88; Braude 1940, p3-135; Levison 1957, p45-56; Leon 1960, p250-6; Applebaum 1961, p41-2; Pope 1962, p921-931; Kuhn TDNT VI, p727-744; Jeremias 1969, p320-334; Moore 1927, I, p327-353; Loader 1973, p270-277; Zeitlin 1974, p407-417; Noland 1979b, p347-55; Simon 1986, p271-305, 390-395; Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3.1, p171-6. That a form of proselytism existed in which circumcision was not required [as proposed by McEleney 1973-4, p320-334] is rejected by Nolland 1981, p173-94 and Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3.1, p169. We need not doubt that there were proselytes in Jewish communities in Asia Minor. See now Reynolds-Tannenbaum 1987, p5,43-5. We know of proselytes elsewhere; see CIJ 21,68,202,222,256,462,523,1385; see also 576; and see Kuhn TDNT VI, p732-3. For proselytes in literary sourcessee Ant 18:82;20:34-48,75-6 cf. Ant 20:145-6; Acts 2:11,6:5,13:43. Simon [1986, p284-5] points out how weak the argumentum ex silentio is with epigraphic evidence. The paucity of proselytes in inscriptions does not entitle us to conclude that there were few proselytes or little proselytising activity.

[4] Bernays 1885 [reprint of 1877], p71-80; see Smallwood 1959a, p330-1 for a useful summary.

[5] See for example Schürer 1897, p218-220; Levy 1905, p1-2; Juster 1914, 1, p274 n6; Strack-Billerbeck 1924, 2, p715-720; Marcus 1952, p247-50; Hommel 1975, p172f; Safrai and Stern 1976, p1158-1159; Simon 1981a, p468; 1981b, col 1060.

[6] Lake 1933 p84-88; Feldman 1950, p200-208. To a considerable extent Acts has provided the foundation for understanding the "God-worshippers", with

φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν and σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν being understood as technical terms. References in classical literature and inscriptions were *added* to this foundation [see for example Simon 1981b, col 1060–1070 and on this approach Kraabel 1981b, p114–5, 118]. Lake and Feldman both argued that the terms in Acts mean "pious" or "worshipping" and had not become so technical that they could only be used of non–Jewish worshippers.

As noted above only θεοσεβής occurs in the Jewish inscriptions of Asia Minor. The two expressions found in Acts – φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν and σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν – do not in fact occur in inscriptions. [See Robert 1964, p41; Lifshitz 1970, p76; Siegert 1973, p151.] We have previously discussed the inscription from Tanais which mentioned εἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόμενοι θεὸν Ὕψιστον. [See Chapter 6, section 6.2.] The use of σεβομενοι here does not involve any necessary implication that "God–worshippers" were meant. Whilst being influenced by Judaism, these ἀδελφοὶ belonged to autonomous groups which were not synagogues. They were not therefore "God–worshippers".

The usage of the two expressions found in Acts will not therefore be examined here. This also avoids the danger, outlined in the text, of reading the meaning of other expressions into the occurrences of θεοσεβής. Further, whilst a number of scholars have continued to argue or assume that the expressions in Acts are to be understood as technical terms [see for example Thraede 1959, p97–98; Kuhn TDNT vol VI, p743; Foester, TDNT, VII, p172; Balz, TDNT IX, p213; Romaniuk 1964, p67–84; Lifshitz 1970 p79–80; Siegert 1973, p129–140; Simon 1981a, p469–471; 1981b, col 1060–1068; Hommel 1975, p173–7], Wilcox [1981, p102–122] has shown how dubious this approach is in terms of exegesis of each passage in Acts. He argues that the terms describe "piety, not belongingness to a group" [p106] and are applicable to Jew, Gentile or proselyte as the context determines. The use of Acts as a basic source for the God–worshippers is thus difficult. See also Kraabel 1981b, p118-121. Two additional points are important:

[i] That Luke uses two terms in Acts makes it highly unlikely that either is the standard technical term for "God–worshippers." [See Finn 1985, p80.]

[ii] σεβόμενοι is found in an inscription from Magnesia ad Maeander [to be dated in 207/6 BCE] in the phrase τοῖς σε[β]ομένοις Ἀπ[όλλωνα]. [See SIG Third Ed II. no 557 line 7.] The participle is also found in Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris* 44 in the expression τοῖς σεβομένοις τὸν Ἄνουβιν. [These examples seem to have been unknown to Bernays and Schürer.] Thus, the term is a general one for "worshipper", and not a technical expression restricted to Judaism. [See Feldman 1950, p 203–4; Siegert 1973, p151.]

[7] Cf. Hommel 1975, p173–7 for an incorrect approach on this point. The Rabbinic term שָׁמַיִם יְרֵאֵי "fearers of Heaven" will not be dealt with here. Just as with Acts, we cannot determine the meaning of θεοσεβής in inscriptions on the basis of the meaning of a different phrase. Further this expression probably reflects the situation in the Palestine and Babylon of the Rabbis and not in Asia Minor. We should also note that whilst Feldman [1950, p207–8] argued that in the eyes of the Rabbis the "fearers of Heaven" constituted a special group of "sympathisers" [see also Lake 1933, p82; Lieberman, 1965, p68–90; Siegert

1973, p110–120; Finn 1985, p77 n9], Wilcox [1981, p115–117] noted that in Qumran the phrase refers to the sectaries themselves, and that in Rabbinic literature it generally means "the devout". He questions the interpretation which understands that Gentile synagogue adherents are referred to in the Mekhilta on Isa 44:5. We cannot therefore assume that Rabbinic literature uses the term as a technical expression for "God–worshippers".

[8] Judaism in Asia Minor is the area under consideration here; the same holds true for Diaspora Judaism in general. On the matter see Kraabel 1982, p453–4; and Conclusions, note 7.

[9] Robert [1964, p40–45] is an example of a scholar who assumed that θεοσεβής must mean the same on every occasion. He argued that it could be applied to a Jew with the meaning of "pious" and therefore that this was what it meant in every instance. Feldman's conclusion [1950, p208] that each occurrence of these four terms should be examined on its own merits since the words were not technical terms, led in the direction I am suggesting. However, he did not follow up the implications of his work.

[10] I am here adopting terminology similar to that used by Siegert 1973, p110 and n1, 147–151. It should be noted that some scholars use "sympathizer" for the group I call "God–worshippers".

[11] We should note that it is often difficult to determine into which category a person fits. [See Simon 1981b, col 1067–8.] For example, the centurion at Capernaum who built a synagogue for the Jewish community was not a member of the community, but was he a "God–worshipper" or a "sympathizer"? [See Luke 7:1–11.] Luke simply makes it clear that he was a pro–Jewish Gentile. On the other hand Julia Severa who built the Jewish community at Acmonia a synagogue [CIJ 766] clearly fits into the category of sympathizer because she remained active in pagan worship. I will not deal specifically with the issue of sympathizers here. There is some evidence directly from Asia Minor – Julia Severa, the adoption of some Jewish terminology by pagans, the Canons of Laodicea – which means that it is not to be doubted that in at least some cities Jewish customs were adopted by a significant number of people and a number of sympathizers existed.

For the Diaspora as a whole note Josephus CAp 2:282-3; Philo, Mos. 2:20-23. Although both authors no doubt exaggerate the extent of the adoption of Jewish customs [but note that Josephus in CAp would have risked easy refutation if he had exaggerated too greatly], pagan authors confirm that they reflect a significant phenomenon. The following passages give supporting evidence for the adoption of Jewish customs and thus for "sympathizers": Horace [Stern No 129]; Seneca [Stern No 186]; Epictetus [Stern No 254]; Plutarch [Stern No 255,263]; Tacitus [Stern No 281,5:1]; Suetonius [Stern No 320]; Cassius Dio [Stern No 406]. Whilst this "outside" evidence is not always reliable [see Kraabel 1981b, p115–6] the fact that it is congruous with Jewish reports reinforces both strands of evidence. On the question of whether Tertullian states that Romans observed Jewish customs in Ad. Nat I.13 see Nolland 1979a, p1–11. On the much debated passage in Cassius Dio [Stern No 435] about Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla see Stern 1980, p379–384; Smallwood 1956, p5–11; they were probably Jewish sympathizers, although they could have been proselytes.

We should be careful to distinguish, as Siegert does, between "sympathizers" who adopted Jewish religious customs, and those who were positive towards the Jewish people for political rather than religious motives [although the two categories are not mutually exclusive]. Among the latter are Publius Petronius, Consul of Syria in 39–42 CE [Ant 18:261–309, BJ II:184–203] and Lucius Vitellius [Ant 18:88–95,120–124]. See Siegert 1973, p149.

[12] Liddell and Scott p791; Bertram TDNT III, p123–4; Feldman 1950, p204; Smallwood 1959a, p331; Robert 1964, p42 n4, p44; Siegert 1973, p155; Simon 1981b, col 1060.

[13] Herodotus 2.37; see also 1.86. Similarly Sophocles *Oedipus at Colonus* 260 wrote: εἰ τὰς γ' Ἀθήνας φασὶ θεοσεβεστάτας εἶναι. "Athens is held of states the most devout..." See also Plato *Cratylus* 394d; Aristophanes *Aves* 897; For further references see Bertram TDNT III, p123–4.

[14] See Pfuhl and Möbius 1979, 2, no 1697, with photo; SEG 29.1697.

[15] SIG[3] II, No 708 lines 19–20. See also Kenyon 1893, p38, no 23a line 20 – τοὺς τοιούτους θεοσεβοῦ[α]ς [158–7 BCE from Memphis]; on this see Wilcken 1927, p159, who suggests the text should be emended to read θεοσεβεῖς, which would be very interesting in view of the rarity of the adjective. In Eger et al, 1910-12, 1, p94, no 55 line 1, a Christian papyrus of the sixth century we have the address "Τῷ ἁγ[απ]ητῷ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἀδελφῷ ..." The term seems to becomes more frequent in Christian usage in this later period.

[16] See Siegert 1973, p156.

[17] Simon 1981b, col 1062. For other inscriptions using terms related to θεοσεβής see IG VII 2712 lines 66–8 [θεοσεβῶς]; Bertram TDNT, III, p124.

[18] See Siegert 1973, p155 and n3 for a list of those who have thought θεοσεβής was a Jewish technical term.

[19] See Liddell and Scott p732; Robert 1946, p81; 1964, p44; Foerster TDNT VII, p175–8; Gauger 1977, p70–75; see in general Tod 1951, p182–90. εὐσεβής occurs in only one known Jewish inscription – CIJ 683 from Stobi.

[20] Robert 1964, p44 and n5, p45 notes that θεοσεβής/θεοσεβεῖν occurs in Greek religious vocabulary and quotes an inscription in which θεοσεβεῖν occurs [quoted above, footnote 15]. He then goes on to state that "the inscriptions do not seem to use the adjective θεοσεβής outside of the Jewish domain." [p44] He concludes that the adjective therefore never designates a "pagan judaizer" [= God–worshipper], but always denotes the piety of a Jew. However, his case relied too heavily on the argument from silence as is shown by the fact that Pfuhl and Möbius 1979, no 1697 provides just the evidence for pagan usage of the adjective which was lacking when Robert wrote. The adjective and the verb are thus both found in pagan literature. Even if θεοσεβής was only found in the Jewish sphere, this would not mean that Jews never used it to refer to God–worshippers as Robert [1964, p44–5] and after him Wilcox [1981, p113] want to argue.

[21] Job 1:1,8; 2:3.

[22] IV Macc 15:28,16:12.

[23] See Bertram TDNT III, p125; Romaniuk 1964, p69.

[24] See Gen 20:11; Bar 5:4; Job 28:28; Si 1:24; IV Macc 7:6,22; 17:15; see Bertram TDNT III, p124–5; 1954–59, p275; Romaniuk 1964, p69.

[25] Mut. 197.

[26] Abr. 114; see also Virt. 186; Her. 60.

[27] Fug. 150.

[28] Cong. 130.

[29] Op. 154; see also Mos. I,303; Spec. IV,134,170. see Romaniuk 1964, p69 n5.

[30] See Bertram TDNT, III, p125.

[31] Ant 7:130; see also 7:153 and the variant reading of Ant 9:260.

[32] Ant 20:195.

[33] See the summary of this line of interpretation in Smallwood 1959a, p330. Those who have held this view recently include Leon 1960 p251; Bertram TDNT III p126 n16; Lifshitz 1970, p79,82; Zeitlin 1974, p416; Hommel 1975, p171 n22; Simon 1981b, col 1064; Finn 1985, p81 n33. Vita 13–16, is also used as evidence to support this view. However, the same line of interpretation as will be given in the text applies equally well there.

[34] See Smallwood 1959a, p331.

[35] See Smallwood 1959a, p332–5; 1981, p278 n79; see also Feldman 1950, p206 n30; Madden 1866, p179 n25.

[36] JosAsen 4:9.

[37] See Philonenko 1968, p142–3; Charlesworth II p206 note m; and more generally on this point Romaniuk 1964, p70–1, 90; Siegert 1973, p113 and n1.

[38] See also JosAsen 8:6,7;20:8;22:8;23:9,10;28:4 [used by the converted Aseneth]; 29:3.

[39] See for example TJos 6:7; TNaph 1:10; TAbram 4:6; LetAris 179.

[40] See Bertram TDNT, III, p125; Simon 1981b, col 1061–2.

[41] See Simon 1981b, col 1061,1064; see also Bertram TDNT III, p125.

[42] $\theta\epsilon o\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ is rare in the NT and in the usage of the Early Church; see Bertram TDNT, III, p126–8. Note that in a passage Eusebius [HE 4.26.5] quotes from

Melito's lost work *To Antonius*, Melito describes the Christians as τὸ τῶν θεοσεβῶν γένος.

[43] Many scholars have started with Acts in the search for other evidence for the Gentile God–worshippers. I have outlined in note 6 above why this approach is unsatisfactory.

[44] Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p505.

[45] Lake 1933 p85. On the difficulties of translating the last phrase of the passage see Siegert 1973, p127.

[46] Marcus 1952, p249. On the grammatical issue see Blass–Debrunner–Funk 1961, section 276; Moulton 1963, III, p181. To support his argument, Marcus gives examples from Xenophon, for example *Anab* I,7,2 where two different groups are linked by the particle καὶ without the article before the second group. [Κῦρος δὲ συνκαλέσας τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ λοχαγοὺς ...] Marcus here is directly refuting Lake's point [Lake 1933, p85] that τῶν was required for the translation of Bernays [1885, p76] and Schürer [1897, p218–9] which Marcus had followed. Marcus' view has been accepted by Lifshitz 1970, p78–9; Siegert 1973, p 127 n4; Wilcox 1981, p121 n46; Kant 1987, p688 n106.

[47] See Marcus 1952, p249; Lifshitz 1970, p78–79.

[48] See Kuhn TDNT VI p732; Bellen 1965–6, p173 n19; Lifshitz 1970, p78–9; Siegert 1973, p127–8; Zeitlin 1974, p416; Stern 1980, 2, p105; Simon 1981a, p470; 1981b, col 1063; Wilcox 1981, p121 n46; Finn 1985, p81 n33; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p162.

[49] See Marcus 1952, p249; in Josephus 7, p505 note a. We should note that this group of Gentiles cannot be proselytes because they would almost certainly be included in the Ἰουδαῖοι. We cannot rule out however the possibility that these Gentiles [or at least some of them] were more casually involved in synagogue life than "God–worshippers" [as we use that term] were. Making a donation to the Temple does not necessarily imply a regular relationship with the synagogue. For example, Livia, Augustus' wife [BJ 5:562–3] made a donation to the Temple but we cannot thereby assume that she had a religious interest in Judaism or was involved in a synagogue. Her motives were political. [See Siegert 1973, p128 n2.] However, Gentiles in Asia and Europe would generally only be able to make a donation to the Temple through a synagogue, and they would only learn of the possibility and value of such donations to the Temple through the synagogue and its teaching. Such gentiles seem therefore to fit into the category of "God–worshipper". In this one passage therefore, σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν *does* mean Gentiles who worship God. Josephus thus chose to use σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν to describe the group of Gentile "God–worshippers"; he did this, not because it was the only appropriate term [and therefore the standard technical term for such Gentiles] but because it was one of a number of possible terms which he could have used to express the concept of God–worshippers. Its meaning in each occurrence must be determined from the context.

[50] Finn 1985, p82; see BJ 4:86, Ant 17:303.

[51] Finn 1985 p82; see also Siegert 1973, p139; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p49.

[52] See for example BJ 2:560, where Josephus speaks of converts to the Jewish religion in Damascus; see also Ant 18:82.

[53] Other passages [though difficult to interpret] may refer to God–worshippers; see Ant 20:34–5 [see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p50]; BJ 2:462 [see Smallwood 1981, p206 n15].

[54] Finn 1985, p82.

[55] Philo calls these Gentiles proselytes, not because they were converted but because the passage in Ex 22 used this term. Philo elsewhere distinguishes between proselytes and others; these Gentiles are allegorically proselytes; see Finn 1985, p82–3.

[56] Finn 1985, p83; cf. Nolland 1981, p173–9; Note also that in Mos. II,41–45 Philo may speak of "God–worshippers" or perhaps "sympathizers".

[57] Text in Stern 1980, no 301, p102–3.

[58] See Bernays 1885, p73; Kuhn and Stegeman 1962, col 1260; Leon 1960, p251; Finn 1985, p81; Simon 1986, p280–1. The Satire was written between the two Jewish wars [70–135CE] and thus shows that "God–worshippers" [presumably in Rome] continued to exist after the first Jewish War. The son is a valuable example of a proselyte; he submits to the Mosaic law and is circumcised.

[59] Siegert 1973, p154; Simon 1986, p281.

[60] Leon 1960, p251; Lifshitz 1970, p83; Siegert 1973, p154; Finn 1985, p81. The inscription from Aphrodisias [see section 4.1] may reveal just the sort of father–son pair Juvenal describes; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p46.

[61] This interpretation does not depend on "metuens" being a technical term for God–worshipper [as has often been thought, originally by Bernays 1885, p73–89; see also Schürer 1897, p219; Thraede 1959, p98 n70; Pines 1968, p148–9; Simon 1981b, col 1060; Safrai and Stern 1976, 2, p1158–9 n1; Stern 1980, 2, p106; see also Feldman 1950 p201–5] but rather on the meaning of the text as a whole. It is possible that Juvenal uses metuens twice because it was common in Jewish usage known to him, rather than because it had a particular Jewish meaning. However the meaning of the word as he uses it is not unusual in Latin usage [see Siegert 1973, p155 and n1; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p51-2] and so no explanation of its use is required. It is therefore incorrect to base the theory of a technical Jewish meaning for metuens on this passage. Further metuens can simply mean "pious" or "religious" and thus can be a confession of any faith, or a tribute to the life of the deceased without implying anything about his or her religion. [See Levi 1906, p11; Lake 1933, p89–90; Feldman 1950, p204]. The actual inscriptions in which metuens occurs [none of which were found in Jewish catacombs [see Leon 1960, p253 n4]] are all ambiguous [as is noted by Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p52]:

[i] Aurelia Soteria [CIJ 642] is just as likely to have been a pious Jewess as a Gentile God–worshipper. She was also responsible for another inscription

[CIJ 641] which begins with D(is) M(anibus). This does not wholly exclude a Jewish origin because "D.M." is found in a number of Jewish inscriptions. [CIJ 678 and probably in 287, 464 from Rome; see also Siegert 1973, p153 n4; Kraemer 1986a,p188–9; Kant 1987, p683 n77. "D.M." and "D.M.S." are also found in Jewish inscriptions from Roman Africa; see Le Bohec 1981a, no 12,46,71. People whom Le Bohec considers were "Judaizers" also used these formulae; see Le Bohec 1981a, no 10,11,64,77,81.] Siegert [1973, p153] thought she was a God–worshipper; see also Bernay 1885, p74; Schürer 1897, p219. Lake [1933, p89] and Feldman [1950, p203] thought she was a Jew. The evidence is inconclusive however.

[ii] We cannot decide if Aemilius Valens [CIJ 5] was a Jewish or a pagan "metuens".

[iii] CIJ 529 is inscribed on a square base which was probably used for a bust which suggests it was not Jewish; see Siegert 1973, p152. Would a "God–worshipper" have a funerary bust? Goodenough [1953–68, 2, p59] noted the funerary bust of three Jews discovered at Pannonia [CIJ 675]. He thought CIJ 529 was an inscription of a God–worshipper [1953–68, 2, p44–5] as did Frey [CIJ, 1 p389–90]. Again the evidence is inconclusive.

[iv] CIJ 524 begins with the phrase Dis Manib(us). This suggests it is not Jewish, although again we cannot be certain. [See Siegert 1973, p151–2; Lifshitz CIJ^2 Prologue p 39.]

[v] CIJ 285 gives no definite indication that it was in any way connected with the Jewish community. See Siegert 1973, p152.

[vi] Le Bohec 1981a, p191 no 72 from Numidia again gives no guide to its religious provenance.

We should note however that we know of non–Jews who received the epithet metuens. CIL 6.390 is clearly addressed to Jupiter; see Lake 1933, p89. Thus not all "metuens" were connected with Judaism. In fact inscriptions [ii]–[vi] above might have no connection whatsoever with Judaism. In these inscriptions metuens could simply mean "pious" or "religious". Only by making the assumption that Juvenal uses metuens because it was a technical term can these inscriptions be seen as those of God–worshippers; however this assumption is unwarranted.

[62] Text in Stern 1974, 1, no 254, p542–3.

[63] See Stern 1974, 1, p543–4 who argues that Epictetus is referring to Jews here and not Christians. Siegert [1973, p161] argues that Epictetus refers to God–worshippers; see also Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p44-5,62. It is difficult to know how much is involved in someone "acting the part" – ὑποκρίνεται – of a Jew. It must involve some association with a Jewish community and adoption of Jewish customs for the person to be identifiable. The passage as a whole also suggests that the person acting the part is not entirely committed to his new way of life.

[64] Scholars have suggested that a possible reference to God–worshippers is given by Suetonius in *Domitianus* 12:1. The first group prosecuted for not paying the

Jewish tax is thought to have been those who "lived as Jews" but were not Jews by birth [as the second group were] nor were they converts and thus were "God-worshippers". See Keil and Premerstein 1914, p33; Hommel 1975, p186, n100; Smallwood 1981, p376–7; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p52. Note however the doubts expressed by Thompson 1982, p336–340.

[65] For the first opinion see for example Bellen 1965–6, p171–6; for the second see Robert 1964, p41–5; Bertram TDNT, III, p125–6. I noted above that two of the terms involved in the debate about "God-worshippers" *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* and *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* – do not occur in inscriptions; see note 6 above. We also discussed the occurrences of metuens in inscriptions and concluded that none of the inscriptions provide unambiguous evidence for this group of Gentiles; see note 61 above.

[66] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p1-131. This inscription was commented upon a number of times before its publication: see Mellink 1977, p306; New Docs 1978, p125; Yamauchi 1980, p125; Kraabel 1981a, p86; 1981b, p125 n26; 1985, p230–2; Brooten 1982, p151; Meeks 1983, p39, 207 n163, 207–8 n175, 208 n186, 209 n195; Finn 1985, p79; Rajak 1985a, p255–8; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p25–6, p166. On the stone see also the debate in Kraabel and MacLennan 1986, p47–53; Tannenbaum 1986, p55–7; Feldman 1986, p58–69.

[67] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p19–22; a late fourth of fifth century date is possible but unlikely.

[68] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p22–3.

[69] The proselytes seem to have taken Jewish names after conversion – *Ἰωσῆς*, *Σαμουηλ* and *Εἰωσηφ* son of *Εὐσεβίος*. The full name of the decany was probably "the decany of the students/disciples/ sages of the law, also known as those who fervently/continually praise God"; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p41. It is difficult to know exactly what functions the group fulfilled, apart from the erection of the building in view here. It seems to be more than just a pious name; it was probably a society for the study of the law and for prayer, but it may also [primarily ?] have been a charitable society, or a general–purpose benevolent society. If its activities included study and prayer [as seems very likely], then it is another indication of the importance of the Torah and of education in the Torah in Judaism in Asia Minor. See further in Chapter 3, section 3.3, 4.2.3 and note 124 there. Its members here are clearly involved in "the relief of misfortune" through the building mentioned in the inscription, so study and practical help go together. We can also note the enthusiasm in the group of Jews as a whole for names which refer to festivals - the Sabbath and probably the Feast of Tabernacles, indicated for example by the name *Ἑορτάσιος*. Probably the people so named were born on one of the festival days; this suggests that the community celebrated the festivals concerned. Reynolds–Tannenbaum [1987, p96] go on to note that a degree of "pietism" is involved in this, as it is in names derived from *Θεός*- and in the name *Εὐσέβιος*. A number of names also relate to virtues such as faithfulness, hopefulness, and thus give some insight into the virtuous aspirations of the group; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p96. Thus, the inscription reveals some significant aspects of the group's faith.

[70] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p6. "θεοσεβῖς" is a common spelling of the case ending; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p12.

[71] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p54. Some names are lost however; for a discussion of the names see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p93-115. The lists are exclusively male except for "Jael" in the decany whom I argued was a woman; see Chapter 5, section 1.3.

[72] Εὐσαββάθιος and Ὀρτάσιος.

[73] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p55,94–5,105–111.

[74] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p55-6.

[75] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p55-6,95. The few with names favoured by the Jews could be sons of fathers who were θεοσεβεῖς themselves and thus gave their children names used by the Jews. We recall the evidence from Juvenal here. Thus Εὐσαββάθιος [found in a Jewish inscription in Rome – CIJ 379] is related to names like Σαμβάθιος which was often given to children in Egypt by Gentile parents who were interested in Judaism, specifically in the Sabbath; on "the Sambathions" see CPJ III, p 43–87.

[76] See Rajak 1985a, p256; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p26,166; Meeks 1983, p208 n175.

[77] This inscription therefore undermines Kraabel's argument that for the Roman Diaspora, the evidence for Gentile God–worshippers was far from convincing. [See Kraabel 1981b, p113–126; see also Kraabel and MacLennan 1986, p47–53. New Docs 1978, p125 and Finn 1985, p79–80 suspect that this inscription undermines Kraabel's case; Meeks 1983, p208 n175; Rajak 1985a, p255–6; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p166 are convinced that Kraabel's argument no longer stands.] However, Kraabel has sought to interpret this inscription in a way that would support his contentions about the "God–fearers". He wishes to translate καὶ ὅσοι θεοσεβῖς as "and [the following] who [are] pious". [Kraabel 1985, p231.] He rightly points out that θεοσεβής does not have a single meaning and that it can be applied to a Jew, or to a Gentile who has had no contact with Jews. [He mentions the anti–Christian graffito from Rome "Alexamenos worships god", but the term used there is σέβετ(αι) which has little bearing on the meaning of θεοσεβής in Aphrodisias.] He acknowledges that some of the Aphrodisias θεοσεβής are Gentiles, but suggests that the adjective should not be interpreted in religious terms. Rather than being sympathetic to the Jewish religion, they were perhaps simply friendly towards Jews as fellow–townspeople. Thus "they could be nothing more than gentile 'good neighbours' whom the local Jews wanted to honor." [Kraabel 1985, p 231–2].

Whilst I agree that not all Gentile support for the Jewish community was support for the Jewish faith [some being support for the Jews as an ethnic minority], it is exceedingly difficult to understand why Jews would call "good neighbours" who were not positive towards their religion "pious". This is completely beyond the known Jewish meaning of θεοσεβής. In Jewish eyes active pagans were not "pious". It is very hard to avoid the implication that here

the term does have a religious meaning, one that implies an approval of the Gentiles' belief and actions in the eyes of the Jews and thus that involves these Gentiles being "God–worshippers" as we understand the term.

We should note that this does not mean the different terms used by Luke – φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν and σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν are technical terms for God–worshippers. It does confirm the possibility that Luke is describing an historical phenomenon; it does not mean that every occurrence of these two phrases in Acts refers to the God–worshippers. Luke does not use the term for God–worshippers used at Aphrodisias; perhaps he did not know it, or perhaps it only became a "technical term" in the period after he wrote.

[78] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p55.

[79] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p56.

[80] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p57. Note that we do not know how the Jewish law was understood at Aphrodisias.

[81] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p57.

[82] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p58.

[83] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p125.

[84] For a helpful discussion of the problems associated with conversion in the period to which the inscription belongs, see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p43–5. We should also note that the three proselytes are members of the decany. In addition the proselyte Samouel was ἀρχιδ(έκανος?) - probably president of the group. This shows that proselytes were fully accepted as complete Jews and that at least three studied the Torah. Perhaps actually becoming a Jew involved some loss of social status, which meant that the city councillors were not circumcised. This can only tentatively be suggested because the inscription "stops" what may have been a process towards conversion.

[85] Note that eleven to thirteen of the θεοσεβεῖς were craftsmen; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p119-122. In addition there were probably θεοσεβεις who were too poor to make a donation t o the building. It is therefore likely that the θεοσεβεῖς included people from a wide social spectrum in their ranks.

[86] See Chapter 2, section 4.10.3.

[87] See Rajak 1985a, p256.

[88] We note that no Jews seem to have been city-councillors. The inscription may date to before Severus and Caracalla passed the edict which allowed cities to recruit Jews into their councils; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p66-7; Chapter 9, section 3.3. Even if it is after this date, Jews may not have always wanted to take up office, or perhaps were unhappy about arrangements made to exempt them from participation in pagan rites. The Jewish community probably included some quite prosperous men, along with a number of people of more modest means. That they attracted nine Gentile city councillors suggests

that the Jewish community included some men of comparably high status and income; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p127-130. As a group the Jews seem to span a large range of status positions. Rajak [1985a, p255] had concluded from the language of the inscription that the group was inward looking and exclusive. However, whilst some of the language does give this impression, the evidence of the names of some of the Jews [names common in Aphrodisias, and a number of transliterated Latin names were used; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p95-6] and the presence of proselytes and θεοσεβεῖς argue strongly in the opposite direction – that whilst having a strong group identity [and thus some of their own language], the group was far from introverted.

[89] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p126 who helpfully compare the situation at Sardis and Aphrodisias.

[90] For example see Feldman 1950, p200–208; Robert 1964, p41–45; Kraabel 1981b, p113–26.

[91] Rajak 1985a, p258. This inscription has therefore contradicted much previous work, and thus necessitates a review of the whole area.

[92] Strictly speaking this inscription is from outside our geographical area. It is examined here because it is geographically close to Asia Minor and because the evidence it provides is related to the Aphrodisias inscription.

[93] See Bellen 1965–66, p174 for a different reading.

[94] Text from CIJ² no 683a. See also CIRB 71; Bellen 1965–66, p172–3.

[95] The translation is based on CIJ² No 683a and Bellen 1965–66, p176 [who thinks "Elpis" was a girl.]

[96] See Lifshitz 1969, p96; Rajak 1985a, p259. CIJ² p66 dates it to the second century CE.

[97] See CIJ 683=CIRB 70=IOSPE II no 52 [dated in 81CE]; CIJ 684=CIRB 73=IOSPE II no 53; CIJ² no 683b=CIRB 72=Lifshitz 1969 no 7. For another inscription in which a Jewish community paid for the enfranchisement, in this case of a Jew, see CPJ no 473; cf. CIJ 709–11; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p65. On the Jews of Panticapaeum see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986 3.1, p36–7. The form in which the manumission is carried out shows that the synagogue had adopted the form from its environment. See on this Schürer 1897, p201–3; Goodenough 1956–7, p221–2; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p105–6. The four documents are interesting in that they show a concern to safeguard the freedom of the ex–slave through the guardianship of the synagogue, but also attempt to make synagogue attendance incumbent upon the ex–slave, perhaps to ensure that the synagogue maintained its size. The ex–slave would probably have previously attended the synagogue as a member of a Jewish household; see Bellen 1965–6, p174–5.

[98] See Bellen 1965–6, p173 where another less likely suggestion of the first editors is also given; see also Lifshitz 1969, p95. Lifshitz and Bellen independently suggested the same emendation [see later] for this inscription.

[99] Bellen 1965–6, p173; Lifshitz 1969, p95; CIJ^2, p65.

[100] Lifshitz 1969, p96.

[101] Bellen 1965–6, p173; the emendation is accepted by Siegert 1973, p158–9; Hommel 1975, p 175 n38; Hengel 1975a, p43–4. In addition, the end of the line occurs at ν, which probably led the mason to complete a familiar word.

[102] See Bellen 1965–6, p173–4; Lifshitz 1969, p96.

[103] Wilcox 1981, p121 n48; see also Siegert 1973, p159; Simon 1981a, p 474–5.

[104] This point is made in part by Bellen 1965–6, p175, who suggests that ex–slaves like Elpias could then go on to become proselytes. See also Hommel 1975, p175 n38 who states of Elpias that he "offenbar zu der Gruppe der 'Gottesfurchtigen' zahlte, ... " Of the four ex–slaves, three were male; the other name is lacking.

[105] Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p54. Siegert [1973, p159] thinks the Jews here ascribe to themselves an honorary epithet, and compares this with the custom of the kings of the Bosphoros kingdom who described themselves as $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$ in inscriptions. He does not consider the point made in the text in favour of the other interpretation. Note also the important point made by Reynolds and Tannenbaum that no ancient synagogues known to us had pious names; see Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, p32. This therefore counts against Siegert's interpretation. Wilcox 1981, p121 n48 makes no decision between the two possible interpretations. The following consider that the inscription should be understood to indicate that the "God–worshippers" were a second group who were part of the synagogue: Bellen 1965–6, p175; Couroyer 1969, p 169; Simon 1981a, p474–5; 1981b, col 1064; Rajak 1985a, p259; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p166,168. Robert [BE 1969, no 52] does not dissent from Bellen's line of interpretation here.

[106] Bellen 1965–6, p175; Simon 1981b, col 1068; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168.

[107] Reading from Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167 also given as a possibility in Robert 1964, p44; cf. Robert 1937b, p 410; Lifshitz 1967, p32; Siegert 1973, p156 who read $\grave{\alpha}\xi\iota o\lambda o\gamma(\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta)$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon o\sigma\epsilon\beta(\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta)$.

[108] Text from Lifshitz 1967, no 30, p32; see also Robert 1937b, p409; CIG 2924; Brooten 1982, p157 no 5.

[109] The $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\rho o\nu$ could be a platform for the Torah or for a menorah, similar to the two discovered at Sardis; see Robert 1964, p50 n4. Alternatively, it could be another name for a bema, used by the reader of Scripture or by a speaker. On the term's use see Kubinska 1968, p86,126.

[110] On $\sigma\kappa o\acute{\upsilon}\tau\lambda\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ see Robert 1964, p50–51; Cameron 1931, p257; see further in Chapter 2, note 110.

[111] See Lifshitz 1967, p33.

[112] Groag 1907, p283.

[113] Robert 1937b, p411.

[114] See Robert 1937b, p411–2; 1964, p40 and n3; TDNT 2, p754–61. For Ευλογια in Jewish inscriptions see Lifshitz 1967 nos 2, 38, 69, 76 VIII, 81a; CIJ 25, 173, 327, 652, 692a, 693a, 776, 798, 1537; Robert 1960b, p392,395; TAM 375; New Docs 1978 p122; Lifshitz 1973, p52–3=SEG 33.1298,1299. Scholars before Robert though that Eulogia was the name of one of Capitolina's children [see Robert 1937, p411]. Groag thought that the phrase ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς indicated that the inscription was Christian [Groag 1907, p283 n1], but the expression is common in both Christian and Jewish inscriptions; see Robert 1937b, p410–1. It is very rare in pagan inscriptions however, which counts against this inscription being pagan; see Robert 1964, p54 n1.

[115] See Robert 1937b, p409–412; Lifshitz 1967, p32–3; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p24,167 are not completely convinced, but do not give a reason for their uncertainty.

[116] See Ant 14:242.

[117] Robert [1937b, p411] thought she was a proselyte, but we will see that this is unlikely.

[118] The inscription is given in Groag 1907, p282 and IGR IV.1340. Robert [1937b, p410] confirmed that the two inscriptions mention the same person. Groag thought that Capitolina was not the same person as Claudia Capitolina [in IGR IV.1340] because he thought the former was a Christian and could not be married to the priest of Zeus Larasios as Claudia Capitolina was.

[119] See Groag 1907, p282–290.

[120] See Robert 1937b, p411; see also Kittel 1940, col 12. In 1964 Robert, who regarded θεοσεβής as meaning "pious", admitted that there was no reason to think that θεοσεβής would be used of a proselyte more than of a Jew. [See Robert 1964, p43–5.] But he does not explain why, in a synagogue inscription [basically a private document] a proselyte was not called by that title. One could understand this in a [public] grave inscription but not in a synagogue inscription.

[121] Is it possible that Capitolina gave herself the title θεοσεβής and that the Jews would not have agreed with this use of it? However, the use of Εὐλογία at the end, as we point out later in the text, confirms that Capitolina [who seems to have written the inscription] was familiar with Jewish usage. It is highly unlikely therefore that she would use a title for herself with which the Jewish community would strongly disagree. She must therefore have received the title from the Jewish community, or at least with their agreement.

[122] Bellen 1965–6, p175 n33 and Bickerman 1958, p158 n58 regard her as a "God–worshipper". Lifshitz 1967, p32 as "très pieuse"; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p24,167 are uncertain. It is difficult to know if there is any significance

in the mention of Capitolina's children and grand–children in the inscription, and the fact that the vow was for them as well as for Capitolina. Were they in some way involved in the synagogue? This is possible but our evidence is not sufficient on this point. Kraemer [1986a,p197–8], who is unaware of Groag's work, notes the absence of the mention of Capitolina's husband. It seems most likely that if he was still alive, he was not a God-worshipper and therefore that Capitolina made the dedication by herself. On women in Jewish communities in Asia Minor see Chapter 5.

[123] We recall the city councillors among the God–worshippers at Aphrodisias. That the Jewish community there attracted God–worshippers from among men of high standing suggests that the interpretation given of Capitolina's inscription is correct.

[124] Text in Robert 1964, p39 no 4, Lifshitz 1966, p61 no 4; 1967, p24, no 17. For the original position of the inscription see Hanfmann 1983, fig 254.

[125] Text in Robert 1964, p39 no 5; Lifshitz 1966, p61 no 5; 1967, p24–5, no 18. The findspot as the forecourt is given in Seager 1974, p45.

[126] See Robert 1964, p45.

[127] Hanfmann 1967, p32.

[128] Waldbaum 1983, p20 no 43. On the menorah see Waldbaum 1983, p20.

[129] Reynolds–Tannennbaum 1987, p88 state that six texts from Sardis refer to theosebeis; to my knowledge, only five have as yet been noted in publications.

[130] For the dating of the synagogue see Chapter 2, section 3.4. The inscriptions from the forecourt mosaics are probably to be dated between 360 and 380 CE. Robert [1964, p40] dated the inscriptions to between 212 and 250 because of the name Aurelius.

[131] See Robert 1964, p40–45; he calls God–worshippers "sympathizers". Seager [1983, p169] follows Robert in translating θεοσεβής as "pious".

[132] Robert 1964, p42.

[133] See Robert 1964, p41, 43–45. He placed weight on the Miletus inscription [see 4.5 below] but this is so difficult to interpret that it cannot be used as a guide to the interpretation of θεοσεβής in other contexts. Robert's claim that θεοσεβής is never used by pagans is unwarranted; see section 2.1 note 20.

[134] See Chapter 3, section 2.

[135] See Lifshitz 1967, p26; 1970, p82; Bellen 1965–6, p175; Hommel 1975, p175 n40.

[136] See Chapter 2, especially sections 4 and 5.1.

[137] See Chapter 8, section 1.1. If the fountain in the inscription was not the one discovered in the excavations, then the community [previously ?] possessed a fountain that was public.

[138] See Chapter 2, section 5.2. It is surprising therefore that Kraabel himself has denied [or at least doubted] that any Jews were sufficiently interested or attracted to become regularly involved in the synagogue as God-worshippers. [See Kraabel 1981b, p113–126; 1985, p224–232] He implies that the "showpiece" failed to impress. Yet these five inscriptions mean that one cannot rule out the possibility that the "showpiece" in fact succeeded and that these inscriptions are to be interpreted as precisely the kind of evidence for God-worshippers which Kraabel has claimed does not exist. [Kraabel does not examine these inscriptions in either article referred to above. In 1981b, p116 he claims that "Theosebes" is used as an adjective describing Jews, but he does not support the claim. In his 1968 thesis Kraabel claimed that the occurrence of the word in the Sardis synagogue proved that it was a conventional designation for a Jew [1968, p188–9]. In this he followed Robert 1964, p41–44. We have noted in the text that this line of reasoning is not convincing. Gentiles could also make donations to the synagogue.] Even if we cannot be certain that the five people were God-worshippers, we equally cannot be certain that they were Jews.

[139] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167; Robert 1964, p40; and compare for example CIJ 22. It could also be the sort of name a God-worshipping father would give his son.

[140] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167 think there is no proof either way; as does Lifshitz 1966, p62; 1967, p25. Simon 1981b, col 1068; Bellen [1965–6, p175] and Hommel [1975 p174–5] think the donors are God-worshippers but their methodology is questionable. Cf. Hemer in New Docs 1978, p55. Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p126 think that θεοσεβής at Sardis refers to Gentile God-worshippers.

[141] On the Roman theatre at Miletus see Bieber 1961, p218; Kleiner 1968, p69–76; 1970, p18–21; for seating inscriptions in other buildings see Hommel 1975, p167 n2, p168 n7.

[142] Text in Deissmann 1965, p451; CIJ 748; SEG 4:441. For its position in the theatre see Deissmann 1965, p451; corrected in Schwank 1969, p262–3. The seats were also near those reserved for the Emperor.

[143] See Deissmann 1965 p451; Kleiner 1970, p20, Hommel 1975, p168–9; Rajak 1985a, p258; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167

[144] For θεοσεβος as a personal name see Crosby 1941, p14–20; Siegert 1973, p159 n3.

[145] See Robert 1964, p46–7; cf. Lifshitz 1966, p62; 1967, p26; Hommel 1975, p169–170. On the Jewish community at Miletus see Ant 14:244–6; on this see Deissmann 1965, p451; Schürer 1909, III, p110 n37. A reference to Miletus was inserted in the LXX of Ezekiel 27:18, showing that the city was well known to some Jews. On the building thought to be the "synagogue" in Miletus, see Chapter 2, section 7.

[146] See Feldman 1950, p204; Smallwood 1959a, p331.

[147] See Deissman 1965, p451–2, von Gerkan 1921, p181; Sukenik 1934, p42; Feldman 1950, p204; CIJ 748; Smallwood 1959a, p331; Bertram TDNT, III. p125;

Robert 1937b, p411 n1; 1964, p41; Philonenko 1968, p143; McEleney 1973–4, p326–7; Siegert 1973, p159–160; Hemer in New Docs 1978, p54; Sheppard 1980-81, p82 n19; Wilcox 1981, p112–3.

[148] Deissmann 1965, p452 n1; Hommel 1975, p178–9.

[149] See Schürer 1909, 3, p174 n70. See also Romaniuk 1964 p81 n2, Bellen 1965–6, p172,175; Lifshitz 1966, p62–3; 1967, p25–6; 1970, p81–2; Simon 1981a, p474–5; 1981b, col 1063–4; Rajak 1985a, p258.

[150] Lifshitz 1966, p62–3; 1967, p25–6; 1970, p81–2. See also Siegert 1973, p 159; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p54; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167–8; cf. Wilcox 1981, p112–3.

[151] This was suggested by Deissmann 1965, p452. See also Lifshitz 1967, p25–6

[152] It is also likely that the theatre management would have used εὐσεβής had they wished to designate the Jews as pious, this being the normal Greek term for the concept. [See Robert 1964, p44; Wilcox 1981, p113.] Lifshitz goes on to attempt to argue that the inscription reflects a misunderstanding of the situation in the synagogue by the Greeks. [Lifshitz 1966, p61–2, 1967, p25–6.] However he seems to read into the inscription more than it can tell us. See the comments on Lifshitz's work in Wilcox 1981, p113.

[153] See Deissman 1965, p452; Frey in CIJ II p15; Feldman 1950, p204 n20; Smallwood 1959a, p331; Bertram TDNT, III, p 125; Robert 1964, p41; BE 1969, no 52; Siegert 1973, p 160; Hommel 1975, p177–8 [who describes it as a "Verzweiflungsschritt"]; Hemer in New Docs 1978, p54.

[154] Robert 1964, p41–2.

[155] See Bellen 1965–6, p171.

[156] That Jews had seats in the theatre at all suggests that they had at least some contact with Gentiles there.

[157] Hommel 1975, p180; see also Kleiner 1970, p20.

[158] See Hommel 1975, p177–187.

[159] Cassius Dio, Stern no 406, *Historia Romana* xxxvii 16.5–17.1. Hommel did not cite this passage, but relied on the evidence that the Rabbis were favourable to those interested in Judaism to argue that the Jews in Miletus would have been prepared to give God-worshippers the title of "Jews" [Hommel 1975, p185–7]. This is highly unlikely. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168 cite this passage from Cassius Dio in support of Hommel's thesis. It is possible that by those "who affect" Jewish customs, Cassius Dio meant to refer to proselytes; ζηλόω is quite vague and Dio does not specify which Jewish customs are involved. If this is the case then the passage does not support Hommel's thesis at all.

[160] See also Sheppard 1980–81, p82 n19; cf. Kant 1987, p689 n108.

[161] Hommel states this but he does not argue the point. His article suggests

[p181 n65] that his judgement is based to some extent on the fact that this is the most frequently found form, but this implies nothing in the present case.

[162] Kant 1987, p689 n108 accepts Hommel's view. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168 present Hommel's view briefly but do not give an opinion of its validity. They do not consider the arguments against his view given in the text. They note that among the θεοσεβῖς of Aphrodisias there were nine city councillors, which suggests that God–worshippers were involved in the life of the city. We also have *Jewish* city councillors at Sardis however.

[163] Rajak 1985a, p258. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167 also comment "In view of the informal character of the inscription it is not impossible that the third and fourth words have been reversed. ... But clearly such a correction is to be avoided if possible".

[164] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p54.

[165] Rajak 1985a, p258. There were different seats for different ranks of society in the Roman theatre; see Bieber 1961, p189.

[166] See von Gerkan 1921, p181; Siegert 1973, p159; Sheppard 1980–81, p82; Rajak 1985a, p258.

[167] It seems clear that both Jews and [if we have interpreted the inscription aright] God–worshippers, attended the theatre in Miletus. We know that Philo was once present at a performance of a tragedy by Euripides; see Prob. 141; see also Deissmann 1964, p452; Siegert 1973. p159 n6. In addition, it seems highly likely that Philo regularly visited the theatre; see Goodenough 1929, p2–3; 1962, p7. This conclusion is made more likely by Harris' study [1976, p51–95; see also Poliakoff 1984, p59–65] in which he shows that Philo was almost certainly a regular attender at athletic competitions, an important element of the culture of the day. He does not simply follow ordinary literary conventions but shows himself to have been a spectator of these competition. [See for instance Agr. 111–7,119–21,180; Cher. 80–1, Prob. 26,110–3; Prov. 58; Spec. II,98–9.] Furthermore, Harris argues that much of Philo's language would have been unintelligable to his readers if they had not had at least a fair acquaintance with a Greek athletics meeting. [See Harris 1976, p62, 72 and for example Mut. 117, Deus. 35–6.] It seems reasonable to suggest that some of the Jews of Alexandria who read Philo's work and whom he had in mind in at least some of his books, had attended these competitions. Further evidence that Jews were involved in the gymnasium in Alexandria is provided by Claudius' letter in which he orders the Jews "not to aspire to the Games". [CPJ No 153 and see Harris 1976, p 92.] The most probable interpretation is that for some time the rule demanding that competitors be Greek had come to be disregarded and that Jews had been entering the competitions. This would suggest that there were Jewish spectators as well. If Jews in Alexandria attended both the theatre [at least Philo did] and the athletic competition then it is no surprise that Jews had regular seats in the theatre at Miletus. It is difficult to know to what extent Jews in Palestine attended the theatres in their localities; see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p54–5. We cannot assume that they did not attend pagan games etc.;

cf. Ant 15:267-8. On Jewish ephebes see Chapter 9, section 3.2. In Ant 19:332–4, Josephus claims that Agrippa II satisfied Simon, who had a "reputation for religious scrupulousness" that there was nothing contrary to the law going on in the theatre. [Note also Josephus' pro–Agrippa sentiments.] The story perhaps suggests that there was controversy about theatre going amongst Jews at this time, and suggests that some were willing to attend. See also Safrai and Stern 1976, 2, p878.

[168] Text in Keil and Premerstein 1914 p32–4, no 42; see also CIJ 754; Lifshitz 1967 no 28.

[169] For the name Ευσταθια see CIJ 804,813; Robert 1964, p43 n5.

[170] Keil and Premerstein 1914, p33; Deissmann 1965, p452 n2; Lifshitz 1967, p31. That Jews lived in Philadelphia is confirmed by Rev 3:9. On the word μασκαύλης see Chapter 8, section 1.3. Keil and Premerstein [1914, p33] noted that the top surface of the column had nine round dowel holes which formed two diagonal rows. Kohl and Watzinger [1916,p144] went on to make the logical deduction that the basin was attached to the column.

[171] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167.

[172] ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἑβραίων recalls inscriptions from Corinth [CIJ 718] and Rome [CIJ 510, see also CIJ 291,317,535]. At Deliler, as at Corinth, "Hebraion" is probably a synonym of Ἰουδαῖοι and thus does not designate one particular synagogue out of a number in the city as it does in Rome; see Lifshitz 1967, p31.

[173] See for example Lifshitz 1967, no 9,13,32,98.

[174] This indication given by the inscription has been overlooked by scholars in the past. Deissmann 1965, p452 n2 thought Eusthatios was a proselyte but gave no reason for his view, which was accepted by Kittel 1944, col 17; Bertram TDNT, III, p126 n4; and Frey CIJ, 2, p19. The following thought he was a God–worshipper: Krauss 1922, p239; Bickermann 1958, p158 n58; Kuhn and Stegemann 1962, col 1266; Bellen 1965–6, p175 and n33; Wilcox 1981, p 118 n1. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167 think this is "slightly more probable". Lifshitz [1967, p31] translated the term as "le pieux"; Robert 1964, p43 thought Eusthatios was perhaps a proselyte, but certainly not a "sympathizer".

[175] Bickerman 1958, p158; Siegert 1973, p142.

[176] Text in Nilsson 1960b, p298; Delling 1964–5, p74; Lifshitz 1967 p20–21, no 12; For a description of the stone, which is now lost, see Nilsson 1960b, p 297–8.

[177] Cf. Delling 1964–5 p78 – "Gott is [kein anderer als] der Herr, der für immer Seiender".

[178] See Siegert 1973, p142; for Jewish usage see Delling 1964–5, p74–6. Pagan parallels are given in Hengel 1974, 2, p177 n61; Cumont 1906, p68. For example, a relief of the Thracian ridergod carries the inscription κύρῳ Θεῷ; see Nock 1936, p67 n75.

[179] See Nilsson 1960b, p298–9; Delling 1964–5, p74–77; Siegert 1973, p142.

[180] See Ex 3:14; Wis 13:1. For phrases applied to Yahweh such as ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα see Sir 18:1; Dan 6:27,12:7. But note Delling's caution [1964–5, p78–9] that the emphasis in line 1 of the inscription is on God's eternity, whereas in Ex 3:14–6 it is on God's being. Some parallels exist in paganism for the emphasis on the deity's eternity; see Bickerman 1958, p155 n51. We should also note that some syncretistic groups [probably influenced by Judaism], did address the god Ιαω with the formula ὁ ὤν; see Preisendanz 1973, 1, IV, line 1564; Winter 1936, 3, no 155 line 2; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p259; Siegert 1973, p143 n1. Points 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 together strongly suggest a Jewish background however.

[181] Nilsson notes [1960b, p299] "Zusammengestellt mit Θεὸς gibt Κύριος eine unmissverständliche Bezeichnung des judischen Göttes." See also Lifshitz 1967 p21.

[182] See Delling 1964–5, p80; Nilsson 1960b, p301; Kraabel 1969, p90; Tacheva-Hitova 1983, p194,213. For the use of lamps in Judaism see CAp 2:118,282; Ant 12:325. Classical authors note that lamps were lit on the Sabbath; see Seneca [Stern no 188]; Persius [Stern no 190]. φωτοφόρος which perhaps indicates some sort of stand on which the light was fastened, occurs elsewhere only in Suidas; φλογοῦχος occurs here for the first time, and means a shelter for the flame. See Liddell and Scott Supplement p148, 149; Robert BE 1958, no 413; Nilsson 1960b, p300–1; Delling 1964–5, p74; Lifshitz 1967, p21.

[183] Bickerman 1958, p158, whose view is accepted by Delling 1964–5 p79–86 and acknowledged as a possibility by Siegert 1973, p143. "Bomos" is used for the altar of Yahweh; see for example Sir 50:12,14; Ant 5:112;13:372–3 and further in Delling 1964–5, p79 n2.

[184] See for example Ant 5:112, CAp 2:193. Note however the existence of temples at Elephantine, Araq el-Emir and Leontopolis in an earlier period.

[185] Bickerman's argument [see 1958, p137–64] is based on the view that Gentiles made sacrifices to the Jewish God, a view itself based on Bickerman's understanding of Rabbinic approval of the building of altars to Yahweh by Gentiles. It is methodologically questionable to decide that the bomos at Pergamon was used for sacrifices by Gentiles [when there are other options for its use] on the basis of Rabbinic literature. Bickerman cites Ant 14:260,227 in support of his view. However, these decrees are both written by Gentiles and it is likely that they were simply permitting Jewish worship using commonly applicable terminology, which therefore included sacrifice. It is difficult to establish from such evidence that Jews actually offered sacrifices in the Diaspora, or that Gentiles were encouraged by Jews to do so; but see on this Bickerman 1958, p151, p158 n60; Siegert 1973, p143 n3.

[186] See Delling 1964–5, p79–80; Siegert 1973, p143.

[187] This possibility is suggested by inference by Delling 1964–5, p79 n6, but rejected. On the use of incense in Judaism and its possible use in the synagogue see Goodenough 1953–68, 4, p195–208.

[188] The name Zopyros is common in the hellenistic world and is also found in use by Jews; see CPJ No 428.

[189] This is essentially Bickerman's view [1958, p158], who, as we have noted thought that Zopyros was a "God–worshipper". He thought that the word–order "Theos Kurios" was not Jewish, but followed the pattern of names like "Zeus Kurios" and "Theos Hypsistos". He concluded that Zopyros did not know that Kurios was the substitue for the proper name of God. He thus took it that Zopyros was not a Jew. Whilst the most frequent word order in the LXX is Κύριος ὁ Θεός [see Hatch and Redpath, p630–47], we should note that in some passages such as Jos 22:22; Ps 117:27, the word order is Θεός Κύριος. See also 1 Kg 2:3; Ps 49:1,67:11,93:1,94:2. The word order is probably not decisive therefore. Delling 1964–5, p79 accepted Bickerman's view, but also suggested that the "altar" could have been used as a base for the lamp, but did not go on to draw the logical conclusion that Zopyros need not therefore have been a God–worshipper but could have been a Jew. Nilsson [1960b, p 298–301], Robert [BE 1958, *no* 413] and Siegert [1973 p142–4] think Zopyros was probably a God–worshipper. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p19 describe it as a "judaizing inscription" on an altar; Lifshitz [1967 p21] thought he was a Jew or a God–worshipper. Kraabel [1969, p90 n40] thought he was probably a Gentile convert; Nock [1972, p895 n1] thought he was a Jew and used the altar to burn incense.

[190] The following inscriptions are from outside of Asia Minor but are relevant to our discussions:

[i] The following epitaph was discovered in Rome in a catacomb of unknown origin [See Schürer–Vermes–Millar, 1986, 3.1, p167]: Ἀγρίππας Φούσκου Φαινήσιος θεοσεβής. [CIJ 500; IG 14.1325.] We do not know if Agrippas, whose home was Phaena in Trachonitis was a Jew or not. This could be a rare instance of the pagan use of θεοσεβής; or he could be a Jew [whose piety called for recognition], or a God–worshipper. There is no way in which we can prefer one of these options. [See Smallwood 1959a, p331; Leon 1960, p247 n2; Schürer–Vermes–Millar, 1986, 3.1, p167.] The stone was decorated with a crown and two palms which Feldman [1950, p204 and n23] and Siegert [1973, p157] took to be Jewish symbols. They are not however restricted to Judaism [see Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p34–5], and hence are not a sure guide. Bertram [TDNT, 3, p126] and Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p74 n217 regarded Agrippas as a Jew, Juster [1914, I, p274 n6] a "Judaizer". Schürer [1897, p219,222 and 1909, 3, p174 n70] believed Agrippas was a member of the sect of Theosebeis mentioned by Cyril of Alexandria since he came from Trachonitis, one of the centres of this cult.

[ii] The following fragmentary epitaph was discovered in a Jewish catacomb in Rome. It is restored as: Ἰ[Ιο]υδέα προσή[λυτος ... θ]εοσεβ(ή)ς. [CIJ 202] It is to be dated in the third century CE. [See Siegert 1973, p156.] Since the stone is fragmentary, there is no indication of the size of the lacuna in the middle of the inscription. Thus, we do not know if this was the epitaph of two people, one a proselyte, the other a pious Jew, or a God–worshipper; or if it was the epitaph of one individual who was a "pious proselyte". See on this inscription Feldman 1950, p204 n24; Robert 1964, p43 n2; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p167; Leon 1960, p256 n1; Hommel 1975, p171 n21; McEleney 1973–4, p327.

[iii] A Latin epitaph comes from the same catacomb and includes the wording "Eparchia Theosebes". [CIJ 228; Frey takes "Theosebes" as Eparchia's surname; it should however be read as an epithet; see Feldman 1950, p204 n24.] That θεοσεβής is here transliterated into Latin means either that it has become a standard term for piety or that it is used to denote a "God-worshipper". See Smallwood 1959a, p332; Schürer-Vermes-Millar 1986, 3.1, p167. Leon [1960 p253 n1] thinks she is a pious Jewish woman; cf. Siegert 1973, p157. Greek terms are transliterated into Latin in a number of Roman Jewish inscriptions. See for example CIJ 482,206, 210,224,229,262, 516,519,523. Thus the occurrence of "Theosebes" here is not unusual. Cf. Lifshitz [1966, p63; 1967, p26, 1970, p81] who wrongly thinks that the transliterated "Theosebes" can only be explained by understanding θεοσεβής as a technical term for "God-worshipper".

Lifshitz [1962, p368-9; CIJ² p46-7] also wishes to interpret an inscription from the Jewish cemetery in Venosa in which we read "Marcus Teuseues..." in Latin letters in a similar way. However again the use of "Theosebes" does not necessarily indicate a "God-worshipper"; the fact that the inscription was found in a Jewish cemetery suggests Marcus was a Jew. Again there is insufficient evidence to decide either way.

[iv] The following inscription comes from Lorium north of Rome: Ἐνθάδε ἐν εἰρήνῃ κεῖτε Ῥουφεῖνος ἀμώμων θεοσεβής, ἁγίων τε νόμων σοφίης τε συνίστωρ. ἐτῶν κα', ἡμ(ερῶν) ε', ὥρ(ῶ)ν ι'. [IG 14, no 2259; Siegert 1973, p158.] The text is of the later Imperial period. Siegert [1973, p158] notes that the remark concerning Roufinos' skill with the law sounds very Jewish. Further, ἀμώμων occurs in other Jewish inscriptions; see for example CIJ 1(93,154) This suggests that θεοσεβής in the above inscription replaces the more common ὅσιος as another term of praise for the exemplary character of the deceased. [On ὅσιος see Smith 1980, p17-18.] Cf. Hommel 1975, p176 n44. It seems likely therefore that Roufinos was a Jew whose piety was noteworthy. See Bertram TDNT, III p126 n16; Reynolds-Tannenbaum 1987, p31,53. Hommel 1975 p176, n44,45 left the issue open.

[v] The following inscription is from Rhodes: Εὐφρο(σ)ύνα θεοσεβὴς χρηστὰ χαῖρε. [IG 12/1, no 593; CIJ² no 731e.] There seems to be no way in which we can decide if Euphrosyna was a pagan, a Jew, or a God-worshipper. [Jews with the name Euphrosyne are known at Alexandria [CIJ 1429], and Sardis [Robert 1964, p55 no 15].] Robert [1937b, p411 n5; 1964, p44] thinks Euphrosyna was Jewish or "Judaizing"; see also Hommel 1975, p173. Siegert [1973, p156 and n3] argues that the inscription is not Jewish because no Jewish inscriptions are known from the area. This does not however rule out the possibility that the inscription is Jewish.

[vi] The following very similar inscription is from Cos: Εἰρήνη θεοσεβὴς χρυστὴ χαῖρε. [Paton-Hicks 1891, no 278.] In view of the fact that we have three other inscriptions and other evidence from the Jewish community on Cos it seems likely that Eirene was a Jew or a God-worshipper rather than a pagan. We cannot however decide between the two possibilities. [On the other Jewish or "Judaizing" inscriptions from Cos see Chapter 6, section 5.4.] Robert [1964, p44] regards Eirene as Jewish. He notes that although "Eirene" occurs in a

Greek milieu it is also found in Jewish inscriptions as the translation of "Salome" [See CIJ 21, 320, 333, 1478, 1491, 1531.] Siegert 1973, p156 is uncertain about the matter.

[191] See Cyril of Alexandria, *De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate* III, 92 in Migne PG 68.281 BC. On this group see Schürer 1897, p222–3; Bertram TDNT, III, p126; Bickerman 1958, p157; Simon 1981b, col 1069.

[192] PG 35.990f and PG 45.482–4 respectively, given in Schürer 1897, p 221–2.

[193] See on this group, which Gregory of Nazianzus calls Ὑψιστάριοι, Schürer 1897, p221–2; Ramsay 1906b, p35–6; Lake 1933, p95; Simon 1981b, col 1068–70.

[194] See Schürer 1897, p224–5; Simon 1981b, col 1070. It is possible however, that they adopted some Jewish practices without any strong link with a synagogue community. The strong movement towards monotheism of this later period probably also contributed to the establishment of such groups.

[195] We have identified other probable God–worshippers elsewhere; see for example Aurelia Tatis at Acmonia, in Chapter 6, section 6.1. For a discussion of why Jewish apologetic propaganda had some success in attracting Gentiles see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p153–9.

[196] It is arguable that Judaism in Pantipacaeum was influenced by that in Asia Minor.

[197] Simon 1986, p271, 286 makes a similar point.

[198] The following authors note that God–worshippers appear to be members of the community in some sense: Bellen 1965–6. p171–2; Simon 1981a, p475; 1981b, col 1068; Meeks 1983, p208 n175; Rajak 1985a, p258; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168; Kant 1987, p689–90; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p22.

[199] See Simon 1981b, col 1067; 1986, p288. where he suggests the possibility of regional variations in practice; see also Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p58-65.

[200] We have discussed in section 4.1 what the Aphrodisias inscription indicates about what "God–worshippers" actually did and did not do. Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p56–66 discuss the issue drawing upon a whole range of sources – Rabbinic texts, the Pseudepigrapha and classical authors. This evidence suggests that there were no fixed universal rules about what God–worshippers should do, although we can suggest that they avoided idolatry and followed some of the dietary and ethical laws. Exactly what each God–worshipper did was perhaps up to the person concerned. [See also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p169.] Reynolds and Tannenbaum [1987, p64] suggest that this lack of definition was because the existence of God–worshippers was never intended, but simply evolved as Gentiles became interested. Thus their status and the requiremnents laid upon them were never clearly defined.

[201] The only inscriptional evidence from the first century is from Pantipacaeum. The earliest inscription from Asia Minor is the inscription from Miletus, probably to be dated in the second century.

[202] See the somewhat different view in Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p88–9. But note how much our inscriptional evidence for Jewish communities increases in the later period, making the argument from silence very difficult. We should also note Rajak's comment [1985a, p257] concerning how difficult it is to identify God–worshippers. There might well be many other God–worshippers in the epigraphic records, as councillors and in other capacities. We should therefore bear in mind that our knowledge is seriously incomplete in this area.

[203] Kraabel 1981b, p113–126; 1985, p224–232. I will not deal with Kraabel's treatment of Acts, but see Hemer in New Docs 1978, p54; Finn 1985, p80–4. On Kraabel's treatment of the Sardis synagogue and inscriptions see note 138.

[204] This inscription is not from an excavated synagogue, but Kraabel unjustly limits the evidence in restricting himself to this field alone. See my comments on Kraabel's treatment of the Aphrodisias inscription in note 77.

[205] Simon 1986, p285 [the translation of Simon 1948], had already noted this point.

[206] Kraabel 1981b, p116,

[207] See Kraabel 1981b, p113–126.

[208] See on this Finn 1985, p81–3.

[209] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p168.

Chapter 8.

[1] See Hanfmann 1968, p29–30; Seager 1983, p169.

[2] Text in Buckler and Robinson 1932, no 17 line 7, p37–40; see also CIJ 751. Due to the state of preservation of the inscription, we do not know if the supply of water from the synagogue was rationed [as was the case with some fountains] or not. If this fountain is the one discovered in the forecourt of the synagogue [see later in the text], then it was probably among the important unrationed public fountains, being capable of delivering a very large quantity of water; see Hanfmann 1968, p29–30.

[3] Buckler and Robinson 1932, p40. This dating is due to the fact that the name Aurelia occurs, but that only one individual has it as a first name. It could well be later.

[4] Seager 1983, p169 expresses some doubt in the matter, as does Hanfmann 1968, p30–1; Kraabel 1978, p21 thinks the fountain mentioned in the inscription is the one discovered in the forecourt. On the earlier synagogue[s] of the Sardis community see Chapter 2, section 2 and 4.1.

[5] The partition itself was a late addition in the forecourt; see Seager 1983, p169. Thus, the basin in this position probably dates from well after 360CE [when the forecourt was finished], but it could well have been sited elsewhere in the synagogue from the beginning of the building's history since it is not connected to any pipes. On the basin see Hanfmann 1963, p46–7; Levine 1981, p182; Seager 1983, p169. The basin was 16 cm deep and had a hole for drainage in its southeast corner; the stand was 60cm by 36cm in dimension, see Hanfmann 1963 p46–7. The basin was presumably filled with water from the fountain.

[6] See Seager 1983, p169.

[7] See Chapter 2, section 6.

[8] This would be comparable to the position of the washbasin in the Sardis synagogue.

[9] On the basin see Kraabel 1979a, p490; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p77. Levine 1981, p165–6 thinks that the use of the basin within the hall is obscure. For a plan showing the basin see Goodenough 1953–68, 3, Fig 879. A building at Miletus, which was identified by von Gerkan [1921, p177–181] as a synagogue had a cistern. However, the evidence is insufficient for it to be included as a synagogue; see Chapter 2, section 7.

[10] See Chapter 7, section 4.6.

[11] Text in Keil and Premerstein 1914, no42, p32–4; Krauss 1922, no 61a p231; CIJ 754; Robert 1958b, p43; Lifshitz 1967 no 28.

[12] Keil and Premerstein 1914, p33; Lifshitz 1967 p31.

[13] Scholars are agreed that "μασκαύλης" is a transliteration of the Hebrew term מַשְׁכֵּל [or מַשְׁכֹּל] which occurs in the Talmud and means washbasin. See Keil and Premerstein 1914, p33; Kohl and Watzinger 1916, p144; Frey CIJ 2, p19; Liddell and Scott p1082; Bickerman 1958, p158 n58; Robert 1958b, p43–4; Lifshitz 1967, p31; Kraabel 1968, p188–9; cf. Krauss 1922 p313–4. Krauss [1922,

p314] used Talmudic references to the "maskel" to describe what he thought the basin at Deliler would have been like. However, whilst the term used was the same as that used in the Talmudic literature, this does not mean its form must have been the same. Kraabel [1968, p187] notes that the use of a semitic word is unusual. We probably cannot draw conclusions about the influence of the Rabbis from the use of this word in Deliler. We do not know if the word came directly from a Rabbinic source in the third century CE, or if it was traditional in both Deliler and the Rabbinic sphere and its usage went back to some period when Jews in Deliler [or at least some of them] lived in Galilee, Judaea or Babylon. In other words, the term might have been in use in Deliler for hundreds of years and thus have no bearing on relations between Asia Minor and Rabbinic Judaism in the third century. This issue is also raised by the new Aphrodisias inscription; see my comments at the end of Appendix 2.

[14] For a drawing of the column see Keil and Premerstein 1914, p32.

[15] Text in Robert 1958b, p36; see also Bean et al 1956, no 69, p94–5; Lifshitz 1967 no 37, P38; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p 33; Brooten 1982, p229 n93. According to I Macc 15:23 Jews had probably been living in Side since the time of the Maccabees.

[16] On μέσαυλος see Liddell and Scott Supplement, p98; Robert 1958b, p45–7. Such a courtyard is often to be found in a synagogue complex. See for example CIJ 738.

[17] Lifshitz 1967, p38; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p33 [fifth or sixth century].

[18] Bean et al 1956, p94–5; Lifshitz 1967, p38.

[19] Robert 1958b, p36–47, especially p42–3; see also Lifshitz 1967, p38; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p33.

[20] Robert 1958b, p47.

[21] See Lifshitz 1967, p38. Note the following concerning inscription 1.4. The title πρεσβύτερος is often found in Jewish inscriptions; from Asia Minor see CIJ 739; Laumonier 1934, p379; CIJ 790,792; see also Juster 1914, I, p440–2; Brooten 1982, p46–52. On the term συγοστάτης see Chapter 9, section 3.3. The title ἄρχων is found in Asia Minor in MAMA VI,264; CIJ 757; and see also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p434–5; 1986, 3.1, p98–9. The title φροντιστής "curator" is found in other Jewish communities; see CIJ 337, 494, 722, 723, 918, 919; Lifshitz 1967, no 66. It is already known in another Jewish inscription from Side which is given in Lifshitz 1967, no 36; Van Buren 1908, no 29, p195–7; Reinach 1910, p132; CIJ 781. [On this interesting inscription, particularly the architectural features mentioned see Van Buren 1908, p195–7; Vincent 1909, p130; N and M Chaviara 1909, p60–4; Krauss 1922, p236–7, 351–2; Kittel 1944, col 11–12; Goodenough 1953–8, 2, p81–3; Robert 1958b, p38–9; Lifshitz 1967, p37; Ovadiah 1978, p864.] This second inscription from Side implies that there was more than one synagogue in the city, which suggests that the Jewish community there was quite large; see Van Buren 1908, p196–7; Kittel 1944, Col 11–12. It is difficult to know if the two inscriptions come from the same building or not; see Robert 1958b, p47.

[22] Chiat 1982, includes most of the evidence for water facilities in Palestine [but not for the Diaspora], but unfortunatley does not include this evidence in the tables on p331–355.

[23] On the synagogue, whose identification has been disputed but is now generally accepted see Chapter 6, section 5.3.

[24] See Bruneau 1982, p492–3; Goodenough 1953–68, 3, Fig 875; Kohl and Watzinger 1916, p144; Plassart 1914, p 531.

[25] Bruneau 1970, p490–1; 1982 p491. It would have been a simple matter to convert the well in the synagogue into the normal type of reservoir by building a subterranean wall. Instead, a bracing arch on top of the vault was built to provide access. A ladder or staircase of wood would have been used to enable a person to descend.

[26] Bruneau 1982, p491. It could therefore be used for proselyte baptism, although this has not been suggested. It is unlikely that this would be the only use to which the well was put.

[27] See Plassart 1914, p531; Robert 1958b, p44; Bruneau 1970 p490 n5.

[28] See Bruneau 1970, p485, p490 n5. A very similar cistern was found in House IIA approximately 70m from the synagogue. [CIJ 726 was found in this house, but it was thought to have come from the synagogue; see Bruneau 1982, p499–502.] These two buildings are the only ones which contain water reservoirs that are easily accessible. It is possible that this cistern is a ritual bath in a private Jewish house. For mikvaoth in private houses in Jerusalem see Avigad 1984, p139–142.

[29] Kraeling 1979, p28,32; Plan VIII, 40.

[30] Kraeling 1979, p13; see also Robert 1958b, p45.

[31] See Moe 1977, p151,156.

[32] Sukenik [1934, p79] stated that a "marble basin for ritual purposes" was found in the peristyle of the "synagogue" of Stobi. Subsequent research has shown however, that this basin belonged to the late fourth or early fifth century Christian basilica; See Robert 1958b, p45 n6 and Moe 1977, p148–157.

[33] Thus only Ostia does not seem to have had any water facilities. On these synagogue see Kraabel 1979a, p477–510.

[34] See Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p 92–4; 3, fig 886–8; Levine 1981, p171. One of the central features of the largest mosaic in the synagogue was a depiction of a large two handled vase on a pillar which served as a fountain. In view of the fact that the urn depicted in the mosaic situated in the apse of the Sardis synagogue is remarkably similar to the actual fountain found in the forecourt of that synagogue, it is possible that the fountain depicted in the Naro mosaic was actually to be found in the synagogue.

[35] Text in CPJ II no 432 lines 57–62; Kenyon and Bell 1907, III, no 1177. A Jew, who was a dealer in lumber or a craftsman, is also mentioned at l 199.

[36] This is the synagogue of Jews from Thebes in Upper Egypt. This probably implies that there were other proseuchai in the town; see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p55.

[37] See CPJ II, p220–4.

[38] See for example CIJ 1404.

[39] See CPJ II, p221; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p55; Robert 1958b, p43 and n3. In an inscription of the Hellenistic period from the Fayŭm in Middle Egypt, Eleazar recorded the donation of a well [φρεαρ; CIJ 1531]. Whilst Eleazar was a Jewish name, he also held the title of ἡγεμων, which is probably a military title. There is no evidence that it was ever used of a synagogue position. It is thus uncertain if the donation was made to the Jewish community, or to some other group; see Robert 1958b, p44 n2; CPJ III p163; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p53; cf. Frey, CIJ 2, p439.

[40] Chiat 1982, p94. The synagogue is probably fourth century, although the dating is controverșial.

[41] See Robert 1958b, p44 n5, with reference to the work of Orfali. Kohl and Watzinger [1916, p144] suggested that a fountain or basin had stood in the forecourt of this synagogue. However later excavators did not find evidence for this; see Robert 1958b, p44.

[42] See Levine 1981, p117; Barag, Porat, Netzer 1972, p582. The synagogue is to be dated from the late second century to the second half of the fifth century; the basin which was discovered belongs to the latest building stage.

[43] See Sukenik 1932, p15, fig 11 and 12, plate XXVII; Robert 1958b, p45 n7. the synagogue was built in the fifth century; see Chiat 1982, p127.

[44] See Kohl and Watzinger 1916, p111, 144; Robert 1958b, p44; Schrage TDNT, VII, p 820 n135. The synagogue was built around 250 CE and synagogue buildings occupied the site until 551CE; see Chiat 1982, p26.

[45] Chiat 1982, p50; the building has been dated to the fourth century.

[46] See Ovadiah 1969, p196. The synagogue was begun around 500 CE.

[47] See Sukenik 1932, p15, with a possible reconstruction with the vessel in place on Plate VI; see also Goodenough 1953–68, I, p242; Robert 1958b, p45 and n7; Chiat 1982, p123.

[48] Safrai and Stern 1976, II, p830 n2. The fragment is undated. An Aramaic inscription was set in the mosaic pavement of the narthex of the synagogue at Na'aran near Jericho. It read: "Remembered be for good Phineas the Priest the son of Justos who gave the price of this mosaic and this basin from his substance." [The inscription is given in CIJ 1197; Sukenik 1934, p75.] However "מדשת" can be read as "basin" or perhaps vessel as Sukenik did, or as "bema" [במדש]. The meaning remains uncertain although the translation of "basin" has been accepted by a number of scholars. [See Sukenik 1934, p75; Chiat 1982, p258, Frey CIJ. 1197; Robert 1958b, p45; Avi–Yonah 1975–8, p891; Schrage TDNT, VII, p820 n 135; Levine 1981, p117; who understand the term to mean basin.]

[49] See Avi–Yonah 1975–8, p891; Chiat 1982, p256 and plan 31.

[50] See Kraeling 1938, p235; Robert 1958b, p45 and n8. The fountain belonged to an early building over which was later built a synagogue and then a church; see Chiat 1982, p317–321.

[51] Inscription in Sukenik 1934, p70; Deissmann 1965, p440; CIJ 1404; Lifshitz

1967, no 79.

[52] See Robert 1958b, p43 n3.

[53] Deissmann 1965, p440 n7; Clermont-Ganneau 1920, p194; Brooten 1982, p24-5.

[54] See Goodenough 1953-68, 1, p208; cf. Chiat 1982, p72. The synagogue dates from the first half of the third century to 352; see Chiat 1982, p74. Another building which was part of the synagogue complex, and may originally have housed the rabbinical court, had several cisterns; see Chiat 1982, p73.

[55] See Sukenik 1951, p15; Chiat 1982, p75. Two cisterns found beneath the pavement of the prayer hall may be left over from earlier quarrying on the site. However, the opening of one cistern is above the level of the pavement which suggests it was used by the synagogue community; the synagogue is of the late third or early fourth century.

[56] Chiat 1982, p108; they date to the fifth or sixth centuries. There were also cisterns associated with a building which may have been a synagogue near Sepphoris, see TDNT, VII, p814 n99.

[57] Avi-Yonah 1975-8, p300; Chiat 1982, p99. The synagogue probably dates from the second to the sixth century.

[58] See Chiat 1982 p205; Levine 1981 p26 and Shanks 1979, p27-8, 30; both regard it as a synagogue.

[59] See Levine 1981, p26, Yadin 1966, p164-7; Avi-Yonah 1975-8, p809; Shanks 1779, p26; Chiat 1982, p249. For a discussion of the attribution of the building see Chiat 1982, p248-51; and on the building see Yadin 1966, p180-191. A wash-basin was found in the building which was thought to have been the synagogue. It was found along with other articles which had been brought to the room from elsewhere, so it is possible that the washbasin originally belonged elsewhere; see Yadin 1966, p184; Levine 1981, p20.

[60] For the rabbinic requirements concerning ritual baths see Mishnah Tractate Mikwaoth. Evidence for mikvaoth which are not connected with a synagogue [or in which such a connection, or the identification as a synagogue, is disputed] comes from [at least] the following places; Gamla [Levine 1981, p32; but note Chiat 1982, p282-4]; Ma'on [see Avi-Yonah 1975-78, p779; Chiat 1982, p245]; Hasmonean Gezer [see Reich 1981, p50-52]; Khirbet Shema' [see Meyers, Kraabel, Strange 1972, p9,21-5; 1976, p40-1,94,113-6]; Meron [see Meyers, Strange and Meyers 1981, p41-4; Chiat 1982 p 38]; Jerusalem [See Avigad 1984, p84-6,94,105,111,139-143;235-41; Mazar 1978, p236]; Jericho, Tel Zakaria and at other sites [see Reich 1981, p50-1]; Khirbet Qumran [see Newton 1985, p26-34; see also CD 11:21f; Text in Fitzmyer 1970]. Other possible water sources at: Huldah [see Levine 1981, p17; Chiat 1982, p209-211]; Qisrin [see Chiat 1982, p267]; Beth Yerah [see Chiat 1982, p306];

[61] This is Chiat's category I; see Chiat 1982, p2.

[62] Two cases [Jassud Hammal'le, CIJ 1404] belong to Chiat's category II, where the location of the building is unknown. We would not expect to know of many washbasins etc. from synagogues in this group. Two other cases [Herodium, Masada] belong to Chiat's category III - disputed attributions.

[63] Note also that in some places a mikvah or wash basin used by worshippers before entering the synagogue may have been completely independent of the synagogue building. Where such arrangements are known, they have not been included in this list [since a connection between the synagogue and the water facility will always be tenuous in such a situation], but they would considerably increase the figures given here.

[64] See Sukenik 1934, p49; TDNT, VII, p814; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p441 n65.

[65] The decree is undated but almost certainly belongs to the first half of the first century BCE.

[66] This passage may possibly only speak about "prayer" [see TDNT, VII, p815 n100] but this seems unlikely.

[67] See CPJ I, p247–9 no 134, Col III; TDNT, VII, p814.

[68] See Sukenik 1934, p7–21,44–5; TDNT, VII, p814; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p441 n65. In Flacc. 122-3, Philo reports that the Jews of Alexandria assembled for prayer by the sea when their synagogues had been destroyed. However, the choice of the site may have been based on covenience or necessity rather than on principle.

[69] On this subject in general see Schürer 1907, 2, p519; Juster 1914, 1, p459 n1; Strack–Billerbeck 1924, 2, p742, 4, p119,122; Krauss 1922, p284; Elbogen 1931, p448–9; Tcherikover CPJ II, p221; TDNT, II, p808; 7, p814–5 and n100; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p440–1.

[70] This is a large area which need not be dealt with in detail here. We will speak of "purity" rather than "ritual purity" because the latter phrase suggests to modern ears something that is not "real", when in fact purity was a very real and material concept. See Neusner 1973, p1–2; Newton 1985 p40–1. We can note the following:

[a] The concern for pure oil shown in Josephus, Vita 74–6 and BJ 2:59 in which Josephus grants John of Gischala permission to provide oil, permission granted reluctantly by Josephus "from fear of being stoned by the mob if I withheld it" [Vita 76] gives an indication of the intensity of feeling surrounding this matter of purity at the time. See also Jud 10:5, Ant 12:120 and on the concern for pure oil in general Baumgarten 1967, p186–190.

[b] Other indications of the importance of purity are found in 1 Macc 13:47–50; Ant 19.331; TLevi 8:4–6; Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 46.2.

[c] There is much evidence that both regular and initiatory immersions were widely practiced in the late Second Temple Period; see Werblowsky 1975, p203–4.

[d] Strict enforcement of purity was one of the major priorities of the Qumran community. Because the community regarded itself as a surrogate for the Temple the purity rules of the Temple were applied to its own life. Newton [1985, p24,26] comments:

> purity was a major focus within the community and the regulations regarding membership, the ongoing life within the community and the discipling of members revolve around this concern.

> The community as a group considered itself to be pure and all those outside to be impure. ... Like the Jerusalem Temple, all objects and participants were required to be in a state of purity so as to enable the divine presence to dwell in their midst.

See also Neusner 1977, p37–49. Washing was therefore an important part of the ordered life of purity at Qumran; see Newton 1985, p26–34. See also Buchanan 1963, p397–406; Baumgarten 1967, p183–192; Hoenig 1969, p558–67; Newton 1985, p10–51; BJ 2:129,149–150; CD 10:10f, 11:18f.

[e] On Rabbinic laws of purity see Büchler 1909–10, p34–40; Neusner 1973, pix–6, 72–130; Safrai and Stern 1976, 2, p828–32, 876–8; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p475–8.

[f] Neusner notes "purity is an essential element in the interpretation of Israel's total religious system." [1973 p28]. Newton [1985, p1–9] shows that the significance of the idea of purity in Judaism has generally been overlooked.

[71] See Chapter 1, section 5.5. When presenting the archaeological data or discussing the siting of synagogues, scholars normally state [often very briefly] that a washbasin was used for ablutions, or for the washing of hands before prayer. See Kohl and Watzinger 1916, p144; Krauss 1922 p361; Strack–Billerbeck 1928, 4, p119,122; Elbogen 1931, p448; Sukenik 1932, p15; 1934, p49; TDNT II, p808; III, p421; Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p77; Robert 1958b, p43; Lifshitz 1967, p38; Tcherikover in CPJ, II, p221; Ovadiah 1978, p860; Kraeling 1979, p13; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p441 n65; Levine 1981, p117; Seager 1983, p169; Safrai and Stern [1976, 2, p829–31] note that ritual baths and hand basins are often discovered in connection with synagogues. They also note that it was quite common to wash the hands before eating and before prayer. On purifications by water in a variety of Jewish and Christian groups [Hemerobaptists, Ebionites etc.] see Neusner 1977, p103–4.

[72] An inscription which seems to have been overlooked [apart from a brief note by Kittel 1944, col 14], is from Tscheschmeli in Lycaonia. It is the grave of "Σωφπον[ι]ος Λευίτης ἁγνός ..." [Text in Anderson 1899, p285 no 178.] "ἁγνός" could mean either pure, as in of pure descent, or holy. It is probably relevant here, since it shows the wider concern for [personal] holiness was still retained, at least by this one "Levite".

[73] See Josephus' version of this in Ant 12:106.

[74] A variant reads "hands".

[75] This passage is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in Protreptikos vi. 70.

[76] Tosefta Berakot 2:13 cited by Safrai and Stern 1976, p946 who suggest that the passage implies that ritual purity was linked with prayer. Text of Tosefta from Lohse and Schlichting 1956, p27. An interesting passage from the Tosefta, which perhaps suggests that immersion before prayer was controversial in the pre–70 period, read as follows: "Those who immerse at dawn say, 'We complain against you, Pharisees, for you mention the divine name at dawn without first immersing.' Say Pharisees 'We complain against you, those who immerse at dawn, for you make mention of the divine name in a body which contains uncleanness.'" Tosefta Yadayim 2:20 [translated by Neusner 1977c, p335.]

[77] See Neusner 1973, p3. It is possible therefore that the custom developed

independently in the different streams of Judaism represented by Rabbinic literature and the earlier literature cited above. However, our concern is with the custom rather than its prehistory.

[78] Tractate Berakoth 14b–15a. The passage goes on to say that one should not search for water at the time for the Shema', in case the right time passed during the search. See also TB Berakoth 53b. Schechter [1909, p66 n1] thinks that the cleansing mentioned in TB Berakoth has nothing to do with priestly ablutions; it is simply an aid to concentration of all of the mind on prayer. However, in prayer one approaches the holy Deity, so washing before prayer seems to involve becoming pure and is therefore more than an aid to concentration. Clement of Alexandria [Strom iv.22.142], after referring to a passage from Homer in which the hands were washed before prayer, states that "It was a custom of the Jews to wash frequently after being in bed." Schürer [1907, II, p519 n63], also quotes two passages from Maimonides in this regard. One states that five things must be done before prayer, one of which is the purification of the hands. Handwashing before prayer and the recitation of the Shema' became one of the twelve occasions on which handwashing was required according to later Jewish custom; see EJ 12, col 998–9.

[79] Safrai and Stern [1976, 2, p831], thus regard washing of hands as a "token bath". An interesting parallel here is provided by John 13:1–11 where footwashing is regard as a symbol for "cleansing" the whole person albeit in a solely spiritual sense. See Dunn 1970, p250; see also Sanders 1985, p387 n51 on the issue of handwashing rather than immersion. Safrai and Stern [1976, 2] conclude from the passages cited in the text: [p831]

> There are many traditions which linked such states [of purity and impurity] with the reading of Scripture and the prayers, and even with the synagogue. ... Only the Amoraim held that the hands have to be washed before prayer. But there is much to indicate that this was an ancient custom, dating from the period of the Second Temple. There were in fact two customs prevailing at the time. Purity before prayer was ensured either by washing the hands or by total immersion. To facilitate the worshippers, there were pools or cisterns where they could bathe near the synagogues or special installations for washing the hands or feet.

It seems that *hands* were washed before prayer because Jews prayed "with outstretched hands" [CAp 1:209]. See also 1 Kg 8:54; CIJ 828b; Sib Or 3:591, 4:166; TDNT, IX, p426; Strack–Billerbeck 1924, 2, p261. Handwashing and other lustrations before prayer are found in pagan religions and in Christianity; see Schürer 1907, 2, p519 n63; Krauss 1922, p361; TDNT, III, p414–6, 4, p946. It is possible that Jewish practice was influenced by this contemporary practice of other religions [see EJ 2, col 86], although we should look to Jewish sources for an explanation first.

[80] See also Ex 40:30–2; [1 Kg 7:27–39 on the laver s themselves]; 2 Chr 4:6; Ps 24:34, Ps 72:13; also Deut 21:6 for hand washing as purification after a death had occurred.

[81] See also Lev 11:25, 28, 40; 15:7, 16–18, 21–7, 22:6; Nu 19:7–8; Ez 16:9. On immersion before entering the Temple see Mishnah Tamid 1:2; Hag 2:6; Yoma 3:2,3. cf Isa 1:16.

[82] See also Jub 21:16 "And at all of the [appointed] times be pure in your body and wash yourself with water before you go to make an offering upon the altar.

And wash your hands and your feet before you approach the altar. And when you have completed making the offering, wash yourhands and feet again". [On this see Neusner 1973, p56.]

[83] The oral law held that because the hands touched things automatically, they were therefore suspected of being unclean and requiring purification. See Safrai and Stern 1976, 2, p829 and Yadaim. We should also note that the hands could be unclean whilst the rest of the body remained unaffected; see Neusner 1977b, p 288.

[84] Perhaps parallels today are useful here. A Gentile male may enter some synagogues provided he covers his head; a person can enter some mosques provide they take off their shoes or a women covers her head. We should also note a possible complementary interpretation of the evidence presented here. In addition to water sources being present because of ablutions before prayer, we can suggest that from the third century CE onwards water sources were used because of the growing sanctity of the synagogue. Thus, when one approached the synagogue, which became a "holy place" [the evidence for this begins in the third century CE], some ablutions were performed. On the growing sanctity of the synagogue see especially CIJ 694, on which see Hengel 1975b, p110f. The following inscriptions refer to the synagogue a "holy place": CIJ 867, 966, 980, 1199, 1203, 1205; Lifshitz 1967, no 70, 73a 90; Chiat 1982, p110, p135 no 10.2. We can suggest that just as purity was associated with the Temple precisely because it was the locus of holiness, so too purity came to be associated with the synagogue as it came to be seen as a locus of holiness for each community. Therefore, in the later period people perhaps washed for two complementary reasons – they carried out ablutions before praying to the Holy God, and before entering the synagogue, the local "holy place". This is connected with the synagogue assuming the legacy of the Temple after the latter's destruction, which is another area of investigation in its own right.

Chapter 9.

[1] On citizenship in the Greek city see Jones 1940, p157–62,172–3; Safrai and Stern 1974, p434. Citizenship was determined by birth, but could also be granted to foreigners who were, for example, benefactors of the city. It was a sign of social and cultural recognition and prestige.

[2] Tcherikover 1961, p328–9; see also Gauger 1977, p46–8; Roth-Gerson 1972, English summary p3; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p127; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p737–41. "ἰσοτίμος" in Ant 12:119 is a political ideal rather than a specific political system; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p436–7. Josephus states that citizenship was at least in part a reward for serving in the army of Seleucus Nicator. However, we have no independent evidence that Jews served in his army; see Gauger 1977, p42–3. Note also the difference between BJ 7:44 and Ant 12:119–20/CAp 2:39 as regards which king gave the Jews citizenship in Antioch. For an assessment of CAp 2:33–42 see Tcherikover 1961, p320–5. The difficulty of reconciling Claudius' Letter [see CPJ 153] with the Edict given in Ant 19:280–5 also casts doubt on Josephus' general usage of legal terminology and thus on these passages. See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p128–130. A number of scholars interpret these passages referring to the Jewish community at Antioch to mean that the Jews there had their own politeuma. This could be suggested by BJ 7:110 and the use of δικαιώματα; see also Ant 12:121; BJ 7:43–4. On this see Safrai and Stern 1974, p138; Smallwood 1981, p358–60; Rajak 1979, p193. Smallwood suggests that πολιτεία could then mean citizenship of the Jewish politeuma; see Smallwood 1981, p229–30, 359 and note 16 below. This does not necessarily mean that the Jews in Ionia were organized in politeumata however. Some scholars accept the claims of Ant 12:119; see for example Ramsay 1897, p668; 1900, p189–91; 1904b, p146–9; Kittel 1944, col 11; Blanchetière 1974, p374.

[3] See Safrai and Stern 1974, p436, 445–6; Liddell and Scott, p840.

[4] Somewhat earlier, Strabo [in Ant 14:115–6] grouped the population of Cyrene into four classes – citizens, farmers, metics and Jews. Thus, Ant 16:160–1 may only refer to the situation there. See Safrai and Stern 1974, p 446–7; Applebaum 1979, p176–8.

[5] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p129 and n15. cf. Schürer 1909, 3, p124 n14; Ramsay 1902, p92–5; 1904b, p152–4; Marcus in Josephus vol 7, p741–2.

[6] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p129, n15; cf. Tcherikover 1961, p516 n92; Schürer 1909, 3, p124 n14.

[7] On this passage see Schalit 1969, p426–34; Roddaz 1984, p451–63.That the two reports concern the same incident is highly likely due to the fact that Nicolas puts the case for the Jews of Ionia before Agrippa in both reports; see Smallwood 1981, p140 n78.

[8] To the Greeks' accusation that "by merely spreading over their country the Jews were now doing them all kinds of harm", Josephus writes: "But the Jews

proved that they were natives [ἐγγενεῖς] ..." [Ant 16:59; a variant reads εὐγενεῖς.] This would seem to be an opportunity for the Jews to assert their citizenship, if they did in fact possess it. That Josephus uses a word like ἐγγενής is therefore revealing.

[9] See the discussions of these two passages in Tcherikover 1961, p329–30; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p129–30; Safrai and Stern 1974, p441–2; Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p741–2; cf. Ramsay 1902, p92–4; Hemer 1986, p38,224 n10. Smallwood 1981, p140–1 reads the text too much in the light of the Alexandrian situation. It is possible that the beginning and end of Ant 12:125–6 did not originally belong together, and have been erroneously collated by Josephus or his source. It seems unlikely that the beginning of the report is entirely a fabrication, since it raises the delicate matter of exemption from the city's cult for Jews who also had citizen rights. This does not seem to be the sort of area a Jewish apologist would want to raise. Is it therefore perhaps the beginning of a different dispute, of which the outcome [now lost] was positive for a Jewish community, and hence recorded by them? Is it thus further evidence for the Jewish claim to have received citizenship from a Seleucid monarch [see 1.1], a claim that was disputed on the grounds that the Jews did not participate in the cult of the city? Unfortunately we can do no more than pose these questions.

[10] Ant 14:235. On the date see Broughton 1952, 2, p260.

[11] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p120 n52; Safrai and Stern 1974, p442 suggest the second reading is more probable. The inscriptions from the synagogue now show that in the third century CE or later a number of Jews were Σαρδιανοί. They were also Roman citizens, since the inscriptions are probably after the Constitutio Antoniniana. The time period between the text of Josephus and the inscriptions is however too great for the latter to be of help.

[12] On the term see Ziebarth in RE XXI,2, 1952, col 1401–2; Tarn 1952, p147; Tcherikover 1961, p299; Fraser 1962, p147–52; Cohen 1978, p86; Smallwood 1981, p139,225–6; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p88. Politeumata were a regular feature of Hellenistic cities, and a number of non–Jewish examples are known; see Smallwood 1981, p226 n23.

[13] See CPJ 153. It seems that at least part of the Jewish community sought to gain Alexandrian citizenship through such means as entering the ephebate, but Claudius' letter put an end to these aspirations. The literature on Alexandria is extensive. See Jones 1926, p17–35; Tarn 1952, p221; CPJ II p25–107 especially p36–55; Tcherikover 1961, p311–26; Safrai and Stern 1974, p125–33, 421–30; 435–40, 473–7; Smallwood 1970, p6–14; 1981, p224–55; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p92, 104, 128, 132, 150–3; a different interpretation in Kasher 1985, p29f.

[14] See Lüderitz 1983, no 70,71; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p88–9, 94–5; Applebaum 1979, p183. Note that πολίτευμα is replaced by συναγωγή in an inscription dated to 55 CE; see Lüderitz 1983 no 72.

[15] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p90. The term also occurs in an inscription from Nysa [see section 1.5] and in Lüderitz 1983, no 71.

[16] A number of scholars think the Sardis community was organized as a politeuma; see Marcus in Josephus Vol 7, p589 n b; Smallwood 1970, p8; 1981, p139; Safrai and Stern 1974, p477–8; Rajak 1979, p193. The use of πολιτεύωνται is interesting, although its range of meaning is quite wide. The "tribe of Leontioi" at Sardis was probably a tribe within the Jewish community rather than within the city; see chapter 2 section 4.2.

[17] Tarn 1952, p221 n9; see also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p130 n17.

[18] Marcus, Josephus Vol 7, p587 nf; Jones 1926, p27–8; Smallwood 1970, p8; 1981, p229–30, 359; see also Kasher 1985, p234f.

[19] The suggestion that Jews used πολίτης to designate a member of their politeuma is attractive and seems to explain the use of πολίτης by Philo and Josephus with reference to Jews in Alexandria. In using the term they would be claiming membership of the politeuma, not citizenship of the city. [See for example Ant 12:121,14:188; Philo, Fl. 47, Leg. 193,349.] This sort of technically incorrect usage of legal terms is similar to Josephus describing Jews as Alexandrians and Antiochians. [For example in CAp 2:38–9; Ant 19:281; see also CPJ 151, Philo Leg. 194. See Jones 1926, p27–8; Smallwood 1970, p8–10.] However; it is another matter to claim that a *city* used πολίτης of Jewish members of a politeuma; see Jones 1926, p28. The untechnical usage of ἴσης πολιτείας in the Edict of Claudius [Ant 19:281] may also perhaps be clarified by seeing it as a Jewish claim to equality of standing between their politeuma and the Greek polis; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p129,452–4; Smallwood 1970, p10–11; Kasher 1977–78, p20–21; Rajak 1979, p193. The view that isopoliteia meant that any Jew who was willing to conform to Greek religious practices had a right to citizenship [see for example, Tarn 1952, p222] is unlikely; see Nock 1972, p960–2; Safrai and Stern 1974, p438–9.

[20] Even if Ant 14:235 should read "your Jewish citizens" [ie of Sardis] this could still only mean that the Jews who visited Lucius Antonius were citizens [and we could well understand the community sending its most prominent members to see Lucius Antonius], and not the whole Jewish community. The use of κατοικέω perhaps indicates the Jews' status as resident aliens; see Smallwood 1981, p230 n41.

[21] On the situation at Antioch see Meeks and Wilken 1978, p2 and note 2 above. There was perhaps a Jewish politeuma at Caesarea; see Kasher 1977–78, p16–27; Smallwood 1981, p285.

[22] See for example Tcherikover 1961, p299–305; Hengel 1974, 1, p38; Kasher 1977–78, p24; Smallwood 1981, p139,226; Saulnier 1981, p193.

[23] See Rajak 1979, p192–3; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p113.

[24] Humann et al 1898, no 212=CIJ 775.

[25] See Oertel in RE XI, 1922, col 1–13; Liddell and Scott, p928; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p89; Jones 1940, p160; Kraabel 1968, p130–134. It perhaps indicates that the community began as a military settlement, see Tcherikover, 1961, p336.

[26] See Tcherikover 1961, p297–8, see also p336; cf. Ramsay 1902, p96–7. Note that Philo [in Flacc. 172, a speech put in the mouth of Flaccus] shows that Jews in Alexandria could be called "κατοίκοις". In another inscription from Hierapolis a fine is to be paid τῷ λαῷ τῶν Ἰουδαί[ω]ν; Humann et al 1898, no 69=CIJ 776. "λαός" is also found in an inscription from Smyrna which Robert has argued is Jewish [see Robert 1960b, p259–62]; and is also found elsewhere [see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p89–90]. This means that at Hierapolis the Jewish community's constitutional position was probably that of a κατοικία, whilst the community at times called itself "the people of the Jews." Note that the reference to ἡ Ἰουδδηνῶν κατοικία in IGR 4.1387 from the Hermus region is not Jewish [as Tcherikover 1961, p502 n63 thought]; see Robert 1962, p282–3; Gauger 1977, p37 n53. Other terms which were used in this way as a designation by the Jewish communities are: "οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι" at Ephesus; see Robert 1960b, p381–4. A fine to be paid "τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Ἰουδαίων" at Smyrna; see CIJ 741=Petzl 1982, no 295. Note the Jews at Smyrna therefore called themselves both "λαός" and "ἔθνος". "συναγωγή" was common, for example at Phocaea, Acmonia, Deliler, Hyllarima. However no conclusions concerning the legal or political position of the Jewish communities can be drawn from these general terms. The Jewish community at Herapolis possessed an archive; see CIJ 775. The archive mentioned in CIJ 776, 778 might also be Jewish; see also CPJ 143 from Alexandria. On these archives see Solin 1983, p698 n239a. This suggests the Jewish community at Hierapolis had a significant measure of independence.

[27] Robert 1960b, p261; Lifshitz 1967, no 31.

[28] Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p89–90. σύνοδος is also found with regard to Sardis in Ant 14:235, see section 1.3 above.

[29] Ramsay believed that a body of Jews were enrolled as citizens of a special Jewish tribe within the Greek city and thus were citizens of the city but avoided pagan worship. Thus, he proposed that Paul was a member of a Jewish tribe in Tarsus; see Ramsay 1902, p22–33; 1904b, p146–54; 1907, p174–80; see also Blanchetière 1974, p375. However, apart from the newly discovered tribe at Sardis, which is probably a group within the Jewish community rather than in the city, we have no evidence for these Jewish tribes. See Welles 1962, p59. It is possible that such tribes existed, but we cannot say more than that. The term "Macedonian" used by Josephus of Jews in Alexandria [see for example BJ 2;487–8] applies to a military unit and is probably not the name of the "Jewish tribe" of all the Jews in the city; see CPJ 1, p14–15; cf. Ramsay 1902, p25; Safrai and Stern 1974, p437–8.

[30] Acts 21:39; cf. Tarn and Griffith 1952, p221–3.

[31] See section 3.2.

[32] On Sardis see Chapter 2, Section 10. For the inscription from Corycos see CIJ 788. It is perhaps significant that none of the 71 Jews listed in the new Aphrodisias inscription can be said to have had local citizenship; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p124–5. This would suggest that very few Jews had local citizenship in the period from which the inscription comes. The Jewish ἀρχιατρός

at Ephesus [see section 3.3] may well have been a citizen of the city and perhaps a Roman citizen as well. We also know of some Jews who were citizens of their cities elsewhere. Thus, the Jewish epheboi at Cyrene and Ptolemais in the reign of Augustus would probably have become citizens [see note 69]; Elazar, a Jewish magistrate in Cyrene in 60/61 CE would also have been a citizen. See Applebaum 1979, p185–9; Safrai and Stern 1974, p445–8 and section 3.3 below. Elazar retained a Jewish name which suggests he was not an apostate. But we do not know what bearing this evidence has on communual right of the Jews in Cyrene. Individuals in Alexandria had also been entering the ephebate and through this probably citizenship; see CPJ 153 and note 13 above. We also know of some individuals in Alexandria who obtained Greek citizenship. Thus, the two Jewish alabachs must have been citizens [see below]; note also Tiberius Julius Alexander; and CPJ 151.

[33] Unfortunately, we have no direct evidence which would tell us if the possession of Greek citizenship by individual Jews involved participation in pagan religious observances. What we know of Paul would suggest that there was some way in which Jews could enjoy full citizenship without abandoning Judaism [perhaps through the granting of some sort of concession], but more than this we cannot say. Nock [1972, p961] believed that the evidence was sufficient to speak of "the compatibility of Jewish practice and Greek citizenship." See also the discussions in Meeks 1983, p37–8; Smallwood 1981, p234–5; Applebaum 1979, p186; Tcherikover 1961, p375–6. On Paul's citizenship of Tarsus see in particular Cadbury 1955, p80–1; Welles 1962, p61–2; Sherwin–White 1963, p178–9. Ant 12:126 perhaps suggests that Jews who were citizens would claim exemption from worshipping the city's gods, but as we have seen this passage is very difficult to interpret. See also CAp 2:65. The later evidence from Sardis shows that Jews could be citizens of the city and remain practising Jews, since the inscriptions are found in the synagogue.

[34] See Sherwin–White 1973, p245–50,322f; Safrai and Stern 1974, p444–5; Balsdon 1979, p82–96. On the advantages bestowed by Roman citizenship see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p134–5. There was no necessary connexion between grants of Roman and of local citizenship; see Bell 1942, p47–8. On the evidence and date for Roman and local citizenship becoming compatible see Sherwin–White 1963, p181–4.

[35] As does Ant 14:230, although it mentions Jews [with no mention being made of Roman citizenship] in Asia; see Smallwood 1981, p127 n24.

[36] The later exemption by Dolabella does not mention Roman citizens but seems to exempt all Jews, see Ant 14:225–7; Smallwood 1981, p128; cf. Safrai and Stern 1974, p458–9; Tcherikover 1961, p510 n43.

[37] Smallwood 1981, p127–8; see also Saulnier 1981, p194, 168–9.

[38] Safrai and Stern 1974, p152 [and p441,719] write with regard to the Jewish community at Ephesus that: "Quite a number of them were Roman citizens." Tcherikover 1961, p342 [and p330] "a considerable group of Jews" who were Roman citizens. Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p120 "many Jews in that area possessed Roman citizenship ..."

[39] If this was the case, Tcherikover [1961, p342], thought some of these Jews or their parents would have gained citizenship through emancipation by Roman masters; cf. Safrai and Stern 1974, p458–9.

[40] See Acts 16:37,22:25–9,23:27. On Paul's Roman citizenship see Cadbury 1955, p65–82; Sherwin–White 1963, p145–62,172–85; Welles 1962, p62.

[41] See chapter 3 section 2; the inscription is to be dated in the 80s–90s.

[42] See Robert 1960b, p381–4, a revision of CIJ 746, to be dated towards the end of the second century CE.

[43] See Robert 1960b, p259–62; Petzl 1982, no 296. This could be before or after 212/214 CE. No Jewish Roman citizens are found in the new list of Jews at Aphrodisias, but the inscription was probably dated to before 212/214 CE; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p126. We know of Jewish Roman citizens elsewhere: At Berenice we know of Decimus Valerius Dionysius and Marcus Laelius Onasion [Augustan era and 24–25 CE respectively]; see Lüderitz 1983 no 70,71. They were perhaps freedmen. See also CPJ 162, 174 from Alexandria. In Carthage and Roman Africa there were 11 Jews who were Roman citizens. Some of the inscriptions are probably to be dated before 212, and a number after that date; see Le Bohec 1981b, p215–7. For the possibility of Jewish Roman citizens at Teucheira see Applebaum 1961, p33. On the situation at Rome see Philo Leg. 155–8; Smallwood 1970, p233–5,242; 1981, p131–2,215,522; see also Acts 6:9. Tiberius Julius Alexander at Alexandria was a Roman citizen, see Smallwood 1970, p13; Antipater was also, see Ant 14:137.

[44] See Jones 1940, p173,175–6,270–1; 1936, p223–35; Bell 1942, p39–49; Smallwood 1981, p502–4; Sherwin–White 1973, p280–7,380–94. For a dating to 214 CE for the Constitutio Antoniniana see Millar 1962, p124–131.

[45] Caracalla's name Aurelius thus occurs quite frequently in Jewish inscriptions. For Asia Minor see CIJ 760,761, 764,774–6,778–80,788; Lifschitz 1967, no 17–19. That these people adopted the name Aurelios suggests that they did not have Roman citizenship before 212/214; see Kraabel 1968, p219. Other inscriptions from Asia Minor are difficult to date and thus we do not know if they are before or after 212/214. For example in a third century inscription we learn of Π(όπλιος) Ῥουτ(ίλιος) Ἰωσῆς, archisynagogos at Teos; see Robert 1940, p27–8; cf. CIJ 744; Pottier and Hauvette–Besnault 1880, p181 no 44. But was this before 212/214? See also CIJ 776.

[46] Smallwood 1981, p503–4.

[47] IGR IV 1431; CIJ 742.

[48] See Smallwood 1981, p234 n59, 507; Frend 1965, p148 n47; Safrai and Stern 1974, p57; Thompson 1982, p331,337; Mandell 1984, p232, n48. The phrase has also been interpreted to mean "those of the former Jewish nation"; see Ziebarth 1896, p129; Ramsay 1904c, p323–4; Brown 1931, p19; Kittel 1944, col 14; Hemer 1986, p9; cf. Yamauchi 1980, p61–2. This interpretation is based on Mommsen's view that after the Jewish revolts the Jews were juridically

equal to all other Asiatics under Roman rule and were no longer regarded as a "nation" but solely as a religious society; see Ramsay 1895b, p272–7; Chapot 1904, p186. However, that the Jews were no longer regarded as a people after 70 CE is unlikley; see Juster 1914, 1, p418 n3; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p114 n28.

[49] See Kraabel 1968, p30–32, 1985, p455; Brooten 1982, p11 and p225 n33; see also Smith 1980, p19; Robert BE 1983, p82; and in general Solin 1983, p647–9; cf. Kant 1987, p686 n97, p707. Applebaum [in Safrai and Stern 1976, p719] claims that the name "Ἄνα" found in a first century CE inscription [SEG 24.1105] from Histria in Moesia which lists benfactors to the town is Jewish; it would then be a parallel case to the inscription from Smyrna. However, although the name is used by Jews [see CIJ 575], it is not limited to Jews [it is used by pagans and Christians; see Zgusta 1964, p68 and for example MAMA VII.206; see also Cohen 1969, English summary, p5–6] and is not a reliable indicator in the present instance.

[50] See Chapter 3, section 7.1. The inscription is undated. See also note 82 below for another example.

[51] See Chapter 7, section 4.5.

[52] On the theatre see Bieber 1961, 1f; Smith 1853, p1120–1125; OCD, p1051–2.

[53] See Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p132; see also Kraabel 1983, p181; Cameron 1976, p315; Robert BE 1977, no 82.

[54] Smith 1853, p822–3; OCD, p746. On the odeum in general see Bieber 1961, p174–7, 220–1. Jews also had seats in the hippodrome at Tyre; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p132. We have two interesting inscriptions from Berenice which the Jewish community there set up in a building called an "amphitheatre"; see Lüderitz, 1983, no 70,71. It is not clear whether the building was a Jewish meeting place [although there are no clear parallels for such a building being called an amphitheatre] or if it was the city amphitheatre. Reynolds [1981, p247] notes that at the likely date of one of the inscriptions [perhaps 9–6 BCE] the word amphitheatre was unlikely to have had a metaphorical sense. In addition, the donor appears to be honoured in the inscription [which commemorates work done in the "amphitheatre"] for benevolence to the whole citizen body of Berenice and not just to the Jewish community. This implies that the amphitheatre was a civic building; see also Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p104; cf. Applebaum 1979, p164–7. If this is correct, it suggests that the Jews of the city at least had access to the building and probably also attended games there along with their Greek neighbours.

[55] For a discussion of the date and state of the text see Chapter 1, note 121.

[56] A comparable example comes from Alexandria where the Jews passed a resolution in honour of Gaius, probably after his accession; see Flacc. 97–103. Philo describes such a resolution as "the duty of piety to the house of our benefactor." A third century CE inscription from Hyllarima in Caria might begin "For the health ... of the King ..." but the inscription is fragmentary at the beginning; see Lifshitz 1967, no 32; Brooten 1982, p162 no 29.

[57] See Chapter 2, section 4.1. Comparative examples would then be the resolutions noted in note 55 and 56.

[58] See Chapter 4, section 4.

[59] We have a number of inscriptions from Egypt in which Jewish communities dedicated their proseuche to the Ptolemaic King and his wife. See for example CPJ 3, 1532A, CIJ 1432,1440–1444. Note that in doing this Jews were probably following the practice of their environment since Greek Temples were dedicated to kings; see Tcherikover 1961, p303,349; Dion 1977, p55–7. Jews in Berenice, Cyrenaica passed a decree in 25 CE honouring Marcus Titius Sextus, who was a Roman in authority. The resolution was a tribute to him for his favourable attitude towards the Jewish community; see Lüderitz 1983, no 71; Reynolds 1981, p245; Applebaum 1979, p161,183. A building that was perhaps a synagogue was dedicated in Palestine to the safety of Septimus Severus and his family; see CIJ 972. In a third century CE inscription from Intercisa in the Balkans the Jewish community made a dedication for the safety of Severus Alexander and Iulia Mammaea; see CIJ^2 677; see also CIJ^2 678a for a similar inscription from Mursa although much of it is a restoration. A first or second century CE inscription from the Ostia synagogue begins "Pro salute Aug(usti)"; see AE 1967, no 77; Solin 1983, p726. Philo informs us that objects such as gilded shields and crowns were set up in honour of the Emperor in Alexandrian synagogues; see Leg. 133; also Fl. 48; Leg. 280. Thus we have evidence of Jews being "good residents" from a variety of places. On this in general see Smallwood 1970, p221; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p104–5; Kant 1987, p700.

Note that according to the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* the Jews in Smyrna played a part in Polycarp's death and seem to have been a significant and perhaps an influential element in the city where they worked together with Gentiles against the common foe. See MPoly 8:1, 12:2, 13:1, 17:2, 18:1. However, the account of Polycarp's death sets out to show the perfect parallelism between Christ's death and Polycarp's martyrdom; see MPoly 1:1, 19:1, also 1:2, 6:2, 12:2, 16:1; on this see Simon 1986, p122; Musurillo 1972, p xiii-xiv. Thus it is unwise to put weight on the historical veracity of the account with regard to the Jewish community of the city; cf. Smallwood 1981, p507–8; Parkes 1934, p136–7; Hemer 1986, p67. It is probable that the Jews were involved in the martyrdom, but we cannot be more specific than this about that involvement. Using the account of Pionius' martyrdom as a historical source is similarly difficult; see MPion 2:1, 3:6, 4:2,5-12; 13:1, 14:1. On these two works see see Kraabel 1968, p37f; Gero 1978, p164–8; Hilhorst 1982, p91–6; Den Boeft and Bremmer 1985, p110–130.

[60] See Magie 1950, p62. On the high value placed upon education in the Hellenistic world see Hengel 1974, 1, p65–70; Feldman 1960, p224; see also Harris 1976, p31; Ramsay 1895a, p111.

[61] Magie 1950, p62; Hengel 1974, 1, p66, 2; p48 n79; Smallwood 1981, p231–2; CPJ 1, p64; Sheppard 1975, p36–8,44–6; Cohen 1978, p36–7.

[62] This inscription was originally published inaccurately by Th. Reinach in 1893. Robert 1937a, p85–6, published a new reading of the inscription; see also Robert 1946, p100–101; Kasher 1976b, p161 n65. The name "Ioudas" occurs

frequently among Jews at Rome, see CIJ I, p610. At Iasos itself we have a grave epitaph for M. Αὐρήλιος Παπίας Εἰούδας; see Robert 1940, p28–9. The name "Euodos" is also found among Jews at Rome and thus is not surprising in a Jewish family. See Robert 1946, p101, n2. Tcherikover [1971, p350; see also CPJ 1, p39 n99] thought that two other people mentioned in the list may be Jewish; he names them as Theophilos and Dositheos. Theophilos is found in CPJ 1, 21 and CIJ 1, 119. Names beginning with "Θεός" are very common among Jews; see CPJ 3, p176–178, CIJ 1, p609–610. The name Dositheos does not in fact occur in this ephebe list and is a mistake for Δωσας; see Kraabel 1968, p16. Dosas occurs fourteen times in CPJ and so may well be Jewish. In CPJ 1, p39 n99 Tcherikover suggests that the whole group given by Robert may be Jewish, and this idea is repeated in Safrai and Stern 1974, p447. However, Robert's list is a section of a longer list of ephebes and that they were all Jews seems unlikely.

[63] Inscription in Reinach 1885a, p74–5; Oehler 1909, p297 no 58, CIJ 755. The inscription is complete; on its date see Reinach 1885a, p74–5.

[64] Reinach 1885a, p75; Safrai and Stern 1974, p447; CPJ I p39 n99. Forbes [1933, p60–1] notes that the term had a variety of meanings, and could include both epheboi and neoi.

[65] See Forbes 1933, p1–69; Jones 1940, p225, Hengel 1974, 1, p66; Ramsay 1895a, p111; Sheppard 1975, p51–55. The "neoi" were more common in Asia Minor than elsewhere; seeForbes 1933, p16.

[66] See Reinach 1885a, p75–76; CIJ 2, p20; Kraabel 1968, p181; Poliakoff 1984, p63. Frey thinks one is to understand at the end of the inscription a word such as "offering" or "place reserved". See also Schürer 1909, 3, p91. There have however been other interpretations of the inscription proposed. [i] Reinach [1885a, p75–6] also thought it was possible that the inscription simply designated "younger" from older Jews ie. νεώτεροι compared to πρεσβύτεροι. Krauss [1922, p231 no 60, p395] understood the inscription to refer to the seating plan of the synagogue. It designated the place where the younger Jews sat, whilst the older Jews sat in another part of the synagogue. See also Achelis 1900, p95–6. Whilst the term "elder" is found in Jewish inscriptions [see for example, CIJ 790] this interpretation is unlikely. We have no other literary or inscriptional evidence for segregation of young and old men in the synagogue. We should note a new piece of evidence here, an inscription from the odeum at Aphrodisias [see further in 3.1]. This mentions the Jewish παλαιοί [for which see also Reinach 1893, p167–71=CIJ 800]; another text nearby which Reynolds and Tannenbaum suggest could be Jewish reads "τόπος νεοτέρω[ν]"; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p132. If this second inscription is Jewish, it would suggest a separation of seating between the Jewish elders and young men in the odeum. However, there is no proof that the second inscription is actually Jewish. On a visit to the odeum in April 1986 I read both inscriptions and in my opinion they are too far apart for the second inscription to be considered as Jewish. Further, we do not actually know of any other internal Jewish organisation called the "young men", although it is possible that a group of Jews simply adopted a name from the gymnasium for a group organised for an unknown purpose.

[This would be in keeping with the normal adoption of Greek organisational terms and structures by Diaspora communities.] However, we do know of the "young men" of the gymnasium and it is much more likely that the inscription has to do with a Jewish group like this. Thirdly, if this was a seating plaque or something similar in the synagogue, the word Ἰουδαῖος seems entirely redundant; see Kraabel 1968, p181. It is much more likely, therefore, that it is a public plaque. [ii] It has been suggested that the inscription shows that some young Jews were organised in their own gymnasium; see Safrai and Stern 1974, p478; Kasher 1976b, p155, p161 n64. However, this is the only evidence for such a Jewish gymnasium, and is unlikely, especially in view of the other Jewish ephebes known to us and the situation at Sardis. Note that one of the donors to the Sardis synagogue was a citizen and council member of Hypaepa; see Chapter 2, section 4.10.3. Although this inscription from Sardis could date from a later period than the present inscription, it does suggest that at some point in their history, at least some Jews at Hypaepa were well integrated into the life of the city. This in turn makes it more plausible [though it does no more than this] that there was a Jewish group among the Neoteroi in the city's gymnasium.

[67] Admission to the ephebate and exercise in the gymnasium involved nudity which Judaism found distasteful; see II Macc 4:9–17; Jub 3:31; Ant 15:267–8. The gymnasium possessed its own guardian dieties, Hermes, Heracles and the Muses, and Greek festivals and competitions had a thoroughly religious character; see Forbes 1933, p56–7; Hengel 1974, 1, p67–8; CPJ 1, p38; Feldman 1960, p224–226; Safrai and Stern 1974, p447 and n3. Note however that Philo was familiar with Greek athletics and does not condemn it; see Chapter 7 note 167. Note also the use of wrestling imagery in TJob 27:2–5. Safrai and Stern [1974, p447–9] and Kasher [1976b, p155] see involvement in the gymnasium by practicing Jews as possible; see also Hengel 1974, 1, p68; Poliakoff 1984, p59–65; Goldstein 1981, p82–4.

[68] The light the Sardis situation throws on Jewish ephebes is noted by Hengel 1974, 1, p68; Safrai and Stern 1974, p449; Rajak 1985a, p260–1; see also Georgi 1987, p371. On the Maccabees and the gymnasium see 1 Macc 1:11–15; 2 Macc 4:9,14–17. We should note here that Judaism in the Diaspora was probably not shaped by the event of the Maccabean period to anything like the same degree as the Judaism of Palestine. Thus views of Jews in Palestine which were crystallised and hardened by the Maccabean revolt may not have been shared by Jews in Asia Minor; see in general Kraabel 1987, p55–6.

[69] We know of a number of Jewish ephebes in Cyrenaica at the end of the first century BCE and in the year 3–4 CE; see Applebaum 1964, p291–2; 1979, 167–8,177–178,185; Rajak 1985a, p259–60; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p61 n68; Lüderitz 1983 no 6,7. Applebaum [1979b, p16–19; Safrai and Stern 1974, p467] thought an ephebe named Ἰτθαλλαμμων from Ptolemais was Jewish, but is mistaken; see Lüderitz 1983, no 36. There were two Jewish ephebes named Aurelios Ioses at Coronea in Messenia in the Peloponnese. Their names appear in an ephebe list of 246 CE. See Robert 1946, p100; Safrai and Stern 1974, p447–8; CIJ² 721c. Claudius' Letter implies that some Jews in Alexandria had joined the ephebate presumably in order thereby to gain citizenship; see

Hengel 1974, 1, p66; CPJ 1, 38–9, 2, no 153; Smallwood 1970, p12–14; 1981, p234,249; Feldman 1960, p222–6; cf. Kasher 1976b, p148–161. We should note, however, that our understanding of the situation in Alexandria [or elsewhere] should not dictate our interpretation of the position of Jews in Asia Minor. Note also Kasher's view: "It would appear, therefore, that the Jewish attitude towards Greek educational and cultural institutions largely reflected the mutual relationship between local Jews and Greeks in the various cities. When relations were good, the Jews [or at least some of them] probably did not avoid taking an active part in such institutions." [Kasher 1976b, p155] Note also that one of the God–worshippers at Aphrodisias was probably an athlete and another a boxer; see Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p119,121. The gymnasiarch in Egypt called Joannes Aurelius [see CPJ no 474, 304 CE], may have been either Jewish or Christian; see Harris 1976, p100; cf. Rajak 1985a, p261.

[70] See Chapter 2, sections 4.10.3, 4.11–4.13.

[71] See Chapter 3, section 3.

[72] MAMA III,262; CIJ 788; see also Robert 1964, p56.

[73] Text in Chapter 8, section 1.4. On the abbreviation see Robert 1958b, p37.

[74] Robert 1958b, p37–8, 42; see also Theodosian Code 12.7.2 in Pharr 1969, p378.

[75] Brooten [1982, p229 n93] translates the title as "treasurer" and perhaps implies that the position involved being treasurer in the synagogue, as does Kant [1987, p697]. This would mean that all the offices mentioned in the inscription were in the synagogue, although this title is nowhere else attested as a synagogue–office. However, the texts presented by Robert, and the related term ζυγοστάσιον – weigh house, strongly suggest the title involves control of money and particularly its weight rather than the more general role of treasurer. This means the position was one within the city rather than within the synagogue.

[76] Text in Hicks 1890b, no 677; on the translation of ἀρχιατρός see Magie 1950, p1494 n13. On the Jews in Ephesus see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, p22–3. Note the new inscription in Engelmann and Knibbe 1978–80, p50 no 94.

[77] On these doctors see Wellmann, RE II, 1896, col 464–6; Liebenam 1900, p100–104; Keil 1905, p128–138; Wolters 1906, p295–7; Jones 1940, p219,264; New Docs 1977, p10–25; Nutton 1977, p198–226.

[78] See Jones 1940, p185, p343 n56.

[79] Jones 1940, p189; Magie 1950, p634; Dig. XXVII.1.6,2–4; L.9.4,2.

[80] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p23; Nutton 1977, p198–206; Kraabel 1968, p52.

[81] The series of inscriptions is given in Keil 1905, p138; see also Wolter 1906, p295–7; New Docs 1977, p12. Another Jewish doctor is known at Venosa; see CIJ 600. Note also that CIJ 1, 5* p535 may be Jewish; see also CIJ 1100.

[82] It has been thought that two magistrates Melito and Andronicus whose names appear on coins of Sala [from the time of Trajan, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius] were Jews by birth because their father's name was Σαλαμῶνος. Melito was also a pagan high priest or an archon. See the coins in Head 1901, p227-230,232; and for this view see Ramsay 1902, p102–3; Juster 1914, 1, p190 n19; Kittel 1944, col 12,16; Saltman 1971, p38–9; Kraabel 1968, p74 n2; see also Safrai and Stern 1974, p469 n1. However, it seems likely that the name Σαλαμῶνος is Lydian; see Zgusta 1964, p451; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p26; see also Cohen 1969, English summary p6.

In MAMA IV.202 [a better reading than CIJ 772; on the text given in Peek 1980, no 39, see Robert BE 1982, no 394], an inscription of the late second or third century CE from Apollonia, we learn that Debborah from "Antioch" [clearly a Jew to judge by her name], was married to a certain Eumelos; see Robert 1963b, p401–6. Some features of this inscription are interesting here. Firstly, Ramsay [1907, p255–9] thought the Antioch concerned was Pisidian Antioch, but it was probably Antioch on the Maeander; see MAMA VII, p x n1; Levick 1967, p128. Secondly, Debborah is described "[Ἀ]ντιόχισσα πάτρης γονέων πολυτείμων ..." Ramsay, followed by Frey read [Ἀ]ντιόχισσα [γένος], πάτρης ... However, Robert [1963b, p401 n3] has noted that it is not necessary to insert "γένος" into the text. Thus it should read "[Ἀ]ντιόχισσα πάτρης, γονέων" ... Debborah called Antioch her "native land" and was evidently "at home" there; this is comparable to some Jews in Acmonia; see Chapter 3, section 7.1. Ramsay [1907, p257–8] also took γονέων πολυτείμων to mean that Debborah's ancestors had held public office. However, the inscription notes that they had won many honours; holding office is not excluded from this, but it is far from definite. Ramsay [1907, p256] also thought Debborah was a citizen of Antioch, but given Robert's new punctuation of the inscription this is unlikely. On this inscription see also Schürer 1909, 3, p21; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p32. Note also in MAMA III,607=CIJ 793 from Corycos, the Jew [M]ωσῆ is described as "προταυραρίου". But was this a position in a city organisation or a Jewish group? Cf. Safrai and Stern 1974, p480; Blanchetière 1984, p55. One of the members of the Jewish decany in the new Aphrodisias inscription is called Θεόδοτος Παλατῖν(ος ?). Reynolds and Tannenbaum [1987, p42–3] suggest he was a former employee of the court. This is not a magistracy, but, as Reynolds and Tannenbaum note [p43], it was a position which could "give a resident of a small provincial town tremendous social prestige."

[83] See CAp 2:49–53 [Jewish generals Onias and Dositheos]; Ant 13:284–7,348–55 [Jewish generals Chelkias and Ananias]; see also CIJ 1450, 1531; cf. CPJ 2, p144–5. Further instances of Jewish commanders are discussed in Kasher 1978, p65–7. In CIJ 1443 Ptolemaios son of Epikydes the chief of police dedicated a synagogue along with the Jews of Athribis. We do not know if he was a Jew [who thus held this important office] or a pagan patron of the Jews; see CPJ I, p17 n46; Schürer 1897, p216. There were also tax–collectors in the Ptolemaic period with Jewish names, although some of them may have been Samaritan; see CPJ I,p18–19,194–226; and a Jewish policeman in CPJ 25 in 173 BCE. See also CAp 2:64. In the Roman period some Jews played a prominent part in public life. Thus Alexander [Philo's brother] and Demetrius both held the office of alabarch, see CPJ 1, p49 n4. On the possibility that Philo held

some sort of political office see Goodenough 1926, p77–79. See also CPJ 137 [grammeteus]; 428 [sitologoi in 101/102; 677 [custom official]; and perhaps CPJ 132. Note also the apostate Tiberius Iulius Alexander. See further Tcherikover 1961, p340–2; CPJ 1, p17–19; Safrai and Stern 1976, p702–5; Smallwood 1981, p222; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1 p136–7. Note also that some Jews in Judaea had attained equestrian rank by the reign of Nero; see BJ 2.308.

[84] In an inscription from Cyrene dated to 60/61 CE Elazar son of Jason is listed among the *νομοφύλακες* – the controllers of the public archives who were also concerned with law–enforcement; see Lüderitz 1983, no 8; Applebaum 1964, p292–303; 1979, 186–9.

[85] Malalas in PG 97, col 440, lines 9–10: "*τὴν οἰκίαν Ἀσαβίνου πολιτευομένου, Ἰουδαίου τὴν θηρσκείαν.*" See also Nock 1972, p961; Meeks and Wilken 1978, p6,9; Rajak 1985a, p257.

[86] See Kaplan 1963–4, p113.

[87] Possible office holders after 200 CE outside of Asia Minor may include: A father of the synagogue at Volubilis, Mauretanea was "*ὁ πρωτοπολίτες*"; see Le Bohec 1981a, no 79. Another example of a Jew with this title comes from near Hebron; see Rahmani 1972, p114. It may have involved holding civic office; see Rahmani 1972, p115–6. However, Lifshitz [1974, p98–100] thinks the title indicates a position of dignity in the Jewish community and not in the city. For later evidence see Jones 1964, p947–8,1392–3; Hunt 1982, p106–123. At least two Jews held the titles "*πατὴρ καὶ πάτρων τῆς πόλεως* – father and patron of the city" at Venosa, probably in the sixth century CE; see Lifshitz in CIJ^2, p47–8.

[88] Digest L.ii.3.3; Text in Mommsen, Krueger and Watson 1985; on the passage see also Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p66–7; dated to between 196–8 by Rabello 1980, p748. The Roman lawyer Modestinus commented that Marcus Aurelius and Commodus regularised the participation by Jews in public office, but the law itself has not come down to us; see Dig. XXVII.1.15.6; see also Gager 1973, p93; Rabello 1980, p686–7.

[89] Prior to the third century there was general enthusiasm for public office, but this should not be over–emphasized; see Jones 1940, p168; Sherwin–White 1973, p255–6. On offices becoming burdensome see Jones 1940, p175–6, 181–191; Rostovtzeff 1957, p483–5; Sheppard 1975, p181–93; Safrai 1963, p67–70; Levick 1985, p219–222 Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p131. In general see Millar 1983, p76–96.

[90] See Jones 1940, p184–5; Abbott and Johnson 1926, p101–111.

[91] Jones 1940, p189.

[92] Jones 1940, p182, 190–1. This point has been overlooked by some scholars; see for example Smallwood 1981, p513–4.

[93] We have some examples of Jews outside of Asia Minor holding office before the third century; see note 83–87 above.

[94] Smallwood 1981, p514.

[95] See Smallwood 1981, p514; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p126.

[96] See Chapter 3, section 2.

[97] See Chapter 7, section 4.1. At Rome we know of the synagogue of the Augoustesioi and of the Agrippesioi [see for example CIJ 284,301; 365,503], who took their names from the first Augustus and his advisor M. Agrippa. It is possible that they were patrons of the communities concerned; see Smallwood 1981, p137–8. However, it is more likely that these communities were originally founded by slaves and freedmen of the two men; see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p96.

[98] See Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p103. Kant [1987, p694–8] compares the situation with Greco–Roman clubs and political associations.

[99] On names used by Jews in Asia Minor see Ramsay 1902, p103–4; Kittel 1944, col 14; Kraabel 1983, p184; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p93–105; in general see Juster 1914, 2, p221–34. Cohen's conclusions [1969, English summary p1–15] need to be modified in the light of the new Aphrodisias inscription.

[100] Text in Humann et al 1898, no 342; CIJ 777; an earlier copy in Ramsay 1897, p545 no 411.

[101] Ramsay [1897, p545–50] thought he was a Christian, but later changed his mind; see 1902, p98; see also Schürer 1909, 3, p18.

[102] See Humann et al 1898, no 133,195; The three inscriptions all use the unusual term στεφανωτικόν. On the custom of decorating graves see Chapter 3, section 6.1.4.

[103] See Humann et al 1898, p129–130; Miller 1985, p47. The sum involved varies as does the time at which the grave is to be decorated.

[104] Ziebarth 1896, p129; Ramsay 1902, p98–101; 1904, p421; Krauss 1922, p234; Hemer 1986, p274 n23; Hengel 1975b, p171 n93; Applebaum in Safrai and Stern 1974, p480–3. Applebaum thought that the guilds were a part of the Jewish communal organisation at Hierapolis; comparable cases to this would then be known at Alexandria and perhaps at Sardis. Against this line of interpretation is the fact that other clearly pagan inscriptions from Hierapolis mention the guild of the purple dyers by the same name; see Humann et al 1898, no 41, 42, 133, 227, p50-51; Broughton 1938a, p843. Could a Jewish guild and a different pagan guild be called by exactly the same name in the one city? This is possible, but on this interpretation one would expect Aelius Glykon to indicate that he meant the *Jewish* purple dyers guild.

[105] Cichorius in Humann et al 1898, p46,51; Kraabel 1983, p181; see also Yamauchi 1980, p152.

[106] Judeich in Humann et al 1898, p174. His membership of at least one of the guilds could be implied; two guilds are also mentioned in Humann et al 1898, no

133. Ramsay disputed Judeich's view in 1902, p98–101, but based his critique on his own view of what a Jew would or would not do.

[107] Judeich [in Humann et al 1898, p174] suggested Aelius Glykon was able to do this through his "Geschäftsfreunde".

[108] See Humann et al 1898, p129–30; Ramsay 1895a, p105–7; Magie 1950, p813 n84; and in general Chapot 1904, p168–70; New Docs 1978, p54–5; Broughton 1938a, p819f, 841–846.

[109] See Kraabel 1983, p181. On the Jews in the city see recently Kraabel 1968, p125–135; Harris 1976, p94; and a new inscription in Robert BE 1971, no 645.

[110] See Acts 13:50, 14:2,5,19. Note also that in Chapter 2, section 5.1 I suggested there was continuity of good relations between the Jewish community and the city of Sardis from the mid first century BCE onwards until the destruction of the synagogue in 616 CE. However, there is no evidence from the first century CE itself.

Conclusions.

[1] See Askowith 1915, p69; Meyer 1925, p26; Nock 1933, p135; Weber 1952, p417–8; Bickerman 1958, p150–1; Tcherikover 1961, p296; Frend 1965, p130; Sherwin–White 1967, p93–100; Malherbe 1977, p37; Meeks 1979, p14; 1983, p36; Smallwood 1981, p123; Amir 1982, p40;

[2] Scholars have often thought or implied that Jewish communities had to remain insular in order to remain Jewish. If the communities were involved in the life of the city or had adopted local practices it was thought to be a sign of syncretism. See for example Levy 1900, p187–8. Bousset 1926, p473; Cumont 1929, p100; also 1906, p64; 1910, p55,60; Oesterley 1935, p119–124; Klausner 1944, p29–30; Nilsson 1950, p639; 1960, p298; Widengren 1961, p64. See also in this regard Kraabel 1982, p450–1. We do know of some Jews who abandoned Judaism. See Hengel 1974, 1, p31, 2, p25 n224 for a list of individuals known to us; see also Feldman 1960, p227–8. CIJ 749 from Iasos is perhaps about a Jew who apostasized but this is far from certain; see Schürer 1909, 3, p16; Hengel 1974, 1, p68; 1976, p104–5; Kraabel 1968, p17. However, this evidence concerns individuals and not Jewish communities as a whole.

[3] Blanchetière [1984, p56] notes with regard to Jewish communities in Asia Minor that "l'assimilation politique et culturelle n'implique pas *ipso facto* assimilation religieuse." See also Rajak 1985a, p250; Kant 1987, p706; Reynolds–Tannenabum 1987, p125. Georgi [1987, p336, in the Epilogue written in 1986] notes, "Scholarship on Hellenistic Judaism must free itself completely of the alternative with which diaspora Judaism allegedly was confronted: continuation and appropriation of "authentic" [or "normative"] Judaism, that is, that of the Palestinian Pharisaic kind; or accommodation, which usually means losing out, to Hellenism."

[4] Modern authors include Smallwood 1981, p123; Frend 1965, p130; Malherbe 1977, p51–2; Balsdon 1979, p67. They cite such authors as Diodorus [in Stern, no 63]; Juvenal [in Stern no 301]; Philostratus [in Stern, no 403]; Tacitus [*Historiae* V,5; in Stern no 281]; see further in Smallwood 1981, p123 n15.

[5] An example which shows how distorted the general pagan view of Judaism could be is the fact that a number of classical authors thought the Sabbath was a day of gloom and fasting; see for example Pompeius Trogus [Stern, no 137]; Martial [Stern. no 239]; Suetonius [Stern, no 303]; and see in general Goldenberg 1979, p435–442. It seems that although classical authors knew of the Sabbath, they knew very little about it.

[6] See Hengel 1980, p55–6; in general see Balsdon 1979, p18–29,64–70.

[7] Our appreciation of the variety and diversity within Judaism in Palestine and the Diaspora in this period has greatly increased in recent years; see for example Smith 1956, p67–81; Grabbe 1977, p149–153; Kraabel 1979a, p479; 1982, p457–8; Gutmann 1981, p x; Kraft and Nickelsburg 1986, p20–1; Porton 1986, p57–80; Georgi 1987, p366–371. Van der Horst [1986, p289] speaks of "the pluriformity and multicolouredness of Judaism at the turn of the era."

[8] In all of this the problem of dating, viz, that a good deal of our evidence comes from after the period of the NT, must not be overlooked.

Appendix 1.

[1] For other formula used in Phrygia see Parrot 1939, p127–139; Carrington 1976, p264–5. For the analysis of a formula which was shared by pagan, Jews and Christians elsewhere, see Simon 1936, p188.

[2] Calder 1939a, p20.

[3] See for example two inscriptions with the basic formula from Cyzicus, in Gregoire 1922, no 7,8. One of these [and perhaps the other] is, to judge by the name, probably the epitaph of a Phrygian buried in Cyzicus using the formula he knew from his native Phrygia [see Gregoire 1922, p7]. See also Cumont 1895, p253 and n3; Parrot 1939, p132.

[4] MAMA IV, no 31; see Waelkens 1979, p127.

[5] The inscription dated 246 CE is given in Calder 1955, p38. See also Gibson 1978, p4; MAMA VII, p xxxvii–xxxviii; Fiessel 1980, p463. The formula is found in Eastern Phrygia in 270–300 CE; see MAMA VII, p xxxviii.

[6] Calder 1955, p26–27; 1939a, p24; Ramsay 1897, p515. On these later formula see Buckler 1924, p37; Calder 1924c, p85–88; 1929, p265; Schepelern 1929, p191 n358; Lattimore 1942, p111; Robert 1960b, p404–405; Kraabel 1968, p67 n1; Fiessel 1980, p463.

[7] Calder 1939a, p21–22.

[8] New Docs 1978, p137.

[9] See New Docs 1978, p137.

[10] Duchesne 1883, p31.

[11] Ramsay 1883, p400–401; 1897, p496–498.

[12] Ramsay 1883, p400; see also p406. He did not consider the possibility of Jewish provenance at this stage.

[13] See Ramsay 1883, p433–434; 1888, p424; 1897, p526 no 371; Cumont 1895, p255. See a slighty different interpretation in Calder 1922–3, p314.

[14] MAMA VI, 224.

[15] MAMA VI, 235, which ends with the simple EF but begins with the word "Christians" in the upper border. See on this inscription Gibson 1978, p112 no 39. MAMA VI, 234 [=Gibson 1978, p113–114, no 40] might be similar to this inscription but the reading is uncertain; see New Docs 1978, p179.

[16] MAMA IV, 355; See Calder 1939a, p21–22; 1931, p424. Ramsay's copy of this inscription is incomplete [see Ramsay 1897, p559, no 446]. However, the fish was not an exclusively Christian symbol; see the comments about a fish on a pagan inscription in Gibson 1978, p139 n3; see also Ramsay 1897, p490.

[17] Ramsay 1897, p521, no 362. Note however that the title ἐπίσκοπος was not exclusively Christian; see New Docs 1978, p138.

[18] Gibson 1975, p151–157; New Docs 1976, p136–137. The word παντοκράτωρ occurs in this inscription, most probably under Jewish influence; see Gibson 1975, p156.

[19] Calder 1955, p38; New Docs 1978, p137. See also Robert 1960b, p408.

[20] Note however, that a belief in some sort of an after–life is common in Judaism of this period and found in Jewish inscriptions, for example, at Beth Shearim. See Lifshitz 1961, p403. Quotations of, or allusions to the NT are found in inscriptions elsewhere. See, for example, the inscription found as part of a mosaic floor at Caesarea which quotes from Rom 13:3 in Lifshitz 1971, p163 no 22.

[21] Calder 1939a, p21; See also Calder 1931, p424–425; Cumont 1895, p254 n2; Creaghan and Raubitschek 1947, p6–7. Ramsay saw this word as an "expression of Christian faith instead of the pagan ηρωον." [Ramsay 1883, p406; see also 1888, p406–407; 1897, p488. 495, 515, 518, 559.] He was also convinced that the term was "exclusively Christian" [Ramsay 1897, p495]. Calder [1939a, p21] knew of five cases in which both the EF and this word occurred. See for example MAMA IV, 355; Buckler 1926, no 172.

[22] Drew–Bear 1972, p203; 1978, p109–110; see also New Docs 1978, p138; Kraemer 1986a, p191.

[23] See CIJ 712, 713, both guaranteed as Jewish by a menorah.

[24] Creaghan and Raubitschek 1947, p6.

[25] See Goodenough 1953–68, 2, p133 n84.

[26] Thus Ramsay was wrong in using the occurrence of this word in inscriptions containing the simple EF as proof of Christian provenance; see for example Ramsay 1897, p530 no 375.

[27] MAMA VII, p xxxvi.

[28] Apart from these EF inscriptions from Phrygia, the epitaph of Aviricius Marcellus, known as bishop of Hierapolis from Eusebius [HE 5.xvi.3] is one of two exceptional Christian inscriptions dated around 200 CE. [See Ramsay 1888 [Vol 9], p156–160, 253–272, 392–400; 1897, p709–715, 722–729; Calder 1939b, p1–4; 1955, p25–26.] This inscription is also notable for its veiled allusions to Christianity. Aviricius Marcellus is later transformed into the legendary St Abercius in the fourth century "Vita Abercii". Eusebius mentions three Christians from Eumeneia. In HE 5.xvi.22 he quotes from a treatise written against the Montanists by Apollinarius of Hierapolis, who wrote of Gaius and Alexander of Eumeneia, both of whom were martyred at Apamea in Apollonius' time. In HE 5.xxiv.4 we learn of Thraseas from Eumeneia, both a bishop and a martyr, who "sleeps in Smyrna". Thraseas is also mentioned in HE 5.xviii.13. All three were anti–Montanists. It is interesting to note that none of the martyrdoms occurred at Eumeneia, which is in keeping with our later suggestion that Christian–Jewish relations in the city were reasonable. Both Harnack and Frend date the martyrdoms to before the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and thus before 180 CE. [See Harnack 1905, p245; Frend 1965, p287, p300 n132, 133; also Calder 1939a, p18.] We thus know that some Christians lived in Eumeneia before the time of these inscriptions.

[29] Cumont 1895, p250–252; Calder 1922–3, p310–312; 1955, p25,28; Gregoire

1964, p15.

[30] Ramsay 1897, p498; When the age of persecution was over, distinctive biblical names and names expressing Christian virtues and hope, along with the mention of Church office give epitaphs a distinctively Christian character. The cross first appeared about the middle of the fourth century. See MAMA VII, p xxxvi; see also Calder 1922–3, p315; Gregoire 1924, p703–704; Gibson 1978, p139.

[31] Cumont 1895, p252–256.

[32] MAMA VII, p xxxvii; Calder 1939a, p16–26; 1955, p25f.

[33] Text in Robert 1960b, p399 n4; Schelepern 1929, p87.

[34] Text in Robert 1960b, p399 n4.

[35] See TAM III, 331,345,365,454,495,713,813; some of these show slight variations.

[36] Robert 1960b, p399 n4; Calder 1939a, p20; The point made by Robert and Calder is ignored by Waelkens 1979, p127.

[37] Calder 1939a, p20.

[38] Schepelern [1929, p87] overlooks the importance of geographical considerations here. Others have claimed that the EF was used by pagans. Rhode [1925, p533 n13] stated that it was "hardly likely" that the EF was Christian. He did not support his contention with concrete argumentation however. Horsley [New Docs 1976, p137] claimed the formula was pagan in origin, but offered no supporting evidence. Schepelern [1929, p87] attempted to argue that some of the inscriptions were pagan. However, he assigned some inscriptions to a pagan group influenced by Judaism in order to explain the strong Jewish element in the wording. [For example the inscription which ends with the phrase "the hand of God"; Ramsay 1897, p535 n392. That this inscription was written by a Jew seems much more likely, as we will argue below.] Schepelern [1929, p87,191 n359] made his strongest case for the inscription given in Chapter 3 as 5.1.2, with its reference to Theos Hypsistos, but he overlooked the clear allusion to Zech 5:1–4, which proves that the inscription is Jewish. On his argument see Robert 1960b, p399 n4, 400 n4. Waelkens [1979, p127], whilst accepting that most of the inscriptions were Christian or Jewish, believes that the formula was known in a pagan milieu. In support of this view he mentions the inscriptions from Pisidia, which we have argued above were too distant geographically to have a bearing on the use of the formula in Eumeneia. However they do show that pagans *could* use the formula. Waelkens also claims that one inscription from Sebaste in Phrygia [LBW III 2,224 no 734], probably combines the formula with a representation of Helios. However, Le Bas described the stone as containing a portrayal of the face of the sun. It is thus not certain that this is a representation of Helios. Further, even if it was meant to be Helios, this would not necessarily mean that the inscription was pagan. We know of a number of synagogues where Helios is depicted in mosaics. [For Hammath Tiberias and Beth Alpha, see Shanks 1979, p112,113,130.] Clearly the name Helios is required to establish that a portrayal of the sun signifies the god. Thus Waelkens is not able to give an indisputably pagan example of the EF from this area. Waelkens [1979, p126 n115] is also wrong to cite Seure in support of pagan use of the formula. Seure [1912, p607] stated that there was nothing in the EF which is "absolutely Christian" although some words could be understood to have a Christian significance. He does not say that the formula was

used by pagans, and gives no examples of pagan usage. Waelkens [ibid.] is likewise wrong to cite Schepelern, in support of pagan usage. [Bjorck [1938, p43 n1] following Schepelern, thinks the inscriptions are [Jewish ? –]Christian and heathen.] Waelkens also cites de Jerphanion and Keil as authors who have expressed doubts about the exclusively Christian and Jewish character of the EF. Keil [in Swoboda et al 1935, p27] expresses doubts about the exclusively Christian character of the formula, but offers no evidence. We can agree with Robert when he writes "It is, in my opinion, rigorously established that this ... funerary formula is not pagan but Christian". [Robert 1960b, p399; see also Calder 1939a, p15f. Robert agrees that the EF is also used by Jews.] Thus whilst the formula could be used by pagans, as it was in Pisidia for example, we have no evidence to show that it was so used in Eumeneia.

[39] For example, because of the use of κοιμητήριον [of dubious validity as we have seen] or Christian names, or a reference to Christ [Cumont 1895, p254 n2, 255]. He also showed that none of the inscriptions were to be suspected of paganism [Cumont 1895, p254].

[40] Cumont 1895, p255–256.

[41] Cumont 1895, p254–255.

[42] Cumont 1895, p255 n2. Duchesne included the Noah coins from Apamea as evidence for the Christian community there. He clearly did not consider a Jewish provenance either. See Duchesne 1883, p32.

[43] On this argument of Cumont see Robert 1960b, p409 n2.

[44] Ramsay 1897, p652–653.

[45] Ramsay 1897, p537 no 394; see also p538, 676.

[46] Ramsay 1897, no 365–366, 379. Having assigned most of the EF inscriptions to a Christian provenance, Ramsay went on to note the comparative scarcity of fourth century Christian inscriptions in Eumeneia. He concluded that Eumeneia was the unnamed Phrygian town which, according to Eusebius and Lactantius was destroyed in the persecutions under Diocletian because its population was largely Christian. [See Eusebius HE 8.11. Lactantius Div. Inst. 5.11.10; Ramsay 1897, p505–507; Schultze 1922, p469–470; Frend 1965, p449, 470 n59; Kraabel 1968, p62–63.] However, other cities, such as Orcistus had large Christian populations by the end of the third century CE, [and thus are possibly the unnamed Phrygian city] and the general decline in literacy levels and educational standards explains the decline in the number of inscriptions [see Kraabel 1968, p63]. Thus we cannot say that Eumeneia was destroyed, and there is no proof that it was substantially Christian.

[47] Ramsay 1914b, p353 n1.

[48] Calder 1924c, p92; See also MAMA I, p xviii–xxii.

[49] Calder 1939a, p25.

[50] Calder 1955, p26; see also MAMA VII, p xxxvii on Jews copying the Christian formula. Although, as we have seen, he acknowledged that some inscriptions might be Jewish, he did not suggest any other possiblities. In fact, he actually assigned one Jewish inscription as pagan [CIJ 761, Calder 1939a, p18] and another as Christian [MAMA VI, 231, Calder 1939. p22].

[51] Calder 1939a, p23. For a similar line of reasoning see Ramsay 1888, p406.

[52] Other scholars have also not mentioned that the EF could be Jewish; see for example Michon 1917, p552.

[53] Calder 1939a, p22.

[54] See Kraabel 1968, p63–64.

[55] Calder 1939a, p25. On the problem of identifying Jewish inscriptions and papyri CPJ, I, pxvii–xx; Kraemer 1986a, p187–92.

[56] I will rely heavily on the usage of the LXX. This is legitimate in view of the inscriptions discussed in Chapter 3, sections 3–5 which show that Jews in the area were familiar with the LXX.

[57] See Chapter 3, footnote 205.

[58] See Chapter 3, footnote 252.

[59] Text from MAMA VI, no 231. The text is also given in CIG 3963; Ramsay 1897, p535–536 no 392; 1883, p400.

[60] Ramsay 1897, p536 and Calder 1939a, p22 thought the inscription was Christian.

[61] TDNT 9, p427.

[62] See for example Ex 13:3; Dt 3:24, 4:34; Ps 111:7; Is 10:4; Jer 6:12, 15:6, 16:21, 51:25. There is a tendency in Philo and Josephus to avoid the use of anthropomorphic expressions when speaking of God and thus they refer to the hand of God infrequently. See TDNT 9, p428.

[63] See Wis 3:1,5:16,7:16,11:17,14:16,16:15,19:8; 2 Macc 6:26; 3Macc 2:8,5:13; 4 Macc 17:19; TJos 2:5; JosAsen 8:11,12:8; Sib Or 3:672,676,709,795; Aristobulus in Eusebius PE 8.10.1.7–9. See also Marcus 1932, p118–9.

[64] Shanks 1979, p112.

[65] In one painting God's hand orders Abraham to desist from sacrificing Isaac [see Shanks 1979, p87] thus recalling the Beth Alpha mosaic; in the other Moses stands before the burning bush with God's hand above the bush [see Shanks 1979, p91]. The earliest example of the hand of God in Christian art occurs in the fourth century; see Kraabel 1968, p66.

[66] TDNT IX, p431. It is most common in Lk–Acts; see Lk 1:66; Acts 4:28,30;:50; 11:21; 13:11.

[67] Lk 1:66; John 10:29; Acts 4:30,11:21.

[68] Matt 3:12 [=Lu 3:17]; Acts 13:11; Heb 10:31.

[69] TDNT 9, p431.

[70] Barn 5:10, 15:3 [cf. Gen 2:2]; 1 Cl 27:7,33:4.

[71] 1 Cl 28:2, cf. 1 Pet 5:6.

[72] 1 Cl 56:7, cf. Job 5:18.

[73] 1 Cl 60:3, cf. Is 51:16; Wis 5:16; see TDNT 9, p434.

[74] Kraabel 1968, p65 n3. Schepelern 1929, p87 thought this inscription had a conspicuously strong Semitic character.

[75] Liddell and Scott p1665.

[76] Ramsay 1897, p536. For another example of Synkletike as a personal name see Ramsay 1897, p643 no 537.

[77] See Ramsay 1897, p536; MAMA VI, p85.

[78] Ramsay 1897, p536; MAMA VI, p85.

[79] Kraabel 1968, p65.

[80] Text in CIG 3102 [incomplete]; LBW III no 70; Paris 1884, p236 no 5; Ramsay 1897, p525 no 369; Sheppard 1979, p173. For inscriptions giving other citizens of Eumeneia, whom Ramsay thought were Christians on the basis of the simple EF, see Ramsay 1897, no 359,364,368. For Jewish citizens of Sardis see Robert 1964, p55.

[81] TDNT 5, p253.

[82] See also for example Nu 6:27; 1 Ki 8:16–48.

[83] See also Ez 5:1; Lev 19:12, 21:6; IV Ki 5:11; II Chr 33:18; Ps 43:20.

[84] Mal 1:11. See also Jos 7:9; II Chr 6:32; Ps 75:1, 98:3; Jer 51:26; [=MT Jer 44:26]; Ez 36:23.

[85] "Your great name" occurs in the MT of I Ki 8:42, but the translation differs markedly in the LXX. A magical amulet of the second century CE dedicated to "Iao" [and thus probably influenced by Judaism] uses the expression "τὸ ὄνομα τῳ μεγάλου θεοῦ"; see Winter 1936, 3, no 155.

[86] TDNT 5, p268–269.

[87] Ant 11:331; 2:275.

[88] NIDNTT 3, p651.

[89] TDNT 5, p266. See Wis 10:20; Judith 9:8; Tob 3:11; Sir 23:9; 2 Macc 8:4,15; 3 Macc 2:9; JosAsen 9:1,15:13; Sib 3:19,550; LetAris 98; TLevi 5:5; 1 En 39:13, 46:6–7, 50:2, 60:6, 69:14; 3 Enoch 48B:1–2 4 Ezra 4:25; 2 Bar 67:3; Artapanus in Eusebius PE 9.27,24–6. Thus Charlesworth [OTP, 2, p717] writes that in this literature "God's name is considered known, holy, revered and often ineffable. The name was powerful because God was behind it." See also Marcus 1932, p94–5.

[90] See NIDNTT 2, p654–655; for example Acts 4:10.

[91] This expression occurs thirteen times.

[92] 1 Tim 6:1; Rev 16:9.

[93] We do however have one example which reads "he will have to reckon with Christ." See footnote 13.

[94] See Vidman 1969, no 304; see also nos 245,357; Sheppard 1980–81, p98–9; Robert 1955, p86–9; see also a different example in MAMA IV,228.

[95] Ramsay thought that this inscription was Jewish or Jewish–Christian. He was not convinced of its Christian character [see Ramsay 1897, p515 n1]. Schepelern [1929, p87] thought that the inscription's Semitic character was "conspicuously strong", and Parrot [1939, p134] that it was probably Jewish. Robert [1955, p86 n10] considered it was Christian, but did not examine it in detail. Both Calder [1939a, p22] and Schultze [1922, p467] thought it Christian. Sheppard [1979, p173] sees "Jewish influence" as the most likely explanation for this inscription.

[96] This is in fact generally the case, but the problem is even more complicated with this series of inscriptions. See Kraabel 1968, p64; New Docs 1978, p137–138; Robert 1960b, p408.

[97] This point is made by Schepelern 1929, p88 against Cumont. Although we have no evidence for a pagan provenance, Schepelern is correct in saying that it must be regarded as an unfounded assumption that all the inscriptions are Christian.

[98] Nor for that matter, can they be shown to be non–Jewish.

[99] Kraabel 1968, p65.

[100] Robert 1960b, p392f.

[101] Robert 1960b, 392, 398–407; see also Sheppard 1979, p174. Schepelern 1929, p87 overlooks the fact that Judgement was a theme in Jewish writings and thus assigns this group of inscriptions to a Christian provenance. Robert [1960b, p407, see also n2–4] writes that references to Judgement are not found in pagan epitaphs. CIG iv 9802, from Rome concludes with the threat "he will have to reckon with the coming anger". This interesting variation shows that the formula is to be found a long way from Phrygia.

[102] Text in MAMA VI, 225; Ramsay 1897, p537 no 394.

[103] See also 1 Ki 24:16; Ps 49:6; Isa 30:18, 33:22, 63:7; Sir 32:12; 2 Macc 12:6,41; Sib Or 3:704; PsSol 2:18, 4:24, 9:2.

[104] Gen 31:53.

[105] Ez 18:30.

[106] Acts 10:42; 2 Tim 4:1.

[107] Jn 8:50; Acts 7:7, 17:31; Rom 6:10; Heb 10:30, 12:23, 13:4; Jm 4:12, 5:9; 1 Pet 4:5; Rev 6:10. See also TDNT 3, p943.

[108] Calder 1939a, p22; see also Calder 1922–3, p315. MAMA VI, p161 lists this as a Christian inscription, but leaves it out of the list of indubitably Christian inscriptions on p xvii, indicating some doubt on the issue. Kraabel [1968, p64] leaves the question open and Ramsay [1897, p538,676] suspected it of being Jewish.

[109] Text in Ramsay 1897, p534 no 388.

[110] Wis 1:15; 4 Macc 14:6, 18:23; see also Si 17:30; 4 Macc 7:3.

[111] Sib Or 3:10, 35,276,278,301,328,582, 593,600,601,604,617,705,711, 717, 721, 733, 757,766; 5:76; see Marcus 1932, p51.

[112] Sib Or 1:45, 73.

[113] Diog 6:8; 1 Clem 36:2; 2 Clem 19:3; Did 4:8.

[114] See Lampe, p42–43.

[115] See Supp 22.5; TDNT 3, p25.

[116] The word is used less often of God than of Christ, however; see Lampe, p42–43. We find the expression "immortal God" in a number of pagan inscriptions; see for example the Men–acclamation text noted by Kraabel 1968, p68.

[117] See Kraabel 1968, p64; Robert 1960b, p437. Again Calder is wrong in writing that this version of the EF "emphasises its Christian character even more strongly". [Calder 1922–3, p315; see also 1939a, p22.]

[118] Sterrett 1888, p153–154, no 138.

[119] Ex 15:16; 2 Macc 15:24.

[120] The word is used 15 times in total; see Hatch and Redpath.

[121] Charlesworth OTP, 2, 1985, p xxxi.

[122] 1 Sm 11:2 and M. Pol 17:1 respectively.

[123] Schepelern 1929, p87, thinks its Semitic character is strong. The expression also occurs in an inscription from Bruxus near Synnada given in Ramsay 1897, p700 no 635; he thinks that it is either Jewish or Christian.

[124] Text in CIG 3902r; Ramsay 1897, p514, no 353–354; Sheppard 1979, p174; see also Cumont 1895, no 138.

[125] Ramsay 1897, p514 thought that the inscription was Christian, but overlooked the fact that references to judgement are common in Jewish literature. A similar mistake was made by Cumont 1895, p254; Schepelern 1929, p87; Calder 1939a, p21. Sheppard 1979, p174 thinks that this inscription "probably reflect[s] Jewish influence in the Church at Eumeneia".

[126] Text in Legrand and Chamonard 1893, p248 no 19; Ramsay 1897, p533 no 385; CIJ 773.

[127] Ramsay 1897, p533.

[128] Ramsay 1897, p526.

[129] See especially Ramsay 1888, p422. Others have included this text in lists of Jewish inscriptions; see Oehler 1909, p298 no 67; Juster 1914, p191 n19; CIJ 773; Cumont included it in his list of Christian inscriptions, see Cumont 1895, p278–279 no 209.

[130] CIJ 48 and CIJ 509 [=CIG 9904].

[131] MAMA VI, 319.

[132] CIJ 118, 775; Reynolds–Tannenbaum 1987, p100 respectively.

[133] CIJ 776.

[134] Ramsay 1897, p523–525 no 365–366.

[135] CIJ 137, 374, 375, 511, 701.

[136] MAMA I, 168, 169, 188, 228, 254, 315, 375, 377a; MAMA VI, 171; MAMA VII, 484; see also Solin 1983, p678.

[137] Cf. Kraabel 1968, p67 who agreed with Ramsay's assessment of a Jewish provenance.

[138] See for example Ramsay 1897, no 355,356; Drew–Bear 1978, no 48.

[139] Matt 16:16, 26:63; Acts 14:15; Rom 9:26; 2 Cor 3:3, 6:16; 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Tim 3:15, 4:10; Heb 3:12, 9:14, 10:31; 12:22; Rev 7:2.

[140] Deut 5:26; Jos 3:10; 1 Ki 17:36; 4 Ki 19:4,16; Ps 41:2, 83:2; Is 37:4,17; Dan 6:20,26; Hos 1:10. See also, for example 2 Macc 8:33,15:4; 3 Macc 6:28; Tobit 13:1; TrShem 8:3, 12:9; TSol 1:13, 5:12; JosAsen 8:5; TJob 37:2; Sib Or 3:763; 1 En 5:1,106:3,11; Jub 1:25,21:4.

[141] Ex 20:4–5, 34:17; Lev 19:4, 26:1; Deut 4:15–18, 5:8; 4 Ki 19:18; Is 37:19; Ez 20:32; see also JosAsen 8:5; Jub 20:7–8; SibOr 3:8–45: TJob 2–5: 1 Enoch 99:6–10.

[142] See for example Ramsay 1897, p521; and Calder 1922–3, p257–258.

[143] See New Docs 1978, p138; Kraabel 1968, p64; Schepelern 1929, p87.

[144] The simple EF was very common; see for example MAMA VI,223–4, 226–7, 229–30, 336.

[145] See section 1.1 [ii].

[146] See footnote 16.

[147] It is possible that the symbol did not function as an identifier, but in some other way, for example as a sign which gave some benefit to the deceased not to the onlooker. It could also reflect boldness in a time of diminished pressure on the Church. The explanation given in the text seems more convincing however.

[148] Text in Ramsay 1897, p519 no 359 and p525 no 368 see also p502. A similar argument could also be given for the inscription from Sebaste given in Ramsay 1897, p560 no 451.

[149] See Chapter 9, section 3.3.

[150] See Ramsay 1897, p519; Schultze 1922, p467 claim that the councillors were Christians. In 1888 Ramsay published an inscription containing the simple EF in which people are described as φιλόθεοι – beloved of God [see Ramsay

1888, p409–410]. Clearly this term could be used by either Christians or Jews. Ramsay referred to "deo carus", a term used by Tertullian to designate the Church, in order to show that the inscription was Christian, but this phrase is hardly relevant here.

[151] Waelkens 1979, p126.

[152] New Docs 1978, p136–139. Also note Gibson 1978, p139, who wrote that the EF is both Christian and Jewish; and Drew–Bear 1978, p106, who describes the formula as "Christian but also Jewish". He does however consider the simple EF as proof of Christian origin [p107]. See also Schepelern 1929, p88; Kant 1987, p685–6.

[153] Robert 1963b, p361; see also 1960b, p399f, 405f, 412f, 423, 437; Frend 1965, p470 n59. Note however, that Robert [1960b, p408] acknowledges the difficulty of distinguishing between Christian and Jewish inscriptions. As we have often noted, he does argue that some additions to the EF are Jewish [see p409f], but does not comment on the simple EF in this regard.

[154] Sheppard 1979, p173–174.

[155] See Schepelern 1929, p88; New Docs 1976, p137.

[156] Calder 1939a, p26; 1955, p29.

[157] Calder 1939a, p25. See also Robert 1960b, p412–413 who argues against Calder here.

[158] On this series of inscriptions see Ramsay 1888, p251–255; Anderson 1906, p193–202; Calder 1922–3, p317–354; 1955, p27; New Docs 1978, p128–134; Gibson 1978.

[159] Calder 1922–23, p319f.

[160] See Anderson 1906, p215; however, Gibson 1978, p4 notes that the formula was not "frozen".

[161] Ramsay 1897, p491; Anderson 1906, p197; Calder 1922–3, p319.

[162] Calder 1922–3, p321; On this element of Montanism see Gibson 1978, p129–130. On the supposed link with Montanism see also Calder 1922–3, p320; 1923, p64–65; 1929, p266–267; 1931, p421–425. Ramsay had suggested this at an earlier stage [Ramsay 1897, p490–491] but then changed his mind [see 1897, p537]. Anderson [1906, p201] followed Ramsay's earlier opinion. Gregoire [1924, p707–8] originally agreed with Calder and published an inscription in which the Montanist qualification "spiritual" πνευματική was added to Χρειστιανή on the epitaph of Mountana, which certainly supports the thesis that the early use of "Christian" on epitaphs was due to the Montanists, although it does not mean that the Chr–Chr inscriptions, in which both the deceased and the dedicator are so labelled, are Montanist. [This inscription is also given by Calder in 1929, p266–267; see also Gibson 1978, p133,138.] Later Gregoire disagreed with Calder on the grounds that the Church at this time did not experience serious persecution, thus making it unlikely, in his view, that writing "Christian" on ones tombstone was a sign of a "fanatical" group rather than of the mainstream [see Gregoire 1964, p16; Calder 1955, p27]. For a refutation of Gregoire's view see Calder 1955, p27–31. The Chr–Chr inscriptions do however, reflect a very different school of thought from the EF, which is so inoffensive, a fact which

Gregoire did not explain.

[163] Calder 1955, p30.

[164] Calder [1955, p30] noted that "but for Montanist intransigence the Christian epigraphy of Phrygia might well be as late – and as dull – as that of Galatia."

[165] New Docs 1978, p130–133. Another inscription is dated to 278 CE; see Ramsay 1897, no 444. [On this inscription see Ramsay 1888, p250–251; Calder 1923, p62–63.] However, this inscription belongs to the group which claims that the deceased was a Christian, but says nothing about the dedicator, and thus as Tabbernee shows [see New Docs 1978, p134–136], belongs to a separate class, which does have some pre–Constantinian examples, some of which come from elsewhere [see Gregoire 1922, I, no 333; from Thyatira].

[166] Three other factors tell against Calder's theory. Firstly, it has been difficult to explain why we only find these EF inscriptions in Northern Phrygia, when we know that Montanism began in Southern Phrygia with no evidence of it spreading to the North. In addition Montanist inscriptions outside Southern Phrygia do not contain the Chr–Chr formula. See New Docs 1978, p132–133. Secondly, the fact that the tombstones with this inscription are identical to others used by pagans also seems somewhat incongrous with what we know of Montanism. See Gibson 1978, p141–144. Thirdly, Sheppard [1979, p171] has also questioned Calder's theory that the unprovocative proclamation of Christian faith on the Eumeneian tombstones was due to the challenge of the bolder attitude of the Montanists nearby. On Calder's reading, four of the Christians who used the EF [we have suspected that they were Jews] were also councillors in Eumeneia, [see Ramsay 1897, no 359, 364, 368, 371] and one was also a successful athlete and member of the Gerousia [no 364; see also Robert 1960b, p423–424]. This shows a willingness to become involved in the society, which is at variance with the Montanist attitude, which seems to have been much more of a disruptive influence in society. Certainly, it is strange that if the Christian community of Eumeneia was under Montanist influence [and thus imitated them in developing a formula which expressed their faith, as the Montanists themselves did] it would also have members who were deeply involved in society. It is also to be noted that none of the features of the Eumeneian Church appear in the Orthodox churches of Africa, where Montanism was also influential; see Sheppard 1979, p171. Thus we can agree with Gibson, who after a thorough study of the Chr–Chr inscriptions concludes that we know too little about the evolution of Montanism in Asia Minor to assign these inscriptions to that movement. See Gibson 1978, p144. Thus even if the dating was not against Calder's theory, we could not agree with Calder's proposal about the origin of the EF.

[167] Ramsay 1897, p653.

[168] The earliest datable inscription of this series [MAMA IV, 31; see Waelkens 1979, p127] contains the simple EF, with no indication of Jewish or Christian provenance. The earliest dated inscription [written in 246 CE, see Calder 1955, p38] is shown to be Christian by its allusion to "God's promise". However, so many of the inscriptions are of unknown date that the religious provenance of the dated inscriptions does not help us to decide on the origin of the EF.

[169] Robert 1960b, p413 and n4.

[170] Kraabel 1968, p67.

[171] Kraabel 1968, p67, 112–113.

[172] The example of the echein pros formula [see footnote 6] is used by Kraabel to support his argument. It is not strictly relevant here, although it is interesting to note that it is a Jewish formula found at Nicomedia in the third century and used by Christian in the fourth century; see also Robert 1960b, p413.

[173] See Chapter 3, section 1. Note that the concord between Eumeneia and Acmonia would probably have made the settlement of Jews from Acmonia in Eumeneia a simple matter.

[174] Sheppard 1979, p171, 174; see also New Docs 1978, p137.

[175] Ramsay 1897, p653; Robert [quoting Ramsay] 1960b, p413.

[176] Thus Ramsay's view [1897, p386–388] that the inscription was an anti-Christian polemic influenced by both Judaism and Hellenism was based upon an incomplete knowledge of the inscription. His view was followed by Schultze 1922, p465.

[177] Text in Buckler et al 1926, p61 no 183; Robert 1960b, p414–415; Sheppard 1979, p177–178. Older reading in Paris 1884, p239; Ramsay 1897, p386 no 232; IGR iv, 743.

[178] Text in Robert 1960b, p430; Sheppard 1979, p175–176.

[179] Paris, Zingerle, Ramsay, Picard, Buckler and Calder; see Robert 1960b, p415–422.

[180] Robert 1960b, p422. It is generally agreed that the name Ῥούβης is Jewish and a Grecized form of Reuben. [See Ramsay 1897, p388; Kittel 1944, p14; Schultze 1922, p465; Robert 1960b, p419; see now the similar name in Chiat 1982, p185.] For a discussion of the name see Cohen 1976, p127–8.

[181] Buckler et al 1926, p61–64, no 183.

[182] Robert 1960b, p421.

[183] Robert 1960b, p422.

[184] Robert 1960b, p423; see also Sheppard 1979, p180.

[185] Mt 13:43; Lk 1:17; 1 Pt 3:12.

[186] For example see 1 En 58:1–4, 91:10; 4 Ez 4:35; 3 Bar 11:9; Sib Or 2:152, 252f; see Charlesworth OTP, 2, p989.

[187] See for example Sib Or 4:179–192, 2:221–251; 1 En 51:1–5; TJud 25:1–4; TZeb 10:2.

[188] See TDNT 3, p132.

[189] This is acknowledged by Robert 1960b, p425 n3; Sheppard 1979, p179 leaves the question open. Prior to 1926, and the deciphering of the monogram on the stone, Oehler 1909, p298 no 70; and Juster 1914, p192 n1 thought the inscription was Jewish. Krauss 1922, p233 had some reservations.

[190] Sheppard 1979, p177,179.

[191] For these three points see Sheppard 1979, p179–180. See also Buckler et al 1926, p63.

[192] Robert 1960b, p427–429 and especially p428 n3. He notes that this inscription is to be dated before numerology became a prominent feature of Christian inscriptions.

[193] See also Robert 1960b, p425–427.

[194] Robert 1960b, p429–435.

[195] See Cohen 1976, p126; Sheppard 1979, p176.

[196] Robert 1960b, p435.

[197] Robert 1960b, p432–433; Gregoire 1922, no 166 ter, 167–207; New Docs 1978, p118.

[198] Robert 1960b, p433.

[199] We are not suggesting that the Jews of Eumeneia were familiar with 1 Enoch, but the passage does show the strong Jewish precedent for the EF under discussion. See also Jub 35:17; TAsher 6:5; TJacob 2:5–18; Ps Philo 15:5, 59:4.

[200] On Jewish angelology see Simon 1948, p402–405; see also the references cited in Robert 1960b, p433 n3. It is possible that the view of angels represented here had been mediated from Judaism in the more distant past, although that Roube was a Jewish convert suggets the influence was more recent.

[201] See Robert 1960b, p433–434. For pagan [mis]appropriation of Jewish religious language, notably concerning angels, see Sheppard 1980–81, p77–101.

Appendix 2.

[1] See Bird 1974, p56–7; Segal 1979, p121; Brenner 1985, p91–8,132–4; Camp 1981, p24–5; see Ex 20:12; Deut 5:16; Lev 19:3. Note also the stress on the importance of sons in the patriarchal narratives; the women are valued for their ability to bear sons; see Exum 1985, p75–80.

[2] Stagg 1978, p29–32; Segal 1979, p136; Selvidge 1984, p620–1; but see also Brooten 1982, p83–90. Meyers 1978, p100 suggests that at the time the cult was being established female energies were desperately needed in the family setting. Thus, restriction from the cult was not because of inferiority, but because of the priority of family needs.

[3] For instance Deborah, Jud 4–5, [see Brenner 1985, p55; Gottlieb 1981, p194–203; Murray 1979, p155–89; Williams 1982, p72]; Huldah, 2 Kings 22:14–20, [on whom see Christensen 1984, p399–404]; Noadiah, Neh 6:14; Miriam, Ex 15:20, Nu 12, Micah 6:4; Esther; A Queen mother like Athaliah, 2 Kings 11, [see Brenner 1985, p17–32]; The wise women of Tekoa [2 Sam 14] and of Abel-beth-maacah [2 Sam 20:19–23 on whom see Camp 1981, p14–29]; Abigail, 1 Sam 25:2–42; Samson's mother, Jud 13; Jael, Jud 4:17–22,5:24–7 [see Gottlieb 1981, p197–200]; Isaiah's wife, Isa 8:3. Brenner [1985, p46–50] wonders if parts of the Song of Songs were written by women. Note also Judith [see later]; the piety of Susanna in Daniel and Susanna 2,23,42–3; Annah, Lk 2:36. See in general Jewett 1975, p121; Bird 1974, p67–8; Williams 1982, p67–94; Craghan 1982, p11–19; Neuberger 1983, p132–5; Exum 1985, p73–85; Brenner 1985, p13–66,87–134.

[4] See Williams 1982, p50,67; Exum 1985, p85.

[5] Exum 1985, p74. Apart from the examples given in note 3, note Rebecca's role in Jacob obtaining his father's blessing and the part played by women in Moses' birth and early life; see Exum 1985, p73–85; Williams 1982, p42–66. Here women determined the future for Israel, but that future was still lived out primarily by sons.

[6] Bird 1974, p56; See also Parvey 1974 p120; Meyers 1978, p102; Longenecker 1984, p73; Meyers 1978, p102; Ruether 1982, p56–7; Brown 1981, p2; Brenner 1985, p132–6.

[7] Brooten 1981b, p284–5; see also Fiorenza 1983, p108.

[8] See Brooten 1981b, p281–5; 1980, p59–60; see also Kraemer 1985a, p7–8; Fiorenza 1983, p106–110. Methodological problems in this area are quite acute and are far from being resolved; see on this particularly Neusner 1979b, p79–90.

[9] Sira 26:1–4,13–18, 36:21–6; see Trenchard 1982, p9–38.

[10] Sira 3:1–16, 7:27–8; see Trenchard 1982, p39–56.

[11] See Trenchard 1982, p22–3, with regard to the wife being thought of as a "possession" of the man in Sira 36:24.

[12] Trenchard 1982, p57–94; see for example Sira 25:13–26; 26:5–9. Compare Sira 25:16 with Prov 21:9,19. It has been thought that Ben Sira in 25:24 attributed the origin of sin and death to Eve; see for example Trenchard 1982, p81–2; also Malina 1969, p24. However, Levison [1985, p617–23] has recently argued that

the verse should be translated as "From the [evil] wife is the beginning of sin, and because of her we [husbands] all die."

[13] Sira 7:4–5, 22:3–5, 26:10–12, 42:9–14; Trenchard 1982, p129–165.

[14] Trenchard 1982, p167–73; see in general Prusak 1974, p93–5.

[15] ApMos 32:1–2. See also LAE 3:1, 5:2, 16:3, 18:1, 26:2, 35:3, 37:2, 38:1–3 44:2–5; ApMos 11:1–3, 14:2, 16:3, 19–21. However, some passages also state that Adam sinned; see LAE 8:2, 33:3, 49:1–3; ApMos 7:3–8:1, 14:3, 27:2–3.

[16] See LAE 9–11.

[17] LAE 19–21. See also LAE 41–43 where the angel Michael addresses Seth only and not Seth and Eve; yet Eve has a vision in LAE 23:2; ApMos 33–6.

[18] See also 2 Enoch 31:6–7; SibOr 1:42–45 [cf. 1:28–30]; GkApEzra 2:16; TAdam 3:5. See Malina 1969, p18–34; Heister 1986, p163–4. Some Church Fathers similarly saw Eve alone as responsible for sin; see Clark 1983, p38–44. Note also that in the story of Pandora's jar Hesiod attributed the root of evil to a woman; see *Works and Days* 47–105; *Theogony* 535–613; and Walcot 1984, p40–1.

[19] See ApocAb 23:1–12; 3 Bar 4:8 [Slavonic], 9:7; Jub 3:17–25; Ps–Philo 13:8.

[20] 4 Ezra 3:20–3, 4:30; 7:116–8; [see Heister 1986, p162]; 2 Bar 18:2, 23:4, 56:5–6; ApSedr 4:4–5:2; Ps–Philo 26:6.

[21] TReu 4:8–5:6, [see Prusak 1974, p92–3]; TJud 15:5–6.

[22] 2 Macc 3:19; 3 Macc 1:18; Ps–Phoc 215–7; Philo L.A. 3.169; Flacc. 89.

[23] Though marriage was probably only for the sake of offspring. See BJ 2:121, 160–1; also Swidler 1976, p195 n29. The cemetery of the community shows that women were buried there; see Stendal 1966 p26.

[24] See Baumgarten 1957, p266–9; Swidler 1976, p62–6.

[25] Milgrom 1978, p119 writes: "There can be no doubt that the Dead Sea sectarians regarded the Temple Scroll as quintessential Torah, the true word of God".

[26] See Milgrom 1978 p114–5; Stagg 1978, p36–7.

[27] CA 2:201; see also Stagg 1978, p45–8; Tetlow 1980, p24.

[28] See Wegner 1982, p555; Schechter 1896, p313; Stagg 1978, p41–5; Meeks 1983, p24; Longenecker 1984, p73.

[29] Quaest Exod 1:7.

[30] Wegner 1982, p553.

[31] See Witherington 1984, p10.

[32] Neusner 1980, p8.

[33] Neusner 1980, p9–13; see further 1979b, p85–100.

[34] Genesis Rabbah 18:2. See Montefiore 1938, p507; Swidler 1976, p72.

[35] Swidler 1976, p73.

[36] See Montefiore 1938, pxviii, p502, 507–15; Moore 1927, 2, p119–135; Swidler 1976, p73; Boucher 1969, p52–5; Loewe 1966, p30–2, 49–50; Witherington 1984, p10; Hauptman 1974, p208; Safrai and Stern 1974, p763; Meiselman 1978 p16; Longenecker 1984, p74.

[37] Neusner 1980, p8.

[38] For example in T. Ber 7.18; pBer 13b. See Montefiore 1938, p507; Swidler 1976, p80–81.

[39] See Montefiore 1938, p656; Moore 1927, 2, p129–131; Schechter 1896, p320; Jeremias 1969, p372–3; Hauptman 1974, p190–2; Swidler 1976, p83–8; Loewe 1966, p42–4; Neuberger 1983, p137–41.

[40] See Brooten 1982, p94–5; also Jeremias 1969, p374; Hauptman 1974, p192; Swidler 1976, p92–3.

[41] See Schechter 1896, p319; Montefiore 1938, p xviii; Jeremias 1969, p373; Swidler 1976, p95–6; Brooten 1982, p283; Witherington 1984, p6. That the rabbis did not expect women to study the Torah does not mean that women would have no knowledge of the Torah, but rather that they would not study it as an "academic discipline"; see Loewe 1966, p29. However Rabbinic literature records that Beruriah had an advanced rabbinic education; on the tradition concerning her see Goodblatt 1975, p68–85. She is the only woman known in the literature of the Rabbis who could be described as learned in the Torah, although stories about other strong and influential women are recorded [See Swidler 1976, p105–111]. In contrast to this the prevalent attitude of the Rabbis was "The perfect wife and mother was one who lived so as to allow her husband and sons to spend as much of their lives as possible in study of Torah." [Swidler 1976 p113 with reference to b.Ber 17a.]

[42] They may for instance have learned Greek. On this see Jeremias 1969, p373; Swidler 1976, p114.

[43] See Swidler 1976, p115; Loewe 1966, p24; Jeremias 1969, p374–5; and Josephus Ant 4:219. But see Witherington 1984, p9 who thinks scholars have underestimated the validity of women's words in the eyes of Rabbis.

[44] See Witherington 1984, p10.

[45] Jeremias 1969, p375. See also Loewe 1966, p24.

[46] See Jeremias 1969, p361–3.

[47] Montefiore 1938 p xviii; see also Archer 1983, p277–284.

[48] See Judith 8:10–11,31–4, 16:6–7,22; see also Craghan 1982, p13–4,17; Will iams 1982, p76–9; Craven 1983, p49–61; Skehan 1963, p94–110.

[49] See most recently van der Horst 1986, p273–89; see also Collins 1974, p37, 43–4, 47–9; Charlesworth OTP, 1, p833–4. The book was probably written in

Greek, during the first century BCE or CE, perhaps in Egypt; see Kee 1974, p54–5; Charlesworth OTP, 1, p829–34. There are different theories about the book's composition, notably that it was written by the Therapeutae, or that Chapters 46–53 were written by a Montanist; but see Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, 3.1, p553. Van der Horst 1986, [p282–9] defends a Jewish origin for the whole work.

[50] See TJob 24:1–10, 25:9–10. Job 2:9 in the LXX is itself an elaboration of the MT. On Sitidos see also Kee 1974, p57, 62–3.

[51] Van der Horst 1986, p275–9 overlooks this point; on the matter see Collins 1974, p40f.

[52] Compare this with Job's seven sons by his second wife who are named but play no further role in the book. See also Nickelsburg 1981, p246–7. The contrast between TJob 1–45 and 46–53 with regard to the role of women suggests that the two sections come from different sources; see van der Horst 1986, p282–9.

[53] Van der Horst 1986, p289. He also suggests that the haggada on Job's daughters originated "in a [Jewish] group in which women played a leading role by their greater ecstatic gifts and their superior spiritual insights into heavenly reality." [1986, p287–8.] Such a possibility is clearly very relevant to the study undertaken here.

[54] Ps–Philo was probably written in Hebrew before 70CE in Palestine; see Charlesworth OTP, 2, p298–300; cf. Nickelsburg 1980, p63–4.

[55] See Nickelsburg 1980, p55–6.

[56] See also 38:2 where Deborah is described as "our Mother".

[57] On Debborah in Pseudo–Philo see Nickelsburg 1980, p55–6.

[58] Cf. the usual "bosom of his fathers".

[59] On Seila see Bogaert 1972, p339–343; Nickelsburg 1980, p57–80. Other features of the book are noticeable. A woman seems to be able to initiate divorce; see 42:1. The names of both sons and daughters are given in a number of genealogies; see 4:12–15, 8:8,11. This seems to be a result of Ps–Philo's interest in genealogies and in names in general [see 27:4, 38:1, 47:11] but the fact that at times both sons and daughters are listed is significant. There is also a noticeable interest in individual women – Dinah in 8:11, Sarah in 23:4, Hannah in 50:1–51:6. Names of nameless OT women are also given; see 42:1, 44:1, 64:3. We can also note here that the Sibylline Oracles purport to be written by a woman, the Sibyl, who on occasions said she was the daughter of Noah; see SibOr Prol 35, 1:287–291, 3:827.

[60] Baron 1952, I, p113; Segal 1979, p126–7.

[61] Baron 1952, I, p113–4; Swidler 1976, p69–70; Geiger 1983, p141.

[62] See Neusner 1979b, p92–3.

[63] See Cont. 32f.

[64] See Swidler 1976, p66–9. Women seem to have enjoyed considerable freedom in Egyptian society, which perhaps influenced the attitude of both the

Elephantine community and the Therapeutae.

[65] See Smallwood 1981, p475–6. We should also note here that the treatment of Rebecca in Jubilees 19–35 is considerably more positive than in the Genesis account; see van der Horst 1986, p288–9.

[66] See for instance Parkes 1934 p11, 79; Jones 1964, p944–5; Safrai and Stern 1974, p205–210.

[67] Neusner 1975 p179. See also Nock 1972, p880; Kraabel 1983, p183. Smallwood 1981, p475–6 does not consider the practical implications of the apostolate's supposed task.

[68] bShab. 147b. See Kraabel 1982, p450.

[69] See Ramsay 1895b, p273; 1897, p674; 1942, p141–2; Pilcher 1903, p231; Kittel 1944, col 15; Blanchetière 1974, p379; cf. 1984, p56; Shepperd 1979, p169.

[70] See Gasque 1966, p21; Kraabel 1982, p450; see also Levy 1900, p183–6.

[71] Kraabel 1982, p454

[72] Kraabel 1968, p148–9; 1983, p183. See also Cohen 1980, p24; Levy 1900, p184–5; Blanchetière 1984, p46. For Rabbinic references to Asia Minor see Kittel 1944, col 14. On Rabbi Meir in "Asia" see Kraabel 1983, p183.

[73] See Cohen 1981–82, p13–17; van der Horst 1987, p102–106.

[74] See Brooten 1981b, p283–4; 1982, p52; Cohen 1980, p26; in general Kraemer 1986a, p182–3.

[75] We should also raise here the issue of whether there was a women's gallery in the ancient synagogue, an issue which has been examined by Brooten 1982, p103–38. It has been thought that in the prayer hall of the synagogue, modelled on the arrangements in the Temple, women were separated from men by a barrier or grillwork, or a high wall, or were confined to an adjoining room, or a gallery. See for example Schecter 1896, p318; Baron 1942, p91; Jeremias 1969, p374; Swidler 1976, p89; Longenecker 1984, p74; Witherington 1984, p7 n79. There are five excavated synagogues in Palestine in which a gallery could plausibly be reconstructed although the evidence is by no means conclusive [Brooten 1982, p121–2]. In some cases further excavations have shown that a conjectured gallery was not in fact correct, in other cases a gallery has been included in the reconstructed floor plan on very minimal evidence. In addition, in no Diaspora synagogue can a strong archaeological case be made for a women's gallery or a separate women's section. We also have no unambiguous literary evidence which requires or refers to separate seating as a regular practice in the synagogue. See Sukenik 1934 p47; Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1979, 2, p447–8 n98; Cohen 1980, p25; Brooten 1982, p130–7; Safrai and Stern 1976, p939–940. Thus even if a synagogue did have a gallery it is not at all certain that it was used by women. The traditional understanding of the separation of the sexes has been a "retrojection of later custom on the material remains of an earlier society." [Cohen 1980, p25; see also Sukenik 1934, p48; Neuberger 1983, p138.] It is not based on the archaeological and literary evidence which suggests men and women worshipped together in the synagogue. We can thus conclude that it is most likely that women leaders would have been able to take an active part in the synagogue and not be restricted to a gallery or an inaccessible room. We can note that Tation [see Chapter 5, section 1.4] who received the προεδρία

certainly did not sit in a gallery.

In the light of the above discussion some comments on Reynold's and Tannenbaum's work on the new Aphrodisias inscription may be in order. Whilst their interpretation of the inscription is balanced and seemsconvincing, I do not find their conclusions with regard to Rabbinic influence in the Aphrodisias community totally compelling; see 1987, p78–84. As they admit, we could be dealing with parallel evolution, or the influence from Palestine could go back considerably earlier and thus be pre–Rabbinic. It is noticeable that there is no evidence for such Rabbinic influence on the Sardis community. However, if Reynolds and Tannenbaum are correct, the situation at Aphrodisias could in this regard reflect another facet of the diversity of Jewish life in Asia Minor. From the third century CE onwards, some communities were influenced by the Rabbis whilst others were not.

Abbreviations.

The abbreviations used here may be found in L'Année Philologique, supplemented by those used in Schürer–Vermes–Millar 1986, vol 3.1, p xiii–xxi.

Bibliography.

Abbott, F.F., Johnson, A.C. 1926. *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Achelis, H. 1900. "Spuren des Urchristentums auf den griechischen Inseln?" *ZNW* 1, p87–100.

Adcock, F.E. 1945. "Women in Roman Life and Letters." *G& R* 14, p1–11.

Akurgal, E. 1985. *Ancient Civilisations and Ruins of Turkey.* Eighth edition. Istanbul: Haşet Kitabevi.

Alexander, P.S. 1984. "Epistolary Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* ed. M.E. Stone, 2, ii, p579–96. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Amir, Y. 1982. "The Term Ἰουδαισμός, A Study in Jewish–Hellenistic Self–Identification." *Immanuel* 14, p34–41.

Anderson, J.G.C. 1897. "A Summer in Phrygia I." *JHS* 17, p396–424.

——— 1899. "Exploration in Galatia Cis Halym." *JHS* 19, p280–318.

——— 1906. "Paganism and Christianity in the Upper Tembris Valley." In *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire,* ed. W.M. Ramsay, p183–227. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Applebaum, S. 1961. "The Jewish Community of Hellenistic and Roman Teucheira in Cyrenaica." *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7, p27–52.

——— 1964. "Jewish Status At Cyrene in the Roman Period." *La Parola Del Passato* 19, p291–303.

——— 1971. "Jews and Service in the Roman Army." In *Roman Frontier Studies 1967. The Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress at Tel Aviv,* ed. M. Gichon, p181–4. Tel Aviv: Students Organisation of Tel Aviv University.

——— 1976. *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt. (AD 132–135)* Oxford: BAR Supplementary Series 7.

——— 1979. *Jews and Christians in Ancient Cyrene.* SJLA 28. Leiden: Brill.

——— 1984. "The Second Jewish Revolt (AD 131– 35)." *PEQ* 116, p35–41.

Archer, L.J. 1983. "The Role of Jewish Women in the Religion, Ritual and Cult of Graeco–Roman Palestine." In *Images of Women in Antiquity,* eds. A. Cameron, A. Kuhrt, p273–287. London: Croom Helm.

Arkwright, W. 1911. "Penalties in Lycian Epitaphs of Hellenistic and Roman Times." *JHS* 31, p269–75.

Arnold, I.R. 1972. "Festivals of Ephesus." *AJA* 76, p17–22.

Askowith, D. 1915. *The Toleration of Jews Under Julius Caesar and Augustus.* Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University, New York.

Atkinson, K.M.T. 1958. "The Governors of the Province Asia in the Reign of Augustus." *Historia* 7, p300–330.

——— 1959. "The Historical Setting of the Habakkuk Commentary." *JSS* 4, p238–263.

Attridge, H.W. 1984. "Josephus and His Works." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* ed. M.E. Stone, 2, ii, p185–232. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Aune, D.E. 1976. "Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism? A Response to N.J. McEleney." *JSJ* 7, p1–10.

Aupert, P. and Masson, O. 1979. "Inscriptions D'Amathonte I." *BCH* 103, p361–389.

Avigad, N. 1984. *Discovering Jerusalem.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Avi–Yonah, M. 1959. "Syrian Gods at Ptolemais–Accho." *IEJ* 9, p1–12.

——— 1975–78. *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* 4 vols. London: OUP.

——— 1976. *The Jews of Palestine. A Political History from the Bar Kokhba War to the Arab Conquest.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Aziza, C. 1981. "Juifs et Judaisme dans le Monde Romain: État Des Recherches (1976–1980)." *REL* 59, p44–52.
Babelon, E. 1891. "La Tradition Phrygienne du Deluge." *RHR* 23, p174–183.
Bachofen, J.J. 1967. *Myth Religion and Mother Right. Selected Writings of J.J. Bachofen.* Translated by R. Manheim. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Baldwin, J.E. 1972. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi,* London: IVP.
Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1979. *Romans and Aliens.* London: Duckworth.
Bandy, A.C. 1963. "Early Christian Inscriptions of Crete." *Hesperia* 32, p227–247.
Barag, D., Porat, V., Netzer, E. 1972. "En-Gedi." *RB* 79, p581–583.
Barb, A.A. 1963. "The Survival of Magic Arts." In *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century.* ed. A. Momigliano, p100–125. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Barnes, T.D. 1967. "Hadrian and Lucius Verus." *JRS* 57, p65–79.
Baron, S.W. 1942. *The Jewish Community. Its History and Structure to the American Revolution.* 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
——— 1952. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews.* Second edition. Vols 1 and 2. New York: Columbia University Press.
Barr, J. 1961. *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* Oxford: OUP.
Bartlett, J.R. 1985. *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Josephus, Aristeas, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus.* Cambridge Commentaries On Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Vol 1.i, Cambridge: CUP.
Bauckham, R.J. 1983. *Jude, 2 Peter.* Word Biblical Commentary Vol 50. Waco, Texas: Word.
Baumgarten, J.M. 1957. "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa." *JBL* 76, p266–269.
——— 1967. "The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity." *RQ* 6, p183–192.
——— 1980. "The Pharisaic–Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts." *JJS* 31, p157–170.
Bean, G.E. 1960. "Notes and Inscriptions from Pisidia Part II." *AS* 10, p43–82.
——— 1966. *Aegean Turkey. An Archaeological Guide.* London: Ernest Benn.
——— 1979. *Turkey's Southern Shore.* Second Edition. London: Ernest Benn.
——— 1980. *Turkey Beyond the Maeander.* Second Edition. London: Ernest Benn.
Bean, G.E., Mansel, A.M., Inan, J. 1956. *Die Agora von Side und die Benachbarten Bauten. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen im Jahre 1948.* Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basineui.
Bean, G.E., Mitford, T.B. 1962. "Sites Old and New in Rough Cilicia." *AS* 12, p185–217.
Beaujeu, J. 1978. "Le paganisme romaine sous le Haut Empire." *ANRW* II, 16.1 p3–26.
Bell, H.I. "P.Giss. 40 and the *Constitutio Antoniniana.*" *JEA* 28, p39–49.
Bellefontaine, E. 1975. "The Curses of Deuteronomy 27: Their Relationship to the Prohibitives." In *No Famine in the Land. Studies in honour of John L. McKenzie,* ed. J.W. Flanagan, A.W. Robinson, p49–61. University of Montana, Missoula: Scholars Press.
Bellen, H. 1965–66. "Συναγωγη των Ιουδαιων και Θεοσεβων. Die Aussage Einer Bosporanischen Freilassungsinschrift (CIRB 71) zum Problem der

'Gottfürchtiger'." *JbAC* 8/9, p171–6.
Bernand, E. 1983. "Au Dieu Très Haut" In *Hommages A Jean Cousin, Rencontres Avec L'Antiquité Classique.* Institut Felix Gaffiot Vol 1, p107–111. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Bernays, J. 1985. "Die Gottesfürchtigen bei Juvenal." In *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* II, ed. H. Usener, p71–80. Berlin: Wilhelm Hartz. Reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1971.
Bertram, G. 1954–59. "Vom Wesen der Septuaginta–Frömmigkeit." *Die Welt des Orients* 2, p274–284.
——— 1972. "ὕψιστος" in *TDNT* 8, p614–620.
Bevan, E.R. 1902. *The House of Seleucus.* Vol 2, London: Edward Arnold.
——— 1940. *Holy Images. An Inquiry Into Idolatry and Image Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity.* London: George Allen and Unwin.
Beyerlin, W. 1965 *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions.* Translated by S. Rudman, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Bickerman, E.J. 1947. "Apocryphal Correspondance of Pyrrhus." *CPh* 42, p137–146.
——— 1958. "The Altars of Gentiles. A Note on the Jewish 'ius sacrum'." *RIDA* 5, p137–164.
——— 1980a. "Une Question D'Authenticité: Les Privilèges Juifs." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History,* Part 2, p24–43. London: Brill.
——— 1980b. "La Charte Séleucide De Jérusalem." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History,* Part 2, p44–85. London: Brill.
Bieber, M. 1961. *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater.* Second edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Blanchetière, F. 1974. "Juifs Et Non Juifs. Essai sur la diaspora en Asie Mineure." *RHPhR* 54, p367–382.
——— 1984. "Le Juif et L'Autre: La Diaspora Asiate." In *Études Sur Le Judaisme Hellénistique,* eds. R. Kuntzmann, J. Schlosser, p41–59. Lectio Divina 119, Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf.
Blass, F., Debrunner, A., Funk, R.W. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Cambridge: CUP.
Bird, P. 1974. "Images of Women in the Old Testament." in *Religion and Sexism. Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions,* ed R.R. Ruether, p41–88. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Björck, G. 1938. *Der Fluch Des Christen Sabinus Papyris Upsaliensis 8.* Arbeter Utgivna Med Understöd Av Vilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond, Uppsala 47, Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells.
Bode, G.H. 1834. *Scriptores Rerum Mythis carum Latini Tres Romae Nuper Reperti.* 2 Vols, Reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968.
Bogaert, P–M, 1972. "Les "Antiquités Bibliques" du Pseudo–Philo. Quelques observations sur les chapitres 39 et 40 à l'occasion d'une réimpression." *Revue Théologique De Louvain* 3, p334–344,
Bokser, B.M. 1983. "Recent Developments in the Study of Judaism 70–200 CE." *The Second Century* 3, p1–68.
Bonner, C. ed. 1940. *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis with some fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel.* Studies and Documents XII. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Boucher, M. 1969. "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11,11–12 and Gal 3,28: The NT on the Role of Women." *CBQ* 31, p50–58.
Bousset, W. 1906. "Sibyllen und Sibyllinische Bücher." *Real encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 18, p265–280.
——— 1911. "Sibyl, Sibylline Books." *The New Schaff– Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* X, p396–400.
——— 1926. *Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter.*

HNT 21, Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
Bowersock, G.W. 1964. "C. Marcius Censorinus, Legatus Caesaris" *HSCP* 68, p207–210.
——— 1980. "A Roman Perspective on the Bar Kochba War." In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* II, ed. W.S. Green, p131–141. BJS 9, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Braude, W.G. 1940. *Jewish Proselyting In the First Five Centuries of the Common Era. The Age of the Tannaim and Amoraim.* Providence RI: Brown University.
Braunstein, O. 1911. *Die politische Wirksamkeit der griechischen Frau. Eine Nachwirkung vorgriechischen Mutterrechtes.* Leipzig: August Hoffmarin.
Brenner, A. 1985. *The Israelite Woman. Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative.* The Biblical Seminar 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Brichto, H.C. 1963. *The Problem of 'Curse' in the Hebrew Bible.* JBL Monograph Series 13, Philadelphia: SBL.
Brooke, A.E., McLean, N., Thackeray, H.St.J. 1935. *The Old Testament in Greek. Vol II, The Later Historical Books.* Cambridge: CUP.
Brooten, B.J. 1980. "Feminist Perspectives on New Testament Exegesis." In *Conflicting Ways of Interpreting the Bible.* ed. H. Kung, J. Moltmann, p55–61, Concilum 138. Edinburgh: T& T Clark.
——— 1981a. "Inscriptional Evidence for Women as Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers,* ed. K.H. Richards, p1–17. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1981b. "Jüdinnen zur Zeit Jesu. Ein Plädoyer für Differenzierung." *Theologische Quartalschrift (Tubingen)* 161, p281–5.
——— 1982. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue. Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues.* BJS 36. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Bros_hi, M. 1982. "The Credibility of Josephus." *JJS* 33, p379–384.
Broughton, T.R.S. 1938a. "Roman Asia Minor." In *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome,* ed. T. Frank, Vol 4, p499–916. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
——— 1938b. "A Greek Inscription from Tarsus." *AJA* 42, p55–57.
——— 1951,1952,1960. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic.* 2 Vols and Supplement. New York: American Philological Association.
Brown, F.E. 1931. "Violation of Sepulture in Palestine." *AJP* 52, p1–29.
Brown, J.P. 1981. "The Role of Women and the Treaty in the Ancient World." *BZ* 25, p1–28.
Bruce, F.F. 1984. "Colossian Problems Part I: Jews and Christians in the Lycus Valley." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141, p3–15.
Bruneau, P. 1970. *Recherches sur Les Cultes De Délos A L'Époque Hellénistique Et A L'Époque Impériale.* BEFAR 217, Paris: de Boccard.
——— 1982. "'Les Israélites De Délos' et la Juiverie Délienne." *BCH* 106, p465–504.
Bruneau, P., Ducat, J. 1965. *Guide De Delos.* Paris: Ecole Française D'Athènes.
Brunt, P.A. 1983. "Princeps and Equites." *JRS* 73, p42–75.
Bryce, T.R. 1981. "Disciplinary Agents in the Sepulchral Inscriptions of Lycia." *AS* 31, p81–93.
Buchanan, G.W. 1963. "The Role of Purity in the Structure of the Essene Sect." *RQ* 4, p397–406.
Büchler, A. 1909–10. "The Law of Purification in Mark vii, 1–23." *ET* 21, p34–40.
——— 1910. "Graeco–Roman Criticism of Some Jewish Observances and Beliefs." *Jewish Review* 1, p17–29,131–145.
Büchler, A., Brodie, I., Rabbinowitz, J. eds. 1956. *Studies in Jewish History,*

The Adolph Büchler Memorial Volume. Jews' College Publications New Series I. Oxford: OUP.
Buckler, W.H., Calder, W.M. 1923. *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Buckler, W.M., Calder, W.M., Cox, C.W.M. 1924, "Asia Minor 1924. I) Monuments from Iconium, Lycaonia and Isauria." *JRS* 14, p24–84.
——— 1925. "Asia Minor 1924. II) Monuments from Cotiaeum." *JRS* 15, p141–175.
——— 1926. "Asia Minor 1924. III) Monuments from Central Phrygia." *JRS* 16, p53–94.
Buckler, W.M., Robinson, D.M. 1932. *Sardis.* Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis. Vol VII, Greek and Latin Inscription. Part I. Leyden: Brill.
Buis, P. 1967. "Deuteronome XXVII 15–26: Maledictions ou Exigences De L'Alliance?" *VT* 17, p478–9.
Bultmann, R. 1964. "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ" *JBL* 83, p12–16.
Cabanes, P. 1983. "La Places De La Femme Dans L'Epire Antique." *Iliria* 13, p201–209.
Cabrol, F. "Azymes." *DACL* i, 2, Col 3254–60.
Cadbury, H.J. *The Book of Acts in History.* London: A & C Black.
Cadoux, C.J. 1938. *Ancient Smyrna. A History of the City from the Earliest Time to 324 AD.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Cagnat, R., Besnier, M. 1902. "Revue Des Publications Épigraphiques Relatives a L'Antiquité Romaine." *RA* 3rd Series 41, p343–368.
Caird, G.B. 1971–72. "Paul and Women's Liberty." *BJRL* 54, p268–281.
Calder, W.M. 1905 "Zeus and Hermes at Lystra." *The Expositor*, Seventh Series, X, p1–6.
——— 1922. "New Light on Ovid's Story of Philemon and Baucis." *Discovery* 3, p207–211.
——— 1922–23. "Philadelphia and Montanism." *BJRL* 7, p309–354.
——— 1923. "The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* eds. W.H. Buckler, W.M. Calder, p59–91. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
——— 1924a. "Nannakos and Enoch." *JMEOS* 11, p30–32.
——— 1924b. "The Tears of Nannakos." *CR* 38, p113.
——— 1924c. "Studies in Early Christian Epigraphy II." *JRS* 14, p85–92.
——— 1925. "The Royal Road in Herodotus." *CR* 39, p7–11.
——— 1929. "Leaves from an Anotolian Notebook." *BJRL* 13, p254–271.
——— 1930. "Lake Trogitis." *Klio* 23, p88–91.
——— 1931. "The New Jerusalem of the Montanists." *Byzantion* 6, p421–425.
——— 1939a. "The Eumeneian Formula." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler.* eds. W.M. Calder, J. Keil, p15–26. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
——— 1939b. "The Epitaph of Avircius Marcellus." *JRS* 29, p1–4.
——— 1955, "Early Christian Epitaphs from Phrygia." *AS* 5, p25–38.
Cameron, A. 1931. "Latin Words in the Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor." *AJP* 52, p232–262.
——— 1976. *Circus Factions, Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Cameron, Averil. 1980. "Neither Male Nor Female." *G& R* 27, p60–68.
Camp, C.V. 1981. "The Wise Women of 2 Samuel: A Role Model for Women in Early Israel?" *CBQ* 43, p14–29.
Carrington, P. 1976. *The Distribution and History of Elements of the Native Culture of Roman Phrygia with Reference to their Ethnic Origin.* Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Casarico, L. 1982. "Donne Ginnasiarco (a proposito di P. Med. inv. 69.01)." *ZPE* 48, p117–123.
Causse, A. 1929. *Les Dispersés D'Israel. Les Origines De La Diaspora et Son Rôle Dans La Formation Du Judaisme.* Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan.
Cavalin, H.C.C. 1974. *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part 1. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background.* Coniectanea Biblica NT Series 7. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
Cerling, C.E. 1973. "An Annotated Bibliography of the New Testament Teaching About Women." *JETS* 16, p47–53.
Chapot, V. 1904. *La Province Romaine Proconsulaire D'Asie Depuis Ses Origines Jusqu'a La Fin Du Haut-Empire.* Paris: Librairie Émile Bouillon.
Charlesworth, J.H. 1981. *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement.* SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 7S. Chico California: Scholars Press for SBL.
——— 1986. "Jewish Hymns, Odes and Prayers (ca. 167 BCE – 135 CE)." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters,* eds. R.A. Kraft, G.W.E. Nickelsburg, p414–436, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
Chaviara, N., Michel, D. 1909. "Une Synagogue Juive A Sidé De Pamphylie." *REJ* 58, p60–64.
Chiat, M.J.S. 1982. *Handbook of Synagogue Architechture.* BJS 29, Chico California: Scholars Press.
Christensen, D.L. 1984. "Huldah and the Men of Anathoth: Women in Leadership in the Deuteronomic History." In *SBL 1984 Seminar Papers,* ed. K.H. Richards, p399–404, Chico California: Scholars Press.
Cichorius, C. 1922. *Römische Studien. Historisches Epigraphisches Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms.* Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
Clarke, E.A. 1983. *Women in the Early Church.* Message of the Fathers of the Church 13. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.
Clark, G. 1981. "Roman Women." *G& R* 28, p193–212.
——— 1982. "The Women at Corinth." *Theology* 85, p256–62.
Clemen, C. 1924. *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung Des Neuen Testaments.* Zweite Auflage, Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.
Clements, R.E. 1972. *Exodus.* Cambridge: CUP.
Clerc, M. 1886. "Inscriptions de Thyatire et des environs." *BCH* 10, p398–423.
Clermont-Ganneau, C. 1920. "Découverte A Jérusalem D'une Synagogue De L'Époque Hérodienne." *Syria* 1, p190–197.
Cohen, A. 1921. *The Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Berakot.* Cambridge: CUP.
Cohen, G.M. 1978. *The Seleucid Colonies. Studies in Founding, Administration and Organisation.* Historia Einzelschriften Heft 30. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
Cohen, J. 1976. "Roman Imperial Policy Toward the Jews from Constantine Until the End of the Palestinian Patriarchate (ca. 429)." *Byzantine Studies* 3, p1–29.
Cohen, N.G. 1969. *Jewish Names and their Significance in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods in Asia Minor.* 2 Vols. Thesis submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Hebrew with English Summary.
——— 1973. "Rabbi Meir, A Descendant of Anatolian Proselytes." *JJS* 23, p51–9.
——— 1976. "Jewish Names As Cultural Indicators in Antiquity." *JSJ* 7, p97–128.
Cohen, S.J.D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian.* Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 8.

Leiden: Brill.
——— 1980. "Women in the Synagogues of Antiquity." *Conservative Judaism* 34, p23–9.
——— 1981–82. "Epigraphical Rabbis." *JQR* 72, p1–17.
——— 1982. "Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains and the Credibility of Josephus." *JJS* 33, p385–405.
Cole, R.A. 1973. *Exodus.* London: Tyndale Press.
Collart, P. 1930. "Inscription De Sélian–Mésoréma." *BCH* 54, p376–391.
——— 1931. "ΠΑΡΑΚΑΤΣΟΤΣΙΝ ΜΟΙ ΡΟΔΟΙΣ" *BCH* 55, p58–69.
Collins, J.J. 1974. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism.* SBL Dissertation Series 13. University of Montanta, Missoula: Scholars Press.
——— 1974. "Structure and Meaning in the Testament of Job." In *SBL 1974 Seminar Papers,* ed. G.MacRae, Vol 1, p35–52. Cambridge, Massachusetts: SBL.
——— 1983a. "Sybylline Oracles." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* ed J.H. Charlesworth, Vol 1, p317–472. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
——— 1983b. *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* New York: Crossroad.
——— 1984a. *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity.* New York: Crossroad.
——— 1984b. "The Sibylline Oracles." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period,* ed. M.E. Stone, 2, ii, p357–381. Assen: Van Gorcum.
——— 1987. "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition." *ANRW* II, 20.1, p421–459.
Colpe, C. 1967. "Hypsistos." *Der Kleine Pauly Lexikon Der Antike* II, col 1291–1292.
Cook, A.B. 1914, 1925, 1940. *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion.* 3 Vols. Cambridge: CUP.
——— 1900. "Iostephanos." *JHS* 20, p1–13.
Cook, S.A. 1917. "A Lydian–Aramaic Bilingual." *JHS* 37, p77–87, 219–31.
——— 1920. "The 'Holy Place' of 'Ain Dûk." *PEFQS,* p82–87.
Cormack, J.M.R., 1974. "Zeus Hypsistos At Pydna." In *Mélanges Helléniques Offerts A Georges Daux,* p51–55. Paris: de Boccard.
Cornish, F.W., Bacon, J. 1931. "The Position of Women." In *A Companion to Greek Studies.* ed. L. Whibley, p610–617. Cambridge: CUP.
Countryman, L.W. 1979. "Welfare in the Churches of Asia Minor Under the Early Roman Empire." In *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers* Vol 1, ed. P.J. Achtemeier, p131–146. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
Couroyer, B. 1969. "Antiquitiés Chrétiennes." *RB* 76. p148–149.
Cousin, G., Diehl, C. 1890. "Inscriptions D'Halicarnasse." *BCH* 14, p90–121.
Craghan, J.F. 1982. "Esther, Judith and Ruth: Paradigms for Human Liberation." *BTB* 12, p11–19.
Craven, T., 1983. "Tradition and Convention in the Book of Judith." *Semeia* 28, p49–61.
Creaghan, J.S., Raubitschek, A.E. 1947. "Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens." *Hesperia* 16, p1–54.
Crosby, M. 1941. "Greek Inscriptions: A Poletai Record of the Year 367/6 BC." *Hesperia* 10, p14–27.
Cumont, F. 1895. "Les Inscriptions Chrétiennes De L'Asie Mineure." *MAHEFR* 15, p245–299.
——— 1896. *Textes et Monuments Figurés Relatifs aux Mystères De Mithra.* Bruxelles: H. Lamertin.
——— 1897. *Hypsistos.* Supplement A la Revue De L'Instruction Publique En Belgigue.
——— 1906. "Les Mystères De Sabazius Et Le Judaisme." *CRAI,* p63–79.
——— 1910. "A Propos De Sabazius Et Du Judaisme." *MB* 14, p55–60.

——— 1911. *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co.
——— 1912. "Un ex-voto au Théos Hypsistos." *RHR* 66, p165.
——— 1913. *Catalogue Des Sculptures et Inscriptions Antiques (Monuments Lapidaries) Des Musees Royaux Du Cinquantenaire.* Bruxelles: Vromant and Co.
——— 1916. "Ὕψιστος." *RE* 9, col 444–450.
——— 1929. *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain.* Troisième Édition. Paris: Librairie Leroux.
Dalbert, P., 1954. *Die Theologie der Hellenistisch-Jüdischen Missions-Literatur Unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus.* Theologische Forschung 4. Hamburg: Reich.
Dalton, W.J. 1965. *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits. A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6.* Analecta Biblica 23. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
Danker, F.W. 1982. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field.* St Louis, Missouri: Clayton Publishing House.
Déaut, R.Le. 1981. "Le Thème De La Circoncision Du Coeur (Dt xxx 6; Jer iv 4) Dans Les Versions Anciennes (LXX et Targum) Et à Qumrân." In *Congress Volume Vienna 1980*, ed. J.A. Emerton, p178–205. Supplements to VT 32 Leiden: Brill.
Deissmann, A. 1965. *Light from the Ancient East. The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World.* Translated by L.R.M. Strachan. Grand Rapids Michigan: Baker Book House.
De Jonge, M. 1978. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text.* Leiden: Brill.
Delling, G. 1931. *Paulus' Stellung Zu Frau und Ehe.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
——— 1964. "Die Altarinschrift eines Gottesfurchtigen in Pergamon." *NT* 7, p73–80.
——— 1971. 'Von Morija zum Sinai [Pseudo-Philo Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum 32,1–10]." *JSJ* 2, p1–18.
——— 1974. "Perspektiven Der Erforschung Des Hellenistischen Judentums." *HUCA* 45, p133–176.
——— 1975. *Bibliographie zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1970.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
Den Boeft, J., Bremmer, J. 1985. 'Notiunculae Martyrologicae III. Some Observations on the Martyria of Polycarp and Pionius." *VC* 39, p110–130.
Denis, A-M. 1970. *Introduction Aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs D'Ancien Testament.* Leiden: Brill.
Denis, A-M., De Jonge, M. 1967. *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece.* Volumen Secundum. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1970. *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testameuti Graece.* Volumen Tertium. Leiden: Brill.
Dentan, R.C. 1963. "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f." *VT* 13, p34–51.
Diehl, C., Cousin, G. 1887. "Inscriptions de Lagina." *BCH* 11, p5–39, 145–163.
Dill, S. 1905. *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.* Second Edition. London: MacMillan and Co.
Dinkler, E. 1953. "Literaturbericht zur Christlichen Archaologie, 1938–1953." *TR* 21, p318–340.
——— 1974. "Schalom-Eirene-Pax. Jüdische Sepulkralinschriften und ihr Verhältnis Zum Frühen Christentum." *RDAC* 50, p121–144.

Dion, P–E. 1977. "Synagogues et Temples dans l'Égypte Hellénistique." *Science et Esprit* 29, p45–75.
Dodd, C.H. 1935. *The Bible and the Greeks.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.
Dodds, E.R. 1940. "Maenadism in the Bacchae." *HTR* 33, p155–176.
Donner, H., Röllig, W. 1962,1964. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inscriften.* 2 Vols, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
Dörner, F.K. 1940. "Außerbithynische Inschriften im Museum von Bursa und neue Funde aus Eskischehir (Dorylaion)." *JÖAI* 32, Beiblatt, p107–136.
Dossin, G. 1963. "La légende phrygienne de Nannakos". *Bulletin De La Classe Des Lettres de L'Academie Royale De Belgique.* 49, p336.
Drew–Bear, T. 1972. "Some Greek Words: Part II." *Glotta* 50, p182–228.
——— 1976. "Local Cults in Graeco–Roman Phrygia." *GRBS* 17, p247–268.
——— 1978. *Nouvelles Inscriptions De Phrygie.* Studia Amstelodamensia ad Epigraphicam Ius Antiquum et Papyrologicam Pertinentia 16. Zutphen, Holland: Terra Publishing Co.
Driver, S.R., 1902. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy.* Third Edition. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Duchesne, L. 1883. "Saint Abercius. Evêque D'Hieropolis en Phrygie. "*RQH* 34, p5–33.
Dunn, J.D.G., 1969–70. "A Note on *δωρεα*." *ET* 81, p349–51.
——— 1970. "The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13:1–20." *ZNW* 61, p247–252.
——— 1983. "The New Perspective on Paul." *BJRL* 65, p95–122.
Dunst, G. 1970. "Eine judischer Inscrift aus Samos." *Klio* 52, p73–78.
Eakin, F. 1916. "The Greek Article in First and Second Century Papyri." *AJP* 37, p333–340.
Easterling, P.E., Knox, B.M.W. 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I. Greek Literature.* Cambridge: CUP.
Eger, O., Kornemann, E., Meyer, P.M. 1910–12. *Griechische Papyri im Museum Des Oberlessischen Geschichtsvereins zu Giessen.* Band I. Leipzig und Berlin: B.G. Teubner. Reprint Milano: Cisalpino–Golardica, 1973.
Ehrenberg, V., Jones, A.H.M. eds., 1955. *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius.* Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Eißfeldt, O. 1966. "Goethes Beurteilung des Kultischen Dekalogs von Ex 34 im Lichte der Pentateuchkritik." *ZTK* 63, p135–144.
Elbogen, I. 1931. *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung.* Dritte Auflage. Frankfurt am Main: Kauffmann.
Elziondo, V., Greinacher, N. 1980. *Women in a Men's Church.* Concilium 134. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Elliot, J.H. 1981. *A Home for the Homeless. A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Engelmann, H., Knibbe, D. 1978–80. "Aus ephesischen Skizzenbuchern." *JÖAI* 52, p19–61.
Enslin, M.S. 1968. "Rome in the East." In *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough.* ed. J. Neusner, p125–136. Leiden: Brill.
Erim, K.T. 1967. "Ancient Aphrodisias and its Marble Treasures." *National Geographic* Vol 132 no. 2, p280–294.
Every, E. 1975. "Jews and God–fearers in the New Testament Period." *Immanuel* 5, p46–50.
Exum, J.C. 1985. "'Mother in Israel': A Familiar Figure Reconsidered." In *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible,* ed. L.M. Russell, p72–85. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Farmer, W.R. 1956. *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus. An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco–Roman Period.* New York: Columbia

University Press.
Farnell, L.R. 1904. "Sociological hypotheses concerning the position of women in ancient religion." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 7, p70–92.
Feissel, D. 1980. "Notes D'Epigraphie Chrétienne (IV)." *BCH* 104, p459–475.
Feldman, L.H. 1950. "Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Classical Literature and Inscriptions." *TAPA* 81, p200–208.
——— 1960. "The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt." *Jewish Social Studies* 22, p215–237.
——— 1984a. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship. (1937–1980).* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
——— 1984b. "Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings and His Significance." *ANRW* II, 21.2, p763–862.
——— 1986. "The Omnipresence of the God–Fearers." *BAR* September/October 1986, Vol 12.5, p58–69.
Fellmann, R. 1981. "Der Sabazios–Kult." In *Die Orientalischen Religionen in Römerreich* ed. M.J. Vermaseren, EPRO 93. Leiden: Brill.
Fennelly, J.M. 1983. "The Jerusalem Community and Kashrut Shatnes." *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers* ed. K.H. Richards, p273–288, Chico California: Scholars Press.
Filson, F.V. 1945. "Ephesus and the New Testament". *BA* 8, p73–80.
Finegan, J. 1959. *Light from the Ancient Past. The Archaeological Background of Judaism and Christianity.* Second Edition. Princetown New Jersey: Princetown University Press.
Fint, J. 1955. *Noe der Gerechte in der Fruhchristlichen Kunst.* Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte Heft 4. Munster/Koln: Bohlav.
Fink, R.O., Hoey, A.S., Snyder, W.F. 1940. "The Feriale Duranum". *YCS* 7, p1–22.
Finn, T.M. 1985. "The God–Fearers Reconsidered." *CBQ* 47, p75–84.
Fiorenza, E.S. 1978. "Women in the Pre–Pauline and Pauline Churches." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 33, p153–166.
——— 1979. "The Study of Women in Early Christianity: Some Methodological Considerations." In *Critical History and Biblical Faith. New Testament Perspectives* ed. T.J. Ryan, p30–58. Villanov, Pennsylvania: The College Theological Society.
——— 1983. *In Memory of Her.* New York: Crossroad.
Fischer, T. 1974. "Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr." *ZAW* 86, p90–93.
Fishbane, M. 1977. "Torah and Tradition." In *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament,* ed. D.A.Knight, p275–300. London: SPCK.
Fitzmyer, J.A. 1970. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work.* ed. S. Schechter, with prolegomenon by J.A. Fitzmyer, New York: Ktav.
Floriani Squarciapino, M. 1963. "The Synagogue at Ostia." *Archaeology* 16, p194–203.
Foakes–Jackson, F.J. 1930. *Josephus and the Jews. The Religion and History of the Jews As Explained by Flavius Josephus.* London: SPCK.
Foerster, G. 1974. "Some Menorah Reliefs from Galilee". *IEJ* 24, p191–6.
Fontenrose, J. 1945. "Philemon, Lot and Lycaon." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology.* 13, 1944–1950, p93–119.
Forbes, C.A. 1933. *Neoi. A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations.* Middletown, Connecticut: American Philological Association.
Ford, J.M. 1966. "Was Montanism a Jewish–Christian Heresy." *JEH* 17, p145–158.
Forrest, W.G. 1966. "Some Inscriptions of Chios." *ABAS* 61, p197–206.
Foss, C. 1976. *Byzantine and Turkish Sardis.* Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Monograph 4. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Foucart, P. 1887. "Exploration de la Plaine de L'Hermus par M. Aristotle Fontrier." *BCH* 11, p79–107.
Fowler, W.W. 1908. *The Roman Festival of the Period of the Republic. An Introduction to the Study of the Religion of the Romans.* London: MacMillan & Co.
Frank, T. 1938. *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.
Frank, P. 1973. "Bemerkungen zur Frühchristlichen Noe–Ikonographie." *RDAC* 49, p171–182.
Fränkel, M. 1890. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon.* Altertümer von Pergamon Band VIII.2. Königliche Museen Zu Berlin. Berlin: Spemann.
Fraser, P.M. 1962. "Inscriptions from Ptolemaic Egypt." *Berytos* 13, p123–161.
Frazer, J.G. 1919. *Folk–Lore in the OT. Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend and Law.* London: Macmillan & Co.
Freedman, D.N. 1960. "The Name of the God of Moses." *JBL* 79, p151–156.
Frend, W.H.C, 1965. *Martyrdom and Persecution in The Early Church. A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Friedrich, G. 1979. *TWNT* X, pt. 2. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
Fuks, A. 1961. "Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in AD 115–117." *JRS* 51, p98–104.
Funk, F.X. 1905. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum.* Vol 1, Paderborn: Ferdinandi Schoeningh.
Gager, J.G. 1972. *Moses in Greco–Roman Paganism.* SBL Monograph Series 16. Nashville, NY: Abingdon.
——— 1973. "The Dialogue of Paganism with Judaism: Bar Cochba to Julian." *HUCA* 44, p89–118.
Galanté, A. 1937, 1939. *Histoire des Juifs D'Anatolie.* 2 vols. Istanbul: M. Babok.
Gardner, J.F. 1986. *Women in Roman Law and Society.* Croom Helm: London.
Gasque, W.W. 1966. *Sir William M. Ramsay. Archaeologist and New Testament Scholar. A Survey of His Contribution to the Study of the N.T.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker.
Gauger, J–D. 1977. *Beiträge zur Jüdischen Apologetik. Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch.* Bonner Biblische Beiträge 49. Köln–Bonn: Peter Hanstein.
Geagan, D.J. 1967. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla.* Hesperia Supplement XII. Princeton, New Jersey: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
Geffcken, J. 1902a. *Die Oracula Sibyllina.* GCS. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
——— 1902b. *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina.* Texte und Untersuchungen 23.1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
Geiger, R. 1983. "Die Stellung der geschiedenen Frau in der Umwelt des Neuen Testaments." In *Die Frau im Urchristentum.* ed. G. Dartzenberg, H. Merklein, K. Muller, p134–157. Quaestiones Disputatae 95. Freiburg: Herder.
Georgi, D. 1987. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Gero, S. 1978. "Jewish Polemic in the Martyrium Pionii and a "Jesus" Passage from the Talmud." *JJS* 29, p164–168.
Gibson, E.P. 1975. "A Unique Christian Epitaph from the Upper Tembris Valley." *BASP* 12, p151–7.
——— 1978. *The "Christians for Christians" Inscriptions of Phrygia. Greek Texts, Translations and Commentary.* Harvard Theological Studies 32. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.

Ginsburg, M.S. 1930–31. "Fiscus Judaicus." *JQR* 21, p281–291.
Ginzberg, L. 1902. "Archisynagogue." *JE* 2, p86.
——— 1909f. *The Legends of the Jews.* 5 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Goitein, S.D. 1956. "YHWH The Passionate. The Monotheistic Meaning and Origin of the Name YHWH." *VT* 6, p1–9.
Goldenberg, R. 1979. "The Jewish Sabbath in the Roman World up to the Time of Constantine the Great." *ANRW* II, 19.1, p414–447.
Goldstein, J. 1981. "Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition.* ed. E.P. Sanders, Vol 2, p64–87. London: SCM.
Goodblatt, D. 1975. "The Beruriah Traditions." *JJS* 26, p68–85.
Goodenough, E.R. 1926. "Philo and Public Life." *JEA* 12, p77–79.
——— 1929. *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt. Legal Administration by the Jews under the Early Roman Empire as described by Philo Judaeus.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
——— 1937. "New Light on Hellenistic Judaism." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 5, p18–28.
——— 1950–51. "The Menorah Among Jews of the Roman World." *HUCA* 23, p449–492.
——— 1953–68. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period.* 13 Vols. New York: Pantheon Books.
——— 1956–57. "The Bosporus Inscription to the Most High God." *JQR* 47, p221–244.
——— 1962. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus.* Second Edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Goodwater, L. 1975. *Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography.* Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.
Gottlieb, F. 1981. "Three Mothers." *Judaism* 30, p194–203.
Gould, J. 1980. "Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens." *JHS* 100, p38–59.
Grabar, A. 1951. "Images Bibliques D'Apamée et Fresques De La Synagogue de Doura." *Cahiers Archeologiques* 5, p9–14.
Grabbe, L.L. 1977. "Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism. What Are The Issues." *JSJ* 8, p149–153.
Graetz, H. 1886. "Die Stellung der kleinasiatischen Juden unter der Römerherrschaft." *MGWJ* 30, p329–346.
——— 1946. *History of the Jews.* 6 Vols. Reprint of 1893–98 edition. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Grant, M. 1973. *The Jews in the Roman World.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
Grant, R.M. 1946. *Second Century Christianity. A Collection of Fragments.* London: SPCK.
——— 1980. "Dietary Laws among Pythagoreans, Jews and Christians." *HTR* 73, p299–310.
Greenewalt, C.H. 1973. "The Fifteenth Campaign At Sardis (1972)." *BASOR* 211, p14–36.
——— 1976. "The Seventeenth Campaign At Sardis 1974." *AASOR* 43, p61–71.
Gregoire, H. 1922. *Recueil Des Inscriptions Grecques-Chrétiennes D'Asie Mineure.* Fasc I. Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1968.
——— 1924. "Epigraphie Chrétienne." *Byzantion* 1, p695–716.
——— 1964. *Les Persécutions dans L'Empire Romain.* Second Edition. Bruxelles: Palais Des Academies.
Gressmann, H. 1925. "Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums." *ZAW* 43, p1–32.
Grissom, F.A. 1978. *Chrysostom and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian*

Relations in Fourth-Century Antioch. Ph. D. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
Groag, E. 1907. "Notizen zur Geschichte kleinasiatischer Familien." *JÖAI* 10, p282–299.
——— 1919. "Iulia Severa." *RE* X, col 946–8.
Gschnitzer, F. 1973. "Prytanis." *RE* Supplement XIII, col 730–816.
Gutmann, J. 1973. ed. *The Dura-Europos Synagogue: A Re-evaluation. (1932-1972).* University of Montana, Missoula: AAR and SBL.
——— 1975. ed. *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture.* New York: Ktav.
——— 1981. ed. *Ancient Synagogues. The State of Research.* BJS 22. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Hachlili, R. 1976. "The Niche and the Ark in Ancient Synagogues." *BASOR* 223, p43–53.
Haenchen, E. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Hall, A.S. 1978. "The Klarian Oracle at Oenoanda." *ZPE* 32, p263–8.
Hall, S.G. 1979. ed. *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and Fragments, Texts and Translations.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hallett, J.P. 1984. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society. Women and the Elite Family.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Hanfmann, G.M.A. 1963. "The Fifth Campaign at Sardis (1962)." *BASOR* 170, p1–65.
——— 1964. "The Sixth Campaign at Sardis (1963)." *BASOR* 174, p3–58.
——— 1965. "The Seventh Campaign at Sardis (1964)." *BASOR* 177, p2–37.
——— 1966. "The Eighth Campaign At Sardis (1965)." *BASOR* 182, p2–54.
——— 1967. "The Ninth Campaign At Sardis (1966)." *BASOR* 187, p9–62.
——— 1968. "The Tenth Campaign At Sardis (1967)." *BASOR* 191, p2–41.
——— 1972. *Letters from Sardis.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
——— 1974. "The Sixteenth Campaign at Sardis (1973)." *BASOR* 215, p31–60.
——— 1975. *From Croesus to Constantine. The Cities of Western Asia Minor and their Arts in Greek and Roman Times.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
——— 1983. *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times. Results of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958–1975.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hanfmann, G.M.A., Ramage, N.H. 1978. *Sculpture from Sardis: The Finds Through 1975.* Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Report 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hanfmann, G.M.A., Thomas, R.S. 1971. "The Thirteenth Campaign at Sardis (1970)." *BASOR* 203, p5–22.
Hanfmann, G.M.A., Waldbaum, J.C. 1970a. "The Eleventh and Twelfth Campaigns at Sardis." *BASOR* 199, p7–58.
——— 1970b. "New Excavations At Sardis and Some Problems of Western Anatolian Archaeology." In *Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century.* ed. J.A. Sanders, p307–326. Garden City: New York: Doubleday.
——— 1975. *A Survey of Sardis and the Major Monuments Outside the City Walls.* Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Report 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hardy, E.R. 1970. "The Priestess in the Greco–Roman World." *Churchman* 84, p264–270.
Harnack, A. 1905. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate.
——— 1907. *Luke The Physican.* New York: Williams and Norgate.
——— 1958. *Geschichte Der Altchristlichen Literatur Bis Eusebius.* Leipzig:

J.C. Hinrichs.
Harris, H.A. 1976. *Greek Athletics and the Jews.* ed. I.M. Barton, A.J. Brothers. Trivium Special Publications 3, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
Harrison, P.N. 1936. *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians.* Cambridge: CUP.
Harvey, D. 1984. "Women in Ancient Greece." *History Today* 34, 8, p45–7.
Haspels, C.H.E. 1971. *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments.* 2 Vols, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Hatzfeld, J. 1907. "Une Ambassade Juive A Pergame." *REJ* 53, p1–13.
Hauptman, J. 1974. "Images of Women in the Talmud." In *Religion and Sexism. Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions,* ed. R.R. Ruether, p184–212. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Head, B.V. 1892. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia.* London: British Museum.
——— 1901. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lydia.* London: British Museum.
——— 1906. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phrygia.* London: British Museum.
——— 1911. *Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics.* Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Heberdey, R. 1915. "Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabungen in Ephesos 1913." *JÖAI* 18, Beiblatt col 77–88.
Heberdey, R., Kalinka, E. 1896. *Bericht über Zwei Reisen im Südwestlichen Kleinasein.* Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie Der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band XLV.I, Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn.
Heberdey, R., Wilhelm, A. 1896. *Reisen in Kilikien.* Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie Der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band XL1V.VI, Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn.
Hefele, C.J. 1876. *A History of the Councils of the Church from the original documents.* Vol 2. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Heister, M–S. 1986. *Frauen in der biblischen Glaubensgeschichte.* Zweite Auflage. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
Hemer, C.J. 1969. *A Study of the Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia with Special Reference to their Social Background.* Ph.D Thesis, University of Manchester.
——— 1976. "A New Inscription of Sardis." *Buried History* 12, p36–7.
——— 1986. *The Letters To The Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting.* JSNT Supplement Series 11, Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Hengel, M. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period.* 2 vols. London: SCM.
——— 1975a. "Proseuche und Synagoge: Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palastina." In *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture,* ed. J. Gutmann, p27–54. New York: Ktav.
——— 1975b. "Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi." In *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture,* ed. J. Gutman, p110–148. New York: Ktav.
——— 1980. *Jews Greeks and Barbarians. Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre–Christian Period.* London: SCM.
Hepding, H. 1910. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1908–1909." *AM* 35, p345–523.
Herrmann, P. 1962. *Ergebnisse Einer Reise in Nordostlydien.* Denkschriften Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band 80. Wien: Hermann Böhlaus.

Hicks, E.L. 1890a. "Ceramus and its Inscriptions." *JHS* 11, p109–128.
——— 1890b. *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum. Part III, Priene, Iasos and Ephesus.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint, Milano: Cisalpino, 1978.
——— 1891. "Inscriptions from Western Cilicia." *JHS* 12, p225–273.
Hilhorst, A. 1982. "L'Ancien Testament dans la polémique du martyr Pionius." *Augustinianum* 22, p91–96.
Hill, D. 1967. *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms.* SNTSMS 5, Cambridge: CUP.
Hiller von Gaertringen, F.F. ed. 1906. *Inschriften von Priene.* Königliche Museen zu Berlin. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
Hillers, D.R. 1964. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets.* Biblica et Orientalia 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
Hirschfeld, G. 1894. "Apameia Kibotos." *RE* 1, col 2664–5.
Hoenig, S.B. 1969. "Qumran Rules of Impurities." *RQ* 6, p559–567.
Hoey, A.S. 1937. "Rosaliae Signorum." *HTR* 30, p15–35.
Hogarth, D.G. 1888. "Notes upon a visit to Celaenae–Apamea." *JHS* 9, p343–349.
Holleaux, M. 1918. ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ/ΥΠΑΤΟΣ. *Étude Sur La Traduction en Grec Du Titre Consulaire.* BEFAR 113. Paris: de Boccard.
——— 1920. "Decret des auxiliaires crétois de Ptolémée Philométor trouvé à Délos." *APF* 6, p9–23.
——— 1942. *Études D'Epigraphie Et D'Histoire Grecques.* Tome III. Paris: de Boccard.
Holmes, T.R. 1923. *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire.* 3 Vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hommel, H. 1975. "Juden und Christen im kaiserzeitlichen Milet." *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 25, p167–195.
Homolle, T. 1882. "Le Proconsul Rabirius. Correction au Texte De Josèphe." *BCH* 6, p608–612.
Hooyman, R.P.J. 1958. "Die Noe–Darstellung in der Frühchristlichen Kunst. Eine christlich–archäologische Abhandlung zu J. Fink: Noe der Gerechte in der frühchristlichen Kunst." *VC* 12, p113–135.
Hopkins, C. 1979. *The Discovery of Dura-Europos.* ed. B. Goldman. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Howard, G. 1971. "The Oldest Greek Text of Deuteronomy." *HUCA* 42, p125–131.
Hughes, P.E. 1943. "The Value of Josephus As A Historical Source." *EQ* 15, p179–183.
Hula, E. 1893. "Eine Judengemeinde in Tlos." *Eranos Vindobonensis* 1893, p99–102.
Humann, C., Cichorius, C., Judeich, W., Winter, F. 1898. *Altertümer von Hierapolis.* Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts Ergänzungsheft IV, Berlin: Georg Reimer.
Hunt, E.D. 1982. "St Stephen in Minorca. An Episode in Jewish–Christian Relations in the Early 5th Century AD." *JTS* 33, p106–123.
Iluk, J. 1979. "Drachmae in the Sepulchral–Penal System of Asia Minor in the Period of the Early Roman Empire." *Eos* 67, p279–286.
Imhoof–Blumer, F. 1901. *Kleinasiatische Munzen.* Sonderschriften Des Österreichischen Archaelogischen Institutes In Wien Band I. Wien: Alfred Hölder.
Irvin, D. 1980. "The Ministry of Women in the Early Church: The Archaelogical Evidence." *Duke Divinity School Review* 45, p76–86.
Jacoby, F. 1957. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker.* Teil 1. Leiden: Brill.
Jamar, A. 1909. "Les Mysteres De Sabazius Et Le Judaisme." *MB* 13, p227–

252.
James, E.O. 1959. *The Cult of the Mother-Goddess.* London: Thames and Hudson.
——— 1963. *The Worship of the Sky-God. A Comparative Study in Semitic and Indo-European Religion.* London: Athlone Press.
Jameson, S. 1980. "The Lycian League: Some Problems in its Administration." ANRW II, 7.2, p832–855.
Janne, H. 1937. "Magiciens et religions nouvelles dans l'Ordre Romain." *Latomus* 1, p37–56.
Jeremias, J. 1969. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the NT Period.* Philadelphia: Fortress.
Johnson, S.E. 1946. "Stray Pieces of Early Christian Writing." *JNES* 5, p40–54.
——— 1950. "Laodicea and its Neighbours." *BA* 13, 1, p1–18.
——— 1958. "Early Christianity in Asia Minor." *JBL* 77, p1–17.
——— 1961. "Christianity in Sardis." In *Early Christian Origins. Studies in honor of Harold R. Willoughby,* ed. A. Wikgren, p81–90. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
——— 1968. "A Sabazios Inscription from Sardis." In *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough,* ed. J. Neusner, p542–550. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1973. "Unsolved Questions About Early Christianity in Anatolia." In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in honour of Allen P. Wikgren,* ed. D.E. Aune, Supplements to NT 33, p181–193. Leiden: Brill
——— 1975. "Asia Minor and Early Christianity." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty,* ed. J. Neusner, Part 2, p77–145. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1978. "Sabaoth/Sabazios: A Curiosity in Ancient Religion." *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 13, p97–103.
——— 1984. "The Present State of Sabazios Research." *ANRW* II, 17.3, p1583–1613.
Jones, A.H.M. 1936. "Another Interpretation of the 'Constitutio Antoniniana'." *JRS* 26, p223–235.
——— 1940. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1964. *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey.* 2 Vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
——— 1971. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces.* Second Edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Jones, C.P. 1970. "A Leading Family of Roman Thespiae." *HSCP* 74, p223–255.
——— 1980. "Prosopographical Notes on the Second Sophistic." *GRBS* 21, p373–380.
——— 1982. "A Family of Pisidian Antioch." *Phoenix* 36, p264–271.
Jones, H.S. 1926. "Claudius and the Jewish Question at Alexandria." *JRS* 16, p17–35.
Joubin, A. 1894. "Stèles Funéraires De Phrygie." *RA*, Third Series, 24, p181–3.
Juster, J. 1914. *Les Juifs dans L'Empire Romain. Leur Condition Juridique, Économique et Sociale.* 2 Vols. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner.
Kane, J.P. 1978. "The Ossuary Inscriptions of Jerusalem." *JSS* 23, p268–282.
Kant, L.H. 1987. "Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin." *ANRW* II, 20.2, p671–713.
Kaplan, J. 1963–64. "The Fifth Season of Excavation at Jaffa." *JQR* 54,

p110–114.
Karwiese, S. 1971. "Der Caesar Maximus und die Homonoia Akmoneia–Eymeneia." *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 86, p40–42.
Kasemann, E., 1969. *New Testament Questions of Today.* London: SCM.
Kasher, A. 1976a. "Some comments on the Jewish Uprising in Egypt in the Time of Trajan." *JJS* 27, p147–158.
——— 1976b. "The Jewish Attitude to the Alexandrian Gymnasium in the First Century A.D." *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, p148–61.
——— 1977–78. "The Isopoliteia Question in Caesarea Maritima." *JQR* 68, p16–27.
——— 1978. "First Jewish Military Units in Ptolemaic Egypt." *JSJ* 9, p57–67.
——— 1985. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. The Struggle for Equal Rights.* Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
Kee, H.C. 1974. "Satan, Magic and Salvation in the Testament of Job." In *SBL 1974 Seminar Papers,* ed.G. MacRae, Vol 1, p53–76. Cambridge, Massachussetts: SBL.
Keil, J. 1905. "Ärzteinschriften aus Ephesos." *JÖAI* 8, p128–138.
——— 1923. "Die Kulte Lydiens." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay,* ed. W.H. Buckler, W.M. Calder, p239–266. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
——— 1939. "Kulte im Prytaneion von Ephesos." In *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler,* ed. W.M. Calder. J. Keil, p119–128. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Keil, J., Maresch, G. 1960. "Epigraphische Nachlese zu Miltners Ausgrabungsberichten aus Ephesos." *JÖAI* Beiblatt, 45, col 75–100.
Keil, J., Premerstein, A. von. 1908. *Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der Südlichen Aiolis.* Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band 53.
——— 1911. *Bericht über eine Zweite Reise in Lydien.* Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band 54.
——— 1914. *Bericht über eine Dritte Reise in Lydien und den Angrenzenden Gebieten Ioniens.* Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien Philosophisch–Historische Klasse Band 57.
Kellett, E.E. 1928. *The Story of Myth.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner.
Kenyon, F.G., Bell, M.I. 1893, 1907. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum.* Vol I, III. Reprint Milano: Cisalpino, 1973.
Kindler, A. 1971. "A Coin–Type From Apameia in Phrygia (Asia Minor) Depicting The Narrative of Naoh." *Museum Haaretz Bulletin* 13, p24–32.
Kittel, G. 1944. "Das kleinasiatische Judentum in der hellenistisch–römischen Zeit. Ein Bericht zur Epigraphike Kleinasiens." *TLZ* 69, col 9–20.
Klauser, T. 1961. "Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte Der Christlichen Kunst IV." *JbAC* Jahrgang 4, p128–145.
Klausner, J. 1944. *From Jesus to Paul.* London: George Allen & Unwin.
Klein, C. 1972. "Jewish Women in the time of Mary of Nazareth." *Bible Today* 60, p746–52.
Kleiner, G. 1969. *Das Römische Milet. Bilder Aus Der Griechischen Stadt in Römischer Zeit.* Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft Frankfurt/Main Band 8, Nr 5. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
——— 1968. *Die Ruinen von Milet.* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Istanbul. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Klein–Franke, F. 1983. "A Hebrew Lamentation from Roman Egypt." *ZPE* 51, p80–84.
Knibbe, D. 1968–70. "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos III." *JÖAI* Beiblatt 49,

p57–88.
——— 1978. "Ephesos–Nicht Nur Die Stadt Der Artemis. Die 'Anderen' Ephesischen Gotter." In *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner*, ed. S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim, J. Wagner, p489–503. EPRO 76. Leiden: Brill.
Knibbe, D., Ipikçioğlu, B. 1981–82. "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesus VIII." *JÖAI* 53, p87–150.
Knoepfler, D., 1973. "La Base De Sosilos A La Synagogue De Délos." In *Études Déliennes publiées à l'occasion du centième anniversaire du début des fouilles de l'École française d'Athènes à Délos.* p233–7. BCH Supp 1. Paris: de Boccard.
Kohl, H., Watzinger, C. 1916. *Antike Synagogen in Galilaea.* Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
Körte, A. 1900. "Kleinasiatische Studien VI. Inschriften aux Phrygie." *AM* 25, p398–444.
Kosmala, H. 1959. *Hebräer–Essener–Christen Studien zur vorgeschichte der Frühchristlichen Verkundigung.* Studia Post–Biblica 1, Leiden: Brill.
Kötzsche–Breitenbruch, L. 1976. *Die Neue Katakombe An Der Via Latina In Rome Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie Der Alttestamentlichen Wandmalereien.* JAC Ergänzungsband 4, Münster: Aschendorff.
Kraabel, A.T. 1968. *Judaism in Western Asia Minor under the Roman Empire with a preliminary study of the Jewish Community at Sardis, Lydia.* D.Th. Thesis, Harvard Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
——— 1969. " Hypsistos and the Synagogue at Sardis." *GRBS* 10, p81–93.
——— 1971. "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Content." In *Studies Presented to George M.A. Hanfmann*, eds. D.G.Mitten, J.G.Pedley, J.A.Scott, p77–85, Fogg Art Museum Harvard University Monographs in Art and Archaeology II, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
——— 1974. "Synagogues, Ancient." *New Catholic Encyclopedia: Supplement (1967–1974)* 16, p436–439.
——— 1978. "Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence." In *Paganisme, Judaisme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon.* eds. A.Benoit, M.Philonenko, C.Vogel, p13–33, Paris: de Boccard.
——— 1979a. "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik." *ANRW* II, 19.1, p477–510.
——— 1979b. "Jews in Imperial Rome: More Archaeological Evidence from an Oxford Collection." *JJS* 30, p41–58.
——— 1981a. "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues." In *Ancient Synagogues. The State of Research*, ed. J.Gutmann, p79–91, BJS 22, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1981b. "The Disappearance of the 'God–fearers.' *Numen* 28, p113–126.
——— 1981c. "The Excavated Synagogues of Late Antiquity From Asia Minor to Italy." *JÖB* 32, p227–236.
——— 1982. "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions." *JJS* 33, p445–464.
——— 1983. "Impact of the discovery of the Sardis Synagogue." In *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times. Results of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958–1975.* ed. G.M.A. Hanfmann, p178–190, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachussetts.
——— 1984. "New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora has been found on Delos." *BA* 47, p44–6.
——— 1985. "Synagoga Caeca. Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretations of Evidence to Judaism in the Early Christian Period." In *"To See*

Ourselves As Others See Us." Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity, eds. J.Neusner, E.S.Frierichs, p219–246, Chico, California: Scholars Press.

——— 1986. "Greeks, Jews and Lutherans in the Middle Half of Acts." In *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles. Essays in Honour of Krister Stendal on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday,* eds G.W.E.Nickelsburg, G.W.MacRae, p147–157, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

——— 1987. "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues." In *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity.* ed. L.I. Levine, p49–60. A Centennial Publication of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: ASOR.

Kraabel, A.T., MacLennan, R.S. 1986. "The God–Fearers – A Literary and Theological Invention." *BAR* September/October 1986, Vol 12.5, p47–53.

Kraabel, A.T., Meyers, E.M. 1986. "Archaeology, Iconography and Nonliterary Written Remains." In *Early Judaism And Its Modern Interpreters.* eds. R.A. Kraft, G.W.E.Nickelsburg, p175–210, SBL Centennial Publications, Atlanta, Gerogia: Scholars Press.

Kraeling, C.H. 1938. *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis.* New Haven, Connecticut: American Schools of Oriental Research.

——— 1979. *The Synagogue,* New York: Ktav.

Kraemer, R.S. 1983. "Women in the Religions of the Greco–Roman World." *RSR* 9, p127–139.

——— 1985a. "Review of *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins,* by E.S. Fiorenza." *RSR* 11, p6–9.

——— 1985b. "A New Inscription from Malta and the Question of Women Elders in the Diaspora Jewish Communities." *HTR* 78, p431–438.

——— 1986a. "Hellenistic Jewish Women: The Epigraphical Evidence." In *SBL 1986 Seminar Papers* ed. K.M.Richards, p183–200, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

——— 1986b. "Non–Literary Evidence for Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt." *Helios* 13, p85–101.

Kraft, R.A., Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 1986. *Early Judaism And Its Modern Interpreters.* SBL Centennial Publications, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Krauss, S. 1922. *Synagogale Altertümer.* Berlin–Wien: Benjamin Harz.

Krill, R.M. 1978. "Roman Paganism under the Antonines and Severans." *ANRW* II, 16.1, p27–44.

Kubinska, J. 1968. *Les Monuments Funéraires Dans Les Inscriptions Grecques De L'Asie Mineure.* Travaux du Centre D'Archéologie Méditerranéenne De L"Academic Polonaise Des Sciences Tom 5, Warszawa: PWN Editions Scientifiques de Pologne.

Kuhn, K.G., Stegemann, H. 1962. "Proselyten." *RE* Supp IX, col 1248–1283.

——— "προσηλυτος", *TDNT* VI, p727–744.

Kuntzmann, R., Schlosser, J. 1984. *Études Sur Le Judaisme Hellénistique Congrès de Strasbourg (1983).* Association Catholique Française Pour L'Étude De La Bible, Lectio Divina 119, Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf.

Künzl, M. 1981. "Das Judentum." In *Die Orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich.* ed. M.J.Vermaseren, p459–484, EPRO Leiden: Brill.

Kurfess, A. 1941. "Oracula Sibyllina I/II." *ZNW* 40, p151–165.

——— 1951. *Sibyllinische Weissagungen. Urtext und Ubersetzung.* Berlin: Tusculum.

——— 1956. "Homer und Hesiod in 1. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina." *Philologus* 100, p147–153.

Labriolle, de P. 1952. *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire.* London: Burn Oates and Washbourne.

Lake, K, 1933. "Proselytes and Godfearers." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I, The Acts of The Apostles,* eds. K.Lake, H.J.Cadbury, Vol 5, p74–96, London: MacMillan and Co.
Lämmer, M. 1981. "Women and Sport in Ancient Greece. A Plea for a Critical and Objective Approach." *Medicine Sport* 14, p16–23.
Lane, E.N. 1971, 1976. *Corpvs Monumentorvm Religionis Dei Menis (CMRDM) Vols I, III. Interpretations and Testimonia.* EPRO 19. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1979. "Sabazius and the Jews in Valerius Maximus: A Re–examination." *JRS* 69, p35–38.
——— 1980. "Towards a Definition of the Iconography of Sabazius." *Numen* 27, p9–33.
——— 1985. *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii (CCIS) II. The Other Monuments and literary Evidence.* EPRO 100. Leiden: Brill
Langlois, V. 1854. *Inscriptions Grecques, Romaines, Byzantines et Arméniennes De La Cilicie.* Paris: Leleux Libraire.
La Piana, G. 1927. "Foreign Groups in Rome during the first centuries of the Empire." *HTR* 20, p183–403.
Laqueur, R. 1920. *Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus.* Giessen: Münchow.
Larsen, J.A.O. 1938. "Roman Greece." In *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome,* Vol IV, ed.T.Frank, p259–498. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte.* Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 4. München: C.H.Beck.
Lattimore, R. 1942. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs.* Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28, No 1–2, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois.
Laubscher, F. Du T. 1980. "Notes on the Literary Structure of IQS 2:11–18 and its Biblical Parallel in Deut 29." *JNSL* 8, p49–55.
Laum, B. 1914. *Stiftungen in der Griechischen und Römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur Antiken Kulturgeschichte.* Leipzig, Reprinted, Aalen: Scientia 1964.
Laumonier, A. 1934. "Inscriptions de Carie." *BCH* 58, p291–380.
Le Bohec, Y. 1981a. "Inscriptions Juives et Judaisantes de l'Afrique Romaine. *Antiquités Africaines* 17, 165–207.
——— 1981b. "Juifs et Judaisants dans l'Afrique Romaine. Remarques Onomastiques." *Antiquités Africaines* 17, p209–229.
Leclercq, H. 1924. "Apamee." *DACL* I.2, col 2500–2523.
Lefkowitz, M.R., Fant, M.B. 1982. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome. A sourcebook in translation.* London: Duckworth.
Legrand, E., Chamonard, J. 1983. "Inscriptions De Phrygie." *BCH* 17, p241–293.
Lemerle, P. 1936. "Le Testament D'un Thrace A Philippes." *BCH* 60, p336–343.
Leon, H.J. 1960. *The Jews of Ancient Rome.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Leutsch, E.L., Schneidewin, F.G. 1839. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum.* Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965.
Levenson, J.D. 1975. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah." *HTR* 68, p203–233.
Lévi, I. 1905, 1906, 1907. "Le Prosélytisme Juifs." *REJ* 50, p1–9; 51, p1–31; 53, p56–61.
Levick, B. 1967. *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1971. "Greek and Latin Epigraphy in Anatolia: Progress and Problems." In *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge 1967,* p371–6. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

——— 1985. *The Government of the Roman Empire. A Sourcebook.* London: Croom Helm.
Levine, L.I. 1981. ed., *Ancient Synagogues Revealed.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
Levinson, J. 1985. "Is Eve to Blame? A Contextual Analysis of Sirach 25:24." *CBQ* 47, p617–23.
Levison, N. 1957. "The Proselyte in Biblical and Early Post–Biblical Times." *SJT* 10, p45–56.
Lévy, I. 1895. "Études Sur La Vie Municipale De L'Asie Mineure Sous Les Antonins. Premiere Série. L'Ecclesia, La Boulé, La Gerousia." *REG* 8, p203–250.
——— 1899. "Études Sur La Vie Municipale De L'Asie Mineure Sous Les Antonins. Seconde Série. Les Offices Publics." *REG* 12, p255–289.
——— 1900. "Notes D'Histoire Et D'Epigraphie." *REJ* 41, p174–195.
——— 1901. "Études Sur La Vie Municipale De L'Asie Mineure Sous Les Antonins. Troisième Série." *REG* 14, p350–371.
Lewis, D.M. 1957. "The First Greek Jew." *JSS* 2, p264–6.
Lewis, J.P. 1968. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature.* Leiden: Brill.
——— 1984. "Noah and the Flood in Jewish, Christian and Muslim Tradition." *BA* 47, p224–239.
Lewy, H. 1938. "Aristotle and the Jewish Sage according to Clearchus of Soli." *HTR* 31, p205–235.
Lewy, I. 1962. "The Puzzle of Deut XXVII: Blessings Announced But Curses Noted." *VT* 12, p207–211.
Liebenam, W. 1967. *Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreiche.* Reprint of 1900 Edition, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
Lieberman, S. 1965. *Greek in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II–IV Centuries CE.* Second Edition. New York: Philipp Feldheim.
Lietzmann, H. 1953. *The Founding of the Church Universal.* Third Edition. London: Lutterworth.
Lifshitz, B. 1960. "Fonctions et Titres Honorifiques dans les Communautés Juives. Notes d'Épigraphie Palestinienne." *RB* 67, p58–64.
——— 1961, "La Vie De L'au–Dela Dans Les Conceptions Juives." *RB* 68, p401–411.
——— 1962. "Les Juifs A Venosa." *RF* 40, p367–71.
——— 1964. "Le Culte Du Dieu Tres Haut A Gorgippia." *RF* 92, p157–161.
——— 1965. "L'Hellénisation Des Juifs De Palestine. A Propos des Inscriptions de Besara (Beth–Shearim)." *RB* 72, p520–538.
——— 1966. "Beiträge zur griechisch–jüdischen Epigraphik." *ZDPV* 82, p57–63.
——— 1967. *Donateurs et Fondateurs Dans Les Synagogues Juives. Répertoire des dédicases grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfections des synagogues.* Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 7. Paris: Gabalda.
——— 1969. "Notes D'Épigraphie Grecque." *RB* 76, p92–98.
——— 1970. "Du Nouveau Sur Les 'Sympathisants.'" *JSJ* I, p77–84.
——— 1971. "Inscriptions de Sinai et de Palestine." *ZPE* 7, p151–163.
——— 1973, "L'Ancienne Synagogue De Tibériade, Sa Mosaique et Ses Inscriptions." *JSJ* 4, p43–55.
——— 1974. "Varia Epigraphica." *Epigraphica* 36, p78–100.
——— 1975. *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions.* by Frey P.J–B. Second Edition, Vol 1, with Prolegomenon by B.Lifshitz. New York: Ktav.
Lifshitz, B., Schiby, J. 1968. "Une Synagogue Samaritaine a Thessalonique." *RB* 75, p368–378.
Lightstone, J.N. 1984. *The Commerce of the Sacred. Mediation of the Divine*

among Jews in The Graeco-Roman Diaspora. BJS 59, Chico, California; Scholars Press.
L'Institut Fernand Courby, 1972–1975. *Index du Bulletin Épigraphique et J. and L. Robert 1938–1965.* 3 Vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Liver, J. 1963. "The Half-Shekel Offering in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature." *HTR* 66, p173–198.
Loader, J.A., 1973. "An Explanation of the Term Proselutos." *NT* 15, p270–277.
Loewe, R. 1966. *The Position of Women in Judaism.* London: SPCK.
Lohse,E., Schlichting, G. 1956. *Rabbinische Texte. Erste Reihe. Die Tosefta Text, Ubersetzung, Erklarüng.* Band 1, Seder Seraim. 1.Heft Berakot. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
Long, B.O. 1971. "Two Question and Answer Schemata in the Prophets." *JBL* 90, p129–139.
Longenecker, R.N. 1984. *New Testament Social Ethics for Today.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
Lozovan, E. 1967–8. "Dacia Sacra." *HR* 7, p209–43.
Lüderitz, G. 1983. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika, mit einem Anhang von Joyce M. Reynolds.* Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients Reihe B, nr 53. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert.
McCarthy, D.J. 1981. *Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament.* Analecta Biblica 21A, Second Edition, Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
MacDonald, D. 1979. "Virgins Widows and Paul in Second Century Asia Minor." *SBL Seminar Papers 1979*, ed. P.J.Achtemeier, Vol 1. p169–184. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
MacDonald, G. 1901. *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection, University of Glasgow.* Vol II. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons.
McEleney, N.J. 1973. "Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century." *JSJ* 4, p19–43.
——— 1973–74. "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law." *NTS* 20, p319–341.
——— 1978. "Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century. Replies to David E. Aune and Lester L. Grabbe." *JSJ* 9, p83–88.
MacMullen, R. 1980. "Woman in Public in the Roman Empire." *Historia* 29, p208–218.
——— 1981. *Paganism in the Roman Empire.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Madden, F.W. 1866. "On Some Coins of Septimius Severus, Macrinus, and Philip I, Struck at Apameia in Phrygia with the Legend ΝΩΕ." *Numismatic Chronicle,* New Series 6, p173–219.
——— 1881. *Coins of the Jews.* London: Trubner and Co.
Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ.* 2 vols. Princetown, New Jersey: Princetown University Press.
Malan, S.C. 1882. *The Book of Adam and Eve.* London: Williams and Norgate.
Malherbe, A.J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
Malina, B.J. 1969. "Some Observations on the Origin of Sin in Judaism and St Paul." *CBQ* 31, p18–34.
Malinowski, F.X. 1985. "The Brave Women of Philippi." *BTB* 55, p60–64.
Malten, L. 1939. "Motivgeschichtliche untersuchungen zur Sagenforschung. 1) Philemon und Baukis." *Hermes* 74, p176–206.
Mandell, S. 1984. "Who Paid the Temple Tax When the Jews were under Roman Rule?" *HTR* 77, p223–32.
Mann, J. 1914. "The Observance of the Sabbath and the Festivals in the First Two Centuries of the Common Era according to Philo, Josephus,

the New Testament and the Rabbinic Sources." *Jewish Review* 4, p433–456, 498–532.
Manson, T.W. 1941–2. "St. Paul in Ephesus: (3) The Corinthian Correspondence." *BJRL* 26, p101–120.
Marcillet–Jaubert, J., Vérilhac, A–M. 1979. *Index du Bulletin Épigraphique de J. et L. Robert, 1966–1973.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
——— 1983. *Index du Bulletin Épigraphique de J. et L. Robert. 1974–1977.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Marcus, R. 1931–32. "Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 3, p43–120.
——— 1952. "The Sebomenoi in Josephus." *Jewish Social Studies* 14, p247–250.
Maritz, J.A. 1983. "Noah's Ark and the Animals of Early Christian Art." *Akroterion* 28, p102–8.
Marshall, A.J. 1975a. "Roman Women and the Provinces." *Ancient Society* 6, p109–127.
——— 1975b. "Flaccus and the Jews of Asia (Cicero Pro Flacco 28. 67–69)." *Phoenix* 29, p139–154.
Mayes, A.D.M. 1979. *Deuteronomy.* London: Oliphants.
Mazar, B. 1978. "Herodian Jerusalem in the Light of the Excavations South and South–West of the Temple Mount." *IEJ* 28, p230–237.
Mazur, B.D. 1935. *Studies on Jewry in Greece I.* Athens: Hestia.
Meeks, W.A. 1974. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *HR* 13, p165–208.
——— 1979. "'Since Then You Would Need To Go Out of the World': Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity." In *Critical History and Biblical Faith. New Testament Perspectives.* ed. T.J.Ryan, p4–29, Villanova University, Villanova, PA: The College Theology Society.
——— 1983. *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of The Apostle Paul.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Meeks, W.A., Wilken, R.L. 1978. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the first four centuries of the Common Era.* SBL Sources for Biblical Study 13, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
Meinardus, O.F.A. 1979. *St. Paul in Ephesus and the Cities of Galatia and Cyprus.* New Rochelle, New York: Caratzas Brothers.
Meiselman, M. 1978. *Jewish Woman in Jewish Law.* New York: Ktav.
Mellink, M.J. 1977. "Archaeology in Asia Minor." *AJA* 81, p289–321.
Mendecki, N. 1985. "Dtn 30, 3–4 – nachexilisch?" *BZ* 29, p267–71.
Meshorer, Y. 1981. "An Ancient Coin Depicts Noah's Ark." *BAR* 7.5, p38–39.
Meyer, E. 1925. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. Zweiter Band. Die Entwicklung des Judentums und Jesus von Nazaret.* Stuttgart und Berlin: J.G. Cotta'sche.
——— 1926. *Geschichte Des Altertums.* Vols I,2. Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta'sche.
Meyers, C. 1978. "The Roots of Restriction: Women in Early Israel." *BA* 41, p91–103.
Meyers, E.M. 1971–72. "The Theological Implication of an Ancient Jewish Burial Custom." *JQR* 62, p95–119.
Meyers, E.M., Kraabel, A.T., Strange, J.F. 1972. "Archaeology and Rabbinic Tradition at Khirbet Shema' 1970 and 1971 Campaigns." *BA* 35, p2–31.
——— 1976. *Ancient Synagogue Excavations at Khirbet Shema', Upper Galilee, Israel 1970–1972.* AASOR 42, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
Meyers, E.M., Strange, J.F., Meyers, C.L. 1981. *Excavations At Ancient Me-*

iron, Upper Galilee, Israel 1971-72, 1974-75, 1977. Meiron Excavation Project Vol III, Cambridge, Massachussets: ASOR.
Michon, E. 1907. "Stèles Funéraires Phrygiennes." *Mémoires De La Société Nationale Des Antiquaires De France* 66, p27–46.
——— 1917. "Sarcophage Antique De Castellorizo Représentant Artemis et Endymion." *RB* 14, p537–560.
Milgrom, J. 1978. "The Temple Scroll." *BA* 41, p105–120.
Millar, F.G.B. 1962. "The Date of the *Constitutio Antoniniana.*" *JEA* 48, p124–131.
——— 1964. "Some Evidence on the meaning of Tacitus *Annals* XII.60." *Historia* 13, p180–7.
——— 1966. "The Emperor, The Senate and the Province." *JRS* 56, p156–166
——— 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31BC - AD337).* London: Duckworth.
——— 1983. "Empire and City, Augustus to Julian: Obligations, Excuses and Status." *JRS* 73, p76–96.
Miller, K.M. 1985. "Apollo Lairbenos." *Numen* 32, p46–70.
Miller, P.D. 1981. "Psalms and Inscriptions." In *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* ed. J.A.Emerton, Supplements to Vetus Testementum 32, p311–332. Leiden: Brill.
Mitchell, H.G., Smith, J.M.P., Bewer, J.A., 1912. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah.* Edinburgh: T and T Clark.
Mitchell, S. 1974. "The Plancii in Asia Minor." *JRS* 64, p27–39.
——— 1982. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II. The Ankara District. The Inscriptions of North Galatia.* British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph 4. Oxford: BAR Int. Series 135.
Mitford, T.B. 1946. "Religious Documents from Roman Cyprus." *JHS* 66, p24–42.
Mitten, D.G. 1965. *The Ancient Synagogue of Sardis.* New York: Published for private circulation by the Committee to Preserve the Ancient Synagogue of Sardis on behalf of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis.
——— 1966. "A New Look at Ancient Sardis." *BA* 29, p38–68.
Moberly, R.W.L. 1983. *At the Mountain of God. Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34.* JSOT Supplement Series 22, Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Moe, D.L. 1977. "The Cross and the Menorah." *Archaeology* 30, p148–157.
Moehring, H.R. 1959. "The Persecution of the Jews and the Adherents of the Isis Cult at Rome AD 19." *NT* 3, p293–304.
——— 1975. "The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: A Study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty.* ed. J.Neusner, Part 3, p124–158. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1984. "Joseph Ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus: The Jewish Prophet and Roman Historian." *ANRW* II, 21.2, p864–944.
Mohler, S.L. 1932. "Feminism in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum." *The Classical Weekly* 25, Feb 15, 1932, p113–117.
Molland, E. 1954. "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch." *JEH* 5, p1–6.
Momigliano, A. 1963. ed. *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1975. *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge: CUP.
Mommsen, T., Krueger, P., Watson, A. 1985. *The Digest of Justinian.* 4 Vols, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Monceaux, P. 1902. "Paiens Judaisantes. Essai D'Explication D'Une Inscription Africaine." *RA* 3rd series, 40, p208–226.
Montefiore, C.G., Loewe, H., 1938. *A Rabbinic Anthology. Selected and Arranged with comments and introduction.* London. Macmillan and Co.

Montevecchi, O. 1981. "Una donna 'prostatis' del figlio minorenne in un papiro del II^a." *Aegyptus* 61, p103–115.
Moore, G.F. 1927–1930. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim.* 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Mor M., Rappaport. U. 1986. "A Survey of 25 Years (1960–1985) of Israeli Scholarship on Jewish History in the Second Temple Period (539 BCE–135 CE)." *BTB* 16, p56–72.
Mordtmann, J.H., 1881. "Zur Epigraphik von Kyzikos." *AM* 6, p121–131.
Mosley, A.W. 1965–66. "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World." *NTS* 12, p10–26.
Moulton, J.H. 1908, 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vols 1, 3. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Murakawa, K. 1957. "Demiurgos." *Historia* 6, p385–415.
Murphy–O'Connor, J. 1976. "Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (I Macc X, 25–45)." *RB* 83, p400–420.
Murray, D.F. 1979. "Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah–Barak Story (Judges IV 4–22)." In *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* ed. J.A.Emerton, Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 30, p155–189. Leiden: Brill.
Musurillo, H. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs. Introduction Texts and Translations.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Nairn, J.N. 1904. *The Mimes of Herodas.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Neiman, D. 1963. "Sefarad: The Name of Spain." *JNES* 22, p128–132.
Neuberger, J. 1983. "Woman in Judaism: The Fact and the Fiction." In *Women's Religious Experience: Cross-Cultural Perspectives.* ed. P.Holden, p132–143, London: Croom Helm.
Neusner, J. 1961. "A Life of Rabbi Tarfon. Ca. 50–130CE." *Judaica* 17, p141–167.
——— 1964. "The Conversion of Adiabene to Judaism. A New Perspective." *JBL* 83, p60–66.
——— 1973. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism.* Leiden: Brill.
——— 1975. *Early Rabbinic Judaism. Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art.* Leiden: Brill.
——— 1975–76. "First Cleanse the Inside." *NTS* 22, p486–495.
——— 1977a. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities. Part Nineteen Tebul Yom and Yadayim.* Leiden: Brill.
——— 1977b. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities. Part Twenty-two. The Mishnaic System of Uncleanness. Its Context and History.* Leiden: Brill.
——— 1977c. *The Tosefta translated from the Hebrew. Sixth Division Tohoroth (The Order of Purities).* New York: Ktav.
——— 1978–9. "Comparing Judaisms." *HR* 18, p177–191.
——— 1978. "History and Purity in First Century Judaism." *HR* 18, p1–17.
——— 1979a. "From Scripture to Mishnah. The Origins of Mishnah's Division of Woman." *JJS* 30, p138–153.
——— 1979b. "Thematic or Systematic Description: The Case of Mishnah's Division of Women." In *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism,* BJS 10, p79–100. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
——— 1980. "Women in the System of Mishnah." *Conservative Judaism* 32.2, p3–13.
——— 1981a. "'Judaism' after Moore: A Programmatic Statement." In *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism. Second Series.* BJS 15, p19–33. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1981b. "The Symbolism of Ancient Judaism: The Evidence of the Synagogue." In *Ancient Synagogues. The State of Research.* ed. J.Gutmann, BJS 22, p7–17, Chico, California; Scholars Press.

——— 1983. "Josephus's Pharisees. A Complete Repertoire." In *Formative Judaism: Religious, Historical and Literary Studies. Third Series, Torah, Pharisees and Rabbis.* BJS 46, p61–82. Chico, California: Scholar Press.
——— 1984. "Review of *Paul, The Law and the Jewish People*, by E.P. Sanders." In *Ancient Judaism Debates and Disputes,* by J. Neusner, p195–203, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Newbold, R.F. 1979. "Boundaries and Bodies in Late Antiquity." *Arethusa* 12, p93–114.
Newton, M. 1985. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul.* SNTSMS 53. Cambridge: CUP.
Nicholson, E.W. 1967. *Deuteronomy and Tradition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 1980. "Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo–Philo's *Liber Antiqitatum Biblicarum.*" In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms,* eds. J.J. Collins, G.W.E. Nickelsburg, p49–65. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 1981. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and The Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction.* London: SCM.
Niese, B. 1899. *Geschichte Der Griechischen und Makedonischen Staaten Seit Der Schlacht Bei Chaeronea.* Erster Teil, Zweiter Teil. Reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
——— 1914. "Josephus." In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. J.Hastings, Vol 7, p569–579, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Nikiprowetzky, V. 1970. *La Troisième Sibylle.* École Pratique Des Hautes Etudes, Etudes Juives IX, Paris: Mouton.
Nilsson, M.P. 1920. "Rosalia." *RE* I, col 1111–1115.
——— 1950. *Geschichte der Griechische Religion. Zweiter Band. Die Hellenistische und Römische Zeit.* Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.2, München: C.H.Beck'sche.
——— 1951a. "Der Ursprung der Trägodie." In *Opuscula Selecta* I, p61–145, Lund: CWK Gleerup.
——— 1951b. "Das Rosenfest." In *Opuscula Selecta* I, p311–329, Lund: CWK Gleerup.
——— 1957. *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age.* Lund: CWK Gleerup.
——— 1960a. "A propos du tombeau de Vincentius." In *Opuscula Selecta* III, p176–181, Lund: GWK Gleerup.
——— 1960b. "Zwei Altäre aus Pergamon." In *Opuscula Selecta* III, p297–303, Lund: GWK Gleerup.
——— 1963. "The High God and the Mediator." *HTR* 56, p101–120.
Noack, B. 1963. "Are the Essenes referred to in the Sibylline Oracles?" *ST* 17, p90–102.
Noack, F. 1894. "Dorylaion. II Grabreliefs." *AM* 19, p315–334.
Noakes, K.W. 1975. "Melito of Sardis and the Jews." In *Studia Patristica Vol 13. Papers presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1971.* ed. E.A. Livingstone. Part 2. Texte und Untersuchungen 116, p244–9. Berlin: Akademie.
Nock, A.D., 1941. "Review of *Maledictions et Violations de Tombes,* by Andre Parrot." *JBL* 60, p88–95.
——— 1943. "The Loeb Philo." *CR* 57, p77–81.
——— 1972. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World.* ed. by Z.Stewart, 2 Vols, Oxford: OUP.
Nock, A.D., Roberts, C., Skeat, T.C. 1936. "The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos." *HTR* 29, p39–38.
Nolland, J. 1979a. "Do Romans Observe Jewish Customs (Tertullian, *Ad. Nat.* 1.13; *Apol.* 16)?" *VC* 33, p1–11.
——— 1979b. "Proselytism or Politics in Horace *Satires* I,4,138–148." *VC*

33, p347–355.
——— 1981. "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" *JSJ* 12, p173–194.
Norris, F.W. 1982. "Asia Minor before Ignatius: Walter Bauer Reconsidered." In *Studia Evangelica* 7, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 126, ed. E.A. Livingstone, p365–377. Berlin: Akademie.
North, R. 1956. "Biblical and Archaeological News. Turkey – Present Accessibility of Pauline Site." *CBQ* 18, p30–35.
Oden, R.A. 1977. *Studies in Lucian's De Syria Dea.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 15, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
Oehler, J. 1909. "Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Judentums." *MGWJ* 53, p292–302, 443–452, 525–538.
Oesterley, W.O.E. 1935. "The Cult of Sabazios: A Study in Religious Syncretism." In *The Labyrinth. Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World.* ed. S.H.Hooke, p113–158. London: SPCK.
Ogilvie, R.M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Olitzki, D. 1889. "Einiges über das Beten am Wasser." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* 16, p268–270.
Oppenheimer, A. 1982. "The Bar Kokhba Revolt." *Immanuel* 14, p58–76.
Otwell, J.H. 1977. *And Sarah Laughed. The Status of Women in the OT.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
Ovadiah, A. 1969. "Excavations in the Area of the Ancient Synagogue at Gaza (Preliminary Report)." *IEJ* 19, p193–198.
——— 1978. "Ancient Synagogues in Asia–Minor." In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Classical Archaeology 1973,* Vol 2, p857–866. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
Papadopulos Kerameus A. 1878. "Inschriften aus Thira in Lydien." *AM* 3, p55–59.
Paris, P. 1883. "Inscriptions de Sebaste." *BCH* 7, p448–57.
——— 1884. "Inscriptions D'Eumenia." *BCH* 8, p233–254.
Paris, P., Holleaux, M. 1885. "Inscriptions de Carie." *BCH* 9, p68–84, 324–348.
Parkes, J. 1934. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism.* Reprint, New York: Atheneum, 1974.
Parrot, A. 1939. *Maledictions et Violations de Tombes.* Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
Parvey, C.F. 1974. "The Theology and Leadership of Women in the NT." In *Religion and Sexism. Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Tradition.* ed. R.R.Ruether, p117–149. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Paton, W.R., Hicks, E.L. 1891. *The Inscriptions of Cos.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Patrick, A.E. 1975. "Women and Religion: A Survey of Significant Literature, 1965–1974." *TS* 36, p737–765.
Pedley, J.G. 1972. *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis. Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Monograph 2.* Cambridge Massachussettes: Harvard University Press.
Peek, G. 1980. *Griechische Versinschriften aus Kleinasien.* Wien: Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften Philosophisch–Historische Klasse, Denkschriften 143.
Pembroke, S. 1965. "Last of the Matriarchs: A Study in the Inscriptions of Lycia." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 8, p217–247.
Penna, R. 1982. "Les Juifs a Rome au Temps de l'Apotre Paul." *NTS* 28, p321–347.
Peppers, J. 1980. "Four Roman Votive Bronzes in the Getty Museum." *Journal of the Paul Getty Museum* 8, p173–180.

Peradotto, T., Sullivan, J.P. Eds. 1984. *Women in the Ancient World. The Arethusa Papers.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Perdrizet, P. 1900. "Inscriptions De Philippes. Les Rosalies." *BCH* 24, p299–323.
Perkins, A. 1973. *The Art of Dura–Europos.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Perles, J. 1875. "On Interment of the Dead in Post–Biblical Judaism. A Study in Archaeology." In *Hebrew Characteristic: Miscellaneous Papers from the German,* p69–96, New York: American Jewish Publication Society.
Petersen, E., Luschan, F. von. 1889. *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratien.* Band 2. Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn.
Pétridès, S. 1905. "Amulette Judéo–Grecque." *Échos D'Orient* 8, p88–90.
Petrie, A. 1906. "Epitaphs in Phrygian Greek." In *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire,* ed. W.M.Ramsay, p119–134, Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
Petzl, G. 1978a. "Vier Inschriften Aus Lydien." In *Studien Zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner,* eds. S. Şahin, E.Schwerthen, J.Wagner, EPRO 76, p145–161, Leiden: Brill.
——— 1978b. "Inschriften aus Der Umgebung von Saittai." *ZPE* 30, p249–276.
——— 1982. *Die Inschriften von Smyrna. Teil 1: Grabschriften, postume Ehrungen, Grabepigramme.* Inschriften Griechischer Städte Aus Kleinasien Band 23. Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, Rheinisch–Westfälische Akademie Der Wissenschaften. Bonn: Dr Rudolf Habelt.
Pfuhl, E., Möbius, H. 1979. *Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs II.* Mainz: von Zabern.
Pharr, C. 1069. *The Theodosian Code And Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions. A Translation with Commentary, Glossary and Bibliography.* New York: Greenwood Press.
Philonenko, M. 1968. *Joseph et Aséneth. Introduction Texte Critique Traduction et Notes.* SPB 13, Leiden: Brill.
Picard, C. 1961. "Sabazios, Dieu Thraco–Phrygien: Expansion Et Aspects Nouveaux De Son Culte." *RA* 2, p129–176.
Picard, C., Avezou, C. 1914. "Le Testament De La Prêtresse Thessalonicienne Rites et Cultes de la Macédonie." *BCH* 38, p38–62.
Pilcher, E.J. 1903. "The Jews of the Dispersion in Roman Galatia." *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.* 25, p225–33, 250–8.
Pines, S. 1968. "The Iranian Name for Christians and the 'God–Fearers.'" *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2, p143–152.
Pippidi, D.M. 1974. "Note de lectura." *SC* 16, p249–265.
Plassart, A. 1914. "La Synagogue Juive De Délos." *RB* 11, p523–534.
——— 1973."Un Siècle De Fouilles A Délos." In *Études Déliennes.* BCH Supp. 1, p5–16, Paris: De Boccard.
Pleket H.W., 1981a. *Epigraphica Vol II. Texts on the Social History of the Greek World.* Textus Minores 41, Leiden: Brill.
——— 1981b. "Religious History as the History of Mentality: the 'believer' as servant of the deity in the Greek World." In *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World,* ed. H.S.Versnel, p152–192, Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2, Leiden: Brill.
Poliakoff, M. 1984. "Jacob, Job, and Other Wrestlers: Reception of Greek Athletics by Jews and Christians in Antiquity." *Journal of Sport History* 11, p48–65.
Pomeroy, S.B. 1973. "Selected Bibliography on Women in Antiquity." *Arethusa* 6, p125–157.
——— 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves. Women in Classical*

Antiquity. London: Robert Hale.
——— 1977. "Technikai Kai Mousikai. The Education of Women in the Fourth Century and in the Hellenistic World." *American Journal of Ancient History* 2, p51–68.
——— 1982. "Charities for Greek Women." *Mnemosyne* 35, p115–135.
——— 1984a. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt From Alexander to Cleopatra.* New York: Schocken Books.
——— 1984b. "Selected Bibliography on Women in Classical Antiquity." In *Women in the Ancient World. The Arethusa Papers,* eds. J.Peradotto, J.P.Sullivan, p315–372, Albany: State University of New York Press.
Pope, M.H. 1902. "Proselytes." *IDB* III, p921–931.
Porton, G.G. 1986. "Diversity in Post biblical Judaism." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters.* eds. R.A. Kraft, G.W.E. Nickelsburg, p57–80. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
Pottier, E., Hauvette–Besnault, A.M. 1880. "Inscriptions D'Érythrées et De Téos." *BCH* 4, p153–182.
Pouilloux, J. 1976. *Fouilles De Delphes. Tom III. Épigraphie Fascicule IV. Les Inscriptions De La Terrasse Du Temple Et De La Région Nord Du Sanctuaire.* Paris: De Boccard.
Préaux, C. 1959. "Le Statut De La Femme á l'Epoque Hellenistique Principalement En Egypt." In *La Femme. Recueils De La Societe Jean Bodin,* Premiere Partie, p127–175, Bruselles: Editions de la Librairie Encyclopedique.
Preisendanz, K. 1928. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri,* Vol 1, Second Edition, Reprint, Teubner: Stuttgart, 1973.
Prusak, B.P. 1974. "Women: Seductive Siren and Source of Sin?" In *Religion and Sexism. Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions,* ed. R.R.Ruether, p89–116, R.R. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Purcell, N. 1986. "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome" *PCPhS* 212, (New Series no 32), p78–105.
Rabello, A.M. 1980. "The Legal Condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire." In *ANRW* II, 13, p662–762.
——— 1984. "L'observance des fetes juives dans l'Empire romain." *ANRW* II, 21.2, p1288–1312.
Rad, von G. 1966. *Deuteronomy.* London: SCM.
Radet, G. 1887. "Inscriptions de Lydie." *BCH* 11, p445–484.
——— 1923. "Eumenia," In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay,* eds. W.H.Buckler, W.M.Calder, p315–322, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Raepsaet–Charlier, M–T. 1981. "Clarissima femina." *RIDA* 28, p189–212.
Rahmani, L.Y. 1972. "A Bilingual Ossuary Inscription from Khirbet Zif." *IEJ* 22, p113–116.
Raisin, J.S. 1953. *Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals With Special Reference to Proselytes.* New York, Philosophical Library.
Rajak, T. 1979. "Review of Smallwood, E.M., *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*; Applebaum, S., *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Revolt (AD 132–135)*; Aziza, C., *Tertullien Et Le Judaisme.*" *JRS* 69, p192–194.
——— 1981. "Roman Intervention in a Seleucid Siege of Jerusalem?" *GRBS* 22, p65–81.
——— 1982. "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews." *JJS* 33, p465–477.
——— 1983. *Josephus, The Historian and his Society.* London: Duckworth.
——— 1984. "Was there a Roman Charter for the Jews?" *JRS* 74, p107–123.
——— 1985a. "Jews and Christians as Groups in a Pagan World." In *"To see Ourselves As Others See Us." Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late*

Antiquity. eds. J.Neusner, E.S.Frierichs, p247–262, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1985b. "Jewish Rights in the Greek Cities Under Roman Rule: A New Approach." In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism Vol 5, Studies in Judaism and Its Greco-Roamn Context.* ed. W.S. Green, p19–35. BJS 32. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
Ramage, A. 1971. "The Fourteenth Campaign At Sardis (1971)." *BASOR* 206, p9–39.
Ramsay, W.M. 1882a. "Inscriptions of Cilicia, Cappadocia and Pontus." *JP* 11, p142–160.
——— 1882b. "The Tale of Saint Abercius." *JHS* 3, p339–53.
——— 1883a. "Unedited Inscriptions of Asia Minor." *BCH* 7, p259–278.
——— 1883b. "The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia." *JHS* 4, p370–436.
——— 1883c. "Inscriptions De La Galatie Et Du Pont." *BCH* 7, p15–28.
——— 1884. "Sepulchral Customs in Ancient Phrygia." *JHS* 5, p241–262.
——— 1888. "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia. A Study in the Early History of the Church." *The Expositor*, Third Series, Vol 8, p241–267, 401–427; Vol 9, p141–160, 253–272, 392–400.
——— 1889 "Inscriptions D'Asie Mineure." *REG* 2, p17–37.
——— 1890. *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor.* Reprint Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1962.
——— 1895a, 1897. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.* Vol I, Pt 1 and 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1895b. "The Rulers of the Synagogue." *The Expositor*, Fifth Series, 1, p272–7.
——— 1900. *A Historical Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* Second Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1901a. "The Cities of the Pauline Churches." *The Expositor,* Sixth Series, 4, p401–414.
——— 1901b. "Deux Jours En Phrygie." *REA* 3, p269–279.
——— 1902a "The Jews in the Graeco–Asiatic Cities." *The Expositor*, Sixth Series, 5, p19–33, 92–109.
——— 1902b. "Nouvelles Remarques sur les Textes D'Acmonia." *REA* 4, p267–270.
——— 1904a *The Church in the Roman Empire Before AD 170.* Eighth Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1904b. *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia and their place in the plan of the Apocalypse.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1904c. "The Letters To The Seven Churches. The Letter to the Church in Smyrna." *The Expositor*, Sixth Series, 9, p321–331.
——— 1904–5. "The Tarsian Citizenship of St Paul." *ET* 16, p18–21.
——— 1906a. *Pauline and Other Studies in Early Christian History.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1906b. "The Christian Inscription of Lycaonia." *The Expositor*, Seventh Series, 1, p32–51.
——— 1907. *The Cities of St. Paul. Their Influence on His Life and Thought.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1914a. "The Old Testament in the Roman Phrygia." *ET* 26, p168–174.
——— 1914b. *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
——— 1931. "Phrygian Orthodox and Heretics 400–800 AD." *Byzantion* 6, p1–35.
——— 1932. "The date of St Polycarp's Martyrdom." *JÖAI* 27, col 245–258.
Rappaport, U. 1971. "Archisynagogos." *EJ* 3, col 335–6.
Reich, R. 1981. "Archaeological Evidence of the Jewish Population at Hasmonean Gezer." *IEJ* 31, p48–52.

Reinach, A. 1913. "Noé Sangariou. Étude sur le deluge phrygien et le syncretisme judéo-phrygien." *REJ* 65, p161–180; 66, p1–43, 213–244.
——— 1915. "L'origine du Marsyas du Forum." *Klio* 14, p321–337.
Reinach, S. 1883. "Inscription Grecque de Smyrne. La Juive Rufina." *REJ* 7, p161–6.
——— 1885a. "Les Juifs D'Hypaepa." *REJ* 10, p74–8.
——— 1885b. "Saint Polycarpe et les Juifs de Smyrne." *REJ* 11, p235–8.
——— 1886. "Une Nouvelle Synagogue Grecque a Phocée." *REJ* 12, p236–243.
——— 1888. "Chronique D'Orient." *RA*, Third Series, 12, p214–226.
Reinach, T. 1888. "Mithridate et Les Juifs." *REJ* 16, p204–210.
——— 1893. "Inscription Juives Des Environs De Constantinople." *REJ* 26, p167–171.
——— 1895. *Textes d'auteurs Grecs et Romains Relatifs au Judaisme. Réunis, Traduits et Annotes.* Paris: Librairie Durlacher.
——— 1899. "Antiochus Cyzicène et les Juifs." *REJ* 38, p161–171.
——— 1901. "La Pierre de Myndos." *REJ* 42, p1–6.
——— 1904. "Une Inscription Juive de Chypre." *REJ* 48, p191–196.
——— 1906. "Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias." *REG* 19, p205–298.
——— 1910. "Note Additionnelle A L'Article 'Une Synagogue Juive A Sidé De Pamphylie.'" *REJ* 59, p131–2.
Reynolds, J.M. 1976. "Roman Inscriptions 1971–5." *JRS* 66, p174–99.
——— 1981. "Inscriptions." In *Excavations At Sidi Khrebish Benghazi (Berenice), Vol 1. Buildings, Coins, Inscriptions, Architectural Decoration.* ed. J.A. Lloyd, p233–254. Supplements to Libya Antiqua V. Peoples Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: The Department of Antiquties Ministry of Teaching and Education.
——— 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome. Documents from the Excavation of the Theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, Together with some related texts.* JRS Monograph 1. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
Reynolds, J.M., Tannenbaum, R. 1987. *Jews and God-Fearers At Aphrodisias. Greek Inscriptions With Commentary.* PCPhS Supplementary Volume 12. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
Ricciotti, G. 1958. *The History of Israel.* 2 Vols, Translated by C.D. Penta, R.T.A. Murphy, Second Edition. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company.
Richardson, C.C. 1953. *Early Christian Fathers.* London: SCM.
Ritschl, F. 1873. "Eine Berichtigung der republicanischen Consularfasten." *Rheinisches Museum* 28, p586–614.
——— 1874. "Römische Senatusconsulte bei Josephus." *Rheinisches Museum* 29, p337–344.
Ritterling, E. 1927. "Military Forces in the Senatorial Provinces." *JRS* 17, p28–32.
Robert, L. 1937a. "Un Corpus Des Inscription Juives." *REJ* 101, p73–86.
——— 1937b. *Etudes Anatoliennes: recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure.* Reprint, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1970.
——— 1938. *Études Épigraphiques et Philogiques.* Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.
——— 1940. *Hellenica. Recueil d'epigraphie de Numismatique et d'Antiquites Grecques.* Vol 1. Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1946. *Hellenica. Recueil d'epigraphie de Numismatique et d'Antiquites Grecques.* Vol 3. Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1954. *La Carie. Histoire et Géographie Historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antique. Tome II. La Plateau de Tabai et ses Environs.* Paris: Librairie D'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1955. *Hellenica. Recueil d'epigraphie de Numismatique et d'Antiquites*

Grecques. Vol 10. Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1957. "Deux Inscriptions D'Iasos." *REG* 70, p361–375.
——— 1958a. "Reliefs Votifs et Cultes D'Anatolie." *Anatolia* 3, p103–136.
——— 1958b. "Inscriptions Grecque De Sidè Pamphylie (Epoque Impériale et Bas–Empire). *RP* Third Series, 32, p15–53.
——— 1960a. "Recherches épigraphiques." *REA* 62, p276–361.
——— 1960b. *Hellenica. Recueil d'epigraphie de Numismatique et d'Antiquites Grecques.* Vol 11–12. Paris: Libraire d'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1962. *Villes D'Asie Mineure. Études de Geographie Ancienne.* Second Edition. Paris: De Boccard.
——— 1963. *Noms Indigènes Dans L'Asie Mineure Gréco-Romaine* I. Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.
——— 1963a. "Nouvelles inscriptions d'Iasos." *REA* 65, p298–329.
——— 1964. *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Sardes. Ier Fascicule. Décret hellénistique de Sardes, Dedicaces aux dieux indigenes, Inscriptions de la synagogue.* Paris: Librairie D'Amerique et D'Orient.
——— 1968 "Trois Oracles De La Théosophie Et Un Prophète D'Apollon." *CRAI* 1968, p568–599.
——— 1969, 1974. *Opera Minora Selecta, Épigraphie et Antiquités Grecques.* 4 Vols, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
——— 1971. "Un Oracle Gravé A Oinoanda." *CRAI* 1971, p597–619.
——— 1975a. "Une Nouvelle Inscription Grecque De Sardes: Règlement de l'autorité perse relatif à un culte de Zeus." *CRAI* 1975, p306–330.
——— 1975b. "Nonnos et les monnaies d'Akmonea de Phrygie." *JS* 1975, p153–192.
——— 1978a. "Malédictions Funéraires Grecques." *CRAI* 1978, p241–289.
——— 1978b. "Documents D'Asie Mineure." *BCH* 102, p395–543.
——— 1980. *A Travers L'Asie Mineure. Poètes et Prosateurs, Monnaies Grecques, Voyageurs et Géographie.* BEFAR 239. Paris: De Boccard.
——— 1981. "Amulettes Grecques." *JS* 1981, p3–44.
Roddaz, J.M. 1984. *Marcus Agrippa.* BEFAR 253. Paris: École Française De Rome, Palais Farnése.
Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche. The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co.
Romaniuk, K. 1964. "Die 'Gottesfurchtigen' im Neuen Testament. Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie der Gottesfrucht." *Aegyptus* 44, p66–91.
Rose, H.J. 1928. "The River of Tears." *CR* 42, p171.
——— 1931, "Juvenal XIV. 103–104." *CR* 45, p127.
——— 1936. *A Handbook of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the Death of St Augustine.* London: Methuen and Co.
Rostovtzeff, M. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World.* 3 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1957. *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire.* Second Edition, revised by P.M. Fraser, 2 Vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Roth–Gerson, L. 1972. *The Civil and the Religious Status of the Jews in Asia Minor from Alexander the Great to Constantine BC 336–AD 337.* Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Hebrew University.
Rubensohn, O. 1913. "Neue Inschriften aus Ägypten." *AFP* 5, p156–169.
Rudhardt, J. 1970. "Les mythes grecs relatifs à l'instauration du sacrifice: les rôles corrélatifs de Prométhée et de son fils Deucalion." *MH* 27, p1–15.
Ruether, R.R. 1982. "Feminism and Patriarchal Religion: Principles of Ideological Critique of the Bible." *JSOT* 22, p54–66.
Rzach, A. 1912. "Sibyllinische Weltalter." *Wiener Studien* 34, p114–122.
——— 1923. "Sibyllinische Orakel (Buch I. [II].) *RE* 2A, col 2146–2152.
Safrai, S. 1963. "The Avoidance of Public Office in Papyrus Oxy. 1477 and

in Talmudic Sources." *JJS* 14, p67–70.
——— 1975. "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the Time of the Second Temple." *Immanuel* 5, p51–62.
Safrai, S., Stern, M. eds. 1974, 1976. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section One: The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions.* 2 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum and Comp. B.V.
Saltman, E.S. 1971. *The Jews of Asia Minor in the Greco-Roman Period: A Religious and Social Study.* M.A. Thesis, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
Sanders, E.P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* London: SCM.
——— 1980. "Puzzling Out Rabbinic Judaism." In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism Vol 2,* ed. W.S. Green, p65–79, BJS 9, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1985. *Jesus and Judaism.* London : SCM.
Sanders, J.A. 1981. "Text and Canon: Old Testament and New." In *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études Bibliques Offertes a L'Occasion De Son 60e Anniversaire,* eds. P. Casetti, O. Keel, A. Schenker, p373–394. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 38. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires.
Sanie, S. 1978. "Devs Aeternus et Theos Hypsistos En Dacie Romaine." In *Hommages À Maarten J. Vermaseren,* eds. M.B. de Boer, T.A. Edridge, Vol 3, p1092–1115. EPRO 68, Leiden: Brill.
Savlnier, C. 1981. "Lois romaines sur les Juifs selon Flavius Josèphe." *RB* 87, p161–198.
Schalit, A. 1959–60. "The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis Regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia." *JQR* 50, p289–318.
——— 1969. *König Herodes Der Mann und Sein Werk.* Studia Judaica Forschungen zur Wissenschaft Des Judentums Band IV. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
——— 1971. "Archon" *EJ* 3, col 397–8.
Scharbert, J. "Formgeschichte und Exegesis von Ex 34.6f und Seiner Parallelen." *Biblica* 38, p130–150.
Schechter, S. 1909. *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.* London : A & C Black.
——— 1945. "Women in Temple and Synagogue." In *Studies in Judaism.* First Series, p313–325. Reprint of 1896 edition, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Schede, M. 1964. *Die Ruinen von Priene.* Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteiling Instanbul, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Schelkle, K.H. 1970. *Die Petrusbriefe, Der Judasbrief.* Herders Theologischer Kommentar Zum Neven Testament 13,2. Third Edition, Freiberg: Herder.
Schepelern, W. 1929. *Der Montanismus und Die Phrygischen Kulte. Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
Scherling. 1935. "Nannakios." *RE* 16, col 1680–1.
Schiffman. L.H. 1983. "Legislation concerning relations with Non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature." *RQ* 11, p379–89.
Schmidtke, F. 1950. "Arche." *RAC* I, col 597–602.
Schmitt, J.J. 1983. "The Gender of Ancient Israel." *JSOT* 26, p115–125.
Schneider, A.M. 1943. *Die Römischen und Byzantischen Denkmäler von Iznik-Nicaea.* Berlin: Istanbuler Forschungen Band 16.
Schoeffer, von. 1901. "Demiurgoi." *RE* 4, col 2856–2862.

Schubart, W. 1920. "Bemerkungen zum Stile hellenistischer Königsbriefe." *APF* 6, p324–347.
Schultze, V. 1922. *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaffen II. Kleinasien Pt 1.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
Schürer, E. 1892. "Die Prophetin Isabel in Thyatira Offenb. Joh. 2.20" In *Theologische Abhandlungen. Carl von Weizäcker zu seinen siebzigsten Geburtstage*, p37–58, Freiburg: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
——— 1897. "Die Juden in bosphoranischen Reiche und die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον ebendaselbst." *Sitzungsberichte der Academie Der Wissenschaften Berlin* 1897, p200–225.
——— 1901, 1907, 1909. *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,* 3 Vols, 3rd and 4th Editions, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich's.
——— 1904. "Diaspora." *Dictionary of the Bible* 5, ed. J.Hastings, p91–109, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Schürer, E., Vermes, G., Millar, F. 1973, 1979, 1986, 1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ.* Vol 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
Schwank, B. 1969. "Theaterplätze für 'Gottesfurchtige' in Milet." *BZ* 13, p262–3.
Schwartz, J. 1984. "Note sur un article de la ZPE 51 (A hebrew lamentation from Roman Egypt)." *ZPE* 55, p141–2.
Schwertheim, E., Şahin, S. 1977. Neue Inschriften aus Nikomedeia und Umgebung "*ZPE* 24, p259–264.
Seager, A.R. 1972. "The Building History of the Sardis Synagogue." *AJA* 76, p425–435.
——— 1974. *Archaeology at the Ancient Synagogue of Sardis, Turkey: Judaism in a Major Roman City.* Ball State University Faculty Lecture Series 3, p41–64.
——— 1975. "The Architecture of the Dura and Sardis Synagogues." In *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture,* ed. J.Gutmann, p149–193, New York: Ktav.
——— 1981a. "The Synagogue at Sardis." In *Ancient Synagogues Revealed,* ed. L.I.Levine, p178–184, Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Israel Exploration Society.
——— 1981b. "Ancient Synagogue Architecture: An Overview," In *Ancient Synagogues. The State of Research,* ed. J.Gutmann, p39–47, BJS 22, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
——— 1983. "The Synagogue and the Jewish Community: The building." In *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times. Results of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958–1975,* ed. G.M.A.Hanfmann, p169–178, Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press.
Segal, J.B. 1979. "The Jewish Attitude towards Women." *JJS* 30, p121–137.
Segré, A. 1946. "Antisemitism in Hellenistic Alexandria." *Jewish Social Studies* 8, p127–136.
Seltman, C. 1956. *Women in Antiquity.* London: Thames and Hudson.
Selvidge, M. J. 1984. "Mark 5:25–34 and Leviticus 15:19–20: A Reaction to Restrictive Purity Regulations." *JBL* 103, p619–23
Seston, W. 1967. "Des 'Portes' de Thugga à la 'Constitution' de Carthage." *Revue Historique* 237, p277–294.
Seure, G. 1912. "Antiquités Thrace De la Propontide." *BCH* 36, p600–611.
Sève, M. 1979. "Un Décret De Consolation À Cyzique." *BCH* 103, p327–359.
——— 1981. "Inscriptions De Thasos." *BCH* 105, p183–198.
Sevenster, J.N. 1968. *Do you know Greek? How much Greek could the first Jewish Christians have known?* Supplements to NT 19, Leiden: Brill.
——— 1975. *The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World.* Supplements to NT 41, Leiden: Brill.
Seyrig, H. 1928. "Note sur Un Texte Relatif Aux Rosalies." *RHR* 97, p275–7.

——— 1933. "Antiquités Syriennes." *Syria* 14, p238–282.
Shanks, H. 1979. *Judaism in Stone. The Archaeology of Ancient Synagogues.* Co-published Washington: The Biblical Archaeology Society, New York: Harper and Row.
Sharvit, B. 1979. "The Sabbath of the Judean Desert Sect." *Immanuel* 9, p42–48.
Sheppard, A.R.R. 1975. *Characteristics of Political Life In The Greek Cities ca. 70–120 AD, With Reference to Later Developments.* Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Bachelor of Letters in the University of Oxford.
——— 1979. "Jews, Christians and Heretics in Acmonia and Eumeneia." *AS* 29, p169–180.
——— 1980–1981. "Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia Minor." *Talanta* 12–13, p77–101.
Sherk, R.K. 1969. *Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus.* Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press.
Sherwin-White, A.N. 1963. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1967. *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome.* Cambridge: CUP.
——— 1973. *The Roman Citizenship.* Second Edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sherwin-White, S.M. 1976. "A Note on Three Coan Inscriptions." *ZPE* 21, p183–188.
——— 1978. *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period.* Hypomnemata Heft 51, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
Shiloh, Y. 1968. "Torah Scrolls and the Menorah Plaque from Sardis." *IEJ* 18, p54–7.
Shutt, R.J.H. 1961. *Studies in Josephus.* London: SPCK.
Siegert, F. 1973. "Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten." *JSJ* 4, p109–164.
Silberschlag, E., 1933. "The Earliest Record of Jews in Asia Minor." *JBL* 52, p66–77.
Simon, M. 1936. "Θαρσει οὐδεις ἀθανατος. Études de vocabulaire religieux." *RHR* 113, p188–206.
——— 1948. *Versus Israel. Études sur les Relations Entre Chretiens et Juifs Dans l'Empire Romain (135–425).* Paris: De Boccard.
——— 1981a. *Le Christianisme antique et son contexte religieus. Scripta Varia.* 2 Vols, WUNT 23. Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
——— 1981b. "Gottesfürchtiger." *RAC* 11, col 1060–1070.
——— 1986. *Versus Israel. A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135–425).* The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, Oxford: OUP.
Simon, Marie. 1975. "Zur Problem Des Jüdisch-Griechischen Synkretismus." *Kairos* 17, p89–99.
Skehan, P.W. 1963. "The Hand of Judith." *CBQ* 25, p94–110.
Skweres, D.E. 1970. "Das Motiv der Strafgrunderfragung in biblischen und neuassyrischen Texten." *BZ* 14, 181–197.
Smallwood, E.M. 1956. "Domitian's Attitude Toward the Jews and Judaism." *CP* 51, p1–13.
——— 1959a. "The Alleged Jewish Tendencies of Poppaea Sabina." *JTS* 10, p329–335.
——— 1959b. "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision." *Latomus* 18, p334–347.
——— 1961. "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision: Addendum." *Latomus* 20, p93–96.
——— 1970. *Philonis Alexandrin Legatio Ad Gaium. Edited with an Intro-*

duction, Translation and Commentary. Second Edition, Leiden: Brill.
——— 1981. *The Jews Under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian.* SJLA 20, Leiden: Brill.
Smith, J.Z. 1980. "Fences and Neighbours: Some Contours of Early Judaism." In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* Vol II, ed. W.S.Green, p1–25, BJS 9, Chico California: Scholars Press.
Smith, M. 1956. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century." In *Israel, Its role in Civilisation,* ed. M.Davis, p67–81. New York: Institute of the Jewish Theological Society.
——— 1967. "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect." *JBL* 86, p53–68.
——— 1986. "The Jewish Element in the Magical Papyri." In *SBL 1986 Seminar Papers,* ed. K.H.Richards, p455–462, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
Soards, M.L. 1985. "The Righteousness of God in the Writings of the Apostle Paul." *BTB* 15, p104–109.
Sokolowski, F. 1955. *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure.* Paris: De Boccard.
——— 1960. "Sur le Culte D'Angelos Dans le Paganisme Grec et Romain." *HTR* 53, p225–9.
Solin, H. 1983. "Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der Römischen Welt. Eine ethnisch–demographische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der sprachlichen Zustände." *ANRW* II, 29.2, p587–789, 1222–1249.
Stagg, E., Stagg, F. 1978. *Women in the World of Jesus.* Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press.
Stendal, K. 1966. *The Bible and the Role of Women. A Case Study in Hermeneutics.* Philadelphia: Fortress.
Stern, M. 1973. "Die Urkunden." In *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums. Eine Einführung.* eds. J.Maier, J.Schreiner, p181–199, Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
——— 1974, 1980, 1984. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism.* 3 Vols, Jerusalen: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
Sterrett, J.R.S. 1883. "Inscriptions of Tralles." *AM* 8, p316–338.
——— 1888. *An Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor. Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens,* vol 2, Boston: Damrell and Upham.
Stichel, R. 1979. *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau. Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst.* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologische–Historische klasse Dritte Folge, Nr 112, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
Stillwell, R., MacDonald, W.L., McAllister, M.H. 1976. *The Princeton Encyclopaedia of Classical Sites.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Stoebe, H.J. 1952. "Die Bedeutung Des Wortes HĀSĀD Im Alten Testament." *VT* 2, p244–254.
Stone, M.E. 1972. *The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions.* Texts and Translations 2, Pseudepigrapha Series 2. University of Montana, Montana: SBL.
Strack, H.L., Billerbeck, P. 1922, 1924, 1928. *Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* 4 Vols, München: C.H. Bech'sche.
Stauß, H. 1966. "Jüdische Quellen frühchristlicher Kunst: Optische oder literarische Anregung?" *ZNW* 57, p114–136.
Strubbe, J.H.M. 1981, "Inscriptions Inédites De La Region Du Mont Dindymos en Galatie." *Mnemosyne* 34, p107–126.
Sukenik, E.L. 1932. *The Ancient Synagogue of Beth Alpha. An Account of*

the Excavations Conducted on Behalf of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. London: OUP.
——— 1934. *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece.* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1930. London: OUP.
——— 1949. "The Present State of Ancient Synagogue Studies." *Bulletin of the Louis M. Rabinowitz Fund for the Exploration of Ancient Synagogues* 1, p1–23.
——— 1951. "The Ancient Synagogue at Yafa Near Nazareth. Preliminary Report." *Bulletin of the Louis M. Rabinowitz Fund for the Exploration of Ancient Synagogues* 2, p6–24.
Sumner, W.G. 1909. "The Status of Women in Chaldea, Egypt, India, Judaea and Greece to the Time of Christ." *Forum* 42, p113–36.
Sundberg, A.C. 1964. *The Old Testament of the Early Church.* Harvard Theological Studies 20, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Suolahti, J. 1958. "The Council of L. Cornelius P.f. Crus In The Year 49 B.C." *Arctos* 2, p152–163.
Svoronos, J.N., Head, B.V. 1976. *The Illustrations of the Historia Numorum. An Atlas of Greek Numismatics* Chicago: Ares.
Swete, H.B. 1902. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.* Second Edition, Cambridge: CUP.
Swidler, L. 1976. *Women in Judaism. The Status of Women in Formative Judaism.* Metuchen N.J.: Scarecrow Press.
Swoboda, H., Keil, J., Knoll, F. 1935. *Denkmäler Aus Lykaonien Pamphylien und Isaurien.* Brünn, Prag, Leipzig, Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer.
Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
——— 1979. *Roman Papers.* 3 Vols, eds. E.Badian, A.R.Burley, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Talbert, R.J.A. 1984. *The Senate of Imperial Rome.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Tannenbaum, R.F. 1986. "Jews and God–Fearers in the Holy City of Aphrodite." *BAR* September/October 1986, Vol 12.5, p55–57.
Tatscheva–Hitova, M. 1977. "Dem Hypsistos Geweihte Denkmäler In Thrakien. Untersuchungen Zur Geschichte Der Antiken Religionen III." *Thracia* 4, p271–301.
——— 1978. "The cult of the ΘΕΟΣ ΥΨΙΣΤΟΣ in Bosporus." *VDI* 143, p142.
——— 1979. "Wesenzüge Des Sabazioskultes in Moesia Inferior und Thracia." In *Hommages á Maarten J. Vermaseren,* eds. M.B. de Boer, T.A. Edridge, Vol 3, p1217–1230, EPRO 68, Leiden: Brill.
——— 1983. *Eastern Cults in Moesia Inferior and Thracia, (5th Century BC – 4th Century AD).* EPRO 95. Leiden: Brill.
Tarn, W., Griffith, G.T. 1952. *Hellenistic Civilisation.* Third Edition, London: Edward Arnold.
Taylor, L.R. 1933. "Artemis of Ephesus, The Asiarches." In *The Beginnings of Christianity,* eds. F.J.Foakes Jackson, K.Lake, Part 1, Vol 5, p251–262, London: MacMillan and Co.
Tcherikover, V. 1961. *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews.* Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Thackeray, H. St. J. 1929. *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York: The Jewish Institute of Religion Press.
Thiselton, A.C. 1974. "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings." *JTS* 25, p283–299.
——— 1979. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." In *New Testament Interpretation. Essays on Principles and Methods,* ed. I.H.Marshall, p75–104, Exeter: Paternoster Press.
Thomas, W.D. 1971–2. "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi." *ET* 83, p117–120.
Thompson, J.A. 1974. *Deuteronomy.* London: IVP.

Thompson, L.A. 1982. "Domitian and the Jewish Tax." *Historia* 31, p329–342.
Thraede, K. 1959. "Beiträge Zur Datierung Commodians." *JbAC* 2, p90–114.
Tod, M.N. 1951. "Laudatory Epithets in Greek Epitaphs." *ABSA* 46, p182–90.
Torrey, C.C. 1917–18. "The Bilingual Inscription from Sardis." *American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature* 34, p185–198.
——— 1952–53. "The Aramaic Period of the Nascent Christian Church." *ZNW* 44, p205–223.
Toynbee, J.M.C. 1967. "A Fragment of an Early Christian Sarcophagus." *RDAC* 43, p315–8.
Trenchard, W.C. 1982. *Ben Sira's View of Women. A Literary Analysis.* BJS 38, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Tscherikower, V. 1927. *Die Hellenistischen Städtegrundungen Von Alexander Dem Grossen Bis Auf Die Römerzeit.* Philologus, Supplementband XIX, Heft I, Leipzig: Dieterich'sche.
Turner, E.G. 1936. "Egypt and the Roman Empire. The ΔΕΚΑΠΡΩΤΟΙ." *JEA* 32, p7–19.
Urdahl, L.B. 1968. "Jews in Attica." *Symbolae Osloenses* 43, p39–56.
Ussishkin, D. "Two Lead Coffins from Cilicia." *IEJ* 27, p215–218.
Van Bremen, R. 1983. "Women and Wealth." In *Images of Women in Antiquity,* eds. A. Cameron, A. Kuhrt, p223–242. London: Croom Helm.
Van Buren, A.W. 1908. "Inscriptions from Asia Minor, Cyprus and the Cyrenaiea." *JHS* 28, p180–201.
Van Der Horst, P.W. 1978. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides With Introduction and Commentary.* SVTP 4. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1986. "The Role of Women in the Testament of Job." *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 40, p273–289.
——— 1987. "'Lord, Help the Rabbi': The Interpretation of SEG XXXI 1578b." *JJS* 38, p102–106.
VanderKam, J.C. 1980. "The Righteousness of Noah." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms,* eds. J.J. Collins, G.W.E. Nickelsburg, p13–32. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Scholars Press.
Van Lennep, H.J. 1870. *Travels in Little Known Parts of Asia Minor.* Vol I, London: John Murray.
Vanoni, G. 1981. "Der Geist und der Buchstabe. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis der Testamente und Beobachtungen zu Dtn. 30, 1–10." *BN* 14, p65–98.
Varinlioğlu, E. 1981. "Two Inscriptions from Ceramus." *ZPE* 44, p51–66.
Vattioni, F. 1977. "A proposito di πρωτοπολίτης." *SP* 16, p23–29.
Vermaseren, M.J. 1983. *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii (CCIS), I. The Hands.* EPRO 100, Leiden: Brill.
Versnel, H.S. ed. 1981. *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World.* Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2, Leiden: Brill.
Vidman, l. 1969. *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae.* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 28. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Vincent, H. 1909. "An Inscription from Side." *JHS* 29, p130.
Visonà, P. 1983. "Three Latin Inscriptions in the Detroit Institute of Arts." *ZPE* 52, p79–86.
Von Gerkan, A. 1921. "Eine Synagogue in Milet" *ZNW* 20, p177–181.
Waelkens, M. 1978. "Phrygian Votive and Tombstones as sources of the Social and Economic Life in Roman Antiquity." *Ancient Society* 8, p277–315.
——— 1979. "Ateliers lapidairies en Phrygie." In *Actes Du VII^e Congrès*

International D'Épigraphie Grecque et Latine, ed. D.M.Pippidi, p105–128, Bucarest: Editura Academiei.
Wahl, C.A. 1972. *Clavis Librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum Philologica,* ed. J.A. Bauer. Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt.
Walbank, F.W. 1981. *The Hellenistic World.* London: Fontana.
Walcot, P. 1984. "Greek Attitudes Towards Women: The Mythological Evidence." *G & R* 31, p37–47.
Waldbaum. J.C. 1983. *Metalwork from Sardis: The Finds Through 1974.* Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Monograph 8, Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press.
Walker, N. 1960. "Concerning Exodus 34:6." *JBL* 79, p277.
Wallis, G. 1974. "Der Vollbürgereid in Deuteronomium 27, 15–26." *HUCA* 45, p47–63.
Wallis, R.T. 1972. *Neo-Platonism.* London: Duckworth.
Walsh, P.G. 1961. *Livy His Historical Aims and Method.* Cambridge: CUP.
——— 1974. *Livy.* Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 8, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Walton, C.S. 1929. "Oriental Senators in the Service of Rome." *JRS* 19, p38–66.
Wardy, B. 1979. "Jewish Religion in Pagan Literature during the Late Republic and Early Empire." *ANRW* II, 19.1, p592–644.
Weber, G. 1900. "Funde." *AM* 25, p452–470.
Weber, M. 1952. *Ancient Judaism.* New York: Free Press.
Wegner, J.R. 1982. "The Image of Woman in Philo." In *SBL 1982 Seminar Papers,* ed. K.H.Richards, p551–563, Chico, California: Scholars Press.
Weinfeld, M. 1972. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Weinrich, O. 1912. "ΘΕΟΙ ΕΠΗΚΟΟΙ." *AM* 37, p1–68.
Weiss, H. 1967. "The *Pagani* Among the Contemporaries of the First Christians." *JBL* 86, p42–52.
Welles, C.B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
——— 1962. "Hellenistic Tarsus." *Mélanges de L'Université Saint Joseph* 38, p43–75.
Wenger, L. 1953. *Die Quellen Des Römischen Rechts.* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Denkschriften der Gesamtakademie Band 2, Wien: Adolf Holzhausens.
Werblowsky, R.J.Z. 1975. "A note on purification and proselyte baptism." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith At Sixty,* ed. J.Neusner, Part 3, p200–205, Leiden: Brill.
Werner, E. 1966. "Melito of Sardis, The First Poet of Deicide." *HUCA* 37, p191–210.
Whittaker, M. 1984. *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views.* Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200BC to AD200, No.6, Cambridge: CUP.
Widengren, G. 1961. "Synkretistische Relgionen." In *Relionsgeschichte Des Orients In Der Zeit Der Weltrelgionen,* Handbuch der Orientalistck I.8.2. ed. B.Spuler, p43–82. Leiden: Brill.
——— 1984. "Yahweh's Gathering of the Dispersed." In *In the Shelter of Elyon. Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honour of G.W. Ahlstrom.* eds. W.B.Barrick, J.R.Spencer, p227–245, JSOT Supplement Series 31, Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Wiegand, T. 1911. "Inschriften aus der Levante II." *AM* 36, p287–301.
Wiegand, T., Schrader, H. 1904. *Priene. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen Und Untersuchungen In Den Jahren 1895–1898.* Königliche Museen Zu Berlin. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
Wilcken, U. 1927. *Urkunden Der Ptolemäerzeit* I. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter

De Gruyter.
Wilcox, M. 1981. "The 'God-Fearers' in Acts – A Reconsideration." *JSNT* 13, p102–122.
Wilhelm, A. 1905 "Zu Josephus." *JÖAI* 8, p238–242.
——— 1974. "Ein Brief Antiochus III." In *Kleine Schriften, Abteilung I: Akadenieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (1895-1951),* Teil 2. p39–56. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat Der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.
Wilken, R.L. 1976. "Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis and the Sacrifice of Isaac." *TS* 37, p53–69.
Will, E.L. 1980. "Women Roles in Antiquity: New Archaeological Views." *Science Digest,* March 1980, p35–39.
Williams, J.G. 1982. *Women Recounted: Narrative Thinking and the God of Israel.* Bible and Literature Series 6. Sheffield: Almond Press.
Willrich, H. 1924. *Urkündenfälschung in der Hellenistisch-Jüdischen Literatur.* Gottingen: Vandehoed und Ruprecht.
Wilms, F.E. 1972. "Das jahwistische Bundesbuch in Ex 34." *BZ* 16, p24–53.
Wilson, R. McL. 1958. *The Gnostic Problem. A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy.* London: Mowbray.
Windisch, H. 1930. *Die Katholischen Briefe.* HNT 15. Second Edition. Tubingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
Winter, J.G. ed. 1936. *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection, Vol III, Miscellaneous Papyri.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Wischnitzer, R. 1964. *The Architecture of the European Synagogue.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Wiseman, J., Mano-Zissi, D. 1971. "Excavations at Stobi, 1970." *AJA* 75, p395–411.
——— 1972. "Excavations at Stobi, 1971." *AJA* 76, p407–424.
——— 1973. "Excavations at Stobi, 1972." *AJA* 77, p391–403.
——— 1974. "Excavations at Stobi, 1973–1974." *JFA* 1, p117–148.
——— 1975. *Studies in the Antiquities of Stobi.* Vol.2. Beograd: Bostin University and National Museum of Titov Veles.
——— 1976. "Stobi: A City of Ancient Macedonia." *JFA* 3, p267–302.
Wiseman, J. 1973a. *Stobi: A guide to the excavations.* Beograd: University of Texas at Austin, and National Museum of Titov Veles.
——— 1973b. *Studies in the Antiquities of Stobi,* Vol 1, Beograd: University of Texas at Austin.
——— 1978. "Stobi in Yugoslavian Macedonia: Archaeological Excavations and Research 1977–78." *JFA* 5, p391–429.
Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer.* Reprint, München: CH Beck'sche 1971.
Witherington, B. 1981. *Women and their Roles in the Gospels and Acts.* Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham.
——— 1984. *Women in the Ministry of Jesus. A Study of Jesus' Attitudes to Women and their Roles as Reflected in His Earthly Life.* SNTSMS 51. Cambridge: CUP.
Wolters, P. 1906. "Αρχιατρὸς τὸ δ!" *JÖAI* 9, p295–297.
Wood, B.G. 1984. "To Dip or Sprinkle? The Qumran Cisterns in Perspective." *BASOR* 256, p45–60.
Yadin, Y. 1966 *Masada. Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
Yahalom, J. 1980. "Synagogue Inscriptions in Palestine– A Stylistic Classification." *Immanuel* 10, p47–56.
Yamavchi, E.M. 1980. *The Archaeology of New Testament Cities in Western Asia Minor.* London: Pickering and Inglis.
——— 1983. "Magic in the Biblical World." *Tyndale Bulletin* 34, p169–200.

Zeitlin, S. 1951–52. "The Last Supper As An Ordinary Meal in the Fourth Gospel." *JQR* 42, p251–260.
——— 1964–65. "The Edict of Augustus Caesar in Relation to the Judaeans of Asia." *JQR* 55, p160–3.
——— 1974. "Proselytes and Proselytism during the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannactic Period." In *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism,* Vol 2, p407–417. New York: Ktav.
Zgusta, L. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen.* Prag: Der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften.
Ziebarth, E. 1896. *Das Griechische Vereinswesen.* Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
Ziesler, J.A. 1972. *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul. A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry.* SNTSMS 20. Cambridge: CUP.
Zingerle, J. 1923. "Phrygisches Griechisch." *Akademic der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Anzeiger* 1923, p47–68.

UNIV DUNEDIN