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Bernadette Brooten’s study, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* (1982), was a landmark in the study of gender in antiquity, bringing attention for the first time to the role that women played in ancient synagogues by focusing primarily on epigraphical evidence. Her book allowed us to see old evidence in a fresh way, revealing a long history of scholarly biases.

This edition incorporates a new preface. The original text is unchanged.

Michael L. Satlow
Managing Editor
January, 2020
In *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*, I argued against a then-prevailing view. On the basis of nineteen inscriptions, I challenged certain ideas about women whose relatives honored them with such titles as head of the synagogue, leader, elder, mother of the synagogue, and woman of priestly class/priestess or who claimed those titles for themselves, such as in donative inscriptions. According to the consensus at that time, these titles did not imply that Coelia Paterna, Gaudentia, Rufina and the other women referenced in the inscriptions carried out any functions at all. Scholars claimed that they bore these titles because their husbands did; that these and comparable titles designated functions when men bore them, but were honorific when women bore them; or, in the case of mothers and fathers of the synagogue, that the titles were honorific for both women and men. In addition, I presented inscriptions honoring women who donated portions of synagogues, or in the case of one non-Jewish woman, an entire synagogue. I identified 43 donative inscriptions involving women, of which 23 commemorate women who donated, 15 commemorate a husband and wife donating together, and five commemorate a donation on behalf of a woman. Finally, I argued that, while there is medieval evidence for a strict separation between women and men in the synagogue during religious events, there is no such evidence for any required, permanent separation in the Roman period. Lest one imagine that Jewish women did not attend synagogue services at all, ancient sources present women in various communities doing just that.

In the intervening 38 years, five or six new inscriptions have come to light in which women bear titles, bringing the total number of inscriptions wherein women bear titles to 24 or 25. I present these new inscriptions here in roughly chronological order.

---

1. Sambathion, archōn, Byblos


ירח המק
אלהי
סמבטי
כתונית שנ
תיו מרט ל

May the pity of YH[WH], my God, be
[on] Sambathi[on], [ar]chontesse. Yea[r]
416, Mars 30.

In contrast to Noy and Bloedhorn in IJO, who take Sambathion as the name of a male archon, Σομβαθίων, Stökl Ben Ezra reads it as the feminine Σαμβάθιον. The waw can render both omega and omicron into Hebrew, but the feminine agrees with the feminine ending of [ar]chōnit, which I would simply translate as “archon,” rather than “archontesse,” which is archaic. If one were to translate it as “female archon,” then all masculine examples of archon should be translated as “male archon.” Noy and Bloedhorn argue that [ar]chōnit represents the Greek stem archont-, rather than a Hebrew or Aramaic feminine, which Stökl Ben Ezra rightly views as problematic, since it is the normal female Hebrew ending. Stökl Ben Ezra notes that “archontesses” are occasionally attested among the many male ones in non-Jewish societies, especially on the Aegean islands. While archons are generally assumed to be leaders of some sort within the state, precise functions that they may have had within a synagogue

2 The dating depends on which system of dating the inscription utilizes. Noy and Bloedhorn in IJO III Syr 30 construe the date, “year 316, 30 March” to be possibly 385-86 ce. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “‘Archontesse,’” 289, suggests 96 ce, 353 ce, 484 ce, or 616 ce.

are less clear. Stökl Ben Ezra concludes that “Sambathion was most likely a woman and not a man and that she bore the title archon,” arguing that while one cannot know for certain whether the title was honorific or indicated a function that she fulfilled, “we should seriously consider the latter probability.”

2. Eulogia, Elder, Malta


Inscription on p. 513.

[..............................]

γερουσιάρχης φίλεντόλι[ος]
kai Εὐλογία πρεσβυτήρα ἡ αὐτοῦ σύμβιος.
[male name, plus perhaps one title and "and"; or plus perhaps name of father]
gerusiarch, lover of the commandments, and his wife Eulogia, elder.

That the husband bears the title gerusiarch, while the wife is styled as elder demonstrates that Eulogia did not bear the title because her husband did. Perhaps as gerusiarch, he headed a council of elders, while she was an elder, but, in the absence of knowledge of the structures of the various synagogues in Rome, we cannot know for certain.

3. Sara, elder (or: the elder Sara), Sebastopolis

IJO II 161. Epitaph. Sebastopolis, Pontus and Bithynia, Asia Minor (4th C. or later). First edited by B. Le Guen-Pollet/B. Rémy (eds.), Pontica I, St. Etienne 1991, 119, No. 2 (SEG 41, 1138). Rectangular marble plaque; a menorah with a three-footed base appears below the inscription (.41 m. by .31 m. by .09 m; letters 2.5-4 cm.).

1 See Stökl Ben Ezra, “Jewish ‘Archontesse,’” 290-291, for references within the New Testament (likely much earlier than the inscription) and within early rabbinic literature (some may be contemporaneous with the inscription). A thorough analysis of the Jewish epigraphic evidence is needed.

Here lies Sara, the elder. Peace.

The term elder, πρεσβυτέρα, could refer to Sara’s age or it could be a title equivalent to πρεσβυτέρα. This is one of just three Jewish inscriptions from Sebastopolis, all dated to the 4th C. or later. IJO II 160 commemorates Lampetis, ἄρχων.

4. Yael, prostatēs, Aphrodisias

IJO II 14. Donative Inscription naming “Yael prostatēs/with her son Iosua” (Lines 9-10). Aphrodisias, Caria, Asia Minor (perhaps late 4th-early 6th C.) Marble block (2.8 m. by .46-.4.25 m. [Side A] and .45-.4.3 m [Side B]; tapers in at the top). Face A is 27 lines long, and Face B is 61 lines long.

In 1990 and 1991 respectively, I argued that Iael is most likely a female name, like that of the Yael who killed Sisera in the Book of Judges (4:17, 18, 21, 22; 5:6, 24) and whom Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, the Apostolic Constitutions (in what may be Jewish prayers incorporated into a Christian work), and early rabbinic sources mention multiple times.6 The inscription’s first editors argued that, while it could be a female name, because the other donors on the inscription were all men, Iael was more likely a male name. Their evidence consists of textual variants in the Septuagint’s translation of the names of לאיה in Ezra 10:26, 43=Septuagint 2 Esdras 10:26, 43), namely: Ιαηλ, Αιειηλ, Ιεειηλ, and Ιαηλ. Walter Ameling follows Reynolds and Tannenbaum in reading Ιαηλ as a male name, but does not take account of the multiplicity of Septuagintal translations for Hebrew names in 2 Esdras 10, most of which were probably never given to actual baby boys in Greek-speaking Jewish communities.7 Using


7 For a detailed discussion, see Brooten, “Gender,” 168-70.
rare Greek variants as evidence for the existence of Iael as a male name, rather than looking to the widely known female Iael of the Book of Judges is methodologically questionable.

Gerard Mussies argues that while the name Iael could be either feminine or masculine, προστάτης can only be masculine. He states that, as an actor word ending in -τής, προστάτης must be προστάτις in the feminine.8 Ἱεροσήμ, the grammatically masculine form of active lover to which there is also a feminine equivalent, does, however, occur for women.9 Throughout history, some important terms and images of leadership have been bestowed upon women in their masculine form, ranging from Hatshepsut (1507–1458 BCE), depicted in the form of a male statue, through to Mary Donaldson (1983–1984) and Fiona Woolf (2013–2014), called “Lord Mayor of London.”10

Prostatēs could denote a high-level administrator, a patron, a presiding officer, or, more generally a leader.11

Yael donates here together with her son, Iosua (also a well-known biblical name: Joshua), illustrating the significance of family in service to the Jewish community, including the service involved in leadership.

5. Head of Synagogue, Name Missing, Göre, Nevşehir, Cappadocia

IJO II 255. Göre, Nevşehir, Cappadocia, Asia Minor.


9 Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos 4.5; §189; and Hephaistion of Thebes, Apotelesmatika 2.21 §25; see Bernadette J. Brooten, Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) 127, 139, where, however, I argue that this term may serve to masculinize tribades.

10 In the form “Lady Lord Mayor of London” and not “Lady Mayor of London,” because “Lord Mayor” is the official title.
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of the Inhabitants of Nevşehir, 1913 (in Karamanli). Transcription; inscription now lost; not yet been published in the contemporary scholarly mode.

[………………………………………]
[...] ής Ιουδέ<α>ς Ν[.. ] ἀρχι-
συναγωγίσας. ἐν ἡ-
ρίνη ἡ κύμεςις αὐτῆς.

[………………………………………..]
[... o]f the Jewish woman, head of
the synagogue (archisynagogisa). In p-
eace her sleep.

I had originally construed the nu as the first letter of νήπια, translating as “i[nfant] head of the synagogue,” but Walter Ameling, who disagrees, may be right.12

In a separate class, because the title may have nothing to do with the synagogue or a temple:

6. Megiste, Woman of Priestly Class/Priestess, Jerusalem

CII/P 297. Burial inscription on limestone ossu-
ary, Qidron Valley, Cave 2. Chamber B, Ossuary 18 (1st C. BCE 1st-C. CE; height 41 cm, width 82 cm, depth 32 cm). Roughly inscribed above each of two medallions. First published by Tal Ilan.13

Μεγίστης ἱερίσης.

Belonging to Megiste,
woman of priestly class/priestess.

As the reader will see in chapter five, I present three possible options for understanding inscriptions in which women bear the title hieria/hierisa: (1) it could be simply the Greek equivalent of Hebrew kōhenet; Aramaic kahanta'; (2) it could mean “priest” in the cultic sense of the term; or (3) it could denote a synagogue function. (Any Jewish priestess was either born into a priestly family or had married into one.) I left the question fully open, but Ilan has written that I

12 IJO II 255.
represents me.
"equat[ed] the title priestess with a religious function,“\(^{14}\)
and that, "She claimed that these women [the three called hiereia or hierisa], as Diaspora Jews living in peripheral communities, functioned as priestesses." On the contrary, I proposed three interpretations and left the question open. Furthermore, I did not suggest that “the Temple of Onias [in Egypt] was sectarian,” but rather that the Onias and other temples outside of Jerusalem suggest pluralism and that Marin might even have served in one of the temples “considered by Onias to be heterodox."\(^{15}\) The Megiste inscription does not "undermine Brooten’s theory equating the title priestess with a religious function,” because (1) I suggested, rather than equated, and (2) because an inscription from Jerusalem does not undermine an inscription from Egypt.\(^{16}\)

**Theoretical and Methodological Questions**

In *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*, I posed mainly epistemological questions. How do we know what we think we know? As analyzed in the pages below, the leading scholars of ancient synagogues and of ancient Jewish epigraphy who preceded me were certain that women did not have any functions within any of the Roman period synagogues of the ancient Mediterranean. I challenged that view. Having written before the systematic analysis of gender within Mediterranean Judaism or among its neighbors in this period, and on the basis of preconceived notions, my predecessors simply declared that women did not carry out leadership functions.

*Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* caused many to question what we know and how we know it. Why could not women, likely from influential, prosperous families, have participated in making decisions within their synagogues,

---


\(^{15}\) Ilan, “Ossuary Inscriptions,” 159; see below, p. 89.

\(^{16}\) See JIGRE 84, at which William Horbury and David Noy, who generally accurately present my views, suggest that only Marin or Marion could theoretically have served as a priestess, and that at the Leontopolis Temple (of Onias), ignoring my proposal that she might have served at a temple not approved by Onias. David Noy, however, writes of Marin or Marion “Brooten’s alternative explanation that she could have had a function in the temple is just conceivable,” although he prefers “of priestly descent.” (“The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa,” in *Studies in Jewish Epigraphy*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Pieter Willem van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1994) 167, 162-182).
likely together with other family members? If the titles in these inscriptions appear in the same or the feminine form of titles borne by men, why should scholars read the male titles as functional and the female as honorific?

If a scholar is set on the notion that Jewish women played only a peripheral role in synagogues of the Roman period, and that they either sat in a separate women’s section, likely a gallery, or did not attend synagogue services at all, then any number of inscriptions pointing to hitherto overlooked possibilities for women will not persuade. Today, however, far fewer today hold that view. Scholars ranging from Géza G. Xeravits; Karen Stern; Susanah Heschel; Ross Shepard Kraemer; Paul R. Trebilco; Pieter W. van der Horst; and Daniel Boyarin; to Ute E. Eisen, who has written on female office-holders within early Christianity; and Aisha Geissinger, who has written on female exegetes within Islam; as well as others who adopt my thesis that a small number of Jewish women carried out synagogue functions and have often incorporated it into their work.17 Others have, sometimes tentatively or with construc-
tive criticism, accepted my analysis of all of the titles, except for “priestess.” Peter Richardson and Valerie Heuchan, however, argue that Marin, herisa, in the Leontopolis inscription discussed below may well have carried out a cultic role in the Jewish Temple in Leontopolis. Further scholars have adopted my research results in large part or suggested that women may possibly have served in these functions.

While Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue has gained widespread acceptance, Sara Parks, in a 2019 article, "The Brooten Phenomenon’: Moving Women from the Margins in Second-Temple and New Testament Scholarship,” points out that my book and other research on women and gender have yet to be adequately incorporated into scholarship as a whole, because research on women and gender is still viewed as specialized and not essential for a full picture. Parks particularly challenges male scholars: “women’s scholarship and scholarship on women should not be construed as optional ‘identity politics.’ Rather they must be accepted as essential to so-called ‘regular’ scholarship. Without them, our scholarship is incomplete, or even incorrect.” She cites Lee Levine as an example of a scholar who discusses Women


19 See below, 73–74. Peter Richardson and Valerie Heuchan, “Jewish Voluntary Associations in Egypt and the Roles of Women,” in Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World, ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson (New York: Routledge, 1996) 226–39, 226–51. They base themselves on: Exod 38:8; 1 Sam 2:22; Targum to Judges 5:24 (all on women performing Israelite cultic functions); t. Menahot 11.II.1 (on the Onias Temple’s [=Leontopolis Temple] high priest wearing women’s clothing, which may be a spoof on priestesses in that temple wearing women’s clothing), and on the more egalitarian gender relations in Egypt and the presence of cultic priestesses, which raises the possibility of assimilation.


Leaders, but then does not incorporate my research in the rest of his work.  

Levine, who holds that synagogue titles held by men denoted leadership positions, concludes: (1) that women attended synagogue service, on the basis of ancient sources for their having done so; (2) that they most likely sat together with men because no ancient source states otherwise; (3) that they may or may not have had a liturgical function—a Toseftan passage on women reading from the Torah is difficult to interpret; (4) that they donated to synagogues, to which inscriptions attest; and (5) that they may have participated in synagogue leadership, although I “did not succeed in providing convincing proof that such official positions were indeed open to women.”

Levine is epistemologically quite self-aware, except for the last point. Proving anything for the ancient world is exceedingly rare and an unreasonable expectation. To his credit, Levine does not argue that female title bearers obtained their titles from their husbands, nor does he simply claim that the female titles were honorific, but rather looks especially to the surrounding cultures for evidence of female religious and civic roles, observing as I also did that these cultures and the Jewish titles used in them varied greatly from region to region. Levine observes the concentration of parallel evidence for women in the religions of Asia Minor, including Christianity, on which basis he argues that Jewish communities there may have, in part, adapted to their surroundings in that region.

Ultimately, however, Levine seems to believe that, in his separate chapters on “Leadership” and “Priests,” he has demonstrated what specific male officeholders did and what role male priests likely had in the synagogue. He is judicious in those chapters, weighing evidence and arguing for his construal of it, but he does not and cannot prove his interpretations, for we cannot know with certainty what any synagogue officer of any gender did. If female title bearers were incorporated into the chapter on “Leadership” and female priests/women of priestly class into the “Priests” chapter, then the reader would recognize that, while scholars cannot prove anything, they can thoughtfully argue that

---


23 Levine, *Synagogue*, 482.
female title bearers may well have participated in decision making and carried out other leadership functions.\textsuperscript{24}

Ross Shepard Kraemer, who agrees that female title bearers had functions, although she questions the distinction between honorific and functional, argues that I and others have insufficiently theorized leadership.\textsuperscript{25} Decision making is central to my understanding of leadership, which would include working with others, such as one’s family in this highly family-based society, in arriving at decisions. A larger question, however, deserves robust discussion among researchers, namely whether administrative decisions about a synagogue complex, decisions about the liturgy, or decisions about Jewish legal matters, among other types of decisions that a synagogue official might make, are the most important indicator of leadership. Some commentators cited here seem at pains to establish that whatever functions female title bearers carried out, they did not carry out the most important ones.\textsuperscript{26}

Kraemer further argues that I did not recognize the extent to which these inscriptions come largely from the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries and that I did not account sufficiently for regional differences.\textsuperscript{27} I noted the geographic specificity of inscriptions with specific titles applied to women: the inscriptions for three female heads of the synagogue are from Asia Minor, and one is from Crete; and the inscriptions for female elders cluster in Venosa (Venusia), Southern Italy. I would love to know more about the Jewish communities in each region and how specific histories relate to the specific women, but no one has yet found the sources to answer that question. Subsequent to 1982, scholars have attempted to date these inscriptions more accurately, yielding later dates for some, although the dating of ancient inscriptions is rarely certain.

Kraemer, who is currently completing a book on Diaspora Jews in late antiquity, points out the precarious situation


\textsuperscript{26} E.g., Walter Ameling, IJO II 1, pp. 39-40.

\textsuperscript{27} Ross Shepard Kraemer, “Jewish Women Synagogue Officers in the Ancient Mediterranean: Some Further Considerations” (Unpublished Manuscript). I thank Kraemer for generously making this manuscript available to me. See also Kraemer’s judicious analysis of then recent studies on synagogue officeholders in Witnesses, 232-246.
of Jewish communities under the Christian Roman Empire, especially as Christian Roman law increasingly removed previously held rights and placed legal disadvantages on Jews. Kraemer plausibly suggests that women sometimes take on roles usually filled by men in situations of great stress to a specific community and that we should, in any case, look at fourth and fifth century diasporic Jewish life circumstance of distress when interpreting inscriptions from that time period.

Women Leaders and my three follow-up articles have also elicited other critiques. Everyone agrees that women donated to synagogues, and a few see donation as their main synagogue function and as the main cause of their titles. Tessa Rajak writes of my books and articles, “Brooten vastly overestimates the amount of administrative activity that would have surrounded an ancient institution, and her picture of dedicated female rabbis of progressive persuasion concerned with everything from liturgy to repairs, introduces an anachronistic note.” I, however, have not presented Jewish female officeholders as progressive, nor as rabbis, and Rajak does not cite any page to back up her claim. As for the activities of synagogue officials, I propose only what ancient sources mention.

Tessa Rajak and David Noy argue that both male and female heads of the synagogue participated in the patronage system in which communities honored donors with honorific titles. Prior to publication of Women Leaders, most scholars held that both “father of the synagogue” and “mother of the synagogue” were honorific titles. Samuel Krauss wrote: “A genuine office could not have been associated with the distinction [of father/mother of the synagogue] for the simple reason that it was also bestowed upon women.”

The presence of female heads of the synagogue has long influenced whether or not scholars view such persons as having authority, contributing to the liturgy and/or teaching, or as bearers of an honorific title. Most scholars who

30 Samuel Krauss, Synagogale Altertümer (Berlin: Benjamin Harz, 1922) 166. See below 64.
do not see the female heads of synagogue as carrying out any functions argue that:

1. The titles of men signify a function, but the women’s do not; or
2. The titles of both female and male heads of synagogue are honorific and signify neither administrative, nor liturgical or teaching functions.

The inscriptions in which women bear a different title than their husband and the absence of husbands in most of the inscriptions have apparently persuaded nearly all interpreters; today almost no one argues that women bore their titles because their husbands did. The honorific interpretation has nevertheless become a default position among some scholars, understood to be proven and evidence-based, in contrast to viewing the titles as including functions. “That these women used their wealth to adorn the synagogue is clear, but that their titles (and these include hierisai), were anything other than honorific has yet to be proved,” writes Margaret Williamson.31 James Burtchaell writes that seeing Jewish women as functioning officers goes against mishnaic culture, not recognizing that that these largely Diasporan female title bearers were not under rabbinic control.32 William Horbury argues that all titles were honors given to men and women for their benefactions and that they designated “governmental, rather than liturgical” functions, but that women were unlikely to have participated in the decision making of a synagogue council.33 His assessment that synagogues in this period probably separated women from men correlates with his views on women’s lack of decision-making capacity. Walter Ameling holds that female heads of the synagogue are “less upsetting than often thought,” because


32 James Tunstead Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 245, 244-246, argues that the feminine titles of office refer to women whose husband’s title bestows dignity upon them. Burtchaell notes the occurrence of episcope[ia] as the wife of an episcopus in Canon 14 of the Council of Tours (567). Eisen, *Women Officeholders*, 200, however, observes that Burtchaell, 316-318, erroneously refers to the wife of a bishop being called an episcopa in Gregory of Tours, noting that the Council of Tours provides the single known Latin example of this usage.

male and female heads of the synagogue had no liturgical functions and did not need to be learned, but were rather often wealthy people who donated to and worked to improve the organization. Tessa Rajak and David Noy argue that “head of the synagogue” was mainly an honorific title for all holders. They view the non-Jewish literary sources indicating functions of heads of synagogues as not useful owing to their biases or lack of knowledge of the internal workings of the synagogue. Taking as the only admissible evidence inscriptions concerning Roman civic office and heads of the synagogue, which rarely mention functions, contributes to the thesis that “head of the synagogue” was an honorific title.

Those above who see all the titles as honorific and mainly deriving from beneficence need to explain who led in the absence of functioning synagogue officers. Should we imagine that an entire congregation jointly organized each liturgy; read from the scriptures with no one to call them forth; as a group decided how to renovate their synagogue; and as a leaderless group raised funding, taught the members, gave advice or judgment on Jewish legal matters, decided on which biblical translation to use and acquired it, etc.? We have no evidence that Jewish communities throughout the ancient Mediterranean were leaderless communities. To be sure, however, many congregations may well have been small and less in need of official roles and designated leaders.

Beyond this, the relationship between benefaction and synagogue titles is far from clear. Among the inscrip-

---

34 IJO II 1, pp. 39–40: “weniger aufregend als oft gedacht” (40).
37 See also Carrie Elaine Duncan, “The Rhetoric of Participation: Gender and Representation in Ancient Synagogues” (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 2012); see also Carrie Duncan, “Inscribing Authority: Female Title Bearers in Jewish Inscriptions,” Religions 3 (2012) 37–49. Duncan argues that one cannot know anything about what female title bearers did, if they had any functions at all, but rather only that they were benefactors to the Jewish community whose titles related to their benefactions. Duncan claims that my and others’ understanding of female officeholders includes their exertion of power through control, which is based on a “modern, andro-normative understanding of power as control” (“Rhetoric,” 214) but she has not identified a specific example of this in this book or in my articles. Duncan helpfully stresses that women worked within their family structures, which is surely true, although we actually know very little about the female office holders’ families.
tions discussed above and below, just two are donative. Why would one assume that all of the remaining twenty-two or -three women are donors? I state below that some of the female office holders may also have been donors and that wealth can accompany access to offices. The appendix below of female donors who bear no titles and who far outnumber female office holders demonstrates, however, the problem in assuming an inextricable link between donations and female titles. The synagogue of Apamea, with its nineteen donative inscriptions, of which nine are by women and others by women together with one or more family members can illustrate this. None of these female donors bear titles.

Deciding which are the best comparable materials for synagogue titles is complicated. The decision determines one’s interpretation. Rajak and Noy give priority to Greek honorific titles and not to, for example, contemporaneous titles of church leadership. Riet van Bremen’s research on the limits of female participation in Roman civic and religious life has provided needed caution, even as some scholars use her work to argue that Jewish women had no functions at all. Whether to compare synagogue titles with civic titles, those of volunteer associations, those of church leadership, or something else depends on one’s assessment as to whether synagogues mainly represent the Jewish community vis-à-vis Roman society, are mainly volunteer associations, or are mainly for religious worship. I see elements of all of these and therefore choose to compare on more than one axis. Riet van Bremen and Rajak and Noy have shown limits and demonstrated the functions of beneficence, and I do not posit an egalitarian form of Judaism in the Roman period. One example can, however, suffice to show the value of Christian inscriptions of female presbyters, bishops, etc., and debates over the leadership of women. In 494, Pope Gelasius complains of a Christian practice in southern Italy and Sicily of women taking on ritual roles, serving as presby-

---

38 IJO II 14, 25.
39 Pp. 141-44.
41 Rajak and Noy, “Archisynagogoi,” 84-86.
42 Riet van Bremen, The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1996). Carrie Duncan presents the civic titles as interpreted by van Bremen as a comparison more plausible than the titles “bishop,” elder,” etc. as analyzed by Eisen. (Duncan, “Representations,” 259-263).
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ters at the “sacred altars.” Eisen presents two inscriptions commemorating female Christian presbyters in southern Italy and Sicily in the fourth–fifth centuries. In Venosa in southern Italy from just this time, three female elders, a Jewish “fatheress” and a “mother” are commemorated in inscriptions. Perhaps Christian and Jewish communities in this region in the 4th–5th C. encouraged and recognized women through titles associated with service to the church and the synagogue respectively, maybe even influencing each other.

The genres of sources declared relevant also heavily determines one’s interpretation. As Levine correctly notes, restricting oneself to epigraphic materials, as do Rajak and Noy, can result in viewing the title “head of the synagogue” as based on benefaction and honorific. In this book, I draw upon the full range of sources.

Finally, the historiographical question: Why has the contention that all titles were mainly honorific arisen following publication of this book. Is it, in part, a response to my interpretation? Previously, scholars decided that fathers of the synagogue, in the presence of mothers of the synagogue, bore their title as an honorific. Given that it has become largely untenable to hold that women acquired

43 Gelasius I, Epistle 14.26: Nihilomus impatienter audivimus, tantum divinarum rerum subisse despectum, ut feminae sacrarum altaribus ministramentum, cunctaque non nisi virorum familiae deputata sexum, cui non competunt, exhibere. “Nevertheless, we have heard to our annoyance that divine affairs have come to such a low state that women are encouraged to officiate at the sacred altars, and to take part in all matters imputed to the offices of the male sex, to which they do not belong.” (Latin: Epistulae Romanorum pontificum genuinae, ed. Andrea Thiel, vol. 1 [Braunsberg/ Braniewo, Poland: Hildesheim, 1867–1868; reprint: New York: Olms, 1974] 376–377; English: Mary Ann Rossi, “Priesthood, Precedent, and Prejudice: On Recovering the Women Priests of Early Christianity: Containing a Translation from the Italian of “Notes on the Female Priesthood in Antiquity,” by Giorgio Otranto,” Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 7 [1991] 81).


45 JIWE I 59; CIL IX 6226 (perhaps 5th C.; see below, pp. 42–43); JIWE 62; CIL IX 6230 (perhaps 5th C.; see below, p. 43);


47 Today, however, I would add discussion of “head of the synagogue” as a non-Jewish title and would also take account of Roman civic and religious titles in the same regions as the Jewish titles. On the former, see the review in G. H. R. Horsley, New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, vol. 4 (Macquarie University: The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1987) 219–220, 214–220.
their titles from their husbands, might the presence of female title bearers have motivated, at least in part, some scholars to declare all titles honorific?

In closing, if I were to write this book today, I would more thoroughly historicize by interweaving discussion of an institution widespread within the Roman Empire and often necessary for obtaining the resources for benefaction, namely slavery. Women in the Roman Empire could hold property, including human property, in their own names. The very first inscription that I discuss below was commissioned by Rufina, a slave-holder, but I did no more than mention that fact. An analysis of female donors as potential slave-holders would have further located these women within the contexts of their economies and their surrounding cultures. Slaveholding reminds us yet again how different were ancient synagogues from contemporary ones and demonstrates the value of thoroughly understanding the world in which they existed.

Concordance of Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum (used for principal inscriptions discussed in this volume) with Newer Editions

Abbreviations:


48 IJO II 43; CII 741. See below, 5–12. Ross S. Kraemer argues that the tomb was not for Rufina’s enslaved laborers raised in her household and for her freedpeople, but instead those of others, perhaps other members of her synagogue. (Ross S. Kraemer, Rufina Refined: A Woman archisynagogos from Smyrna Yet Again,” in Worship, Women, and War: Essays in Honor of Susan Niditch [Brown Judaic Studies 357; Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2015] 287–299. Kraemer observes that the “her” usually assumed in l. 4 is in fact missing. Kraemer does not, however, argue that Rufina was not a slave-holder.
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INTRODUCTION

It is my thesis that women served as leaders in a number of synagogues during the Roman and Byzantine periods. The evidence for this consists of nineteen Greek and Latin inscriptions in which women bear the titles "head of the synagogue," "leader," "elder," "mother of the synagogue" and "priestess." These inscriptions range in date from 27 B.C.E. to perhaps the sixth century C.E. and in provenance from Italy to Asia Minor, Egypt and Palestine. While new discoveries make this a growing corpus of material, a number of the inscriptions have been known to scholars for some time. The purpose of this dissertation, therefore, is not to present a hitherto unknown body of evidence, but rather to suggest a new interpretation of known material.

According to previous scholarly consensus, Jewish women did not assume positions of leadership in the ancient synagogue. Scholars have therefore interpreted the titles borne by women in these inscriptions as honorific. Samuel Krauss, for example, made the gender of the office holder a criterion for the functionality of the title: "The office of archon does not occur for women, and this is the best proof that we must regard archons as genuine, practicing officials of the gerousia or synagogue, in a way that one certainly could not have taken them from the ranks of the women."¹ This tradition of interpreting the titles borne by Jewish women as honorific has continued until the present day,² although in recent years several scholars have begun to question it, among them A. Thomas Kraabel, Dorothy Irvin and Shaye Cohen.³ Jeanne and Louis Robert also seem to view the titles as functional.⁴ In order to decide if the titles were functional or honorific it is necessary to examine each title and each inscription.
PART ONE

THE INSCRIPTIONAL EVIDENCE
CHAPTER I

WOMEN AS HEADS OF SYNAGOGUES

A. The Inscriptional Evidence for Women as Heads of Synagogues

In three Greek inscriptions women bear the title archisynagogos/archisynagogissa. The formation is a rather curious one. Whereas, for example, archiereus, archigrammateus, archikybernētēs consist of archi- plus the name of the office, archisynagogos/archisynagogissa comes from archi- plus an element formed from the institution over which the officer stands, in this case synagogē. Architrikinos (from triclinium—a dining room with three couches), meaning "head waiter," would be a parallel. Although the title also occurs occasionally in paganism, it is most often Jewish, and it is probable that the pagan examples represent a borrowing from Judaism, rather than vice versa.

Smyrna, Ionia

CIL 741; IGR IV 1452. Marble plaque (36 x 26 x 2 cm); horizontal lines beneath each row of letters (probably 2nd C.).

'Ρουφετινα Ἰουδαια ἄρχη-
2 συνάγωγος κατεσκεύα-
σεν τῷ ἔνωριον τοῖς ἀπε-
4 λευθέροις καὶ ἀφέμασιν
μηδενὸς ἄλλου ἔξουσιαν ἐ-
6 χοντος ἄφαιν τινά. εἰ δὲ τις τολ-
μήσει, δῶσει τῷ λεωτάτῳ τα-
8 μέλῳ (ἡπάραρα) ἅπα καὶ τῷ ἔθνῃ τῶν Ἰου-
δαίων (ἡπάραρα) τ. Ταύτης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς
10 τῷ ἀντίγραφῳ ἀποκεῖται
εἰς τῷ ἄρχετον.

L.4: read ἀφέμασιν.
L.5: read ἄλλου.

Rufina, a Jewess, head of the synagogue, built this 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 or she 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.
The history of the interpretation of the title archisynagōgos in this inscription can serve as an exemplification of the way in which scholars have dealt with all of the following inscriptions. Salomon Reinach, who first published the inscription, solves the dilemma of a woman archisynagōgos in a novel way. He first reviews how Emil Schürer deals with the problem of mothers of the synagogue, namely by declaring both mothers and fathers of the synagogue to be honorary office holders. What can be done now that a woman head of the synagogue has been discovered, he asks, for this goes against Schürer's establishment of the title archisynagōgos as functional. Reinach solves the crass contradiction between genuine function and woman by positing two stages in the development of the title. Since we know that at the early stage heads of the synagogue had a genuine function, we cannot, he reasons, depart from the accepted understanding. Later, however, archisynagōgos became a purely honorific title, one which passed from father to son. It took on a sense which was "more vague and more general," analogous to the title father or mother of the synagogue. Thus it is in the category of head of the synagogue honoris causa that Rufina is to be seen.

M. Weinberg's solution to the dilemma is that Rufina was the wife of an archisynagōgos, "for women have never held an office in a Jewish community, and certainly not a synagogue office." Emil Schürer's is simple: "Rufina herself bears the title ἄρχισύναγωγός, which in the case of a woman is, of course, just a title." Jean Juster, after describing how difficult it was to fill the office of archisynagōgos, what authority and knowledge were required, notes in closing that "the title of archisynagōgos could also be accorded honorifically, even to women and children." Samuel Krauss adopts the wife solution: "Concerning the women, it can certainly not mean that they were bestowed with the dignity of a head of the synagogue, for the synagogue did not allow women such honors; it is rather the wives of heads of the synagogue who are meant." Salo Wittmayer Baron writes, "The aforementioned woman archisynagogus of Smyrna, if not merely the wife of an official, was very likely a lady whom the congregation wished to honor, but to whom it could hardly have entrusted the actual charge of an office." Jean-Baptiste Frey, querying whether the title could be honorific or whether Rufina was simply the wife of a head of the synagogue, notes, "It seems difficult to admit that she actually exercised the functions of a head of the synagogue."
It does seem difficult for these scholars to admit that a woman could have exercised an official function in the ancient synagogue. Are there any who can imagine it? The epigraphist Louis Robert is a notable exception in the history of the interpretation of this inscription. In the context of discussing a Jewish woman who bears the title archGoissa, which will be discussed below, Robert notes, "In Jewish communities women bore titles," and lists the Rufina inscription and others. Robert does not make any further attempts to define the titles or to discuss the functions associated with them, but he does see all of these examples as part of the same phenomenon and not as something exceptional. More recently, A. Thomas Kraabel, Dorothy Irvin and Shaye Cohen have also suggested that the title archisynagogos in this inscription denotes an actual function.

Are the arguments of those who consider the title honorific convincing? As to the view that Rufina was merely the wife of an archisynagogos, it is striking that in the legal matter at hand, namely that of guaranteeing a burial place for her freed slaves and the exposed infants raised in her household, she acts in her own name. Thus we do not even know whether she was married or not. The suggestion that the title archisynagogos was honorific in the later period will be discussed below. The primary argument, however, is that a woman, qua woman, could not have held such a post. This will be discussed after all of the evidence has been surveyed.

Excursus: What is an Honorific Title?

In order to ascertain whether the titles discussed in this thesis were or were not honorific titles, the meaning of the term "honorific title" must first be clarified. The sense in which this term has been used by scholars dealing with the Jewish inscriptions in question is that a title which normally designates a function (e.g., archisynagogos) is here merely meant to honor a person. In the case of pater/mater synagogue, one decided that the title itself implies no function, but is per se an honorific title.

This is by no means the way in which "honorific title" is normally used. For example, Friedrich Preisigke devotes a section to Ehrentitel in his dictionary of the papyri. The honorific titles listed fall into two categories: adjectives, often in the superlative (e.g., clarissimus, lamprotatos), and nouns, often corresponding to a titular adjective (e.g., spectabilitas, lamprota). A man of senatorial rank, for example,
could bear the title *vir clarissimus* (abbreviated *c.v.*), while the wife being *clarissima femina* (abbreviated *c.i.*). While the title does not necessarily pass on to the children, there are examples of *clarissimus juvenis* (*c.j.*), *clarissima puella* (*c.p.*), and *clarissimus puer* (*c.p.*) for a young man, and a young girl and boy respectively. Thus, a "distinguished" (clarissimus/a) person was not simply any distinguished person, but rather a person of senatorial rank. The senatorial rank certainly implied certain duties and functions, but these were not expressed with this title, and *clarissimus/a* can properly be termed an "honorific title." Quite unlike the title archisynagogos, *clarissimus/a* never denoted an official function; it was per se honorific. Note also that while a wife does receive the title of her husband, it is not the case that his title was functional while hers was purely honorific. The titles of both were honorific. Finally, while the wife did receive the title *clarissima femina* through her husband, she apparently could continue to bear it even if no longer married to the *vir clarissimus*, but to another not of senatorial rank. This, then, is the standard use of "honorific title," and it will become clear that our case has little to do with it.

What of the wife of a religious functionary receiving his title? Could this not be seen as an honorific title? For example, the wife of a *flamen dialis* is called *flaminica*, but this was not simply a title, for a *flaminica* had certain cultic functions and appeared at her husband's side wearing official cultic garb. Like her husband, the *flaminica* wore priestly garb; on her head she wore the red veil, the *flammeum*, and a purple scarf, the *rica*, to which was attached the pomegranate branch, the *arbor felix*. Her mantle was also purple in color and her tunic was made of wool. She wore shoes made of the leather of an animal which had been slaughtered, but not of an animal which had died a natural death. Like her husband, she was not allowed to touch a corpse, nor did she have to swear oaths. Further, the *flaminica* had the duty to offer sacrifice. According to Plutarch, she was the priestess of Juno, but this may be incorrect information on Plutarch's part. Certain *flaminicae* were assigned to the cult of deceased women of the imperial family. Thus it is clear that having attained a title through marriage did not necessarily imply that no duties accompanied that title or that it was not an official one.

The example of the *flaminica* is not meant to be a parallel to the Jewish materials. Indeed, the *flaminicae* and *flamines*
bear little resemblance to the Jewish functionaries, and most of the Jewish materials are later. The point of this example is not to compare the two groups, but rather to call into question the widespread and otherwise unsubstantiated notion that if a wife bore the title of her husband, then this meant that her title was purely honorific. Therefore, even if one were to conclude that the Jewish women bearing titles were in fact simply the wives of synagogue officials, this would not in itself prove that they had no function.

Before speaking of the honorific nature of these women's titles, one must first establish that honorific titles even existed in the ancient synagogue. The assumption is that titles normally functional were honorific when bestowed upon women, which is similar to suggesting the existence of a church with functioning male bishops and honorary female bishops. There is no internal reason to assume that any of the titles of synagogue organization were honorific.

One often cites the child office-holders as a parallel to the women (e.g., CII 120: archōn nēpios; 402: mellarchōn), thereby overlooking that a grown woman has little in common with a two year old boy. Rather than attesting to the existence of honorific titles, such inscriptions can be seen either as evidence for the hereditary nature of some offices in certain synagogues or for the role of family ties in the selection process. Judging by the word, a mellarchōn became a functioning archōn upon reaching adulthood.24 Such a case in no way parallels adult women bearing titles.

Is it nevertheless possible, and even probable, that the women title-bearers received the titles on account of their husbands? A major difficulty with this hypothesis is that in all of the inscriptions in which women bear titles, husbands are mentioned only twice (CII 166, 619d). Even if it were to have been the case that the women in these two inscriptions acquired their titles on account of their husbands, which is not a necessary consequence (why should two Jewish leaders not be married to each other?), it does not follow that no functions were attached to the title. Nor does it follow that all of the other women acquired their titles in this way. The Jewish women's titles have been compared to German women being addressed as "Frau Dr." when their husbands hold a doctorate,25 but even this custom does not prove the honorific nature of the titles. Many German women are called "Frau Dr." because they have written a doctoral dissertation. Further, if it had been a common custom
for Jewish women to assume the titles of their husbands, why does this not find expression in the inscriptions? Numerous inscriptions mention male title-bearers and their wives, but with the two exceptions noted above, the wives are not honored with titles (CII 22, 216, 247, 265, 333, 391, 416, 457, 511, 532, 553, 681, 733b, 739, 770, 788, 949, 1145, 1531, etc.) and the situation is the same with the daughters of male title-bearers (CII 102, 106, 147, 172, 291, 510, 535, 537, 568, 610, 645, 1202, etc.).

In sum, we do not have evidence that the custom of wives taking on their husbands' titles even existed in ancient Judaism, but even if it did exist, and even if one or two of our inscriptions were to reflect that custom, this would not prove that the wives in question had no functions attached to their titles, nor would it prove that all Jewish women acquired their titles in this way. Further, there is no indication in the ancient sources that any of the titles of synagogue leadership were honorific at any period.

From the Rufina inscription it is clear that Rufina was a wealthy woman who possessed the funds to build a special tomb for her freed slaves and thremmata (= Latin alumni), i.e., those children who had been exposed as infants by their parents and taken by her to be raised either as slaves or as adoptive children. Since this is a tomb for the freed slaves, to whom Rufina would have been a patron, and not for other members of her family, it is likely that the thremmata mentioned here were slaves and not adoptive children. This grave, the persons to be buried in it, the marble plaque with its official legalistic language, and the high fine to be imposed all point to the wealth and influence of this woman. We know nothing about her marital status, but it is noteworthy that no husband is mentioned; she has drawn up the deed in her own name.

This type of inscription, that is, a document stating for whom a particular tomb is meant, forbidding others to bury anyone in it and imposing a fine, usually to be paid to a public institution, is quite typical for Jewish, as well as for non-Jewish inscriptions from Asia Minor. The "sacred treasury" (hierōstaton tameion) is most likely the imperial treasury, the sacrum aeraarium. The fines insure that Jewish and Roman officials maintain their interest in protecting the tomb.
What do we know about the Jewish community in which Rufina was active? There are only two other Jewish inscriptions from Smyrna which mention office holders. CII 739 is a donative inscription made by one Irenopoios, who was an elder and father of the tribe, and the son of an elder; CII 740 is a further donative inscription, probably from the same synagogue. Another inscription not included in the CII names a Roman citizen, Lucius Lollius Justus, who was a scribe of the Jewish community in Smyrna. Further inscriptions from Smyrna include a magical amulet (CII 743), and a 45-line inscription from the time of Hadrian (117-138), listing donations to the city, one line of which refers to former Judeans who had donated 10,000 drachmas. Of the titles in these inscriptions, elder and scribe are fairly common elsewhere, and father of the tribe seems to be analogous to father of the synagogue. That both father and son bear the title elder in CII 739 could mean that in Smyrna titles could pass from father to son, whether automatically or not is another question.

The picture of Rufina the Jewess which emerges from this and related inscriptions is that of a wealthy, independent woman looking after her business affairs according to the customs of the time. Her Roman name and her wealth could indicate that she was a member of a leading family of Smyrna. There is no indication that she was married. She bore the title archisynagogos, which, if her name had been Rufinus, would have entitled her to being listed in modern secondary literature as a leader of the Jewish community in ancient Smyrna.

Kastelli Kissamou, Crete

CII 731c White marble sepulchral plaque (45 x 30 x 2.8 cm; height of letters: 1.5-3.0 cm; distance between lines: 0.5-1.5 cm; 4th/5th C.).

Σωφία Γορτυνί—
2 α, προσβυτέρα
κέ ἀρχισυναγώ—
4 γυσσα Κισάμου ἐν—
θα. Μνήμη δικαίας
6 ἕς εὐδα. ἀμήν.

L. 3: read καλ.
L. 5: read δικαίας.
L. 6: read εἰς αἰώνα.

Sophia of Gortyn, elder and head of the synagogue of Kisamos (lies) here. The memory of the righteous one for ever.

Amen.
A. C. Bandy dated the inscription to the first or second century. Jeanne and Louis Robert, however, are of the opinion that it is from the fourth or fifth century. Given the script, especially the rounded \textit{sigma} and the nearly cursive \textit{omega} and \textit{mu}, the later date seems much more plausible.

Unlike the Rufina inscription, this one gives us no hints as to the background of Sophia. Here, again, no husband is mentioned, so one cannot assume that she was married.

This is the only Jewish inscription from Kastelli Kissamou and one of only three from Crete. The other two Cretan inscriptions do not supply us with any information which could help us to reconstruct the organizational structure of Cretan synagogues.

It is noteworthy that Sophia of Gortyn was both elder and head of the synagogue. She bears the feminine forms of both titles (\textit{presbytera} and \textit{archisynagogissa}). In Greek, both \textit{he archisynagoggos} as in the previous inscription, and \textit{he archisynagogissa} are possible. The title will be discussed below in the context of other women elders.

As this inscription was first published in 1963, the older authors cited in connection with Rufina did not express their opinion as to the meaning of \textit{archisynagogissa}. A. C. Bandy, however, did carry forward the tradition by suggesting that, "The term \textit{presbute} implies that the deceased either was the wife of a \textit{presbuteos} or she received this as an honorary title, since it was often bestowed on women. The word \textit{dorxosynagwgos} implies either that her husband was, in addition, an \textit{dorxosynagogos} or that she received this as a second honorary title, since this also was given to women." Jeanne and Louis Robert do not suggest such a thing. Rather they compare the title with other Jewish women's titles: \textit{archegissa}, \textit{hierisa}, \textit{archisynagogos}, and \textit{presbytera}.

Anyone reading the inscription can see that there is no internal reason for believing that Sophia of Gortyn received the titles through her husband. If her husband was the source of her titles, why is she not called Sophia, the wife of X? The image of Sophia of Gortyn emerging from the inscription, albeit in much more vague outlines than that of Rufina, is of a very important figure in the Jewish community of Kisamos. She was not only an elder, but also head of the synagogue. There is no evidence that she was married.
Donative inscription on chancel screen post of white marble (ca. 1 m x 21 cm x 19 cm); decorative grooves on the inscription side, forming a sort of "i"; topped by a multi-tiered pedestal (at least 4th/5th C.).

```
[´Απὸ Θ]εωπεμπτης
2 [Δρ]ιομι(αγιου) κε τοο υί
οο αύτης Εουεβίου.
```

L. 2: read και.

[From Θ]εοπεμπτη, head of the synagogue, and her son Eusebios.

Charles Diehl, whom Théodore Reinach consulted as to the date of the inscription, was inclined towards a sixth-century dating, which Reinach accepted. The main reason for the late dating is the use of the siglum υ for ου, which in the rounded form of our inscription points to a late date. The rounded sigma and epsilon would further substantiate a later dating, but a century or two earlier than the sixth century would also be possible.

The inscription is carved into the top of a white marble quadrangular post. Reinach was not certain whether the inscription was a funerary or donative inscription. Noticing the groove on the left side of the post, he suggested that it might be for a tenon leading into a lattice-work, which would in turn lead to another post like this one, this being a donative inscription for the structure. Recently discovered parallels confirm that this is close to correct. Our post is most likely the support for a synagogue chancel screen, such as those found in Tell Rebov and Khirbet Susiya in Israel. Zeev Yeivin's inscription no. 19 from Khirbet Susiya is a chancel screen post with a donative inscription in exactly the same place as the Theopempte inscription, that is, at the top of the quadrangular portion of the post. The screens, which fitted in between two posts, were flat marble slabs decorated with geometric, floral, and/or Jewish motifs, some of them also containing an inscription.

This arrangement of post, screen, post, screen was placed as a divider at the front of a basilica separating what in Christian churches would be the altar from the nave. In this way, the apse could be set off from the rest of the prayer hall. What we should imagine, then, is a chancel screen post which would have been placed at the front of the synagogue prayer hall.
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The inscription names the head of the synagogue, Theopempte, and her son, Eusebios, as donors of the post, and perhaps also of the screen which would have fitted into it.

Of Theopempte, one can at least say that she possessed sufficient funds to make this donation together with her son, whose age we do not know. Again, no husband is mentioned, but the presence of the son indicates that she was or had been married. Her son bears no title, which shows that if his father had a title, it did not automatically pass on to the son.

Since this is the only known Jewish inscription from Myndos, we can say nothing about the organization of the Jewish community there.

The scholarly opinion as to what archisynagogus could mean here is quite the same as for Rufina. Théodore Reinach, the brother of Salomon Reinach, who had published the Rufina inscription eighteen years earlier, adopted his brother's theory that the title archisynagogus in this period had come to have a "purely honorific sense." The Theopempte inscription, to the extent that it was known, was also meant in the evaluations listed above for the Rufina inscription. The interpretation of one scholar should, however, be especially noted. Erwin Goodenough translates the inscription in a peculiar way:

... of Theopempte, archisynagogus, and of his (sic) son Eusebius.

How Goodenough could translate "of Theopempte," when the genitive form is already [Theopempte], and especially how he could translate autēs as "his" is not easy to comprehend, but then this is not the first time in the history of scholarship that a woman has been transformed into a man.

Theopempte, then, was a donor to the synagogue which recognized her as a head of the synagogue. She was the mother of a son. Judging by the inscription, the funds for the donation were either hers, if the son was still a child, or hers and her son's, if he was an adult. The donation, the formulation of the inscription and the title betray not a hint of dependency. The figure which emerges is an independent, at least moderately well-to-do, leader of the synagogue in Myndos—a woman.

In order to ascertain the exact functions of these women synagogue heads, a survey of the literary and inscriptive evidence for their male counterparts is necessary.
B. The Meaning of "Head of the Synagogue"

1. Literary References to the Title

In comparison with other titles of synagogue office, we have at our disposal considerable literary evidence for the title head of the synagogue. The sources, Jewish, Christian and pagan, include references to both Palestinian and Diaspora synagogues. For the first century, some of the best evidence is found in the New Testament. Mark 5:22,35,36,38 and the parallel Luke 8:49 mention an archisynagogos, Jairos by name, whose daughter is healed by Jesus. Interesting for our question is the parallel to Mark 5:22, Luke 8:41, where instead of archisynagogos, Luke writes archon tēs synagōgēs. That Luke considers the two to be synonymous is shown by his use of archisynagogos in 8:49. In Matt 9:18,23 we read neither archon tēs synagōgēs nor archisynagogos but rather simply archon. Does this mean that all three titles are synonymous?

Mention should be made here of a textual variant to Acts 14:2 found in the Western text (D, partially supported by syrhṃ̄ and cophG67). Instead of, "The unbelieving Jews stirred up and poisoned the minds of the Gentiles against the brothers" (i.e., Paul and Barnabas) the Western text has, "The heads of the synagogue of the Jews and the archons of the synagogue (syrhṃ̄ omits "of the synagogue," which would give the general meaning of "rulers," possibly identifying them as the rulers of Iconium) stirred up for themselves persecution against the righteous." Important here is the distinction between "heads of the synagogue" and "archons of the synagogue." One should keep in mind, however, that this is a later textual variant, which cannot be used as first-century evidence of this distinction. Further, this textual addition was made by a Christian, who may have had very little knowledge of a Jewish distinction between heads of the synagogue and archons, which would leave us to explain the seeming identification of head of the synagogue, archon of the synagogue and archon found in a synoptic comparison of the Jairos story, as well as within Luke himself (Lk 8:41 vs. 8:49). One could assume that either the identification found in the Jairos story or the distinction made in the Acts textual variant reflects actual Jewish practice or one could assume that the authors in question were not particularly familiar with Jewish synagogue organization and used the titles loosely. This could well be the case with Luke and the author of the textual addition.
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to Acts 14:2. It is difficult, however, to assume that Matthew, who was writing for Jewish-Christians, would have been unfamiliar with the organizational structure of the synagogue. Perhaps the problem can only be solved by assuming that titular practice varied as to geography and time. At any rate, since two Italian inscriptions (CII 265 from Rome: archôn and archi-synagogos; CII 553 from Capua: Alfius Juda, archôn, archisynagogos) give further attestation of a distinction between the two offices, it is probably safe to assume they were usually distinct.

A second question raised by the Jairus passage is whether there was more than one synagogue head in each synagogue (Mark 5:22: "one of the heads of the synagogue, Jairus by name"), but the meaning could simply be that Jairus was one of the class of heads of the synagogue rather than that several synagogue heads served in one synagogue.

Luke 13:10-17 is more instructive as to one of the functions of head of the synagogue. When Jesus healed a woman at the synagogue on the Sabbath, the head of the synagogue, "indignant because Jesus had healed on the Sabbath, said to the people, 'There are six days in which work ought to be done; come on those days and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day'" (Luke 13:14). From this passage it would seem that the head of the synagogue was responsible for keeping the congregation faithful to the Torah.

The Acts of the Apostles attests to the office of head of the synagogue in first-century Diaspora Judaism. When Paul and Barnabas come to Antioch of Pisidia and attend the synagogue service on the Sabbath, the heads of the synagogue invite them to give a word of exhortation to the people immediately following the reading of the law and the prophets (Acts 13:15). The plural "heads of the synagogue" is not insignificant here, for the only reasonable interpretation is that this synagogue possessed not just one head of the synagogue, but several. Further, their inviting Paul and Barnabas to give the sermon indicates a leadership role in the planning and organizing of the service, as well as the role of representative of the congregation vis-à-vis the visitors from abroad.

In Acts 18:1-17, which describes Paul's missionary activity in Corinth, we also find more than one head of the synagogue (Acts 18:8: Crispus, who had become a believer in Jesus; Acts 18:17: Sosthenes, who had not) in a single community, although from the passage it is not clear that they served in the same
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It seems probable that Sosthenes, who in Acts 18:17 is said to have been beaten by the crowd before the judgment seat of Gallio, is the leader of the group of Jews who had attacked Paul and dragged him before the proconsul Gallio with the complaint that Paul was "persuading people to worship God contrary to the law" (Acts 18:13). If Sosthenes was indeed the leader of this delegation, this would point to a function of leadership similar to the one we saw in Luke 13:10-17, where the head of the synagogue warned against transgressing the Torah by breaking the sabbath. Sosthenes' involvement indicates a sense of responsibility for keeping his people faithful to the law, as interpreted by him, as well as a representative role over against the Roman proconsul.

As for rabbinic sources on the first century, one must consider a Mishnaic passage, Yoma 7:1 (parallels: m. Sota 7:7,8). The context is the reading from the Torah on Yom Kippur (in m. Sota the septennial Sukkot reading of the Torah):

The sexton of the synagogue takes the Torah scroll and gives it to the head of the synagogue (or: of the assembly), and the head of the synagogue gives it to the adjutant high priest, and the adjutant high priest gives it to the high priest. The high priest stands and receives and reads it standing.54

Due to the etymological similarity between ṭauS hakkek- neset and archisynagogos, the identification between the two is likely. Since it is unclear what would be the purpose of a synagogue on the temple mount, and since Josephus55 and the Mishnaic tractate Middot do not mention such a synagogue in their descriptions of the temple, Frowald Hüttenmeister56 and others go against the older interpretation by doubting that such a synagogue existed. Sydney Hoenig translates ṭauS hakkekneset as "head of the assembly" and hazzan as "overseer of the assembly." He believes that they were "Pharisaic leaders of the Anshé Maamad who were stationed in the Temple as the lay participants alongside the Sadducean officiants."57 If such were to be the case, this would be a rather different meaning of head of the synagogue than is attested elsewhere, i.e., the synagogue head as leader of an individual synagogue. An alternative proposal which would not presuppose the existence of a synagogue on the temple
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mount, would be that the hazzan and the r’ōs hakkēneset mentioned here were synagogue functionaries in one of the many synagogues of Jerusalem and were selected for the special honor of passing the Torah scroll to the high priest in the Yom Kippur (and Sukkot) services. The number of persons in the chain of passing certainly seems more than absolutely necessary and must therefore have something to do with honor. According to this interpretation, the hazzan and the r’ōs hakkēneset would be the two representatives of synagogue officials (or of the laity, as Hoenig suggests) in the festival service.

The only r’ōs bêt hakkēneset known to us by name from rabbinic literature is Shagbion (SGBTHN, variant Shavion, SBTWN), who was r’ōs bêt hakkēneset (note the alternative form of the title) in Akhzziv in the time of Rabban Gamliel (II), i.e., in the second half of the first century.

The later rabbinic evidence is no less scattered than the material discussed thus far. One is once again reminded of how much the rabbinic authorities differed from their Christian neighbors, the latter producing numerous and complex church orders, while the former displayed little interest in defining the duties of the respective synagogue officers. After the Mishnaic passages discussed above, the earliest rabbinic evidence is found in t. Meg. 4.21 (Zuck. 227): "The head of the synagogue should not read (from the scripture) until others have told him that there is no one." Could this imply that the head of the synagogue was responsible for asking others to read, but did not read himself (or herself)? This would fit in well with Acts 13:15, where the heads of the synagogue ask Paul and Barnabas to preach (rather than preaching themselves).

In b. Pesah 49b (top) a list has been put together for the young man seeking a wife. It forms a sort of catalogue of highly respected positions in Judaism:

Our rabbis taught: Let a man always sell all he has and marry the daughter of a scholar. If he does not find the daughter of a scholar, let him marry the daughter of [one of] the great men of the generation. If he does not find the daughter of [one of] the great men of the generation, let him marry the daughter of a head of synagogues. If he does not
find the daughter of a head of synagogues, let him marry the daughter of a charity treasurer. If he does not find the daughter of a charity treasurer, let him marry the daughter of an 'am ha-aretz because they are detestable and their wives are vermin, and of their daughters it is said, "Cursed be he that lieth with any manner of beast" (Deut 27:21).62

This passage shows which positions the rabbis considered to be the highest; head of the synagogue is listed third, after scholar and great men of the generation (probably a title of civic leadership) and before charity treasurer and children's teacher. This view is from a particular perspective, and it is therefore easy to understand why scholar would rank highest. One must be cautious about using this list as an objective presentation of how all Jews would have ranked professions and offices. Given this particular perspective, slot number three in the list may well imply that the head of the synagogue was normally a person of some learning. The whole thrust of the advice given here is not to marry the daughter of an 'am ha-aretz, i.e., the contrast is between ignorance of the law and knowledge of it. This confirms the image of the head of the synagogue which has been emerging from the literary passages referred to thus far.

A further sign of the honor in which the rabbis held the head of the synagogue is the directive in a baraita to drink a glass of wine in honor of the head of the synagogue at a funeral ceremony (y. Ber. 6a,28-29).63

Several fourth-century laws preserved in the Theodosian Code further attest that the head of the synagogue was one of the main synagogue officials. Cod. Theod. 16.8.4 reads:

Idem A. hieresis et archisynagogis et patribus synagogarum et ceteris, qui in eodem loco deserviunt. Hieros et archisynagogos et patres synagogarum et ceteros, qui synagogis deserviunt, ab omni corporali munere liberos esse praecipimus. Dat. kal. dec. Constant(i)o)p(oli) Basso et Ablavio cons.

The same Augustus to the priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all others who serve in the said place.

We command that priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all others who serve the synagogues shall be free from every compulsory public service of a corporal nature.

Given on the kalends of December at Constantinople in the year of the consulship of Bassus and Ablavius (December 1, 331; 330).65
The legal assumption is that since these officials are already fulfilling a *munus*, they should be liberated from the public *munera corporalia*.\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Cod. Theod.} 16.8.13 from the year 397 reaffirms certain privileges for synagogue heads and other Jewish officials, among which are the exemption from the forced public service of decurions and the right to live according to their own laws.

\textit{Idem AA. Caesario p(raefecto) p(raetori)o. Iudaei sint obstricti caerimoniiis suis: nos interea in conservandis eorum privilegiis veteres imitemur, quorum sanctionibus definitum est, ut privilegia his, qui inlustrium patriarcharum dicioni subjecti sunt, archisynagogis patriarchisque ac presbyteris ceterisque, qui in eius religionis sacramento versantur, nutu nostri numinis perseverent ea, quae venerandae Christianae legis primis clericis sanctimonia deferuntur. Id enim et divi principes Constantinus et Constantius, Valentinianus et Valens divino arbitrio decreverunt. Sint igitur etiam a curialibus munere aliennis pareantque legibus suis. Dat. kal. ivl. Caesario et Attico conss.}\textsuperscript{67}

The same Augustuses to Caesarius, Praetorian Prefect. Jews shall be bound by their own ritual. Meanwhile, in preserving their privileges, We shall imitate the ancients by whose sanctions it has been determined that privileges shall be preserved for those who are subject to the rule of the Illustrious Patriarchs, for the heads of the synagogues, the patriarchs, and the elders, and all the rest who are occupied in the ceremonial of that religion, namely those privileges according to the consent of Our Imperial Divinity, which by virtue of their holy office are conferred on the chief clergy of the venerable Christian religion. The foregoing, indeed, was decreed by the divine imperial authority of the sainted Emperors Constantine and Constantius, Valentinian and Valens. Such Jews shall therefore be exempt from the compulsory public services of decurions and shall obey their own laws.

Given on the kalends of July in the year of the consulship of Caesarius and Atticus (July 1, 397).\textsuperscript{68}

While these two laws do not give us actual details of any of the concrete functions of synagogue heads, \textit{Cod. Theod.} 16.8.14 from the year 399, under the emperor Honorius, does:

\textit{Idem AA. Messalae p(raefecto) p(raetori)o. Superstitionis indignae est, ut archisynagogi sive presbyteri Iudaeorum vel quos ipsi apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum adque argentum a patriarcha certo tempore diriguntur, a singulis synagogis exacta summan adque susceptam ad eundem reportent. Qua de re omne, quidquid considerata temporis ratione confidimus esse collectum, fideliter ad nostrum dirigatur aerarium: de cetero autem nihil praedicto decernimus esse mittendum. Noverint igitur populi Iudaeorum removisse nos depraedationis huiusmodi functionem. Quod si qui ab illo depopulatore Iudaeorum ad hoc officium exactionis fuerint directi, judicibus offerantur, ita ut tamquam in legum nostrarum violatores sententia proferatur. Dat. iii id. april. Med(iolano) Theodoro v. d. cons.}\textsuperscript{69}
The same Augustuses to Messala, Praetorian Prefect. It is characteristic of an unworthy superstition that the heads of the synagogues or the elders of the Jews or those whom they themselves call apostles, who are dispatched by the patriarch at a certain time to collect gold and silver, should bring back to the patriarch the sum which has been exacted and collected from each of the synagogues. Wherefore, everything that We are confident has been collected, taking into consideration the period of time, shall be faithfully dispatched to Our treasury. For the future, moreover, We decree that nothing shall be sent to the aforesaid patriarch. The people of the Jews shall know, therefore, that We have abolished the practice of such depredation. But if any persons should be sent on such a mission of collection by that despoiler of the Jews, they shall be brought before the judges, in order that a sentence may be pronounced against them as violators of Our laws.

Given on the third day before the ides of April at Milan in the year of the consulship of the Most Noble Theodorus (April 11, 399).

The practice presupposed here is a continuation of the ancient practice of each male Jew annually contributing a half-shekel to support the temple in Jerusalem. After the destruction of the temple, a similar practice grew in its stead, with the money going to support the patriarch in Palestine. From this description, one could assume that the synagogue heads and presbyters collect money in their individual synagogues and then turn it over to the apostles who have been sent by the patriarch to collect the money and to bring it back to him. One could also interpret the passage to mean that some of the money was brought directly by synagogue heads and elders, while some of it was brought by the apostles sent out for this purpose.

The value of these three laws is that they give an outsider's view, i.e., that of the lawgiver, of the internal leadership structure of the synagogue. In the eye of the lawgiver, the head of the synagogue was one of the main, if not the main, synagogue functionaries.

Several patristic sources make reference to synagogue heads. In Dialogue with Trypho 137, Justin Martyr (died ca. 165) delivers the following exhortation to Jews:

Σωμάτες οὖν ὑπὸ λοιδόρητε ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, μηδὲ φαρισαίοις πειθόμενοι διὰσκάλοις τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισκόπητε ποτε, ἐπιταχθοῦσον οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι ὑμῶν, μετὰ τὴν προσευχήν.

Do not agree to abuse the Son of God, nor follow the Pharisees as teachers in jesting at the King of Israel, as your synagogue heads teach you, according to the prayer.
While the polemical nature of this passage must serve as a warning not to accept it at face value, the image of head of the synagogue as spiritual and intellectual leader in no way contradicts what we have seen up to this point; it rather confirms it.

Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 315-403), in his discussion of the Jewish-Christian Ebionites, writes:

.ACCESSOU Oλ, καὶ παρ' ἁλικίαν ἐκγαμίζουσι τοὺς νέους, ἐξ ἐπιτροπῆς ἔθεσεν τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς διδασκάλων. Πρεσβύτεροι γὰρ οὗτοι ἔχουσι καὶ ἄρχουσιναγώγους. Συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ οὔχ ἐκκλησίαν, τῇ κρισιμίᾳ δὲ δύναται μόνον σεμνὸνονται.

Their young men, having attained the marriageable age, are given to marriage under coercion, on account of a decision of their teachers, for they have elders and synagogue heads, and they call their church a synagogue and not a church and honor Christ in name only.73

It seems that the Jewish-Christians described here maintained the traditional synagogue organizational structure. While we do not know to what extent Epiphanius actually had direct contact with Jewish-Christians, there seems no reason to doubt that Jewish-Christians would have maintained Jewish organizational structures. If this bit of information is not a reflection of the fourth century, then it may have come down to Epiphanius from his sources and reflect an earlier period. What is interesting here is that synagogue heads and elders are classified as teachers.

Palladius, in his Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom, probably written around 408 in Syene in Egypt, states that the ("corrupt and falsely named") patriarch of the Jews changes yearly, as do the synagogue heads, in order to gain wealth, for the buying and selling of the priesthood is a Jewish (and Egyptian) custom.74 The context of this statement is a discussion of six bishops who were accused of having attained their office by the payment of money, whereby the Christian rejection of the practice is contrasted with the Jewish tolerance of it. Given this polemical purpose, one should be more sceptical of taking this remark at face value than is Jean Juster, who notes, "This text proves that the archisynagogue was nominated for a term."75 Palladius himself does not state that he is personally familiar with this Jewish practice, but rather employs the vague introductory formula "it is said" (phasis).

Several further Christian sources do not seem reliable enough to warrant a detailed discussion. The Acts of Pilate,76 which mentions heads of the synagogue throughout, seems to have drawn upon a sort of catalogue of known Jewish titles (synagogue
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Heads, Levites, elders, priests, high priests) and combined them at random to create scenes in which Jewish leaders debated and deliberated in council meetings. Further, the passages in Ambrose and Jerome cited by Juster to support his theory that synagogue heads had to have a knowledge of medicine, do not seem particularly convincing to me.

Pagan authors were also familiar with the title. In Flavius Vopiscus' Life of Saturninus 8, Scriptores Historiae Augustae 3.398-399 is preserved a letter from the emperor Hadrian (117-138) to his brother-in-law Servianus. Among the various negative comments about Egypt we read:

Illic qui Serapem colunt Christiani sunt, et devoti sunt Serapi qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Iudaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes.

Those who worship Serapis are in fact Christians, and those who call themselves bishops of Christ are, in fact, devotees of Serapis. There is no head of the Jewish synagogue, no Samaritan, no Christian elder, who is not an astrologer, a soothsayer, or an anointer.79

Of interest here is the parallelization between Christian bishop, Christian elder and Jewish synagogue head.80 This is a further attestation that the title was well known.

The emperor Alexander Severus (222-235) was called the "Syrian archisynagogus" by his opponents, most likely because he was friendly to the Jewish people. This simply serves to underscore that "head of the synagogue" was the official Jewish title most widely known in the ancient world.

2. Inscriptional References to the Title

Well over thirty Greek and Latin inscriptions making mention of synagogue heads are known to modern scholarship.82 Of these, three make reference to women synagogue heads. The geographical spread is large: Italy, Greece, Macedonia, Moesia, Asia Minor, Cyprus, Syria, Palestine, and Africa. The chronological span is also considerable, ranging from before the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. until well into the Byzantine period.

What can we learn from these inscriptions about the function of the synagogue head? Taking note of the fact that a number of synagogue heads are mentioned as donating portions of the synagogue or of restoring the synagogue, it is tempting to conclude that the head of the synagogue was in charge of maintaining the
physical plant of the synagogue. Unfortunately, this argument falls in the face of the fact that bearers of other titles, as well as bearers of no titles, are also listed as donors in numerous inscriptions. Furthermore, the very nature of epigraphical material is such that we must expect building activity to be mentioned fairly frequently. One memorialized donations in inscriptions. Bookkeeping, organizing the religious service, administering the guest house and ritual bath, exhorting the congregation to follow the commandments or any of the other functions which must have been performed by synagogue officials did not merit public inscriptions. Mention of these is more likely to occur in literature, if at all.

If the inscriptions cannot help us to define accurately the functions of the head of the synagogue, they can nevertheless provide us with useful information. For example, on the basis of inscriptive evidence, one must conclude that the head of the synagogue was distinct from the archon. In CII 265 and CII 553, one person holds both titles, indicating that they cannot be synonymous. Further, CII 766 lists a head of the synagogue—fore-life, a head of the synagogue and an archon, as if these were different offices.

Of special interest is the Theodotos inscription (CII 1404; Lifshitz, *Donateurs*, no. 79) which was found on Mount Ophel in Jerusalem and dates from before the destruction of the temple:

```
Θ[ε]όδοτος Οὐστήθως, ἱερεὺς καὶ
2 ἄρχων[αγώνος, υἱὸς ἄρχου] ἵππον, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχοντῆς τοῦ νόμου καὶ εἰς ἅγια[ὴν έντολ[ήν, καὶ]
4 τὴν συναγω[γὴν εἰς ἄν[άγιω[σ[ιν] νόμου καὶ εἰς ἅγια[ὴν έντολ[ήν, καὶ]
6 τ[ῷ ἔξωδο[ν, καὶ] τά δόματα καὶ τά χρη[σ[ι]μάτα τῶν θε[άτων εἰς κατάλυμα το[ι-
```

Theodotos, son of Vettenos, priest and head of the synagogue, son of a head of the synagogue, grandson of a head of the synagogue, built the synagogue for the reading of the law and the teaching of the commandments, and the hostel and the side rooms and the water facilities, as lodging for those from abroad who need it). His fathers and the elders and Simonides founded it (i.e., the synagogue).

From this we get a vivid picture of the types of activities occurring in a synagogue complex. In addition to the reading of scripture and the study of the commandments, we read of a guest house for visitors from abroad, which was probably especially necessary in Jerusalem, as well as water facilities, most likely
for ritual purposes. Each of these items required administration, and while the active participation of the congregation must be presupposed, it is nevertheless reasonable to assume that synagogue officers had a special responsibility in the administration of all these aspects of synagogue life. The officers mentioned in this inscription are synagogue heads and elders. This does not mean that this congregation had no other officers, but it does imply a sort of council which formed the founding body. 98

It is tempting to conclude from the fact that Theodotos' father and grandfather were also synagogue heads that the office was hereditary. CII 587, 99 which speaks of the child synagogue head Kallistos, who died at the age of three years and three months, would serve to strengthen this hypothesis, as would CII 584, 100 which speaks of Joseph, head of the synagogue, son of Joseph, head of the synagogue. It may be that the office was hereditary in the cases mentioned, but if we assume that it was hereditary everywhere, then there is no way of explaining the phrase "head-for-life of the synagogue" (ho dia biou archi-synaaggoς), which occurs in CII 744 101 and 766, 102 for that implies that not every head of the synagogue was one for life. 103 Also of importance is Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 85 104 which, according to Lifshitz's reconstruction, mentions a person who had been head of the synagogue five times, which obviously implies temporary terms of office. If most synagogue heads served for a term only, then they must have been elected or appointed, for a title bestowed by inheritance would surely be for life. A further factor which makes it unlikely that the title archi-synaggoς was generally an inherited one is that the title which the son bore was not always that of his father. In CII 504, for example, the son is a gerusiarch, while the father is an archi-synaggoς. 105 Here the office of archi-synaggoς could not have been hereditary. At most one could imagine that we are dealing with the custom of honoring the son of an office-bearer by appointing or electing him to an office, be it that of his father or another. 106

Part of the general difficulty in evaluating these hints that the office may have been hereditary, as well as the literary evidence for the patriarch's having appointed the synagogue heads annually, which was discussed above, is the temptation to take one piece of evidence as applying to all places and for the entire period in question. Rather than taking the Theodotos inscription (CII 1404) and the two inscriptions from Venosa
(CII 584 and 587) as proof that the office of synagogue head was hereditary, it seems more reasonable to assume that these indicate the special honor in which the son of a synagogue head was held, this honor being expressed in his being (automatically?) appointed or elected to an office, sometimes the same as his father and sometimes not. This reverence could even extend to infants (e.g., CII 587); the boy received the title of the office he would fill when he came of age.

CII 681, 107 766 108 and 804 109 provide us with a further warning not to assume that the only way to attain the title of synagogue head was by inheritance. In each of these inscriptions the son is a head of the synagogue, and the father bears no title. Thus we see that, although the modern scholar would like very much to have a clear answer as to how a synagogue head was selected, there is no one solution which fits all the literary and epigraphical evidence. It is best to assume that there was no unified practice in this regard. Probably some were appointed by a council or an individual, some were elected, and some inherited the office. Some persons seem to have been synagogue heads for life and others for a period of time.

One inscription deserves special mention because of the constellation of office holders it presents to us. CII 803 (Lifshitz, Donateurs 38) 110 is dated to the year 391 and was found, along with many other mosaic inscriptions, in the floor of a synagogue ruin in Apamea in Syria. It reads:

'Επὶ τῶν τιμωτάτων ἄρχουσιν[γώ]-
2 γων Εὐσεβίου καὶ Νεμίου καὶ Φινέου
καὶ Θεοδόρου γερουσιάρχου καὶ τῶν
4 τιμωτάτων πρεσβυτέρων Εἰσακίου
καὶ Σαουλοῦ καὶ λοιπῶν, Ἴλασιος, ἄρχουσινάκ
6 γωγος Ἀντιοχέων, ἐποίησεν τὴν ἱεραδον τοῦ
ψηφίου πό(δας) ρυ', ἐτους γυ' Εὐδένεου ζ'. Εὐλογεῖα πάσι.

L. 4: read τιμωτάτων.
L. 6: read ἱεραδον.

At the time of the most illustrious heads of the synagogue Eusebios, Nemios and Phineos, and under the gerusiarch Theodoros, and the most illustrious elders Eisakios and Saulos and the others, Ilasios, head of the synagogue of the Antiochenes, made the entrance of the mosaic, 150 feet, in the year 703, in the seventh month of Audyneos. Blessing on all.

Three offices are mentioned: head of the synagogue, gerusiarch and elder. If the order of offices implies order of importance, then head of the synagogue was the highest office in this synagogue. The fact that Eusebios, Nemios and Phineos were all
serving as heads of the synagogue in the year 391 is an important piece of evidence for the debate as to whether more than one archisynagogos could serve simultaneously.111 Probably Theodoros the gerusiarch presided over the council of the elders,112 who seem to be too numerous to mention.

How Ilasios fits into this picture is unclear. His title, archisynagogos of the Antiochenes, surely cannot imply that he was the sole synagogue head in Antioch, as Jean-Baptiste Frey imagines.113 In such a large city as Antioch, which had a considerable Jewish population, there must certainly have been many synagogue heads.114 Perhaps Ilasios served as synagogue head for a group of people from Antioch who had moved to Apamea and become part of the community there.

3. Reconstruction of the Office of Head of the Synagogue

The reader with a sensitivity for chronology, geography, genre and religious tradition will doubtlessly be overwhelmed by the variety of material cited, and cited side by side, as if Moesia were Jerusalem and the first century were the fifth. This colorful mixture of quotations of the friends and enemies of the ancient synagogue heads should at the very least remind us of how little we know of the office they held. The dream of every historian of religion is to trace a development, to differentiate, to set the late fourth-century Apamean synagogue head in sharp relief against the first-century Roman one. It is not for lack of desire that this will not be done. It is for lack of evidence.

If there is not enough evidence to trace a development, there is also not so little evidence as to evoke general despair of knowing anything. The evidence clearly permits us to say, for example, that "head of the synagogue" was one of the best, if not the best, known titles of synagogue office. One could call Alexander Severus the "Syrian archisynagogus" and the meaning was clear. I would propose the following reconstruction of what seems to have been the leading office in the ancient synagogue.

Was there more than one synagogue head in each synagogue?

The evidence (Mark 5:22; Acts 13:15; CII 766, 803; possibly Acts 18:8,17) suggests that more than one synagogue head could serve in a synagogue at a time. No ancient source limits the number to one.115
How was a head of the synagogue selected?

There seems to have been more than one method of selection. The two inscriptions mentioning synagogue heads who were sons of synagogue heads (CII 584, 1404) and the one mentioning an infant head of the synagogue (CII 587) suggest that the office was hereditary. The two inscriptions mentioning a head-for-life of the synagogue (CII 766, 744), as well as the one which possibly speaks of a person having been head of the synagogue five times (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 85), suggest that not all held the office for life and that some were selected in a way other than by inheritance. Although election is not mentioned in connection with synagogue heads, it should not be excluded as a possibility. If there is a kernel of truth to the note in Palladius (Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom 15) about the patriarch's appointing synagogue heads, then this could be seen in connection with Cod. Theod. 16.8.15 with its mention of "persons whom the patriarchs have placed in authority over others." This would mean that among those officials whom the patriarch appointed were included some heads of the synagogue.

What were the functions of the head of the synagogue?

If the synagogue was for "the reading of the law and the teaching of the commandments" (CII 1404), then it is logical to assume that the synagogue head was responsible in a special way for seeing that this was done. Our sources confirm this. Given the thrust of thebaraitha in b. Pesah 49b, it seems that the head of the synagogue was a person learned in the law. It follows that a major function of the head of the synagogue was the exhortation and spiritual direction of the congregation (Lk 13:10-17; possibly Acts 18:12-17), which included teaching (Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho 137; Epiphanius, Panarion 30.18.2). It was the synagogue heads who invited members of the congregation to preach (Acts 13:15); apparently they did not themselves read from scripture unless no one else was able (t. Meg. 4.21). M. Yoma 7:1 and m. Sota 7:7-8 report on a special liturgical function accorded to one synagogue (or assembly?) head during a holiday service. The synagogue heads, together with the elders, collected money from their congregations to be sent to the patriarch (Cod. Theod. 16.8.14,17). While responsibility for erecting new synagogues and restoring old ones was not limited to the head of the synagogue, synagogue
heads were among those who felt especially responsible for the building and restoration of synagogues, drawing upon their own funds when necessary (CII 722, 744, 756, 766, 803, 804, 1404, etc.). It is possible that synagogue heads were often members of leading families who were financially able to perform this service.

Using the analogy of Diaspora Jewish leaders today, the ancient Diaspora head of the synagogue was probably both a leader for the congregation and representative of the congregation vis-à-vis non-Jewish neighbors and Roman authorities. (Possibly Acts 18:12-17 is to be seen in this light.) As in the Jewish Diaspora today, the civic and religious functions were probably seldom sharply distinguished.

What was the relationship between the head of the synagogue and other synagogue officials?

The head of the synagogue seems to have been the leading functionary in the ancient synagogue. In inscriptions, wherever synagogue heads are mentioned, they are mentioned first in the list (CII 766, 803). In the Theodosian Code the order varies (cf. Cod. Theod. 16.8.4,13,14). In m. Yoma 7:1 and m. Sota 7:7-8 the head of the synagogue occurs before the sexton and after the high priest and the adjutant high priest; in other words, here too, the head of the synagogue is the first of the synagogue officials named, (if the reference is to a synagogue official). In the baraita in b. Pesah. 49b the head of the synagogue does not occur first in the list, but rather after scholar and great ones of the generation and before charity treasurer and teacher of children, but then this is not a list of synagogue officials.

That the head of the synagogue was the main synagogue functionary is further supported by the fact that the title is the one chosen by Alexander Severus's enemies to mock his friendship with the Jews and is the one used in Hadrian's letter to Servianus to single out the typical Jewish official for mockery.

Was the head of the synagogue identical with the archon?

It seems that in most cases archisynagogos must be distinguished from archôn (CII 265, 553, 766; the Western text of Acts 14:2). The identification between the two implicit in the synoptic comparison of the Jairus story (Matt 9:18,23; Mark 5:22,35,36,38; Luke 8:41,49) could be a loose use of terminology,
a reflection of a time or place in which the two terms were interchangeable, or a mistake.

4. The Role of Women Synagogue Heads

Given the evidence for women heads of the synagogue, and using the proposed reconstruction of the office of synagogue head as a base, what can one say about the role these women might have had? Or did they even have a role? Perhaps the title was purely honorific after all?

The two arguments adduced in favor of the title's being honorific are:

1. The women received the title from their husbands (M. Weinberg, S. Krauss, S. W. Baron, J.-B. Frey, A. C. Bandy);

2. In the later period the title was honorific for both women and men (S. Reinach, Th. Reinach);

3. In the case of women, the title must be honorific (E. Schürer, J. Juster).

Erwin Goodenough's translation, which makes Theopempte a man, will not be discussed here.

Concerning the wife thesis, one searches in vain for the husbands in question. In the three inscriptions with women synagogue heads, no husbands are mentioned. Further, Rufina and Theopempte give the impression of a certain autonomy (control of one's own funds, household and business affairs); if they were married, the marriage seems to have allowed for a certain independence on the part of the women. The fact that Theopempte's son Eusebios does not bear a title shows that, if his father had one, he did not inherit it. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that Theopempte could have received the title from her husband, but it does call into question the connection between women's titles and children's titles made by modern scholars, the implication being that the former are the wives of, the latter the sons of, synagogue officials. Finally, in the three inscriptions where wives of synagogue heads are named (CII 265, 553, 744), they do not in fact bear the title of their husbands. In other words, there is no case where both husband and wife are called synagogue heads. Where women are called synagogue heads, we have no evidence that they were even married at the time of the inscription.

No less questionable is the thesis of the brothers Reinach that in the later period the title was honorific for both women and men. From the survey of the evidence for synagogue heads it
is evident that no ancient sources allude to this possibility. Indeed, as discussed above, we cannot assume that such honorific titles even existed in the ancient synagogue. Further, it is rather unclear what is meant by "late." Since Salomon Reinach dates the Rufina inscription to not before the third century, one wonders how he would deal, for example, with the fourth-century references in the Theodosian Code to heads of the synagogue (16.8.4 [331]; 16.8.13 [397]; 16.8.14 [399]) or with CII 803 from Apamea in Syria dated to 391 and mentioning synagogue heads. These can certainly not be said to be honorific titles, and yet they probably post-date the Rufina inscription. One has the suspicion that the theory of the later development into an honorific title was created expressly for the purpose of interpreting the Rufina inscription and then came in quite handy for the Theopempte inscription when it was discovered some years later. In any case, there is no support for this theory in the literary and insessional evidence surveyed.

As for the argument that the titles must be honorific by virtue of the femininity of the holders, it is difficult to discuss this in a few sentences. In a sense it is much more honest than the two theories just presented, for the author states his basic assumption clearly and without embellishment. It forces the discussion to where it should be, namely at the question of whether it is inconceivable that a woman was a leader in the ancient synagogue. We are in possession of three ancient inscriptions in which women bear the title head of the synagogue. It is our task to interpret these in the context of other ancient references to women officers of the synagogue. If the presupposition is that a woman was not capable of fulfilling the office of synagogue head or that the ancient synagogue considered all women, qua women, incapable or unfit, then one must produce a plausible explanation for the existence of these three inscriptions. They themselves call into question certain presuppositions about the history of Jewish women.

It is true that there are certain indications that women's lives were restricted in a number of ways in ancient Judaism, but a word of caution is in order here. Modern scholarship does not possess the Jewish literature which would be the proper companion to our inscriptions, namely Graeco-Jewish literature from the early Byzantine period from Asia Minor or Crete or even any Graeco-Jewish literature from this period or even any Jewish literature from Asia Minor or Crete.
Rather than trying to fit these inscriptions into our pre-conceived notions of what women were (and are) and of what Judaism was, would it not be more reasonable to take these inscriptions as a challenge to our pre-conceptions, as traces of a Judaism of which we know very little? It is, of course, not sufficient simply to make counter-assertions to the statement that archisynagōgos was a purely honorific title when borne by women. It is necessary to produce a counter-reconstruction which is more convincing than the view that these women did nothing.

I propose the following reconstruction. Women synagogue heads, like their male counterparts, were active in administration and exhortation. They may have worked especially with women, although we should not assume that they worked only with women. Perhaps they looked after the financial affairs of the synagogue, administering it as Rufina administered her large household; perhaps they exhorted their congregations, reminding them to keep the sabbath as had the synagogue head in Luke 13:14 before them. We must assume that they had a knowledge of the Torah in order to be able to teach and exhort others in it.

Rufina, Sophia and Theopempte could have worked in a team of two or three synagogue heads, for we have seen that the number was not necessarily restricted to one. Or perhaps they served alone. A community like Myndos could well have selected Theopempte, a woman who had donated to the synagogue, possibly a widow at this time, as its sole archisynagōgos. And perhaps the Jewish congregation in Smyrna considered itself fortunate to have such an able administrator as Rufina as its sole synagogue head. Whether they served alone or with others we cannot say; either is possible.

How did these women come to this high office? Rufina, for example, was wealthy. Perhaps she came from a leading and learned Jewish family, and the congregation honored her with this office much as they would have honored her brother. Or possibly she was the daughter of a leading Roman family, as the name suggests, and the congregation wished to honor a high-born newcomer to Judaism with a responsibility worthy of her descent. Theopempte also had certain funds at her disposal. Had she shown such an active interest in seeing the new synagogue built that the congregation rewarded her with this office? Sophia of Gortyn, both elder and head of the synagogue, must have been very actively involved in the affairs of the synagogue. Was it her long years of work that convinced even the most skeptical that a woman was capable of filling that office? Family ties, long
years of active involvement, largesse--these have often played a role in attaining various offices and seem as likely in the case of women as of men. Whether they were appointed or elected we do not know.

The final key to the interpretation of these three inscriptions, as well as of those which follow, lies in accepting this reconstruction as historically plausible, or in refuting it as historically impossible.
CHAPTER II

WOMAN AS LEADER

A. The Inscriptional Evidence for a Woman as Leader

One of the more recent additions to our knowledge of women leaders in ancient Judaism is the Peristeria inscription, first published in 1937, from the area of Thebes in Phthiotis in Thessaly.

Thebes in Phthiotis (Thessaly)

CII 696h. A kioniskos (also called columnella: a small column, flat on top and without a capital, used as a gravestone) with the symbol of the seven-branched menorah.

Μνήμα
2 Περιστερίας
4 γίος.

Ll. 3-4: read ἀρχηγίας (genitive of ἀρχηγίας).

Tomb of Peristeria, leader.

G. Sotirou, who discovered the inscription, took peristeria to be a common noun (cf. peristera, "pigeon," "dove"), and Archégisis to be the name of the deceased. Louis Robert suggested the interpretation given above, on the basis that a common noun peristeria is inexplicable here. Robert explains the proper name Peristeria as one of the Greek personal names formed from the names of animals, comparing it to Peristera (from peristera).

The title archégissa he explains as the feminine equivalent of the term archégos which occurs on a Jewish gold medallion now at the Jewish Museum in London.

CII 731g.

ἐνέρ γυνής ἴ-
2 αἰωθ ἀρχιγοῦ
πιννωνῆ.

L. 2: read ἀρχηγοῦ.

In accordance with a vow of Jacob, president, the setter of pearls.
Robert points out that although archēgos is not attested elsewhere as a Jewish title, the Latin principalis, which occurs in an inscription from Moesia, could be a parallel:

CII 681.

Ioses arcisna
2 et principales
filius Maximini
4 Pannoni sibi et
Qyriae coiugi
6 sui vivo suo me-
moria dedica-

L. 1: read arcisynagogus (ἀρχισυνάγωγος).
L. 2: read principalis.
L. 5: read coiugi.
Ll. 6-7: read guae vivo se memoriam.7

Ioses, head of the synagogue and leader, son of Maximinus Pannonus, dedicated this monument, while still alive, for his wife and himself.

Thus, Robert considers the title archēgissa to be the female equivalent of archēgos, which occurs only once in the Jewish inscriptions, but has its Latin equivalent in principalis. Robert is in no way disturbed by an ancient Jewish woman bearing an official title; on the contrary, he refers to other Jewish women bearing titles in inscriptions.

Robert's suggestion that Peristeria is a proper noun and archēgissa a title is convincing. In order to interpret archēgissa in the context of ancient Judaism, a study of possible meanings is required. Since archēgissa is, to my knowledge, a hapax legomenon, the search for its meaning must concentrate on archēgos (m. and f.), the word from which it was derived.

The only other Jewish inscription found on this site, CII 696a, a stele with a seven-branched menorah, a lulav and a dove, does not provide further information about the organizational structure of the congregation:

Μνήμα Σαου-
2 λ και τῆς αὐτοῦ
γαμητῆς 'Αννᾶς.

The tomb of Saul and his wife Anna.

B. Archēgos in Ancient Literature and Inscriptions

Archēgos appears both as an adjective, meaning "beginning," "originating," "primary," "leading," "chief," and as a noun,
meaning "founder" (as of a family), "ancestral heroine," "prince," "chief," "first cause," "originator" or "originating power." An archēgos could be a deity, and thus Plato reports that the Egyptians said that Neith was the founder of Sais in Egypt, while the Greeks said it was Athena, and the daughters of Ascopus (Salamis, Aegina, Thebe, Sinope, etc.) were considered to be the ancestral heroines of cities. Archēgos could also be the human ancestor of a tribe or family. The word can also mean "leader," and it is in this sense that Eusebius calls his opponent Marcellus "leader of the godless heretics," and an inscription from Dijon, France refers to a man named Chyndonax as archēgos of the priests (CIG 6798).

In the LXX, archēgos translates a number of Hebrew words, but most often ḫāsin, in the sense of military, political or clan leader (Exod 6:14; Num 13:3; 14:4; 25:4; Deut 33:21; Judg 9:44; 1 Chr 5:24; 8:28; 12:21; Neh 7:70-71; 11:16-17; Lam 2:10). Archēgos as a translation of qāgin, "chief," "ruler" (Judg 11:6, 11; Isa 3:6,7) and šar, "prince," "official," "governor" (Judg 5:15; 1 Chr 26:26; Neh 2:9; Isa 30:4) is also relatively frequent. Josephus uses archēgos five times, three times in the sense "originator," "author" (of crimes: Ant. 7.9.3520; of trouble: Ant. 20.6.38136; of legal violations: Ag. Ap. 1.270), and twice in the sense of "ancestor," "founder of our race" (Ag. Ap. 1.71,130). Philo uses archēgos in the meaning "leader," "chief" (Leg. alleg. 3.175 [Num 14:4; Hebrew: ṭōš; De somn. 1.89 [Num 25:4; Hebrew: rōš ḫāʿam]); much more common in Philonic usage is the related archēgētēs, which refers to Adam as the founder of the human race (De opific. 79,136,142), Seth, "the head of our race" (De poster. 42), God, as the originator of the universe (De ebriet. 42), the twelve sons of Jacob (De fuga 73), etc.

In the NT Christ is the archēgos, i.e., originator of life (Acts 3:15), of salvation (Heb 2:10), and of faith (Heb 12:2), as well as archēgos kai sōtēr, i.e., leader and savior (Acts 5:31).

This survey has yielded three basic meanings of archēgos:
1. ancestral hero or heroine, founder;
2. originator;
3. leader, chief.

C. The Meaning of archēgissa/archēgos in Jewish Inscriptions

For the two archēgissa/archēgos inscriptions (CII 696b, 731g), the second meaning cannot apply, for one must be the originator of something, and in neither inscription is there a
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genitive to indicate that something. The third meaning, "leader," "chief" is a plausible one, although it is not possible to define it more accurately in relation to other Jewish offices. If, as Robert has suggested, the equivalent of principalis (CII 681), then archegos is not a substitute for archisynagogos, because the Ioses of CII 681 bears both titles: archisynagogos et principal(is). However, since Jewish titles differed from locality to locality, archegissa/archegos may in fact have been the equivalent of archisynagogos in Peristeria's (CII 696b) or in Jacob's (CII 731g) community. Since there is no further indication either in the inscriptions themselves or in Jewish literature, one cannot decide definitively whether archegissa/archegos means leader of the Jewish civic community or of the worship congregation, but this distinction would apply only in areas where these two were not the same. Perhaps the Jewish community in Thebes in Phthiotis was so small that this distinction is irrelevant.

Given the background of the term archegos, however, another meaning also presents itself. We have seen that archegos in the sense of "ancestor," "founder" was widespread among both Jews and non-Jews, whereby the reference was nearly always to an ancestral figure or to a deity. Could it be that archegissa/archegos meant "founder of the Jewish community" in a particular city? One must admit that this would be a somewhat new meaning for this term, a further development of the meaning "ancestral founder" of a city, a clan, a race, but in a time in which Judaism was still a missionary religion, it is possible that the founder of a community could have been a revered figure, and by this title, have been compared to the ancestral founders of cities, families, etc. In the writings of the Jewish-Christian Paul, one finds traces of the reverence in which he, as the founder of a Christian community or as the one who had baptized a particular individual, was held or expected to be held (e.g., 1 Thess 2:9-12; 4:1-2; Phlm 10).

While the idea that a woman might have founded a Jewish community might seem absurd at first glance, seen in the light of ancient Jewish proselytism, it is not implausible. Scholars have recognized for some time that women proselytes are mentioned relatively frequently in ancient sources. If numbers of women were converting to Judaism, it is not impossible to imagine that one woman could have been the first in her community to convert and could have been active in persuading others to do so as well. Proselytizing activity by women, if it indeed existed, would have been similar to the work of such Jewish-Christian women as
Priscilla and Junia, both of whom seem to have been active missionaries. Priscilla, who together with her husband Aquila had a house church (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19), was a teacher in the early church (Acts 18:26—notice the synagogue context) and an important co-worker of Paul (Acts 18:2-3,18; Rom 16:3-5; 1 Cor 16:19; see also 2 Tim 4:19). The Jewish-Christian woman Junia (Rom 16:7) bore the title apostolos, which implied active missionary work. (See esp. 1 Cor 9.) Another important parallel, although non-Jewish, would be Thekla, probably the most well known of early Christian women missionaries.

If archēgissa were to have meant "founder," then we would have to imagine the same type of leadership in Peristeria that we encounter in Priscilla or Junia. Thekla would be a parallel case as to proselytizing activity, although she is described as being more counter-cultural than a Jewish archēgissa may have been.

In sum, while it is impossible to ascertain more accurately what functions the title archēgissa/archēgos implied, other passages in which the term occurs indicate that "leader" is an accurate translation. "Founder," which emerged as a second possible meaning is an intriguing possibility which must remain uncertain.
CHAPTER III

WOMEN AS ELDERS

A. The Inscriptional Evidence for Women as Elders

Six ancient Greek inscriptions have been found in which women bear the title "elder" (presbytera/presbyterissa = presbyterissa). In addition to these, there exists one Greek inscription in which a woman is called PRESBYTNS (sic), most likely presbytis.

Kastelli Kissamou, Crete

CII 731c.1 White marble sepulchral plaque (45 x 30 x 2.8 cm; height of letters: 1.5-3 cm; distance between lines: .5-1.5 cm; 4th/5th C.).

Σοφία Γορτύνι-
2 α, πρεσβυτέρα
εκ θεολογικού
4 γλώσσα Κιάμου έν-
θα. Μνήμη δικέας
6 ζε ἑώνα. Ἄμην.

L. 3: read καλ.
L. 5: read δικαίας.
L. 6: read εἰς αἰώνα.

Sophia of Gortyn, elder and head of the synagogue of Kisamos (lies) here. The memory of the righteous one for ever. Amen.

This inscription was discussed above in the context of heads of the synagogue.2 Important for the interpretation of the title presbytera is its parallelization with archisynagōgissa, which makes it unlikely that presbytera is simply a term meant to distinguish Sophia the elder from a Sophia the younger.

Bizye, Thrace

CII 692.3 Grey marble stele (width: .23 m; broken off below the lettering; height of letters: 2.5 cm.; no earlier than 4th/5th C.); above the inscription a seven branched menorah and an ethrog.

Ethrog Menorah

Μνήμ(μ-) σι
2 α Ἐθρέβκα[ς]
τῆς πρεσ-
4 βυτέρας τ- 
-ς κεκυμημ- 
6 ἐνης.

L. 1: ligature between Μ, Ν, and Η.
L. 3: ligature between Η and Η.
L. 5: ligature between Η and Η.
Ll. 5-6: read κεκοιμημένης (The η for ω is one reason for the late dating.)

Tomb of Rebeka, the elder, who has fallen asleep.

Whereas the original editors of the inscription, R. M. Dawkins and F. W. Hasluck, see a connection between presbytera here and archisynagogos in the Rufina inscription from Smyrna (CII 741), Jean-Baptiste Frey argues that "elder" here either simply distinguishes this Rebeka from another, younger Rebeka or that it designates the wife of an elder, that is, of a member of the local gerousia. Samuel Krauss also suggests that the title "elder" when applied to women could mean that the woman was the wife of an elder. Jean Juster believes that "elder" when applied to women was probably a "simple title" accorded to women who were "pious and venerated in the community." We have seen this kind of argumentation in the context of the other titles borne by women. It is therefore not necessary to quote further secondary authors on this point; the line of argumentation is nearly always the same.

This is the only Jewish inscription from Bizye, so one can say nothing about the Jewish community there or its form of organization. As the inscription itself gives no further information about Rebeka, nothing of her background or status can be known.

Venosa, Apulia

Three Greek inscriptions found in a Jewish catacomb in Venosa (ancient Venusia) in Apulia, which is in southern Italy, mention women elders. They probably date from the third to the sixth centuries.

CII 581; CIL IX 6226.

Τάφος
2 βερωνυκε- 
-νις πρεσβιτέ- 
4 ρες ετ φιλια 
-Ἰωσείτις.
Ll. 3-4: read πρεσβυτέρας.
L. 4: ετ φιλία = Latin et filia (should be et filiae).

Tomb of Beronikene, elder and daughter of Ioses.

Note that Beronikene's father bears no title and that she is described as the daughter of her father rather than as the wife of a given man.

CIL 590: CIL IX 6230. Painted in red letters on the stucco covering of the wall of the grave.

Στόμιος
2 Μαννινές πρεσ-
βιτερες τιγάτερ Λον-
4 γινι πατέρις ιγγόνυ
Φαοστυν πατέρις
6 έτ[ω]ν λη'.

L. 1: read Στόμιος.
L. 2: read Μαννινές.
L. 2-3: read πρεσβυτέρας δυγάτηρ.
L. 3-4: Λονγίνυν = Latin Longini (gen. of Longinus).
L. 4: read έγγόνιον.

Tomb of Mannine, elder, daughter of Longinus, father, granddaughter of Faustinus, father, (aged) 38 years.

Mannine was 38 years old at her death; she is the only woman elder whose age we know. The title pater, borne by the father and the grandfather, is known from other Venosan inscriptions (CIL 599, 611 twice, 612, 613 twice, 619c, 619d). The constellation of Mannine, presbytera, Longinus, pater, and Faustinus, pater, makes it unlikely that Mannine's title simply means "aged woman" (which would also be precluded by her age at death) or is meant to distinguish her from a younger Mannine. Perhaps Mannine's appointment or election was not unrelated to her family background. The inscription shows, however, that her father's title had not passed down automatically to her, for her title is not the same as her father's.

CIL 597: CIL IX 6209. Painted in red letters on the stucco covering of the wall of the grave.

Στόμιος Φα-
2 οστινές πρεσ-
βιτερες. ἅλησ

Ll. 1-3: read Φαοστυν πρεσβυτέρας.

Tomb of Faustina. Peace.
This name, sometimes spelled slightly differently, is quite common at Venosa (CII 569, 578, 590, 591, 593, 598, 599, 600, 601, 611 three times, 612, 613 twice, 619d), and a good number of these persons are title-bearers (CII 590, 599, 600, 611 twice, 612, 613 twice, 619d). Perhaps Faustina's title was not unrelated to her family background.

It is striking that three of the five extant presbytera inscriptions are from Venosa. CII 606 (Alexsanra, pateressa) and CII 619d (Faustina, mëter), which are discussed below, are also from Venosa, giving a total of five women title-bearers from one town. Although the total number of Venosan inscriptions is considerable (CII 569-619; 619a-619e), and 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.

The masculine presbyteros occurs only once at Venosa (CII 595). The inscription is a strange mixture of Hebrew and Greek written in Hebrew characters, and the elder in question bears the Latin name Secundinus. The elder's wife, Materina, bears no title.

Oea, Tripolitania

SEG 27(1977) no. 1201. Inscription on a loculus in a Jewish catacomb; text lined up in three columns, above which is a menorah and a lulav and between which are two palm branches (4th/5th C. C.E., possibly later).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
<th>Column III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μνήμη-</td>
<td>Μαζαυζαλα</td>
<td>άναπαυσης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 η τῆς</td>
<td>2 πρεσβετέρη</td>
<td>2 δ ΘΕ μετά τῶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Μακαρία | οψα ξησε | δοσίων κ η τὸ δικ-
| | 4 εαυτου τς | ίν- |
| | | 4 έω. |

I, 1. 3: read Μακαρίας (or: μακαρίας).
II, 1. 1: read Μαζαυζαλας.
II, 11. 2-3: read πρεσβυτέρησας.
II, 11. 4: read ένιαυτούς (?).
III, 1. 1: read άναπαυσης.
III, 11. 2-4: read ο ΘΕΟΧ μετά τῶν δοσίων καὶ μετὰ τῶν δικαιῶν.

Tomb of Makaria (or: the blessed) Mazauzala, elder. She lived [...] years. Rest. God is with the holy and the righteous ones.
This inscription was found in Libya in a Jewish catacomb which was destroyed during World War II. The primary difficulty of interpretation is found in II, 1. 4, the meaning of which must remain uncertain; the connection between II, 1. 4 and III, 1. 1 is also rather unclear. Mazauzala is probably a Libyan name. This need not imply that the woman was a convert, for Jews in antiquity bore a wide variety of names. The title presbeteres is similar in form to archisynagogissa in CII 73lc. Three other inscriptions are known from the same catacomb, but they add little to our knowledge of the Jewish community there.

Rome


Ευδα (d)ιε
2 κετα Σα-
α Ούρα π-
4 πρεσβύτης

Menorah

L. 1: text has ΕΝΘΔΔΕ.
L. 2: read κετα.
L. 3: Müller suggests Ούρασα.
Ll. 3-4: text has ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΗΣ, probably πρεσβύτης (m.) but could also be πρεσβύτης (m. or f.).

Here lies Sara Ura, elder (or aged woman).

The male presbys can be used much like presbyters, and perhaps the female form used here also means more than simply "aged woman." A possible parallel could be the Christian order of presbitides, which was forbidden by the Council of Laodicea.

These six, possibly seven, inscriptions form the evidence for Jewish women elders. The geographical spread is greater than for women heads or mothers of the synagogue, with one inscription from Crete, one from Thrace, one from the province of Tripolitania in North Africa, one from Rome, and three from southern Italy. The inscriptions themselves teach us little about the women themselves and nothing about the title presbytera/presbyteressa (or presbytis). The only age given (38 for Mannine) would seem to preclude the meaning "aged woman." The parallelization of presbytera and archisynagogissa in CII 73lc is further support for presbytera being an official title. The inscriptions themselves give no indication that these women were the wives of elders, for no husbands are mentioned.
If the title *presbytera/presbyteressa* implied a function, what could that function have been? As with the other titles, an analysis of the functions of male elders can shed light on the duties and rights of female elders.

B. The Meaning of "Elder"

1. Literary References to the Title

Of the various titles occurring in ancient inscriptions, "elder" is one of the most difficult to define precisely, for in the course of its long history the title took on rather different meanings. "Elder" could denote a political function, as in the "elders of Israel" (Num 11:16-30; 2 Sam 3:17; 5:3; 17:4, etc.). It sometimes included judicial functions, as in the "elders of the city" (Deut 19:12; 21:2-9,19-20; 22:15-21; 25:7-9). Philo (In Flacc. 74,76,80; Leg. ad Galum 229) and Josephus (J.W. 7.10.1 §412) speak of the *gerousia* of Alexandria, a body which would have had representative political (and religious?) functions; it is not certain, however, that the members of this gerousia were called *presbyteroi*. The New Testament regularly refers to members of a group in the Sanhedrin as "elders" (Matt 16:21; Mark 8:31; 11:27; Luke 9:22, etc.). According to a saying in the Talmud, "elder means nothing other than scholar" (b. Qidd. 32b). The Theodosian Code (16.8.2,13,14) speaks of "elders" as if they were synagogue officials. A further complication arises from the possibility that *presbyteroi* is equal in meaning to such terms as *seniores* or *maiores*. It is this spectrum of meanings and possible synonyms which makes it very difficult to utilize ancient literature to help define the title *presbytera/presbyteressa* as it occurs in our inscriptions. For the following, those parallels are preferred which are closest chronologically, geographically and linguistically to the *presbytera/presbyteressa* inscriptions. The following passages do not all necessarily refer only to male elders; women could be included in some of them.

The oldest *presbyteros* inscription is CII 1404 (the Theodotos inscription), a pre-70 Palestinian inscription written in Greek. We have seen that the geographical range of the title was considerable, and that the chronological extension was well into the Byzantine era. Thus, New Testament references would be quite appropriate as parallels. Luke 7:3-5 is of special interest, for it could well be a close parallel to the Theodotos inscription:
When he (the centurion) heard of Jesus, he sent to him elders of the Jews, asking him to come and heal his slave. And when they came to Jesus, they besought him earnestly, saying, "He is worthy to have you do this for him, for he loves our nation, and he built us our synagogue."

As in the Theodotos inscription, "elders" occurs in the plural. The elders' reference to the centurion's having built the synagogue, as well as the fact that the centurion chose them to go to speak to Jesus, makes it likely that the centurion considered the elders to be the official representatives of the Jewish community and that his negotiations for the building of the synagogue had been with them. A significant difference, of course, is that these elders, being in the provincial town of Capharnaum (Luke 7:1), could well have served as the Jewish elders of the city, while the elders who founded the synagogue of Theodotos could hardly have been the elders of the city of Jerusalem.

The New Testament references to Christian elders are striking in that they occur especially, although not exclusively, in a Jewish-Christian context (Acts 11:30; 15:2,4,6,22-23; 16:4; 21:18; Jas 5:14; etc.). These elders usually appear in the plural as a decision-making body of the church. Apparently Jewish-Christians continued to organize themselves on a presbyterian constitution for some time, for Epiphanius (died 403) says that the Ebionites had teachers whom they called presbyteroi and archisynagogoi and who made such decisions as whom the young men would marry (Panarion 30.18.2). The many other New Testament references to elders, especially to elders as members of the Sanhedrin, are not likely to be useful parallels to our inscriptions.

Another major source of information on Jewish elders is the Theodosian and Justinian Codes, for the term presbyterus occurs several times in texts found therein. A law from the Theodosian Code (16.8.2), from November 29, 330, reads:

Idem A. ad Ablavium p(raefectum) p(raetorio). Qui devotione tota synagogis Iudaeorum patriarchis vel presbyteris se dederunt et in memorata secta degentes legi ipsi praesident, immunes ab omnibus tam personalibus quam civilibus munerebus perseverent, ita ut illi, qui iam
forsitan decuriones sunt, nequaquam ad prosecutiones aliquas destinentur, cum oporteat istiusmodi homines a locis in quibus sunt nulla compelli ratione discedere. Hi autem, qui minime curiales sunt, perpetua decurionatus immunitate potiantur. Dat. III kal. decemb. Constantino p(oli) Gallicano et Symmacho conss.30

The same Augustus to Ablavius, Praetorian Prefect. If any persons with complete devotion should dedicate themselves to the synagogues of the Jews as patriarchs and elders and should live in the aforementioned sect and preside over the administration of their law, they shall continue to be exempt from all compulsory public services that are incumbent on persons, as well as those that are due to the municipalities. Likewise, such persons who are now perchance decurions shall not be assigned to any duties as official escorts, since such people shall not be compelled for any reason to depart from those places in which they are. Moreover, such persons who are not decurions shall enjoy perpetual exemption from the decurionate.

Given on the third day before the kalends of December at Constantinople in the year of the consulship of Gallicanus and Symmachus (November 29, 330).31

Like Cod. Theod. 16.8.4 (December 1, 331)32 this law exempts certain Jewish officials from compulsory public services and from the burdensome decurionate.33 Whereas Cod. Theod. 16.8.4 frees "priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues and all others who serve the synagogues" from compulsory public service, our law speaks of "patriarchs and elders." The two laws together form, with the exception of "patriarchs," a list of several of the more common titles of synagogue leadership. This law states that the patriarchs and the elders "preside over the administration of their law," thus informing us of at least one function of the elders. The "administration of their law" could be a continuation of certain decision-making functions assigned to elders in the bible (on blood redemption: Deut 19:11-13; expiation for an unknown murderer's crime: Deut 21:2-9; the stubborn and rebellious son: Deut 21:18-21; defamation of a virgin: Deut 22:13-21; levirate: Deut 25:5-10).

Cod. Theod. 16.8.13 (July 1, 397) reads:

Idem AA. Caesario p(raefecto) p(raetori)o. Iudaei sint obstricti caerimonii suis: nos interea in conservandis eorum privilegiis veteres imitemur, quorum sanctionibus definitum est, ut privilegia his, qui incultrium patriarcharum dicioni subjecti sunt, archisynagogis patriarchisque ac presbyteris ceterisque, qui in eius religionis sacramento versantur, nutu nostri numinis perseverent ea, quae venerandae Christianae legis primis clericis sanctimonia deferuntur. Id enim et divi principes Constantinus et Constantius, Valentinianus et Valens divino
The same Augustus to Caesarius, Praetorian Prefect. Jews shall be bound by their own ritual. Meanwhile, in preserving their privileges, we shall imitate the ancient methods by whose sanctions it has been determined that privileges shall be preserved for those who are subject to the rule of the Illustrious Patriarchs, for the heads of the synagogues, the patriarchs, and the elders, and all the rest who are occupied in the ceremonial of that religion, namely those privileges according to the consent of Our Imperial Divinity, which by virtue of their holy office are conferred on the chief clergy of the venerable Christian religion. The foregoing, indeed, was decreed by the divine imperial authority of the sainted Emperors Constantine and Constantius, Valentinian and Valens. Such Jews shall therefore be exempt from the compulsory public services of decurions and shall obey their own laws. Given on the kalends of July in the year of the consulship of Caesarius and Atticus.35

Of importance for our question is the parallelization of Christian clerics with "those who are subject to the Illustrious Patriarchs, . . . the heads of the synagogues, the patriarchs, and the elders." As in Cod. Theod. 16.8.2, the concern here is clearly with official synagogue functionaries, and not with bearers of honorific titles. The context further makes clear that the functions are specifically religious ones, both through the comparison with Christian clerics, and by the phrase "all the rest who are occupied in the ceremonial of that religion."

Cod. Theod. 16.8.14, given on April 11, 399, discussed above in the context of heads of the synagogue,36 says that it is customary "that heads of the synagogue or the elders of the Jews or those whom they themselves call apostles, who are dispatched by the patriarch at a certain time to collect gold and silver, should bring back to the patriarch the sum which has been exacted and collected from each of the synagogues" (ut archisynagogi sive presbyteri Iudaeorum vel quos ipsi apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum adquæ argentum a patriarca certo tempore diriguntur, a singulis synagogis exactam summam adquæ susceptam ad eundem reportent), and continues by saying that this custom is now abolished. This text gives us one of the official functions of elders in this period; given this function, it is not unreasonable to posit that elders normally had some responsibility for the finances in the synagogue. This text makes clear that money was collected through the synagogues, and not, independently of them, from the Jewish community at large. This particular constellation, heads of the synagogues and elders,37 reminds one of Epiphanius's reference to the Jewish-Christian
elders (presbyteroi) and heads of the synagogue (archisynagogoi), a roughly contemporary attestation of the same synagogal organization.

These three fourth-century laws are especially valuable due to the specificity of the information they give. All three place the elders in the context of religious activities: 16.8.2: "preside over the administration of their law;" 16.8.13: "... and the elders, and for all the rest who are occupied in the ceremonial of that religion;" 16.8.14: "... the elders of the Jews ... should bring back to the patriarch the sum which has been exacted and collected from each of the synagogues." This does not exclude the possibility that elders also had civic, representative functions, but in the eyes of the Roman lawgiver, it seems that the religious ones were considered primary.

Two further laws should be briefly considered in this context. Cod. Just. 1.9.15, dates from the year 418 and reads:

Si qua inter Christianos et Iudaeos sit contentio, non a senioribus Iudaorum, sed ab ordinariis iudicibus dirimatur.38

When any dispute arises between Christians and Jews, it shall not be decided by the elders of the Jews, but by the ordinary judges.39

The Latin seniores here is most likely the equivalent of the Greek presbyteroi of our inscriptions and of the three laws just cited. This text is a further attestation to the judicial functions of Jewish elders.

Corpus Juris Civilis, Novellae 146.1, from the year 553, forbids pericope masters, elders and teachers (archipherekitai ... presbyteroi ... didaskaloi) to hinder the reading of the Greek bible in the synagogue by means of excommunications (anathematismoi).40 This is a further attestation of the synagogal, religious functions of the elders.

In rabbinic literature there are a number of references to elders (zqenim), although it is not certain that the rabbinical authorities meant the same thing with zqenim as our inscriptions meant with presbyteroi. B. Qidd. 32b, in a baraita (i.e., Tannaitic, that is, pre-220), defines elder: "an elder is nothing other than a scholar" (אֵלֶּהָ דַעַת אֲלֵי אַלְמָן)41 According to a saying attributed to R. Jose the Galilean (b. Qidd. 32b), who flourished around 110, "an elder is one who has acquired wisdom" (זָכַר וָאֵלֶּה דַעַת אֲלֵי אַלְמָן), which is a play on the letters of זָכַר וָאֵלֶּה (זָכַר וָאֵלֶּה) This definition complements what we have
learned from the Greek and Latin texts discussed thus far. The references to judicial activity (*Cod. Theod*. 16.8.2; *Cod. Just*. 1.9.15), although these texts are much later, fit in well with the definition of elder as scholar.

The Manual of Discipline from Qumran makes reference to a special seating place for elders (*1QS* 6:8-9): "The priests should sit first, and the elders second and then all of the rest of the people; each should sit in his proper place" (ההנה ומכ שלוחה). The Tosefta also speaks of elders having a special seating place (*Tosefta* Meg. 4.21 [Zuck. 227]): "How did the elders sit? With their faces towards the people and their backs towards the sanctuary." The difficulty with this text is that it probably does not refer to a synagogue service. It does, in any case, refer to elders seated together in a group at a worship gathering. Two possible non-literary corroborations of a separate seating place for elders are the semi-circular steps in the apse of the Sardis synagogue, for they could have served as seats for the elders, and an inscription (*CII* 663; Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 101; probably 4th C.) from a synagogue in Elche, Spain, for the inscription could indicate that the archons and elders were to sit in that portion of the synagogue in which the inscription was found. The geographical and chronological spread represented by these two literary and two possible archaeological attestations of a special seating place for Jewish elders during the worship service or other public gathering make it likely that the practice was more widespread than these few pieces of evidence would make us think. This is not to imply, however, that "elder" meant the same in each place. The Qumran elders probably had rather different functions from the elders mentioned in the Tosefta passage and from those in the Elche inscription. In spite of these possible differences, two elements are constant and confirm what other sources have told us: the context is a religious one and elders are mentioned in the plural, as if they formed a council.

It is not possible to discuss the many further rabbinic passages referring to הַבָּנִים, but it is also questionable, on the basis of geography and chronology, whether they are appropriate parallels to our inscriptions. For example, according to certain rabbinic passages, the ordination of elders was limited to the Holy Land, which would mean that all Diaspora inscriptions with the title "elder" refer to unordained elders. It is
methodologically questionable, however, to take rabbinic statements concerning the Diaspora as objective, unbiased reports of actual Diaspora practice. Perhaps ordinations in fact occurred in Rome or in Asia Minor, but were not recognized—or not known—by the rabbis, which would not necessarily mean that these ordinations were not recognized in the communities in which they occurred. Since evidence for the ordination of elders in the Diaspora is lacking, however, we should probably assume that the question is irrelevant for our inscriptions (excepting CII 931: Jaffa; 1277: Jerusalem; 1404: Jerusalem).

2. Inscriptional References to the Title

The title presbyteros occurs in over twenty ancient Jewish inscriptions. They come from as far west as Elche, Spain (CII 663) and as far east as Dura Europos, Syria (CII 829). The chronological range is also considerable. The Theodotos inscription (CII 1404) found in Jerusalem is from the Second Temple period, and presbyteros inscriptions from later centuries attest that the title remained in use for some time.

Most of the inscriptions mentioning presbyteroi tell us little or nothing about the office. Several inscriptions mention elders as donors. Since we have seen donors bearing each of the titles discussed thus far, as well as no title at all, it would be incautious to assume that elders were responsible in a special way for the upkeep of the synagogue. CII 803 is the most informative of the donative inscriptions. The plural "elders" indicates a council of elders, the number of which is larger than three; only Eisakios and Saulos are mentioned here by name. Possibly the gerusiarch Theodoros is a sort of president of the council of elders. The relationship between the heads of the synagogue and the gerusiarch and the elders is not clear, but the inscription gives the impression that these are the three main titles of leadership in the synagogue in question.

That more than one elder functioned at a time is also clear from CII 731f, an inscription which is difficult to reconstruct, but which clearly has hoi presbyteroi in the first legible line. CII 663 also speaks of elders in the plural. CII 800 records the son of an elder, who is himself a scribe and president of the ancients (hoi palaioi). Should one assume two councils, one of elders and one of ancients? This seems unlikely. Given the lack of evidence, one cannot come to a
more exact understanding of the organizational structures of that community.

In CII 1404 Theodotos' forefathers are listed together with the elders and Simonides as the founders of his synagogue. The plural "elders," as in CII 663, 731f and 803, makes one think of a council of elders. Simonides, who bears no title at all, should remind us that synagogue leadership was not (and is not today) limited to title-bearers. The activities and installations of the synagogue listed in the inscription ("the reading of the Law and the teaching of the commandments, the hostel and the side rooms, and the water facilities, as lodging for those from abroad who need it") give us an idea of what the elders and other synagogue leaders had to administer.

In summary, these inscriptions teach us that the title "elder" was geographically widespread and known from at least the first century C.E. onwards. Four inscriptions (CII 663, 731f, 803, 1404) have presbyteroi in the plural, indicating a sort of council of elders. CII 800, which mentions both a presbyteros and palaios, raises the question of the diversity of synagogal constitutions.

3. Reconstruction of the Office of Elder

The comprehensive survey of the title presbyteros in Jewish inscriptions and the selective survey of literary references to Jewish elders has yielded a certain outline, albeit shadowy, which can help in defining the functions of the elders of our inscriptions. It is clear, of course, that "elder" implied different functions in different periods and probably also varied regionally. The following reconstruction is not meant as an ahistorical blurring of differences, but should rather be seen as representing the range of possible functions in the early centuries of the Common Era.

The evidence points to councils of elders rather than single elders.

Four inscriptions refer to elders in the plural (CII 663, 731f, 803, 1404), and a number of New Testament references to Jewish and Jewish-Christian elders (Luke 7:3-5; Acts 11:30; 15:2, 14; 16:4, 21:18; Jas 5:14) presuppose a council of elders. The evidence for a special seating place for elders (Lk. Neg. 4.21 [Zuck. 227]; 1 QS 6:8-9; possibly CII 663 and the benches in the Sardis synagogue) also points to a council of elders.
Elders appear often in a specifically religious context.

The Roman lawgiver appears to have viewed Jewish elders primarily as religious functionaries, as a Jewish counterpart to Christian clerics (Cod. Theod. 16.8.13). In addition to functions relating specifically to the worship service (Corp. Iur. Civ., Nov. 146.1), the collecting of money in the synagogue to be sent to the patriarch (Cod. Theod. 16.8.14) must also be seen as a religious function. Judicial functions (Cod. Theod. 16.8.2; Cod. Just. 1.9.15) could be viewed as secular activity, but to the extent that for Jews to live by their own law is a religious issue, this, too, must be seen as religious. Special seating arrangements during the worship service (t. Meg. 4.21, etc.) also point to a religious context for the elders' activities. The rabbinic definition of an elder as a scholar (b. Oidd. 32b), if this was shared by Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews, is further support for a religious locus of their activity. Given the title's background as a political, civic term, it should not be excluded that elders also had political, representative functions, but the texts cited show that one could not argue that they had only civic functions and not religious ones.

Whether the elders of our inscriptions were ordained or not cannot be known.

There is no positive evidence that they were, and rabbinic sources (e.g., y. Bik. 65d.11-15; b. Sanh. 14a) claim that ordination was limited to the Holy Land.

4. The Role of Women Elders

It should not be necessary to discuss once again the question of whether presbytera was an honorific title or not. The line of argumentation is the same as for the other titles borne by women. The person fully convinced that women could not have had official functions in the ancient synagogue is likely to remain unconvinced by all evidence to the contrary, and will argue that these women elders were wives of elders or older women (in spite of Mannine's age of thirty-eight in CII 590 and of the parallelization of presbytera and archisynagogissa in CII 731c, and in spite of the fact that no husbands appear in the inscriptions) or simply honorific elders. A. E. Harvey, for example, writing in 1974, notes, "... there are several Jewish tombstones in Italy and Asia Minor bearing the word πρεσβύτερος, but some of them must be purely honorific (four are in the
To those willing to accept the possibility that the six, possibly seven, inscriptions in which women bear the title "elder" are evidence that ancient Jewish women could fulfill certain official functions, the following reconstruction is suggested.

Jewish women elders were most likely members of a council of elders. This council may have had some oversight of synagogue finances; until 399 elders annually collected money in the synagogue to be sent to the patriarchs. We should imagine that women elders were as involved in these financial matters as their male counterparts. If the women elders of our inscriptions were members of synagogues in which the elders sat in the front facing the people, then we should assume that these women sat among their colleagues facing the people. Although some may find it difficult to imagine that women could have been full members of a judicial council, the existence of the presbytera inscriptions at least raises this question. Could Jewish women actually have been scholars? Could they have had some say about the reading of the bible in the synagogue? Again, the technical terminology of our inscriptions raises these possibilities. Those maintaining their impossibility should at least consider how limited our knowledge of Jewish women in ancient Crete, Thrace, Italy and Libya actually is.
CHAPTER IV

WOMEN AS MOTHERS OF THE SYNAGOGUE

A. The Evidence for Mothers of the Synagogue

1. The Inscriptional Evidence

There exist two Greek inscriptions in which the title μητέρας συναγωγῆς occurs (reconstructed), one Greek inscription in which a woman bears the title μητέρα, two Latin inscriptions in which the title mater synagogae occurs, and one Latin inscription in which a woman bears the unusual title pateressas. All six of the inscriptions are from Italy, three being from Rome, two from Venosa in Apulia and one from Venetia in Brescia. They range in date from around the second century C.E. until perhaps as late as the sixth century.

Rome

CIL 523 (= CIL VI 29756).1 Sarcophagus fragment decorated by a shofar, a lulav and a seven-branched menorah; known since the late sixteenth century, but no longer extant. Date unknown. The manuscripts differ on points of spelling; for the variants see CII, ad loc. The text of Leon is:

Beturia Pau-
2 1la F domi
 heterne quos-
4 tituta que bi-
 xit an(nos) LXXXVI meses VI
6 proselyta an(norum) XVI
 nomine Sara mater
8 synagogarum Campi
 et Bolumni
10 en irenae ai cymysis
 autis.

Shofar Lulav Menorah

L. 3: read aeternae con-
L. 4: read quae vi-
L. 5: read menses.
Ll. 10-11: read ἐν ἐλπίνη (ἡ) κοιμημένας ἀντῆς.

Veturia Paulla F(?), consigned to her eternal home, who lived 86 years, 6 months, a proselyte of 16 years, named Sara, mother of the synagogues of Campus and Volumnius. In peace her sleep.2
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Veturia Paulla, a proselyte to Judaism at the age of seventy, had taken on the name Sara, most likely as a sign of her conversion. Campus probably means Campus Martius, a plain of around six hundred acres on the left bank of the Tiber. CII 88 and 319 refer to fathers of the synagogue of the Campesians, which may be the same congregation. These three inscriptions are the only evidence for the synagogue of the Campesians. While it would be quite dangerous to generalize on the basis of three inscriptions, it is striking that of the four title-bearers mentioned, three bear the title mother/father of the synagogue, which raises the question whether this might have been a central title in that congregation. As to the infant archon, which must indicate archon-to-be, it seems reasonable to assume that the boy was given his title because of his father's active leadership in the congregation. (This inscription is thus indirect support for the view that the title mother/father of the synagogue was functional, rather than honorific, a point which will be discussed below.)

Our knowledge of the synagogue of the Volumnesians is based on four inscriptions (CII 343, 402, 417, 523). Leon locates it among the Transtiberine group of congregations. CII 343, 402 and 417 were found in the Monteverde catacomb, which according to Leon, was the earliest of the Roman Jewish catacombs, perhaps going back to the first century B.C.E. and remaining in use until at least the end of the third century. With the exception of CII 523, the title mother/father of the synagogue does not occur in connection with the synagogue of the Volumnesians. The titles which do occur are archon (archon: CII 343), archon-to-be (mellarchon: CII 402) and (archon?)—for-life (zabio = dia biou?: CII 417).

Veturia Paulla, then, was the mother of two synagogues, one in which the title mother/father of the synagogue may well have been a key term of leadership and one in which archon may have been a major function. Her functioning as mother of two synagogues is not unparalleled, for CII 508, also from Rome, mentions a father of synagogues. There is no difficulty in imagining that a person could be actively involved in two synagogues. Note that no husband is mentioned in the inscription. If Veturia Paulla did not become Jewish until the age of 70, then, considering the life expectancy of that period, her husband was most likely already dead when she converted, if indeed she had been married. In any case, the inscription gives
us no reason to assume that she received her title through her husband.

CII 496. Sarcophagus fragment. Found in the Via Anicia; may have come from the Monteverde catacomb (1st C. B.C.E. - 3rd C. C.E.).

Here lies (Maria? Julia?) Marcella, mother of the synagogue of the Augustesians. May [...] be remembered (?). In peace her sleep.

The form of the letters would indicate a second- or possibly third-century C.E. dating. That Markella was a woman is indicated by the fragmentary -ia before Markel- and by the final sigma for au[tel]. "Mother of the synagogue" is also partially reconstructed: μητέρ συνα[γωγίς], but seems to be quite a plausible reconstruction.

Six inscriptions bear witness to the Synagogue of the Augustesians (CII 284, 301, 338, 368, 416, 496). The other titles mentioned are scribe (grammateus) and archon-to-be (mellarchon = mellarchōn: CII 284), gerusiarch (gerousiarchēs: CII 301, 368), archon (archōn: CII 338), (archon?)-for-life (zabio = dia biou ?: CII 416).

The synagogue could have been named for the emperor Augustus (27 B.C.E. to 14 C.E.), who was in fact friendly toward the Jews. He may have been a patron of the community. If the synagogue was founded during the reign of Augustus, it would be one of the oldest in Rome.

As in CII 523, no husband is mentioned in our inscription, so we should not assume that Marcella received her title because of her husband. Unfortunately, the brief inscription does not yield any further information about Marcella's life, age at death or title.

CII 166. Marble fragment; more fragmentary today than when first discovered. Found in the Appia catacomb (1st - 3rd C. C.E.).
Menorah 2 ναγωγής, φίλανδρος [................] συναγωγής τῇ ἱδίᾳ σὺμβλὼ ἐποίησέν.

L. 1: read κεῖται.

Here lies Simplicia, mother (?) of the synagogue, who loved her husband. [Husband’s name and office] of the synagogue set up (this stone) to his own wife.

The form of the letters would indicate a second- or possibly third-century C.E. dating. The μητέρ συναγωγῶς is admittedly conjectural, but the gender of the deceased is established by the φίλανδρος and by the τῷ ἱδίῳ σὺμβλfollower. Further, the title mother of the synagogue, known from elsewhere, is a plausible reconstruction for the lacuna preceding -ναγωγής, especially since συναγωγής occurs in the following line.

In contrast to the two inscriptions just discussed, the name of the synagogue is lacking here, so that one cannot discuss comparative materials from the same synagogue. A further contrast is that a husband is mentioned here, and he seems to have been an office-holder. He may have borne the title πατέρσ συναγωγῆς or perhaps another title. As the titles of both wife and husband are missing, it is impossible to say whether they bore the same title, but since it seems quite possible that she was a mother of the synagogue and he a father of the synagogue, then the question of how she attained her title gains added relevancy.

Venetia, Brescia

CII 639; CIL V 4411.23 First quoted by Peliciani in 1463.24 Date unknown.

Coeliae25 Paternae matri synagogae Brixianorum.

To Coelia Paterna, mother of the synagogue of the Brescians.

Unfortunately, the only other Jewish inscription from Brescia (CII 638) reads [. . . ] χλουα/γωγ[( . . . )], certainly archisynagogos, but hardly enough to give us significant information about the Jewish community in Brescia.
Venosa, Apulia

In 1853, a Jewish catacomb in Venosa (the ancient Venusia) was discovered. The inscriptions (CII 569-619; 619a-619e) are of two types: dipinti, painted in red on the stucco covering of the walls, and graffiti, scratched onto the walls, whereby most of the latter have disappeared. Two of the Venosan inscriptions are of interest for the question at hand.

CII 606; CIL IX 6231. Letters traced by finger into the wet stucco, later painted in red (3rd - 6th C.).

Hic requiesc-
2 et Alexsanra
pateressa qui v-
4 it anoro plus m[. . .].

Ll. 1-2: read requiescit (l. 1 Lenormant; reque[fse-]
De Rossi: Alexsanfa. (Ligature on the r possibly indicates dr.)
Ll. 3-4: read quae vixit annorum plus minus.

Here lies Alexsanra, "fatheress" (pateressa), who lived approximately [. . . ]. Peace!

The title pateressa is simply the feminine of pater. The name could be Alexandra (as the reported ligature may indicate), but then the present spelling may simply be a variation thereof. Since a husband is not mentioned, there is no reason to make assumptions about his possible titles or office; perhaps she was not married or perhaps she was a widow. Therefore, it would be rather incautious to agree with Harry Leon when he writes:

There is one example (606) of a pateressa Alexandra (spelled Alexsanra). It seems more likely that this title was given to the wife of a pater than that it was an independent title like that of mater synagogae at Rome and elsewhere.

While there is certainly a linguistic difference between pateressa and mater synagogae, there is nothing in this difference to indicate that the one is an independent title while the other is derived from the husband's title. Indeed, one could as easily have argued the opposite, namely that the pateressa was a genuine office-holder, for her title indicates that she was a female pater, while the matres synagogae were just that, mothers and not fathers. Such an argument would be as arbitrary as that given by Leon. There is in fact no reason to consider pateressa as either more or less official than mater synagogae, whereby the question
of whether pateressa implied a synagogue function or a civic one, must remain open.

CII.619d. Found in the hypogeum (3rd - 6th C.).

Ἡδε κεῖτε
2 Φαυστεία
μήτηρ, γυν
4 ἂν Ἀὐξανίος
νίου πατήρ
6 τρός καὶ
πάτρων τῆς πόλεως.

L. 1: read κεῖται.
Ll. 4-5: Frenkel, Lifshitz: Αὐξανίου; Bognetti: Αὐξανίου;

Here lies Faustina, mother, wife of Auxanios, father and patron of the city.

CII.619c. The epitaph of the husband, Auxanios:

Ὡδε κεῖτε Ἀὐξάνειος πατήρ
2 καὶ πάτρων τῆς πόλεως.

Here lies Auxanios, father and patron of the city.

This inscription again raises the question whether women bearing the title mother received it through their husbands. Unlike CII 166 (Simplicia) discussed above, this inscription is not fragmentary. It is thus clear that both wife and husband had the same title, which could indicate that the offices of both Faustina and Auxanios implied active leadership or it could mean that Auxanios alone was a leader, while his wife Faustina simply bore an honorific title. It is possible that Faustina received her title because of her family connections, but this does not necessarily imply that it was honorific.

A further question raised by this inscription is the nature of the title μητέρ/πατέρ when it stands alone, without the additional "of the synagogue." For example, was Auxanios father of the synagogue and patron of the city or was he also a father of the city? The question raised by the term pateressa, which also stands alone, takes on new interest in light of the "of the city" in connection with "patron." A definitive solution is impossible, but the patron τῆς πόλεως makes a civic function for the title patēr/metēr seem more likely than a synagogue function. It is probable that in the Diaspora the line separating synagogue leadership from civic leadership was rather fluid. The parallel use of patēr and patron in this inscription, as well as in 619b.
and 619c, should caution us from making too quick an identification between father/mother and patron.

Father/mother is one of the more common titles among the Jewish Venosan inscriptions. Patēr/pater occurs nine times outside of our inscription, while mēter and pateressa occur one time each. Of the ten patres mentioned among the Venosan inscriptions, seven are named Faustinus, and the mother in CII 619d is named Faustina. This may indicate that they were all from the same family (see especially CII 611 and 613 for the passing down of names) and that the name Faustinus/a was as important a factor in attaining this title as any individual leadership skills a person might possess. In fact, Faustina may even have been named mother on the basis of the family into which she was born, most likely the same basis for success as that of the men named Faustinus in arriving at their office, rather than the family into which she married.

The twelve occurrences of the title pater/pater/mēter/pateressa indicate that it played a central role in the Jewish community at Venosa. Unfortunately, the inscriptions do not give us any indication of the actual function involved. Leon posits, "It is not improbable, therefore [because the title was common at Venosa], that the Venusian pater was a board member." This seems plausible. One would only want to add that it is also not improbable that Alexsanra, pateressa (CII 606), and Faustina, mother (CII 619d) were also members of the board.

2. The Literary Evidence

There is one literary reference to Jewish mothers of the synagogue. It occurs in a Christian anti-Jewish polemic entitled De Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae. The work is a dialogue between two matrons, Synagoga and Ecclesia, in which a number of controversial points are discussed. In the context of a discussion of circumcision in which Church argues that circumcision cannot be the sign of salvation, because if this were the case, women, who do not receive circumcision, could not be saved, we read: "... what will your virgins do, what your widows, what even your mothers of the synagogue, if you bear witness that the sign of circumcision has helped the people to eternal life?" (quid facient virgines tuae, quid facient viduae, quid matres etiam synagogae). The argument is that not only will normal Jewish women be excluded from eternal life if circumcision is the sign of eternal life, but that even the most outstanding women of the Jewish community, the mothers of the synagogue, will be
excluded. This Christian document thus attests that the title "mother of the synagogue" was sufficiently widespread to be known outside of Jewish circles and could be used as in some sense synonymous with "leading Jewish women." From the rhetorical standpoint, the title had to be vested with some authority or the sarcasm implicit in *quid matres etiam synagogae* would not have carried.

The careful work of dating and ascertaining the provenance of the *De Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae* remains to be done. Jean Juster dates it from 438 to 476. We would thus have a fifth-century literary attestation of the title "mother of the synagogue," which fits in well with the inscriptive evidence. Bernhard Blumenkranz suggests that the work may have originated in Spain or in Gaul, but in any case in an area which had only recently been assumed into "Romania," because Synagogue claims that Church was still living like a barbarian at a time when Synagogue already possessed Roman citizenship and was fighting wars.39

B. The Meaning of "Mother/Father" and "Mother/Father of the Synagogue"

1. The Received Scholarly Opinion

The scholarly consensus is that both "mother of the synagogue" and "father of the synagogue" were honorific titles. It is my belief that this view arose because "mother of the synagogue" inscriptions have been known since the fifteenth (CII 639) and sixteenth (CII 523) centuries. That is, scholars have been faced for some centuries with the dilemma of women bearing this title. Rather than admit that the title signified a function, thereby allowing women into the ranks of synagogue leadership, they proposed that both fathers and mothers of the synagogue were honored members, but nothing more. Samuel Krauss's argumentation is quite specific in this respect: "A genuine office could not have been associated with the distinction [of father/mother of the synagogue] for the simple reason that it was also bestowed upon women."40 The few scholars who have gone beyond the view of an honorific title have, unfortunately, produced speculations based on little evidence. Abraham Berliner, for example, suggested that the *pater synagogae* was the *parnās* (administrator of charities) of the older period, later called *gabba'y*. He was to care for the sick and dying and to make the necessary arrangements for funerals.41 The *mater synagogae*, which is the same as *pateressa*, was responsible for
Mothers of the Synagogue

sick and dying women and for providing money to poor brides. Her office corresponds to the office of parnesessa, which was still known in seventeenth-century Italy. No reason is given for this identification; since the words have totally different etymologies, one can certainly not posit a continuity of terminology. One wonders whether an office dealing with charity was chosen because this seems appropriate for women. The parnesessa/parnēs suggestion has the double advantage of maintaining the similarity between pater and mater which the terms themselves suggest and of assigning to them functions which need not be construed as implying leadership inappropriate to women.

Harry J. Leon, who rejects Berliner's identification of pater and parnēs as ungrounded, reports on Berliner's theory that the mother of the synagogue "cared for women, especially the sick and dying" with considerably greater sympathy, although he must admit that we have little to go on. In the end he classifies mother and father of the synagogue as honorary offices.

Jean-Baptiste Frey, on the basis of CII 533 and the law of immunity in the Theodosian Code (both to be discussed below) is forced to conclude that the title must imply an active role in administration. The existence of mothers of the synagogue, however, sways the interpretation once again in the direction of charity, and Frey posits that these persons may have had certain functions which were particularly honorable, such as directing charitable works and assistance in the community. "This could have been the special role of the 'mothers' of the community," he adds. In the same vein, several scholars imagine that the role could have been one of patronage.

Most scholars, however, have concluded that the office was honorary and are quite specific in citing the existence of mothers of the synagogue as the reason for this.

2. Further Literary References to the Title

In trying to arrive at a better understanding of this title, the lack of literary documentation is a particularly severe problem. While we possess no synagogue constitutions or rules of order to help us with any of the titles, some, such as head of the synagogue, are at least mentioned in several literary sources. For father/mother of the synagogue, in contrast, there is a paucity of literary references. The most important of these is found in the Theodosian Code 16.8.4:
Idem A. hierieis et archisynagogis et patribus synagogarum et ceteris, qui in eodem loco deserviunt. Hieroeis et archisynagogos et patres synagogarum et ceteros, qui synagogis deserviunt, ab omni corporali munere liberos esse praecipimus. Dat. kal. dec. Constant(ino)p(oli) Basso et Ablavio conss. 51

The same Augustus to the priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all others who serve in the said place.

We command that priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all others who serve the synagogues shall be free from every compulsory service of a corporal nature.

Given on the kalends of December at Constantinople in the year of the consulship of Bassus and Ablavius (December 1,331;330). 52

It is unlikely that the holder of an honorific title would be included in the group of persons to whom *immunitas* 53 from corporal duties (*munera corporalia*) was granted. In Roman law certain groups of society were freed from these duties. Among others, these included high state officials and members of certain professions. Pagan priests were included to a certain extent, and in the course of time Christian clergy were also included. Thus, the context of this law implies that the three synagogue officials mentioned here are freed from the duties on the basis of their functional role in the synagogue. The following phrase, "and all others who serve the synagogues" (et ceteros, qui synagogis deserviunt) strengthens this interpretation, for it makes it evident that the law wishes to free those who are actually serving as functionaries, even those whose actual title is not included. The plethora and non-uniformity of titles must have been the cause for this additional, rather inclusive clause. In any case, it seems clear that this law refers to synagogue functionaries, and one would be hard pressed to argue that the *patres synagogae*, who are being freed from very concrete public duties, are merely distinguished members of the synagogue who bear an honorific title.

One cannot generalize from this fourth-century law that the *pater synagogae* was in all periods an actual functionary rather than just a distinguished member of the synagogue. However, presumably the law is simply recognizing organizational structures which had existed for some time and which continued to exist after the promulgation of the law.

To my knowledge, this law and the mention of *matres synagogae* in the *Alterratio Ecclesiae et Synagogae* are the only explicit literary references to mothers or fathers of the
synagogue. Several other texts may be of indirect value. In Matt 23:9, for example, Jesus makes reference to "fathers": "And call no one your father on earth, for you have one father, the heavenly one."

This occurs just after the prohibition to call anyone "rabbi" (vv. 7-8) and just before the injunction to his hearers not to allow themselves to be called "masters" (kathēgetai; v. 10). This certainly looks like an honorific use of the term pater, since one has the choice of using it or not, and it seems to be a form of address. It may be that in Jesus' time, in Palestine, the title was just coming into use and was, in fact, an honorific title. "Rabbi" would be a somewhat parallel case, for it only came into use gradually (Hillel and Shammai, for example, do not bear the title). Only after some time did it come to be conferred through ordination, and only in the modern period did a rabbi come to be anything like a synagogue functionary, with duties similar to a minister or a priest. Perhaps pater began as an honorific title, but that seems to have changed by the fourth century, as the law in the Theodosian Code indicates. It is also possible, however, that pater theos synagogae is not the actual successor to the pater title about which Jesus warns, but rather had an independent development.

Also of interest in this context is the Aramaic title ʾabba (Hebrew: ʾiʿāb or ʾiʿābi), which occurs as an honorific title in rabbinic sources. The title occurs in conjunction with a proper name, as, for example Abba Sha'ul (m. Menah. 8:3; 11:5; m. Mid. 2:5; 5:4; m. B Meg. 4:12; 6:7; m. B Bat. 2:7,13; m. Sanh. 10:1; etc.), Abba Guria (m. Qidd. 4:14) or Abba Gorion (m. Qidd. 4:14). Although according to a baraita in b. Ber. 16b one may call only the three patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) "father" and the four matriarchs (Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel and Leah) "mother," the use of these terms was not infrequent. According to a further baraita (b. Ber. 16b; y. Nid. 49b.45-47), one should not call slaves "mother so-and-so" or "father so-and-so," but in the house of Rabban Gamliel one did so. Thus, the honorific use of both "father" and "mother" is attested.

Also of interest is the term ʾab bêt din, a title borne by the head of the Sanhedrin during the Second Temple period. The ʾab bêt din was second in line to the nāšî. This very limited literary evidence for the terms mother/father and mother/father of the synagogue is certainly an insufficient basis for tracing a development or for ascertaining the precise functions of the title-bearer. The Aramaic terms for
"mother" and "father" could be used honorifically as terms of respect; that such a usage would at least have been understandable to a Greek audience is indicated by Matt 23:9. The one legal reference to fathers of the synagogue occurs in the context of synagogue officials (Cod. Theod. 16.8.4). The literary evidence, therefore, limited as it is, forces us to distinguish between an honorific use of the title, which takes the form "mother/father so-and-so," and an official use thereof, which in the Theodosian Code takes the form *patres synagogarum*.

3. Further Inscriptional References to the Title

If the literary evidence for this title is quite limited, there is considerable epigraphical evidence. In Rome eight fathers are mentioned and three mothers. Most are connected with an individual synagogue. Marcella (CII 496) was the mother of the synagogue of the Augustesians; Menophilos (CII 537) was father of the Carcaresians; Julianus (CII 88) and Quintus Claudius Synesios (CII 319) of the Campesians, Gadas (CII 510, 535) of the Hebrews; Pancharios (CII 509) of the synagogue of Elaea, and Domnus (CII 494) was father of the synagogue of the Vernacians. Veturia Paulla (CII 523) was the mother of the synagogue of the Campesians and the Volumnesians. In addition to these references to specific communities, Mniaseas (CII 508) is called father of synagogues (pater synagogion), Assterias (CII 93) is called father of an unnamed synagogue, and Simplicia (CII 166) seems to have been the mother of an unnamed synagogue, according to the plausible reconstruction in the CII.

That the office was one of high honor can be seen in CII 319, the epitaph of Irena, wife of Clodius, the brother of Quintus Claudius Synesius, the father of the synagogue of the Campesians. A derived honor to say the least! The inscription shows the pride that even being related to a father of the synagogue must have evoked. Domnus (CII 494) had already held two other offices; he was an archon three times and phrontistes twice. While this does not necessarily imply that father of the synagogue was a higher office than archon and phrontistes, we should probably take it to mean that they were at least of equal stature. Mniaseas (CII 508) was also a mathetés sophôn (Hebrew: talmid hakham), a scholar, although there is not necessarily a connection between the two. The age at death is indicated in only two of the inscriptions: Veturia Paulla (CII 523) was eighty-six when she died, and Pancharios (CII 509) lived to the
extraordinary age of one hundred ten. While we cannot generalize from two examples, the advanced age of these two people does support what one would expect from the title itself, namely that the office-holder should be an older, venerable member of the community.

In the much discussed, late third-century Stobi inscription (CII 694), it is Claudius Tiberius Polycharmus, also called Achyrios, father of the synagogue in Stobi, who, in fulfillment of a vow, constructed the "buildings for the holy place and the triclinium and the hall with four rows of columns." This he did with his own funds, without touching the revenues of the sanctuary. While it would be an error to use this inscription as evidence that one function of the father of the synagogue was to be in charge of building activity, (indeed, according to this method nearly all office-holders and many non-office-holders could be seen to have this function, for it is in the nature of epigraphical remains that many inscriptions are donative), it is probably not an accident that this one was wealthy enough to make this donation. Further, the reference to the communal funds may be significant. Could it imply that the father of the synagogue would have access to this money for building purposes?

In addition to the form father/mother of the synagogue, one also encounters the simple father or mother alone. It is not immediately clear if this is a synagogue title, a municipal title or a civic title (denoting representation of the Jewish people in a given area). At Venosa in Apulia, for example, the terms pater (CII 611 twice, 612, 613 twice), pater (CII 590 twice, 599, 619c, 619d), pater pateron (CII 619b), mater (CII 619d), and pateressa (CII 606) occur with no genitival addition. Should we take these as indicating synagogue office? CII 619b, which mentions Marcellus, "father of fathers" (pater pateron) and patron of the city, could lead one to think that Marcellus' first title referred to a religious function (especially in light of Mithraic parallels to be discussed below), while the second was a municipal title. Auxanios (CII 619c, 619d) is called father and patron of the city, so that one could construe "of the city" with both father (of the city) and patron (of the city). CII 613, which mentions Faustinus pater, grandson of Faustinus pater, son of Vitus, gerusiarch (ierusiarcontis [gen.]), probably refers to three synagogue officials, although it is conceivable that the man and his grandfather held municipal or civic office, while his father was a synagogue official. My tendency is to think that father/mother at Venosa refers to synagogue office, but the
several inscriptions which clearly refer to municipal honors (CII 611, 619b, 619c, 619d) should teach us that the leading families of the synagogue(s) of Venosa were also leading citizens of Venosa, thus making a definitive answer to the question impossible.

An inscription (CII 533) from Castel Porziano in Italy (nearly 10 kilometers to the southeast of Ostia), which probably dates from the first half of the second century, mentions a Livius Dionisius, pater (also without synagogae), who, together with the gerusiarch and an Antonius whose title is broken off, seem to be the three main leaders of the community, at least regarding the grant of a small plot of land to the gerusiarch Gaius Julius Justus for a family tomb. (This interpretation relies on the generally accepted reconstructed version given in the CII.) From this inscription we would have to conclude that the pater had some control over Jewish community property. Although it may be accidental, the pater is listed before the gerusiarch and the other official. Again, pater here could also be a civic title, he being the head of the Jewish community, while the gerusiarch headed the synagogue (the third title probably also being a synagogue title).

CII 739 from Smyrna in Asia Minor mentions a pater tou stematos (sic) who was also an elder and the son of an elder. Whatever father of the tribe (or guild?) might mean is unclear.

From Mantinea in Arcadia comes CII 720 with its mention of a father of the people-for-life (pater laou dia biou). This term makes one think of the entire Jewish community rather than just the synagogue, although at Smyrna these may have been coterminous.

In summary, the epigraphical data alone are insufficient for arriving at an exact definition of this title. Especially problematic is whether to distinguish between mother/father of the synagogue and mother/father without a genitive. However, we can see that wherever the titles occur, the context implies that these people were among the highest functionaries of the synagogue (or community), and that they may well have had control over the common treasury, probably together with other leaders. The inscriptions indicate nothing about caring for the sick, the dying or young unmarried girls. Likewise, there is nothing in the inscriptions themselves to make us think that the titles were purely honorific. Further, the only times patronage is mentioned (Venosa: CII 619b, 619c, 619d--the last two referring to the
same person), the men are called fathers and patrons of the city, thus precluding an identification of those two terms.

4. Possible Non-Jewish Parallels

A brief survey of the title in the Graeco-Roman world may be useful for ascertaining a more exact meaning. However, the range of uses, being quite broad, yields a somewhat confusing picture. We find everything from the title of a Roman emperor, father of his country (pater patriae) to a priestess of Venus being addressed as mother (mater). One also finds mothers and fathers of various sorts of guilds (collegia) and of cultic clubs, especially of oriental cults. While it could be that the mothers and fathers were patrons of the professional guilds the evidence from cultic clubs seems to point to cultic leaders of some sort.

For our question, the cultic clubs will yield the most valuable material for comparison. The most obvious parallel comes from the cult of Mithras, where pater was the highest of the seven grades through which a person could pass. It seems that the lower orders, such as Lions, could have a pater at their head, and that the patres could have a pater over them, who would be called pater patrum/pater pateron, PP in abbreviated form. One is immediately reminded of the pater pateron from Venosa (CII 619b) and of CII 607, 610, and 614, where the abbreviation PP occurs. The Mithraic parallels are a further confirmation that PP equals pater patrum. While we have no evidence that Judaism had anything like the seven grades of Mithraism, the exact concurrence of titles is striking and one should not exclude Mithraic influence here. Pater patrum, even when taken out of the Mithraic context of seven grades, could still signify a high office. Mother and father were also used in other cults, several inscriptions from which make clear that a simple identification of mother/father with patrona/us is inappropriate. Thus, the evidence indicates that mothers and fathers in the professional clubs may have had a different role from those in the cultic clubs. While the evidence from Mithraism must be seen in light of the Mithraic ranking system, which Judaism did not have, it is nevertheless a help for us, for it indicates the leading role a pater played, as a member of the highest rank or as a pater over another rank or as pater over the highest rank, that is as pater patrum.
Conclusions

There is solid evidence that women bore the title mother of the synagogue, or variations thereof, in inscriptions that may represent a span of six centuries. The six inscriptions discussed are all from Italy. These inscriptions cannot be seen as freaks of history, nor can they be cavalierly dismissed as purely honorific titles. Given the fragmentary nature of our evidence, we should assume that the six women discussed were not the only women to have borne this title. The fifth-century (?) anti-Jewish polemic, De Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae, bears witness that non-Jews were also familiar with this phenomenon. While we cannot exactly define the function of a mother/father of the synagogue, all indications are that it had something to do with the administration of the synagogue. Family ties seem in certain instances to have played a role in a person's selection to this office, so we can assume that most mothers/fathers were members of leading families.
CHAPTER V

WOMEN AS PRIESTS

A. The Inscriptional Evidence for Female Priests

There exist three ancient Jewish inscriptions in which a woman bears the title hierisai/hierissa. They range in age from the first century B.C.E. through possibly the fourth century C.E. and were found in Tell el-Yahudiyyeh in Lower Egypt, in Beth She'arim in Galilee, and in Rome.

Tell el-Yahudiyyeh

CII 1514 (SFR 1 [1923] no. 574). Rectangular stele, 45 cm in height, 22 cm in breadth, with an indented space ruled for the inscription, but without architectural decoration.

ΜΑΡΙΝ  
2 ἱερίσαι ΧΡ-  
3 ησθ ηνα-  
4 σύφιλε κ-  
5 αί ἀνυπνε κ-  
6 αί φιλογίτ-  
7 ὁν χαίρη, ὃ-  
8 εὶ ἔτοι ν'.  
9 Λ γ' Καίσαρ Π-  
10 αὐντ γ.'

L. 9: read λυκάβαντος γ' Καίσαρος.

O Marin, priest, good and a friend to all, causing pain to no one and friendly to your neighbors, farewell! (She died at the age of) approximately fifty years, in the third year of Caesar (Augustus), on the thirteenth day of Payni (= June 7, 28 B.C.E.).

C. C. Edgar, who first published the inscription in 1922, thought that IERISA was "the name of Marion's father; whether it is an indeclinable noun or whether this is a genitive in -α I do not know."\(^1\) Edgar thus thought that Marion's father's name was IERISAS or IERISA. This rather strange interpretation of a not uncommon Greek noun was corrected the following year by Hans Lietzmann, who recognized it to be hieris(s)ai, "priestess" (Priesterin).\(^2\) The name Marin is a form of Marion\(^3\) and also occurs in other Greek inscriptions.\(^4\)

This is one of eighty Jewish inscriptions found in a Jewish necropolis in Tell el-Yahudiyyeh.\(^5\) Many of the inscriptions are dated; CII 1466, 1492, 1493, 1498 are also from the time of
Augustus. The terminology (chresta, pasiphile, alypos) and form of our inscriptions (name followed by adjectives, chaire, approximate age at death, year, day of Egyptian month) are very similar to the terminology and form of the other Tell el-Yahudiyyeh inscriptions, both of those from the time of Augustus and of the others, which range from the second century B.C.E. through the first century C.E.

As with the other inscriptions in which women bear titles, modern scholars have been at pains to point out that hierisai here has no real meaning, e.g., Jean-Baptiste Frey, "This is not to say that Marin had an actual function as a priestess in the Jewish community, but rather that she belonged to the descendants of Aaron, to the priestly family . . . ." 6

For the interpretation of hierisai, it is rather significant that the Marin inscription was found in Tell el-Yahudiyyeh, i.e., the ancient Leontopolis in the nome of Heliopolis, for it was in Leontopolis that Onias IV, the legitimate heir to the Jerusalem high priesthood, founded a Jewish temple during the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra II (181-146 B.C.E.), when he saw that he had no chance of attaining the Jerusalem high priesthood due to events surrounding the Maccabean revolt. 7 He founded the temple, probably around 160 B.C.E., by renovating and purifying an Egyptian temple. (On the Onias temple, see Josephus, J.W. 1.1.1 § 33; 7.10.2-4 §§ 420-436; Ant. 12.9.7 §§ 387-388; 13.3.1-3 §§ 62-73; 13.10.4 § 285; 20.10.3 § 236.) Josephus reports (Ant. 13.3.3 § 73) that "Onias found some Jews who, like him, were priests and Levites to minister there" (ἐδρεὶ δὲ ὁ Ὀνιας καὶ Ἰουδαίους τινάς διωτός αὐτῷ καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ λευτῖται τῶν ἑκεί θρησκεύοντας, cf. Ant. 13.3.1 § 63; J.W. 7.10.3-4 §§ 430-434). The temple of Onias existed, and Jewish priests served at it, until 73 C.E. or shortly before 73, when the Romans closed it (Josephus. J.W. 7.10.2-4 §§ 420-436).

The later rabbis are still familiar with the temple of Onias, the sacrificial service of which they view with some ambivalence, but which they are willing to recognize as valid under certain limited circumstances. (See m. Menah. 13:10; t. Menah. 13.12-14 [Zuck. 533]; b. Meg. 10a; b. Menah. 109; y. Yoma 43c.64-43d.6; y. Sanh. 19a.9.) One should view the Onias temple in the context of other Jewish temples outside of Jerusalem. 8 The very existence of these various cultic sites raises the question of pluralism within the Jewish cult.
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Rome

CII 315. Plaque of white marble, 19 cm in height, 35 cm in width, 3.7 cm in breadth, from the Monteverde catacomb in the Via Portuensis.

Ενδέαξε κατε
2 Γαυδεντία
4 Εν Λοφήνη ἡ
6 τῆς.

L. 1. read κεῖται.
L. 4. read εἰρήνη.

Here lies Gaudentia, priest, (aged) 24 years. In peace be her sleep!

On the basis of the form of the carved letters, in particular of the μω, which is nearly cursive, the inscription is probably from the third or fourth century C.E. The menorah and the Torah shrine (with open doors revealing five shelves and six compartments) attest to the Jewishness of the inscription. Torah shrines also occur on other Jewish inscriptions from the Monteverde catacomb (cf. CII 327[4th C.], 343, 401[3rd C.], 460[3rd/4th C.]). Möller and Bees suggest that the Torah shrine may be a special symbol of Gaudentia's priestly ancestry and that the Roman Jewish community, with its limited knowledge of Hebrew, may have identified Ἀρῶν (Torah shrine) with Aaron. The depiction of an Ἀρῶν would indicate descendancy from Aaron. Since, however, this is the only one of the Monteverde inscriptions embellished by a Torah shrine which was dedicated to a person of priestly class, their suggestion is not convincing. The Torah shrine, like the other Jewish symbols which ornament ancient epitaphs, may simply indicate that the deceased was Jewish.

The name Gaudentia also appears in another inscription from the Monteverde catacomb in the Via Portuensis, CII 314, where the bearer of the name is the daughter of a man named Oklatios. The male (?) form of the name, Galudentis (Gaudentios?), occurs in CII 316, which is also from the Monteverde catacomb.
Four, possibly five, men bear the title hierus in inscriptions from the Monteverde catacomb: CII 346, 347 (twice), 375, 355 (?). These will be discussed below.\footnote{11}

As for the meaning of hierisa, modern commentators follow the pattern we have seen elsewhere. Harry J. Leon writes:

One woman, Gaudentia (315), is styled a hierisa. This is apparently the equivalent of the Hebrew cohenet and probably designates the wife (or daughter) of a hierus. It could hardly point to a priestly function for a woman, since no priestesses are to be found in the Jewish worship. Father Frey thought that the title must denote a feminine member of the priestly family of Aaron.\footnote{12}

Frey himself writes, "ἱέρισα, literally 'priestess,' cannot, in the present case, mean anything other than a member of the priestly family of Aaron."\footnote{13}

Beth She'arim

CII 1007.\footnote{14} Painted in red above and to the right of arcosolium 2 of Hall K in Catacomb 1, 38 cm in length and 26 in height, with the height of the letters varying from 3 to 5 cm.

Σαρα Θυγάτηρ
2 Ναίμιας μη-
το το ἱερείας
4 κύρα Μαρ[ε]ης
[ἐν]θα θα κ[είται?].

L. 4. read κύρας.

Sara, daughter of Naimia, mother of the priest, Lady Maria, lies here.

The inscription should probably be dated to the fourth century C.E.\footnote{15} Schwabe and Lifshitz argue that Sara's corpse had been brought from abroad, perhaps from Palmyra, for burial in Beth She'arim.\footnote{16} The specific evidence for this case, however, namely nails and chips of wood found in her resting place, is not particularly convincing. The title kyra, "Lady," is not uncommon among the Greek inscriptions of Beth She'arim.\footnote{17} The name of Sara's father, Naimia, is the equivalent of the Hebrew Nehemyah.\footnote{18} Note that Sara's father is not called a priest.\footnote{19} On the meaning of hierisa, Schwabe and Lifshitz write:

Particularly the use of the title ἱέρεια is most interesting. Sarah, the mother of Miriam the priestess, was not a priestess herself and neither was her daughter. Miriam was a cohenet, i.e., the wife of a cohen. The relatives of the deceased wanted to indicate in the epitaph that Sarah was the mother of a cohen's wife. We cannot find a better proof
of the high social status of the priests in the Jewish community.20

Since Sara's father is not called a priest, it is indeed unlikely that Sara was the daughter of a priest, and therefore a priest herself. Why Maria, however, who is called a priest, should not after all be one, is unclear. The meaning of cohenet (kohenet) will be discussed below.21

CII 1085. Frey, on the basis of a communication with Moshe Schwabe, gives the following transcription:

.... [ŋŋ薄弱?]
2 καὶ Σάρα [ζ δραματρός?]
Ν]αυμάκας υφε...
4 Μαριν [ας .....]22

[Tomb of . . . ], priest (?), and of Sara,
[daughter of?] Naimia and of Maria . . . .

Schwabe and Lifshitz (Beth She'arim no. 68) state that the inscription is set above an arcosolium in room III of Hall K in Catacomb 1, and is 26 cm in length and 10 cm in height, with the letters being 3 cm high. According to them, line 1 is incised, and lines 2-4 are painted in red. Their reading is:

Καὶ Σάρα [θυγατέρας]
2 [τηρ Ν]αυμάκας υφε [μήτηρα]?
Μαριν [ας Σερίριφ [ας?]23

And Sara, daughter of Naimia and mother of the priest Maria.

Note that Frey has a line above the first line of Schwabe and Lifshitz. The difference between the two transcriptions should be sufficient evidence for the illegibility of this one inscription. A major difficulty with the Schwabe and Lifshitz transcription and reconstruction is that it is based on the assumption that two women, both by the name of Sara, both daughters of men named Naimia, and both mothers of priests named Maria, were buried at approximately the same time in the same hall, an assumption which is rather unlikely. Due to the uncertain reading of this inscription, it will not be considered as evidence for the title hierelix.

B. Possible Interpretations of hierelix/hierissa

There exist several possibilities for interpreting this term in our inscriptions:
1. **Hieris/hierissa** is simply the Greek equivalent of **kohenet** (Aramaic: **kahantta**)

**Kohenet** is not a biblical but a rabbinic term. Although linguistically **kohenet** is the feminine of **kohen** (Aramaic: **kahana**), it is not exactly parallel in meaning to **kohen**. A man becomes a **kohen** in one way, by birth. **Kohen** can therefore be defined as "son of a **kohen,**" who must, of course, be married to a Jewish woman. 24 A woman becomes a **kohenet** in two ways, by birth and by marriage. **Kohenet** can therefore be defined as "daughter of a **kohen**" (**bat kohen**) or as "wife of a **kohen**" (**peset kohen**).

The priest's daughter 25 had certain priestly rights, such as the right to eat from the priestly dues, a right which is laid down in the Bible (Lev 22:12-13):

If a priest's daughter is married to an outsider she shall not eat of the offering of the holy things. But if a priest's daughter is a widow or divorced, and has no child, and returns to her father's house, as in her youth, she may eat of her father's food; yet no outsider shall eat of it.

The presupposition here is that the priest's daughter, while a child, may eat of the priestly offerings. Unlike her brother, however, the daughter of a priest can lose her right to eat of the priestly offerings by marrying a common Israelite; if he marries a common Israelite, he may continue to eat the priestly dues, but if she does so, she relinquishes that right. If she marries a priest, however, she may continue to eat of the priestly offering, but this right is a derived one, i.e., due to her priestly husband and not to her own priestly descendence (also a derivation, of course).

The Holiness Code in Leviticus places the sexual activity of priests' daughters and wives in the context of the holiness of the male priests. Lev 21:9 reads:

If a priest's daughter is married to an outsider she shall not eat of the offering of the holy things. But if a priest's daughter is a widow or divorced, and has no child, and returns to her father's house, as in her youth, she may eat of her father's food; yet no outsider shall eat of it.

And the daughter of any priest, if she profanes herself by playing the harlot, profanes her father; she shall be burned with fire.
Thus, the holiness of the priest can be damaged by the sexual activity of his daughter; his holiness is to be preserved by executing the daughter whose sexual activity is not within the bounds of patriarchally-sanctioned marriage.

Similarly, the prospective wife of a priest must reflect his holiness (Lev 21:7):

אשת זכה תורה ולא י反腐_ASSOCירת מראשת לא י反腐
לך-שךיה תורה לא תארחה.

The (priests) shall not marry a harlot or a woman who has been defiled; neither shall they marry a woman divorced from her husband; for the priest is holy to his God.

The priest must marry a widow or a virgin to preserve his own holiness. A prostitute, a rape victim or a divorced woman would endanger his holiness. Ezekiel warns priests to marry only Israelite virgins, but allows them priests' widows (Ezek 44:22). The high priest is allowed to take only "a virgin of his own people, that he may not profane his children among his people" (Lev 21:14). The issue in these laws is the holiness of the priestly semen, which should not be allowed to enter a "vessel" previously profaned by pre- or extra-marital sexual intercourse, whether the intercourse had been forced or not. The distinction between the divorced woman and the priest's widow is not immediately clear; perhaps the divorced woman was considered more likely to engage in prostitution or other non-marital sexual intercourse than a widow, a view common in patriarchal societies.

The questions raised in these biblical laws, namely, the right to eat of the priestly dues and the profanation of the priest through his wife or daughter, form the background of much of the rabbinic discussion on the kohenet. Further marriage limitations, i.e., limitations on who could become a kohenet through marriage, are also spelled out. For example, a huluša (a childless widow whose brother-in-law refused to marry her according to the duty of levirate marriage; see Deut 25:5-10) may be forbidden to a priest (m. Ye'bam. 2:4; cf. 1:4:26 the School of Shamai forbids it; the School of Hillel allows it), as may a woman taken in levirate marriage (m. Ye'bam. 1:4: the School of Shamai allows it; the School of Hillel forbids it). A kohenet who by accident (through a mix-up) had had intercourse with the wrong husband was also forbidden to marry a priest (m. Ye'bam. 3:10).

Lev 22:13 had already established that the daughter of a priest could lose her priestliness by marrying a non-priest. The
Mishnah (Yeḥam. 7:4-6) lists a number of further causes for which a bat kōḥēn can lose her right to eat of the priestly heave-offering (tārūmā) or by which she may not attain it in the first place. For example, the brother-in-law whose duty it is to marry the widowed, childless bat kōḥēn (m. Yeḥam. 7:4) is a hindrance for her; since she is bound to him, she cannot return to her father's house and eat the heave-offering. As we saw above, if her brother-in-law refuses to marry her, she becomes a hālūqā and priests are forbidden to marry her; thus, she also loses the possibility of regaining the right to eat heave-offering by marrying a priest.

A central text on the kōhenet is m. Sōta 3:7:

A daughter of an Israelite who is wed to a kōhen: her meal-offering is burned; and a kōhenet (i.e., a daughter of a priest) who is wed to a common Israelite: her meal-offering is eaten.

In what manner does a kōhen differ from a kōhenet? The meal-offering of a kōhenet is not eaten; a kōhenet may forfeit her priestly rights, but a kōhen does not forfeit his priestly rights; a kōhenet may become defiled because of the dead, but a kōhen must not contract defilement because of the dead; a kōhen may eat of the most holy sacrifices, but a kōhenet may not eat of the most holy sacrifices.

This text is specifically concerned with pointing out that the priestliness of a kōhenet implies less than the priestliness of a kōhen. Thus, the commandment to burn the meal-offering of a priest (Lev 6:16, "Every meal-offering of a priest must be a whole-offering; it is not to be eaten.") is taken to refer to the son of a priest, but not to the daughter of a priest. The kōhenet who marries a non-priestly Israelite is to eat the meal-offering as if she had not been born into the priestly class. In contrast, the non-priestly Israelite woman who is married to a priest is considered to be of priestly class, and her meal-offering is burned.

Similarly, a daughter of a priest may lose her right to eat the heave-offering (tārūmā) by having sexual intercourse with a man forbidden to her. Such a sexual connection also implies that
she may never marry a priest. The son of a priest, however, who marries a woman forbidden to him, such as a prostitute or a divorced woman (see Lev 21:7), loses his priestly rights only for the period during which he is married to her. If he divorces her or if she dies, he may once again claim his priestly rights. Thus, while a daughter of a priest can "profane herself" permanently, a son of a priest cannot. The Babylonian Talmud (Sota 23b) gives Lev 21:15 ("that he may not profane his seed among his people") as scriptural proof for the permanency of a male priest's priestliness: a priest can profane his seed but not himself, i.e., the children of such a union are not of the priestly class, but he himself remains a priest (cf. B. Mak. 2a; m. Bek. 7:7).

Further, a kohener, unlike a kohän, is allowed to touch a corpse. The Babylonian Talmud (Sota 23b) gives Lev 21:1 as scriptural proof for this distinction between kohän and kohener: "Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron ( . . . that none of them shall defile himself for the dead among his people)," is taken to mean "the sons of Aaron" and not "the daughters of Aaron."

Finally, a kohän may eat of the most holy sacrifices, while a kohener is not allowed to do so. The scriptural proof adduced by the Babylonian Talmud (Sota 23b) is Lev 6:11: "All male descendants of Aaron may eat ( . . . of the offerings made by fire . . . )."

M. Sota 3:7 makes clear that at least one rabbinic view was that the priestliness of a woman was much more fragile and open to profanation than that of a man. There was no circumstance under which a man could lose his priestliness; the priestliness of a woman, however, could be forfeited forever by one act of sexual intercourse, whether desired or forced. Further, according to this view, the priestliness of a woman did not imply the same degree of sanctity as the man's priestliness. Thus, the prohibition of touching a corpse and the right to eat of the most holy sacrifices did not apply to the kohener. Nevertheless, there is a recognition that the kohener, be she a priest's daughter or a priest's wife, has the right to eat of the heave-offering.28 Her eating of the heave-offering is surrounded by purity regulations, such as that she not eat of it during her menstrual period (m. Nid. 1:7).

In light of this background, one is rather surprised to read the following passage (B. Bül. 131b-132a):
'Ulla used to give the priestly dues to the kohenet. Rava raised the following objection to 'Ulla. We have learned: "The meal-offering of a kohenet is eaten, and the meal-offering of a kohen is not eaten" (m. Sota 3:7). Now if you say that kohen includes a kohenet too, is it not written, "And every meal-offering of a priest must be a whole-offering; it is not to be eaten" (Lev 6:16)? He replied, "Master, I borrow your own argument, for in that passage are expressly mentioned Aaron and his sons."

The School of R. Ishmael taught: "Unto the kohen" (Deut 18:3), but not unto the kohenet, for we may infer what is not explicitly stated from what is explicitly stated.

The School of R. Eli'ezer ben Jacob taught: "Unto the kohen" (Deut 18:3), and even unto the kohenet, for we have here a limitation following a limitation, and the purpose of a double limitation is to extend the law.

R. Kahana used to eat (the priestly dues) on account of his wife. R. Papa used to eat them on account of his wife. R. Yemar used to eat them on account of his wife. R. Idi bar Avin used to eat them on account of his wife.

Ravina said, Meremar told me . . . that the halakha is in accordance with 'Ulla's view. 29

The issue here is whether the kohenet (priest's daughter) who has married a non-priest is allowed to eat the priestly dues (Deut 18:3-4). According to the passages discussed thus far, the answer seems to be a clear no. A priestly woman who has married a non-priestly man forfeits her priestly rights. Yet this text reports on a tradition according to which priests' daughters who had "profaned themselves" (cf. m. Sota 3:7) were in fact allowed to continue to eat the priestly dues. Even more surprising is the tradition that a number of non-priestly rabbis 30 ate the priestly dues on account of their priestly wives, which means that not only did these women not forfeit their priestly rights upon marriage to a non-priest, but that they were even able to pass these rights on to their husbands. Two scriptural arguments are made for giving priests' daughters the priestly dues even
Priests

if they are married to sons of non-priests. The arguments are both based on Deut 18:3, which reads:

ויהי הנחל מפריש החכמים
הוחל ערב פסח ביום הודי והכיר ארמיום
postcode לקהל חזרה להחללים התוכנה:

And this shall be the priests' due from the people, from those offering sacrifice, whether it be ox or sheep: they shall give to the priest the shoulder and the two cheeks and the stomach.

The arguments are:
1. Deut 18:3 speaks of "priests" (m.) and "priest" (m.) as the recipients of the priestly dues; according to 'Ulla, these terms, in contrast to the "Aaron and his sons" of Lev 6:16, which refer to the meal-offering and is the scriptural basis for burning the meal-offering of קהלים (m.) and letting קהלות (f.) eat their meal-offering (m. סנה 3:7), can include women.
2. According to the School of R. Ishmael, the grammatical gender of "priest" in Deut 18:3 implies the exclusion of women.
3. According to the School of R. Eli'ezer ben Jacob, the use of both "priests" (m.) and "priest" (m.) in Deut 18:3, both of which exclude women, has the effect that the double exclusion implies an inclusion.

These two strands of tradition, i.e., that the priestliness of a קהנת is lasting and that it is not, must be left to stand side by side. There is no reason to try to harmonize the two.

It is not possible to discuss all of the passages in which קהנת appears, but even the few passages cited show that:
1. The rabbis recognized that a קהנת had certain rights and duties; 2. There were divergent views as to how derivative and fragile a woman's priestliness was, so that whether she could lose her priestly rights is not univocally answered.

There would be no difficulty in identifying 히레아/ἱερίσσα as the Greek equivalent of קהנת. Such an identification would in no way imply congregational leadership or a cultic function, other than the right to eat the priestly offerings (and possibly the right to pass this right on to their husbands). It would also imply the respect due to a member of the priestly caste.

2. 히레아/ἱερίσσα in the Inscriptions Means "Priest" in the Cultic Sense of the Term

Some may find this hard to believe. Female cultic functionaries do not fit our image of ancient Judaism. To be
sure, seventy-five and eighty years ago there were those who argued that women could have held some official position in the ancient Israelite cult, but their view gradually fell out of scholarly favor. This is not the place for a thorough, critical examination of the question of female priests in ancient Israel, but it is necessary to survey briefly some of the evidence cited by scholars at the turn of the century, as well as by several contemporary scholars who have argued that women may at one time have served as priestesses in ancient Israel. The relevance of the early material for the later should be clear. Earlier practices could have lived on for centuries, and biblical priestesses could have functioned as a model for the post-biblical period.

Two biblical texts which have been cited as evidence for priestesses in ancient Israel are Exod 38:8 and 1 Sam 2:22. Exod 38:8 reads:

וריהת את הכליור נחתת ואתה כנר נחתת
בכראת התעבת אשר צבאר פחה בתו פרעה:

And he (Bezalel) made the laver of bronze and its base of bronze, from the mirrors of the ministering women (ḥagqob'ōt) who ministered (pāḥ'ō) at the door of the tent of meeting.

The root pāḥ', in addition to the more usual meaning of "to wage war," can also mean "to serve in the cult," as it does in Num 4:3,23,30; 8:24, where it refers to the cultic service of Levites.

1 Sam 2:22 reads:

והליר זיק מאר רושע ואת כל-אישר יישרל
בכיר לכל-ישראל ראות אשע-רשכבל
וחודישת הצבאות פחת אתו פרעה:

Now Eli was very old, and he heard all that his sons were doing in Israel, and how they lay with the women who ministered (ḥagqob'ōt) at the door of the house of meeting.

Whether this text refers to ritual, polyandrous sexual activity, normally called "cultic prostitution" by modern scholars, is unclear. If so, then we must assume that ritual sexual activity at a YHWH cultic site (Shiloh) was at least tolerated. An alternative explanation is that the sexual intercourse between the sons of Eli and the women ministering at the tent was not ritual in any way, and that the cultic service of these women consisted of some other sort of activity.

As might be expected, a number of modern scholars have suggested that the "women who ministered at the door of the tent
of meeting" in Exod 38:8 and 1 Sam 2:22 were actually housekeepers. S. R. Driver speaks of "the performance of menial duties by the women." 35 A. Eberharter speculates that the women may have been the wives and daughters of the priests, who would seem to have a special calling "to perform those tasks at the temple which required feminine diligence and sense of aesthetics." 36 Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg writes: "The women mentioned here (and in Exod 38:8) have the responsibility for seeing to it that the entrance, which is especially important for what goes on at the sanctuary, is kept clean." 37

These two texts, both of which refer to the pre-Jerusalem temple period, must be treated very cautiously. Rather than calling them evidence, I would prefer simply to say that they raise questions. The problem of over-interpretation actually lies not in suggesting that these women may have been cultic functionaries, but rather in knowing that they must have performed those menial duties which the modern commentators assign to their wives, daughters and housemaids.

It has been suggested that several biblical figures were possibly priestesses. Zipporah, for example, daughter of a Midianite priest and wife of Moses (Exod 2:16, 21), performed the ritual of circumcision on her son in order to avert the destructiveness of the Lord (Exod 4:24-26). F. M. Cross suggests that she was "apparently a priestess in her own right." 38 One must note, however, that circumcising is not usually considered to be a priestly activity, although it may have been in that period.

Benjamin Mazar suggests that Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, in whose tent Sisera sought refuge (Judg 4:17-20), could have functioned as a priestess at the sacred precincts related to the terebinth of Elon-bezaanannim:

It may be concluded that Sisera fled from the battle to the tent of Jael not only to seek the peace which reigned between Jabin the king of Hazor and the family of Heber the Kenite, but also because of the special exalted position of Jael, and because her dwelling place, Elon Bezaannaim, was recognized as a sanctified spot and a place of refuge where protection was given even to an enemy. As for Sisera's murder at a sanctified spot, in violation of all rules of hospitality, it may be explained only as the fulfillment of a divine command by a charismatic woman; thus: "Blessed above women shall the wife of Heber be, blessed shall she be above women in the tent" (Judg 5:24). 39

Mazar's conclusion is based on the background of the family of Heber the Kenite, on the religious significance of terebinths, 40 as well as on the verse in the Song of Deborah, "In the days of
Shamgar, son of Anath, in the days of Jael, caravans ceased and travelers kept to the byways" (Judg 5:6). This parallelization of Shamgar and Jael led the medieval Jewish commentator Rashi to note, "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael' indicates that even Jael was a judge in Israel in her days" (מלמד שמחה עלף שמחה את יראת ברמות).

Judg 5:24 reads, "Blessed above women be Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, of the women in the tent most blessed" (יתבֶּרֶךְ מְבֹרֶךְ נְבֵרֶךְ נַפְעָלָה בְּנֵרֶךְ נַפְעָלָה נַפְעָלָה נַפְעָלָה). It is worth noting that Targum Jonathan translates this verse as follows:

הַתֹּבֵר מְבֹרֶךְ נְבֵרֶךְ נַפְעָלָה בְּנֵרֶךְ נַפְעָלָה נַפְעָלָה נַפְעָלָה

Let the blessed one of goodly women, Jael the wife of Heber, be blessed; her perfection is as one of the women who minister in the houses of learning. Blessed is she!

The root אֶמֶשׁ means "to minister," "to officiate," "to wait upon." In Hebrew it is used of the high priest and the common priests in reference to their Yom Kippur functions in the temple (e.g., m. Yoma 7:5; y. Yoma 44b.40-42), to the high priest's exercising the office of high priest (e.g., b. Yoma 47a), to the functions of the segan, i.e., the adjutant high priest (e.g., y. Yoma 41a.3-4), and to other administrative functions (e.g., y. Sota 24a.24-25). In the targums, אֶמֶשׁ is also used to mean priestly activity. For example, for 1 Sam 1:3, "the two sons of Eli, Hophni, and Phineas, were priests of the Lord" (שְׁנֵי בְנוֹי אֵלִי חֲפָנִי וּפִינְאָס היוֹתְרֵי הָעֵדֶד וְהָעֵדֶד וְהָעֵדֶד וְהָעֵדֶד), Targum Jonathan reads, "the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phineas, ministered before the Lord (שְׁנֵי בְנוֹי אֵלִי חֲפָנִי וּפִינְאָס וְעַדְוַהְנֵךְ וְעַדְוַהְנֵךְ וְעַדְוַהְנֵךְ וְעַדְוַהְנֵךְ)." Seen against the background of the use of אֶמֶשׁ to refer to priestly activity, the "women who minister (דִּימְשָׁמְשִין) in the houses of learning" of Targum Jonathan gains added interest, whereby the "houses of learning" remains an enigma. Doubtlessly some scholars will want to see the ministry of these women as consisting of sweeping the floor and rearranging the mats after the pupils and their learned teachers had finished the day's lesson, but such an interpretation would seem to be biased by a particular view of women. Could they have been teachers in the houses of learning?

In summary, Jael's family background, the fact that she is mentioned together with Shamgar (Judg 5:6) and the fact that Sisera sought refuge in her tent (Judg 4:17-21; 5:25-27) point to the possibility that Jael was a charismatic and perhaps even a priestly figure. Targum Jonathan's use of אֶמֶשׁ could indicate
that even in later periods the remembrance of Jael as a priestly figure was still alive, although what ministering in the houses of learning could have meant is unclear.

The figure of Miriam should also be mentioned here. Miriam, who is called a "prophet" (nēbi'ā), is said to have led the Israelite women in religious dancing and singing (Exod 15:20-21). Num 12 reports on a struggle for spiritual influence and authority which pitted herself and Aaron against Moses. The prophet Micah also seems to view Miriam as a prophet: "I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam" (Mic 6:4). These and further biblical references to Miriam (Num 20:1; 26:59; Deut 24:9; 1 Chr 5:29) are in need of a systematic study in order to ascertain what the exact nature of Miriam's cultic role may have been, whereby cultic does not necessarily imply priestly.

Further, one must answer the difficult questions of dating, and thereby of original historical context (and of historicity), of the Miriam texts, before it is possible to describe adequately the development of the Miriam tradition. 44

One later chapter of the Miriam tradition deserves at least brief mention. Philo of Alexandria reports on a group of women called the Therapeutrides (De vita contempl. 2), who devoted their lives to the study of scripture (De vita contempl. 28). These celibate women (De vita contempl. 68) lived in a type of dual monastery together with their male colleagues, the Therapeutai. Philo emphasizes that they flourished in his time (20 B.C.E.—after 40 C.E.) in many countries, including non-Greek ones (also in Palestine?), but that they were especially numerous in the area of Alexandria (De vita contempl. 21).

According to Philo, the Therapeutrides and Therapeutai closed their sabbath meal by singing together (De vita contempl. 87-88):

This wonderful sight and experience (cf. Exod 14:26-29—the crossing of the Red Sea), an act transcending word and thought and hope, so filled with ecstasy both men and women that forming a single choir they sang hymns of thanksgiving to God their saviour, the men led by the prophet Moses and the women by the prophet Miriam. It is on this model above all that the choir of Therapeutai and Therapeutrides, note in
response to note and voice to voice, the treble of the women blending with the bass of the men, create an harmonious concert, music in the truest sense.

Thus, the ceremonial singing of the Therapeutrides and Therapeutai took as its model the singing of the Song of the Sea in Exod 15, in which the women were led by their prophet, Miriam, and the men by their prophet, Moses. From this text it is clear that the Miriam tradition played a role in the cultic life of the community. 

This very cursory survey of evidence for women in ancient Israel having performed religious functions that may have been priestly cannot replace the intensive philological and historical work required to answer the question whether there were in fact women priests in ancient Israel. The passages cited show, however, that the question is not as absurd as it seems at first sight. In spite of the overwhelmingly masculine nature of the ancient Israelite priesthood, there are scraps of scattered evidence which could indicate a more varied historical reality than we are accustomed to imagine. The Israelite priesthood, like other institutions in ancient Israel and in the Jewish Diaspora, was not monolithic. The above texts, as well as the three inscriptions in question, are themselves hints of a diversity in the institution of the priesthood.

In the narrow sense of priesthood, i.e., fulfilling cultic functions at a sacred site, Marin from Leontopolis in the Heliopolitan nome is the only one of the three women named in the inscriptions who could have been a temple functionary, for she is the only one to have lived in a city and in a time in which a Jewish temple existed. Cultic or priestly functions could have included singing psalms, providing musical accompaniment, performing priestly blessings, examining the priestly offerings and animals and performing sacrifices. While it may seem strange to some that a temple founded by the Jerusalem high priestly family, the Oniads, could ever have allowed the cultic service of women, we must remind ourselves how little we actually know of the temple of Onias, which did, after all, endure for nearly two and a half centuries. Could it be that practices such as allowing women to exercise cultic functions were among the reasons for the rabbis' hesitancy to recognize the sacrifices offered there as valid? Could it be that the Jews of Leontopolis, living in a country in which there were female priests, had come, over the course of time, to accept as natural the cultic participation of Jewish women who claimed to be descendants of Aaron (or the
successors to Miriam?)? Our knowledge of the Jewish temple at Leontopolis is too meager to be able to give a definitive answer to these questions.

In addition to the temple of Onias, Josephus mentions other Jewish temples in Egypt. He quotes Onias IV as writing in a letter to Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra II (Ant. 13.3.1 § 66):

... καὶ πλείστους εὑρὼν παρὰ τὸ καθήκον ἔχοντας ἱερὰ καὶ διὰ τούτο δύσνυμος ἄλληλοις, δὲ καὶ ἱγυπτίοις συμβέβηκε διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰς ᾲρησκελίας οὐχ ὅμοιοβεβεβεῖν ...

... and I found that most of them have temples, contrary to what is proper, and that for this reason they are ill-disposed toward one another, as is also the case with the Egyptians because of the multitude of their temples and their varying opinions about the forms of worship ...

Agatharchides of Cnidus (2nd C. B.C.E.) also speaks of Jewish temples in the plural (hieron) as do Tacitus (1st C. C.E.; tempora) and Tertullian (2nd - 3rd C. C.E.; tempora). Whether hieron/temple in Agatharchides, Tacitus and Tertullian (and Josephus) means "temples" in the narrower sense of the term or simply "places of worship" is not absolutely certain. Perhaps these terms were simply the equivalent of proseuchai, which was the usual term for synagogue in Egypt and also occurred elsewhere. On the other hand, the resistance to the possibility that hieron/temple meant "temples" in one or more of these texts probably has its origin in the belief that the existence of the Jerusalem temple excluded the possibility of other genuinely Jewish temples, that is, that the centralization of the cult was absolutely effective, a view which has little basis in the evidence.

Perhaps Marin served in one of these other Jewish hiera which Onias considered to be heterodox. Or perhaps she served in Onias's temple itself. According to the Josephus passage, the Jewish communities who supported these temples disagreed with each other concerning the proper form of worship. Could the temple service of women have been one of the points of the dispute, much as today Reform, Reconstructionist, Conservative and Orthodox Jews are in disagreement as to whether women should be called up to read the Torah or should be ordained rabbis?

We cannot know precisely how Marin and her relatives and community understood the title hiera. The existence of the Marin inscription should at least serve as a warning to any
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scholar who would categorically deny that a woman may have functioned as a priest in a Jewish temple in Leontopolis. The mention in several ancient authors of Jewish "temples" should remind us just how little we know about Jewish worship in this period.

3. Hierëia/hierissa could denote a synagogue function

To some, synagogue function may seem as incredible an interpretation as cultic function. Is it not the case that the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E. and the closing of the Jewish temple in Leontopolis in or shortly before 73 C.E. saw the end of priestly cultic service? Ancient sources show that the situation is not that simple. We know that priests continued to give the priestly blessing even after the destruction of the temple. (This practice has continued until our own day.) The priestly blessing in the synagogue is a continuation of the priests' blessing of the people in the temple, a practice which is based on Num 6:22-27. Whether the priestly blessing in the synagogue was practiced already during the time of the Second Temple is not clear. There is evidence that the practice of having a priest be the first to read from the Torah during the synagogue service is an ancient one. M. Git. 5:8 reads:

These are the things which they ordained because of peace: a priest is the first to read (from the Torah) and after him a Levite, and after him a common Israelite, for the sake of peace.

Philo of Alexandria also attests to the priests being preferred as readers (Hypothetica 7.13):

Kal διὴτα συνερχονται μὲν αἷλοι καὶ συνεδρεύονσι μετ' ἄλληλων· οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ σιωπᾶς, πλὴν εἰ τι προσεπενήμησα τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων νομίζεται· τῶν ἱερέων δὲ τις ὁ παρὰν ή τῶν γερόντων εἰς ἀναγινώσκει τους ἱερεῖς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ καθ' ἔκαστον ἔχει εἶναι μέχρι σχεδὸν δειλῆς ὑφής· κάκα τοδέ άπολύονται τῶν τε νόμων τῶν ἱερῶν ἐμπείρως ἔχοντες καὶ πολο πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ἐπιθεδωκότες.

And indeed they do always assemble and sit together, most of them in silence except when it is the practice to add something to signify approval of what is read. But some priest who is present or one of the elders reads the holy
laws to them and expounds them point by point till about the late afternoon, when they depart having gained both expert knowledge of the holy laws and considerable advance in piety.

According to this description of a sabbath service at the time of Philo, which is presumably a reflection of Alexandrian practice, a priest or elder reads a scriptural passage and then delivers a sermon on it. In this passage, Philo is referring to general Jewish practice and not to one of the Jewish sects. The practice presupposed here is different from the rabbinic ideal expressed in *m. Git.* 5:8. According to Philo, one person reads the entire passage, whereas *m. Git.* 5:8 ordains that more than one person should read. Philo does not state that the priest has preference over the elder, but the priest is mentioned first. Perhaps a priest, if present, was given preference, and otherwise one of the elders read and preached.

In addition to the ancient evidence for these two priestly practices in the synagogue, i.e., the priestly blessing and the preference for priestly readers, the Theodosian Code contains a rather surprising reference to priests as synagogue functionaries. The word "priest" (in the plural: *hiereis*, used as a foreign word in the Latin text) occurs only once in reference to Jews in the Theodosian Code (16.8.4, given on December 1, 331):

Idem A. hieres et archisynagogos et patribus synagogarum et ceteris, qui in eodem loco deserviunt. Hieros et archisynagogos et patres synagogarum et ceteros, qui synagogis deserviunt, ab omni corporali munere liberos esse praecipimus. 54

The same Augustus to the priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all those who serve in the said place. We command that priests, heads of the synagogues, fathers of the synagogues, and all others who serve the synagogues shall be free from every compulsory service of a corporal nature. 55

This law has been discussed above in the context of mothers/fathers of the synagogues 56 and of heads of the synagogue. 57 Important for the present context is the inclusion of *hiereis* among others who serve in the synagogue, including heads of the synagogues and fathers of the synagogue. There are two possible explanations for the Roman lawgiver's having included *hiereis* in this law:

1. Christians, in writing the law, used the general Christian and pagan term for official religious functionary, not realizing that Jewish priests were not synagogue functionaries.
2. The authors of the law were well-informed of the inner workings of the synagogue, and this law is therefore an attestation of the Jewish priest's having been a synagogue functionary in this period.

In support of the first possibility, the increasing use of *hierēus* for Christian office-holders should be mentioned. In a period in which Christians had come to use the specifically cultic title *hierēus* to refer to deacons, presbyters and bishops, *hierēus* could have taken on the general meaning of "religious functionary." Thus, *hierēs* may reflect Christian, and not Jewish, usage. A modern parallel would be the use of "Islamic priest" to describe a *mullah*, which reflects the religious background of Western journalists, rather than Islamic usage. The position of *hierēs*, i.e., first in the list, could support this interpretation: the authors first employ the term which they consider to be the general term for "religious functionary," and then proceed to the specific titles of synagogue office known to them.

In support of the second explanation, one must note that the Christian authors had a deep enough knowledge of synagogue organization to employ two terms not in use in the Christian church: *archisynagogi* and *patres synagogarum*, although *archisynagogos* would have been known to them from the New Testament. Further, the imperial court writers would certainly not have had an interest in liberating more persons than necessary from the corporal duties. Their interest would rather have been to limit the liberation to those persons who were clearly synagogue functionaries.

It is difficult to decide which is the better explanation, particularly in the light of the fact that the term *hierēs*, as applied to Jews, occurs only once in the Theodosian Code. Although the second explanation is probably more convincing, it seems more prudent simply to let the two explanations both stand as good possibilities.

Evidence for special recognition of priests in non-temple worship services can be found at Qumran, where priests, together with the elders or the Levites and the elders, are commanded to sit in front (1QS 6:8; IQM 13:1). One must note, however, that the people of Qumran probably viewed their worship service as a substitute temple service, while it is not clear that synagogue congregants did. Further, according to the Manual of Discipline, there are to be three priests in the Council of the Community (1QS 8:1). The Damascus Document ordains that of the ten judges
Priests of the community, four must be from the tribe of Levi and Aaron (CD 10:4-5).

This scattered evidence for priests having roles in the synagogue or worship service as synagogue functionaries should not be misunderstood as evidence for priests as synagogue functionaries, but Philo, from the period before the destruction of the temple; the rabbinic references to the priestly blessing and the first Torah reader's being a priest, which can be dated back to at least the redaction of the Mishnah in the early third century; and the fourth-century Theodosian Code reference to Jewish priests in the context of synagogue officials (which may not be reliable, however) do show that several streams within Judaism seem to have given priests certain rights and roles within the non-temple worship service.

Does any of this mean that Jewish women of priestly caste had special roles in the worship service? This is by no means immediately obvious. Our starting point was the three hierieia/hierissa inscriptions. If male priests could, by virtue of their priesthood, exercise certain roles in the non-temple worship service, is it possible that female priests could likewise have performed certain functions in the worship service? There are certain hindrances to an acceptance of this proposition. For example, the male, i.e., exclusive, language of Num 6:23 ("Say to Aaron and his sons"); LXX: Ἀδάκησου Ααρων καὶ τοῦς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ), was probably understood by all later exegetes to mean that men--but not women--of priestly caste are to recite the priestly blessing. The rabbis usually take exclusive biblical language to mean that women are in fact excluded. This tradition of interpretation should be taken much more seriously by those of today who argue that "sons" really includes "daughters" and "man" really includes "woman." Against the background of the exclusion of women where the bible uses male terminology, it is surprising to find a rabbinic example of the exact opposite: taking the biblical "son" (bên) in Deut 25:5 to mean "son or daughter." The context is the woman whose husband dies without a son and whose brother-in-law is therefore required to marry her in order "that his (i.e., the dead husband's) name not be blotted out of Israel" (Deut 25:6). The rabbis ruled that if the deceased husband had a daughter, then the brother-in-law was not required to marry the woman (b. B. Bat. 109a). Perhaps this inclusive tradition is an old one, for the LXX has sperma for bên, and to paidion for habbêkôr (Deut 25:5-6). In sum, it is likely that most streams of Judaism
would have taken Num 6:23 ("sons of Aaron") to mean that only male priests should recite the priestly blessing, but the extension of "sons" to include "daughters" would not be a total anomaly in the history of Jewish exegesis.

Is it possible that priestly women could have been preferred readers of the Torah? Again, to most scholars of Judaism, this proposition sounds absurd, largely because of the general view that women were not allowed to read the Torah in the ancient synagogue at all. Can ancient sources shed any light on this question? An important passage is T. Meg. 4.11 (Zuck. 226):

(DateTime of Leilah, the Temple, the Assembly of the priests and Levites)

Everyone can be counted in the minyan of the seven (who read the Torah in the worship service), even a woman, even a minor, but one does not bring a woman up to read to the congregation.

The Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 23a) has:

(DateTime of Leilah, the Temple, the Assembly of the priests and Levites)

Our rabbis taught: Everyone can be counted in the minyan of the seven, even a minor, even a woman; but the sages said: A woman does not read from the Torah due to the honor of the congregation.

It is clear that these texts forbid women from reading the Torah to the congregation. The enigma is that if they are clearly forbidden to read, why are women included in the quorum of the seven in the first place? Minors, who are also included, are in fact allowed to read (see m. Meg. 4:6), a practice which later receded with the rise of the bar-mitzvah. Why are women included here at all? Ismar Elbogen suggests that women were originally allowed to read, but that by the Tannaitic period, they were already excluded. This would mean that the rabbinic inclusion of women in the quorum of the seven attests to a more ancient tradition, later suppressed, according to which women were allowed to read from the Torah in public.

Why the Babylonian Talmud gives the "honor of the congregation" as a reason for not allowing women to read is unclear. A possible parallel case could be a woman, a slave or a minor reading the Egyptian Hallel (Pss 113-118) to a man who is not able to read or to recite it from memory himself. The Mishnah ordains that such a man should repeat it after the woman,
the slave or the minor reading it, but curses be upon him (m. Sukk. 3:10)! The shame of having a member of one of these groups read to an illiterate, Jewish, adult male was apparently great in the eyes of the rabbis. What m. Sukk. 3:10 does show is that it was not unknown in the rabbinic period for women to be capable of reading scripture aloud.

Neither t. Meg. 4.11 nor m. Sukk. 3:10 can be dated more specifically than to the Tannaitic period, which closed around the first quarter of the third century. They are not parallel passages, of course, for t. Meg. refers to women reading the Torah in public and forbids it, while m. Sukk. 3:10 refers to women reading the Hallel in private and grudgingly allows it. The enigma of the inclusion of women in the minyan of the seven cannot be definitively solved with the few hints available to us in our sources, but their inclusion does make it impossible to state that under no circumstances did women publicly read from the Torah in the ancient synagogue. We must simply admit that we do not know if women did or did not read. If we do not know what the situation in Palestine and Babylonia was, how much less do we know of synagogue worship in Egypt or in Rome, where Marin and Gaudentia worshiped.

In conclusion, although the recitation by priestly women of the priestly blessing seems unlikely in light of the explicit "Aaron and his sons" in Num 6:22, it is not impossible that certain communities could have interpreted this to mean "Aaron and his children" and have asked both the priestly women and the priestly men present to bless them. Further, although there is no solid evidence for women having read the Torah publicly in the synagogue service, it cannot be excluded, particularly for the Greek-speaking congregations (about which we know next to nothing), that they did. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that one or more of the three women of our inscriptions were remembered with the title "priest" because their priestly descent had entitled them to certain rights and honors in the synagogue service during their lifetime.

C. References to Male Priests in Inscriptions and Papyri

Before attempting to come to a decision as to the likelihood of the three possible interpretations of hieroies/hierissa, a brief survey of hieroies in Jewish inscriptions and papyri is necessary. From Rome there are four hieroies inscriptions, all
from the Monteverde catacomb, which Leon dates from the first century B.C.E., through the end of the third century C.E.67

CII 346. Marble plaque.

\[\text{Ἐνδάδε κύτε}\]
2 \text{Ἰουδας ἱερεύς.}\n
L. 1: read κεῖται.
Ll. 2-3: read ἱερεύς.

Here lies Judas, priest.

CII 347. Marble plaque.

\[\text{Ἐνδάδε}\]
2 κεῖται
3 \text{Ἰουδας καὶ}\n4 \text{Ἰωσῆς ἀρ-}
5 κοντες
6 καὶ ἱερεῖς
καὶ ἄδελφοι.

Here lie Judas and Joses, archons and priests and brothers.

CII 355. Three marble fragments.

\[\text{Ἐνδάδε κύτε Ι[...]}\]
2 \[...\]ος ἱερεύς[...]
[...]καὶ ἐγ[...]
4 [...]

L. 1. read κεῖται.

Here lies J[...], priest [....].

CII 375. Marble plaque engraved on both sides; broken into six fragments.

\[\text{Ἐνδάδε κύτε}\]
2 \text{Μαρία ἡ τοῦ ἱε-}
3 ρέως.

L. 1. read κεῖται.

Here lies Maria the (wife? daughter?) of the priest.69

It is striking that all of the Roman hieres/hierus inscriptions are from the Monteverde catacomb.70 Unfortunately, no information about the actual role of the priest can be gleaned from these inscriptions. CII 375 is especially important for the question of whether hieres/hierissa simply means "wife (or daughter) of a priest." The Maria here, who is the wife or daughter of a priest, is not called hieres or hierissa, but
rather ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἵερῳ. This does not mean that ἱερέα/ἱερίσσα in the three inscriptions in question could under no circumstances mean "wife (or daughter) of a priest," but it does show that there was a way in Greek to express such a relationship without this title, which a Greek speaker would have understood as meaning "female cultic functionary." Perhaps the "of the priest" is to distinguish her from another Maria in the community or perhaps it was meant to indicate that she was a non-Aaronide wife of a priest and therefore not a hierissa herself.

There are three occurrences of ἱερεὺς at Beth She'arim:

CII 1001 (Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 49).

Ἰερέων.

Of the priests. Priests.

Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 180 (part one).

ΒΑ

Π[εφύς]

The priest, Rabbi Hieronymos.

Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 181.

Ἑλουάς

Ἐφεύς.

Judas, priest.

In addition to these, there are two further inscriptions of relevance:

CII 1002 (Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.28).71

ἡμῶν θαυμάζω

This place belongs to priests.

Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 148.

Ἀθινῆ θυρίττοι.

A priest from Beirut.

CII 1001 is carved on the ceiling above arcosolium 1 of Hall I in Catacomb 1. The "Of the priests. Priests," must mean that arcosolium 1 was set aside for the graves of priests. CII 1002
in Hall I of Catacomb 1 also indicates a separate burial place for priests; Schwabe and Lifshitz are of the opinion that magom here must mean "arcosolium," so that this inscription would be a further attestation of burying people of priestly descent separately. It is worthy of note that in none of the Greek inscriptions in arcosolium 1 of CII 1001 does the term "priest" occur (Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2, nos. 50-53). Perhaps the single inscription CII 1001 was viewed as sufficient emphasis of the priestly ancestry of those buried in that arcosolium, making the use of hierus/hieresa on each individual epitaph unnecessary. This practice of the separate burial of priestly women and men indicates a strong concern for the priesthood even in the third and fourth centuries C.E. 72

Little can be said about the other inscriptions. In Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2, no. 148, ch6M is the Greek transliteration of k6M. At Leontopolis in Heliopolis, the site of CII 1514, the Marin inscription, no Jewish hierus inscriptions have been found. In fact, other than the Roman and Beth She'arim inscriptions, few Jewish inscriptions with hierus have been found at all to date. 73 In light of this rather striking distribution—a number of "priest" inscriptions from the Monteverde catacomb in Rome and from the necropolis at Beth She'arim and few elsewhere—it is reasonable to assume that priestly descent was especially emphasized in the communities which buried their dead on these two sites. 74 Whether this special emphasis on the priesthood also implies that priestly women and men in these communities had special roles cannot be said.

The term hierus also occurs several times in Egyptian Jewish papyri (CPJ 120, 121, 139 [twice]), but since each occurrence consists only of a name followed by "priest," they are of little help to us in identifying any priestly functions.

Conclusions

As unsatisfying as it may be, it must be admitted that it is impossible to know precisely what hieresia/hierissa in the three ancient Jewish inscriptions means. Were this term to be the equivalent of the rabbinic k6M, no problems of orthodoxy would present themselves, for k6M does not signify a cultic or administrative religious functionary. If, on the other hand, it were to imply certain functions in the synagogue or temple worship service, the accepted image of ancient Jewish worship...
would have to be altered considerably. In contrast to the synagogue functionaries discussed thus far, the Jewish priesthood has biblical roots and was attached to the temple service, both of which make the question of Jewish male and female priests highly complex.

For all of these difficulties, it must also be emphasized that if the three inscriptions had come from another Graeco-Roman religion, no scholar would have thought of arguing that "priest" does not really mean "priest." The composers of these inscriptions must have been aware that they were employing a term which normally implied a cultic function. Further, as the above survey has shown, it is not as far-fetched to imagine that a woman could have had a cultic function, for example, at the Jewish temple in Leontopolis, or that a woman could have had a synagogue function, such as reading from the Torah, as it might seem at first blush. Until further evidence is found to support one or the other of the interpretations, it seems most prudent to keep the various options open. In light of the evidence surveyed, an absolute statement such as that of Jean Juster, "... women were not allowed to be priestesses among the Jews," does not seem prudent.
PART TWO

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS
CHAPTER VI

DID THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE HAVE A WOMEN'S GALLERY OR SEPARATE WOMEN'S SECTION?

In a lecture on the Galilean synagogue ruins held on December 16, 1911 in Berlin, the great Judaica scholar Samuel Krauss said to his audience:

Now that we are inside the synagogue, let us first of all—as politeness demands—look for the rows of the seats of our dear wives, on the supposition that something will be found which could be viewed as the remains of a "Weiberschul" in the synagogue ruins.

Following the demands of politeness, Mr. Krauss did look for, and did find, the remains of what he called the women's gallery in the ancient Galilean synagogues. The majority of modern Judaica scholars and archaeologists follow Krauss in both method and result, i.e., they look for a women's gallery and they find one.

The significance of the question of the women's gallery for the question of women as leaders in the synagogue should be clear. If all ancient synagogues relegated women to a side room, a balcony or to the back of the prayer hall, perhaps even further separating them from the men by a lattice work or a translucent or even opaque curtain, as the contemporary Orthodox synagogue does, then it is indeed difficult to imagine that the women discussed in the previous chapter had any official functions in the synagogue, at least during the religious service. This type of seating arrangement does not imply "separate but equal." It is true, of course, that the Jewish service cannot be compared, for example, with a Roman Catholic mass, where the entire focus of the service is the altar and what goes on there. Certainly many Orthodox women feel that they can say their prayers behind a curtain as well as were they seated together with the men. Nevertheless, the reading of scripture, the sermon and the leading of prayers in an Orthodox synagogue all occur in the men's section. When the Torah scroll is carried around it is a focus of attention; everyone who has the opportunity to touch it is overjoyed. Needless to say, that same Torah scroll is not passed from the hands of the men into the hands of the women, so
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that the women up in the gallery might also have the opportunity to touch it. No, instead the women peer down to what is happening below, sometimes leaning over the railing to get a better look. In some synagogues the women cannot hear the sermon well from where they are seated, and in most they cannot see well. If they are behind a curtain, they can only see shadows and outlines. If, by analogy, we use the contemporary Orthodox seating arrangement as the background against which to interpret the titles borne by ancient Jewish women, then it is in fact difficult to come to any other conclusion than that these women had no official function.

But just how strong is the archaeological and literary evidence that the ancient synagogue possessed a women's gallery? Upon what do Krauss and his colleagues base their theory? A survey of the archaeological and literary evidence for the women's gallery can answer that question.

A. Is there Archaeological Evidence for a Women's Gallery or a Separate Women's Section?

In our century numerous synagogues have been excavated in Palestine and in the Diaspora. Sometimes the remains are minimal, such as a single inscription. Other remains are quite sufficient for drawing up a complete floor plan. In no case has an actual gallery been found. All of the galleries in all the architects' reconstructions are reconstructed and not extant. In order to decide whether these reconstructions are convincing, a survey of the evidence from the major sites is necessary. We should remember, however, that monumental remains can only tell us whether a side room or gallery existed, not whether it was for women. Theoretically, donative inscriptions could speak of a women's gallery, room for women or divider between the women's and men's sections, but none do.

1. Synagogues in Roman and Byzantine Palestine

With the exception of the Theodotos inscription (CII 1404), there exist no undisputed synagogue remains from the Second Temple period. This is probably due to the fact that the floor plans of the earliest synagogues differed little from those of normal houses and cannot be identified by archaeologists as synagogues, if by "synagogue" one means a building whose main function was to house the worship service. The first possible synagogue ruin from the first century was discovered at Masada, Herod the
Great's fortress near the Dead Sea. In its present state, the structure can be dated to the period of the Zealot occupation during the First Jewish Revolt (66-73 C.E.); it is unclear whether the original Herodian building was also a synagogue before being remodeled by the Zealots. The building, approximately 10.5 by 12.5 meters in size, is located directly on the casemate wall on the northwest side of the plateau. The original Herodian building had an anteroom, and the main room had had five pillars along the northern, western and southern sides. When the Zealots remodeled, they removed two of the columns of the western row, and tore down the wall dividing the anteroom from the main room, placing the two pillars where the wall had been. They also built a small room (3.5 x 5.5 m) in the northwestern corner with an entrance from the main hall and set up a four-tiered row of plastered benches along the north, west and south walls and a single bench on the eastern entrance side.

In addition to the structure's clear nature as an assembly room, the discovery of scripture fragments (Deuteronomy and Ezekiel) found buried under the floor (as if in a geniza?) added to the conviction that the building in question was indeed a synagogue. However, since we know little about the layout of first-century synagogues, one should not consider the identification as a synagogue a closed matter.

Concerning the women's gallery, it is clear that there was none, and the small room in the corner is clearly unsuitable as a women's room as it has no separate entrance. All worshipers sat in the one main room on the benches along the walls.

At Herod the Great's fortress, Herodion, just southwest of Bethlehem, a structure very similar to the one at Masada was found. The room (14 x 10 m), with an entrance in the east, was remodeled by the Zealots during their occupation (66-70 C.E.). It had a nave and two side aisles with four (or perhaps six) columns on each side and a three-tiered row of stone benches along the sides and back. Due to its clear nature as an assembly room and because of the similarities to the synagogue at Masada, it is likely that this too was a synagogue. As at Masada one searches in vain for a women's gallery.

A further first-century public building which is most likely a synagogue was found in Gamla, the Jewish fortress in the Golan Heights destroyed by the Romans in 67 C.E. One enters the building through a narthex and proceeds through a vestibule into the main prayer hall, which, like Masada and Herodion, is lined with rows of benches. Four rows of columns run parallel to
the walls. The synagogue is approached in its southeast corner by stairs coming up the side of the hill. An article in the Biblical Archaeological Review states that these stairs possibly led to an upper gallery, and a photograph of the synagogue at Capernaum, which also has stairs, is printed as a parallel. Further excavation in the summer of 1979, however, has revealed that these steps are the continuation of a road leading up the side of a hill to the synagogue. They should, therefore, be seen as leading to the synagogue itself rather than to a gallery.

Migdal (Magdala) and Korazin (Arabic: Khirbet Karaza; N.T.: Chorazin) have also been in the discussion of first-century synagogues, but both must now be excluded.

After the first century, synagogue ruins become much more identifiable and much more varied in their architecture. In a number of these ruins archaeologists have conjectured the existence of an upper gallery for women or of a separate room for them. This is on the basis of evidence ranging from one pillar base to a number of pillars, entablature and stairs. In a number of other cases no one has claimed that any provision for separation existed.

Eshtemoa (Arabic: es-Samu) in Judea, south of Hebron, is an example of the latter category. One enters the building (13.3 x 21.3 m) on the east side through a narthex with two pillars and two columns. In the prayer hall itself it is the Torah niche in the long northern wall, rather than on one of the narrow walls, which orients the synagogue towards Jerusalem. Two-tiered stone benches line the north and south walls. There seem to have been no columns in the prayer hall itself. Without columns there could have been no upper gallery, and one can see from the floor plan that there is no place for a separate room for women. The synagogue can be dated to the fourth century.

A further case where there seems to be no women's gallery is the synagogue at Beth She'an. The room in question is roughly square (7 x 7 m) and part of a larger complex including the house of a man named Leontius and a court. One entrance was through the court on the north, and a second entrance was from the east. The excavators have assumed the existence of a niche in the south wall (towards Jerusalem). There were benches along the walls. One can see that all synagogue worshipers sat together in one room. The date is from the middle of the fifth to the sixth century.
In a further number of cases where remains for a gallery could conceivably have been found, the archaeological reports mention none. These are cases where one finds sufficient remains to expect some evidence for an upper story if one existed. They include: Beth She'arim (352-53), Beth Yerah (dating ranging from 4th to 6th C.), Qasrin (4th C.), Jerash (4th/5th C.), Isfiya (5th/6th C.), Jericho (6th/7th, possibly 8th, C.), Na'aran (6th C.), Khirbet Sumag (3rd C.), Tell Menora (6th C.), Gaza (6th C.), Rehov (4th/7th C.), Ma'oz Hayyim (4th/5th C.), Hammat Teverya (north of the hot springs--3rd/4th C.).

There are a number of synagogue ruins, particularly in Galilee, where excavators have reconstructed a women's gallery on the basis of various pieces of evidence. Let us now turn to these.

The synagogue at Capharnaum on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee is one of the best-preserved synagogues found in Israel. The white limestone structure is a basilica with a nave and two side aisles. A third row of pillars runs parallel to the back wall. The structure is oriented towards Jerusalem. Three doors on the south wall provide access to the nave and two side aisles respectively. The prayer hall is adjoined by a court with a colonnade carrying a portico along the northern, southern and western walls, leaving the central court open. At the outer northwestern corner of the synagogue proper there is a small structure made of black basalt (like the rest of the village, but in contrast to the white limestone of the synagogue itself). This structure is flanked by stairs leading up and away from the back, i.e., northern wall of the synagogue.

The first major excavation of the synagogue was undertaken in 1905 by Heinrich Kohl and Carl Watzinger. According to their reconstructed model, a women's gallery, which was reached by the basalt steps at the northwest corner, extended over the two side aisles and across the back of the synagogue proper, being supported by the columns below. Their two-story model is reprinted by Erwin Goodenough, Stanisla Looffreda, Zev Vilnay, etc. A printed reconstruction like this tends to achieve a life of its own; one soon forgets which stones are actually there and which ones were called into being by the artist's pen.

This reconstruction assumes that women would have entered the gallery by the stairs attached to the black basalt annex at
the back. The gallery would have had Doric columns of a slightly narrower width than the Corinthian columns below.\textsuperscript{35}

The reconstruction should be clear and indeed looks plausible. Let us now examine the actual remains of this gallery. The visitor to the reconstructed synagogue at Capharnaum does not see a gallery. What is it that would archaeologically force us to assume the existence of such a thing? It is not the basilica style that would necessitate one, for indeed most basilicas did not have galleries.\textsuperscript{36} Nor do we have the remains of a gallery: the floor, the railing, the walls behind it, the lintel of the door leading into it. There do exist several Doric columns of a diameter slightly less (10 cm less) than that of the columns of the prayer hall. Further, one finds several fragments of what could have been the architrave of the upper row of columns and the first steps of a staircase located at the back of the synagogue, i.e., at the northwest corner next to the basalt structure. The best evidence for a gallery consists of these steps in the back, which could possibly lead up to a gallery door. This theory presupposes a rather narrow, winding, outside staircase leading up to a rather elegantly decorated gallery. An alternative interpretation would be that the basalt staircase served the basalt structure to which it is attached. This is, in fact, the way the most-recent excavators of the synagogue, Virgilio Corbo, Stanislao Loffreda, and Augusto Spijkerman, interpret it. They take the basalt structure (Installation 143) to be some type of storeroom and surmise that the staircase leads to an upper level of the storage area.\textsuperscript{37} This reconstruction is also based on their observation that too few fragments of the alleged gallery have been found and that the winding staircase is too narrow to assume that women used it for the regular sabbath services.\textsuperscript{38}

Just four kilometers north of Capharnaum lie the ruins of Korazim.\textsuperscript{39} The synagogue measures 16.7 by 22.8 meters and is divided by two rows of columns into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns forming a further aisle along the northern side. A small room which could be entered only from the inside extended out into a courtyard, which was about five meters in width. Between the wall of this courtyard and the small room were found several steps. Nahman Avigad writes, "Apparently, these were part of a staircase leading to the upper story."\textsuperscript{40} Other evidence from Korazim for a gallery consists of fragments of smaller columns as well as fragments from a frieze, which is
reconstructed as having run along the upper portion of the walls of the gallery.\textsuperscript{41}

The synagogue in \textit{an-Nabratein} (Hebrew: \textit{Nevoraya}),\textsuperscript{42} just north of Safed was surveyed by Kohl and Watzinger in 1905 and recently excavated under the direction of Eric M. Meyers, James F. Strange, and Carol L. Meyers. Because the excavations began in 1980, only preliminary reports are available.\textsuperscript{43} The excavators surmise that Kohl and Watzinger are relatively accurate in assessing the dimensions at 16.9 x 11.65 m.\textsuperscript{44}

Two rows of four columns run north-south; one entered through a single entrance in the southern facade, and there must also have been one entrance in the north. Eric Meyers notes that the "presence of smaller column fragments and pedestals suggest a possible portico on the southern side."\textsuperscript{45} In 1905 Kohl and Watzinger found a single base to a column outside of the building on the south (front) side, the diameter of which is 46 cm, in contrast to the bases inside which have a diameter of 66.5 cm and conjectured that the base could be the single remain of a gallery.\textsuperscript{46} However, due to the smallness of the building they concluded that a better guess is that the building had only one story and that there existed a separate room for women on the same level on the north side, the northern door being the entrance to this women's section.\textsuperscript{47} Erwin Goodenough comments, "Since guessing is all that can be done, my guess is that women were left out altogether."\textsuperscript{48} Presumably the base of a column found in 1905, which served as the base not only of a column but in fact of a whole gallery, was among those fragments found in the campaign and taken possibly to be part of a portico, which means that the fragments lay near where they had originally stood.

The two varying interpretations of these fragments are a good illustration of the difficulties inherent in the women's gallery hypothesis at many sites. Kohl and Watzinger reconstruct an entire gallery on the basis of one fragment and in the absence of a staircase, while the recent excavators suggest a more plausible interpretation of the same data. As to Goodenough's theory that women did not come to the synagogue, one can only ask on what evidence he bases his view.

One of the best preserved synagogues in Galilee was found in Bar'am (Arabic: \textit{Kafir Bir'im}),\textsuperscript{49} eleven kilometers northwest of Safed. The large building (15.2 x 20 m), probably to be dated to the third century, had a porch on the south side (facing Jerusalem), which was supported by eight columns. There were
three front entrances leading into the prayer hall, which was divided by two longitudinal rows and one transversal row of columns into a nave surrounded by three side aisles.

Kohl and Watzinger assume the existence of a gallery. Their evidence consists of one base for a column 49 cm in diameter and the fragments of a pillar with a diameter of 43 and 44 cm. These items being of a lesser diameter than the others found, Kohl and Watzinger assume that they must have belonged to an upper gallery. They further suggest that an Ionic capital found in the house of village priest, a capital having a diameter of 45 cm, would fit well for an upper gallery. This is a rather motley collection of evidence. The only common denominator seems to be the diameter, which is in all three cases less than that of other columns found inside the prayer hall. It is by no means clear, however, that these three architectural fragments have anything to do with a women's gallery or even with each other. One cannot exclude the possibility that these three fragments belonged to a gallery, but we have no particular reason for assuming that the one base, the fragments of a pillar and the Ionic capital are the sole surviving elements of a gallery, rather than elements from some other part of the building. What definitely speaks against the gallery thesis is the lack of even the trace of a staircase providing access to such a gallery. In their floor plan, Kohl and Watzinger have added a reconstructed staircase on the outer northwestern corner of the building (as at Capharnaum), punctuating it with question marks. While such reconstruction is not an illegitimate endeavor, one should be aware that there is not a single bit of evidence to support this. Since Kohl and Watzinger's time, when this corner was as yet uncleared, the whole synagogue area has been cleared and partially restored. In a visit to the site in June 1978, I was able to find no traces of a staircase.

It is worthwhile to compare Kohl and Watzinger with two more recent scholars. For Erwin Goodenough the gallery was no longer a thesis to be supported by evidence, but a fact to be cited. He reprints Kohl and Watzinger's floor plan, with its reconstructed staircase, commenting that the synagogue had "columns carrying a balcony on the east, north and west sides" and that, "Steps seem to have gone up to the gallery on the north side of the building as at Capernaum." Rahman Avigad writes, "The facade undoubtedly was two stories high and terminated in a Syrian pediment, but no traces of such a pediment have been found." He further comments, "No remains of the upper story were
It is unclear whether Avigad discounts the evidence cited by Kohl and Watzinger or whether he has overlooked it. In any case, he is willing to stick to the theory of an upper story, even in the face of no evidence at all. Since Avigad's plan has no reconstructed staircase, there is no way of knowing how he would provide access to such a second story.

There is one more piece of evidence to be considered. When the Dutch traveler C. W. M. van de Velde was in the village of Bar'am in the middle of the last century, an old man told him about an upper "story with pillars," which had stood in his youth, but which had been destroyed by an earthquake. This does make more credible the possibility of a gallery, although the problems raised above still remain, particularly the lack of a staircase. However, a "story with pillars" could mean anything from pilasters set high up on the walls to an actual second story. A further question is how much credence one should give to such a second-hand report.

In conclusion, while a gallery at Bar'am cannot be excluded, the burden of proof rests upon the proponents of a gallery. The meager evidence cited to date is simply not sufficient to suppose the existence of such a gallery.

One of the most fascinating of the ancient synagogues is the one excavated at Khirbet Shema in Upper Galilee. Built directly into the hill, it offers the visitor a spectacular view of the hills of Galilee. The entrance from the top of the hill is by steps leading down into the prayer hall, and, the building being of the broadhouse type, one would turn upon entering to face the long wall with the beam in order to be oriented towards Jerusalem. The building is about 11 by 15 meters in size. There were two building periods, the first in the third century (Synagogue I), the second in the fourth or fifth century (Synagogue II). The first synagogue was probably destroyed in an earthquake.

The gallery posited by the excavators in the same place for both Synagogue I and Synagogue II was probably constructed of wood which rested on bedrock at the western side of the synagogue. It is posited that those entering the gallery either turned to the left into the gallery at the top of the stairs leading down to the main prayer hall or, more likely, entered by a separate door in the north wall (in Synagogue II). The hypothesis is that the gallery was meant for women and that a back entrance to the gallery would insure a total separation of
the sexes. The evidence for such a door is a trace of a cutting in the bedrock into which the threshold would have fit.60

In comparison with other synagogue ruins, Khirbet Shema' lends itself to the reconstruction of a gallery reasonably well. At least one can say that a space exists which could plausibly be a gallery; in the other ruins that space must first be created. Nevertheless, here, as with the other posited galleries, one must carefully distinguish between what actually exists and what must be reconstructed. The evidence for the gallery consists of the bedrock upon which it may have rested and a slight indentation in the bedrock which may have been meant to receive the threshold for a door leading into the gallery. What is not extant is any of the gallery itself. In light of this lack, the excavators suggest that it may have been made of wood,61 and that some of the smaller pieces found in the main prayer hall may have belonged to the gallery.62 Nor have remains of the actual western wall been found. At the northwestern corner, one finds only bedrock, making the exact line of the wall and of a northern door a matter of reconstruction.63

Thus, Khirbet Shema' does bear evidence for a space of some sort upon bedrock, but the actual gallery, wall and door must be entirely reconstructed. Even if one were to accept the existence of a wooden gallery, rather than assuming an area for storage or some other purpose, there is no archaeological reason for assuming that it must be for women. Maybe a gallery existed for no other reason than that the builders wanted to make the best use of the space available to them and decided that a gallery was the best way to utilize the bedrock.64 What is clear from this is that while the analogy of other synagogues could be used to posit the existence of a gallery at Khirbet Shema', Khirbet Shema' itself, due to the particular problems raised by its building site, cannot be used as an analogy for other synagogues.

Just one kilometer to the north of Khirbet Shema', also on a hill, were found the ruins of the synagogue of Meiron,65 probably dating from the second half of the third century. The building, cut out of the rock on the northeastern side of the hill, is about 27 by 13.5 meters in size. Very little of the building has survived. Kohl and Watzinger66 were the first to posit the existence of an upper gallery, and later archaeologists have not called this into question. The evidence for such a gallery consists of the base of a corner column, the diameter of which is somewhat less (47 cm) than that of other columns which were found (60-69 cm). Even Kohl and Watzinger recognize that
this is rather meager evidence upon which to reconstruct an entire gallery, and they concede that the fragment in question may have belonged to a narthex, as in Bar'am, although no traces of such a narthex remain, making such a suggestion fairly speculative. What is significant about this suggestion, however, is that it shows that a column, base or capital of lesser diameter than others found on a given site could have come from several parts of the synagogue, with narthex, _medicula_ and forecourt being alternative suggestions to gallery.  

Just outside of Gush Halav (Arabic: al-Jish), a Maronite village not far from the Lebanese border, are found the ruins of a synagogue, the first phase of which dates from ca. 250-306. The building was last used as a synagogue in around the middle of the sixth century. The prayer hall of the synagogue measured 13.75 by 10.6-11.0 meters. Two rows of columns divided the room into a nave and two side aisles. According to Kohl and Watzinger, three columns against the back wall formed a further row of columns. In their view, it was by these three columns which the hypothetical women's gallery would have been supported. The evidence given by Kohl and Watzinger for such a gallery consists of two Ionic capitals, 39 and 42 cm in diameter respectively, a drum of a column 41 cm in diameter and a small ashlar with a carved rosette which would form part of a wall frieze, the supposition being that the frieze ran along the back wall of the gallery.  

In 1977-78 Gush Halav was re-excavated under the direction of Eric M. Meyers, and further side rooms were discovered, the function of which is unclear. The excavators note that especially "the function of the area to the north between the outer and inner wall has been difficult to determine." They suggest that there was a gallery across the north end of the building. This gallery would have been entered either from outside the basilica or possibly from within by wooden stairs, although there are no traces of such an entrance.  

As further evidence for such a gallery they note, "The debris underneath the architectural dump of the final phase of the synagogue (VIIIb) was virtually sterile, suggesting a kind of raised gallery area above it." They do not suggest that this hypothetical raised area was for women. Note that although the recent excavators call this hypothetical raised structure a gallery, they envisage something quite different than Kohl and Watzinger had imagined. The putative raised area is simply a
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raised platform in the main prayer hall rather than an upper story gallery.

The synagogue found in Arbel in Galilee, six kilometers northwest of Tiberias, measures 18.2 by 18.65 meters and is separated into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, a third row of columns extending along the northern side. The synagogue probably dates from the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. The evidence for a women's gallery consists of the base of a column with a molded side and bottom as if it were meant to be placed on top of another row of columns. The diameter of the column fitting this base would be 41 cm; one shaft of this diameter, as well as one other base without the molded side and bottom portion, but of the same size, were also found. On the basis of these three pieces of evidence, Kohl and Watzinger conclude:

It is therefore certain that there was a two-story structure also in Arbel, a structure with a gallery on three sides above the ambulatory formed by the columns; the entrance to the gallery was probably directly from the slope which juts into the south wall.

What of this entrance? Are any traces of it extant? Kohl and Watzinger show on their plan a small room, noting that the entrance to the gallery was probably above it. In other words, no trace of a staircase has been found. As for the column base in question, the form does indeed make one think that it was placed above something else, and the theory of a second row of columns is a quite attractive one, although why only one of these was found on the site, while quite a number of other columns are still there, is a question which remains unanswered. If we nevertheless assume a second row of columns and do not assume a stone staircase which later disappeared or a wooden staircase (the latter should by no means be excluded), there remains the possibility of a pseudo-gallery, i.e., of a second row of columns above the first, creating the look of a gallery, a device which would not be unprecedented in ancient architecture. A number of dressed stones with engaged columns were also found on the site of the Arbel synagogue, which Kohl and Watzinger suggest ran along the northern wall behind the gallery. This reconstruction would fit in with either a genuine or a pseudo-gallery.

Samuel Krauss is of the opinion that the women did not sit in a gallery at Arbel, but rather on the tiered stone benches found at the sides, which he calls "terraces." Krauss writes:
Now if our assumption concerning the purpose of this loft [i.e. the terrace] is correct, then one cannot really speak of a separation of the sexes in the ancient synagogues of Galilee, and we would therefore have to concede that all of the Reform congregations which build their synagogues with only a loft for the women on the two long sides of the building are right.77

His words, spoken in 1911, make clear what has been at stake here. For a Jewish scholar to admit that there may not have been a women's gallery in the ancient synagogue would be to raise the question as to just how much a necessary part of the Jewish tradition the women's gallery really is. Krauss was confronted with the Reform congregations of his day, for whom the equality of the sexes was an important issue and who had begun to do away with the strict separation between the sexes in the worship service. Krauss perceived the absence of a women's gallery at the ancient synagogue of Arbel as a threat to the practice of having women sit in a gallery or closed-off women's section in the Orthodox synagogues of his day.

The ancient synagogue in Umm al-'Amad78 in Galilee, a few kilometers due west of Arbel, dates to the turn of the fourth century. The prayer hall is 22.55 by 14.06 meters in size. Two rows of columns divide it into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns running along the back wall. On the basis of several columns of lesser diameter than the others, Kohl and Watzinger suggest that there may have been a gallery,79 although they do not press this hypothesis because the diameter of all the columns is quite variable. No stairs have been found at Umm al-'Amad.

In Hammat Teyerya (Tiberias; Arabic: Tabariya),80 on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, just south of the hot springs, were found the layered ruins of several buildings dating from the third through the eighth centuries. The earliest recognizable synagogue, dating from the second half of the third century, is 13 by 14 meters in size and is divided by three rows of columns into a nave and three side aisles. Moshe Dothan suggests that the side aisle to the extreme left may have been a women's section, adding, "nevertheless, there was no trace of wall or other division between this aisle and the remainder of the hall, though there may have been some temporary partition (such as a curtain) between the columns."81 After the second synagogue was destroyed at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, the "Severus Synagogue," also measuring 13 by 14 meters,
was built. Here, too, one assumes that the side aisle to the extreme left may have been for women.\textsuperscript{82}  

When this synagogue was destroyed in the fifth century a synagogue in the form of a basilica was built. One entered through a narthex into the main prayer hall, which had an apse at the southwest side and was divided by columns into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns running along the northwest side. The hypothesis is that these columns bore a women's gallery which would have extended over the side aisles and along the back aisle. No evidence is listed for this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{83}  

In Hammat Gader (Arabic: al-Hamma),\textsuperscript{84} 7.5 kilometers to the southeast of the Sea of Galilee, a synagogue was found which measures around 13 by 14 meters and probably dates from the first half of the fifth century. Erwin Goodenough believes that a small room on the east side with a bench running along its east wall was meant for women.\textsuperscript{85}  Eliezer Sukenik, who takes this small room to be a schoolroom, imagines that there was a women's gallery. Sukenik writes:

The remains of the synagogue are practically confined to the foundation. Consequently no data are available for a restoration of the superstructure. It may, however, confidently be inferred that the basilica was provided with a gallery for women worshippers, from the massive pillars at the north-east and north-west corners of the colonnade, features which are shared by our synagogue with those of Chorazin, Capernaum and some other sites.\textsuperscript{86}  

Since there exist no material remains from the gallery, it is difficult to understand why it may "confidently be inferred" that one existed. Sukenik is working on an analogy with other synagogues where he believes that the women's gallery is archaeologically certain. As this survey of the evidence shows, the gallery is far from being archaeologically certain at the other sites.\textsuperscript{87}  

The ruins of a synagogue, probably dating from the third century, were found in Umm al-Qanatir\textsuperscript{87} in the Golan Heights, 19 kilometers to the northeast of Hammat Gader. The building is 14 by 19 meters in size and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, with a third row running along the back (west) wall. Kohl and Watzinger conjecture that a gallery ran along the north, west and south sides.\textsuperscript{88}  No trace of a staircase has been found. As evidence for the hypothetical gallery, Kohl and Watzinger cite a fragment of the base of a half column (found in front of the building) which would fit with the
fragment of a shaft of a half column. The fragments could have decorated the wall of the gallery. Kohl and Watzinger further note that there are two types of capitals and suggest that the one type could have been for the lower story and the other for the gallery. Goodenough, in citing Kohl and Watzinger's reconstructed gallery, is faced with the dilemma of where to place the Torah shrine. Although the main entrance is in the east and Jerusalem to the south, Goodenough writes, "The Torah shrine with its Shekinah could not have stood anywhere but in the east, for it is inconceivable that women would have been allowed to stand or pass above it" (i.e., in the gallery). Presumably Goodenough is in some way identifying women with impurity and implying that the men would not tolerate this impurity above the sacred Shekina, but the meaning of his thought is rather unclear here.

Mention should be made here of ad-Dikka, which is located on the eastern side of the Jordan river, four kilometers north of where it enters the Sea of Galilee. The building, 15.3 by 11.9 meters in size and divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, probably dates from the third century. Even Kohl and Watzinger admit that there is not enough clear evidence to reconstruct a gallery. They note the existence of one base, one shaft and one capital as well as a double quarter column from a corner. No trace of a staircase has been found. It is unclear why this evidence, i.e., several fragments of columns and no stairs, should be insufficient at ad-Dikka, while at most of the other sites where Kohl and Watzinger reconstruct a gallery there is not a bit more evidence to support such a hypothesis. In spite of their caution in the text, Kohl and Watzinger nevertheless show a gallery in their reconstruction sketch of the synagogue.

The synagogue in Beth Alpha, famous for its beautiful and well-preserved mosaic, is situated 7.5 kilometers northwest of Beth She'an and can be dated at the latest to the end of the fifth century. The basilica is 10.75 by 12.4 meters in size and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of pillars. One entered the prayer hall through a narthex. Sukenik believes that the entrance to a gallery extending over the two side aisles and the narthex was through a small side room to the west of the prayer hall. No traces of the gallery or of the reconstructed stairs in this small room remain. Asher Hiram suggests that this small room may have been a schoolroom.
The ruins of a third- or fourth-century synagogue were found in Caesarea Maritima.\textsuperscript{96} It was 9 by 18 meters in size and is of the broadhouse type. Michael Avi-Yonah believes that the synagogue possibly had a gallery.\textsuperscript{97} The evidence consists of the fact that the columns and capitals found were of two sizes, 50 and 25 cm respectively; the reports include no mention of stairs. The synagogue was destroyed in the middle of the fourth century and a new one built in its place in the middle of the fifth. No mention is made of this synagogue having had a gallery.

In 'En-Gedi\textsuperscript{98} on the western side of the Dead Sea were found the remains of a synagogue around 12 by 15 meters in size, consisting of a nave and side aisles on the east and west sides, with a further aisle at the south end with stepped benches. A narthex ran along the western side. A number of smaller rooms surround the prayer hall; two of these can be entered from the prayer hall itself. The others are accessible only from the outside. In one of these outer rooms, traces of stairs were found which could have led to a gallery.\textsuperscript{99} Further, an Aramaic donative inscription, found in the western side aisle, speaks of "the great (?) steps," which Dan Barag takes as possibly referring to the steps leading to the gallery.\textsuperscript{100} Benjamin Mazar, on the other hand, translates "the upper (?) step."\textsuperscript{101} Thus, there is not a consensus as to what this inscription refers to. The inscription itself is clearly later than the other mosaic inscriptions, which are from the late Byzantine period,\textsuperscript{102} so that whatever step or steps the inscription refers to must be a later addition to the synagogue. The synagogue itself is a Byzantine-period reconstruction of an early third-century synagogue and was probably in use until around 530.\textsuperscript{103}

The synagogue ruins in Khirbet Susiya\textsuperscript{104} in Judea, thirteen kilometers south of Hebron, probably date from the fourth or fifth century. The building, 9 by 16 meters in size, is of the broadhouse type. One entered the prayer hall through a courtyard and then a narthex. Extending along the south side of the prayer hall are two rooms, which could be entered through the narthex, the second room also from an outside door. At the southern end of the narthex are the remains of several steps, which have been taken as leading to a gallery,\textsuperscript{105} which was a later addition and would have extended over these two side rooms and possibly the narthex. It is also possible, however, that these steps led to an area above the courtyard. In the small southwestern room, a stairs was later installed when the room was used for storage.
In addition to the monumental remains, one inscription has been adduced as evidence for a synagogue gallery. The inscription, written in Aramaic with the last two words in Greek, was found in Dabbura in the Golan Heights. Partially reconstructed, it reads, according to Dan Urman:

אַלְעְצֵר הָרֵין ... [ר]בָּהּ עַבְרָה אָמְרָה דַּעֵל מַל
כָּפָתָה רַפֶּל | אֵמָרָה

El'azar the son of ... made the columns above the arches and beams ... Rusticus built (it).107

The inscription, probably dating from the third century, consists of two lines carved in three fragments of a basalt architrave, the total length of which is 110 cm. Urman writes concerning "the columns above the arches and beams":

These seem to be columns standing on top of a construction of arches and beams or pilasters. In a synagogue such columns could only be in the upper gallery, that is, the women's gallery.108

We have seen from the survey thus far that there is no archaeological reason to assume the existence of a women's gallery and that the evidence for any kind of a gallery at all is surprisingly meager. Nevertheless, one could take this inscription as independent evidence for a gallery.

The inscription is not unambiguous, however, and before we simply accept it as evidence for a gallery, the vocabulary must be carefully examined. It is not "gallery" which is mentioned, but "columns." These "columns" could indeed be the columns of a gallery, but they could also be demi-columns built into the wall or the columns of a pseudo-gallery, i.e., a row of columns placed on the architrave for decoration and giving the appearance of a gallery. There is, however, one architectural difficulty with the gallery or pseudo-gallery reconstruction. If these fragments are a portion of the architrave on which the columns rested, which it is reasonable to assume, the donative inscription usually being fairly close to the object donated, where are the arches? The Palestinian synagogues have usually been reconstructed as being trabeated rather than arcuated, and this architrave itself would fit in with the reconstruction. Further, the word kippatta can mean "arches" and pass[imayya] can mean "beams," but kippa can also mean "arched doorway."109 and passim (Hebrew and Aramaic) can, and usually does, mean "door post."110

An alternative suggestion would be that these fragments do not
come from an architrave at all, but from a lintel, and that the passimayá are door jambs and the kippattá are rounded arches of the type found above the central door in Bar'am. What, then, would the columns be? Perhaps they are tall columns of the type found in Bar'am in the porch. This would be a rather loose interpretation of dé 'al min, however, so that this interpretation, like that of Urman, does not solve all of the architectural problems. It must be concluded that this inscription is possible evidence for a gallery.

What can we conclude from this survey? First, it is clear that a number of Palestinian synagogues had no gallery. These include the three first-century synagogues, Masada, Gamla and Herodion—if these are indeed synagogues—as well as Beth She'an, Eshtemoa', and probably also the other synagogues where archaeologists have not even thought of reconstructing a gallery. As for those synagogues where archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, we have seen that the evidence ranges from literally no evidence at Beth Alpha, Ḥammat Teverya (south of the hot springs, basilica synagogue) and Ḥammat Gader to the base of one corner column at Meiron, the base of one column (and possibly some additional fragments) at an-Nabraten and one base, one shaft and one capital at ad-Dikka to several steps, fragments of smaller columns and fragments of a frieze at Korazim and steps, several Doric columns and several fragments of an architrave, as well as a number of demi-columns, at Capharnaum.

Archaeological reconstruction must be based on analogy and on material evidence from the site in question. In my view, most excavators of the Palestinian synagogues have taken for granted that there exists solid evidence at other synagogues for a (women's) gallery, and have therefore maximalistically interpreted the minimal evidence at their own sites. One searches in vain for the archaeologically well-founded example of a synagogue with a gallery. Capharnaum has long served as the prime example of a synagogue with a gallery, but, as we have seen, the most recent excavators are of the opinion that they do not have sufficient archaeological evidence to assume the existence of a gallery.

The most serious barrier to the reconstruction of a gallery seems to me to be the lack of staircases. It is simply unrealistic to suppose that campers would have selectively removed all traces of a staircase while leaving behind courses of ashlars, numerous pillars and entire mosaic or flagstone floors. Conversely, the best candidates for having had galleries are those
synagogues where traces of staircases have been found. A staircase is at least solid evidence that people ascended to something. However, even here caution is advised. Gamla is a good example of the need for caution. The first reaction at finding the steps outside the Gamla synagogue was that they led to a gallery. Further excavation showed that the steps formed the culmination of a road leading up to the synagogue. Of the Palestinian synagogues there are five with traces of a staircase: Gamla, Capharnaum, 'En-Gedi, Khirbet Susiya and Korazim. Gamla must be excluded for the reasons just mentioned. As for the others, the possibility must be taken very seriously that these steps led to a gallery. However, one must also note that in none of these cases is it clear that the steps in question actually led to a gallery. At Capharnaum the most recent excavators believe that the steps led to a storage room. At 'En-Gedi the steps are situated in front and to the side of the narthex among a number of rooms surrounding the synagogue proper. The steps could have led to a gallery, but they could just as easily have led to the roof or second story of one of the adjoining structures. The reconstruction of a gallery at Khirbet Susiya seems fairly plausible on the basis of the steps, which are located in the narthex and must therefore lead to something above either the prayer hall or the courtyard. The difficulty at Khirbet Susiya, however, is that no other finds indicating a gallery have been found. Further, one must remember that there are also steps in the second small room to the south of the prayer hall which apparently led to a storage room; these should remind us of the variety of things to which steps can lead. Korazim has both steps and some fragments which could have come from a gallery, and therefore a reconstructed gallery does not seem implausible, although here again the steps could have led to the roof or second story of the storage room on the northwest corner of the building or to another installation. In spite of all these difficulties one can say that a reasonable case can be made for the existence of a gallery at Capharnaum, 'En-Gedi, Khirbet Susiya and Korazim.

Khirbet Shema' is a special case and must be treated separately. Here stairs are not necessary, due to the synagogue's being built into the side of the hill. As with the four synagogues just mentioned, here, too, it is not implausible that a gallery existed. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that nothing remains of the gallery itself except the bedrock on which it may have rested and a trace in the stone which could
have been for a door. The several small pieces of architecture found among the ruins could just as easily belong elsewhere as in the gallery.

As for the other synagogues discussed where archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, one must say that the evidence is entirely insufficient to support such a hypothesis. The fragments of columns and capitals which have been assigned to the galleries of the various sites, if all taken together, would hardly be enough for one single gallery. Why should campers and builders in search of reusable materials have carefully selected columns, capitals, bases and architraves just from the gallery, leaving behind considerably more of the first story? No synagogue has been found where more of the gallery was extant than of the first story, and yet if left to chance this situation should certainly occur. In addition to the lack of stones from all of these hypothetical galleries, we are confronted with the lack of stairs leading up to them. Now, one could begin reconstructing wooden galleries with wooden staircases, but this seems highly speculative, and the lack of stairs and columns must be taken as a very serious hindrance to the reconstruction of a gallery.

Further, it is not at all clear that these fragments of architecture had to come from a gallery. Perhaps the smaller columns, capitals and bases belonged to other installations, such as an aedicula or a porch. The diameter of columns often varied considerably within a single synagogue and it is purely a matter of definition to assign one column to the lower story and another to the gallery. The diameter of the columns in one portion of the synagogue can also vary from that of another portion, as, for example, between the main prayer hall and the courtyard at Capharnaum. For these reasons, the architectural fragments in question can no longer simply be treated as clearly having come from a gallery.

In summary, then, there are at least five synagogues (if the three first-century structures are synagogues) which clearly had no gallery, and there are five synagogues where a gallery could plausibly be reconstructed, although the evidence is by no means conclusive. In addition to these, there are a considerable number of synagogues where no one has reconstructed a gallery, as well as over a dozen where some archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, but where a closer examination shows that the evidence is insufficient for supporting such a hypothesis. In other
words, the vast majority of the ancient synagogues in Israel do not seem to have possessed a gallery.

Brief mention of side rooms for women must also be made here. The reader will notice that most of the synagogues whose floor plans are included here do not have a side room. Several, however, do, and it has been suggested that they served as women's sections. The general rule seems to have been that if one did not reconstruct a gallery, one took such a room to be a schoolroom or other type of room. A good example of this is Ḥammat Gader, where Asher Hiram and Erwin Goodenough suggest that the side room with the bench along one wall could have been the women's section, while Eliezer Sukenik, who assumes the existence of a gallery, takes it to be a schoolroom. Ḥammat Teverya (south of the hot springs) is a further example. In the Severus Synagogue, where a gallery is not assumed, one has taken the aisle to the extreme east to be a women's section, whereas in the later basilica synagogue built on the same spot a gallery is assumed and the side room to the west of the prayer hall is considered a schoolroom. One cannot exclude the possibility that the side rooms found in some Palestinian synagogues did serve as women's sections, but there is no archaeological or, as we shall see, literary reason to do so. The real analogy has been the use of a separate room as a women's section in modern synagogues. This is an anachronistic analogy and therefore methodologically questionable.

2. Synagogues in the Diaspora in the Roman and Byzantine Periods

A number of synagogue remains have also been found in the Jewish Diaspora. A brief survey of the evidence for a women's gallery or women's section will complete the collection of Palestinian evidence considered thus far.

The most ancient synagogue (1st C. B.C.E.)—if it is indeed a synagogue—found to date is the synagogue on the island of Delos in the Southern Aegean. The building consists of three oblong rooms side by side. The wall separating Room A from Room B is later than the structure itself and is pierced by three doors. Benches lining the northern and western walls of Room A are broken by a highly decorated stone chair. In Room B benches run along the western wall and part of the southern one. It has been suggested, presumably because of the stone chair, that Room A served the men and that Room B was for the women.
Erwin Goodenough, however, who is very interested in establishing the mystery nature of ancient synagogue worship, writes:

Those who have discussed the synagogue as such have thought that the two rooms were respectively for men and women, but this I should doubt. As in the early structure at Dura, I should think the women stood in the outer chambers of C, or did not attend at all, but not that benches were provided for them in Room B. The inner chamber, A, seems to me to be the adyton which in Capernaum, for example, lay behind the screen.

This discussion demonstrates the arbitrariness of assigning a particular room to the women. While some scholars would relegate the women to Room B, where they could at least sit and hear, though not see very much, Goodenough sends them off to Room C, where they could neither see nor hear, nor even have a bench to sit upon. There is no archaeological reason for any of these room assignments; they are, rather, the result of the presupposition that there must have been a separation of the sexes in the ancient synagogue. Room B could as easily have been a classroom as a women's section and Room C could have served as a hostel or some other purpose.

On the island of Aegina, just across from Piraeus, which is in Attica, were found the remains of a synagogue which the excavator Belle Mazur dates to the fourth century, while noting that the foundations of an older building, possibly also a synagogue, lie under the present structure. Due to abutting houses, the entire complex could not be excavated. What was excavated is a single hall exactly enclosing a mosaic floor which measures 13.5 by 7.6 meters. An apse on the east side extends beyond the mosaic. On the level of the older building and running parallel to its northern wall were found two chambers. Mazur suggests that the younger synagogue made use of these older chambers as women's quarters or as levitical chambers. One must note that it is not even clear that these older rooms had anything to do with the prayer hall at all.

The largest ancient synagogue found to date is the basilica synagogue in Sardis in Asia Minor. (The main hall alone is 54 by 18 meters in size.) The building went through a number of building stages, with the present interior of the structure dating from the fourth century, although some portions of it are older. One entered through an atrium with a colonnaded portico and proceeded into the prayer hall; an internal apse was situated at the west end and the famous "eagle table" in the nave. There were two rows of piers, one along the northern and
one along the southern wall. In his 1963 report, David Gordon Mitten notes, "It is still uncertain whether these features were bases for roof-supports or for piers on which galleries, similar to those familiar from synagogues in Palestine, rested." Andrew R. Seager also shows a second story for the main prayer hall in his 1968 reconstruction of the Sardis synagogue. By 1972, however, probably after more careful study of the matter, Seager writes, "Two rows of piers within the hall may have supported side galleries as well as the roof, but no cogent evidence for galleries has been found." This development is worth noting. At first one assumed a gallery on the basis of the supposed Galilean parallels, but further study revealed that the site itself produced no cogent evidence for such an assumption.

The German excavators Theodor Wiegand and Hans Schrader discovered the ruins of what they took to be a house church in 1895-1898 in Priene in Ionia. Subsequently discovered Jewish symbols in the building are evidence that the building, which measures 10 x 14 meters, was actually a synagogue. One entered through a small forecourt into the prayer hall, which, as stylobates attest, was divided into a nave and two side aisles. A stone bench ran along the northern wall, and a small square niche in the eastern wall probably served as a Torah niche. No suggestion has been made of a women's gallery or women's section, and there is nothing in the ruins to indicate such a thing.

In Miletus in western Asia Minor are the remains of a building which could be a synagogue, although no Jewish evidence has been found. I believe that there is insufficient evidence to identify this as a synagogue, but cite it here to illustrate the way in which A. von Gerkan deals with the issue of the women's gallery. The date of the building is uncertain, but a late, i.e., Byzantine, date seems likely. Located in a complex of buildings, the room in question is oblong (18.5 by 11.6 m) and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns. One proceeded from a forecourt with a peristyle through one of three doors (at an earlier stage) into the large room; at the present stage the two outer doors are blocked by two piers. Gerkan is of the opinion that the columns must have borne a gallery because they are so close together; he does not suggest that this would have been a women's gallery, nor does he mention any fragments that might have belonged to it or stairs leading to it.

Recent excavations in Stobi in Macedonia (Yugoslavia) have brought to light the remains of two synagogues underneath...
Christian basilica ruins. The older synagogue (possible 1st C. C.E.), which measures ca. 7.9 x 13.3 meters, contains donative inscriptions mentioning the name Polycharmos, thus tying it in with the dedicatory inscription mentioning Claudius Tiberius Polycharmos found on a column in the atrium of the basilica. This latter inscription (CII 694)\(^{135}\) speaks of "upper chambers" (hyperpóna) of which the donor and his descendants were to maintain disposal, perhaps for living purposes. In other words, far from being a women's gallery, these "upper chambers" were for the private use of the donor. A women's section or women's gallery has not been suggested for the younger synagogue.

The ancient synagogue excavated in Ostia,\(^ {136}\) the port of ancient Rome, dates from the fourth century. The prayer hall, which measures 24.9 by 12.5 meters, is part of a complex of rooms including one with an oven for baking. One approached through an area with a mosaic floor, then proceeded through an inner gateway with four columns and finally entered the innermost section, an oblong room with a bema at the western end and an aedicula, or Torah shrine, at the southeastern end. Two fallen marble columns were found in the main prayer hall. The excavators have not suggested the existence of a gallery or separate women's section. Beneath this synagogue were found the remains of a first-century C.E. building, which may also have been a synagogue. Here, too, the excavators do not assume the existence of a separate section for women.

The third-century synagogue found in Dura Europos\(^{137}\) has been one of the most spectacular synagogue discoveries to date, due to the excellent condition of the building and especially of the frescoes decorating its walls. The main prayer hall, measuring 13.65 by 7.8 meters, is located in a complex. No one has suggested the existence of a gallery, which would be impossible given the architecture. A separate women's room has, however, been suggested. Beneath the third-century synagogue were found the remains of an earlier synagogue, and in this earlier synagogue, Room 7, a small room to the east of the prayer hall has been taken to be a possible women's section.\(^{138}\) Erwin Goodenough, however, sees this as impossible due to the wear on the threshold between Room 7 and the main prayer hall, Room 2. Goodenough writes:

*First, the well-worn threshold of the little door that joined Room 7 with Room 2 indicates a frequency of going back and forth unthinkable if the room was used for women, but quite intelligible if processions from one room to the other were a*
regular part of the ritual. A glance at the plans of oriental synagogues strengthens this feeling. Kohl and Watzinger give a number of such plans, from which it is at once clear that if women were accommodated in the synagogues at all, they did not stroll in with the men and sit in full view of them. Rather they had a separate entrance from the outside to a room entirely screened off from the room where the men worshiped. The heavy wear of the sill shows that Room 7 in the early synagogue could not thus have been blocked off.

The oriental synagogues referred to by Goodenough, several floor plans of which are given by Kohl and Watzinger, are none other than modern oriental synagogues. With this it becomes clear that the true analogy for the women's section and the starting point for the search thereof is the contemporary Orthodox synagogue. Given the absolutely strict separation implied by the modern concept of the women's section, Goodenough seems to me quite right in insisting that a worn threshold could not have served as the barrier between women and men. Presumably, Goodenough assumes that, in the absence of a women's section, women did not go to the synagogue at all.

The later synagogue did not have this separate room, for the whole area was taken up by the forecourt. Carl Kraeling therefore suggests that the women prayed with the men in the main prayer hall, but that they sat on the south side of the room. Kraeling writes:

> What we know about the nature of the wall decorations in this area, and what we can infer from the existence of the smaller door, makes it clear that the benches in question were those normally used by the women and that here the raised footrests were omitted lest modesty and propriety be offended. Along the south wall in the benches used by the women two additional provisions were made to safeguard modesty and simultaneously to provide easier access. One was a rectangular recess in the lower bench where it abutted on the reveal floor of the smaller door, the other a rectangular platform set into the southwest corner of the chamber floor below the lower bench.

By the "nature of the wall decorations," Kraeling means that the west wall bears the fresco with Elijah raising the widow's son. He suggests that this scene is especially appropriate vis-à-vis the women's entrance.

While it must be emphasized again that Kraeling is doing what archaeologists should do, namely reconstructing, one must nevertheless note how shaky the evidence is upon which he builds his theory. The fact that a woman appears in a certain fresco can hardly be taken as evidence that it was women who sat beneath
it, and there are many reasons why one door is smaller than another. The special features of the benches (steps, etc.) could be taken as safeguards for feminine modesty, but they could also mean no more than that a different person built the benches on that side of the room, adding some features (steps) and omitting others (footrests). In spite of all this, Kraeling's suggestion that the women sat together on one side of the room in the later synagogue at Dura fits in better with the archaeological evidence than other possible suggestions, such as a gallery or a women's room. It may well be that if there was any separation of the sexes at Dura, then it was of the informal type proposed here. In any case, the later synagogue at Dura did not have a women's gallery or a separate room for women. Most likely, neither did the earlier synagogue.

In 1883 a Captain Ernest de Proudhomme who was stationed at Hammam Lif (Naro), not far from Tunis in North Africa, performed an amateur excavation of a synagogue mosaic and of the building complex in which it was located. What seems to have been the main prayer hall can be approached from two directions, with many small rooms on either side of the approach ways. In the prayer hall was a magnificent mosaic (much of it now lost) with a large inscription in the middle:

Sancta sinagoga Naron pro salutem suam ancilla tua Iuliana p(ateressa?) de suo proprium teselavit. Menorah

L. 1: read sancta sinagogam.

Your servant Juliana, "fatheress"(?), paved with mosaic, from her own funds, the holy synagogue of Naro for her salvation.

A woman donated the entire mosaic for the prayer hall; given the high costs of mosaics, this must have been a very substantial donation. Does it seem reasonable that the wealthy woman who donated the mosaic should also have had the right to tread upon it? Not so to Erwin Goodenough, who writes:

She herself could presumably not have attended the services in this sancta sinagoga; but as with all daughters in Israel, her hope was in the maintenance of Jewish worship and life.

Goodenough places the women worshipers in the room to the left of the prayer hall, for it has a separate entrance and no access to the prayer hall at all; indeed, one could neither see nor hear anything from this room. Goodenough notes, "This room might have
been used for a guest hostel, but seems to me more likely, from its total isolation, to have been designed for the women.147

Methodologically it is important to keep open the possibility that the ancient Jewish men in Hamamam Lif were of the mentality described by Goodenough, that they desired to isolate totally the women in a room from which they could not see into the prayer hall nor hear the Torah being read or the sermon being given. It is also important not to exclude the possibility that the ancient Jewish women in Hamamam Lif accepted this, that the benefactor Juliana did not take offense at never being allowed to pray in the room in which lay the mosaic she had donated. All of this is possible, but where is the literary or archaeological evidence for it? There being no Jewish literary sources from Hamamam Lif, we are dependent on the monumental remains. Archaeologically, there is no reason to assume that the room in question is a women's section rather than a hostel, a meeting room or a schoolroom.

This survey has shown that there is no Diaspora synagogue in which a strong archaeological case can be made for a women's gallery or a separate women's section. At Priene and Ostia a gallery or room for the women has not even been suggested. In the later synagogue at Dura there is also no separate room or gallery for women. Although there was some speculation in the earlier phases of excavation as to whether the Sardis synagogue might have had a gallery, it has now been recognized that there is "no cogent evidence" for such a gallery. The Stobi inscription does speak of "upper chambers" but these were not for women but rather for the use of the donor, Claudius Tiberius Polycharmos, and of his heirs. At Aegina, the earlier synagogue at Dura, Hamamam Lif and Delos, a side room (or rooms) has been suggested as a possible women's section. At Aegina it is not even clear that the rooms suggested had any connection with the synagogue. At Dura the worn threshold between the hypothetical women's room and the main prayer hall speaks against the use of Room 7 as a strictly separate women's section. At Hamamam Lif there are many side rooms, and we do not know the exact use of any of them. There is no archaeological reason for assigning any one of them to women. At Delos we have seen that, while Plassart supposed that the division between Rooms A and B represents the division between the men and the women, Goodenough assigns the women to Room C and makes Room A into an inner chamber for the men, Room B being the men's outer chamber. It is time to recognize that we can only guess at the function of the many
adjoining side rooms in the Diaspora synagogues. It is arbitrary to assign one or the other to women.

B. *Is there Literary Evidence for a Women's Gallery or a Separate Women's Section?*

No scholar is of the opinion that ancient Jewish literature attests to a general regulation that the sexes be separate in synagogue worship. All admit that this regulation cannot be found in ancient Jewish sources. Eliezer Sukenik, for example, writes:

> The ancient literature nowhere mentions a specific regulation to the effect that men and women must be kept separate at public worship; still less is it prescribed that the women's section shall be built in the form of a gallery.¹⁴⁸

In spite of this consensus, scholars have argued that even without a regulation, it was in fact the case that the sexes were kept separate in the synagogue worship. What is the literary evidence for a factual separation?

In the Second Temple there existed a women's forecourt (*tezrat hannāṣīm; gynaikōnitis*),¹⁴⁹ which contrasted with the forecourt of Israel. This meant that women were normally only allowed into the women's forecourt, but not beyond that;¹⁵⁰ only the men were allowed into the inner forecourt of Israel. What is often overlooked, however, is that the women's forecourt was not reserved for women. It was the large outer court where both sexes mingled together freely. It was not an area where women could pray quietly by themselves, undisturbed by men, for the men had to pass through this area in order to enter the forecourt of Israel. Therefore it can hardly be taken as an example of the separation of the sexes. "Women's" here does not mean reserved for women, but rather restrictively that women could not pass beyond this outer court. Thus, the men had a court reserved for them, but the women did not. This is a totally different model from the one presupposed by those archaeologists who reconstruct a women's gallery with a separate entrance in the Galilean synagogues.

Once a year, however, an actual separation of the sexes was ordained. This was during the water-drawing celebration on the night following the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles. *B. Sukk.* 51b-52a reads:
"At the conclusion of the first festival day, etc." (m. Sukk. 5:2). What was the Great Enactment? -- R. El'azar replied, As that of which we have learned. Originally [the walls of the women's forecourt] were smooth, but [later the court] was surrounded by a gallery, and it was enacted that the women should sit above and the men below.

Our Rabbis have taught, Originally the women used to sit within [the women's forecourt] while the men were without, but as this caused levity, it was instituted that the women should sit without and the men within. As this, however, still led to levity, it was instituted that the women should sit above and the men below.

But how could they do so? Is it not written, "All this [do I give you] in writing as the Lord has made me wise by his hand upon me"? (1 Chr 28:19)-- Rav answered, They found a scriptural verse and expounded it: "And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart" (Zech 12:12). Is it not, they said, an a fortiori argument? If in the future when they will be engaged in mourning and the evil inclination will have no power over them, the Torah nevertheless says, "men separately and women separately," how much more so now when they are engaged in rejoicing and the evil inclination has sway over them.151

The text describes a temporary (wooden) gallery which was erected for the annual all-night celebration of the water-drawing ceremony on Sukkot. It would have surrounded the women's forecourt, so that the men were on the floor of the women's forecourt of the temple and the women in a gallery surrounding it. R. El'azar's words are a nearly exact quotation of m. Mid. 2:5.152 They are followed by a baraitha (i.e., Tannaitic saying), and the two sayings serve to explain each other, that is, the reader is meant to take the geozõtéra (Greek: exóstra) as the architectural concretization of the women sitting above. The gemara raises the question as to how this innovation in the temple architecture could be allowed, quoting 1 Chr 28:19 as proof that the (First) Temple should not be changed. The third century Babylonian Amora Rav answers that Zech 12:12 can serve as a proof text for the
validity of this innovation. The explanation is that the text refers to a future period of mourning and requires a separation of the sexes even when mourning, that is, when one would not expect the evil inclination to arouse their sexual desires. How much more is it necessary to separate the sexes when they are engaged in celebrating this special festival—a time when one would expect sexual desire to arise.

Here we have the precise model that scholars have assumed for the synagogues. Is this not sufficient evidence for assuming a similar arrangement in the synagogue? Aside from the fact that a rather uneven development is described here, a development based on anything but a stable notion of how the sexes should be arranged, it is of special note that the Babylonian Talmud brings this gallery into connection with a special holiday, i.e., a night when many people would be present and dancing and wine would be an integral part of the festival. One can hardly draw generalizations from this special arrangement—not for the regular temple service and even less for synagogue worship.153

A further possible reference is found in v. Sukk. 55b.14-23 according to which the famous Diplostoön (Hebrew: dip’olestōab, Hebrew: diplo stoa)154 in Alexandria was destroyed by the Emperor Trajan. After he had killed the men, Trajan offered the women mercy if they would surrender, to which the women answered, "Do to those above (’iliyyā’) as you have done to those below (’ar’āyā’)." This seems to be a very clear case of the separation of the sexes. What is often overlooked, however, is that the parallels in Lam. Rab. 1:45 (on 1:16) and 4.22 (on 4.19)155 have the terms reversed: "Do to those below (i.e., the women) as you have done to those above." Sukenik dismisses this reversal:

Right or wrong, the Palestinian narrator cannot conceive of the Community Centre in Alexandria otherwise than with a gallery, and that reserved for the women.

Accordingly it would seem that the reading of the parallels in the ordinary edition of Lamentations Rabba, 58b and 68d, where the terms are reversed, is due to a misapprehension. In Buber's edition, p.83, they are simply replaced by 'men' and 'women.' It is even possible that in Palestinian Aramaic the male and female halves of any congregation were designated colloquially as אַנְשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ, literally 'those of the ground (floor)' and אָנְשֵׁי הַרְכֵּסָה, 'those of the upper (floor)' respectively.156

At the historical level, it is not clear that this account is based on historical fact. Sukenik and those who follow him,
however, are less interested in the early second-century Alexandrian Diplostoon than in the third- and fourth-century Palestinian synagogues. But if this is the case, then how can one so rapidly dismiss the parallels, where "those above" and "those below" are reversed, making the women "those below"? If the interest is in ancient Israel rather than Alexandria, then this discrepancy must be taken very seriously. Further, it is not even clear that 'יִלְּאָיָה' and 'אִרְמָיוֹת' are spatial terms at all. Marcus Jastrow, for example, takes them to mean "inferior" (i.e., the women) and "superior" (i.e., the men) respectively, and lists *y. Sukk. 55b* as an "incorrect version"! 157 A further possibility is that the image behind this haggadah is that of a castle or a fortress, where the men fought up above and only when they were killed did the Roman soldiers reach the women below. 158

In light of the ambiguity of the terminology and the lack of agreement in the sources, this passage and its parallels cannot be taken as evidence either for a gallery in the Alexandrian Diplostoon or for galleries in ancient synagogues in Israel.

A further passage of interest is found in Philo of Alexandria. In describing the life of the Therapeutides and Therapeutai, Philo writes (*De vita contempl. 32-33; cf. also 69*):

This common sanctuary in which they meet every seventh day is a double enclosure, one portion set apart for the use of the men, the other for the women. For women too regularly make part of the audience with the same ardour and the same sense of their calling. The wall between the two chambers rises up from the ground to three or four cubits built in the form of a breastwork, while the space above is left open. This arrangement serves two purposes; the modesty becoming to the female sex is preserved, while the women sitting within ear-shot can easily follow what is said since there is nothing to obstruct the voice of the speaker.

Should we take this as a first-century example of a separation of the sexes? Yes, by all means, but that gives us no license to generalize that all or even most first-century Jews followed the example of the Therapeutai and Therapeutides. The group which Philo is describing is a sect, a sect which follows
such unusual life customs as celibacy and the pursuit of the purely contemplative life, as the context of this passage clearly demonstrates. Scholars would not think of using this sect as proof that celibacy or the contemplative life were widespread in Judaism. Why should one view their separation of the sexes during worship in a different way? It may well be that their celibacy and the desire to preserve it were what gave rise to this custom. Further, the divider described does not fit in with any synagogue remains known to us. One cannot use a room divider of about 4.5 to 6 meters in height as proof for a women's gallery or separate room for women. Finally, the very tenor of Philo's description of this group of people suggests that he was telling his readers something they did not already know. Whether written for Jewish or for non-Jewish readers, the report on this exotic sect is an introduction to customs not widely practiced. Philo's detailed description arouses the impression that we have before us a rare custom rather than one so widespread that describing it is unnecessary.\(^{159}\)

A further text worth noting here reflects a fourth-century Babylonian practice (b. \\textit{Qidd.} 81a [mid.]): \(^{160}\) אברא מדריר נפליר. רבח מדריר קולה. אברא מדריר קולה. אברא מדריר קולה. "Abaye placed jugs around (them); Rava placed reed around (them). Avin stated, The sorest spot of the year is the festival season." The context of this passage is a discussion of women and men mixing with each other. The jugs and reed were two means of separating the men from the women, i.e., they could be placed on the floor forming a sort of boundary between the two groups. Rashi says that the jugs were pottery shards and that these or reeds were placed in rows between men and women at such gatherings as a sermon or a wedding. The statement, "The sorest spot of the year is the festival season," is a reference to the type of frivolity discussed above in the context of the water-drawing ceremony.

Note that this text makes no reference to the synagogue. If Rashi is right, the gatherings were not necessarily synagogue services, but rather large public gatherings of various sorts. Given all the discussion by archaeologists of permanent architectural features designed to separate women from men, it is especially noteworthy how temporary a jug or reed divider looks to us. This text, therefore, rather than providing support for the thesis of a women's gallery or section in the ancient synagogue, lends credence to the thesis that the separation of the sexes was occasionally practiced at certain large public
gatherings and was facilitated by means of temporary dividers, as for example, reed or jug dividers.

This survey of the literary evidence adduced by scholars in support of a women's gallery or women's section has shown that none of this evidence is convincing. The women's forecourt in the temple was not just for women. The gallery erected in the women's forecourt was just for women but was rarely used. The story concerning Trajan and the women is ambiguous in its terminology and contradictory in its versions. The separation practiced by the Therapeutrides and the Therapeutai cannot be used as evidence for general Jewish practice. The passage concerning the separation of women from men by means of jugs or reeds is not related to the synagogue and actually underscores the temporary nature of the divider. There is, therefore, no convincing literary support for the existence of a women's gallery or women's section.

C. Further Considerations

In order to set the study of the synagogues in its proper context, it is necessary to compare them briefly with churches and temples. As to Christian practice, there was some variety and a certain development. The vast majority of the Byzantine churches in Palestine do not seem to have had a gallery. Outside of Palestine some churches seem to have had one (e.g., the Church of St. John Studios in Constantinople [463], the Church of the Acheiropoeitos in Salonika [470], the Umm-es-Surab in the Hauran, Syria [489], and the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople [537]). While others seem not to have (e.g., St. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna [490], Maria Maggiore in Rome [432-440]), Galleries in churches, of course, could serve a number of purposes, and should therefore not be identified as "women's galleries." There is, however, some evidence that some Christian communities did institute a separation of the sexes. These varied in form and sometimes applied only to the laity. There is no reason to assume that this practice was ancient or universal or that the earliest Christians adopted it from the Jews. The evidence points to its being an independent Christian development which occurred in an uneven and regionally varied way.

It is impossible to give any kind of a survey of temples here, and it also does not seem necessary since ancient synagogues do not bear a great deal of resemblance to ancient Graeco-Roman temples. One type is worth mentioning, however, and
that is the temple with a staircase. Robert Amy made a very thorough survey of temples with staircases, especially of those in Syria, Lebanon and Trans-Jordan. What is significant for our question is that staircases do not disappear in the course of time. Where they are present in the ruins, they have as good a chance of surviving raids by builders in search of material as do columns, piers, or courses of ashlar stones. This fact should be particularly significant for those archaeologists who would reconstruct galleries in Palestinian synagogues even when no staircase is to be found.

If the evidence points so heavily against the reconstruction of a gallery and against the assumption that women and men were strictly separated in the ancient synagogue, why is the opposite the prevailing view? The most likely reason is that modern scholars are still using the contemporary Orthodox synagogue as their tertium comparationis rather than allowing for the possibility that in antiquity certain customs were different from today's customs. Further, archaeologists have looked to certain Galilean synagogues for their point of departure, assuming that the reconstructed women's gallery was based on firm evidence.

Has no one called all of this into question? As a matter of fact, five prominent scholars, over a period of the last eighty-one years, have offered their reasons for calling into question the existence of a separate gallery or women's section in the ancient synagogue.

The first was Leopold Löw, who pointed out that the Talmud makes no mention of it, and that a number of stories make mention of women participating in the synagogue services. He also discusses a number of the passages dealt with above and comes to the conclusion that there was no women's section in the ancient synagogue.

Löw was followed by Ismar Elbogen, who referred to several of the same texts and concluded that women and men probably sat separately, but that the rows for women and for men were side by side. Elbogen does assume, however, that the galleries in the Galilean synagogues were probably for women, although he adds that this is not certain.

Richard Krautheimer also believed that the ancient synagogue did not have a strict separation of the sexes, suggesting that this probably came in gradually.

Asher Hiram argued on various grounds that the ancient synagogue in Israel did not have a gallery, whether for women or not. As a technical argument, Hiram points out that the
Palestinian synagogues were built of ashlar stones with no cement of any sort and that such buildings could not have supported the lateral pressure which would have been exerted by a gallery. As an archaeological argument against the gallery, Hiram cites the ancient coins which bear the images of synagogues, noting that no gallery is visible on them. He further proposes the economic argument that a gallery is rather expensive and the architectural argument that a gallery would have been aesthetically unpleasing. If there was a gallery, Hiram concludes, then it must have been over the transverse aisle and have functioned as a classroom. If there was a pseudo-gallery, it could have been used for storage purposes. By rejecting the theory of the gallery, Hiram does not totally exclude the possibility that the women sat in a side room, as he believes they did at Gammat Gader.

Finally, and in the greatest depth, Shmuel Safrai has called the existence of the women's gallery into question. Safrai accepts the existence of galleries, but argues that these were not for women and that, in fact, no reference to a general separation of the sexes in synagogue worship can be found in ancient Jewish literature. Safrai also discusses a significant number of texts which show that women went to the synagogue and participated in the services.

It is time that scholars of Judaica and archaeologists take these arguments seriously.

Conclusions

The archaeological survey has demonstrated that the ancient synagogue ruins in Palestine yield little evidence for galleries. The ancient Diaspora synagogues yield none. While there are side rooms, especially in Diaspora synagogues, there is no archaeological reason to assume that these were for women. It should be stated here that it is not my thesis that one can prove that all ancient synagogues were built without galleries. Rather, it is my thesis that at nearly all sites the evidence is totally insufficient to reconstruct a gallery. Even if these galleries were for women, the architectural and cultural picture emerging would still be vastly different from the one current in modern scholarship. As for the side rooms, it is not my thesis that one can prove that these were not for women, but rather that all evidence is lacking to support the hypothesis that they were for women. Even if the one or the other were a women's section, the cultural picture emerging would still be vastly different from the one current in modern scholarship.
Ancient Jewish literature yields no hint of a strict separation of the sexes in the synagogue. Thus, even if a gallery were to have existed in a particular synagogue, this would not prove that it was a women's gallery. By the same token, ancient literature should caution us from identifying unidentified side rooms as women's sections.

The parallel of Christian churches shows that they do not give us reason to reconstruct a gallery in the ancient synagogues in Israel. The development of the arrangement of the sexes was uneven and regionally influenced. Earliest Christianity does not seem to have had a separation of the sexes.

Ancient pagan temples with stairs show that stairs do not disappear more quickly than other architectural elements.

This has not been the first attempt to call the existence of the women's gallery and the women's section in the ancient synagogue into question. Rather than simply relying on the consensus of scholarship, it is time to rethink the prevailing view, to produce evidence where it exists and to alter one's hypothesis where it does not. It is therefore inappropriate to reject the possibility of women leaders in the ancient synagogue on the grounds that women were not even admitted into the main prayer hall.
CHAPTER VII

FURTHER BACKGROUND ISSUES RELATING TO WOMEN LEADERS IN THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE

A. Women's Participation in Synagogue Worship Services

The lack of an adequate understanding of women's participation in the life of the ancient synagogue has hindered research on the Jewish inscriptions in which women bear titles. Even the following, very cursory survey of several salient points should shed light on the context from which they arose. The basis for all other participation is attendance at the synagogue services. Women's attendance at synagogue worship services is taken for granted in the ancient sources. The New Testament gives several of the earliest attestations of this. In Luke 13:10-17, Jesus heals a woman who had been bent over for eighteen years. According to the evangelist, the framework of the miracle is a sabbath service: "Now he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath" (Luke 13:10).

The Acts of the Apostles also attest to women's presence at worship services. When Paul and Silas traveled to Philippi, they followed their usual custom of searching out the local synagogue (Acts 16:12b-14):

"Ὑμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς, τῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἐξω τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμόν οὗ ἐνοικίζομεν προσεύχην εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθόσας γυναιξίν. καὶ τὰς γυνῆς ὀνόματι Λυδία, παρασυρόμενις πόλεως θυατείρων σεβομένη τόν θεόν, ἦκουν, ὡς ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου.

We remained in this city for some days; and on the sabbath day we went outside the gate to the riverside, where we supposed there was a synagogue (proseuchē); and we sat down and spoke to the women who had come together. One who heard us was a woman named Lydia, from the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple goods, who was a worshiper of God. The Lord opened her heart to give heed to what was said by Paul.

There is a general tendency among scholars to assume that it is not an actual synagogue service which is meant, but rather some sort of outdoor prayer meeting. The reasons for the hesitancy to translate proseuchē as "synagogue" are: 1) the "we supposed" (hōu enomizomen) of v. 13; 2) the use of proseuchē instead of
synagogōgē, which is the usual term in Acts (Acts 6:9; 9:2; etc.); and 3) the fact that the congregants are women.² As to the first reason, it does not seem unusual that the missionaries would not know the site of the synagogue in a strange town. Secondly, the term proseuchē perhaps goes back to the sources of the author of Acts (the same term occurs immediately following in 16:16) or is perhaps a simple variant in the author's usage. It is in any case well-attested as meaning "synagogue."³ I believe that the real reason for the hesitancy is that the only congregants mentioned are women. One can see that this is a circular argument: on the assumption that women did not attend or only rarely attended synagogue services, a text which speaks of women attending services is taken as not referring to genuine synagogue worship. None of the three reasons is convincing, and this text is therefore a further attestation of women's presence at Jewish worship services. Another example is found in Acts 17:4, in which "not a few of the leading women" were persuaded by Paul's sermon in the synagogue of Thessalonica. Finally, Acts 18:26, "He [Apollos] began to speak boldly in the synagogue; but when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they took him and expounded to him the way of God more accurately," is an example of a Jewish woman not only attending the service, but also teaching in a synagogue context.

Rabbinic sources also speak of women participating in synagogue services. B. "Abod. Zar. 38a-38b reads:

אשה עדיריה על בני כריה נבא ערובת כרכיה
וירבינה על שבלית מקית המתרחי א מ_splits התכנית
אריגה ורשפת.

[An Israelite] woman may set a pot on a stove and let a gentile woman then come and stir it pending her return from the bathhouse or the synagogue, and she need take no notice of it.

This saying is a baraita (i.e., Tannaitic). Just preceding these words, the text speaks of a male Israelite leaving a gentile man to watch his meat while he is in the synagogue or house of learning. Thus it is assumed that just as men ordinarily go to synagogue, so too do women ordinarily go to synagogue. A further relevant text is y. Ber. 9d.6-8 (cf. b. Šotâ 38a):

עיר שבלית חתית נבירה אד כריה. למד חים מבריכים?
לאותיה שכרתיי לאותית שכרתיי לאותית שברתיי
לאותית שברתיי. רמי ערובת אתריהי אמקי? חסרי רמהי.
Background Issues

In a town where all are priests they raise up their hands [to give the blessing]. Whom do they bless? Their brothers in the north, in the south, in the east and in the west. And who answers, "Amen," after them? The women and the children.

Again, the women's presence in the service is simply presupposed. Note that this text presupposes that only male priests give the priestly blessing. A story told of a woman who used to go each week to hear R. Me'ir (ca. 150) preach would be one more example of the way in which also the rabbinic sources take women's attendance at worship services to be an ordinary phenomenon (y. Sota 16d.38-52; Lev. Rab. 9.9; cf. Deut. Rab. 5.15). Another story about a woman's regular attendance at synagogue services is also relevant here (b. Sota 22a):

דָּוִיתָה יַלְדוֹתָה דָּוִיתָה בּ כְּנֶסֶתָה בּשֶׁדַעְבּוֹתֵיהּ
כָּל יָדוֹתָה יַלְדוֹתָה בּ מְדַדְּשָּׁתָה בּ דְּרִיבֵי קְדוֹשָּׁה, היא לך, בתיה! לא ידַעְבּוֹתֵיהּ בּשֶׁדַעְבּוֹתֵיהּ.
אמרה לו, בתיה! לא ידַעְבּוֹתֵיהּ בּשֶׁדַעְבּוֹתֵיהּ.

A certain widow had a synagogue in her neighborhood; yet she used to come daily to the school of R. Johanan and pray there. He said to her, "My daughter, is there not a synagogue in your neighborhood?" She answered him, "Rabbi, but have I not the reward for the steps!"

The issue here is not that the woman goes to the synagogue regularly, but rather that she walks quite a distance to attend services in a synagogue far from her home and merits reward for her extra steps. That she attends is not cause for surprise. The background of these sources is that, according to Tannaitic halakhah, women are obliged to pray (m. Ber. 3:3); prayer in the synagogue is one of the ways of fulfilling that obligation.

In the light of such sources, one can say with certainty that Jewish women attended synagogue services in the period of the Second Temple and of the Mishnah and the Talmud. It is difficult to understand how Goodenough could write with reference to the Juliana who had donated the mosaic in the synagogue at Naro in North Africa:

She herself could presumably not have attended the services in this sancta synagogue; but as with all daughters in Israel, her hope was in the maintenance of Jewish worship and life.

B. Women as Donors to and of Synagogues

Anyone familiar with the workings of private institutions is acutely aware of the connection between the ability to give money and the capability of wielding influence. The boards of
trustees of the private institutions of this country provide ample attestation of this phenomenon. In the ancient world, philanthropy and power were also intimately connected with each other, perhaps even more so than today, whereby it is not always clear whether philanthropy was the prerequisite to holding office or vice versa. In an article entitled "Feminism in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum," S. L. Mohler writes:

It follows as a natural corollary to the importance of games and *epula* in the life of the ancient communities that social leadership was determined to a considerable extent by the ability of individuals to supply the demand for these forms of entertainment.6

After outlining the concrete relationship between certain official titles held by women and philanthropy, Mohler notes:

Having once received this formal recognition as public functionaries—which meant as much or as little as election to a magistracy--, these women were in a position to enter upon the prescribed career of philanthropy.7

Without simplistically transferring the situation of the non-Jewish world onto Judaism, it does seem reasonable to ask whether there might have been a relationship between donations to and of synagogues and influence in the Jewish community. This is not to ask whether synagogue functionaries attained their titles through engaging in donative activity or whether maintaining the synagogue building was one of their functions. Throughout the discussion of the various titles, we have seen that while persons who bear titles often appear in donative inscriptions, so too do those who bear none. The purpose of pointing out the women in Jewish donative inscriptions is not, therefore, to suggest that all of these held leadership positions or were synagogue functionaries. The point, rather, is to view the women title-bearers against the backdrop of women donors, that is, to consider the implications of the existence of women donors for the interpretation of the nineteen inscriptions in question.

For an overview of women donating alone and together with their husbands, as well as of others donating on behalf of women, see the forty-three inscriptions given in the appendix. The most important aspect of this corpus is not any one detail, but rather the very fact of the existence of such inscriptions. They belie the current, often unstated, view of Jewish women in antiquity as very much in the background, as not in any way involved in the public sphere, but rather as absolutely restricted to domestic
activities. They show that at least some women controlled their own property and possessed sufficient sums of money to be able to donate from it. One might ask whether the system of guardianship would not have been a severe restriction on women's control of their property, as the approval of the guardian (tutor, kyrios) was necessary before disposing of one's property. Guardians are not mentioned in the donative inscriptions, probably because donative inscriptions are not legal documents. If the guardian's approval was necessary, which, especially with the smaller donations, may not have been the case, all of these women succeeded in obtaining it. Since the system of guardianship had broken down considerably by the late Roman period, the question may even be irrelevant for most of the inscriptions.

One synagogue where women were particularly active as donors was that in Apamea in Syria, which contained a mosaic floor with nineteen dedicatory inscriptions (Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 38-56; Inscr. Syrie 1319-1337; CII 803-818). One of the inscriptions is dated to 391 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38; CII 803). Of the nineteen inscriptions, nine were ordered by women (Appendix nos. 7-15), and another five were ordered by a man (or men) and a woman (or women) together, in two cases with their children (Appendix nos. 30-34). Two further inscriptions contain donations on behalf of women (Appendix nos. 39-40). There are only three inscriptions (Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 38, 47, 49; Inscr. Syrie 1319, 1328, 1330; CII 803, 812, 814) which mention only male donors (in contrast to nine which mention only women), although one of these (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38) refers not to one, but rather to several male donors. A caveat concerning the relationship between being a donor and holding an official position is in order here. In spite of the preponderance of women donors, the only office-holders mentioned by name are men. Thus, the case of Apamea does not demonstrate that where women donate money, they receive official titles. It simply shows that they were active members of the synagogue and in control of a certain amount of money.

An inscription which shows a closer connection between donative activity and official honor is the Tation inscription from Phocaea, Ionia (Appendix no. 3; perhaps 3rd C.). Tation donated an entire synagogue and was honored with a golden crown and prohedria, that is, the right to sit in front in the seat of honor. Perhaps this refers to the type of special chair or throne found in the synagogues at Delos, 'En-Gedi and Korazim. One is reminded also of Jesus' indictment of the scribes and
Pharisees who "sit on the seat of Moses" and who "love the best seats (prōtokathedraί) in the synagogues" (Matt 23:2, 6). The prohedria granted to Tation does not fit in with the hypothesis of a women's gallery. One could imagine that this inscription is unambiguous with respect to the honor bestowed upon a woman. Not so to Salomon Reinach, who writes:

The inscription of Phocaea shows us that this distinction [i.e., prohedria] was accorded not only to the wealthy and the learned, but that the community conferred it, by special decision, even upon women.\(^{13}\)

It would seem that a woman who donates an entire building is, by definition, wealthy, and how Mr. Reinach can know that Tation was not a learned person is unclear to this author.

Another woman who donated an entire synagogue was Julia Severa (Appendix no. 6; probably 1st C.), probably a non-Jewish woman\(^{14}\) who was a high priestess, agōnōthetis and eponymous magistrate (MAMA VI 153, 263, 265).\(^{15}\) Her name continued to be associated with the synagogue for some time, for the extant inscription does not commemorate the erection of the building, but rather its repair at a later date.

The one woman title-bearer who was also a donor is Theopempte (Appendix no. 4), head of the synagogue. The contribution of her and her son Eusebios was a chancel screen post, possibly also the chancel screen attached to it.

In summary, the references to women in Jewish donative inscriptions do not prove that women were synagogue functionaries in antiquity, but they do show that some women controlled considerable sums of money and were active in supporting the synagogue. This is an important piece of information when considering the question of whether women could have been members of boards of elders or whether mothers of the synagogue might have served on governing boards. One of the functions of such boards might have been to make budgetary decisions. Those in society who are appointed or elected to make budgetary decisions are often those who possess property or money themselves. These inscriptions show that some women in antiquity controlled money and would, therefore, have been good candidates for board membership.

C. Women as Proselytes to Judaism

Scholars have recognized for some time that women proselytes are mentioned relatively frequently in ancient sources.
Josephus, in speaking of the Jewish War, writes that the men of Damascus wanted to carry out a massacre against the Jews of Damascus, and that "their only fear was of their own wives, who, with few exceptions, had all become converts to the Jewish religion (πλὴν ὀλίγων ὑπηγμένας τῷ Ἰουδαϊκῷ θρησκείᾳ), and so their efforts were mainly directed to keeping the secret from them" (J.W. 2.20.2 § 560). Because this report seems exaggerated to modern scholars, they often assume that these women, or at least the majority of them, had not become full Jews, but rather "God-fearers."  

It is not at all clear why this should be the case. Josephus further reports that the Jewish merchant Ananias converted King Izates of Adiabene in the following way (Ant. 20.2.3. §§ 34-35):

...πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας εἰσιῶν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐδόθασέν αὐτάς τὸν θεὸν σέβεσθαι, ὡς Ἰουδαϊκὸς πάτριος ἦν, καὶ δὴ δι' αὐτῶν εἰς γνώσιν ἀφικόμενος τῷ Ἰζάτῃ κἀκεῖνον ὄμοιώς συνανθέπεσεν...

...[Ananias] visited the king's wives and taught them to worship God after the manner of the Jewish tradition. It was through their agency that he was brought to the notice of Izates, whom he similarly won over with the co-operation of the women...

Izates' mother, Helena, independently of her son, also converted to Judaism. Helena was well-known for her help to the people of Jerusalem in a time of famine and was buried in Jerusalem.  

The Mishnah (m. Yoma 3:10) mentions Helena's gifts to the Jerusalem temple, and the Babylonian Talmud says that she was very careful to observe all of the commandments (b. Sukk. 2b). Josephus also reports on a Roman woman of high rank, Fulvia by name, who had become a Jewish proselyte and was tricked by three Jewish men into giving them purple and gold, which they promised to deliver to the temple in Jerusalem, but which they actually kept for themselves (Ant. 18.3.5 §§ 81-84). In contrast to all of these references to female proselytes, Josephus mentions only one male proselyte in the Diaspora, Izates.

Some have argued that Poppaea Sabina, the wife of Nero, was perhaps a proselyte or at least favorably inclined to Judaism (Josephus, Ant. 20.8.11 § 195) but this is rather uncertain.  

The ancient Jewish inscriptions also support the theory that it was especially women who were attracted to Judaism. Of the seven or eight inscriptions from Italy which mention Jewish proselytes, five refer to women (CII 21, 202, 222, 462, 523), and only two or three to men (CII 68, 256, possibly 576). As for the
"God-fearers," Kuhn and Stegemann\textsuperscript{19} count four inscriptions referring to women (CII 285, 524, 529, 642), and three referring to men (CII 5, 500, 642). According to their use of the term "God-fearer," CII 683a and 731e should be added to the list; the first refers to a man and the second to a woman. A. Thomas Krabel, however, has recently called into question the existence of a clearly defined group of persons called by the technical term "God-fearers," and therefore caution is called for in the use of these materials.

Rabbinic literature also makes mention of female proselytes (e.g., m. *Ketub.* 4:3; b. *Ber.* 8b; b. *Rosh HaSh.* 17b; b. B. *Qam.* 109b; b. *Hor.* 13a; b. *Yebam.* 46a, 78a, 84b; b. *Ketub.* 37a; Ger. 21, 4). In fact, as the following law from the Theodosian Code makes clear, women continued to become proselytes to Judaism well into the Christian era (*Cod. Theod.* 16.8.6; August 13, 339):

\begin{quote}

Imp. Constantius A. ad Evagrium.
(Post alia:) Quod ad mulieres pertinet, quas Iudaei in turpitudinis suae duxere consortium in gynaecio nostro ante versatas, placet easdem restitui gynaeceo idque in reliquum observari, ne Christianas mulieres suis iungant flagitiis vel, si hoc fecerint, capitali periculo subiagentur.
Dat. id. aug. Constantio A. ii cons.\textsuperscript{21}

Emperor Constantius Augustus to Evagrius.
(After other matters.) In so far as pertains to the women who were formerly employed in Our imperial weaving establishment and who have been led by the Jews into the association of their turpitude, it is Our pleasure that they shall be restored to the weaving establishment. It shall be observed that Jews shall not hereafter unite Christian women to their villainy; if they should do so, however, they shall be subject to the peril of capital punishment.

Given on the ides of August in the year of the second consulship of Constantius Augustus.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

The only explanation for this law is that large numbers of Christian women had converted to Judaism. Had there only been isolated instances, such a law would be inexplicable. Placing Jewish missionary activity among Christian women under the death penalty must certainly have placed a damper on such activity; that the Roman lawgiver considered such a penalty necessary must indicate that the Jewish mission to women had been enjoying considerable success.

John Chrysostom attests, not to the conversion of women to Judaism, but to Christian women attending the Jewish New Year service in the Antioch of his time, as well as other synagogue services. Not surprisingly, Chrysostom condemns this practice with the sharpest of words, emphasizing that a Christian man is
the head of his wife and that he should keep his wife and his
slave at home, not allowing them to go to the synagogue or the
theater (Adv. Jud. 2.4-6; 4.3). 23

All of this evidence for women being attracted by and
converting to Judaism sheds a new light, not only on ancient
Judaism in general, but also on the question of the make-up of
new communities of the Diaspora. If large numbers of women in
the ancient world converted to Judaism, then it could have been
the case that in some communities women formed the majority.
Further, if large numbers of women became proselytes, then why
should we imagine that men were the only proselytizers? In the
imperial weaving establishment, for example, one could visualize
women workers, Jewish by birth or by conversion, discussing
religious questions with their fellow weavers, inviting them to
religious services or festivals and finally arranging for their
conversion.

Further, women's attraction to Judaism may have had some-
thing to do with the nature of the Judaism to which they were
attracted. Is it possible that these forms of Judaism were less
restrictive regarding women than some of its forms known to us
through history? This does not mean that women could not or have
not converted to religions oppressive of women, which is simply a
fact in the history of religions. If Judaism was especially
appealing to women in the Roman world, however, scholarship must
face the question why this was so and re-evaluate our under-
standing of ancient Judaism accordingly. The attractiveness of
Judaism to women cannot be explained as a result of the presence
of Jewish women title-bearers, but it is plausible to imagine
that active, leading Jewish women were influential in attracting
non-Jewish women to join the Jewish community. One clear point
of connection between proselytes and women title-bearers is CII
523, in which Veturia Paulla, who had converted to Judaism
sixteen years before her death, is called the mother of two
synagogues. It is not surprising that a convert, who would have
been an especially active member of the synagogue, should also
have been involved in the leadership of it.
CONCLUSION

The view that the titles in question were honorific is based less on evidence from the inscriptions themselves or from other ancient sources than on current presuppositions concerning the nature of ancient Judaism. Seen in the larger context of women's participation in the life of the ancient synagogue, there is no reason not to take the titles as functional, nor to assume that women heads or elders of synagogues had radically different functions than men heads or elders of synagogues. Of the functions outlined for each title, there are none which women could not have carried out. If women donated money, and even large sums of it, surely they were capable of collecting and administering synagogue funds. Nor is it impossible to imagine Jewish women sitting on councils of elders or teaching or arranging for the religious service. Even women carrying out judicial functions is not impossible in a tradition which reveres one of its women prophets (Deborah) as a judge. This is not to say that the women of these inscriptions might not have been exceptions. Indeed, they probably were. It is an exception today for women to hold positions of religious leadership. The point is not whether these women were exceptions or not, nor even whether they faced opposition or not—today's women rabbis, ministers and priests certainly do—but whether their titles were merely titles or whether they implied actual functions, just as for the men. It is my view that they were functional, and that if the women bearing these titles had been members of another Graeco-Roman religion, scholars would not have doubted that the women were actual functionaries. This collection of inscriptions should challenge historians of religion to question the prevailing view of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman period as a religion all forms of which a priori excluded women from leadership roles.

Further steps in research would be to consider these Jewish women leaders in the larger context of the history of religions, comparing their functions with those of women leaders in other communities and religions, such as the Isis, Demeter or Dionysus religions. It would also be especially useful to study possible connections between Judaism and Jewish Christianity. For example, it is striking that several early Christian women leaders were Jewish: the apostle Junia (Rom 16:7), the teacher and missionary Prisca (Acts 18:2, 18, 26; Rom 16:3-4; 1 Cor
16:19; 2 Tim 4:19; note that in Acts 18:26 she teaches in a synagogue context), and possibly the Mariam of Rom 16:6, "who labored much for you" (on *koproes* as a term of leadership, see 1 Cor 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12). The inscriptive evidence for Jewish women leaders means that one cannot declare it to be a departure from Judaism that early Christian women held leadership positions. A further context in which to study this material would be the political titles borne by women in this period, in particular in Asia Minor, since some of the Jewish titles may have had civic and political overtones. Another area in great need of research is the social and economic aspects of Jewish women's lives in this period. If we had a clearer picture of women's daily lives, it would be much easier to visualize how Jewish women leaders fit into the larger context of Jewish women's history. A historian wishing to add to the picture of which the present study is a small portion might look at other periods of Jewish history, in particular, the Persian, Hellenistic and medieval periods, to see if similar evidence from those periods exists, raising the question of a continuum of Jewish women leaders.

Historians of Judaism, in particular rabbinics scholars, might consider taking this evidence into account when assessing statements concerning women in Jewish literary sources. Non-literary materials should be a challenge, and not a simple complement, to the view of reality emerging from literature. Literature composed by men is the product of men's minds and not a simple mirror image of reality. As we begin to evaluate all of the sources for Jewish women's history in the period in question, including inscriptions and papyri, a much more differentiated picture will emerge. It will then be impossible to mistake male Jewish attitudes towards women for Jewish women's history. Jacob Neusner has already made an important contribution to this endeavor with his five-volume work, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Women* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), in which he attempts a systemic analysis of the mishnaic division on women. That is, Neusner sees clearly that what the male rabbis said about women does not necessarily reflect who women were, what they did or what they thought. Rather it reflects who the men making these statements were. Therefore, one must view their words in the context of their system of thought. Only subsequent to this can one evaluate how relevant for women's history a given passage might
be, that is, if it contains accurate historical data about women or not. Perhaps this greater sensitivity to the nature of the historical documents and a heightened awareness of the perspectives they represent can bring us one step closer to understanding the reality of women's past.*

*Just as this study was being prepared for publication, Prof. Dr. Martin Hengel kindly informed me of the existence of an unpublished Jewish inscription from Aphrodisias in Caria in which a woman by the name of Jael is called prostatēs ("presiding officer," "patron," "guardian"). Her son Josua, who is called an archōn, is also mentioned. The long inscription is reported to date from the third or fourth century and to be concerned with charitable activities. It is to be published soon by Miss Joyce Reynolds of Newnham College, University of Cambridge and others in Revue des études grecques and may well be an important piece of evidence for the further discussion of Jewish women's leadership. An analysis of the title prostatēs in the inscription could also shed light on the work of the early Christian prostatis, Phoebe, mentioned by Paul in Rom 16:1-2.
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APPENDIX

WOMEN AS DONORS IN THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE

A. Women as Donors of Synagogues or to Synagogues

GREECE

Delos

These two inscriptions from Delos are from what is most likely a synagogue (1st C. B.C.E.). One of the reasons for assuming that it was a synagogue is the use of the term "most high God" in the inscriptions.

1. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 5; CII 728.

Laodike to the most high God, having been saved by him with the medical treatments, in fulfillment of a vow.

2. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 7; CII 730.

To the most high (God), Marcia, in fulfillment of a vow.

IONIA

Phocaea

3. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 13; CII 738. Perhaps 3rd C.

Tation, daughter (or wife) 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 honored Tation, daughter (or wife) of Straton, son of E(m)pedon, with a golden crown and the privilege of sitting in the seat of honor.

CARIA

Myndos

4. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 29; CII 756. Chancel screen post. After 4th/5th C.

From Theompekte, head of the synagogue, and her son Eusebios.

CARIA

Tralles

5. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 30; CIG 2924. Probably 3rd C.

I, Capitololina, the most revered and pious one, having made the entire dais, made the revetment
Women Leaders in the Synagogue

4 οά το πάμ βάθρο[ν] of the stairs, in fulfillment
εκσκούτλωσα τ[δον]
of a vow for myself and (my)
(α) ναβασμόν ύπ[ερ]
children and (my) grandchil-
ευχής έμαυτής [καλ;?]
dren. Blessings.
8 πεδίων τε καὶ ἐγ-
γόνων. Εὐλογία.

PHRYGIA
Akmonia

6. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 33; CII 766; MAMA VI, 264. Probably 1st C.

Τὸν κατασκευασθέντα οἶκον ὑπὸ Ἐκλέκτης Συναγωγῆς. Π(ολίλος) Τυρρώνιος Κλα-
δος, ὁ διὰ βίου ἀρχισυνάγωγος καὶ

4 Λουκίου Λουκία Αρχισυνάγωγος
καὶ Ποπίλιος Ἐντικός δρῶν ἔπεσ-
κέλασαν ἐκ τῶν ἔδρων καὶ τῶν συν-
καταθήκων καὶ ἔγραψαν τοὺς τοι-

8 χόντας καὶ τὴν δρομὴν καὶ ἐποίησαν
τὴν τῶν θυρίδων οἰκόλειων καὶ τὸν
λυπῶν πάντα κόσμον, οὐστινας καὶ
ἡ συναγωγὴ ἐτελέσατε διόλῳ ἐπιχερι-

12 ὡς διὰ τὴν ἐνάρετον αὐτῶν δῆλο[ν]
σιν καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν συναγωγὴν εὐνοιαν
tε καὶ συνοδήν.

The 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 the money
which had been deposited, and they donated the murals for the
walls and the ceiling, and they reinforced the windows and
made all the rest of the ornamentation, and the synagogue
honored them with a gilded shield on account of their virtu-
ous behavior, solicitude and zeal for the synagogue.

SYRIA
Apamea

Inscriptions 7-15 are from the mosaic floor of a synagogue; they
date from ca. 391; cf. nos. 30-34, 39 and 40 below.

7. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 41; Inscr. Syrie 1322; CII 806.

‘Αλεξάνδρα

Alexandra made 100 feet, in
εὔξαμενή ὑπὲ-
fulfillment of a vow, for the
ρ οὐσινάς πάντων
salvation of all (her) rela-
4 τῶν τῶν ἔδρων
tives.
ἐποίησεν χάο(δας) ρ'

8. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 42; Inscr. Syrie 1323; CII 807.

‘Ἀμβροσία εὔξα-
Ambrosia made 50 feet, in
μένη ὑπὲρ σω-
fulfillment of a vow, for the
tηρῶν πάντων
salvation of all (her) rela-
4 τῶν τῶν ἔδρων
tives.
ἐποίησεν χάο(δας) ν'

9. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 43; Inscr. Syrie 1324; CII 808.

Δομινα[νία]
Domina made 100 feet, in
εὔξαμενη
fulfillment of a vow, for the
ὑπὲρ σωτη-
salvation of all (her) rela-
τῶν πάντων
tives.
4 ρίας πάντων
ἐποίησεν χάο(δας) ρ'.
10. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 44; Inscr. Syrie 1325; CII 809.

Εὐπηθής
ἐξαμένη
ύπερ σωτη-
4 ρίας πάντων
tὸν ἄκον
ἐ(ποίησεν πό(δας) ρ'.

Eupithis made 100 feet, in fulfillment of a vow, for the salvation of all (her) relatives.

11. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 45; Inscr. Syrie 1326; CII 810.

Διογενής
ἐξαμένη
ύπερ σωτη-
4 ρίας πάντων
tὸν ἄκον
ἐποίησεν πό(δας) ρ'.

Diogenis made 100 feet, in fulfillment of a vow, for the salvation of all (her) relatives.

12. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 46; Inscr. Syrie 1327; CII 811.

Σαπρίκια
ἐξαμένη
ύπερ σωτη-
4 ρίας πάντων
tὸν ἄκον
ἐποίησεν πό(δας) ρν'.

Saprikia made 150 feet, in fulfillment of a vow, for the salvation of all (her) relatives.

13. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 51; Inscr. Syrie 1332; CII 816.

Κολώνης
ἐξαμένη
ύπερ σωτη-
4 ἁυτῆς καὶ τῶν
tέκνων ἁυτῆς
ἐποίησεν πό(δας) οε'.

Colonis made 75 feet, in fulfillment of a vow, for the salvation of herself and her children.

14. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 54; Inscr. Syrie 1335.

[... ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας-]
ας ἁυτῆς καὶ τῶν
[τέκνων ἁυτῆς?]
καὶ τῶν ἔγονων ἐποίησεν...

So and so made ... for the salvation of herself and her children (?) and (her) grand-children.

15. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 55; Inscr. Syrie 1336.

Εὐπηθής
ἐξαμένη
ύπερ σωτηρίας ἁ-
τῆς καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός
4 καὶ τῶν τέκνων
καὶ παντὸς τοῦ οἴκου
αὐτῆς τὸν τόπον ἐποίησεν.

Eupithis made this place, in fulfillment of a vow, for the salvation of herself and (her) husband and (her) children and all of her household.

PALESTINE
Ashkalon

16. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 70; Hüttenmeister 24-25, no. 2; CII 964. Three marble fragments. 604.

θ(εός) Β(οσίθεν)· κυρᾶ λυμα 'Ιου[λανου; καὶ κυρ(α) Μάρι(ν)
νόνου εύχαριστοθατί]
προσφέρωνεν. Κύριο(ς) · ἔγιόνυν Ἕλικου[εὐχαριστῶν]
τῷ θε(ού) και(λ) τῷ ἄγ[ίω τόπῳ προσήγεγκα ὑπὲρ σωτ(ρίας)
· Κύριο(ς) Κυριακοθάτί προσήν-

4 εγκα ὑπὲρ σωτ(ρίας) [καὶ] ζωήν. ἐτούς Θεν'.

God help. We, lady Domna, the daughter (or wife) of Julianos (?) and lady* Marin (?), the daughter (or wife)* of Nonnos, donate in thanksgiving. I, lord (or lady) so and so, the
grandchild of Helikios, donate in thanksgiving to God and to this holy place, for my salvation. I, lord (or lady) Kom... donate for my salvation and my life. In the year 709 (604).

*Lifshitz and others read: ...P ἌΠΙ ΝΟΝΝῗ as, "lord Mari(n), son of Nonnou; κο]p(ος) Μάρι(υ) Νόννου.

**PALESTINE**

Huldah

17. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 81b; Hüttenmeister 177-178, no. 2. Mosaic. Probably late 5th C.

Eύτυπος

Blessings to Eustochios (or Eustochion, f.) and Hesychion (f.)* and Evagrios, the founders.

*Lifshitz and others read Eustochios (m.) and Hesychios (m.).

**PALESTINE**

Isfiyah


... and blessed be Halifo, the wife of Rabbi .... Let every one who promised and gave his (or her) donation be of good memory. Blessed be that one .... Be of good memory. Be of good memory Josiah who gave ....

**PALESTINE**

Na'aran

19. Hüttenmeister 324, no. 2. Mosaic. 6th C.

дврож

May Rivqa, the wife of Pinhas, be of good memory.

**PALESTINE**

May Ḥalipho, daughter of Rabbi Saphra, who has gained much merit in this holy place, be of good memory. Amen.

**PALESTINE**

Ḥammat Gader (al-Ḥamma)

May lord Leontis and lady Qaliniq, who have donated ... for the honor of the synagogue, be of good memory. May the King of the universe give his blessing on their work. Amen. Amen. Selah. Peace. And may the woman Anatolia, who donated one denar for the honor of the synagogue, be of good memory. May the King of the universe give his blessing on her work. Amen. Amen. Selah. Peace. May the people of the city, who donated one trimissis, be of good memory.

AFRICA
Hammam Lif

22. Goodenough 3. fig. 894; cf. 2.91-100. Mosaic.
Sancta sinagoga Naron pro salutem sua ancilla tua Iuliana- na P (??), paved with mosaic, from her own funds, the 
Venerah holy synagogue of Naro for her salvation.

CYRENAICA
Berenice

23. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 100. Twenty-line dedicatory inscription (16 men; 2 women). 55 C.E.

Column 2, lines 8-12:
8 Σεραφιώνος (δρ.) ε'.
10 Ζωιτην Τερ- 

Cf. also above, no. 21.

B. Women Donating Together with Their Husbands

IONIA
Teos

24. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 16; CII 744. 3rd C.
Π(ολιος) 'Ρουτ (ιλιους) 'Ιωσης ο διαλογισματος ο δια βίου 
γωνας) σύν Βισιννία Δημη τῇ συνβίω αὐτῷ ἐκ θεμελίων ἐκ 
τῶν Σ(ίων).

The most excellent P(ublius) Rut(ilius) Ioses, head-for- 
life of the synagogue, together with his wife Bisinnia Demo, 
(rebuilt this edifice) from the foundations, with their own 

LYDIA
Sardis

Αύρ(ηλιους) 'Ολύμ- 

I, Aur(elios) Olympios, from the 

Lеоntiоi, together 

fуllеd a vоw.

[... ...]ς μετά τής συμβίου μου Ἰηνενθ να καὶ τῶν τέκνων μου
(ca 7 11?)

[... ες]ωμα ἐν τῶν δωρεῶν τὸν παντοκράτορας Θ(εο)ῦ τὴν
σκούτλωςι πᾶσαν νας.

[to] τοῦ οἴκου καὶ τὴν ζωγραφίαν.

[So and so] with my wife Regina and my children ...
I gave, from the gifts of the omnipotent God, the entire
marble revetment ( ... ?) of the hall and the painting.

27. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 22.

[ ... ος] δέντα βιού (ευής) κρυσσο[χός]
[μετά τής] συμβίου Εὐ-
[ ... ες]ωμα.

LYDIA
Philadelphia of Lydia

28. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 28; CII 754. 3rd C.

[Τῇ ἁγιοτ[στρ]] [συμαγωγη]
τῶν Ἐβραίων
4 Εὐστάθιος
δ ἰδεσεβής
ὑπὲρ μνήμας
τοῦ ἄγελου
8 Ἀρμοφίλου
τὸν μασκαῦ-
λής ἰαθή-
κα ἡμι τῇ νύμ-
12 Εὐ μου Ἀδα-

CARIA
Hyllarima

29. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 32. 3rd C.

Ἐπερ θύλας ΝΟ[ ... ] ΙΑΙ
Βασιλέως[ ... ]
Αὔρηλος[πας] Ἐσσανδράτος προεσθυκερος καὶ Αὔρηλ[ηλα] Ἐπιτυν-
χάνου [ ... ] ὑπὲρ τῆς θατών σωτηρίας καὶ παῖδων αὐτῶν καὶ
4 ΚΙΦΙΠ[ ... ] OY
τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ συμαγωγῇ τὰ πρα[ ... ] ἀπὸ τῶν ἱδίων χρηματάτων.

For the health ... of the king ... Aurelius Euanbatios,
elder, and Aurelia Epitynchanousa, for their own salvation
and that of their children and ... to the most holy syna-
gogue the ... from their own funds.

SYRIA
Apamea

Inscriptions 30-34 are from the mosaic floor of a synagogue; 31-
34 date from ca. 391; cf. nos. 7-15 above and nos. 39-40 below.

30. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 40; Inscr. Syrie 1321; CII 805. March
9, 391. Note that the reference to a wife is reconstructed,
but relatively certain in view of the parallels.
Appendix

Under Nemias, ἱζαζᾶν and deacon, the porch (addition?) of the sanctuary was paved with mosaic, in the year 703, on the ninth day of the month of Dystros (March 9, 391). ... so and so, in fulfillment of a vow, together with (his) wife and children, made (this).

31. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 48; Inscr. Syrie 1329; CII 813.

Thaumásις δίκαι Ἰουσίχω

καὶ Εὐσταθία πενθερά<ς>

ἐποίησεν πάνας ρ'.

32. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 50; Inscr. Syrie 1331; CII 815.

Aδείτω τα ἐπι
tῶν 

φιλαδέλ-

φῶν Ἐσεβίου

καὶ Βπτουροῦ σοῦ

tὸς γυνηῖν αὐ-

tῶν.

33. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 52; Inscr. Syrie 1333; CII 817.

'Ἴερος δίκαι Οὐρανίας

γυνηῖν ἐξάδενος

ἐποίησεν πάνας ρ'.

34. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 53; Inscr. Syrie 1334; CII 818.

Thεοδώρος δίκαι

'Ἱουσίχων ἑουῆνος ἐπι-

4 οίησαι πάνας λε.'

SYRIA

Emesa (Homs)

35. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 57; Inscr. Syrie 2205. Mosaic in a basilica which was possibly a synagogue. Possibly 5th C.

Εὐδόξιος δίκαι ἑουῆνος καὶ τέκνοις

ἐξάδενος ἐψήφωσεν

πάνας δᾶς.

PALAESTINE

Ḥammat Gader (al-Ḥamma)


May lord Hoplis and lady Proton and lord Sallustis, his son-in-law, and comes Phruros, his son, and lord Photis, his son-in-law, and lord Ḥanina, his son, these and their sons, whose gifts are present in every place, who have given here five denars, be of good memory. May the King of the

PALESTINE
Between Jaffa and Gaza

37. Hüttenmeister 135-137, no. 5; Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 72; CII 966. Fragment of a marble plaque. Byzantine period.

For the salvation of Iakobos, Lazaros and ...sina, in gratefulness to God in (this) holy place (i.e., synagogue), renovated the construction of the conch together with the chancel screen from the foundations. In the month of March, Indiction ....

AFRICA
Hammam Lif

38. Goodenough 3. fig. 895; cf. 2.90. CIL VIII 12457b. Mosaic.

C. Donations on Behalf of Women

SYRIA
Apamea

From the mosaic floor of a synagogue; 39-40 date from ca. 391; cf. nos. 7-15, 30-34 above.


Ilasios, son of Eisakios, head of the synagogue of the Antiochenes, for the salvation of Photion his wife and his children, and for the salvation of Eustathia his mother-in-law, and in memory of Eisakios and Edesios and Hesychios, his ancestors, donated the mosaic entryway. Peace and mercy on all your holy people.
Appendix

PALESTINE
Caesarea

41. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 67. Marble column. 4th/5th C.

Προ(σφορά) Θεωδόρο(υ)
υιοῦ Ὄλυμπου
ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας
4 Ματώνας
Σωγατρός.

Donation of Theodoros, son of Olympos, for the salvation of his daughter Matrona.

PALESTINE
Ashkalon

42. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 71; CII 965. Hüttenmeister 26, no. 3.
(Reading according to Hüttenmeister.)

ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας Μενα-
μο(υ) κ(αί) Μα(τ)ρώνας
(σ)ηβίου αύ-
τοῦ κ(αί) Σαμουλου υίοθ
4 αύτῶν

For the salvation of Menamos (=Menaḥem) and Matrona, his wife, and Samoulous (=Samuel) their son.

EGYPT
Alexandria

43. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 91; CII 1438. Base of a column. Probably Byzantine period.

[Ὑπ] ὑπὸ σωτηρίας ρουᾶς Σωγατρός [τοῦ μα]-
καριστάτου Ἐντολίου Βοροῦχ Βαραχία. Ἀγάθ

For the salvation of lady Roua, daughter of the most blessed Entolios, Borouch, son of Barachias (dedicated this column?). Peace.

*The Ḥammāt Gader inscriptions (nos. 21 and 36) are much more fragmentary today than when discovered by Sukenik. To indicate this, the following sigla are used (following Hüttenmeister):

[ ] = lacuna at the time of discovery;
.   = partially legible letter at the time of discovery;
<>  = lacuna today;
   _  = partially legible letter today.
Plates follow the order of the discussion.
ΡΟΥΦΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΔΑΙΑ ΑΡΧΗ
ΕΥΝΑΓΩ ΓΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΕΚΕΥΑ
ΕΝΤΟ ΕΝ ΚΟΙΠΟΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΤΤΕ
ΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΙ ΚΑΙΘ ΡΕΜΑΙΝ
ΜΗ ΔΕΝΟΙ ΑΛΟΥΕΙΟΥΕΙΑΝΕ
ΧΟΝΤΟΛΟΒΙΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ ΕΙΔΕΤΙΣΙΟΝ
ΜΗΕΙΔΩ ΒΕΙΤΙΕΡΩΤΤΑΤΩ ΤΑ
ΜΕΙΩ ΧΑΡ ΚΑΙΤΩ ΘΕΛΕΝΗΤΩΝ ΙΟΥ
ΔΑΙΩΝ ΧΑ ΤΑΥΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΗΣ
ΤΟ ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΟΝ ΑΠΟΚΕΙΤΑΙ
ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΡΧΕΙΟΝ

CII 741; IGR IV 1452. From REJ 7 (1883) 161 (Salomon Reinach). See discussion on pp. 5-7; 10-11.
Plate removed due to copyright

CII 73lc. From Hesperia 32 (1963) pl. 64, no. 1 (A. C. Bandy; Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens). See discussion on pp. 11-12; 41.
Plate removed due to copyright

Plate removed due to copyright

CII 166. From CII. See discussion on p. 59.
Plate removed due to copyright
Plate removed due to copyright

CII 315. From CII. See discussion on pp. 75-76.
Plate removed due to copyright

CII 1007. From Mazar, *Beth She'arim* pl. XV, no. 5. See discussion on pp. 76-77.
### Geographical and Chronological Chart of Inscriptions Mentioning Women Who Bear Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>B.C.E.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>C.E.</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naro</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripolitania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4th/5th C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greece</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessaly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brescia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palestine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thrace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**AFRICA**: Tripolitania

**ASIA**: Caria, Ionia

**CRETE**:

**EGYPT**: 1 (27 B.C.E.)

**GREECE**: Thessaly

**ITALY**: Apulia, Brescia, Rome

**PALESTINE**: Galilee

**THRACE**:

The chart indicates various locations and dates where inscriptions mentioning women bearing titles have been found.
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MASADA. From Levine, *Synagogues Revealed* 25.
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CAPHARNAUM. From Kohl and Watzinger pl. IV. Reconstruction with a view to the south.
CAPHARNAUM. From Kohl and Watzinger pl. V. Reconstruction model.
CAPHARNAUM. From Kohl and Watzinger pl. VI. Model showing reconstructed back entrance.
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GUSH ḤALAV. From Levine, Synagogues Revealed 76.
ARBEL. From Kohl and Watzinger pl. IX. Reconstruction of the interior.
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BETH ALPHA. From Goodenough 3. fig. 631.
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'EN-GEDI. From Levine, Synagogues Revealed 117.
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KHIRBET SUSIYA. From EAE 4.1126.
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DABBURA INSCRIPTION. From IEJ 22 (1972) pl. 4 (Dan Urman).
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DELOS. From Goodenough 3. fig. 875.
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AEGINA. From Goodenough 3. fig. 881.
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MILETIUS. From Goodenough 3. fig. 880.
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STOBI. From *Archaeology* 30 (1977) 154-155 (Dean L. Moe).
Plate removed due to copyright

OSTIA. From Archaeology 16 (1963) 194 (Maria Floriani Squarciapino).
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DURA EUROPOS. From Goodenough 3, fig. 593.
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DURA EUROPOS. From Goodenough 3. fig. 594.
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HAMMAM LIF. From Goodenough 3. fig. 886.
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HAMMAM LIF. From Goodenough 3. fig. 894 (Bardo Museum).
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Notes to the Introduction

1 Krauss, Altertümer 149.

2 A recent example would be Emil Schürer, History 2.435-436. The editors simply add to the footnotes the newly discovered inscriptions in which women bear titles, without calling into question Schürer's view that they were honorific.


Notes to Chapter 1

1 Eusebius Hist. eccl. 7.10.4; CIG 2007f (Olynthos); 2221c (Chios) IG XII.2(1)288 (Thessalonica); Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn 19 (1896) 67.

2 Salomon Reinach, "Inscription grecque de Smyrne. La Juive Rufina," REJ 7:14 (1883) 161-166 (facsimile). Reinach's dating of the inscription as not before the third century is based on the nearly cursive omega, the squared sigma and the bar through the upsilon, all of which point to a late date.

3 Schürer, Gemeindeverfassung 29, cited and discussed by S. Reinach, "Inscription" 165.

4 See CII 584, 587.

5 "Die Organisation der jüdischen Ortsgemeinden in der talmudischen Zeit," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 41, n.s. 5 (1897) 658-659.

6 Schürer, History 2.435.

7 Juster 1.453.

8 Krauss, Altertümer 118.

9 Baron, Community 1.97.

10 Jean-Baptiste Frey, CII 2.11.


E.g., CIL VI 8420.

E.g., CIL VI 1334.

E.g., CIL VI 1421.

E.g., CIL V 34.

E.g., CIL VI 1334.

See CIL XII 675. Hydia Tertulla c(larissima) f(emina) was married to Terentius Museus (no title) at the time of her death.

See FW 12 (1909) 2484-2492.

Macrobius 1.16.30.

Quaestiones Romanae 86.

The elder Faustina (Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Antoninus Pius 6.6-7) and Claudia, the daughter of Nero (Tacitus, Annales 15.23) were accorded this honor. See also Otto Hirschfeld, "Zur Geschichte des römischen Kaiserkultes," in: *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913) 491. Hirschfeld believes that the *flaminica* was responsible for the cult of the empress, her husband being responsible for that of the emperor.

The case of the thirty-eight-year old *mellarccon* (CII 457) is enigmatic. Perhaps it is analogous to "president-elect."

See, for example, Harry J. Leon, *JQR n.s.* 44 (1953-1954) 271, n. 9.

CII 752, 757, 770, 773, 775, 776, 778, 779, 788, 791, 799, etc. A number of Phrygian inscriptions impose a curse rather than a fine: CII 760, 761, 767, 768, 769, etc.

CIG 3265, 3266, 3281, 3286, 3401, etc.

S. Reinach, "Inscription" 163-164.

CII 739 (Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 14; Smyrna, Ionia; 4th C.): ἡ ἠθοποιώς πρ(εσβύτερος) κέ πατήρ τοῦ στέματος ὑλός ἔλαμβάνει εκ τοῦ γυναικοῦ μου κέ τοῦ γυναικοῦ μου τέκνου ἐποίσα τὴν στροφήν τοῦ εἰσοτικοῦ· σιν τοὺς σκάμφοις καλλιεργόντας· νο(μίσματα) ζ'.
Notes to Chapter I
(Pages 11-13)

"(I), Irenopoios, elder and father of the tribe, son of Jacob, himself also an elder, in fulfillment of a vow by myself and my wife and my lawfully begotten child, beautifully made the pavement of the interior together with the balustrades; seven coins. Peace."

30 CII 740 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 15; Smyrna, Ionia): Εγένετο τὸ ἐργὸν σπουδάζον τοῖς Λισόθ. "The work was done through the efforts of Dosas."


32 CII 743 (Smyrna, Ionia): ἠθαναταθάν αυτοῖς αἵρεσις/ ὕπαινου/ ἐκείνου; (reverse side): Ναλη/ἐκείνου.

33 CII 742 (Smyrna, Ionia; 117-138 C.E.): L. 29: ὁ ποιήσας "Ἰουστίων μω(ολαθα) α". "The former Judeans, 10,000 drachmas." For this interpretation of Ioudaioi, see Kraabel, Judaism 28-32. Previous to Kraabel, interpreters took the inscription as referring to former Jews.

34 First published by Anastasius C. Bandy, "Early Christian Inscriptions of Crete," Hesperia 32 (1963) 227-229, no. 1, pl. 64. See also idem, The Greek Christian Inscriptions of Crete (Christianikai Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Ηλλαδός 10; Athens: Christian Archaeological Society, 1970) Appendix no. 3. The inscription was included by Lifshitz in his prolegomenon to the CII, p. 88.

35 Bulletin épigraphique, Revue des études grecques 77 (1964) no. 413. Bandy later accepted this dating (Inscriptions ad loc.).

36 CII 731b (Elyros): Σαῦδας/ Ερμῆ μνά/ μας χάριν. "Sanbathis to Hermes for the sake of his memory." CII 731d (Arcades): Ἰουστίων/ Θεοῦδωροῦ/ Ἰουστίων τῷ ναῷ στόριον/ (μ)νείας χάρις/ ἐκείνου, ἐτοις αὕτης. "Josephus, son of Theodoros, to Juda his son, for memory, (he lived) one year."

37 Cf. ἡ διακόνος (Rom 16:1) and ἡ διακόνισσα, which came into use in the later period (e.g., Council of Nicaea, can. 19).

38 Bandy, "Inscriptions" 227-228.

39 Robert, no. 413.

40 First published by Théodore Reinach, "La pierre de Myndos," in: REJ 42 (1901) 1-6 (photograph). Reinach suggests that the lacuna in the first line be filled with apo or para, p. 4.

41 T. Reinach, "La pierre" 1.

42 T. Reinach, "La pierre" 4.

43 D. Bahat, "A Synagogue Chancel-Screen from Tel Reḥob," IEJ 23 (1973) 181-183, pl. 48.


"First published by Theodore Reinach, "La pierre de Myndos," in: REJ 42 (1901) 1-6 (photograph). Reinach suggests that the lacuna in the first line be filled with apo or para, p. 4.

41 T. Reinach, "La pierre" 1.

42 T. Reinach, "La pierre" 4.

43 D. Bahat, "A Synagogue Chancel-Screen from Tel Reḥob," IEJ 23 (1973) 181-183, pl. 48.
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45 Gil 756a was seen but never copied down and is now lost.

46 T. Reinach, "La pierre" 2.

47 Goodenough 2.79.


50 See Ramsay, who argues that this variant shows that the Bezan Text cannot be pre-70 ("Rulers" 272-277).

51 It is also possible, of course, that when Matthew wrote archōn, he did not take it as synonymous with archisynagōgos. It could simply be a variant.

52 Discussed and quoted below, p. 24; n. 95.

53 Emil Schörer's view (Gemeindeverfassung 27) that Sosthenes is not Crispus' colleague, but rather his successor, is not convincing. We cannot assume that at this early date a synagogue head who became a Christian had to be replaced.

54 M. Sota 7:8 adds one more link to the chain, namely the king, who reads instead of the high priest.

55 J.W. 5.5.1-6 §§ 184-227.

56 Hüttenmeister 201; for further bibliography see 197-198.

57 JQR 54 (1963-1964) 119.

58 It is possible, particularly in light of Sidney Hoenig's considerations, that ῥ’ ἡκκῆνεστ and ῥ’ ὁ ὁ ἡκκῆνεστ are not the same title, that only the latter is the equivalent of archisynagōgos.

59 T. Ter. 2:13 (Zuck. 28); see Hüttenmeister 8.

60 Remesh ḳων ἡ δωρα ὑπὲρ ἱεραμερ ρ ἔφαβε ἱερας ἀντικρατικ ἀντικρατικ.

61 A further confirmation that the head of the synagogue was only to read if necessary is found in b. Git. 60a (top), where R. Isaac the smith states that after the priest and the Levite the following are to read: "scholars who are appointed parnasim of the community, and after them scholars who are qualified to be appointed parnasim of the community, and after them the sons of
the scholars, whose fathers had been appointed parnasim of the community, and after them heads of synagogues and members of the general public. The scholars, whose fathers had been appointed community, and after then heads of synagogues and members of the general public, were the heads of the community. The scholars, whose fathers had been appointed community, and after then heads of synagogues and members of the general public.

62 Note that this passage is a baraita, i.e., from the Tannaitic period (before ca. 220).

63 One should note the parallel in the extra-canonical tractate San. 14 (end), which is very similar to y. Ber. 6a.28-29, as well as b. Ketub. 8b, which instead of פְּרֶנֶּסֶר רַאְשָׁ תַּכָּנָה מַעֲקַל רַבָּה has מַעֲקַל רַבָּה מַעֲקַל רַבָּה, "city administrators." This coincides with a gloss in y. Ber. 3.28-29, which interprets head of the synagogue as city administrator, cf. Str-B 4.1.146-147.


66 See below, pp. 65-66; 91-92, for a slightly more extensive discussion of this passage. On the legislation concerning Jews in the Theodosian Code, see Amnon Lindner, "The Roman Imperial Government and the Jews under Constantine," Tarbiz 44 (1974-75) 95-143 (Hebrew), English summary, p. V; Klaus Dieter Reichardt, "Die Judengesetzgebung im Codex Theodosianus," Karios 20 (1978) 16-39; Robert L. Wilken, "The Jews and Christian Apologetics after Theodosius I Cunctos Populos," HTR 73 (1980) 451-471, esp. 464-466. Baron sees Cod. Theod. 16.8.2-4 as the result of a battle fought by the rabbis, in which they persisted and finally won (Community 1.138). While political activity on the part of the Jewish leadership should certainly be assumed, Baron's assumption that the primary Jewish leaders were the rabbis is questionable.

67 Ed. Mommsen 1. 890.

68 Tr. Sheila Briggs, drawing partially upon Pharr 468. For a description of the development of the decurionate from a vied-for honor in the republican period to what sometimes amounted to a punishment in the late imperial period, the period with which we are dealing here, see PW 8 (1901) 2319-2352.

69 Ed. Mommsen 1. 890.

70 Tr. Pharr 468. For a discussion of this custom, see Juster 1.385-388. On the various roles of the Jewish patriarch, see Lee I. Levine, "The Jewish Patriarch (Nasi) in Third Century Palestine," ANRW 19,2.649-688.

71 This law was rescinded in 404 (Cod. Theod. 16.8.17), thus allowing the practice to be resumed.


73 Panarion 30.18.2 (PG 41.436A); included in Klijn and Reinink 186-187. I am following the reading of Klijn and Reinink, who have "teachers" (didaskalion), rather than that of PG ("teachings"; didaskalion). See also Panarion 30.11.1, in which
Spiphanius mentions heads of the synagogue, priests, elders and azzanitoli (Hebrew: hazzānim), which he says should be translated as diakonoi or hypēretai (PG 41.424B).

Palladius, Dialogue on the Life of Saint John Chrysostom 15 (PG 47.51 mid.).

Juster 1,452, n. 5. Juster's theory that the synagogue heads were appointed by the patriarch, which he bases on Palladius and on Cod. Theod. 16.8.13 (397 C.E.) and 16.8.15 (404 C.E.), is also not convincing. In Cod. Theod. 16.8.13 (quoted above, p. 20), there is no reason to take "heads of the synagogues . . ." as an appositive to "those persons who are subject to the power of the Illustrious Patriarchs;" the more straightforward sense is that these are two separate groups. In Cod. Theod. 16.8.15, no specific officeholders, such as synagogue heads, are mentioned. More weighty than these arguments, however, is the silence of Jewish sources on such a practice. Silence concerning the patriarch's annual appointment of all main Jewish functionaries can only be compared to a total silence in Vatican sources about the custom of appointing bishops and cardinals.

Hennecke-Scheer and Schneemelcher 1. 449-470.

Exposition on Luke 6.50 (PL 15.1767D; see also 1768C); quoted and discussed in Juster 1,452, n. 3.

Epistles 121.10 (PL 22.1033 bot.); quoted and discussed in Juster 1,452, n. 3.

Vopiscus' section of the Historia Augusta is an early fourth-century work. Whether the letter is genuine or not cannot be discussed here. Assuming that it is the composition of Vopiscus, it can be counted as a fourth-century attestation of the term, which is no less valuable than a second-century attestation. On this passage, see Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964) 117; Krauss Altechrist 115; Schörer, Gemeindeverfassung 26.

That "Samaritan" is used alone probably just indicates that the author was not familiar with official Samaritan titles.

Lampridius, Life of Alexander Severus 28, Scriptores Historiae Augustae 2.234-235. Since archisynagogus was not exclusively Jewish, it is possible that the jibe had nothing to do with Judaism. The title is, however, much more widely attested as a Jewish title than as a pagan one, and this interpretation therefore seems the most likely.

This number includes several, such as CII 282, 548 and 638 and Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 212, in which a number of the letters of the word "head of the synagogue" are missing.


CII 722 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 1), 731c.

SEG 27 (1977) no. 267.
86 CII 681.

87 CII 731g, 741, 744 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 16), 756 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 29), 759, 766 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 33; cf. MAMA 6. no. 264 [a better edition of this inscription]); Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 37 (could also be archon).

88 Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 85.

89 CII 803, 804 (Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 38, 39).

90 CII 991 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 74; for a detailed discussion of this difficult inscription, see Hüttenmeister 404-407), 1404 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 79), 1414; Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 66; SEG 20 (1964) no. 443; Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. nos. 164 (quoted below, n. 114), 203, 212. SEG 26 (1976-1977) no. 1687 includes the word archisynagogos as reconstructed by Moshe Schwabe, but there is no basis for this reconstruction.

91 CIL VIII, Suppl. 1. 12457.

92 CII 1404 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 79).

93 The inscriptions mentioning synagogue heads as builders are: CII 548 (Porto): [. . . .]敷ou[. . . .] / [. . . ἐκ τῶν [Δίων καὶ [. . . ]] / [. . . ἄρχισου]γαγωγ[. . . .]. "[. . . from] (his/her) own funds and [. . .] the side door [. . . head of the synagogue [. . .]."

94 (Obviously this inscription is heavily reconstructed.) CII 722 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 1; Aegina): Θεοδώρου ἄρχη[ς] ο[ς] ἡγουμένων έτη τέσσερα/ ἐκ Θεοδώρου έκ[α] τὴν συναγωγ(ήν)] οίκονδάμα. Προσευχὴ(δήσαν)/ χρησάται πε' καί ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θεο[ς] ο[ς] δωρεάν χρύσανον ρο'[. . .]. 

95 'I, Theodoros, head of the synagogue, having served as phrontistes (business manager) for four years, built the synagogue from the foundation up. 85 gold pieces were contributed, as well as 170 gold pieces from the gifts to God [. . .]."

96 CII 744 (Teos, Ionia; 3rd C.): quoted below Appendix no. 24. CII 756 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 29; Myndos, Caria: 4th/5th C): Theopempte inscription, quoted above, p. 13. CII 776 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 33; Akmonia, Phrygia; end of 1st C. C.E.): quoted below, Appendix no. 6. Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 37 (Side, Pamphylia; 5th C.): [Ἐπὶ] Λεωνίτου προσβ(υτέρου) καὶ ζυγ(α)τάτου τῆς συναγωγῆς καὶ ζυγ(α)τάτου έγένετο ή κρήνη/ σὺν τῷ μεσαλάβῳ έν(α)τίου] γ', μη (νφ) Ε'. "At the time of Leontios, elder, treasurer and business manager, son of Jacob, head of the synagogue and treasurer, the fountain was installed in the courtyard, in the third year of the indiction, in the sixth month."

97 "(Note that arch could also be an abbreviation for archon.) Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 66 (Caesarea, Palestine; 6th C.): Βη[ρ]υλλος ἄρχη[ς] συναγωγῆς καὶ φροντιστὴς/ ὀς Ἰωτοῦ, ἐποίησε τὴν ζυγού/θεσίαν τοῦ τρίτη/κλίτου τῷ ἀγιῷ. "Beryllos, head of the synagogue and business manager, son of Juda (lit.: Ioutos), made the mosaic of the dining hall (triclinium) with his own funds." CII 803 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38; Apamea, Syria; 391 C.E.): quoted below, p. 26. CII 804 (Apamea, Syria; end of the 4th C.): quoted below, Appendix no. 39. CII 991 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 74; Sepphoris, Palestine; first half of 5th C.): (Ἐπὶ) 'Ἑλλαστοῦ σχο(λαστικῷ) κῶ(μης) λαμ(προτάτου) ὑπελόθ Αἰετίου τοῦ θεο(υς) Εὐφραίνη ἄρχη[ς] συναγωγῆς Ἐνδούνιου καὶ θεότητος τῆς Συναγωγῆς τοῦ ἀγίου Καραντίνου τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ θεοτόκου τοῦ ἀγίου Καραντίνου τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ θεοτόκου τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ θεοτόκου. 

98 "At the time of Gelasios, lawyer, most illustrious cameos, son of
Aetios, *comes*, and of Juda, head of the synagogue of Sidon . . . (?) of S(e)verianus Apher, the most illustrious head of the synagogue of Tyre." This is just one reading of a difficult inscription. For an extensive discussion, see Hüttenmeister 404-407. CII 1404 (Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 79; Jerusalem; before the destruction of the Second Temple): quoted below, p. 24. Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 85 (Constantia-Salamine, Cyprus; 3rd C.): [. . . ]/ πεντ(έκις) ἄρχι(συναγωγών)/ υπὸ Ανανία/ δίς άρχοντ(ος) (reconstruction of B. Lifshitz). "[So and so], five times head of the synagogue, son of Ananias, twice archon."


95 CII 553 (Capua, Italy): Alfius Iuda,/ arkon arcosynagogus q(ui) vi(xit)/ ann(ys) LXXI/ dieb(us) X, Alfia So/teris, cum q(ua) vixit/ XXXVIII, coiugi/ incomparabil(i)/ benemerenti fecit. "Alfius Juda, archon, head of the synagogue, who lived 70 years, 7 months, 10 days (lies here). Alfia Soteris, with whom he lived for 48 years, set up (this stone) for her incomparable husband in grateful memory."


97 For recent bibliography, see Hüttenmeister 192-194.

98 A further member of the founding body was a certain Simonides, who bears no title at all, a fact which should remind us that the title-bearing officers were not the only leaders of the ancient synagogue.

99 CII 587 (Venosa, Italy): *Σάρκας Καλ/άρσου νυπίου/ ἄρχοντος νικογοῦ, ἔτων γ'/ [μή]/ν/ [γ'] ἐν ζητεύεσθαι κοιμηθη. "Tomb of Kallistos, infant head of the synagogue, (aged) 3 years, 3 months. In peace his sleep."

100 CII 584 (Venosa, Italy): *Σάρκας/ Ἰωσήφ ἄρχοντος/ αὐτοῦ, νεοτοῦ τῆς νυνίας. Ἐν τῷ νεανίῳ. "Tomb of Joseph, head of the synagogue, son of Joseph, head of the synagogue. Peace on his bed."


103 CII 416 and 417 (Rome: Via Portuensis): with their curious mention of *za biou*, which probably equals *dia biou* (see Schürer, *Gemeindeverfassung* 23-24) should also be considered in this context. CII 416 is quoted below in chap. 4, "Women as Mothers of the Synagogue," n. 18, while CII 417 is quoted in the same chapter, no. 9.

104 Quoted above, n. 93.

105 CII 504 (Rome: uncertain provenance): *Ενθάδε/ καταβί/ Ἰουδανοιο/ ἀρχοντοι/ συναγείαν ὑπὸ/ Ἐισφορὰν/ ἀρχισυναγωγοῦ. "Here lies Julianus, gerousiarch (or priest, archon) of the Calcaresians, son of Julianus, head of the synagogue." See also CII 991 (Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 74)
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and Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 37, 85, all three of which are quoted above in no. 93.

106 Other inscriptions where father and son both bear a title, but not the same one: CII 88, 145, 146, 613, 800.

107 CII 681 (Sofia, Moesia): quoted below, p. 36.

108 CII 766 (Akmonia, Phrygia): quoted below, Appendix no. 6.


110 On this inscription in the context of other inscriptions relating to Jews in Antioch see also Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era (SBL Sources for Biblical Study 13; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978) 53-57; Meeks and Wilken also discuss the internal organization of Jews in Antioch, ibid., 6-9.

111 Jean-Baptiste Frey's suggestion that these synagogue heads served successively rather than simultaneously (CII, ad loc.), does not take epi, "at the time of," "under," seriously. It is most reasonable to assume that the mosaic was constructed "under" all of those named.

112 See Meeks and Wilken, 7.

113 CII, ad loc.

114 The case of the gerusiarch of Antioch in a Beth She'arim inscription is rather different, for that person could have been the head of an Antiochene gerousia composed of delegates from various synagogues. The inscription reads: 'Ἀψίσ/ Ἀλεξάνδρου/ γερους(ο)τάρχου/ Ἀντιοχέως. "Burial chamber of Aidesios, the gerusiarch of Antioch." (Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 141; Meeks and Wilken, 55). A somewhat parallel inscription is Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 164: Ἑυθράκητος Παλαιάποντος καταλαμβάνωντας ἀνθρωπίνην. "Here lies Eusebi(os) the most illustrious head of the synagogue of the people of Beirut." (For δον read τούς.)

115 I. Meg. 74a.18 is interesting in this context: נַפְּרָת הַנוֹסֵס בְּךָ הָנָסָס. "Three (delegates) from the synagogue are like the synagogue," i.e., have the authority to represent it. It is the plural which is important here.

116 See above, n. 93.

117 Schürer's argument is quite similar to argument two; he says that in the later period women and children bore the title archisynagogos "just as a title," but he does not suggest that the title was honorific for men in the later period (History 2.435; see also Geschichte 3.88).

Notes to Chapter II

For photographs of κιόνισκοι, see Alexander Conze, Die attischen Grabreliefs (4 vols.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1911-1922) 4. pls. CCCLXXIX-CCCLXXXVII.

Sotirou 148.

Robert 25-27.

On Peristera, see Friedrich Bechtel, Die Attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902) 88, n. 2; Friedrich Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit (Halle/S.: Max Niemeyer, 1917) 591; Friedrich Bilabel, Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1926) no. 6783 (Zenon Papyri); Louis Robert, Hellenica I (1940) 26-71.


In late Latin, vivo guo is used for se vivo; on this see Veikko Väätäinen, Introduction au latin vulgaire (Paris: C. Klinkesiek, 1963) 179.

See LSJ 252; Gerhard Delling, "Archēgos," TWNT 1(1933) 485-486; or TDNT 1 (1964) 487-488; LPGL 236.

Plato Timaeus 21E. Archēgetis/archēgetēs is used synonymously with archēgos, e.g., Artemis Leukophyrene was archēgetis of Magnesia on the river Maianedros (Asia Minor), see Wilhelm Dittenberger, Syllagae Inscriptionum Graecarum 1. nos. 256.22, 259.19, 261.18-19; 2. no. 552.18.


Robert 25.

Apparently members of the Corinthian community placed an emphasis on who had introduced them to Christianity that was far too great for Paul's liking (1 Cor 1:12-16; 3:4-11).

For a discussion of women proselytes in ancient Judaism, see below, pp. 144-147.


See Bernadette J. Brooten, "'Junia . . . Outstanding among the Apostles' (Romans 16:7)," Women Priests. A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration (ed. Leonard Swidler and Arlene Swidler; New York: Paulist Press, 1977) 141-144. That Junia was Jewish is indicated by συγγενείς μου (Rom 16:7), which
can have either the narrower sense of "my relatives," or the extended sense of "people of my race." Since Paul was Jewish, either of these meanings would imply that Junia and Andronicus were likewise Jewish.

18 Other women who were important co-workers of Paul include: Phoebe (Rom 16:1); Mariam (Rom 16:6); Tryphaina, Tryphosa and Persis (Rom 16:12); Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2-3); Apphia (Phil 2); cf. also Chloe (1 Cor 1:11) and Nympha (Col 4:15). On these women, see esp. Elisabeth Schtssler Fiorenza, "Women in the Pre-Pauline and Pauline Churches," USQR 33 (1978) 153-166.

19 See The Acts of Paul and Thecla, Hennecke-Schneemelcher 2.353-364. The work ends with the words, "Having enlightened many with the word of God, she [Thekla] slept a noble sleep."

Notes to Chapter III

1First published by Anastasius C. Bandy, "Early Christian Inscriptions of Crete," Hesperia 32 (1963) 227-229, no. 1, pl. 64. See also idem, The Greek Christian Inscriptions of Crete (Christianska Epigraphia tēs Hellados 10; Athens: Christian Archaeological Society, 1970) Appendix no. 3. The inscription was included by Lifshitz in his prolegomenon to the CII, p. 88.

2Pp. 11-12.


4CII, ad loc.; p. LXXXVI, n. 2.

5Krauss, Alte Texte 144.

6Juster 1.441, n. 8.

The transcription of the name is unclear. Frey takes it to be Berenikenes (CII, ad loc.), while Leon suggests the Latin Veronicene ("Jews" 278). Lifshitz believes it is "the feminine form of Berenicianus: Береники (α) ν (η)") (CII, Prolegomenon 45).


Leon suggests Mannina ("Jews" 275, n. 20).

See below, pp. 62-63.

First published by Ascoli 53 no. 5.

CII 595: "The transcription of the name is unclear. Frey takes it to be Berenikenes (CII, ad loc.), while Leon suggests the Latin Veronicene ("Jews" 278). Lifshitz believes it is "the feminine form of Berenicianus: Береники (α) ν (η)") (CII, Prolegomenon 45)."


Leon suggests Mannina ("Jews" 275, n. 20).

See below, pp. 62-63.

First published by Ascoli 53 no. 5.


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).


Romanelli suggests this, noting that Mazauzala is unattested in both Greek and Latin (Romanelli 114-115).
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40 Archipherekitai comes from the Aramaic ῥῆ ῃ πιγρά, which means "heads of the school" (e.g., b. Qidd. 31b).

41 For a discussion of the possibility that elders spoke the words of excommunication, cf. H. Zucker, Studien 188-189. This text is, however, not necessarily a definition of the title zagan as used in the rabbinic period. It rather defines zagan as used in the bible and is an attempt to assert the antiquity of the "scholar-class" and to claim special prerogatives for themselves, such as having others rise in their presence (Lev 19:32), which is the context in b. Qidd. 32b.

42 See also 1QM 13:1, which speaks of the elders' place in the messianic battle.

43 The terminus ad quem for this passage would be the early third century.

44 The benches were probably installed in stage three of the building (3rd C.) and remained in use in stage four (4th C.); cf. Andrew R. Seager, in: AJA 76 (1972) 426, pl. 93, fig. 4; photo in: BASOR 199 (1970) 50, fig. 41.

45 CII 663: [. . . ἐξ ἑαυτῶν καὶ πρὸς (ὁ) βυτέρων [. . .]. "... of the archons and the elders . . ."


47 E.g., y. Bik. 65d.11-15; b. Sanh. 14a; on the ordination question, see H. Zucker, Studien 174-180; Edward Lohse, Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951) 28-66; Str-B 2.647-661. The question of ordination and the Holy Land is related to the power of the patriarch; on this, cf. y. Sanh. 19a.41-48; Str-B. 2.649-650. Epiphanius' note that an apostle of the patriarch could remove an elder from office (Panarion 30.11.1, PG 41.424B) is also apropos here.

48 See CII 378 (Via Portuensis, Rome; Greek); 595 (Venosa, Apulia; Hebrew and Greek in Hebrew characters) quoted above, n. 13; 650c (Tauromenion, Sicily; Greek); 650d (Tauromenion, Sicily; Greek); 653b (Philosophiana, Sicily; Greek) 790 and 792 (Corycos, Cilicia; Greek); 801 (twice; Chrysopolis, Pontus; Greek); 931 (Jaffa, Palestine; Greek); 1277 (Jerusalem; Greek).

49 See CII 663 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 101; Elche, Spain; probably 4th C.): quoted above, n. 45; CII 735; Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 82; Golgoi, Cyprus; probably 4th C.): ὧς ἐκεῖ ὁ Πρεσβύτερος (ὁς τοῦ ὀνόματος Χρυσοσλέοντος/ θανάτου τῆς Ἐβραϊκῆς). "Joseph, elder, together with his son Synesios, restored the entire structure of the synagogue;" CII 739 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 14; Smyrna, Ionia; 4th C.): quoted above, chap. 1, n. 29; CII 803 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38; Apamea, Syria; 391 C.E.): quoted above, p. 26; CII 829 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 58; Dura Europos, Syria; 244 C.E.): Ἐξις ἐκεῖ ὁ Πρεσβύτερος/ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔκτισε. "Samuel, son of
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Jaddaio, elder of the Jews, built (it)." For the name "Jaddaio", see CII 828a (XYDXW); Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 32 (Hyllarima, Caria; probably 3rd C.): quoted below, Appendix no. 29; Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 37 (Side, Pamphylia, 5th C.): quoted above, chap. 1, no. 93; Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 84 (Lapethos, Cyprus; probably 5th C.): θ(εδε) Β(σάθει). 'Εντόλας/ προσβύτερος καὶ/ Ένκαιρος υἱὸς Ἰς/ Επίκλης Σινθυδροῦ/ τοῦ μακαριστάτου./ τά σὰ ἐκ τῶν σοι/ σοι προσφέρω/ μὴ (νῦς) ε', ἐν (υτιώνος) ε'/ Κ(υρὶ) ε ὁδὸν, / ἀμήν. "God assists. We, Entolios, elder, and Enkairios, son of the late Isaak, also called Sindouros, offer to you from that which is yours, in the fifth month, the fifth indiction. Lord save, Amen."

50Quoted and discussed, pp. 26-27.


52CII 663 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 101; Elche, Spain): quoted above, no. 45.


54Quoted above, p. 24.

55H. Zucker, drawing on rabbinic sources, speaks of the "local elder" ("Ortsältester"), assuming that each elder had a sort of local jurisdiction. While one must allow for variety on this point, Zucker's interpretation must be viewed with caution, since he rather loosely interprets other terms as meaning "elder," such as ἡκατ and ἀβίκτω, and uncritically places passages with these terms side by side with passages referring to zqšωμιν, Studien 184-190.

56A. E. Harvey, "Elders" 325.

Notes to Chapter IV

1The earliest records of this inscription are given by Philippe de Winghe (died 1592) in Cod. 17872-3 of the Royal Library of Brussels, Claude Ménestrier (died 1639) in the Vatican manuscript Cod. Lat. 10545, fol. 150b, and Alonso Chacón (1540-1599), (exact location unknown). For further background and bibliography see Leon 67-68; CII ad loc.

2The translation is that of Leon 341, with minor variations. Note that no plausible solution has been suggested for the F. Frey's filia or feliciter are not satisfactory. For all of the following Roman inscriptions consult Leon 263-346 ("Appendix of Inscriptions"). The following translations of Roman inscriptions are those of Leon, with minor variations.

3The readings for this name vary considerably: Paucla, Paulina, Paullina. See CII, ad loc.
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4CII 88 (Rome: Via Appia): "Ενδά (δ)ε κείτε Ἀννίανος
ἀρχων [νη]πίσοι/ υδός Ἰουλιανοῦ πατρὸ[ς] συναγῳγῆς Καμπῆ/σων
αἰτῶν ἡ μηνῶν β'. 'Ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ κοιμήσεις αὐτός. "Here lies
Annaios, infant archon, son of Julianus, father of the synagogue
of the Campesians, aged 8 years, 2 months. In peace his sleep."

Note that the infant archon did not receive the same title as his
father.

5CII 319 (Rome: Via Portuensis): "Ενδάδε κείτε Ἐιρήνα/
παρθενικὴ σύμβασις/ κληρον άδελφοβ/ Κουντού Κλαυδίου/ Συνεσίου
πατρὸς/ συναγῳγῆς Καμπῆ/σων Ῥώμης. "Εν ἐν αὑτοῖς ἤ 
κοιμήσεις αὐτοῖς. "Here lies Eirene, virgin wife of Clodios, brother of Quintus Claudius Synesios,
father of the synagogue of the Campesians of Rome. Peace."

6On the synagogue of the Campesians, see Leon 144-145; CII
433 may also contain a reference to the Campesians, but only the
Kαι extant.

7CII 343 (Rome: Via Portuensis): "Ενδάδε κείτε Ἰλαρος/
ἀρχων ἀπὸ συναγωγῆς/ ξησάς ἐπὶ λε'. 'Ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν
κοιμήσεις αὐτοῖς. "Here lies Hilaros, archon from
the synagogue of the Volumnesians, who lived 35 years. In peace
his sleep. His memory (for a blessing?)."

8CII 402 (Rome: Via Portuensis): "Ενδάδε κείτε Σικου/λος
Σαβελνος μελ/λάρχων Βολομνήν/σων ἄτονν Β' μνήμων ν'. "Here lies
Siculus Sabinus, archon-to-be of the Volumnesians, aged 2 years,
10 months.

9CII 417 (Rome: Via Portuensis): "Ενδάδε κείτε/ Φαλαβος
Σαβελνος/ ζαβήου συναγῳγῆς/ τῶν Βολομνῆν νυ/σω. 'Ἐν ἐν ἐν
κοιμήσεις αὐτοί(οι). "Here lies Flavius Sabinus, (archon?)—for-life
of the synagogue of the Volumnesians. In peace their sleep." On
this interpretation of ζαβήου as ἄρχων δι' αὐτοῦ see Schürer,
Gemeindeverfassung 23.

10Leon 66, 157-159.

11CII 508 (Rome: uncertain provenance): "Ενδάδε κείτε
Μνιασᾶς, διάκονος τῶν συναγωγῶν. "Here lies
Mniaasas, disciple of the sages (= talmid ḥakam) and father of
synagogues."

12First published by Giuseppe Gatti, "Nuove scoperte nella
città e nel suburbio," Notizie degli Scavi, Atti della R.
Accademia dei Lincei, anno CCXCVII, series 5, Classe di scienze
morali, storiche e filologiche 8 (1900) 88. See also idem,
"Notizie di recenti trovamenti di antichità," Bulletinino della
Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma (1900) 223-225.

13Leon 142.

14CII 284 (Rome: Via Appia Pignatelli): Marcus Cuyn/us
Alexus gra/mmateus ego t/on Augusthsio/n mellarcon / eccion
Augus/stesion an(norum) XII. "Marcus Quintus Alexus, scribe of
the Augustesians ( = εκ τῶν Αὔγουστησιων), archon-to-be of the
Augustesians ( = μελλάρχων εκ τῶν Αὔγουστησιων), (aged) 12
years."

15CII 301 (Rome: Via Portuensis): "Ενδάδε κείτε Ἀννίς/
γερουσάρχης (sic) συναγῳγῆς Ἀγουστεσιων. 'Ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν
κοιμήσεις αὐτοῖς. "Here lies Annis, gerusiarch of the synagogue
of the Augustesians. In peace his sleep."
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18 CII 416 (Rome: Via Portuensis): 'Εν [Θάδε χείτε Φλά / Βία / Αυτωνίνα γυνή / Δατίβου τοῦ ζαβίου / ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς / τῶν Αύγουστῆσων]. "Here lies Flavia Antonina, wife of Dativus, (archon) for life of the synagogue of the Augustesians."

19 Cf. CII 417, quoted above, n. 9.

20 Leon 142.

First published by Raffaello Garrucci, Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in vigna Randanini (Rome: Coi tipi della Civiltà cattolica, 1862) 52.

21 Leon 66.

22 For references to the manuscripts which quote the inscription, see CIL V 4411 (ad loc.), and for previous editions of the inscription, see CII 639 (ad loc.).

23 Brix. B 4; see CIL V 4411 (ad loc.).

24 Frey's Caelia seems to be a simple printing error. Lifshitz corrects it in his prolegomenon to the 1975 edition, 49.

25 For literature on the Jewish catacomb in Venosa, see above, chap. 3, n. 7.

26 First published by G. I. Ascoli, Iscrizioni inedite o mal note, greche, latine, ebraiche di antichi sepolcri guidaici del Napolitano (Estratto degli Atti IV Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti tenutosi in Firenze nel 1878; Turin: Ermanno Loescher, 1880) 53, no. 6.

27 Ascoli, Iscrizioni 45, suggests this date for the catacomb. Leon, JQR n.s. 44 (1953-1954) 284, dates it to the fourth or perhaps early fifth century, and he also refers to further attempts to date the catacomb.

28 JQR n.s. 44 (1953-1954) 271-272; see also Leon 188. For a further possible example of the title pateresssa, see below, pp. 128-129.

29 See W. Frenkel, Nella patria di Orazio Flacco, guida di Venosa (referred to by Lifshitz, CII, Prolegomenon, p. 46, but unavailable to me); G. P. Bognetti, Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (1954) 194; Jeanne Robert and
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33 CII 619b (Venosa): Ἡδε ηεῖτε Μάρκελλος/ πατήρ πατέρων
καὶ πάτρων τῆς πόλεως. "Here lies Marcellus, father and patron of the city."

34 CII 590: quoted and discussed above, p. 43. CII 599:

CII 611: Hic ciscued Fausthna/ filia Faustin(i) pat(eris) annorum/
quattuordecim(m) mnsurum/ quinque que fue unica paren/turn quern
dixerunt trhnus (= δρομόντως)/ duo apostuli et duo rebbites et/
satis grandem dolorem fecet pa/rentebus et lagremas cibita/ti/.

CII 612: Absida (= δόξα) ubi/ cesquit Faustinus/ pater. "Tomb where Faustinus, father lies."

CII 613: Hic pa[u]sad Fausthus/ nepus Faustinus/ pat(eri)/ nepus Biti et Asella/ qui fuerunt maiures cibi/tatis.

35 NOR n.s. 44 (1953-1954) 271.

36 PL 42.1131-1140. This work is not to be confused with the twelfth-century work which has gone under the title

37 PL 42.1134.

38 Juster 1.74, n. 1. Bernhard Blumenkranz accepts this
dating (TQ 4 [1948] 126; Altercatio Aecclesie Contra Synagogam
[Strasbourg: Palais de l'Université, 1954] 27). The work was
incorrectly attributed to Augustine, which explains its present
location in PL 42.

39 TQ 4 (1948) 126; see PL 42.1131.

40 Krauss, Altertämer 166.

41 Berliner 1.69.

42 Berliner 2,2.57.

43 Berliner’s description is rather clear in this regard:
"Für kranke und sterbende Frauen, wie für die Versorgung armer
Bräute sorgte die mater Synagogae (No. 27 [ = CII 523]), die auch
unter dem Titel Pateressa bekannt ist und noch im 16. Jahr-
hundert als Parnesessa (somit Femininum von Parness) ihre Würde
behauptete. Als ehrwürdige Matrona erschien sie überall, wo dem weiblichen Theil der Gemeinde Hülfe, Beistand und Trost zu bringen war" (Berliner 1.69).

44 Leon 186-187.
45 Leon 188, n. 2.
46 Leon 194.
47 Frey, CII 1. p. XCVI.
48 Frey, CII 1. p. XCVI.

49 Juster 1.448-449; Baron, History 2.413, n. 22 (see also 2.186-188, 194); Applebaum, "Organization" 497-498. For further discussion of this title, see: Schürer, Gemeindeverfassung 29-30; Vogelstein/Rieger 1.43-44; Schürer, Geschichte 3.88-89,96; Krauss, Alttöffner 118,156,166-167; Elbogen 484; George La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome in the First Centuries of the Empire," HTR 20 (1927) 361; Frey, CII 1. pp. LXXXIV, XCV-XCVI; Baron, Community 1.96-97,101; Baruch Lifshitz, Prolegomenon to the 2d ed. of Frey, CII 1.48.

50 The following example is representative rather than exceptional: "Schon der Umstand, dass eben auch der letztere Titel [mater synagogae] vorkommt, macht es wahrscheinlich, dass damit nicht ein eigentliches Gemeindeamt bezeichnet wird" (Schürer, Geschichte 3.88-89).

53 On immunitas see PW 9 (1916) 1134-1136.
55 See Str-B 1.916-917; Schürer, History 2.325-326.

58 CII 537 (Porto, Italy): Καττία Ἀμμίας θυγατέρα τοῦ Μινώφη/ λοι πατήρ συναγωγῆς τῶν/ Καρκαρησίων. Καλλίς βίωσα/σα ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαιϊσμῷ ἐτῆς ζῆσασα/ τρομάσαντα καὶ τέρσασα μετὰ τοῦ/ συμβίου. εἶδεν ἐγὼ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς ἣγονα. δὲν κεῖται Καττία/ Ἀμμίας. "Cattia Ammias, daughter of Menophilos, father of the synagogue of the Carcaresians. She lived a good life in Judaism, having lived 34 years with her husband. From her children she saw grandchildren. Here lies Cattia Ammias."
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60 CII 319 (Rome: Via Portuensis): quoted above, n. 5.

61 CII 510 (Rome: probably from the Monteverde catacomb): "Ωδε κείτε Σαλω/ δύοντες γα/δια πατρός/ συναγωγής/ Αλβρέαν. 
ἐβδόμεν λ(υκάβαντας) μα'. ἐν ἑδρὴν ἡ κοιμίασε αὐτῆς. 
"Here lies Salo, daughter of Gadias, father of the synagogue of the Hebrews. She lived 41 years. In peace her sleep." CII 535 (Porto): Ἐνταδέ κείτε/ τυγατέρες δύο/ πατρός τῶν/ Ἐβρέων Γα/δια 
"Here lie two daughters of the father of the Hebrews, Gadias Tossara. In peace."

62 CII 509 (Rome: uncertain provenance): Ἐνθάδε κείται 
παν/χάριος πατέρα συνα/γωγῆς Ἐλαίας ἐτῶν ἐκατο/ν δέκα 
φιλέντολος/ καιλως βίωσας. ἤν εἰρήνη κοιμήσεις/ αὐτῶν. 
"Here lies Pancharios, father of the synagogue of Elaia, (aged) 110 
years, lover of his people, lover of the commandments. He lived 
well. In peace his sleep."

63 CII 494 (Rome: Region of the Via Portuensis): Ἐνθάδε 
κ/είτε διομένος πατέρα συνα/γωγῆς Ἐπεξεργασθηκόν/ τρικ 
δέκα/ ἐν ἑδρήν ἡ κοιμήσεις/ αὐτῶν. 
"Here lies Domnus, father of the synagogue of the Verniacians, thrice 
archon and twice frontistes. In peace his sleep."

64 CII 508 (Rome: uncertain provenance): Ἐνθάδε κείτε 
Μασίας μαθητής/ σώφρων καὶ πατὴρ/ συναγωγῶν. 
"Here lies Masiass, disciple of the sages and father of synagogues."

65 CII 93 (Rome: Via Appia): Ἐνθάδε κείτε Ἀστερία/ 
πατήρ συναγωγῆς δι/απείτης αὐτῆς. ἤν ἐρήμη κοιμήσεις 
"Here lies Asteries. You were father of the synagogue, holy, 
irreproachable. In peace your sleep."

66 See above, n. 60.

67 CII 694 (Stobi, Macedonia): quoted below, chap. 6, 
n. 135.

68 See above, n. 34.

69 Quoted and discussed above, p. 43.

70 See above, n. 34.

71 See above, p. 62.

72 See above, p. 62.

73 CII 619b (Venosa): Ἐνθάδε κείτε Μαρκέλλος/ πατήρ 
Pατέρων καὶ πάντων τῆς πόλεως. 
"Here lies Marcellus, father of fathers 
and patron of the city."

74 Cf. the maiures cibitatis (a woman and a man) in CII 611, quoted above in n. 34.

75 CII 533 (Castel Porziano; probably from the first half of 
commorantium qui comparat/verunt ex conlat]ione locum C. Iulio 
Iusto/ [gerusiarchae ad m]unimentum struendum/ [donavit 
rogantibus Livio Dionisio patre et/ [.........]no gerusiarche 
et Antonio/ [.........diab]iu anno ipsorum consent. ger/ [us.C. 
Iulius Iustus gerusiarches fecit sibi/ [et coniugi] sue 
lib.lib.posterisque eorum/ [in for]nte p. XVIII in agro p. XVII. 
"The community of Jews living in the colony of Ostia, who by
means of a collection acquired a plot of land for G(aius) Julius Justus, gerusiarch, so that he might construct a (grave) monument, gave it to him at the request of Livius Dionysius, father, and of [..........]us, gerusiarch, and of Antonius [archon-for-life?], in the year of (their office?), by consent of the gerou sia. G(aius) Julius Justus, gerusiarch, made (the monument) for himself [and] his [wife], for his freedmen and freedwomen and their descendants. [Width, 18 feet, length 17 feet].

76 CII 739 (4th C.): quoted above, chap. 1, n. 29.

77 CII 720 (Mantineia, Arcadia): Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἐλπίδου/ πατήρ λαοῦ/ διὰ βίου δόμον/ τὸ(ν) προνοοῦ/ τῇ συναγῳγῇ. "Aur(elius) Elpidys, father-for-life of the people, (made) a gift of the forecourt to the synagogue."

See Krauss, Altertümer 243.

79 This title was bestowed, for example, upon the emperor Antoninus Pius in the mid-second century by the senate (Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Antoninus Pius 6.6-7).

80 Plautus, Rudens 1.5.

81 Egg., CIL III 7505; VI 8796, 10234; IX 2687, 5450; XIV 37, 2408.


83 Waltzing, Étude, 1.446-447; PW 4 (1901) 425.


85 Vermaseren, Corpus, indices to vols. 1, 2 under "List of Mithraic Grades"; Waltzing, Étude 1.446-447.

86 CIL III 882 (Ladislaus Viddmann, Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapicae [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969], no. 698), CIL VI 406,408,413 (the patronus is distinguished from the pater); see also CIL III 8147; VI 377; XIV 37,69,707; IG XIV 1084 (Viddmann no. 384).

87 Since women were probably not admitted to the cult of Mithras, the question of mater is an irrelevant one. There is, however, one case of a woman in Leptis Magna, Africa, who bore the title lea, a Mithraic grade (Vermaseren 1. no. 115).

By pointing out the similarity between Mithraism and Judaism with respect to this one title, I do not mean to imply a structural similarity between the two. Mithraism is a cult, whereas Judaism in the Roman Diaspora is a community, albeit a cultic community.
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4. E.g., SEG 17 (1960) 818 (Cyrenaica). The name Marion occurs in an inscription from the same site, SEG 17 (1960) 819.


6. CII ad loc.


8. For a brief survey of these, see Michael Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 77-82. Stone mentions the temples at Arad, Elephantine, Arad el-Emir and Leontopolis, as well as the evidence for animal sacrifice at Qumran and at Sardis.


10. On this name, see Möller and Bees, *Inschriften* 43-44.

11. Discussed below, pp. 95-97.

12. Leon 193.

13. CII ad loc.

14. First published by Moshe Schwabe, *Yadiot* 5 (1937-1938) 91; see also Mazar, *Beth She'arim* 1.102; pl. 15, no. 5; Schwabe and Lifshitz, *Beth She'arim* 2.42-43, no. 66. There is a contradiction between 1.102, which refers to our inscription as "a three-line Greek inscription painted in red, with the addition of a word in Hebrew: 'Shalom,'" and locates it above and to the
right of arcosolium 3, and 2.42-43, which locates the five-line Greek inscription above and to the right of arcosolium 2. An arcosolium is a grave niche with an arched ceiling.

15 Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.39-40.

16 Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.39-40; see also Mazar, Beth She'arim 1.102.

17 See CII 1050, 1067, 1088; Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2. nos. 151, 165, 191, 219. The use of the nominative kyra may be due to Aramaic influence, as the Greek loan word Qyer, indeclinable in Aramaic, is not unusual in Palestinian Aramaic inscriptions.

18 For a discussion of this name, see Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.42.

19 He was buried next to Sara in arcosolium 1 (CII 1081; Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.42, no. 65). His own epitaph also does not call him a priest, although perhaps one should nevertheless not exclude the possibility that he was one.

20 Beth She'arim 2.43; see also Baruch Lifshitz, RB 74 (1967) 52.

21 Pp. 78-83.

22 There are certain minor inconsistencies between Frey's uncial and minuscule transcriptions. Whether this is due to Schwabe's communication to Frey or to Frey himself, I cannot judge.

23 Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.43.


26 These and the following references represent only a selection of the rabbinic passages on each question.

27 This text, which is unattributed, cannot be dated precisely. Jacob Neusner believes that the tractate Sota is the work of Ushans, i.e., from the period of 140 to 170 (A History of the Mishnaic Law of Women [5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1980], 5.147; for commentary on this passage, see 4.36-37).
On the heave-offering, see Num 18:8,12,24,26; Deut 18:4. See also Terumot, the tractate on heave-offerings in the Mishnah, Tosefta and Jerusalem Talmud. On the question of whether Babylonia was seen as subject to agricultural taxes, see Jacob Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia (5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1966-1970), 2 (1966) 260.

The difficulties in dating this text are related to the difficulties in dating any Talmud text. It is unclear which 'Ulla is referred to here; Mordechai Margolioth (Encyclopedia of Talmudic and Geonic Literature [2 vols.; Tel Aviv: "Yavneh," 1976], 2.716 [Hebrew]) believes that the text is speaking of an 'Ulla who was a contemporary of Rava (died 352). With the exception of R. Idi bar Avin (ca. 310), it is impossible to know precisely which rabbis are referred to as having eaten priestly dues on account of their wives, as there was more than one rabbi by the name of Kahana, Papa and Yemar. They were in any case Babylonian Amoraim. Even if one knew precisely which rabbis were meant, we have no guarantee of the accuracy of the ascription. In light of the lack of critical studies of the biographies and sayings of the rabbis in question, we can only say that the theories and sayings found in the text are Amoraic.

One might ask whether R. Kahana was not in fact a priest, as his name would indicate. First, it must be noted that having the name Kahana or Kohen does not necessarily imply priestly descent. Secondly, the text would make no sense if he were a priest, for then he would eat the priestly dues on account of himself and not on account of his wife.

A text strongly expressing the fragility and derivative nature of a woman's priestliness is m. Yebam. 9:5-6, which describes under which circumstances a common Israelite woman who is the widow of a priest and a priest's daughter who is the widow of a common Israelite may eat of the priest's due.


For the position that there were no female priests in ancient Israel, see esp. A. Eberharter, "Gab es im Yahwekult Priesterinnen?" (Töbinger) Theologische Quartalschrift 94 (1912) 183-190. His position has remained the majority one.

Some scholars consider 1 Sam 2:22b to be a later interpolation; see the commentaries by Otto Thenius and Max Lühr, 3rd. ed. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1898) 17; Henry Preserved Smith (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899) 20; S. R. Driver, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 33; and others. The reasons for this theory are:
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1. The LXX and Qumran do not include 1 Sam 2:22b; 
2. 1 Sam 2:22b is linguistically very similar to Exod 38:8 (P); 
3. 1 Sam 2:22b speaks of a "tent of meeting," whereas 1 Sam 1:9 presupposes an established building (יהז"א) . While it is impossible to discuss this question at any length here, one should simply note the possibility that the LXX and Qumran could have censored their Vorlage and that the phrase "women who served at the door of the tent of meeting" was a standard phrase. If it was a standard phrase still in use at the time of the writing of 1 Sam 2:22b, this would explain how "tent of meeting" could occur with reference to Shiloh, which had a building rather than a tent. 

35 Driver, Books of Samuel 33. 
36 * ... jene Arbeiten am Tempel zu verrichten, welche weiblichen Fleiss und Kunstinn erheischten ... " (Eberharter, "Priesterinnen" 190). 
39 "The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite," JNES 24 (1965) 302. Frank Moore Cross concurs with Mazar: "Mazar is no doubt correct in seeing Heber and his wife Jael as persisting in their priestly functions at a temenos related to the terebinth" (Cross, Canaanite Myth 201). 
40 "It should be especially noted that the term terebinth (תירבע) appended with a surname always refers to a holy tree; and it is a recurring theme in the Bible that a Patriarch pitched his tent by such a tree and sanctified the spot by erecting an altar or massebah" (Mazar, "Sanctuary" 301). See Gen 12:6-7; 26:23-25; etc. 
41 Migra'ot Gedolot. Prophets and Writings (Tel Aviv: Pardes, 1958) ad loc. 
43 Sperber, Bible 94. 
44 The same is also true for the Jael, Zipporah and "women who minister at the door of the tent of meeting" texts. On the Miriam traditions, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, The Liberating Word, (ed. Letty M. Russell; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) 49-52. 
45 Philo himself was also very interested in the story of Miriam leading the Israelite women in song; see De Agricultura 80-83; De vita Mosis 1.180; 2.256.
An excellent survey of female priests in Graeco-Roman Egypt is given by Lea Pringmann, Die Frau im ptolemäisch-kaiserlichen Aegypten (Bonn: Bonner Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1939) 75-86, 123-125. See also her discussion of women in cultic clubs, 86-90.


Historiae 5.5.

De ieiuno 16.6 (Tertulliani Opera 2, CChr, SL [1954] 1275).


See above, n. 8.

On the priestly blessing, see m. Ber. 5:4; m. Meg. 4:5, 6, 7; m. Sota 7:6; m. Tamid 7:2; b. Roš. Haš. 31b; b. Sota 40a; y. Ber. 9d.2-5; Num. Rab. 11.1-8 (on Num 6:23-27).


LPGI 670.


On priestly leadership at Qumran, see John Strugnell, JBL 77 (1958) 110-111.

See also Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Alexander Severus 45.7 (Lampridius), who describes how Alexander Severus used to announce publicly the name of a governor, military officer, procurator, etc. before appointing him, noting that "Christians and Jews observed this custom in announcing the names of those who were to be ordained priests" (sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt), but this may be due to a misapprehension, cf. Juster 1.445, no. 1.

One passage which illustrates this very well is the gemara on m. Sota 3:7 (b. Sota 23b), the mishnaic passage defining the differences between a kohen and a kohenet, as well as between a man and a woman. The reason given for a number of these differences is the male language used by scripture. For example, Lev 21:11 is taken as referring only to sons of priests and not to daughters of priests, because it says "the sons of Aaron," but not "the daughters of Aaron." Another of the many examples of this phenomenon would be b. Qidd. 29b, in which Deut 11:19 (in the Hebrew text) is taken to mean that one is required
to teach one's sons the Torah, but not one's daughters, a
regulation which has had enormous consequences for Jewish women
for centuries.

63 Or: berabbin, see Tosefta, ed. Lieberman 356, no. 34
(second apparatus).

64 Elbogen 170. Elbogen thus takes this text to be a
"defensive" text, that is, one which is required to defend
the innovation of not allowing women to read.

65 Krauss, Altetomer 174, also believes that the issue is
one of male illiteracy.

66 For further discussion of this question, see Salo
Wittmayer Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 2nd
ed., rev. and enl. (vol. 1-; New York: Columbia University
Press, 1952- ), 2.413, n. 23.

67 Leon 66.

68 This transcription and interpretation follow Leon, rather
than Frey, who according to Leon, misread the letters because
minium had been carelessly applied (Leon 192, n. 3; 316-317).

69 CII 379 is carved on the other side of the marble plate,
which causes Leon to suggest that CII 375 is incomplete, perhaps
because the stonecutter had omitted gyne (wife) in 1. 2 (Leon
320-321).

70 Leon believes that this may be due to the general con-
servatism of the Monteverde catacomb (Leon 192).

71 The transcription given here does not actually follow
either of the ones given by Frey, but rather that in Schwabe
and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim 2.28.

72 For the dating, see Schwabe and Lifshitz, Beth She'arim
2.29.

73 CII 746 (Ephesus; end of 2nd C.): Τού μυημετόν εσ/τι
Μ(αρκου) Ἀ(υρί)πλου Μουσα/ου ταρεώς (=τερέως). Ζηηηηηηη
Κβνηντα οί Ἰο/νάτοι. (Reading according to Louis Robert,
Hellenica 11-12 (1960) 381-384, and not according to Frey.)
"The Tomb of Marcus Aurelius Moussios, priest. May he live! The
Jews mourn." CII 785 (Corycos, Cilicia): Σωματοθήκη Ἀβα (or
Ἔβα) ἑυμνόνος/ τοῦ μακαρίου εἰερέων. "Funerary urn of Aba (or
father?) Symon, the blessed one (= deceased one) of the priests."
CII 930 (Jaffa): Ἰσα υἱοῦ Ἀμαρου/ ἡερέως ΓΙΠΟ ('Εγνητίου)./ Ε/ο/η/νν/ / ἱ/γγ/ "Isn (Isak?), son of Lazaros, priest of Egypt (?).
Peace! Lazar." CII 1404 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 79;
Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 100 (Berenike, Cyrenaica; dated to 77
C.E.): a long dedicatory inscription, 1. 17. Καρτισθένης Ἀρχιά
ἱερέως (δρ.) /'. "Kartisthenes, son of Archias, priest, 10
(drachmas). Baruch Lifshitz, RB 74 (1967) 50-52 (Caesarea): θη/η
Μ[.] / κε ἔλευς κε [. . .]/ [. . .] ευς εἰερή[ων].
"Tomb of Μ[.] and of Eeleas and of [. . .] the priests."
Also important are the lists of priestly courses found in Ashkalon
(CII 962) and Caesarea (Michael Avi-Yonah, IEJ 12 [1962]
137-139), as well as Hebrew and Aramaic occurrences of "priest,"
e.g., CII 828a, 1197, 1221, 1317, 1411.
A number of those buried at Beth She'arim were from abroad, e.g., the könén from Beirut (Schwabe and Lifschitz, Beth She'arim 2. no. 148). Therefore, one should not overemphasize the interest of the town of Beth She'arim in the priesthood. Juster 1.453, n. 8 ("... les femmes ne pouvaient pas être prêtresses chez les Juifs.").

Notes to Chapter VI

1 Literally "women's synagogue," "Weiberschul" denotes a totally separate prayer room for women in the synagogue, be it a gallery or a separate room on the same level.

2 Die galiläischen Synagogenruinen (Gesellschaft für Palästina Forschung. 3. Veröffentlichung) 15.

3 Synagogenruinen 15-16; Altdümmer 355-357.

4 Kohl and Watzinger 140 and passim; Sukenik, Synagogues 47-48 and passim; Goodenough 1.226 and passim. The two latest, most complete and extremely useful works on Palestinian synagogues, Hättenmeister pp. VII-IX and passim, and Chiat passim, report on others having reconstructed a gallery and are cautious in their evaluations of these reports, but do not call the existence of such a gallery into question.

5 Quoted above, p. 24.

6 Marilyn J. Chiat, in a paper given on November 18, 1979 in New York at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature, questioned the identification of buildings at Masada, Herodion, Gamla, Migdal and Korazim (all discussed below) as synagogues. Chiat makes a good case for questioning the identification of these buildings as synagogues in the narrow sense, but one must then ask if what seem in any case to be public meeting halls might not have been used for worship services. Synagogues are attested literally for the 1st C.: Matt 4:23; Mark 1:23; John 6:59; Acts 6:9 and passim; Josephus, J.W. 2.14.4 § 285; Life 277, 280, 293; Ant. 19.6.3 § 300.

7 Yigael Yadin, Masada. Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand, tr. Moshe Pearlman (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966; Sphere, 1973) 180-189; EAE 3.809-810 (Yigael Yadin); Hättenmeister 314-315; Chiat 561-567, 904, 1008, 1021-1022. It is not possible to quote all of the bibliography for this and other sites. The reader desiring further bibliography is referred to Hättenmeister and Chiat for the ancient synagogues in Israel and to Kraabel, "Synagogue" for the Diaspora synagogues. Also worthy of special mention are: Rachel Wischnitzer, The Architecture of the European Synagogue (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1964); Hershel Shanks, Judaism in Stone. The Archaeology of Ancient Synagogues (New York: Harper and Row, 1979); Levine, Synagogues Revealed. For a survey of various issues relating to the ancient synagogue, including the architecture, see Wolfgang Schrage, "Synagogue," TWNT 7 (1964) 798-839; or TDNT 7 (1971) 798-852. For Masada and the following sites discussed here, see the plates at the back of this volume. The plates follow the order of the discussion.
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8 Gideon Foerster, *Eretz-Israel* 11 (1973) 224-228; English summary, 30*; pl. XLIV, 2; *EAE* 2.503-505, 509 (Gideon Foerster); Hüttenmeister 173-174; Chiat 467-471, 899, 1009; Doron Chen, *BASOR* 239 (1980) 37-40.


10 A photograph of these steps is printed in Gutman, *Gamla* 27.


12 *AA* 57-58 (1976) 8-9; Hüttenmeister 316-318; Chiat 244-247, 887-888.


14 Further excavation has shown that those remains identified as a synagogue at Migdal are actually part of an urban villa, thus excluding it from the discussion; see Virgilio Corbo, "Piazza e villa urbana a Magdala," *Studi Biblici Franciscani* 28 (1978) 232-240, pls. 71-76. As to the supposed synagogue at Korazim, there are no extant remains and it therefore seems imprudent to discuss it in the same context as Masada, Herodion and Gamla.


17 It is also quite possible that the court was actually the synagogue itself, a synagogue in the form of a basilica; see *AA* 48/49 (1974) 44. The remains are too sparse to ascertain whether or not there was a gallery.

18 Goodenough 1.208-211; 3. figs. 535, 545; Mazar, *Beth She'arim* 1.14-20; fig. 3; *EAE* 1.233-237 (Nahman Avigad and Benjamin Mazar); Hüttenmeister 68-72; Chiat 155-161, 879, 947.

19 Goodenough 1.263-264; *EAE* 1.258 (Ruth Hestrin); Hüttenmeister 72-73; Chiat 713-716, 913.

20 *AA* 39 (1971) 8; *AA* 56 (1975) 2-3; *EAE* 2.460-462 (Dan Urman); Hüttenmeister 357-358; Chiat 611-614, 1024-1028.


23. D. C. Baramki and Michael Avi-Yonah, QDAP 6 (1938) 73-77; pls. XVII-XXIII; Goodenough 1.260-262; 3. figs. 655, 657, 659, 666; EAE 2.571, 573 (Gideon Poerster); Hüttenmeister 189-191; Chiat 579-582, 907, 1022.


25. Kohl and Watzinger 135-137; Goodenough 1.208; 3. figs. 529, 536; Hüttenmeister 419-420; EAE 4.1136 (Michael Avi-Yonah); Chiat 382-384, 994.


27. Goodenough 1.223; 3. figs. 583-584; EAE 2.410-417 (Asher Ovadiah); Hüttenmeister 130-137; Chiat 414-419, 898, 999, 1001-1003.


30. N. Slouschz, Proceedings of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society 1,1 (1921) 3-39; Goodenough 1.214-216; 3. figs. 561-568; Hüttenmeister 159-163; EAE 4.1178-1180 (Moshe Dothan); Chiat 222-227, 884, 965-967.

31. Kohl and Watzinger 26-27, 33, 35; pls. II-V.

32. Goodenough 3. fig. 452.

33. A Visit to Capernaum, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1973) fig. 31. Since the text of this booklet states that there was probably no women's gallery (p. 52), the use of this reconstruction model is even more noteworthy.


35. On the gallery see, Kohl and Watzinger 26-27, 33, 35; frontispiece; pls. IV-VI; Sukenik, Synagogues 8; Goodenough 1.182; 3. figs. 452, 457.

36. See below, C. Further Considerations.
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della città; vol. 2: Stanislao Loffreda, La ceramica; vol. 3:
Augusto Spijkerman, Catalogo della monete della città; vol. 4:
E. Testa, I graffiti della casa di S. Pietro; 1 (1975) 145; pls.
66-67. See also the review by James F. Strange of the latter
book, where Strange takes the view that the stairs led to a

38Conversation with Stanislao Loffreda, Jerusalem, June
1978. For further information on the synagogue at Capharnaum,
see Kohl and Watzinger 4-40, 193-195; pls. I-VI; frontispiece;
Gaudenzio Orfali, Capharnaüm et ses ruines d’après les fouilles
accomp!ées à Tell-Houm par la Custodie Franciscaine de Terre
Goodenough 1.181-192; 3. figs. 451-452, 457-479, 660, 662, 664;
EAE 1.286-290 (Nahman Avigad); Huttenmeister 260-270; Chiat
200-212, 882.

39Kohl and Watzinger 41-58; pl. VII; Goodenough 1.193-199;
3. figs. 484-502, 544; EAE 1.299-303 (Zeev Yeivin and Nahman
Avigad); Huttenmeister 275-281; Chiat 213-221, 883, 960-965.

40EAE 1.301.

41EAE 1.302.

42Kohl and Watzinger 101-106; pl. XIV; Goodenough 1.203-
204; 3. figs. 504, 523; Huttenmeister 343-346; EAE 3.710-711;
Chiat 94-98, 877, 939-941.

43Eric M. Meyers, "Excavations at En-Nabratein, Upper
Newsletter no. 2 (September 1980) 3-7, 10-11; (Eric) M. Meyers,
James P. Strange and Carol L. Meyers, "Nabratein, 1980," IEJ 31
(1981) 108-110. One of the more important aspects of the Duke
University excavation is that the latest level of the synagogue
can now be dated to between 650-700 on the basis of twenty-three
coins found beneath the latest floor of the building (Meyers,
"Excavations 4").

44Meyers, "Excavations" 6.


46Kohl and Watzinger 104-105; fig. 197.

47Kohl and Watzinger 106.

48Goodenough 1.204.

49Kohl and Watzinger 89-100; pls. XII-XIII; Goodenough
1.201-203; 3. figs. 505, 510-515; Huttenmeister 31-34; EAE
3.704-707 (Nahman Avigad); Chiat 70-76, 874, 942.

50Kohl and Watzinger 97, 100.

51Kohl and Watzinger pl. XII.

52Goodenough 1.202; see 3. fig. 505.


54EAE 3.705.
55 EAE 3.707.


58 Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 56-59, 80-83; see esp. figs. 3.3, 3.4, 3.10, and 3.14.

59 Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 80.

60 Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 58, cf. fig. 3.2.

61 Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 57.

62 Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 81.

63 In their preliminary reconstruction the excavators posited that the western wall extended much further to the north and slanted slightly to the west; see Eric M. Meyers, Thomas Kraabel and James F. Strange, RA 35:1 (1972) 10, fig. 5. In their final excavation report they alter their earlier reconstruction, making the gallery considerably smaller in size; see Meyers et al., Khirbet Shema' 56, n. 25.

64 In a letter to me of November 20, 1979, Eric M. Meyers writes that he is "not inclined to call the gallery a 'women's gallery.'"

65 Kohl and Watzinger 80-88; pl. XI; Goodenough 1.200-201; 3. figs. 506, 543; Höttenmeister 311-314; EAE 3.856-860 (Dan Barag); Chiat 86-93, 876, 937-939.

66 Kohl and Watzinger 88, figs. 173, 188.

67 On the narthex, see the literature on Bar'am cited above in n. 49; on the aedicula, see the photograph of the synagogue in Ostia in Maria Floriani Squarciapino, Archaeology 16 (1963) 196, and of that in the synagogue in Dura Europos in The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report (vols. 1-; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943- ), 8.1: Carl H. Kraeling, TheSynagogue (1956) pl. V; on the forecourt, see the literature for Capharnaum cited above, notes 33,34,37,38.


69 Kohl and Watzinger 111, fig. 216.
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70 Meyers and Meyers, "Gush Ḥalav" 278.
71 Meyers, Strange, Meyers and Hanson, "Report" 46; see also Meyers and Meyers, "Gush Ḥalav" 277.
72 Meyers and Meyers, "Gush Ḥalav" 278.
73 Kohl and Watzinger 59-70; pls. VIII-IX; Goodenough 1.199; 3. figs. 503, 508; Hüttenmeister 15-17; EAE 4.1133-1134 (Michael Avi-Yonah); Chiat 240-243, 886, 973-974.
74 Kohl and Watzinger 68, fig. 128.
75 Kohl and Watzinger 68.
76 Kohl and Watzinger pl. VIII.
77 Synagogenruinen 16. On the modern discussion among Orthodox Jews concerning the separation of the sexes and the historical arguments for it, see Baruch Litvin (ed.), The Sanctity of the Synagogue: the case for mehitzah, separation between men and women in the Synagogue, based on Jewish law, history, and philosophy, from sources old and new (New York: Spero Foundation, 1959).
79 Kohl and Watzinger 76-77.
80 Goodenough 12.45, 185-186; Moshe Dothan, Qadmoniot 1 (1968) 116-123; Hüttenmeister 163-172; EAE 4.1178-1184 (Moshe Dothan); Chiat 228-234, 885, 968-972; Moshe Dothan, "The Synagogue at Ḥammath-Tiberias," in: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 63-69.
81 In: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 65; see also Dothan, Qadmoniot 119.
82 Hüttenmeister 166.
83 Hüttenmeister 166.
84 Eliezer Sukenik, JPOS 15 (1935) 101-180; Goodenough 1.239-241; 3. figs. 626-630; EAE 2.469-473 (Michael Avi-Yonah); Hüttenmeister 152-159; Chiat 717-724, 912, 1035.
85 Goodenough 1.239; see also Asher Hiram, Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte 19 (1962) 46.
86 Sukenik, JPOS 162.
87 Kohl and Watzinger 125-134; pl. XVII; Goodenough 1.206-207; 3. figs. 530-534; Hüttenmeister 465-468; EAE 4.1137-1138 (Michael Avi-Yonah); Chiat 688-690, 1035.
88 Kohl and Watzinger 133.
89 Goodenough 1.207.
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90 Kohl and Watzinger 112-124; pl. XVI; Goodenough 1.205-206; 3. figs. 520-521, 524-528; Hüttenmeister 103-105; EAE 4.1134-1135 (Michael Avi-Yonah); Chiat 636-639, 909; Z. Ma'oz, in: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 102-103.

91 Kohl and Watzinger 124; cf. Goodenough 1.205.

92 Kohl and Watzinger 124, fig. 251; reprinted in Goodenough 3. fig. 521 and by Ma'oz, in: Levine: Synagogues Revealed 102.


94 Sukenik, Beth Alpha 16-17; pl. III; fig. 17.


97 IEJ 6 (1956) 261.


99 QA 41/42 (1972) 36; Barag, Porat and Netzer, "Synagogue" 119.

100 EAE 2.379.

101 Tarbiz 40 (1970-1971) 21; English summary, p. IV.

102 Mazar, Tarbiz 20.

103 Barag, Porat and Netzer, "Synagogue" 119.

104 Shmaryahu Gutman, Zeev Yeivin and Ehud Netzer, Qadmoniot 5 (1972) 47-52; pl. 1; cover; Hüttenmeister 422-432; EAE 4.1124-1128 (Shmaryahu Gutman, Ehud Netzer and Zeev Yeivin); Chiat 524-530, 902, 1016-1019; Shmaryahu Gutman, Z(eev) Yeivin and E(hud) Netzer, "Excavations in the Synagogue at Horvat Susiya," in: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 123-128.

105 Gutman, Yeivin and Netzer, Qadmoniot 48, EAE 4.1124-1125, Levine, Synagogues Revealed 124; Chiat 525.


107 IEJ 17, no. 1.

108 IEJ 18.
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110. E.g., b. Menah. 33b, 34a, b. B. Bat. 12a.

111. I have not seen the stone itself, but only pictures of it, so this can be taken as nothing more than a suggestion. However, the length (110 cm) would fit in well with this hypothesis.

112. At Gush Halav a raised platform does seem to be a plausible reconstruction, although here again no traces of an entrance to it were found.

113. In Umm al-Amad, for example, the extant capitals vary from 43 to 48 cm under the capital and 50 to 56.5 cm at the base; see Kohl and Watzinger 77. The extant columns vary in diameter from 40 to 58 cm, there being no clear cut-off point between the hypothetical gallery and the main story; see Kohl and Watzinger 76. A further example would be the column of the porch at Bar'am, which is 49 cm in diameter under the capital, narrower than some, if not all, of the interior columns, which range up to 70 cm in diameter at the base; see Kohl and Watzinger 92-100.


115. Goodenough 1.239-240.


117. Moshe Dothan, Qadmoniot 1 (1968) 119; in: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 65.

118. Moshe Dothan, EAF 4.1182; in: Levine, Synagogues Revealed 69.

119. André Plassart, in: Mélanges Holleaux. Recueil de mémoires concernant l'antiquité grecque (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1913) 201-215; pls. V, XII; reprinted in: RB 11 (1914) 523-534 (missing one plan; contains substitute by the editors of RB); Sukenik, Synagogues 37-40; pl. X; Goodenough 2.71-75; 3. figs. 874-876. For the reasons against this being a synagogue, see Belle D. Mazur, Studies of Jewry in Greece (vol. 1- ; Athens: Hestia, 1935- ), 1.15-24. The most recent extensive study of the question is Philippe Bruneau, Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 217; Paris: E. de Boccard, 1970) 480-493. See also Kraabel, "Synagogue" 491-494, who accepts Bruneau's identification of the building as a synagogue.

120. Plassart, in: Mélanges Holleaux 210; he notes that the separation of the sexes is certain, even though it is "not explicitly attested in the ancient sources."

121. Goodenough 2.74.

122. Mazur, Studies 25-33; pls. IV-V; Sukenik, Synagogues 44-45; pl. XI; Goodenough 2.75-76; 3. fig. 881.

123. Mazur, Studies 28-29.
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126. Seager, AJA 433.

127. BASOR 170 (1963) 41.

128. BASOR 191 (1968) 24, fig. 24.

129. AJA 426.

130. Theodor Wiegand and Hans Schrader, Priene (Berlin: Georg Riemer, 1904) 480-481.

131. Sukenik, Synagogues 42-43; Goodenough 2.77; 3. fig. 882; Kraabel, "Synagogue" 489-491.

132. A. von Gerkan, "Eine Synagoge in Milet," ZNW 20 (1921) 177-181; Sukenik, Synagogues 40-42; Goodenough 2.78; 3. fig. 880; Kraabel, "Synagogue" 488-489. Goodenough believes that it is "at best only a possibility" that this is a synagogue, and Kraabel, due to lack of Jewish evidence, disputes it entirely.

133. Gerkan, "Synagoge" 179.


135. CII 694 (Stobi, Macedonia): [־אעוג ותIA?] [קL.]


"(I)

Claudius Tiberius Polycharmon, also named Aχbyrios, father of the synagogue at Stobi, who conducted my whole life according to Judaism, (have), in fulfillment of vow, (erected) the buildings for the holy place and the triclinium together with the tetraстаun with my own means without in the least touching the sacred (funds). Howbeit, the right of disposal of all the upper chambers and the proprietorship (thereof) shall be vested in me, Claudius Tiberius Polycharmon, and my heirs for life; and whoso-
ever shall seek in any way to alter any of these dispositions of mine shall pay unto the patriarch 250,000 denarii. For thus have I resolved. But the repair of the tile-roof of the upper chambers shall be carried out by me and my heirs." (The translation is according to Sukenik, Synagogues 80, with minor changes.)


138 Kraeling, Synagogue 31.

139 Goodenough 9.31.

140 Kohl and Watzinger pl. XVIII.

141 Kraeling, Synagogue 16-17.

142 Kraeling, Synagogue 147, n. 537.

143 Kraeling, Synagogue 23, specifically notes, "At Dura the women shared equally with the men in the use of the House of Assembly, though they entered by a special doorway and sat on benches reserved especially for them."

144 E. Renan, Revue archéologique ser. 3, 2 (1883) 157-163; 3 (1884) 273-275; pls. VII-XI; Krauss, Altertümer 266, 309, 341, 347-348, fig. 7; Goodenough 2.89-100; 3. figs. 886-888, 890-892, 894-895, 897-906, 913-921.

145 Photograph, Goodenough 3. fig. 894; see also 2.91. Samuel Krauss suggests that the P could be p(uella) or p(ateressa), (Altertümer 266). The abbreviation is difficult to decipher, but pueilla ("girl") seems a rather unlikely title for the person who has donated the most expensive mosaic of the synagogue. Pateressa can by no means be taken as a certain reading, but the abbreviation PP, which seems to be pater patrum (cf. pater pateron; on these terms see above, p. 71) increases the likelihood that pateressa is the solution of the abbreviation. On the title pateressa, see the discussion of CII 606 above, pp. 61-62. Goodenough does not mention Krauss's suggestions in his discussions of the inscription.

146 Goodenough 2.100.

147 Goodenough 2.90.

148 Sukenik, Synagogues 47.

149 M. Sukk. 5:4; m. Mid. 2:5; etc; Josephus, J.W. 5.5.2 § 199; 5.5.3 § 204. See also Adolf Böckler, "The Forecourt of Women and the Brass Gate in the Temple of Jerusalem," JQR 10 (1898) 678-718.
260 Women Leaders in the Synagogue (Pages 130-135)

150 See, however, Shmuel Safrai, "Was There a Women's Gallery in the Synagogue of Antiquity?" Tarbiz 33 (1963-1964) 329-338, esp. 332 (Hebrew); English summary, p. II, who argues that women sometimes did enter the forecourt of Israel.

151 Cf. m. Mid. 2:5; t. Sukk. 4.1 (Zuck. 198); v. Sukk. 55b.30-38.

152 m. Mid. 2:5 reads: הַחְלַקָה הַחָלָק הַבַּעַרְשְׁרְבָּה רִוכְפָּרָה לְאַרְּצוּרָה לְאַרְּצוּרָה. "Originally [the walls of the women's forecourt] were smooth, but [later the court] was surrounded with a gallery so that the women should look on from above and the men from below, in order that they should not intermingle."

153 On this passage, see Safrai, "Gallery" 331.

154 See t. Sukk. 4.6 (Zuck. 198); v. Sukk. 55a.62-55b.7; b. Sukk. 51b. Note that the spelling of Diplostoon varies. The building was probably a synagogue, although the description of it is a highly extravagant one (e.g., that it held twice the number of those who left Egypt or 1,200,000). Krauss, Altertümer 261-263, believes that it was a market hall, used also for judicial purposes (on the model of the Roman basilica) and as a prayer hall.

155 Note that Salomon Buber, Midrash Echa Rabbati (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967; reprint of the Wilna, 1899 edition) 83, has simply replaced these terms by "men" and "women." A. Cohen's translation ([London: Soncino, 1951] 127, 232), does not make this emendation, but rather translates "inferiors" (i.e., women) and "superiors" (i.e., men). See also the parallel account of the story in the proem to Esth. Rab. (3), which does not include the passage on the women.

156 Sukenik, Synagogues 48, n. 1.


158 Safrai, "Gallery" 333.

159 See Safrai, "Gallery" 334.

160 Or: אֲדָרְלִי. Mention should also be made here of the enigmatic term andrôν, which occurs four times in Josephus (J.W. 2.18.9 § 503; 5.4.4 § 177; Ant. 15.6.7 § 199; 16.6.2 § 164). Only Ant. 16.6.2 § 164 describes what may be a synagogue context, and here the meaning is unclear. Could it be aardôn (= Hebrew 'אֲדָרְלִי)?


163 Krautheimer, Architecture 74; fig. 25.

164 Krautheimer, Architecture 108; fig. 41.


170. E.g., *Testamentum Domini* 1.19, 23; cf. also 1.41, 43; 2.4, 8 (ET: James Cooper and Arthur Maclean [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902] 64, 76, 108, 111, 120, 127). Widows, who are here part of the clergy, sit within the veil and are called "those who sit in front" (Syriac: *degadman yatban*, ed. Ignatius Ephraem II Rahmani [Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1899] 26, etc.). The laity, however, are divided into two aisles according to sex.

171. John Chrysostom's *Homilia in Mattheum* 73 (PG 58.677; ET: George Prevost [Cambridge, 1939] 443) is a good example of this. Chrysostom describes a wooden divider separating the sexes and then berates his congregation for making such a thing necessary, saying that the elders had told him that a divider did not exist in former times and referring to Gal 3:28; Acts 1:13-14; 16:15 and to such women as Priscilla (Acts 18:2, 18:26; Rom 16:3; 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19) and Persis (Rom 16:12) to prove his point that the earliest Christians did not have a separation of the sexes.


174. Elbogen 466-468.


177. Safrai, "Gallery" 329-338; English summary, p. II. See also the response by S. D. Goitein, *Tarbiz* 33 (1963-1964) 314. Goitein gives an eleventh-century example. Perhaps this is the earliest example to be found.


4 Another text which simply presupposes women's presence is the *Midrash ha-Gadol* on Deut 29:10. It states, "your wives, even though they do not understand, are to come and listen and receive their reward." A further later text, found in the extra-canonical tractate *Soperim* 18:6, speaks of the necessity of reading the translation after every passage from the Torah and the prophets on the sabbath, for the benefit of the people, including the women and children. The same passage goes on to say that people come late to the service on feast days because the food has to be prepared. If it is the women who prepare the food, then the coming late must refer at least also to them.

5 Goodenough 2.100.


7 Mohler, *Classical Weekly* 115.

8 On guardianship, see Max Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht* (Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums III,3,1; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1971) 367-369; Adolf Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society n.s. 43, pt. 2; Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1953) 393, 469, 530, 610, 748; see also 577, 621. There is no mention of the *tutela mulierum* in the Theodosian Code (312-438).

9 Quoted above, p. 26.

10 See Appendix no. 39 and Lifshitz, *Donateurs* no. 38 (quoted above, p. 26).


12 For illustrations of the thrones at Delos, 'En-Gedi and Korazim respectively, see Goodenough 3. fig. 876 (drawing); Levine, *Synagogues Revealed* 116 (photograph; seat can be seen in the northern wall of the synagogue, to the right); *EAR* 1.302 (photograph) and Goodenough 3. fig. 544.

13 Reinach, "Synagogue" 240.
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14. Tation may also have been non-Jewish, but this is not certain. A hint in that direction would be the way in which the term "Jews" is used in the inscription, almost as if she were not included in that group.

15. On Julia Severa, see A(lf) Thomas Kraabel, Judaism in Western Asia Minor under the Roman Empire, with a Preliminary Study of the Jewish Community at Sardis, Lydia (Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968) 71-80.


17. J.W. 5.2.2 § 55; 5.3.3 § 119; 5.4.2 § 147; Ant. 20.2.3-5 §§ 35-53; 20.4.3 §§ 94-95; 20.5.2 § 101; m. Nazir 3:6; etc.

18. In her article, "The Alleged Jewish Tendencies of Poppaea Sabina," JTS n.s. 10 (1959) 329-335, Mary Smallwood has argued that there is no basis for this assumption.
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Sardis, 51, 53, 124-125, 129, 161-162, pl. XLIV, 244
Sea of Galilee, 107, 115-117
Sepphoris, 229
Shiloh, 84, 247
Sicily, 236
Side, Pamphylia, 229, 237
Sidon, 230
Smyrna, 5-7, 10-11, 32, 42, 70, 223-225, 236
Sofia, Moesia, 231
Spain, 51-52, 64, 236
Stobi, 69, 125-126, 129, pls. XLVII-XLVIII, 242
Syene, Egypt, 22
Syria, 23, 26, 31, 52, 135-136, 143, 158-159, 162-164, 229, 231, 236
Tabariya. See "Tiberias" and "Hammat Teverya"

Tauromenion, Sicily, 236
Tell el-Yahudiyyeh, Egypt, 73-74, 244
Tell Menora, 107
Tell Rehov, 13
Teos, Ionia, 161, 229-230
Thebes, Thessaly, 35-39
Thessalonica, 135, 140, 223
Thessaly, 35-39
Thrace, 41-42, 55
Thyatira, 139
Tiberias, 114-116
Tralles, Caria, 157-158
Trans-Jordan, 136
Tunis, 128-129
Tyre, 230
Umm al-'Amad, 115, pl. XXIX, 257
Umm al-Qanatir, 116, pls. XXXII-XXXIV
Venetia, Brescia, 57, 60
Venusia. See "Venosa"
Via Anicia, Rome, 59
Via Appia, Rome, 59, 230, 238, 241-242
Via Appia Pignatelli, Rome, 238
Via Portuensis, Rome, 75-76, 230, 236, 238-239, 242

Aramaic
'abbâ', 67
'ar-‘Myê', 132-133
dê ‘al min, 119-120
‘ilâyê', 132-133
kahantêtâ/kahânâ', 78-83
kippâ, 119-120
paşšîm, 119-120
rêšê pirqâ', 236

Greek
aarôn, 260
agônophêtes, 144
alipos, 74
anathematismos, 50
andrôn, 260
apostolos, 39
archêgetis/archêgetês, 37, 232
archêgissa/archêgos. See "Leader"
archiereus, 5
archigrammateus, 5
archikybernêthês, 5
archipherekitês, 50, 236
archisyngôgos/archisyngôgissa. See "Head of the synagogue"
architriklinos, 5
archôn. See "Archon"
archôn nêpios, 9
archôn tôs synagogês. See "Archon of the synagogue"
azaritoi, 228
chaireô, 74
chrêstê, 74
hê diakonissa, 225
diakonos, 225, 228
didaskalía, 228
didaskalos, 50, 228
diplê stoa, 132
exôstra, 131
gerousia, 1, 42, 46, 231, 235, 243
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ergousiarchēs. See "Gerusiarch"
grammateus, 59
gynaikōnitis, 130
hierēia/hierissa/hierēus. See "Priest"
hierōn, 89
hierōstaton tameion, 10
hypēretēs, 228
hyperōn, 126
kathēgētēs, 67
kioniskos, 35, 232
koplaō, 150
kyra, 76
kyrios, 143
lamprotatos, 7
lamprotēs, 7
mathētēs sophōn, 68
mellarchōn, 9, 58-59,
metēr, 44, 57, 62-63, 69. See also "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
metēr synagogēs. See "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
oua, 234 (cf. 45)
paidion, 93
palaios, 52-53
pasiphōn, 74
patēr, 43, 62-63, 69. See also "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
patēr laou dia biou, 70
patēr patern, 69, 71, 259
patēr synagogēs. See "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
patēr synagogion, 68
patēr tou stematos, 70
patrōn tēs poleōs, 62
peristera, 35,
philandros, 60
phrontistēs. See "Business manager"
presbytera/presbyterēsa/presbyteros. See "Elder"
presbytēs, 41, 45. See also "Elder"
prohēdria, 143-144, 157
proseuchē, 89, 139-140
prostatēs, 151
prostates, 151
prōtokathedria, 144
sōtēr, 37
sperma, 93
synagogē, 5, 140
syngeneis mou, 232-233
tē idia s[ymbiō], 60
temenos, 247
thermos, 10
zabiou = dia biou?, 58-59, 230

Hebrew
'āb, 67
'āb bēt dīn, 67
'ābī, 67
'ārōn, 75, 260
bat kōhen, 78, 80
bēkōr, 93
bēn, 93
cohen. See "kōhenet/kōhen"
cohenet. See "kōhenet/kōhen"
dīppēlē 1ṣṭēḇā', 132
'ēset kōhen, 78-83
'ezrat hannaḥāmim, 130
gabbā'ı, 64
gēzūṭērā', 131
hāḵām, 237
ḥašāṭā, 79-80
ḥazzān, 17-18, 228
hēkāl, 247
kōhenet/kōhen, 76-83, 248, 250
māgōm, 98
mēsîa, 67
nebīqā, 87
parnās, 64-65, 226-227
(parneosophsa, 65)
qāṣīn, 37
rōdā, 37
rōdā bēt hakkēneset, 18, 226
rōdā hāḵām, 37
rōdā hakkēneset, 17-18, 226
sar, 37
šb', 84
šmā, 86-87
talmid ḥēḵām, 68, 238
tērūma, 80
yāḥid, 237
zāqān, 50-51, 235-237

Latin
alumna/us, 10
clarissima/us, 7-8, 224
collegium, 71
columella, 35
comes, 163, 229-330
flamen, 8-9
flaminica, 8-9, 224
ierusiarconis [gen.], 69
immunitas, 66, 235, 241
maior, 46, 235
maiores cibitatis, 240, 242
mater, 65, 71
mater synagogae. See "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
meIlarcon, 59, 224
munera corporalia, 20, 47-48, 66, 91
pater, 61, 63, 65, 69-71, 243.
See also "Mother/Father of the synagogue"
pateress a 44, 57, 61-63, 69, 239, 259. See also 
"Mother/Father of the synagogue"
pater patriae, 71
pater patrum, 71
pater synagogae. See 
"Mother/Father of the synagogue"
patrona/us. See "Patron"
Pp, 71, 259
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degadman yatban, 261
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<td>21:19-20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:13-21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:15-21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Deuteronomy 24:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:9</td>
<td>25:5-10 48, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:5-6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:7-9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>4:17-20 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17-21</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>85-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25-27</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>3:1:3 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:22</td>
<td>84-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:22b</td>
<td>246-247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>3:17 46, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>46, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>46, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3:6, 7 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>44:22 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>6:4 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>12:12 131-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>113-118 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>2:10 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>2:9 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:70-71</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:16-17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>5:24 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:29</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:59</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Qumran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>10:4-5</td>
<td>92-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 QM</td>
<td>13:1</td>
<td>92, 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 QS</td>
<td>6:8-9</td>
<td>51, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo of Alexandria</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De agricultura 80-83</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De ebriet. 42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Flacc. 74, 76, 80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De fug. 73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetica 7:13</td>
<td>90-91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg. ad Gaium 229</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg. alleg. 3.175</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De opific. 79, 136, 142</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De posterior. 42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De somn. 1.89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vita contempl. 2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-33</td>
<td>133-134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>87-88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vita Mosis 1.180</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Josephus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ap. 1.71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. 7.9.3 § 207</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9.7 §§ 387-388</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3.1-3 §§ 62-73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3.1 § 63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3.1 § 66</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3.3 § 73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10.4 § 285</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6.7 § 199</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.2 § 164</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3.5 §§ 81-84</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6.3 § 300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2.3 §§ 34-35</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2.3-5 §§ 35-53</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4.3 §§ 94-95</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.5.2 § 101</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6.3 § 136</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.8.11 § 195</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.3 § 236</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. 1.1.1 §§ 33</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.4 § 285</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.9 § 503</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.2 § 560</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 § 55</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 § 119</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 § 147</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 § 177</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1-6 §§ 184-227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2 § 199</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3 § 204</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.1 § 412</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.2-4 §§ 420-436</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.3-4 §§ 430-434</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosefta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Meg. 4.11</td>
<td>94-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>18, 28, 51, 53-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Menah. 13.12-14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Sukk. 4.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Ter. 2.13</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian Talmud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 'Abod. Zar 38a-38b</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. B. Bat. 12a</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109a</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ber. 8b</td>
<td>16b 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Qam. 109b</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Erub. 11b</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giṭ. 60a</td>
<td>226-227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. 13a</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥul. 131b-132a</td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketub. 8b</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mak. 2a</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg. 10a</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23a</td>
<td>94-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menaḥ 33b</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34a</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesah 49b</td>
<td>18, 28, 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qidd. 29b</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32b 46, 50, 54, 236</td>
<td>81 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roš. Haš. 17b</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanh. 14a</td>
<td>54, 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soṭa 22a</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23b</td>
<td>81, 248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38a</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40a</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukk. 2b</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51b</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51b-52a 130-132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yebam. 46a</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoma 11b</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47a</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jerusalem Talmud**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y. Ber. 6a.28-29</td>
<td>19, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Bik. 65d.11-15</td>
<td>54, 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Meg. 74a.18</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Nid. 49b.45-47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Sanh. 19a.9</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Soṭa 16d.38-52</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Sukk. 55a.62-55b.7</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Yoma 41a.3-4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ger. 2.1, 4</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem. 14</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sop. 18.6</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. Rab. 9.9</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. Rab. 11.1-8</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. Rab. 5.15</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esth. Rab. proem 3</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam. Rab. 1:45 (on 1:16)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6:59</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 1:13-14</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midrash ha-Gadol</td>
<td>4.22 (on 4:19) 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Deut. 29:10</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Rabbinic Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 4:23</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>15-16, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>15-16, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:2,6</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:7-8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:9</td>
<td>67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1:23</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:22</td>
<td>15-16, 27,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>15-16, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>47, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>16, 18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:14</td>
<td>16, 32, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6:59</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 1:13-14</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3-5</td>
<td>46-47, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:41</td>
<td>15, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12b-14</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women Leaders in the Synagogue

Acts 17:4 140
18:1-17 16-17
18:2,18,26 149, 261
18:2-3,18 39
18:8,17 27, 248
18:12-17 28-29
18:26 39, 140, 150
21:18 47, 53
Romans 16:1-2 151
16:1 225, 233
16:3-5 39
16:3-4 149
16:3 261
16:5 39
16:6 150, 233
16:7 39, 149, 232
16:12 233, 261
1 Corinthians 1:11 233
1:12-16 232
3:4-11 232
9 39
16:16 150
16:19 39, 149-150, 261
Galatians 3:28 261
Philippians 4:2-3 233
Colossians 4:15 233
1 Thessalonians 2:9-12 38
4:1-2 38
5:12 150
2 Timothy 4:19 39, 150, 261
Philemon 2 233
10 38
Hebrews 2:10 37
12:2 37
James 5:14 47, 53

Other Early Christian Literature

The Acts of Paul and Thecla 233
The Acts of Pilate 22-23
De Altecatione Ecclesiae et Synagoge 63-64, 66, 72
Apostolic Constitutions 2.57 261
Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus 18 261

Ambrose
Exposition on Luke 6.50 228

Choricius of Gaza
Laudatio Marciani 2 261

John Chrysostom
Adv. Jud. 2.4-6 147
4.3 147
Homilia in Mattheum 73 261

Council of Laodicea
can. 11 234
Council of Nicaea
can. 19 225

Didascalia Apostolorum
2.57 261

Epiphanius
Panarion 30.2.6 235
30.11.1 227 236
30.18.2 22, 28, 47, 227

Eusebius
De ecclesiastica theologia 2.9 232
Hist. eccl. 7.10.4 223

Evagrius Scholasticus
Ecclesiastical History 4.31 261

Jerome
Epistles 121.10 228
In Matt. 23.5 263

Justin Martyr
Dialogue with Trypho 137 21-22, 28

Palladius
Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom 15 22, 28, 228

Procopius of Gaza
Monodia in Sanctam Sophiam 261

Tertullian
De ieiuno 16.6 248

Testamentum Domini
1.19, 23 261
1.41, 43 261
2.4, 8 261
Index of Ancient Sources Cited

Other Ancient Sources

Aristotle
The Nicomachean Ethics 8.12.4 232

Bacchylides 8.50-52 232

Cod. Theod.
16.8.1 235
16.8.2 46-51, 54
16.8.4 19, 29, 31, 48,
       65-66, 68, 91-92
16.8.6 146
16.8.8 235
16.8.13 20, 29, 31, 46,
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Cod. Iust. 1.9.15 50-51,
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       1.9.17 235
Novellae 146.1 50, 54

Macrobius
1.16.30 224

Plato
Timaeus 21E 232

Plutarch
Quaestiones Romanae 86 224

Plautus
Rudens 1.5 243

Scriptores Historiae
Augustae
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Alexander Severus
2.234-235 228
45.7 248

Tacitus
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Historiae 5.5 248