

Neues Testament und hellenistisch-jüdische Alltagskultur

Herausgegeben von
ROLAND DEINES, JENS HERZER
und KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
274*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)
James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

274



Neues Testament und hellenistisch-jüdische Alltagskultur

Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen

III. Internationales Symposium zum
Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti
21.–24. Mai 2009, Leipzig

Herausgegeben von

Roland Deines, Jens Herzer
und Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr

Mohr Siebeck

ROLAND DEINES, geboren 1961; Studium der evangelischen Theologie in Basel und Tübingen; 1997 Promotion; 2004 Habilitation; Professor für Neues Testament, Department of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Nottingham, UK.

JENS HERZER, geboren 1963; Studium der evangelischen Theologie in Berlin; 1993 Promotion; 1997 Habilitation; Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig.

KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR, geboren 1956; Studium der evangelischen Theologie an der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg; 1986 Promotion; 1991 Habilitation; Professor für Neues Testament an der Theologischen Fakultät der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151563-7

ISBN 978-3-16-150170-8

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2011 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Das Buch wurde von Gulde-Druck in Tübingen auf alterungsbeständiges Werkdruckpapier gedruckt und von der Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier gebunden.

Vorwort

Das III. Internationale Symposium zum Corpus Judaeco-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti (CJHNT) fand vom 21. bis 24. Mai 2009 in Leipzig statt. Nachdem die ersten beiden Symposien den literarischen Schriftenkorpora des Philo¹ (2003 in Eisenach/Jena) bzw. des Josephus² (2006 in Greifswald) gewidmet waren, stand die Leipziger Tagung im Zeichen der nicht-literarischen und materialen Kultur des hellenistischen Judentums und deren Bedeutung für die Erforschung des Neuen Testaments.

Für das Leipziger Symposium war nicht nur das 600. Gründungsjubiläum der hiesigen Alma Mater ein willkommener äußerer Rahmen. Insbesondere hat auch die Erforschung der antiken Alltagskultur in Leipzig Tradition, insofern in den Altertumswissenschaften Papyrologie und Epigraphik einen großen Stellenwert einnehmen und weit über die regionalen Grenzen hinaus durch das von Leipzig aus verantwortete Gemeinschaftsprojekt des Papyrus-Portals³ bekannt sind. Die Mitwirkung der Leipziger Papyrologie am Symposium ist daher an dieser Stelle besonders hervorzuheben, namentlich die Beteiligung des Kollegen Reinhold Scholl, der nicht zuletzt maßgeblich an der Realisierung des Projektes der virtuellen Zusammenführung des Codex Sinaiticus⁴ beteiligt war und im Rahmen des öffentlichen Vortrages auf dem Symposium einen lebendigen Einblick in die Arbeit der Leipziger Papyrologie gegeben hat.

Der Begriff der Alltagskultur als Thema des Symposiums ist allerdings in einem umfassenden Sinn zu verstehen. Die in dem vorliegenden Band dokumentierten Beiträge des Symposiums umspannen den gesamten Bereich jener nichtliterarischen Zeugnisse, die in besonderer Weise den Alltag der Menschen prägen: von Architektur und Baukultur bis hin zur

¹ Roland Deines / Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr (Hg.), Philo und das Neue Testament. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. I. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeco-Hellenisticum (1.–4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena), WUNT 172, Tübingen 2004.

² Christfried Böttrich / Jens Herzer (Hg., unter Mitarbeit von Torsten Reiprich), Josephus und das Neue Testament. Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. II. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeco-Hellenisticum (25.–28. Mai 2006, Greifswald), WUNT 209, Tübingen 2007.

³ Vgl. www.papyrusportal.de.

⁴ Vgl. www.codexsinaiticus.com/de/.

Denkmalskultur, von Namensgebung bis Numismatik und Ikonographie, von Inschriften bis zu den Papyrusdokumenten des alltäglichen Lebens. Die grundlegend leitende Frage war dabei nicht nur diejenige nach dem Wert dieser Zeugnisse für das Verständnis der hellenistisch-jüdischen Alltagswelt, sondern vor allem im Blick auf das Verständnis neutestamentlicher Texte und Traditionen. Der Horizont der Fragestellung wird durch die den Band einführenden Beiträge von Eric und Carol Meyers (Duke University) sowie Roland Deines (University of Nottingham) anschaulich entfaltet. Das Grundanliegen prägte – wie schon in bewährter Weise in den vorangegangenen Symposien – die Struktur der Tagung: Wie der Untertitel des Bandes anzeigt, geht es um die wechselseitigen Wahrnehmungen, so dass einem Vortrag über die materialen Zeugnisse jeweils ein Korreferat aus neutestamentlicher Perspektive beigelegt wurde. Ergänzt wurde dieses Vortragsprogramm durch Arbeitsgruppen, in denen exemplarisches Material gelesen und diskutiert wurde. Diese wechselseitige Perspektive nimmt darüber hinaus das Grundanliegen des CJHNT-Projektes auf, konsequent interdisziplinär zu arbeiten und dadurch aktuelle Forschungen der benachbarten altertumswissenschaftlichen Disziplinen im unmittelbaren Fachdiskurs zu thematisieren und aufzunehmen. Beteiligt waren Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler aus den Bereichen der Althistorik, Archäologie, Papyrologie, Epigraphik, Numismatik, Gräzistik, Judaistik sowie der neutestamentlichen Forschung aus den USA, Großbritannien, Österreich, der Schweiz, Russland und Deutschland.

Allen Referentinnen und Referenten, den Leitern der Arbeitsgruppen sowie allen Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmern sei an dieser Stelle nochmals ausdrücklich für ihre Beiträge und den daraus sich ergebenden, ausgesprochen ertragreichen Diskurs gedankt. Dass es einer wissenschaftlichen Tagung nicht nur gut ansteht, durch Vorträge ein Themenspektrum zu erschließen, sondern darüber hinaus auch in Arbeitsgruppen genügend Gelegenheit zur gemeinsamen Forschungsarbeit zu geben, das hat diese Tagung und das Engagement aller Teilnehmenden erneut gezeigt.

Der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung ist für die großzügige Finanzierung der Tagung zu danken. Ohne diese Förderung wäre ein solcher wissenschaftlicher Austausch nicht möglich. Unser Dank gilt darüber hinaus dem Verlag Mohr Siebeck, namentlich Herrn Henning Ziebritzki, der die Tagung nicht nur finanziell unterstützt hat, sondern auch – wie bereits bei den vergangenen Symposien – die Veröffentlichung des Tagungsbandes übernommen hat.

Für die Herstellung des Manuskriptes danken die Herausgeber Herrn Ionuț-Adrian Forga, der mit großer Akribie und Erfahrung diese Arbeit übernommen und das Autorenregister erstellt hat. Ihm zur Seite standen für das Lesen der Korrekturen Frau Claudia Tost und Herr Paulus Enke; Herr Sebastian Ziera hat die Stellen-, Sach- und Personenregister angefer-

tigt. Ihnen sowie Frau Tanja Mix, der verantwortlichen Mitarbeiterin des Verlages Mohr Siebeck, sei ebenfalls herzlich für ihre sorgfältige Arbeit gedankt.

Wie in den vorangegangenen Bänden werden auch in diesem Symposiumsband die im Rahmen des CJHNT-Projektes erarbeiteten Abkürzungen für die außerbiblischen Texte erneut abgedruckt, weil sie sich inzwischen bewährt haben und einen Standard innerhalb des Projektes darstellen, der auch darüber hinaus empfehlenswert ist.

Leipzig, im März 2011

Für die Herausgeber
Jens Herzer

Inhalt

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Vorwort | V |
| Abkürzungsverzeichnis | XIII |

Übergreifende Beiträge

ERIC M. MEYERS and CAROL MEYERS

| | |
|---|---|
| The Material Culture of Late Hellenistic – Early Roman Palestinian Judaism: What It Can Tell Us about Earliest Christianity and the New Testament | 3 |
|---|---|

ROLAND DEINES

| | |
|---|----|
| Non-literary Sources for the Interpretation of the New Testament: Methodological Considerations and Case Studies Related to the Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum | 25 |
|---|----|

REINHOLD SCHOLL

| | |
|--|----|
| Licht aus dem Osten. Die Leipziger Papyrussammlung und die Erforschung des Neuen Testaments | 67 |
|--|----|

Paarvorträge

Archäologie und Alltagskultur

RENATE PILLINGER

| | |
|--|----|
| Jüdische Alltagskultur in Ephesos und Umgebung im Spiegel der Denkmäler | 85 |
|--|----|

JÖRG FREY

| | |
|---|----|
| Das Johannesevangelium und seine Gemeinden im Kontext der jüdischen Diaspora Kleinasiens | 99 |
|---|----|

Architektur und Alltagskultur

ACHIM LICHTENBERGER

| | |
|--|-----|
| Zur Vorbildfunktion der Bauten Herodes' des Großen in Palästina | 133 |
|--|-----|

RAINER RIESNER

Herodianische Architektur im Neuen Testament 165

Namen und Identität

TAL ILAN

Jüdische Identität und die Namen von Juden in der Antike 197

DIETER SÄNGER

Sara, die Freie – unsere Mutter. Namenallegorese als Interpretament
christlicher Identitätsbildung in Gal 4,21–31 213

Alltagsethos und Epigraphik

WALTER AMELING

Paränese und Ethik in den kleinasiatischen Beichtinschriften.
Zu den Voraussetzungen christlicher Mission in Kleinasien 241

KARL-WILHELM NIEBUHR

Jüdisches, jesuanisches und paganes Ethos im frühen Christentum.
Inschriften als Zeugnisse für Rezeptionsmilieus neutestamentlicher
Texte im kaiserzeitlichen und spätantiken Kleinasien
am Beispiel des Jakobusbriefes 251

Münzen als Ausdruck der politischen Alltagskultur

ADELA YARBRO COLLINS

Portraits of Rulers in the Book of Revelation 275

Papyrusdokumente als Zeugnisse der Alltagskultur

PETER ARZT-GRABNER

Formen ethischer Weisungen in dokumentarischen Papyri
unter besonderer Ausrichtung auf 1Tim und Tit 301

JENS HERZER

Die Pastoralbriefe im Licht der dokumentarischen Papyri
des hellenistischen Judentums 319

Spuren hellenistisch-jüdischer Alltagskultur in Kleinasien

| | |
|--|-----|
| IRINA LEVINSKAYA | |
| The Traces of Jewish Life in Asia Minor | 347 |
| JENS SCHRÖTER | |
| Die jüdische Diaspora in der Apostelgeschichte | 359 |

Beiträge aus den Arbeitsgruppen

| | |
|---|-----|
| ANDREW CHESTER | |
| Jewish Inscriptions and Jewish Life | 383 |
| MARTIN MEISER | |
| Reinheitsfragen und Begräbnissitten. Der Evangelist Markus als Zeuge der jüdischen Alltagskultur | 443 |
| Autorenverzeichnis | 461 |
| Stellenregister | 463 |
| Autorenregister | 476 |
| Sach- und Personenregister | 486 |
| Register griechischer Begriffe | 493 |

Abkürzungsverzeichnis

Die Abkürzungen folgen bei deutschen Beiträgen in der Regel S. M. Schwertner, Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete, Berlin/New York 2. Auflage 1992. Biblische Bücher sowie Qumran-Texte werden hier nach dem Abkürzungsverzeichnis des Werkes Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, hg. v. H. D. Betz u.a., Bd. 1, Tübingen 4. Auflage 1998, abgekürzt. Für englische Beiträge gelten die Regeln des SBL Handbook of Style. Abweichende Abkürzungen, die nur in einem Beitrag vorkommen, werden an Ort und Stelle aufgelöst. Darüber hinaus finden folgende Abkürzungen Verwendung:

1 Abkürzungen in deutschen Beiträgen, die im Abkürzungsverzeichnis nach RGG⁴ fehlen:

| | |
|---------|--|
| ABG | Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte |
| AJEC | Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Fortsetzung von: Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums) |
| Anton. | Antonianum. Periodicum philosophico-theologicum trimestre, Rom |
| ArtB | The Art Bulletin |
| BAZ | Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte |
| BWM | Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographien |
| ECNT | Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament |
| FiE | Forschungen in Ephesos |
| IstMitt | Istanbuler Mitteilungen |
| JGS | Journal of Glass Studies |
| JRA | Journal of Roman Archaeology |
| PCPhS | Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society |

2 Abbreviations used in English contributions not to be found in The SBL Handbook of Style

| | |
|--------|--|
| ADPV | Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins |
| AJEC | Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (formerly Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums) |
| BAR | British Archaeological Reports |
| JRASup | Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series |
| SCI | Scripta Classica Israelica |
| ECNT | Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| OEANE | The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East |

| | |
|---------|--|
| NEAEHL | <i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i> |
| TAVO.B | Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orient, Beiheft (supplement) |
| SBF.CMa | Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Jerusalem), Collectio major |
| SBF.CMi | Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Jerusalem), Collectio minor |
| SPag | Sacra Pagina |

3 Abkürzungen des CJHNT

3.1 Frühjüdische Schriften

3.1.1 Philo

A. Gesetzesauslegung, *Expositio legis*

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Opif | De opificio mundi / Über die Weltschöpfung |
| Abr | De Abrahamo / Über Abraham |
| Jos | De Josepho / Über Josef |
| VitMos | De vita Mosis I–II / Über das Leben Moses |
| Decal | De decalogo / Über den Dekalog |
| SpecLeg | De specialibus legibus I–IV / Über die Einzelgesetze |
| Virt | De virtutibus / Über die Tugenden |
| Praem | De praemiis et poenis / Über die Belohnungen und Strafen |
| Praem 79–126 | auch: De Benedictionibus / Über die Segnungen |
| Praem 127–172 | auch: De Exsecrationibus / Über die Flüche |

B. Allegorischer Kommentar

| | |
|--------|--|
| LegAll | Legum allegoriae I–III / Allegorische Erklärung der Gesetze (zu Gen 2,4–3,19) |
| Cher | De Cherubim / Über die Cherubim (zu Gen 3,19–4,1) |
| Sacr | De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini / Über die Opfer Abels und Kains (zu Gen 4,2–4) |
| Det | Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat / Über die Nachstellungen die das Schlechtere dem Besseren bereitet (zu Gen 4,8–15) |
| Post | De posteritate Caini / Über die Nachkommen Kains (zu Gen 4,16–25) |
| Gig | De gigantibus / Über die Riesen (zu Gen 6,1–4) |
| Imm | Quod deus sit immutabilis / Über die Unveränderlichkeit Gottes (zu Gen 6,4–12) |
| Agr | De agricultura / Über die Landwirtschaft (zu Gen 9,20) |
| Plant | De plantatione / Über die Pflanzung (Noahs) (zu Gen 9,20) |
| Ebr | De ebrietate / Über die Trunkenheit (zu Gen 9,21) |
| Sobr | De sobrietate / Über die Nüchternheit (zu Gen 9,21–24) |
| Conf | De confusione linguarum / Über die Verwirrung der Sprachen (zu Gen 11,1–9) |
| Migr | De migratione Abrahami / Über die Wanderung Abrahams (zu Gen 12,1–4.6) |
| Her | Quis rerum divinarum heres sit / Über den Erben des Göttlichen (zu Gen 15,2–18) |
| Congr | De congressu eruditionis gratia / Über das Zusammenleben der Allgemeinbildung wegen (zu Gen 16,1–6a) |

| | |
|------|---|
| Fug | De fuga et inventione / Über die Flucht und das Finden (zu Gen 16,6b–9.11–14) |
| Mut | De mutatione nominum / Über die Namensänderung (zu Gen 17,1–5.15–22) |
| Deo | De Deo / Über die Gottesbezeichnung „wohlätig verzehrendes Feuer“ (nur arm., Siegert 1980) (zu Gen 18,2) |
| Somn | De somniis I–II / Über die Träume (zu Gen 28/31/37/41) |

C. Fragen und Antworten, *Quaestiones et solutiones*

| | |
|-----------|---|
| QuaestGen | Quaestiones in Genesim I–IV / Fragen zur Genesis (nur arm.) (zu Gen 2,4–28,9) |
| QuaestEx | Quaestiones in Exodum I–II / Fragen zu Exodus (nur arm.) (zu Ex 12,12–23; 20,25–28,38) |

D. Historisches und apologetische Schriften

| | |
|---------|--|
| Flacc | In Flaccum / Gegen Flaccus |
| LegGai | Legatio ad Gaium / Gesandtschaft an Gajus |
| VitCont | De vita contemplativa / Über das betrachtende Leben |
| Hypoth | Hypothetika bzw. Apologia pro Judaeis (fragmentarisch bei Euseb, PraepEv VIII 6,1–9; 7,1–20; 11,1–18) |

E. Philosophische Abhandlungen

| | |
|------|---|
| Prob | Quod omnis probus liber sit / Über die Freiheit des Tüchtigen |
| Prov | De providentia I–II / Über die Vorsehung |
| Aet | De aeternitate / Über die Unvergänglichkeit der Welt |
| Anim | De animalibus / Über die Tiere (nur arm.) |

3.1.2 Josephus

| | |
|------------|---|
| Bell I–VII | De Bello Judaico / Über den Jüdische Krieg |
| Ant I–XX | Antiquitates Judaicae / Jüdische Altertümer |
| Vita | Vita Josephi / Selbstbiographie |
| Ap I–II | Contra Apionem / Gegen Apion |

3.1.3 Sonstige jüdisch-hellenistische Schriften

(aufgelistet sind hier auch die sogenannten Apokryphen des LXX-Kanons, die eigentlich den biblischen Schriften zugehören)

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Achik | Achikar |
| ApkAbr | Apokalypse Abrahams |
| ApkAdam | Apokalypse Adams |
| ApkDan | Apokalypse Daniels |
| grApkDan | Griechische Apokalypse Daniels / Griech. Daniel-Diegesse (Berger 1976) |
| syApkDan | Syrische Daniel-Apokalypse (Henze 2001) |
| ApkElia | Apokalypse Elias |
| koptApkElia | Koptische Apokalypse Elias (Steindorff 1899) |
| hebrApkElia | Hebräische Apokalypse Elias (Jellinek, Bet ha Midrasch) |
| ApkEsra | Griechische Apokalypse Esras |
| (ApkMos) | (Apokalypse des Mose) siehe grLAE |
| ApkSedr | Apokalypse Sedrachs |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| ApkZef | Apokalypse Zefanjas |
| (ApkZos) | (Apokalypse des Zosimos) siehe HistRech |
| ApokrEz | Apokryphon Ezechiel |
| ApokrPs | Apokryphe Psalmen Davids (auch: syrische Psalmen Davids) |
| AristExeg | Aristeas der Exeget (bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 25,1–4) (AristExeg 1 etc. verweist auf Euseb, PraepEv IX 25,1) |
| AristobExeg | Aristobulos der Exeget |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, HistEccl VII 32,16–18 |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv VIII 9,38–10,17 (Frg. 2 10,3 verweist auf Euseb, PraepEv VIII 10,3) |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,1–2 |
| Frg. 4 | Euseb, PraepEv XIII 13,3–8 |
| Frg. 5 | Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,9–16 |
| ArtapHist | Artapanus der Historiker |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 18,1 |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 23,1–4 (zur Zit.weise s. AristExeg) |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 27,1–37 |
| (AssMos) | (Assumptio Mosis) siehe TestMos |
| 1Bar | Buch Baruch (LXX) |
| 2Bar | Syrische Baruchapokalypse |
| 3Bar | Griechische Baruchapokalypse |
| gr3Bar | Griechische Baruchapokalypse |
| slav3Bar | Slavische Baruchapokalypse |
| 4Bar | 4 Baruch (= Paraleipomena Jeremiae bzw. Jeremiou) |
| DemetrChron | Demetrius der Chronograph (zur Zit.weise s. AristExeg) |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 19,4 |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 21,1–19 |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,1–3 |
| Frg. 4 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,15 |
| Frg. 5 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 29,16 |
| Frg. 6 | ClemAlex, Strom I 21,141,1–2 |
| EldMod | Eldad und Modad |
| EpArist | Aristeasbrief |
| EpJer | Brief Jeremias (LXX, gelegentlich auch 1Bar 6) |
| 3Esra | Apokryphes Buch Esra (LXX) |
| 4Esra | Jüdische Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 3–14 |
| 5Esra | Christliche Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 1–2 |
| 6Esra | Christliche Apokalypse Esras = 4Esra 15–16 |
| EupolHist | Eupolemos der Historiker |
| Frg. 1A ¹ | ClemAlex, Strom I 23,153,4 |
| Frg. 1B | Euseb, PraepEv IX 26,1 |
| Frg. 2A | ClemAlex, Strom I 21,130,3 |
| Frg. 2B | Euseb, PraepEv IX 30,1–34 |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 34,20 |
| Frg. 4 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 39,2–5 |
| Frg. 5 | ClemAlex, Strom I 21,141,4f |

¹ Die Unterscheidung der Fragmente in A und B erfolgt nach dem Vorbild von Holaday im Falle von differenzierenden Parallelüberlieferungen.

| | |
|----------------|--|
| EzTrag | Ezechiel der Tragiker (Auszüge bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 28f) |
| 1Hen | Äthiopisches Henochbuch |
| aethHen | Äthiophische Überlieferung des 1Hen ² |
| aramHen | Aramäische Fragmente zum 1Hen (Milik 1976) |
| grHen | Griechische Fragmente zum 1Hen (Black 1970) |
| 2Hen | Slavisches Henochbuch |
| 3Hen | Hebräisches Henochbuch |
| HistJosef | Geschichte Josefs |
| HistMelch | Geschichte Melchisedeks |
| HistRech | Geschichte der Rechabiter (auch: Apokalypse des Zosimos) |
| JannJamb | Jannes und Jambres |
| Jdt | Judit (LXX) |
| JosAs | Josef und Asenet |
| Jub | Jubiläen (auch: Leptogenesis) |
| KleodMalchHist | Kleodemos Malchas |
| A | Zitat bei Josephus, Ant I 239–241 |
| B | Zitat bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,2–4 (übernommen von Josephus) |
| KlimJak | Klimax Jakobou / Leiter Jakobs |
| LAB | Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (auch: Pseudo-Philo) |
| LAE | Leben Adams und Evas |
| grLAE | Griechisches Leben Adams und Evas / Apokalypse des Mose |
| latLAE | Lateinisches Leben Adams und Evas (Meyer 1878) |
| armLAE I | Armenisches Buch Adams (Preuschen 1900) |
| armLAE II | Armenische Buße Adams (Stone 1981) |
| georgLAE | Georgisches Leben Adams und Evas (Mahé 1981) |
| slavLAE | Slavisches Leben Adams und Evas (Jagi 1883) |
| 1Makk | 1 Makkabäer (LXX) |
| 2Makk | 2 Makkabäer (LXX) |
| 3Makk | 3 Makkabäer (LXX) |
| 4Makk | 4 Makkabäer (LXX) |
| MartJes | Martyrium Jesajas (= Ascensio Jesaiae [AscJes] 1–5) |
| OdSal | Oden Salomos |
| OrJak | Oratio / Gebet Jakobs |
| OrJosef | Oratio / Gebet Josefs |
| OrMan | Oratio / Gebet Manasses (LXX [Odae 12]) |
| OrSynag | Hellenistische Synagogengebete (aus den Apostolischen Konstitutionen 7–8) |
| (ParJer) | (Paralipomena Jeremiae) siehe 4Bar |
| PhiloEpik | Philo der Epiker (zur Zit.weise s. AristExeg) |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,1a ³ |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 20,1b |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 24,1 |
| Frg. 4 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,1 |

² Sprachkürzel nur im Bedarfsfall zur Abgrenzung gegenüber der griechischen oder aramäischen Überlieferung, ansonsten steht 1Hen allein für die äthiopische Fassung.

³ Abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von Walter, JSRZ IV/3, 148–153, in Übereinstimmung mit Holladay, indem jede Zitateinleitung als Markierung verwandt wird. Diese Erhöhung der Zahl der Fragmente erlaubt eine präzisere Zitation.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Frg. 5 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,2 |
| Frg. 6 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 37,3 |
| PseudAisch 1–12 | Gefälschte Aischylos-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 131,1–3; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 261f = Dram.-Gnom. I) |
| PseudApoll 1–2 | Gefälschtes Apollon-Orakel (Euseb, PraepEv IX 10,4; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 276 Nr. XVI) |
| PseudDiph 1–3 | Gefälschte Diphilos-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 5 [irrtümlich Menandros zugeschrieben]; ClemAlex, Strom V 133,3; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 269f = Dram.-Gnom. VII) |
| PseudEupolHist | Pseudo-Eupolemos / Samaritanischer Anonymus |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 17,2–9 |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 18,2b |
| PseudEurip | Gefälschte Euripides-Verse |
| 1,1–2 | PseudJustin, Mon 2 [irrtümlich Philemon zugeschrieben]; ClemAlex, Protr 68,3; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 263 = Dram.-Gnom. III |
| 2,11–20 | ClemAlex, Strom V 75,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 265–267 = Dram.-Gnom. V |
| 3,1–2 | PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,1–3 [irrtümlich Diphilos zugeschrieben] ; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 270 = Dram.-Gnom. VIII |
| PseudHekatHist I ⁴ | Pseudo-Hekataios I |
| Frg. 1 | Josephus, Ap I 183–205 |
| Frg. 2 | Josephus, Ap II 43 |
| PseudHekatHist II | Pseudo-Hekataios II ⁵ |
| Frg. 1 | Josephus, Ant I 154–157 (fehlt bei Holladay) |
| Frg. 2 | Josephus, Ant I 161 (fehlt bei Holladay) |
| Frg. 3 | Josephus, Ant I 165 (fehlt bei Holladay) |
| Frg. 4 | ClemAlex, Strom V 113,1–2 (= Frg. 3 bei Holladay) |
| PseudHesiod | Gefälschte Hesiod-Verse |
| 1,1–2 | ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse IX |
| 2,1–2 | ClemAlex, Protr 73,3; Strom V 112,3; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 275 = Weitere gefälschte Verse XV |
| PseudHomer 1–4 | Gefälschte Homer-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse X) |
| PseudKallim 1–5 | Gefälschte Kallimachos-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 271–273 = Siebener-Verse XI) |
| PseudMenand 1–24 | Gefälschte Menander-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 4 [irrtümlich Philemon zugeschrieben]; ClemAlex, Strom V 119–120; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 267–269 = Dram.-Gnom. VI) |
| PseudMenandSyri | Sprüche des syrischen Menander |

⁴ Die Aufteilung der Hekataios-Fragmente in der Forschung ist umstritten, wobei zwischen einem und drei verschiedenen Verfassern unterschieden wird; eine gute Übersicht über die Zuteilung der Überlieferung bei Holladay 292f. Die hier gegebene Aufteilung folgt Walter, JSHRZ I/2, 144–153.

⁵ Abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 158–161.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| PseudOrph | Pseudo-Orpheus (Zitierung nach N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 235–243) ⁶ |
| Rez. A | PseudJustin, Mon 2 / Cohor 15 = Orph. Frg. 245 [Kern] = version J in OTP II = shorter version; diese Version auch durch einzelne Zitate bei ClemAlex, Strom u. Protr, bezeugt (= version C ¹ in OTP II) |
| Rez. B | ClemAlex, Strom V 123,2–124,1 = Orph. Frg. 246 [Kern] = version C ² in OTP II (entspricht weitgehend Rez. C) |
| Rez. C | Euseb, PraepEv XIII 12,5 = Orph. Frg. 247 [Kern] = version E in OTP II = longer version |
| Rez. D | Tübinger Theosophie (Text: C. R. Holladay, Fragments IV 220f) |
| PseudPhilem 1–10 | Gefälschte Philemon-Verse (PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,1–3 [irrtümlich Diphilos zugeschrieben]; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 265–267 = Dram.-Gnom. V) |
| PseudPhiloJona | Über Jona, hellen. Synagogenpredigt (arm., Siegert 1980) |
| PseudPhiloSimson | Über Simson, hellen. Synagogenpredigt (arm., Siegert 1980) |
| PseudPhok | Pseudo-Phokylides |
| PseudPind 1–4 | Gefälschte Pindar-Verse (ClemAlex, Strom IV 167,3; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 275 = Weitere gefälschte Verse XIV) |
| PseudPyth | Gefälschte Pythagoras-Verse |
| 1,1–4 | PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 107,1–108,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 273 = Jüd. Pseudo-Pythagorika XII |
| 2 | PseudJustin, Cohor 19b; ClemAlex, Protr 72,4; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 274 = Jüd. Pseudo-Pythagorika XIII |
| PseudSoph | Gefälschte Sophokles-Verse |
| 1,1–9 | PseudJustin, Mon 2; ClemAlex, Strom V 113,1–2; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 262f = Dram.-Gnom. II |
| 2,1–11 | PseudJustin, Mon 3; ClemAlex, Strom V 121,4–122,1; = N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 264f = Dram.Gnom. IV |
| (PsDav) | (Syrische Psalmen Davids) s. ApokrPs |
| PsSal | Psalmen Salomos |
| (syrPs) | (Syrische Psalmen) s. ApokrPs |
| QuaestEsra | Quaestiones / Fragen Esras |
| RevEsra | Revelatio / Offenbarung Esras |
| SapSal | Sapientia Salomonis / Weisheit Salomos (LXX) |
| Sib | Sibyllinische Orakel |
| Sir | Jesus Sirach (LXX) |
| TestXII | Testamente der 12 Patriarchen |
| TestRub | Testament Rubens |
| TestSim | Testament Simeons |
| TestLevi | Testament Levis |
| TestJuda | Testament Judas |
| aramTestJuda | Testament Judas nach der aram. Überlieferung |
| TestIss | Testament Issachars |
| TestSeb | Testament Sebulons |
| TestDan | Testament Dans |

⁶ Zitierung nach der Zählung der 47 Hexameter d.h. PseudOrph 34 und in Klammer dahinter die Angabe der Rezension. Wenn alle Rezensionen übereinstimmen, kann dieser Hinweis entfallen.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| TestNaf | Testament Naftalis |
| hebrTestNaf | Testament Naftalis aus der hebr. Chronik des Jerachmeel |
| TestGad | Testament Gads |
| TestAss | Testament Assers |
| TestJos | Testament Josefs |
| TestBenj | Testament Benjamins |
| TestAdam | Testament Adams |
| TestAbr | Testament Abrahams |
| TestHiob | Testament Hiobs |
| TestIsaak | Testament Isaaks |
| TestJak | Testament Jakobs |
| TestMos | Testament Moses (auch: Assumptio Mosis) |
| TestSal | Testament Salomos |
| TheodEpik | Theodotus der Epiker |
| Frg. 1 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,1 |
| Frg. 2 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,2 |
| Frg. 3 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,3 |
| Frg. 4 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,4–6 ⁷ |
| Frg. 5 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,7 |
| Frg. 6 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,8–9 a |
| Frg. 7 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,9b |
| Frg. 8 | Euseb, PraepEv IX 22,10–11 |
| TheophHist | Theophilus der Historiker (bei Euseb, PraepEv IX 34,19) |
| Tob | Tobit (LXX) |
| TrSem | Schrift / Traktat des Sem |
| VisEsra | Vision Esras |
| VitProph | Vitae Prophetarum |

3.2 Frühchristliche Schriften

3.2.1 „Apostolische Väter“

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Barn | Barnabasbrief |
| Did | Didache |
| Diogn | Diognetbrief |
| Herm | Hirt des Hermas |
| HermVis | Hirt des Hermas, Vision / Visio I-V |
| HermMand | Hirt des Hermas, Gebot / Mandatum I-XII |
| HermSim | Hirt des Hermas, Gleichnis / Similitudo I-X |
| Ign | Ignatiusbriefe |
| IgnEph | Brief des Ignatius an die Epheser |
| IgnMagn | Brief des Ignatius an die Magnesier |
| IgnTrall | Brief des Ignatius an die Traller |
| IgnRöm | Brief des Ignatius an die Römer |
| IgnPhilad | Brief des Ignatius an die Philadelphier |
| IgnSmyr | Brief des Ignatius an die Smyrner |
| IgnPolyk | Brief des Ignatius an Polykarp |

⁷ Ab hier abweichende Zählung der Fragmente von N. Walter, JSHRZ IV/3, 167–171 in Übereinstimmung mit C. R. Holladay.

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 1Klem | 1. Klemensbrief |
| 2Klem | 2. Klemensbrief |
| MartPolyk | Martyrium des Polykarp |
| Papias | Papias-Fragmente (Zitierung nach der Nummerierung bei K. Wengst, SUC III, Darmstadt 1998, d.h. Papias Frg. 1 etc.) |
| Polyk | Brief des Polykarp |
| Quadr | Quadratus-Fragment |

3.2.2 Patristische Quellen

Zur Orientierung sind eine Reihe von Abk. genannt; weitere sind in Entsprechung dazu zu bilden.

| | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| ClemAlex | Clemens Alexandrinus |
| Protr | Protreptikos |
| Strom | Stromateis |
| Epiph | Epiphanius von Salamis |
| Pan | Panarion |
| Euseb | Eusebius von Caesarea |
| DemEv | Demonstratio evangelica |
| HistEccl | Historia ecclesiae |
| PraepEv | Praeparatio evangelica |
| Hier | Hieronymus |
| Justin | Justinus Martyr |
| Dial | Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon |
| PseudJustin | Pseudo-Justin |
| Cohort | Cohortatio ad gentiles |
| Tert | Tertullian |

Übergreifende Beiträge

The Material Culture of Late Hellenistic – Early Roman Palestinian Judaism

What It Can Tell Us about Earliest Christianity and the New Testament

ERIC M. MEYERS and CAROL MEYERS

Investigating the material culture of ancient Palestine is an important part of biblical study. Just as the focus on Late Bronze and Iron Age sites has contributed for generations to the study of the Hebrew Bible, attention to sites of the Greco-Roman period in recent decades now helps in the study of the New Testament. It has been amazing to observe the rapid growth of the field of “archaeology of the New Testament” within such a short time span. Our own work in Galilee over a period of almost four decades – at four, small Jewish villages in Upper Galilee and one cosmopolitan urban site in Lower Galilee – informs some of the material presented in this paper. It has been a privilege to contribute in this way to the development of archaeological approaches that illumine the emergence and development of early Christianity as well as early Judaism.¹

Our goal in this paper is to provide an overview, or synthesis, of developments in the field of archaeology related to the early centuries in Palestine as the setting of early Christianity. We indicate how the archaeological work of the last three to four decades has led to a new consensus about the Jewish character of Galilee in relation to Hellenism and about the interaction between urban and rural communities in the first century C.E. and later. In terms of the New Testament itself, as appropriate, we point to a number of texts that may be understood in a new way in the light of insights made possible by studying recent archaeological discoveries. But the overall thrust is to consider the larger picture of life in the early centuries C.E., in Galilee as well as in Judea, as informed by studying burial practices, synagogue architecture, and other aspects of material culture.

¹ We are grateful to the wonderful staff, students, and colleagues who have worked with us over the years and who have contributed to this field.

1 Influence of Hellenism

Most scholars turn to the time of Alexander the Great in the late Second Temple period to assess the advent of Hellenic influence in Palestine.² However, extensive evidence of Greek culture appeared in Palestine already in the preceding two centuries of Achaemenid rule, from 539 to 332 B.C.E.³ Perhaps the most notable indicator of Greek presence, probably in the form of commerce and also colonization along the coast, is the rich repertoire of ceramics imported from Greece; these include many undecorated vessels as well as the distinctive, glossy Attic ware – first black-figured on a red background, and later red-figured on black.⁴ Another sign of Greek influence is the depiction of the Athenian owl on the coinage of Yehud.⁵ Other examples are freestanding sculpture and the Hippodamian plan of cities in the coastal plain.⁶ In contrast, the evidence of Persian culture in this period consists largely of the construction of new roadways and forts to protect Persian imperial interests in the east Mediterranean.⁷

Consequently, when Alexander arrived in Jerusalem after defeating Darius III, a significant substratum of culture, manifest in the material remains, already existed and comprised the foundation for what was to be a very long engagement of the Semitic East with Greek civilization. One of the earliest literary responses to the arrival of Hellenic thought and culture

² E.g., Oren Tal, “Hellenism in Transition from Empire to Kingdom: Changes in the Material Culture of Hellenistic Palestine,” in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (ed. Lee I. Levine and Daniel R. Schwartz; TSAJ 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 55–73.

³ For a convenient summary of this era see Ephraim Stern, “Between Persia and Greece: Trade, Administration and Warfare in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods (539–63 B.C.E.),” in *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land* (ed. Thomas E. Levy; New York: Facts on File, 1996), 432–45. See also Eric M. Meyers, “Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine,” in *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (ed. David Biale; New York: Schocken, 2002), 134–78, and Andrea M. Berlin, “Hellenistic Palestine: Between Large Forces,” *BA* 80 (1997), 2–51. The classic treatment in English is Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1974); trans. *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ³1988). Many of Hengel’s assumptions have been challenged because of new discoveries and re-assessments.

⁴ Ephraim Stern, “Ceramics of the Persian Period,” *OEANE* 1:465–69.

⁵ For a superb and well-illustrated presentation of both the ceramic and numismatic data see John W. Betlyon, “A People Transformed: Palestine in the Persian Period,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 68 (2005), 4–58: 24–25, 47, and passim.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 31–37.

⁷ Kenneth G. Hoglund, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Mission of Ezra and Nehemiah* (SBLDS 125; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 165–205.

in the East is the Book of Qohelet (Ecclesiastes), which probably dates to either the end of the Persian period or the beginning of the Hellenistic era. This book reflects an early Jewish response to the intellectual and social challenges associated with the rise of Hellenism. Texts that were to become the Hebrew Bible had yet to offer any view of afterlife that dealt with the question of posthumous judgment. The biblical idea of *nepeš*, often translated “soul,” actually involves a person’s entire being and vitality, the body as well as the personality of an individual.⁸ In Greek philosophy, however, the idea of the soul was understood in Platonic terms: the body was the physical prison in which the immaterial soul was trapped. Qohelet was confronting the challenge of new ideas and was not yet ready to accommodate to them. Nor was Ben Sira, who, a century or so later, strongly maintained that Wisdom, the true inheritance of Israel (Sir 24:32), was to be found in the Torah of Moses, whereas Greek philosophy essentially viewed the world as intelligible by reason. This was apparently a new concept for the Jewish people, and it first becomes evident in the writings of Philo Judaeus of Alexandria in the first century C.E.

Because of Alexander the Great’s goal of unifying the world into one giant *oikumene* with common cultural forms, including language, art, and architecture, along with the philosophical ideas espoused in Greek education, Hellenism’s contact with other traditions is often considered a culture clash.⁹ However, we offer another view, namely, that the encounter of Greek culture with others over several centuries was one of the most important and positive developments in the history of humanity, presaging the current era of globalization. To be sure, Hellenism posed many challenges for each culture that it encountered; yet ultimately it allowed each of those cultures to formulate its distinctive views in a more universalistic and accessible way than was possible before its interaction with Hellenism. This was especially true of emerging Judaism and its interpretation of biblical theology and ideas.

As we have suggested, the engagement of Judaism with Greek culture began already in the Persian period; and it continued until the dawn of the Middle Ages.¹⁰ For nearly a millennium, Jews in the eastern Empire and Palestine embraced various features of Greco-Roman culture without com-

⁸ E. Meyers, “Jewish Culture” (see n. 3), 139–40; cf. Horst Seebass, “*nepeš*,” *TDOT* 9:497–519.

⁹ See the discussion by Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), xiv–xv. Reacting to the older view of a culture class, Gruen sees both Palestinian and Diasporic Judaism as symbiotic responses to Hellenic culture, leaving their respective Judaisms intact.

¹⁰ Eric M. Meyers, “The Challenge of Hellenism for Early Judaism and Christianity,” *BA* 55 (1992), 84–91; 86, and Glen W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), *passim*.

promising their own heritage. Indeed, Jewish accommodation to Hellenism made it possible to express the most emblematic Jewish values in innovative ways. For example, we can ask whether Rabbi Judah the Patriarch could have accomplished the editing and publication of the Mishnah in the early third century C.E. if he hadn't been living in the urban center of Sepphoris, which was thoroughly acculturated to Greco-Roman ways by that time.¹¹ Similarly, could Paul's achievement in spreading the message of Jesus have succeeded if much of his audience had not already embraced the Hellenized world of Athens and Rome? Or, perhaps even more important, could that message have been so well received and understood had many peoples of those areas not been aware of some form of diasporic Hellenistic Judaism? Moreover, it is unlikely that the Hebrew Bible could have had the impact it did on world civilization had it not been translated into Greek in the Hellenistic period by Hellenized Jews.¹² That is, the early church probably would not have been able to incorporate the Hebrew Bible into its worship, liturgy, and theology had Jewish scripture been available in Hebrew or Aramaic only. These are some of the larger issues to keep in mind as we seek to understand this epochal cultural process – the merger of Athens and Jerusalem.

Our views of the relationship of Hellenism and Judaism differ from those of a great scholar, Martin Hengel, who devoted much of his life to this subject and whose work on the Hellenistic influence on Second Temple Judaism has had an enormous impact, especially on New Testament scholarship. One of the main points he makes is that Palestine was thoroughly Hellenized by the Hasmonean period, if not before, and that the material record of the land reflects that reality.¹³ In his opinion, the Maccabean struggle is testimony to that reality, as is the translation of Ben Sira into Greek only two generations after it was written. Indeed, there is strong evidence for the Hellenization of Judea. Examples, discussed below, include Herod the Great's vast building projects, including the remodeling of

¹¹ This is the thesis of E. Meyers, "Jewish Culture" (see n. 3), and underlies all of the joint publications of the authors regarding Sepphoris in the Roman period. For summaries of the work on Sepphoris see Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, "Sepphoris," *OEANE* 4:527–35 and, more recently, Zeev Weiss, "Sepphoris," *NEAEHL* 5:2029–35.

¹² See Tessa Rajak, "The Greek Bible among Jews in the Second Century CE," in *Jewish Identities* (see n. 2), 321–32. Rajak notes the continuing process of the translation of the Bible into Greek after 70 C.E. among Greek-speaking Jews.

¹³ See Hengel's major work, *Judaism and Hellenism* (see n. 3). His more recent remarks on this subject may be found in "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (ed. John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 6–37, now in idem, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen: Kleine Schriften VII* (ed. Claus-Jürgen Thornton; WUNT 253; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 179–216.

the temple and the construction of palaces at Jericho and Masada, a grand port city at Caesarea, and a palace fortress at Herodium.¹⁴

However, Hengel perhaps overstates his case for Hellenization in not recognizing that some major areas of Jewish habitation were not so rapidly or thoroughly Hellenized. Consider Galilee in this regard. Assessing the degree to which the process of Hellenization occurred must take into account the epigraphy of different regions. Greek is hardly attested in Galilee until the early second century C.E., whereas Judea has an abundance of material in Greek at the turn of the era. Most of the inscriptions found there are in Greek; and others, especially many of the ossuary inscriptions, are bilingual. These important data clearly indicate that Jews in Jerusalem and Judea by the end of the Hasmonean era may have been thoroughly Hellenized, while still maintaining their Jewish values and identity,¹⁵ but that may not have been the case, or to the same extent, in all areas of Jewish Palestine.

Another significant consideration is that the Qumran sect was established in this period; almost all of its diverse literature was written in Hebrew, although the degree to which the Qumran community remained apart from the dominant Hellenistic milieu of Judea is not clear.¹⁶ In this period too, other Jewish groups, notably the Sadducees and the Pharisees, emerged and formulated their ideas, which had an enormous impact on the evolution of classical or rabbinic Judaism as well as the early Christian movement. These groups remained in the mainstream of Semitic Jewish thought; and it would be difficult to argue that either was thoroughly Hellenized, although early Pharisaism was apparently familiar with Greek forms of rhetoric and argumentation and used them in their academies.¹⁷

¹⁴ The most extensive treatment of Herod's architectural projects are Achim Lichtenberger, *Die Baupolitik Herodes des Großen* (ADPV 26; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), and Ehud Netzer, *The Architecture of Herod the Great Builder* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2008); see especially pp. 288–94.

¹⁵ Especially helpful on this topic is Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002), 91–150.

¹⁶ For a discussion of this complex issue, see Eric M. Meyers, "Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scroll* (ed. John J. Collins and Timothy Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

¹⁷ Henry Fischel, "Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism," in *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (ed. Henry Fischel; New York: Ktav, 1977), 443–72.

2 Material Culture: Burial Practices

Changes in Jewish burial practices, visible in the archaeological record, are among the indicators of the arrival of Hellenistic ways. Jewish values with respect to burial and afterlife were clearly maintained in burial practices, but there were new developments. For example, the existing pattern of multiple burials collected in a subterranean tomb gave way to individual burial receptacles or individual interments. For the elites, this meant that the bodies of the deceased were placed in sarcophagi (coffins) and ossuaries (reburial of an individual's desiccated mortal remains or bones into a small container), typically bearing an inscription identifying the deceased, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This change, especially the use of inscriptions, probably reflects the Greek emphasis on the individual maintaining his or her identity in death as in life.

The use of ossuaries has often been interpreted as a reflection of the pious practices of the Pharisees, who practiced extreme purity measures;¹⁸ but it more likely arises from the meeting of the two cultures, with Jews now placing a greater emphasis on the individual in death, possibly borrowing the ossuary either from the receptacles – cinerary urns – Romans used for the ashes of the dead or, more likely, from the *astodans*, in which Parthians re-buried the bones of the dead.¹⁹ At the same time, these receptacles (both sarcophagi and ossuaries) were placed in recesses, called *loculi* or *arcosolia*, in rock-cut tombs where deceased family members had similarly been placed; this practice, as we explain below, maintained the importance of kinship ties as expressed by burial in a subterranean family tomb.²⁰

The discovery of the tomb and ossuary of Caiaphas, high priest in the time of Jesus, reveals that even a Sadducee practiced reburial and seemingly believed in “renewed existence” after death, contrary to what is normally thought to be Sadducean belief (e.g., Mark 12:18–27; Acts 23:6–9; Jo-

¹⁸ Notably by Levi Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collection of the State of Israel* (Jerusalem: The Israel Antiquities Authority and the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994), 53–55. This book presents a view that Rahmani held throughout his career and appears in all his previous publication. Eric M. Meyers questioned that view already in *Jewish Ossuaries: Reburial and Rebirth* (BibOr 24; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971), 85, where he wrote: “It is an oversimplification to suggest that the custom of Jewish ossuaries reflects only the Pharisaic community of Jerusalem, which adhered to a rather literal conception of resurrection.”

¹⁹ E. Meyers, *Jewish Ossuaries* (see n. 18), 27–31.

²⁰ For a review of this material in its broader context see E. Meyers, *Jewish Ossuaries* (see n. 18), and Byron R. McCane, *Roll Back the Stone: Death and Burial in the World of Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 27–60.

sephus *J.W.* 2.164–165; *Ant.* 18.16).²¹ Similarly, another ossuary has been identified as that of a Sadducean because of its Aramaic inscription: “Yehochana daughter of Yehochanan, son of Theophilos, the high priest”; Theophilos, probably the son of the high priest Ananus whose term in office was 37–41 C.E., was a Sadducean.²² The names of other Sadduceans on ossuaries – Boethus, Annanias, and Ananus – further suggest that this form of secondary reburial was common among the urban elites, perhaps indicating belief in post-mortem existence as well as a propensity for the individualism of a receptacle keeping the remains of one body separate from other burials.

The Caiaphas ossuary is also interesting because a coin of Herod Agrippa I, dated to 42–43 C.E., was found in a skull in the ossuary, possibly signifying payment to the Greek deity Charon for carrying the deceased spirit across the River Styx. This is likely an instance of cultural syncretism, which combines Jewish and Greco-Roman customs in a single practice of a supposedly “conservative” Jewish faction.²³

Not only elite Jews used individual interments. Other inhumation practices of the period involved individual burials. Notable in this regard is the discovery at Beit Safafa, near Jerusalem, of forty-seven rectangular shaft graves, each containing the skeletal remains of one person.²⁴ Similarly, other burials, presumably those of commoners, have been discovered outside Jerusalem, where individuals were interred in depressions, ca. 30 cm deep, cut into the bedrock and then covered with stone slabs.²⁵ These are in sharp contrast to the elaborate family tombs of the elites in which ossuaries were deposited: the magnificent monuments in the Kidron Valley in Jerusalem, such as the tombs of Zechariah, Absalom, and the Bnei Hezir²⁶; and especially the elaborate sarcophagus recently found in the tomb of Herod the Great at Herodium.²⁷

²¹ Zvi Greenhut, “Burial Cave of the Caiaphas Family,” *BAR* 18 (1992), 28–36, 76.

²² For the names in this tomb, especially Caiaphas, see Ronny Reich, “Caiaphas Name Inscribed on Bone Boxes,” *BAR* 18 (1992), 38–44, 76.

²³ Greenhut, “Burial Cave” (see n. 21), 35, especially the caption “Styx and Bones.” See also Rachael Hachlili and Ann Killebrew, “Was the Coin-on-Eye Custom a Jewish Burial Practice in the Second Temple Period?” *BA* 46 (1983), 147–53.

²⁴ Boaz Zissu, “Odd Tomb Out: Has Jerusalem’s Essene Community Been Found?” *BAR* 25 (1999), 50–55, 62. Because of their similarity to Qumran burials, Zissu suggests that the Beit Safafa burials are those of Jerusalem Essenes.

²⁵ Jonathan L. Reed, *The HarperCollins Visual Guide to the New Testament* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 95.

²⁶ Rachael Hachlili, *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period* (JSJSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 29–34.

²⁷ Netzer, *Architecture of Herod* (see n. 14), ix–xiv.

Hellenization may have brought with it the process of individuation, evidenced in inscribed coffin and ossuary burials. However, at the same time, placing the individual receptacles in family tombs indicates the persistence of longstanding local burial customs. Family tombs indicate strong kinship ties, which may be reflected in the biblical idiom “to be gathered to one’s ancestors.”²⁸ That the ossuaries and coffins often contain the burial of more than one individual, sometime with multiple names appearing in the inscription, may also signify an emphasis on reuniting family members after death. And the use of ossuaries also reinforced family ties in that it required the family to gather not only for the initial interment but also for the re-interment many months later. Such a practice may have left its mark in the New Testament idiom “let the dead bury their own dead” (Matt 8:22 par. Luke 9:60). McCane persuasively argues that this phrase reflects the realia and social context of secondary burial, for the would-be disciple is requesting time to gather the bones of his father, presumably for reburial.²⁹ The force of Jesus’ words thus is ironic, for the dead could obviously not perform this task.

3 Other Aspects of Material Culture

In turning to other features of the material world, Herod the Great (37–34 B.C.E.) emerges as the most influential force for advancing Hellenization after Alexander. To be sure, Greco-Roman architectural forms had appeared in the region before the time of Herod. Two prominent examples of this, both dating to the beginning of the Hasmonean era, are the Tomb of Jason (a member of the priestly Oniad family) in Jerusalem³⁰ and ‘Iraq el-Amir in Transjordan.³¹ But Herod the Great, more than anyone, changed the face of monumental architecture in Roman Palestine; and his building projects were surely his greatest cultural legacy.³² These many projects include: the Temple Mount complex and the area around it, constructed on a grand scale with colonnaded streets and the pilgrim way leading to steps

²⁸ E. Meyers, *Jewish Ossuaries* (see n. 18), 14 n. 38.

²⁹ McCane, *Roll Back the Stone* (see n. 20), 74–75.

³⁰ Hachlili, *Jewish Funerary Customs* (see n. 26), 34–36.

³¹ Fawzi Zayadine, “‘Iraq el-Amir,” *OEANE* 3:177–80.

³² See Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), Appendix A, 197–202, for a list of all Herod’s buildings, whether they survived or not. Richardson has carefully collated all the relevant literary references to Herod’s buildings. For individual cities and their archaeological remains, see Netzer’s authoritative work (*Architecture of Herod* [see n. 14]) and the entries for those cities in the two major archaeological reference works: *NEAHL* and *OEANE*.

built against the southern wall of the temple precinct;³³ a large palace in Jerusalem;³⁴ theaters at Caesarea, Damascus, and Sidon;³⁵ resorts and refuges at Masada, Jericho, and Herodium;³⁶ pagan temples at Sebaste, Caesarea, Banias,³⁷ and possibly Omrit;³⁸ and a deep-sea harbor at Caesarea Maritima, which probably meant that an increased array of goods from the Mediterranean Basin were arriving in Palestine by the time of Jesus.³⁹

In addition to his monumental building projects, Herod was probably responsible for the construction of dozens of *miqva'ot*, intended for the use of pilgrims, in Jerusalem including along the southern wall of the temple precinct and at the Siloam Pool.⁴⁰ Ritual baths were also discovered at Herod's desert resorts: at the winter palace at Jericho, originally built by the Hasmoneans but subsequently refurbished by the Herodians; at Masada at the very heart of the western palace, adjacent to the storeroom; at Lower Cypros, a Herodian outpost south of the Wadi Qelt; and at Lower Herodium. That *miqva'ot* were found at all these sites suggests that Herod wanted his family and staff to have access to facilities necessary for adhering to Jewish purity concerns.⁴¹

Although most of the structures he built were explicitly Greco-Roman in form and also, to some extent, function, Herod seemed to know what kinds of buildings would be acceptable to the Jewish population of his realm. At the very least he was careful to place them so as not to offend Jewish sensibilities. Still, some of his projects and activities were apparently meant to please his Roman patrons and sponsors as well as to serve his personal interests. In several Gentile cities – for example, Acco/Ptolemais, Tripolis, and Damascus – Herod built *gymnasia*, where youths could be educated in Greek language and culture. In Caesarea, which was predominantly Gentile, he organized the quinquennial games. In Samaria/Sebaste he built a new city for Gentiles. Although he erected a theater, amphitheater, and hippodrome accessible to residents of Jerusalem, he situated them outside the city at a distance from the Jewish population of the capi-

³³ Netzer, *Architecture of Herod* (see n. 14), 137–78.

³⁴ Loc. cit., 246–47.

³⁵ Loc. cit., 279; Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews* (see n. 32), 186–88.

³⁶ Netzer, *Architecture of Herod* (see n. 14), 17–42, 179–201.

³⁷ Loc. cit., 270–76.

³⁸ J. Andrew Overman, “Horvat Omrit,” *NEAEHL* 5:1987–89.

³⁹ Netzer, *Architecture of Herod* (see n. 14), 94–118.

⁴⁰ See the recent statement on this subject by Boaz Zissu and David Amit, “Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean *Miqwa'ot* (Ritual Immersion Baths),” in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 47–62, 237–42 (notes): 57–59.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 51–52.

tal. That is, his policy was to separate his more explicitly Roman projects from the Jewish population by locating them in Gentile areas or at least away from concentrations of Jews. That he did so likely indicates that there were tensions in the early first century about the intrusion of foreign culture to Jewish lands.

Note, however, that the somewhat later theater at Sepphoris was constructed in the heart of the Jewish quarter of the city and possibly adjacent to the homes of leading Jewish citizens. This theater dates to the end of the first century C.E.,⁴² perhaps indicating that the Jewish inhabitants of Sepphoris, and maybe even the country as a whole, had become more tolerant of Roman cultural forms by then.

Herod's apparent sensitivity to the fact that Jews had to share their land with outsiders – Romans, Macedonians, Syrians, and other ethnic groups – suggests that, although Greco-Roman culture had made significant inroads into Palestine by the first century C.E., there were limits to what the Jewish population would tolerate. Whereas the Hasmonean leadership sought to homogenize the population of the land through forced conversion to Judaism, Herod's political skills allowed him to create cultural forms that different factions could tolerate and even accept. Several centuries later this successful model of apparent multi-ethnic harmony was to appear in Galilee, where Jews and Gentiles interacted positively in the predominantly Jewish cities such as Sepphoris and Tiberias and also in the largely Gentile cities of Tyre, Caesarea Philippi/Banias, and the Decapolis. The presence of some Jews in these predominantly Gentile cities is known from both literary and archaeological sources. And sizeable Jewish minorities lived in several of those cities, including Tyre and Beth Shean.

All told, Herod's achievements are impressive, as indicated by the *Res gestae* compiled by Richardson using that of Augustus as a model.⁴³ Despite some of the dreadful things he did to both family members and enemies, many of his accomplishments were positive. Although hated by various segments of the population in his own time, Herod clearly left an indelible mark on the history of the Jewish people.

4 Galilee in the Time of Jesus

Galilee for the most part was mainly Jewish in the time of Jesus. Indeed, one of the most important contributions of archaeological work in Galilee

⁴² Some would date it earlier, to the time of Jesus or Herod Antipas (ca. 4 B.C.E.–39 C.E.); see Richard A. Batey, *Jesus and the Forgotten City: New Light on Sepphoris and the Urban World of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1991), 83–104.

⁴³ Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews* (see n. 32), 315–18.

in recent decades has been to establish that fact. How have scholars of material culture accomplished this assessment of the nature and extent of Jewish presence in first-century Galilee? We can point to several developments.

For one thing, advances in the analysis of archaeological data have contributed to a dramatic improvement in the dating of pottery and identifying its distribution. Trace element analysis of potsherds has shown where the main production centers were and hence how items were traded and sold. The efforts of our Sepphoris excavation team, which worked very closely with David Adan-Bayewitz of Bar Ilan University, have been quite significant in this regard.⁴⁴ This kind of analysis has demonstrated that there was much greater interaction between Upper and Lower Galilean sites than was previously thought. For example, the Jewish city of Sepphoris in Lower Galilee bought pottery from at least one Jewish manufacturing center in Upper Galilee (Khirbet Hananiah). That the Sepphorean Jews did so may signal their desire to purchase ceramic vessels from Jewish manufacturers, which may indicate Jewish interest in purity concerns.⁴⁵

Another contribution of archaeology has been the discovery of *miqva'ot* in numerous excavations all over the country. Seven hundred of them, many dating to the first century, have now been identified.⁴⁶ The existence of a large number of ritual baths in Galilee indicates a Jewish population that was far more observant in this regard than previously thought. In Sepphoris, for example, more than thirty ritual baths, dating mainly to the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, have been discovered on the western summit, the so-called “Jewish quarter” of the site.⁴⁷

Consider too the nature of the faunal remains excavated at Sepphoris. Apparently there was a complete absence of pork consumption throughout the entire Roman period in areas of the city presumed to be Jewish, whereas thirty percent of the animal remains were pig bones in areas shown to be

⁴⁴ David Adan-Bayewitz’ work in this area is exemplified by his pioneering study, *Common Pottery of Roman Galilee* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1993); see also his many other studies, such as “The Local Trade of Sepphoris in the Roman Period,” *IEJ* 40 (1990), 153–72.

⁴⁵ Adan-Bayewitz made this point already in *Common Pottery* (see n. 44), 237.

⁴⁶ Yonatan Adler, “Second Temple Period Ritual Baths Adjacent to Agricultural Installations: The Archaeological Evidence in Light of the Halakhic Sources,” *JJS* 59 (2008), 62–72. For the discussion about how to identify a stepped pool as a *miqveh*, see, inter alia, Zissu and Amit, “Common Judaism” (see n. 40), and Stuart S. Miller, “Stepped Pools and the Non-Existent Monolithic ‘Miqveh,’” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough; ASOR Annual 60/61; Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 215–34.

⁴⁷ Katharina Galor, “The Stepped Water Installations of the Sepphoris Acropolis,” in *The Archaeology of Difference* (see n. 46), 201–24.

pagan or Christian on the basis of artifacts such as decorated lamps, stamped jars with crosses, or inscriptional remains, to be pagan or Christian.⁴⁸ In all probability a similar pattern would be found at other sites if faunal analysis were to be carried out. Although it may be debatable whether the absence of pigs was an ethnic marker of Israelites in pre-exilic times, it surely was a mark of Jewish identity by the first century.

Finally, analysis of chalkstone vessels – mostly bowls, plates, and cups – has also contributed to our understanding of Jewish life at first century C.E. sites in Judea as well as Galilee. These vessels are ubiquitous in this period and are often in the context of ritual baths and private domiciles. They were surely used by Jews, judging from the reference to them in the New Testament in relation to the story of the wedding at Qana (John 2:6). Their presence indicates an awareness of biblical purity laws and a desire to avoid transmitting impurity; for, according to later rabbinic texts, chalkstone vessels, unlike ceramic ones, are impervious to impurity.⁴⁹

Clearly the data amassed in recent decades provides much greater certainty about the ethnic and religious character of Galilee than was possible before we began excavating there over forty years ago. Many other projects have similarly contributed to the expanded corpus of materials illuminating the character of Galilee in the Hellenistic-Roman period. Notable in this regard are the excavations at Nazareth, Khirbet Qana, and Yodfat (Jotapata).⁵⁰

Gender archaeology too has much more recently begun to contribute to the interpretation of material culture in ways that affect our understanding of attitudes to women in early Judaism and Christianity.⁵¹ For example, in

⁴⁸ See Billy J. Grantham, “A Zoological Model for the Study of Ethnic Complexity at Sepphoris” (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1996), and more recently, “The Butchers of Sepphoris: Archaeological Evidence of Ethnic Variability,” in *The Archaeology of Difference* (see n. 46), 279–90.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 158–61. Cf. also the contribution of R. Deines in this volume (pp. 34–38).

⁵⁰ For Nazareth, see Stephen Pfann, Yehudah Rapuano, and Ross Voss, “Surveys and Excavations at the Nazareth Village Farm (1997–2002): Final Report,” *BAIAS* 25 (2007), 19–79; for Yodfat, see Mordechai Aviam, “Yodfat,” *NEAEHL* 5:2076–78. The only publication to date on Qana is Douglas R. Edwards, “Khirbet Qana: From Jewish Village to Christian Pilgrim Site,” in *The Roman and Byzantine Near East III* (ed. John H. Humphrey; JRASup 49; Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2002), 101–32. In addition, the discovery of a residential building in Nazareth from the time of Jesus has just been announced; see “A Residential Building from the Time of Jesus was Exposed in the Heart of Nazareth,” Israel Antiquities Authority Press Office (12/21/2009). Online: http://www.antiquities.org.il/article_Item_eng.asp?sec_id=25&subj_id=240&id=1638&module_id=#as.

⁵¹ Carol Meyers’ book *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) was a pioneering work in this area with respect to household life and gender dynamics in the Iron Age; see more recently her “Archäologie

village settings grinding flour to produce bread was done largely by women using the millennia-old method of rubbing grains of wheat, spread on a concave stone surface, with a convex hand stone. The location of these tools, with several sets of grinding tools often found near each other, indicates that women often worked side-by-side to ease the tedium of this laborious and time-consuming task. However, in urban contexts, at least at Sepphoris, flour was produced, probably in commercial workshops, by the new machines – lever (Olynthus) mills or donkey mills – reaching the east Mediterranean in the Roman period.⁵² Analysis of the relation of women's work in flour production to their status in their households and communities indicates that village women who ground their own flour at home worked long hours to do so but may have enjoyed considerable status and household power, as contributors to the family economy and also as participants in networks of women that facilitated mutual aid in the community. In contrast, in cities with commercial mills, women, probably from the elites, could acquire their flour in markets and would thus have had more leisure time, which in turn made them vulnerable to the charges of improper behavior underlying many of the prejudices and related misogyny of the rabbis.⁵³ Note that the New Testament has Jesus speaking about two women grinding together (Matt 24:41; Luke 17:35), as would have been the case for village women. Because such women presumably enjoyed household power and status, their presence in Christian Scripture challenges claims that Jesus liberated women from an inferior status in Jewish families.⁵⁴

als Fenster zum Leben von Frauen in Alt-Israel," in *Die Bibel und die Frauen: Eine exegetisch-kulturgeschichtliche Enzyklopädie*, vol. 1.1: *Tora* (ed. Irmtraud Fischer and Mercedes Navarro Puerto, with Andrea Taschl-Erber; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2009), 63–109. However, gender archaeology focusing on the Hellenistic-Roman period has been slower to emerge.

⁵² Carol Meyers, "Grinding to a Halt: Gender and the Changing Technology of Flour Production in Roman Galilee," in *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities* (ed. Sandra Montón-Subías and Margarita Sánchez-Romero; BAR Archaeological Series 1862; Oxford: ArchaeoPress, 2008), 65–74: 67–69.

⁵³ Ibid., 70–72.

⁵⁴ The New Testament also seems aware of the existence of milling machines, notably the donkey mill: the *μύλος ὀνικῶς* of Matt 18:6 and Mark 9:42, where Capernaum is the setting. It is not certain that those machines would have existed at first century Capernaum, probably not a true urban site at that time, although it was one of Galilee's larger villages, so Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 152. To the best of our knowledge the many donkey mills still seen displayed on site at Capernaum are Late Roman and Byzantine in date.

5 Ancient Synagogues – pre-70 C.E.

Another area of archaeological research, perhaps the most prominent one with respect to our understanding of earliest Christianity as well as Judaism, is the excavation of synagogues, especially those of the late Second Temple period, in both Palestine and the Diaspora. A plethora of field projects exploring Hellenistic-Roman sites has led to the documentation of pre-70 C.E. Palestinian synagogues⁵⁵ at Masada, Gamla, Herodium, Qiryat Sefer, Dor, Caesarea, and possibly Jericho, Capernaum, Khirbet 'Itri, and most recently at Migdal.⁵⁶ Diaspora examples from the first century C.E. or earlier have been discovered at Ostia and Delos;⁵⁷ and, although none has yet been discovered, synagogues that perhaps date as early as the third century B.C.E. probably existed in Egypt according to ancient texts and inscriptions.⁵⁸ Both Palestinian and Diaspora synagogues are mentioned in first-century literary sources, such as Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament;⁵⁹ and epigraphic remains such as the Theodotus inscription are another source of textual information.⁶⁰ These data strongly suggest that the central function of the earliest synagogues in Palestine was communal gathering for prayer and for study of Scripture.

However, providing a place for reading Scripture and for prayer and study was not the only function of the early synagogue as analysis of several of their features indicates.⁶¹ Built of local stone, the pre-70 syna-

⁵⁵ For a convenient summary of the early pre-70 C.E. synagogues see Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 42–73, and also Levine's more recent views in "The First-century Synagogue: Critical Reassessments and Assessments of the Critical," in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions and New Approaches* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards; New York: Routledge, 2004), 70–102, and "'Common Judaism': The Contribution of the Ancient Synagogue," in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 27–46.

⁵⁶ The Migdal example has only recently been discovered, and the details that would allow us to check the dating have not been released. See "Unique Ancient Synagogue Exposed at Sea of Galilee" (09/14/2009). Online: <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Israel+beyond+politics/Unique-ancient-synagogue-exposed-at-Sea-of-Galilee-14-SEP-2009.htm>.

⁵⁷ Levine, *Ancient Synagogue* (see n. 55), 74–123.

⁵⁸ For a compendium of literary references to Diaspora synagogues, see Anders Runesson, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 118–247. This book also gives literary references to pre-200 C.E. Palestinian synagogues; see 20–79.

⁵⁹ See Donald D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS 169; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997), 41–90.

⁶⁰ John S. Kloppenborg, "Dating Theodotus (*CIJ* II 1404)," *JJS* 51 (2000), 243–80.

⁶¹ See Levine's extensive treatment of this subject in *Ancient Synagogue* (see n. 55) 124–59.

gogues in Palestine were small, simple structures.⁶² Diversity in building plan is a defining characteristic of these synagogues, perhaps indicating a variety of functions. The Judean examples all have *miqva'ot* nearby, indicating that ritual purification of objects and persons took place near synagogues. Perhaps most important is the fact that the early synagogues are devoid of artistic decoration and inscriptions; they certainly had none of the Jewish symbolism found in mosaics and carved reliefs in later synagogues. Moreover, unlike later synagogues, none had a Torah Shrine or *bema*; and none seems to have been intentionally oriented to Jerusalem. That is, the pre-70 synagogues lacked specifically religious features in their architecture, suggesting that they served some community functions in addition to being places for reading Scripture, prayer, and study.

The likelihood that the earliest synagogues were used for multiple purposes is supported by the possibility that the model for the early synagogue was probably the Hellenistic *bouleuteria* or *ecclesiasteria*, where people assembled to decide community matters.⁶³ In this regard, note the report in Josephus (*J.W.* 2.266–270, 284–292; *Ant.* 20.173–178, 182–184) about the actions of Jews in the Caesarea synagogue on the Sabbath in 65–66 C.E. on the eve of the Great Revolt. That they were gathering to consider their status in that city indicates that a political meeting took place in the synagogue and thus that the building had a function other than as a place only for specifically religious activities. Note that the New Testament reports that Jesus attends synagogue on Shabbat, reading from the Torah (Luke 4:16–20); but it also indicates other activities – casting out demons (Luke 4:31–37) and “teaching in the synagogues and proclaiming the good news” (Matt 4:23). Finally, the Theodotus inscription provides relevant information:

Theodotus, son of Vettanos, priest and *archisynagōgos*, son of an *archisynagōgos* grandson of an *archisynagōgos*, built the synagogue for Torah-reading and for the teaching of the commandments. Furthermore, [he built] the hostel and the chambers, and the water installation for lodging needy strangers. Its foundation stone was laid by his ancestors, the elders, and Simonides.⁶⁴

In addition to mentioning the religious and educational nature of the early synagogue, it also refers to its function as a hospice or hostel as well as about its priestly and administrative leadership.

⁶² E.g., the Gamla and Masada synagogues probably held no more than 250 individuals: 150 on benches and perhaps another 100 standing or seated in the center; see Reed, *HarperCollins Visual Guide* (see n. 25), 65–66. The synagogues at Qiryat Sefer and Jericho (if in fact the Jericho building is a synagogue) would have held half that number.

⁶³ Levine, “Common Judaism” (see n. 55), 39–40.

⁶⁴ Translation by K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2008), 75.

Clearly, the emergence of the synagogue in various locations and diverse forms signified the growing decentralization of Jewish life at this time, even though Herod's rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem and the concomitant expansion of its priestly precincts indicate that the idea of the centrality of the Holy City was not only continuing but perhaps becoming more prominent. Yet, the reality of the late Second Temple period was that, despite the emphasis on the Jerusalem temple, the synagogue was already becoming a pivotal institution, serving diverse communal needs, in Jewish communities both in the Diaspora and in the homeland. It is in this context that Jesus' ministry in Galilee and perhaps Syria involved appearances in synagogues.

6 Ancient Synagogues – post-70 C.E.

After the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., the synagogue became the central communal and religious institution of Jewish life. A brief glimpse of the synagogue in the post-70 C.E. Roman period is in order, for some of its characteristics may already have been present in its first-century precursors. Indeed, it is only after 70 that its specifically religious character appears in the archaeological record and that its sacred character becomes dominant; but those were also among the diverse functions of the earlier synagogues.

Most post-70 synagogues exhibit archaeological features relating to their religious functions. The earliest post-70 Galilean synagogue is that of Nabratein; it dates to the second century C.E. and has the earliest *bema* and possible Torah Shrine.⁶⁵ The *bema* is on the southern wall of the Nabratein synagogue, indicating the orientation of the building to Jerusalem. Although Jerusalem was no longer a Jewish city at this time, its conceptual significance as the Holy City was maintained in the orientation of synagogues, with the focus of worship toward Jerusalem. This focus is found in synagogues all over Roman Palestine and in the Diaspora too.

In contrast to the architectural diversity of earlier synagogues, the dominant plan of the post-70 synagogue is the Roman basilica. The choice of that form in the first centuries C.E. is another indication, in addition to what we have already mentioned, that many Jews found features of Roman culture congenial. Yet the local Jewish community did not always relinquish their indigenous architectural forms. The third to fifth century C.E. synagogue at Khirbet Shema' provides a fascinating illustration of this

⁶⁵ Eric M. Meyers and Carol L. Meyers, *Excavations at Ancient Nabratein: Synagogue and Environs* (Meiron Excavation Project Reports 6; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 35–44, and especially Figs. 7 and 8 and Photos 5–7.

point.⁶⁶ Like the synagogues of Eshtemo‘a and Susiya in the south, the Khirbet Shema‘ synagogue is a broadhouse (or broadroom) structure, as were many temples in the Semitic world, with its *bema*, or focus of worship, on the long, Jerusalem-oriented wall. Yet, with its characteristic columniation, and when viewed looking east-west rather than to the south, it appears basilical. It thus exhibits a mixed or hybrid architectural type: its classical basilical features are derived from Roman building types, and its broadhouse plan represents an indigenous form that echoes Canaanite prototypes. This combination of plans meant that the Holy Ark, placed on the *bema* of the long southern wall, facing Jerusalem, could not be seen from all directions because the many columns along the main sight lines blocked it. The Khirbet Shema‘ synagogue, although later than the first century, is a striking indication of the creative response of Palestinian Jews to Greco-Roman culture and Hellenistic influence.

Another indication of Roman architectural influence on the ancient synagogue of the late Roman and Byzantine periods is the Torah Shrine as the focus of worship. This component of synagogue buildings was likely modeled after the pagan aedicule. Perhaps the best example is the oldest extant Torah Shrine: the one from the third century C.E. synagogue at Nabratein.⁶⁷ Its elaborate construction on a raised *bema*, with columns and rampant lions as well as a place for a chain to hold the *nēr tāmīd* (perpetual light; cf. *m. Tamid* 3:9), indicates how important Scripture had become in the life of the Jewish people at the time when the Mishnah was edited and the formation of the canon of the Hebrew Bible was coming to a close.

Another feature of the developing synagogue – the use of Scripture in the form of scrolls – is known from depictions, dating to the third century C.E. and later, in ancient art of the Torah Shrine as a receptacle for scrolls.⁶⁸ That this was already the case in the pre-70 C.E. synagogue is indicated by the reference in Luke 4:16–20, where Jesus reads a prophetic passage (Isa 61:1–2; 58:6) from a scroll. In contrast, the sacred books of early Christianity were apparently in the form of a codex – probably an invention of Greco-Roman culture – according to the evidence from ancient mosaics and frescoes.⁶⁹ This may mean that in this respect, the syna-

⁶⁶ Eric M. Meyers, A. Thomas Kraabel, and James F. Strange, *Ancient Synagogue Excavations at Khirbet Shema‘: Upper Galilee, Israel, 1970–1972* (AASOR 42; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1976), 40, Fig. 3.10, Photos 3.30, 33, 34, 35.

⁶⁷ Meyers and Meyers, *Ancient Nabratein* (see n. 65), Photo 26 and Figs 11, 12, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28.

⁶⁸ For examples, see Eric M. Meyers, “The Torah Shrine in the Ancient Synagogue: Another Look at the Evidence,” in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction During the Greco-Roman Period* (ed. Steven Fine; London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 201–23; 204–7.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

gogue as a Jewish house of worship differed from the places, apart from synagogues, where the first Christians prayed.⁷⁰ However, Christianity in the East was still in the formative stages in the first centuries C.E., as indicated by the absence of a distinct symbolic vocabulary and of any structures that can be identified as having been purposely built as churches. Wherever Christians prayed in the early centuries, it is likely that they used the codex rather than scrolls.⁷¹

In this regard, early Christian architecture needs further attention. Take the case of Capernaum and especially Peter's house, both of which are critical for archaeological study of early Christianity. Capernaum was the center of Jesus' Galilean ministry; it was his "own town" according to Matt 9:1. It was where Jesus preached, performed miracles, and chose five of the apostles – Peter, Andrew, James, John, and Matthew – according to the Gospels (Matt 4:13–22, 8:5–22; 9:1–34; Mark 1:21–34, 2:1–17; Luke 7:1–10). Also, according to Luke (7:5), Jesus stayed numerous times at the house of Peter. Just as many of the early Pharisees and Jesus' disciples had gathered before in Jerusalem "from house to house" (Acts 2:46), so too did the first Christians gather at Capernaum and at other key places in Jesus' ministry. The house of Peter is located in the *insula sacra*, some 30 m south of the magnificent synagogue built of white limestone and dating to the late fourth century C.E. Peter's house was clearly venerated by the fourth century C.E., when it became a *domus ecclesia*. At this time an enclosure wall was built around it; and Christian pilgrims left many inscriptions in Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic. Despite the statement in Luke 7:5 that a Roman centurion built a synagogue at Capernaum, there is no indisputable evidence for a first century synagogue under the great fourth century one.⁷² Therefore, the data from Capernaum probably do not contradict the hypothesis that earliest Christianity in the Holy Land had no structure built exclusively for worship.⁷³ The oldest such structure in the East is at Dura Europos, where a third century C.E. building represents the architectural adaptation of a private house to a house church, or *domus ecclesia*. It is almost certain that the house church first provided Palestinian Christian communities with a meeting place for study and prayer.⁷⁴ The

⁷⁰ See the discussion below of the Christian house-church and the fact that some Christians prayed in synagogues. See also the contribution of R. Riesner in this volume (pp. 165–196).

⁷¹ See E. Meyers, "Torah Shrine" (see n. 68), 206–7.

⁷² The case for the existence of a pre-fourth century is presented in Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue* (see n. 58), 25–31.

⁷³ For a convenient summary of the archaeology of the site, see Stanislaw Loffreda, "Capernaum," *NEAEHL* 1:291–94.

⁷⁴ To the best of our knowledge, there is no equivalent "house-synagogue," although the excavators of Horvat 'Itri suggest that a first-century building they identify as a syna-

absence of buildings dedicated solely to Christian worship in the Roman period is in accord with evidence in Patristic sources that the early Christians continued to worship in synagogues, apparently attracted by the “awesomeness” of those buildings (Chrysostom, *Homilies against the Jews* 1.3), their holiness as a place where the Torah and Prophets were read (1.5), and perhaps also by the prestige of its leaders who could heal and do wonders (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4.31).⁷⁵ At least some Jews likely opposed the presence of early Christians in the synagogue, given that the *birkat haminim*, or maledictory prayer against heretics, was added to the Eighteen Benedictions of synagogue liturgy no later than the mid-second century C.E. if not somewhat earlier, perhaps soon after 70 C.E.⁷⁶

7 Qumran

Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls are surely relevant to the discussion of archaeology and early Christianity and Judaism, but the issues surrounding the interpretation of both the texts from and the archaeology of the site are so contentious that a full discussion is beyond the scope of this paper. A few brief comments will have to suffice. One important point is that the new discoveries near the Dead Sea and recent scientific analysis of the ceramics from Qumran now provide compelling evidence that the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran were not isolated from their surroundings as had often been claimed.⁷⁷ On the basis of both provenience study and the renewed attention to ceramic typology in its regional context, the putative isolation of the community has now been seriously challenged.⁷⁸ Chemical analysis of some Qumran sherds shows that the clays from which they were made came from Jerusalem, indicating that either the clays or the jars

gogue may have been adapted from a house; see Boaz Zissu and Amir Ganor, “Horvat ‘Etri—A Jewish Village from the Second Temple in the Judean Foothills,” *Qad* 123 (2002), 18–27 [Hebrew].

⁷⁵ Reuven Kimelman, “Identifying Jews and Christians in Roman Syria-Palestine,” in *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (ed. Eric M. Meyers; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 301–33: 307–9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 323–27. Kimelman’s point is that the tensions were from both sides, Jewish and Christian, in respect to the “other.” The rise of Jewish Christianity and the fall of the temple in 70 C.E., with the concomitant animosity toward Rome, surely occasioned the addition of the nineteenth benediction in position number 12. The text loosely translated is “May there be no hope for slanderers and may all wickedness instantly perish, and may all your enemies be quickly destroyed. And may you speedily uproot, smash, destroy, and humble the insolent quickly in our day.” See also Joel Marcus, “Birkat Ha-Minim Revisited,” *NTS* 55 (2009), 523–51.

⁷⁷ E. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran” (see n. 16).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

themselves were “imported.” The corpus of pottery forms draws heavily from contemporary local traditions. The scroll jars themselves have been shown to be modifications of several storage jar types; these forms were adapted for scroll storage by making their openings large enough for rolled scrolls to be inserted in them. Another observation is that the unique character of the site, with its more than ten ritual baths and its elaborate water system, supports the view that its inhabitants were extremely observant of purity laws. Also, although the shaft tombs in Qumran’s cemetery have affinities to other burials in the region and even to the Beit Safafa interments mentioned above, the near absence of female skeletal remains supports the claim that ascetic male Essenes inhabited the site. Finally, despite arguments to the contrary, it seems certain that the scrolls stored or perhaps hidden in the caves are related to the inhabitants of Qumran. For one thing, because most of the scrolls were found in caves that are very close to the site, it is difficult to imagine how the process of climbing to the caves with jars of scrolls to be stored could have escaped notice of the Qumran residents. Furthermore, the discovery of a number of blank fragments among the scrolls supports the widely accepted claim that the Qumran community was responsible for writing many if not all of the documents discovered in the caves.⁷⁹

Assessing the degree to which the content of the scrolls contributes to a better understanding of early Christianity is a complicated task, which we leave to others. That said, we want to emphasize that perhaps the most important contribution of Qumran for understanding early Christianity comes from the scrolls themselves rather than from the archaeology of the site. They indicate that the Essenes and the early Christians shared certain key concepts and beliefs: both expected the Kingdom of God to be imminent; both believed that their respective leader (the Teacher of Righteousness for the Essenes, and Jesus for the Christians) received his revelation from God and shared it with his followers; and both expected the imminent appearance of a messianic figure (two messiahs, a priestly and a prophetic one, in the Qumran literature; and Christ’s reappearance for the early Christians). Although the notions of the immanence of the Kingdom of God and of the Second Coming have been modified, many of these features survive in Christianity but not in Judaism. Clearly, the evidence from Qumran, mainly its scrolls and to a lesser extent its archaeological remains, are invalua-

⁷⁹ References to these blank pages can be found in Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History, 1947–1960* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 153 n. 31. Fields says that Roland de Vaux, the original excavator of Qumran, wanted to buy several pieces of blank parchment that had come onto the market and were reported to have come from caves 4 and 5 at Qumran; de Vaux believed that these blank pages would support his claim that documents were being written and copied on parchment scrolls at Qumran.

ble for understanding the beliefs and perhaps practices of both Jews and Christians of the Early Roman period.⁸⁰

8 Concluding Comment

This glimpse into the material culture of Late Hellenistic and Early Roman Judaism indicates how important it is for scholars of early Judaism and Christianity to be familiar with archaeological data. To ignore the evidence of material culture is to ignore an important vehicle, to be used in addition to the study of ancient texts, for entering the world of early Christianity. If we have focused largely on Jewish material remains, it is because, as far as we know, those are the only ones that have been recovered; that is, the material culture of the Christians of the first centuries seems not to have been distinct from that of their Jewish and Roman context, with much of Jewish culture itself being an amalgam of Semitic and Greco-Roman features. Engaging in the discoveries of archaeology, along with utilizing the ever more sophisticated ways of analyzing millennia-old literature, is the optimal way to reconstruct the world of early Judaism and Christianity and to understand its social and religious dynamics.

⁸⁰ In addition to E. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran” (see n. 16) see *inter alia* Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1973); trans. *L'archéologie et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Schweich lectures, 1959; London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1961) and Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002).

Non-literary Sources for the Interpretation of the New Testament

Methodological Considerations and Case Studies Related to the Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum

ROLAND DEINES

1 Introduction

The papers collected in this book have one thing in common: They lavish readers with a wealth of fascinating material remnants of Jewish life in the Hellenistic-Roman Era both in Israel and the various Diasporas. Due to our training as Biblical scholars, the focus lies very much on non-literary *written* sources. For those not regularly dealing with epigraphical, numismatic, papyrological and archaeological sources, these areas might seem to include too much to handle with any confidence. While this may well be the case, I want to take this opportunity to point to some further fields and topics which might also profitably be taken into consideration for the study of New Testament texts in general, with particular reference to the *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum*.

2 Non-literary artefacts as part of the *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum*

The following programmatic statement stands at the beginning of the renewed *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum*:

The aim of the *Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* is to make accessible those witnesses of early Judaism which are influenced by Hellenistic culture and the political-economical circumstances of the Hellenistic-Roman era, for the research and interpretation of the New Testament. (...) The arrangement of the source-excerpts follows that of the New Testament writings and they were chosen according to their significance for the understanding of New Testament passages. The source-excerpts should be presented in

their original language and translation as they relate to the understanding of the New Testament.¹

In the following, I want to address two issues in relationship to the aim of the CJH and the topic of this volume. The first is the necessity of contextualizing individual archaeological artefacts in the same way as individual words, phrases or whole text-passages need to be contextualized into their wider literary setting. As the meaning of a specific word depends on the sentence in which it is used so the meaning of an archaeological artefact depends on the context in which it is situated. The second is the precise meaning of “Judaean-Hellenistic” as it is used in the programmatic statement of the project, in dealing with archaeological artefacts from the Jewish world to which the New Testament writings belong.

1. The quotation above refers only to texts in the narrow sense of the word. Therefore one might argue that it is enough for the sake of the CJH to deal with those texts which help us to contextualize the New Testament texts. One might also include inscriptions and other non-literary but nonetheless textual evidence as provided by papyrology, numismatics and epigraphy. But is there any need to go further and to include non-textual objects and archaeological remains? And if so, how should they be treated in a commentary on texts? Ever since my first visit to the Wohl-Museum in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City in Jerusalem² in 1990 I have been attracted by the visibility of the ancient world, which up to this point I had mainly known from literary sources and the relatively few pictures that were available in textbooks, journals like *Biblical Archaeological Review*,

¹ K.-W. Niebuhr, “Das Corpus Hellenisticum: Anmerkungen zur Geschichte eines Problems,” in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: Mit einem Anhang zum Corpus Judaean-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (ed. W. Kraus and K.-W. Niebuhr; WUNT 162; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 361–82: 363: “Ziel des *Corpus Judaean-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* ist die Bereitstellung von Zeugnissen des Frühjudentums in seiner durch die hellenistische Kultur und die politisch-ökonomischen Verhältnisse der hellenistisch-römischen Epoche geprägten Gestalt für die Erforschung und Interpretation des Neuen Testaments. (...) Anordnungsprinzip der Quellenauszüge ist die Textfolge der neutestamentlichen Schriften, Auswahlprinzip ihre Aussagekraft für das Verständnis neutestamentlicher Aussagen. Die Quellenauszüge sollen in ihren für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments wesentlichen Passagen in Originalsprache und Übersetzung (...) wiedergegeben werden.”

² For a very helpful guide to this important site and museum see N. Avigad, *The Herodian Quarter in Jerusalem: Wohl Archaeological Museum* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1991), and now also M. Küchler, *Jerusalem: Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zur Heiligen Stadt* (OLB IV.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 581–89. The idea for my book on the Jewish stone vessels (see below n. 12) originated during a guided tour of this museum.

or were used as slides in lectures.³ After all it was only relatively recently that the world wide web made millions of pictures and countless videos showing the remnants of the ancient world available at one's fingertips. But even the relatively limited amount of pictures of archaeological artefacts available to me during my time as a student helped to increase and adjust my 'apperceptive encyclopedia' to the actual world of the texts I am interested in beyond a reliance on my own cultural knowledge and background.⁴ The new visual opulence, however, makes it even more necessary to understand what is depicted in the plethora of archaeological images now so easily available.

To demonstrate the necessity of contextualization of individual archaeological artefacts I would like to start with the uncontroversial use of inscriptions within the CJH. We are used to treating inscriptions like texts, and we use them like texts. But inscriptions are very often firmly rooted in a non-literary archaeological context. An inscription mentioning the donor of a building is often ambiguous as long as the context of the building is not clear: Is the donation for a synagogue, a church, or the building of another cult assembly? Rainer Riesner has recently drawn attention again to the "House of Leontis" which was excavated in Beth Shean/Scythopolis. Is it a synagogue, a house-church, or a Jewish-Christian meeting place, and, if the latter, should it be labelled a church or a synagogue? The central inscription reads "be remembered for good and for praise the Kyrios Leontis the Kloubas, because for the salvation of himself and of his brother Jonathan has he paved this from his own."⁵ Another short inscription on the

³ I recall with gratitude the lectures of Professor Siegfried Mittmann in Tübingen on the archaeology of the Holy Land, which were always illustrated with slides. In 1990/91 I had the privilege to stay for one year as a guest at the German Protestant Institute of Archaeology in Jerusalem on the Mount of Olives, directed by Professor August Strobel (1930–2006) who willingly shared with me his wide-ranging knowledge. In 1997/98 I returned to the Institute as assistant of Professor Volkmar Fritz (1938–2007) under whose guidance I learnt some basic skills of archaeological fieldwork. All three scholars, each in his own way, shaped my understanding that the biblical texts should not be read and interpreted without their geographical and material context, for which I am deeply grateful.

⁴ Cf. U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979); for the application of Eco's concept in 'reading' archaeological findings see S. Alkier and J. Zangenberg, "Zeichen aus Text und Stein: Ein semiotisches Konzept zur Verhältnisbestimmung von Archäologie und Exegese," in *Zeichen aus Text und Stein: Studien auf dem Weg zu einer Archäologie des Neuen Testaments* (ed. S. Alkier and J. Zangenberg; TANZ 42; Tübingen: Francke, 2003), 21–62: 51–56.

⁵ Μνήσθ/ εἰς ἀγαθὸν κ(αὶ) (ε)ἰς/ εὐλογίαν ὁ Κύριος/ Λεόντις/ ὁ Κλούβας ὅτι ὑπὲρ (menorah)/ σ<ω>τηρίας αὐτοῦ κ(αὶ) τοῦ/ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωαθα/ ἐψήφ<ω>σεν τὰ ὅδε/ ἐξ <ι>δ<ι>ων; translation taken from R. Riesner, "What does Archaeology Teach us about Early House Churches," *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke* 78 (2007), 159–84: 173; the twice mentioned name(?) Κλούβ resp. ὁ Κλούβας is difficult to understand: Riesner,

upper panel reads “Lord, help Leontis Kloub,” and the κυριε for “Lord” is abbreviated as a *nomen sacrum* KE with a stroke above it. This seems to support its interpretation as belonging to a Christian context.⁶ But within the longer dedicatory inscription a five-branched *menorah* is depicted

following Z. Safrai, “The House of Leontis ‘Kaloubas’ – a Judaeo-Christian?,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature* (ed. by P. J. Tomson and D. Lambers-Petry; WUNT 158; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 245–66, sees in it a member of the Judaeo-Christian “Kleobian sect,” which is mentioned by Epiphanius of Salamis (*Pan.* 51.6.6; cf. also *Apost. Const.* 6.81), whereas G. Stemberger (following N. Zori), sees it as a nickname or a profession “der Korbmacher”, see G. Stemberger, *Juden und Christen im spätantiken Palästina* (Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen 9; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 46–49. For the Leontis mosaic see further the discussions in: N. Zori, “The House of Kyrios Leontis at Beth Shean,” *IEJ* 16 (1966), 123–34 (excavation report); L. Roussin, “The Beit Leontis Mosaic: An Eschatological Interpretation,” *JJA* 8 (1981), 6–19; G. Foerster, “Allegorical and Symbolic Motifs with Christian Significance from Mosaic Pavements of Sixth-Century Palestinian Synagogues,” in *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land: New Discoveries* (FS V. C. Corbo; ed. G. C. Bottini et al.; SBF.CMa 36; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1990), 545–52; 548–50. Foerster sees the whole compound as a large synagogue-complex with guest quarters and a prayer hall but emphasises that Christian iconographical influence is very strong; Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson and University of Washington Press, 1998), 152: “To date, it is still an open question whether the Leontis hall was part of a Jewish private home, a communal building complex or – less likely – an actual synagogue hall.” See also idem, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 198–203, 587. Here Levine proposes that the rooms around the courtyard (which include the ‘prayer hall’ and the room with the Leontis mosaic) “were part of either a large synagogue complex or a wealthy individual’s home which also included a prayer room” (similar to the situation in Stobi). “These two sites may be examples of what rabbinic literature refers to as ‘the synagogue of an individual’” (201, 381, cf. yMeg 3,4 [74a]); against a religious interpretation of the Odysseus mosaic see P. Baumann, “Mythological Heroes in the Service of Private Representation: A Case Study on Some Late Antique Mosaics in the Holy Land,” in *What Athens has to do with Jerusalem* (FS G. Foerster; ed. L. V. Rutgers; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 69–85: 82–85.

⁶ The appearance of *nomina sacra* is often taken as a clear indicator that a given text is of Christian provenance, cf. L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), 95–134, although some exceptions may exist (106–10). In addition to the ambiguous case from the House of Leontis J. R. Edwards pointed recently to a further example of ΘΥ for θεοῦ from the synagogue of Sardis, whose Jewishness cannot be doubted, cf. “A *Nomen Sacrum* in the Sardis Synagogue,” *JBL* 128 (2009), 813–21. Although it is clearly visible it is not discussed in W. Ameling, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis* (vol. 2 of *Kleinasien*; TSAJ 99; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 261–63 (no. 90). Edwards, however, seems to be unaware of the Leontis inscription which is not mentioned in the article and the claim is made that the Sardis inscription “appears to be the first known example of a *nomen sacrum* in a synagogue” (814).

which seems to point towards a Jewish background.⁷ To complicate matters further, the mosaic panel above the inscription shows scenes from the life of Odysseus, the one below a Nile scene with the river god Nile prominently displayed. Nilotic scenes are known from pagan, Jewish and Christian buildings, and the image of Odysseus bound to the mast to withstand the sirens (*Od.* 12.39–45) was often given an allegorical interpretation by the Church Fathers whereby one is able to resist the temptations, as represented by the Sirens, by being bound to the cross, represented by the mast.⁸ But the same story was also used by Philo as an example for the power of music in his explanation of Gen 15:9 demonstrating that a Jewish explanation of Scriptures could equally use Homeric heroes as examples.⁹ To add to the conundrum: At the south-western angle of the same courtyard that allows access to the room with the Leontis mosaic lies another mosaic-paved room which is unanimously interpreted as a synagogue. Here a seven-branched menorah is in the center of the mosaic carpet flanked by an *ethrog* and an incense shovel, accompanied by inscriptions in Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic.¹⁰

From this it becomes clear that an inscription alone, isolated from its archaeological context, is not the full ‘text’ that needs to be taken into consideration. A careful analysis of the Leontis-mosaic will need to ‘read’ not just the inscription but also the iconography and the setting of the room containing the inscription within the building complex. The plan of the building (and in addition, the location of this particular building within its neighbourhood), its images and inscriptions together make up the whole available, but still very fragmented, ‘text’. The ambiguity of this ‘text’ cannot be resolved without doubt even by the combined force of epigraphical, iconographical and the remaining archaeological evidence.

⁷ For the menorah in Christian contexts see R. Hachlili, *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-Armed Candelabrum* (JSJSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 271–72; Stemberger, *Juden und Christen* (see n. 5), 35.

⁸ Cf. Foerster, “Allegorical and Symbolic Motifs” (see n. 5), 549; cf. Hugo Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche: Die Ekklesiologie der Väter* (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1964), 239–71 (“Odysseus am Mastbaum”), 361–405 (“Das Kreuz als Mastbaum und Antenne”); the whole third part of the book “Antenna Crucis” is devoted to the use of ship imagery in Christian ecclesiology which was well under way already in the second century; for a more popular approach to the same topic see idem, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung* (3rd ed.; Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1957), 281–328 (ET: *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery*, London: Burns & Oates, 1963, 286–328).

⁹ *QG* 3.3. For Jewish familiarity with Homer and further archaeological finds with Homeric motives from Palestine see M. Hengel, *Achilleus in Jerusalem: Eine spätantike Messingkanne mit Achilleus-Darstellungen aus Jerusalem* (SHAW.PH 1/1982; Heidelberg: Winter, 1982), 50–52.

¹⁰ D. Bahat, “The Synagogue at Beth-Shean,” in *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (ed. L. I. Levine; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981), 82–85.