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CHAPTER I
JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN ANTIOCH

Asked to think of Jews and Christians in the first four centuries of our era, the mind obliges with pictures of peasants and shepherds in Galilean hills, fishermen at the lakeshore, women around a village well. Such is the power of the gospel stories of Jesus, the many laws of Mishnah that deal with agriculture or crafts or village life, and the rural setting of so much aggadah. In reality, however, both early Judaism and early Christianity were mostly urban movements, streetwise and cosmopolitan.  

Antioch on the Orontes was a key city for both, besides being one of the three or four most important cities in the Roman Empire. Jews were among the original settlers of the city when it was founded by Seleucus Nicator in 300 B.C.E.  

Antioch's proximity to Palestine (the lake of Antioch was considered by later rabbis to be one of the seven lakes surrounding Eretz Israel), as well as its importance as an administrative and commercial center, made it attractive to Jews. Its accessibility to Asia Minor also made it a convenient stopping place for Jews traveling between Palestine and Asia Minor, either by land through Cilicia or by ship to the coastal cities.

Antioch was also to become one of the principal centers of Christianity. At the beginning, Christians were merely one among the various groups which we may suppose to have existed in the Jewish community of the city. However, it was precisely in Antioch, according to our earliest sources, that the Christians were first perceived as a distinct movement, and there that they first crossed the boundaries of Judaism and sought gentile proselytes.

At that moment began the powerful ambivalence which has marked the relationship between the parent community and its somewhat unnatural offspring throughout the history of their encounters. The Pauline missionary group, which originated in Antioch although its center soon shifted elsewhere, fought most vigorously for the freedom of gentiles to become Christians.
without becoming Jews, yet it also made the unity of Jew and gentile in the new community a primary theological paradigm. Emerging from Judaism, the new movement would inevitably inherit some of the gains and losses which had accrued to the Jewish diaspora in its long struggle to live well and truly in the midst of a pagan society. But equally inevitably, the Christians would complicate life for the Jews and even threaten the delicate balance of their social and political position. Indeed, they would become active competitors with the Jews for the social as well as religious favors of the larger society, and finally the synagogue's most dangerous enemy. The ambivalence is amply exhibited in Christian literature from Antioch. From Ignatius to John Chrysostom, Isaac, and Symeon Stylites, attacks on Judaism and on "Judaizing" Christians grow in both ferocity and specificity. Yet those very attacks were occasioned by the attraction which Judaism continued to exert on Christians, in one way on ordinary church folk, in another way on their theologians, even those who attacked "Judaizing" most vehemently. The ambivalent relationship did not, of course, develop in a vacuum, but was intertwined with the complex attachments and reactions of each group to the Greco-Roman culture and government. Consequently an investigation of Jewish-Christian relations will shed some light on the broader question of each group's place in the larger society.

The Jews of Antioch

The Political Situation

By the middle of the second century B.C.E., and perhaps earlier, the Jews were recognized as a distinct group within the city, free to follow their own customs. This probably meant that they were organized as a πολίτευμα within the larger community. Josephus says they were called "Antiochenes" (Ag. Ap. 2.39), but the legal significance of this term is unclear. For most of the Hellenistic period the Jewish community was able to carry on its affairs undisturbed except for the brief interlude under Antiochus Epiphanes (175 B.C.E.). His policy of repression of Judaism surely had consequences for the Jews of Antioch, because the capital of his kingdom was located
there, but it is noteworthy that most of the events associated with his reign occurred in Jerusalem, not Antioch. Josephus does say, however, that his successors restored to the Jews of Antioch portions of the spoil Antiochus had taken from Jerusalem and "granted them citizen rights on an equality with the Greeks" (J.W. 7.44), implying that these rights had been curtailed by Antiochus.6 Possibly captives from Jerusalem were brought to Antioch. Later Jewish tradition spoke of three "exiles," one of which was at Daphne near Antioch,7 and John Chrysostom speaks of a "captivity" under Antiochus Epiphanes (Hom. ad Jud. 5.10). Further, the Maccabean martyrs are sometimes associated with Antioch,8 though it seems more likely that the martyrdoms actually took place in Jerusalem.

All this suggests that Antiochene Jewry was affected by the policies of Antiochus, but details are sparse. Josephus, our chief source, emphasizes, no doubt intentionally, that except for the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes the Jews lived in peace and tranquility under the Hellenistic kings and the community grew and prospered. Jews were, he writes,

particularly numerous in Syria, where intermingling is due to the proximity of the two countries. But it was at Antioch that they specially congregated, partly owing to the greatness of that city, but mainly because the successors of King Antiochus had enabled them to live there in security. For, although Antiochus surnamed Epiphanes sacked Jerusalem and plundered the temple, his successors on the throne restored to the Jews of Antioch all such votive offerings as were made of brass, to be laid up in their synagogue, and, moreover, granted them citizen rights on an equality with the Greeks. Continuing to receive similar treatment from later monarchs, the Jewish colony grew in numbers, and their richly designed and costly offerings formed a splendid ornament to the temple. Moreover, they were constantly attracting to their religious ceremonies multitudes of Greeks, and these they had in some measure incorporated with themselves.9

The Romans captured Syria in 64–63 B.C.E. and made it into a Roman province. The new rulers brought changes, but their policies had little immediate effect on the status of the Jews in Antioch. If the analogy of other Jewish communities within the empire is used, the Jews of Antioch will have been allowed to exist as a distinct group within the city, to use their own
laws on matters which pertained to their common life, to main­
tain relations with Eretz Israel and to send funds to Jeru­
salem, to follow their traditional mode of worship. 10

To be sure, Roman rule was not always benign, for the
Jews of Antioch were inevitably drawn into the growing con­
flict between Jews and Romans in Palestine. Nevertheless, the
history of the conflict shows that the imperial officials
usually worked to contain local hostilities and to preserve the
fundamental rights of the Jewish community. For example,
Caligula's order that his statue be placed in the temple in
Jerusalem was transmitted via the governor of Syria, precipi­
tating a dangerous confrontation. The governor Petronius
warned that, if the Jews resisted the order, his army was
"ready at hand" and would "strew the land with the dead." The
Jews refused to be intimidated, and when the governor went to
Jerusalem to carry out the order, Jews lined the roads to pro­
test his action. The initial impetus for this protest, which
succeeded in persuading Petronius to delay, according to both
Philo and Josephus, probably originated in Antioch. 11 In the
same year, Malalas reports, mobs in Antioch attacked Jews,
killing many and burning synagogues. Although the story re­
lated by Malalas is fantastic, including a retaliatory expedi­
tion of 30,000 men led by Phineas, high priest in Jerusalem,
both Kraeling and Downey find a local disturbance in 40 C.E.
perfectly credible. Malalas also reports that the emperor him­
self settled the strife, and that, too, is credible, if we
identify him not with Caligula but with Claudius, who did the
same in Alexandria. 12

The next crisis came at the time of the revolt in 66-70
C.E. At first, although there were massacres of Jews through­
out Syria (Josephus, J.W. 2.457-79), Jews in Antioch, Sidon,
and Apamea were not affected (J.W. 2.479). However, shortly
after Vespasian arrived in Syria, an apostate named Antiochus,
son of the archôn of the Antiochene Jews, incited the pagans
with a story that Jews were plotting to burn the city (J.W.
7.47). The pogrom which followed brought terror to the Jews,
and four years later they were threatened with a recurrence of
the same violence when fire actually broke out and destroyed
several public buildings, appearing to confirm Antiochus' charges. This time the Jews were saved from mob action by Gnaeus Collega, the deputy governor, who carefully investigated the affair and cleared the Jews of any complicity (J.W. 7.58-61). However, Josephus suggests that the Jews were still in danger until the coming of Titus Caesar, for when he arrived at Antioch the population greeted him with cries urging the expulsion of the Jews (J.W. 7.100-103). When Titus returned from Zeugma on the Euphrates, the petition was repeated by the assembled citizens and senate. Again Titus refused, on the grounds that, Judea being destroyed, the Jews had nowhere to go if they were banished (J.W. 7.109). Thereupon the Antiochenes demanded that the privileges of the Jews inscribed on bronze tablets be removed. That also was refused by Titus, "leaving the status of the Jews of Antioch exactly as it was before" (J.W. 7.110-11). Josephus may have put too happy a face on the situation, for Malalas reports that the emperor set up several bronze figures, presumably from the temple, outside the southern gate of the city. Since Jews were concentrated in that part of the city, the figures served as an affront to Jews every time they passed through the gate, reminding them of the fall of Jerusalem. Malalas (260-61) also says that a theater was built on the site of the Jewish synagogue in Daphne with the legend: "From the Jewish spoils." Nevertheless, there is no evidence that the war and its aftermath produced any substantial change in the status of the Antiochene Jews.

This picture is consistent with what we know of other parts of the diaspora. The legacy of the war lingered in attitudes toward the Jews, the imposition of an onerous tax, the fiscus judaicus, and the devastation of Palestine and the loss of Jerusalem. However, the long-range consequences of the war affected Jewish life in Palestine more than in the diaspora; for example, the center of Palestinian Jewry shifted from Jerusalem to places like Caesarea, on the coast, and the northern towns of Sepphoris, Tiberias, and Beth She'arim. The Bar Kochba revolt in 135 C.E. again brought great destruction and desolation to Palestine, but its significance for the diaspora communities was minimal. Under Antoninus Pius (138-161)
relations with Rome began to improve. Hadrian's ban on circumcision was modified to allow Jews to circumcise their own sons, and in Palestine as well as in diaspora cities Jews began gradual recovery. It is in this period, for example, that a large building adjacent to the Palaestra in Sardis was bought and made into a Jewish synagogue.

In the beginning of the third century, with the establishment and official recognition of the patriarchate, and the new law (Constitutio Antoniana) recognizing all free inhabitants of the Empire as citizens, the Jews in Palestine and in the diaspora were more fully integrated into civic life. For the next several hundred years the Jews are a significant factor in the life of the Greek-speaking cities of the East. (1) Jews sometimes served on the councils of the cities in which they lived. They performed liturgies and held positions as magistrates. They served as watchmen, clerks in the markets, police officers in Sardis several served as members of the provincial administration. According to Malalas (p. 290), Antioch had a Jewish magistrate ca. 190 C.E. (2) Numerous dedicatory inscriptions of synagogues built during the third and fourth centuries have been found in cities scattered throughout Asia Minor, Syria, Greece, and of course Palestine. These inscriptions indicate that the Jews were able to continue their way of life undisturbed and that they had the resources to build and decorate suitable structures for religious, educational, and social purposes. (3) Even after Constantine there was little change in the legal status of the Jews, and opposition to the continuation of privileges to Jewish leaders (e.g., exemption from liturgies) indicates that the cities counted on and could not dispense with the contributions of the Jewish citizens. The scattered references we have to Jewish life in Antioch in the third century and the somewhat fuller evidence from the fourth are consistent with this wider picture. In Antioch as in other cities in the eastern Empire Jews held an important place in the city's life.

Internal Organization

Not very much is known about the organization of the Jewish groups or about their internal divisions. There was one
principal official who could be called "the ἀρχων of the Antiochenes" in 69/70 C.E. Three centuries later a letter from Libanius speaks of "the chief of their officials" (τὸν τῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀρχοντα). Both probably refer to the γερουσιαρχός, head of the council of elders, which, as in other Jewish communities in the East, was made up of representatives of the various synagogues in the city. The Gerousia served as the governing body for all the Jews in the city, and thus also as the formal channel for interaction between the imperial government and the Jewish community. The family tomb of one Gerousiarch of Antioch, Aidesius, was found in the cemetery of Beth She'arim.

Libanius' letter provides tantalizing hints about the governance of the Jewish community in Antioch, but it is most helpful in illustrating the informal relations of power and influence which existed in the fourth century between that community and the larger society. Importuned by the Antiochene Jews, Libanius writes to his long-time friend Priscianus, who has just become proconsul of Palestine, because the Jews have heard that Priscianus has been persuaded to use his influence to get their chief official to appoint a certain "wicked old man" to office. They are deeply disturbed, because at some former time the man in question had exercised the same office so tyrannically that he had been removed. With his customary tact, Libanius assures Priscianus that he doesn't believe that the governor has really been taken in by the old man. Moshe Schwabe argues that the old man, or rather "Elder," is a delegate sent by the Patriarch in Tiberias to be the head (ἀρχων) of the whole Antiochene community, so that the letter is testimony both to the extended political power of the Patriarch and at the same time to the way in which the Roman governor of Palestine could control the Patriarch's decisions. This reconstruction cannot be sustained, however, as Gedaliahu Alon has succinctly shown. The "archon of the archons" cannot be the Nasi' in Tiberias, for the phrase παρ' αὐτοῖς corresponds to that in the first sentence of the letter, ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν Ἰουδαῖοις, i.e., among the Jews of Antioch. It would have been quite astonishing to find the Nasi' actually governing the Jewish community in a city like Antioch through his delegate,
and there is no evidence in any other source which would prove that he had such power. If Schwabe's argument fails, however, we cannot be sure just what office (Δρυη) the old man was trying to regain. It cannot have been the head of the whole community, for that was the position (Δρυων των Δρυοντων) of the one expected to appoint him. Perhaps, as Schwabe argues, he would be called Δρυων, i.e., as one of the Αρχοντες, but that is a rather general term, found in literary but not legal sources. Or perhaps he was to be the Δρυονδυογος of one of the synagogues. The latter office is attested from two inscriptions in Apamea, for in the year 391 Ilasios, "Archisynagogos of the Antiochenes," made a substantial contribution for the mosaic floor of the synagogue there, where he had close family connections.

Kraeling estimates a Jewish population in the city of 45,000 in the time of Augustus and 65,000 in the fourth century, but these figures are probably high. Liebeschuetz, for example, estimates that the city itself contained perhaps as few as 150,000 persons in the fourth century, while the whole territory of Antioch (comprising some 2,500 square miles) had a population approaching 400,000. If we accept Liebeschuetz' low estimate, and assume with Kraeling that the proportion of Jews to the total population was somewhat higher than the twelve to thirteen percent usually accepted for Egypt, we would arrive at a figure around 22,000. Obviously the margin of error in such guesswork is enormous.

We cannot be certain how many synagogues existed in Antioch, for the literary evidence is spotty and the archaeological data nil. From Seleucid times there was one in the city itself. In the Roman period the main synagogue was located in the southern quarter of the city, the Kerateion. It was probably the one supposed to have been built over the tomb of the Maccabean martyrs and thus called, at least in one medieval source, kenesset hašmûnit, i.e., Synagogue of the Hasmoneans. The same source, however, says that this was the first synagogue built after (the destruction of) the Second Temple. It was surely not the only synagogue within the city. One of the synagogues burned in the disorders of the late fifth
century was named for Asabinus, perhaps the same as the Jewish ouvialis of that name whose property, according to Malalas, had been purchased to build a new Plethrion in 193 C.E. This was obviously different from the Hasmonean synagogue and, assuming its foundation to have been near the time of the Asabinus known to us, it must have existed simultaneously with the Hasmonean rather than having been built to replace the latter when it was seized by the Christians in the fourth century.

During the Hellenistic period Jews had also settled in Daphne, the lovely suburb on a plateau south of the city. At least since Tiberius there was a synagogue in Daphne, and it is possible there had been one earlier. Rabbinic sources speak of Daphne as a Jewish center, even locating a meeting there between King Nebuchadnezzar and the Sanhedrin. The account is no doubt legendary, but it indicates a certain importance to Daphne in Jewish memory. In John Chrysostom’s day there was a synagogue in Daphne called Μαρούνης.

Whether there was also an organized Jewish community to the north of the city, on the plain of Antioch, as Kraeling argues, is more uncertain. There certainly were rural Jews in the vicinity of Antioch; the question is what their status was. As Kraeling pointed out, the Tosefta speaks of rice grown in the Hulat of Antioch, so there must have been Jewish farmers. Moreover, his argument that the ναός ουαλανθαδινικων ιδιων is the same as the ούσαλαθα mentioned by Josephus, Ant. 17.24, and τὸ τῶν Ἀντιοχείων πέδιων in Strabo, Geog. 16.2.8, is both ingenious and convincing. But it will not do to regard that area as a "Jewish suburb." At several places in Midrash Rabbah there is a story of a visit to this area by rabbis to collect money for Eretz Israel. The account makes clear that the rabbis came regularly to the area to collect funds. From Libanius' Oration 47.13-16, "On Patronages," we learn of Jewish peasants who had worked Libanius' family land for four generations. Although some earlier scholars argued that the estate must have been in Palestine, L. Harmand has shown that it must have lain near Antioch, in the Orontes valley--i.e., probably in the Hulat of Antioch by Kraeling's reckoning.
These tenants of Libanius were not like the small free proprietors who lived in the large villages (κώμαι μεγάλαι) and owned tiny portions of the communal fields, though since Libanius also describes the troubles of the latter, they were evidently to be found in the same area, and there may well have been Jews among them, too. Nor were they hired free workers (ξογναταί = operarii or μισθωταί = mercenarii). Rather, they were tenants of the most restricted sort (γεωργοί = coloni). Even though the colonate in the strict legal sense (which made the colonus virtually a serf) probably did not yet exist in Syria in Libanius' time, Harmand argues that workers like these had lost their original liberty by consuetudo. The terms of their work and their share of the crop were determined entirely by the landowner. In a desperate attempt to "shake off the old yoke and henceforth to dictate the terms" of their employment, they went on strike.

Unfortunately we do not learn what kind of connections there may have been between these Jewish peasants and their more affluent coreligionists in the city. It may be significant, however, that their confrontation with Libanius does not seem to have affected the congenial relationship which he had both with the patriarch in Tiberias and with leaders of the Jewish community in Antioch, and that the peasants did not, so far as Libanius informs us, try to get either of these to intercede with him on their behalf. Whether they were separated from the urban Jews by language (the latter used Greek), by religious practice, or only by economic class, one can only guess.

In one respect, however, the peasants of Libanius and the urban Jews of Antioch were alike. When in difficulties, both sought help from a strong patron, who was likely to be connected with the imperial government. In the case of the peasants, this was a military commander, perhaps the magister militum per orientem. Such military patrons are the chief object of Libanius' complaints to the emperor, for they have usurped a role which used to belong to the local aristocracy.
power of this new form of patronage is well illustrated in the fact that Libanius lost his case. The fact that he had to file suit against his workers already shows that disadvantaged groups like the Jews could count on some protection from Roman law. Nevertheless, Libanius' case, at least on grounds of breach of contract, would appear to have been very strong—certainly he thought it was—had it not been for the superior power of the patron. Those peasants who lacked such a patron—a person of influence standing outside the structure of the aristocracy that oppressed them—were little better off than slaves.

For the patron, on the other hand, intervention in such cases provided opportunity to increase his power as the number of clients dependent upon him grew. That is likely to have been a more important factor in his self-interest than the amount of money he could squeeze out of them, which Libanius dwells on. The whole episode, as Libanius himself emphasizes, was part of a very general shift in the forms of social and economic power, and during the transition there were enormous opportunities for entrepreneurs of all sorts, via the military, the rapidly growing imperial civil service, the law, and—the church.

Not all the Jews had thrown in their lot with the new power brokers. Ironically Libanius himself acted as a patron for the whole Jewish community of Antioch on one occasion, in the letter to Priscianus already quoted, and he often intervened informally as a patron for individuals in the correspondence he conducted with the Patriarch between the years 388 and 393. Eight of his letters "To the Patriarch" are extant. They provide an interesting and, to those accustomed to handbook generalizations about rabbinic Judaism's anti-hellenism after Bar Kochba, astonishing picture of the relationship between cultured Jews and pagans at the end of the fourth century. The earliest of these letters replies to a complaint by the Patriarch about mistreatment which Jews have suffered, perhaps in the Christian reaction after Julian's death. Libanius assures the Patriarch that, far from having any sympathy with the Jews' opponents, he would regard help for them as damaging
to himself. The others are written on behalf of individuals, as introductions (973) or appeals for help against opponents (917), for financial help (974), or other favors (1084, 1097). One (1105) asks the Patriarch to assist in the defense of Libanius' former pupil who, as proconsul of Palestine 392/93 C.E., has committed some misdeed resulting in criminal charges. And one (1098) is a charming letter on behalf of the Patriarch's son, who has dropped out of school after studying briefly with Libanius. Libanius asks the old man to be neither harsh nor perplexed, for at this stage of life "perhaps it will be profitable for him to see many cities—as it was for Odysseus." It is apparent that the Patriarch himself was educated in Greek culture, for Libanius flatters him for his love of books and the excellence of his letters (1084; cf. 973).

It is also clear that for some Jews in Antioch it was perfectly natural to work through the network of relationships involving the curial class and the old rhetorical schools.

The urban Jews of Antioch were of all classes. The *curialis* Asabinus has already been mentioned. The donors of the fourth-century mosaics in the Apamea synagogue, including the Antiochene *archisynagōgos*, were both wealthy and Greek-speaking and bore hellenic names. But there were also Jewish shopkeepers and artisans, still in the time of Chrysostom and doubtless from the beginning. A few members of these groups were able to gain wealth, but for the most part they were poor, burdened directly or indirectly by the heavy traders' tax (collatio lustralis) and subject to abuse by soldiers and officials. There were certainly Jewish slaves as well.

Libanius' letters to the Patriarch show that, at least in the fourth century, there were close connections between the Antiochene Jews and Palestine. That is confirmed by inscriptions, from earlier in the same century, found at Beth She'arim and Tiberias, and by occasional references in rabbinic sources. The Palestinian rabbis knew of a Beth Din in Antioch, and a number of them are reported to have visited the city. Some of the stories of R. Tanhuma bar Abba's disputes with gentiles over Jewish beliefs are set in Antioch, and R. Simlai (3rd century) was also associated with Antioch.
occasion the Patriarch traveled to Antioch because of dealings with the Roman legate of Palestine who was often in Antioch. After the revolt under Gallus two rabbis visited Ursicinus in Antioch, and the Palestinian Talmud depicts them as respected by the Roman general and on good terms with him. These scattered references indicate that Jews from Palestine had continuous relations with the Jews of Antioch (and the community outside the city as well) and with Roman officials in the city.

Christians and Jews

Beginnings of Christianity in Antioch

For the story of Christianity's beginnings in Antioch, and consequently of the first interactions between Jews and Christians there, we have to depend upon the account in the book of Acts, together with the clues in a few verses of Galatians. If there is one thing that has been made clear by scholarship from F. C. Baur until the most recent "redaction critics," it is that historians have to read the Acts' account with a sharp eye open for its functions within the literary and theological plan of the whole two-volume work. When that is done, however, it becomes a very useful document for our purposes.

In Acts Antioch is singled out as the scene of the first deliberate mission to gentiles (11:19-26) and as the locus of the decisive controversy over terms of their admission to the church (chap. 15). There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the former, and comparison with Gal 2:11f. suggests that the second as well has some factual basis. The account begins with a sentence (Acts 11:19) which is probably entirely a Lucan construction. It links the Antioch report with the preceding story of Stephen, the subsequent persecution, and the "scattering" of the Jerusalem disciples--actually of the Jewish-Christian "Hellenists" in the consensus of most modern scholarship. In between, the author has inserted the story of Paul's conversion and the story of Peter's instruction and baptism of Cornelius--both important for the significance which our author
wants to give to the gentile mission that begins in Antioch. Since the notion that the persecution produced a wider spread of the Word is an important Lucan motif, the final phrase of 11:19, "speaking the Word to no one except to Jews alone," is probably Lucan. It looks as if the author wants especially to avoid the impression that the "Hellenists" were directly responsible for the beginning of the gentile mission. Rather (vs. 20) it was certain anonymous individuals of Cyprus and Cyrenaea. If so, his purpose is partly defeated by vs. 20, for the Cypriot and Cyrenaean preachers were also among the scattered "Hellenists" (τινες εἴ οὕτων ἀνδρείς). Perhaps the author has merely chosen an awkward way of saying that in general the Hellenists spoke only to Jews, but some few of them, who happened to be Cypriots and Cyrenaecans (thus distinct from those who had previously been living in Jerusalem, chap. 6?), by exception began preaching to gentiles. Nevertheless, it is worth asking why so competent an author was led into such awkwardness. One plausible answer is this: he had a tradition or source that connected the origin of the gentile mission with Antioch, beginning in the mission of certain Greek-speaking Jews associated with the "hellenistic" wing of the Jerusalem Christians. (It may be significant that one of the seven hellenist Diakonoi elected in Jerusalem was an Antiochene proselyte, Nicolaus [Acts 6:5].) The disclaimer of vs. 19 is Luke's own, for he wants to tie this beginning in Antioch firmly to the authoritative figures in Jerusalem and also properly to introduce Paul, who is for him the paradigmatic missionary to the gentiles. Hence he sets before this report the vision of Peter and the conversion of Cornelius, so that a nihil obstat for the conversion of gentiles has already been provided among the Jerusalem apostles, under the authoritative person of Peter. And he inserts the story of Paul's conversion, tying it artificially to the martyrdom of Stephen, to prepare Paul for the role given him in 11:25. Then appears Barnabas, himself a Cypriot (4:36), who has been introduced before as one with impeccable Jewish credentials (a Levite, 4:36) and a particularly devoted disciple directly and obediently related to the apostles in Jerusalem (4:36-37). Finally Paul is introduced
to the Antioch situation at second-hand, by Barnabas, who has been made the official Jerusalem delegate at Antioch (11:25).

From this brief report, which is a keystone in the structure of Luke's second volume, what trustworthy information can be gleaned then? That Antioch was the starting point for self-conscious mission to gentiles who had not previously become Jewish proselytes; that this mission was initiated by Greek-speaking Jewish Christians, "Cypriots and Cyrenaeans," among whom Barnabas was probably the leading figure.

This tiny glimpse of the early leadership at Antioch is augmented very slightly at the beginning of Luke's next major section, 13:1, by another bit of information: a list of "prophets and teachers" in Antioch. The list is traditional; Symeon called the Black, Lucius the Cyrenaean, and Menaen (= Menahem) the σώτροφος of Herod the Tetrarch (Antipas). One might be tempted to doubt whether the names which Luke puts in the prominent positions at the head and tail of this list, Barnabas and Paul, belonged to the traditional list, since this author often manipulates the comings and goings of his chief characters. In this case, however, we have confirmation from Galatians that both Paul and Barnabas were closely connected with Antioch in the earliest days of their mission. The presence in the Antiochene church of a syntrophos of Herod Antipas is interesting, for while we have no record of any significant connection between the Tetrarch and Antioch, his father had been a major benefactor of the city. The honorific ("childhood companion," "foster brother"; Haenchen: "Milchbruder") obviously implies high social status. If Menaen was a native of Antioch, of which we cannot be sure, the Herodian connection may have been advantageous. Of the five names, all but Lucius are Semitic, but only because Luke up to this point calls Paul "Saul."

In 11:26 Luke adds another "first" for Antioch: "And in Antioch they first called the disciples 'Christians.'" This detail is not likely to have been invented by the author of Acts. Considerable ingenuity has been expended on attempts to explain its significance, but the most satisfactory remains the simplest: that the disciples were called "Christians,"
i.e., "Christus-people," by pagans, because it was in Antioch that they first stood out from Judaism as a distinct sect.\textsuperscript{79} It is interesting that among Christian writers Ignatius of Antioch is the first to use the term "Christianity" (Χριστιανός).\textsuperscript{80} And later Theophilus writes to Autolycus, "You call me a Christian as if I were bearing an evil name...."\textsuperscript{81} Whatever the reason for the original designation, the author of Acts thought it significant that it took place precisely in Antioch. Even if it is only the accidents of transmission that make Ignatius' usage appear unique, it also calls attention to the fact that the "Christ-movement" attained a degree and kind of self-identity at Antioch which made it visible to outsiders as a distinct movement very early in its history. Antioch was the birthplace of "gentile Christianity."

It was also the place where controversy between Jews and gentiles first erupted within the church.\textsuperscript{82} We cannot touch on all the issues which have been raised in the long debate over the "Jerusalem Council" and the conflicting descriptions of it in Acts 15 and Galatians 2. Olof Linton's suggestion, made a number of years ago, is likely correct: the version of the events which Luke had was just the kind of interpretation Paul was trying to refute in Galatians.\textsuperscript{83} But both versions agree on a few points that are clear and significant. (1) The question of the terms of admission of gentiles to the Christian community, with circumcision as the focal issue, arises at Antioch and is sent up to Jerusalem for adjudication. (2) The principal delegates from Antioch are Paul and Barnabas. Paul adds the name of Titus, not as a delegate but as a test case, unmentioned by Acts, though Acts does mention "certain others" (15:2). Paul implies that the decision for the trip was primarily his own, "by revelation," while Acts records a formal action (ἐν τῷ άγαθῷ) by the Antioch congregation to send them. But if the decision was made by prophetic leadership, like that described in Acts 13:2f., both could be talking about the same procedure.\textsuperscript{84} (3) The issue is raised by a particular group among the Judean Christians, not identified with the leadership. In the Acts version, these were already active at Antioch, precipitating the whole issue; Paul has them first intervene in
the discussions at Jerusalem. Acts calls them former Pharisees; Paul does not identify them but calls them "false brothers." (4) The upshot of the debate is agreement between the Antioch delegates and the Jerusalem leadership that the former are to pursue the gentile mission as before, and that circumcision is not to be required of gentile converts. The Acts version, however, goes on to record a "decree" requiring a modified form of kashrut as well as forbidding idolatry and sexual immorality. The only requirement Paul acknowledges is "remember the poor," and it is commonly understood that his concern for the "collection" for Jerusalem was his way of carrying out that part of the agreement.

Acts and Galatians further agree that Paul and Barnabas had a major disagreement soon after these decisions were made (Acts 15:39 calls it a παροξυσμός; Gal 2:13 accuses Barnabas of "hypocrisy"). The reasons given for this break, however, are quite different. Acts knows nothing of a visit of Peter to Antioch or of the confrontation there between him and Paul, nor of a delegation from James that wrecked the previous agreement and provoked such a confrontation.

There is one further area of agreement, of a negative sort. Neither in Acts nor in Paul's letters does Paul have any further important connection with Antioch. After the "first missionary journey," which has Antioch as its base, Acts has Paul pay only one further, obscure visit (18:22); in his letters Paul never mentions Antioch outside Galatians. Now John Schütz has made the shrewd deduction that Barnabas' turnabout and support for Peter (Gal 2:11-21) and Paul's subsequent separation from him do not represent merely a personal disagreement, as Acts would have us believe, but a fundamental crisis of authority affecting the relationship between Paul and Antioch. What Paul was resisting, in his confrontation with Peter, was the attempt of Jerusalem to extend its authority to Antioch. When not only Peter but even Barnabas, whose connection with Antioch was older and more intimate than Paul's, accepted compromise with the James group, Paul made himself independent of Antioch as well as of Jerusalem.
Antioch at this earliest point in the church's history looks then like a place of compromise, a bridge between Jewish and gentile Christianity. Neither in Acts nor in Paul do we learn of any locally bred division between Jewish and gentile Christians; division occurs only at the instigation of certain people from Jerusalem. The form of the compromise after the crisis and Paul's withdrawal is not altogether clear, although it looks from Gal 2:12f. as if former Jews and former gentiles formed henceforth separate fellowships, presumably meeting in different houses. There is also no mention of hostility from synagogue authorities in Antioch, although an argument from this silence would be precarious. Had the emergence of the Christianoi as a distinct religious movement not yet occurred?

William Farmer has argued that the decisive break came in fact, and precisely at Antioch, a generation later: in the aftermath of the Jewish revolt of 66-70 C.E. The war must have had a strong effect on Antioch, he argues, because troops would have been recruited there to take part in putting down the rebellion, resulting in an increase of the "perennial anti-Jewish feelings." Farmer thinks the Christians would consequently have had very good reasons for distinguishing themselves from the Jews. It is an attractive hypothesis, even though there is hardly any evidence to support it. Josephus' reports of the pogrom in 66/67 and the uproar following the Antioch fire of 70 certainly show the intensity of anti-Jewish feeling. The desire of some Christians to separate from them is a plausible conjecture. However, this would have amounted to a reinforcement of the division along lines of religious practice which had been effected by the Peter-Barnabas concessions, rather than an abrupt breakdown of the successful Jerusalem compromise, as Farmer sees it. Moreover, if such a separation did take place around 70, it certainly did not mean the once-for-all isolation of the Judaeo-Christians from gentile Christians nor of Jews from Christians. The active influence of Judaism upon Christianity in Antioch was perennial until Christian leaders succeeded at last in driving the Jews from the city in the seventh century.
Christians and Jews in the Second and Third Centuries

Sources of information about Christian-Jewish relations in the second and third centuries are fragmentary, mostly indirect, and almost entirely from the Christian side. During this period it is also difficult or impossible to distinguish between continuing direct Jewish influence on Christianity and the independent internal development of Christian exegesis of the common scriptures. Consequently the "Jewishness" posited of certain schools of Antiochene theology by ancient as well as modern writers may sometimes be so vague as to be of little help.

Ignatius, although his letters address directly the problems of the Asian churches to which he is writing and speak only allusively of the situation in Antioch, nevertheless allows some inferences to be drawn for our topic. Certain passages in the letters to the Smyrnaeans, the Magnesians, and the Philadelphians are particularly important. The letter to Smyrna opens with an epistolary thanksgiving (1:1f., not usual in Ignatius' letters) which probably echoes the liturgy of baptism at Antioch. It is therefore particularly interesting that it contains a version of the "baptismal reunification formula" which in the New Testament is found in writings of the Pauline school: "...that 'he might set up an ensign' [Isa 5:26] for all ages through his Resurrection, for his saints and believers, whether among the Jews, or among the heathen, in one body of his Church." Furthermore, just as in the Pauline school, it is the unification of Jew and gentile in the one body of Christ that is the paradigm instance of God's will to make all one. Ignatius himself, however, is far from positive toward continuing Jewish elements in Christianity. He can equate Jewish teachings (though of what sort is not said) with heterodoxy and "old fables (μυθώματα) which are profitless" (Magn 8:1). To live "according to Judaism" would mean to confess "that we have not received grace" (Magn 8:2). He warns that "It is monstrous (ἄτομον) to talk of Jesus Christ and to practise Judaism. For Christianity did not base its faith on Judaism (εἰς Ἰουδαϊόμον ἐπίστευσεν), but Judaism on Christianity, and every tongue believing on God was brought together..."
in it" (10:3, Lake). Similarly Ignatius warns the Philadelphians against Judaeo-Christianity:

> But if anyone interpret Judaism to you do not listen to him; for it is better to hear Christianity from the circumcised than Judaism from the uncircumcised. But both of them, unless they speak of Jesus Christ, are to me tombstones and sepulchres of the dead...
> (Philad 6:1)

These polemical passages may be occasioned by controversies in Magnesia and Philadelphia, but almost certainly they reflect also Ignatius' experience of Judaeo-Christians in Antioch.\(^{105}\) Note that it is the Judaeo-Christians, Christians adopting Jewish practices, not Jewish-Christians, i.e., those of Jewish origins, who attract Ignatius' ire. If his language in Philad 6:1 is careful, not just a rhetorical flourish, then both sorts of Christians are known to him. The other group whom Ignatius takes pains to refute in his letters are the docetists, and it has become customary to think of these as the opposites of the Judaeo-Christians. That may be misleading, however, for there are prominent elements drawn from Jewish or Judaeo-Christian tradition in most of the gnostic movements associated with Syria.\(^{106}\) This seems to have been true, for example, of Menander, the first of the gnostic teachers known by name in Antioch,\(^{107}\) whose christology was undoubtedly docetic. To be sure, Ignatius does say of his docetists, "These are they whom neither the prophecies nor the law of Moses persuaded, nor the gospel even until now, nor our own individual sufferings" (Smyr 5:1, Lake), but that does not necessarily mean that they opposed the Jewish scriptures--only that they interpreted them differently than Ignatius. His own hermeneutic principle is stated in Philad 8:2:

> For I heard some saying, "If I do not find it in the archives (ἀρχές), I do not believe in the gospel." And when I said to them, "It is written," they replied, "That is just the issue." But for me "the archives" are Jesus Christ; the inviolable archives are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith which comes through him...

In practice, however, at least in the extant letters, Ignatius does not offer any extended exegetical arguments. Laeuchli
even goes so far as to deny that he knew much of the Old Testament: "Ignatius, therefore, cannot have grown up in a Septuagint-diaspora community, nor can he have lived very long in a Christian congregation that was familiar with Old Testament models."  

If traditions of Septuagint-exegesis are lacking in Ignatius, the lack is amply made up by his successors, for exegesis depending ultimately on Jewish models becomes a hallmark of the Antioch school. This is quite clear in Theophilus, who wrote his apology to Autolycus around 180, for "almost everything in his exegesis can be paralleled in Jewish haggadic literature." It is not only with Palestinian aggadah that Theophilus' exegesis has parallels, however, for Grant has shown that many of the apologist's basic theological phrases and ideas are drawn from the synthesis of biblical and Stoic language which had been worked out in hellenistic Judaism and best known to us through Philo. Theophilus' expositions, however, never attain the profundity of Philo's, nor his allegorical complexity; it is doubtful that he knew Philo's works at first hand. Theophilus' attitude toward the Law also sounds superficially like that of Alexandrian Jews: "Of this divine law the minister (δικηνος) was Moses, the servant of God, not only to all the world but especially the Hebrews (also called Jews)..." The positive emphasis upon the Law probably carries a specifically anti-Marcionist thrust, thus providing evidence for a Marcionite--and consequently counter-Jewish--influence in Antioch at this early date. He can call Moses "our prophet and the minister of God" (3.18), the Hebrews "our forefathers" (3.20), and David "our ancestor" (3.25). Yet it is also clear that "this great and marvellous law" is understood by Theophilus as the moral law epitomized in the "ten chapters" (μεσοδάλαω) (3.9), distinct from the ritual commandments which Christian commentators were by now regularly interpreting as a secondary addition pertinent only to Jews. Furthermore, this strong emphasis on the continuity of the revelation to "the Hebrews" with that to the Christians does not carry any necessary implication of continued positive relationship with living Jews. On the contrary, Theophilus commonly
speaks of "our scriptures" (τὰ Ἑμετέρα γράμματα) with casual disregard for the continued existence of Judaism. When he argues, for example, that the true picture of the world's origin and the early spread of its peoples is found only in the scriptures (and the Sibylline oracles that depend on them) rather than in pagan writings, he concludes that "it is plain that all the rest were in error and that only the Christians have held the truth..." (2.33). 115

During the whole of the second and third centuries we have evidence for the continued influence of Jewish scriptures and thought on Antiochene Christianity, but virtually none from which we can get a picture of relationships between Jewish and Christian communities. The presence of Jewish elements in the local liturgy, which Grant has demonstrated, 116 does not prove continued contact with the synagogue, for they may have been included earlier. They are not like the entire book of prayers incorporated into the eucharistic prayer in the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions, which Simon thinks must have resulted from a mass conversion of a whole Jewish community. 117

Even the intensive textual and exegetical work accomplished by Lucian and his school, though it indicates a certain continuity of tradition from the rather naive expositions by Theophilus to the mature work at the turn of the third to fourth centuries, does not prove that Lucian and his associates were in close contact with the synagogue. It is true that Eusebius describes a certain Dorotheus, a contemporary of Lucian, who "made so careful a study of the Hebrew tongue that he read with understanding the original Hebrew scriptures." 118 One may suppose that he, like Jerome, learned his Hebrew from the rabbis, but there is no evidence to that effect.

Yet at one point, around 200 C.E., we hear of a conversion from Christianity to Judaism, proving that the kind of contact and attraction which would become chronic in the fourth century was not unknown earlier. The case was important enough for the apostate, a certain Domnus, to receive a letter from his bishop, Serapion, which Eusebius mentions but unfortunately does not quote. 119
More problematic for our topic is the significance of Paul of Samosata, who was bishop of Antioch during the period of Palmyrene rule, 260/61 to 272 C.E. John Chrysostom calls him "a Jew wearing a Christian mask," and the nickname may well have been coined earlier by Paul's opponents, for reports circulated which connected his teaching with Judaism, and Athanasius even asserted that he was pro-Jewish in order to please his protector, the Palmyrene queen Zenobia, herself a Jewess. Both Loofs and Bardy, however, after independently examining the sparse evidence, conclude that there is no historical substance to the reports that Zenobia had a special relationship to Judaism. Loofs thinks all the reports originated in Antiochene gossip, perhaps fueled by the fact that Zenobia had a Semitic (probably good Palmyrene) name, Bat Zvi. Athanasius' statement that Zenobia was Paul's "patroness"—if indeed ἀνήρ Παλμυραῖος has here that narrow sense and does not mean simply that she was his sovereign—probably referred to her helping him avoid the execution of the sentence of excommunication decreed by the Council of Antioch.

Until recently, Harnack's conjecture, that Paul represented the "Palmyrene party" in Antioch, was almost universally accepted. Bardy supposed that Paul had to gather around him all those who were pro-Palmyrene, be they Christians, Jews, or pagans. Downey thought it likely that support would have come especially from "people of Semitic stock in and around Antioch who hated the Romans and looked to the East for sympathy and possible rescue." Recently, however, Fergus Millar has shown that there is no reason at all to suppose either that Paul represented a general resurgence of "Oriental," Aramaic culture against the Greco-Roman world, or that he held an official post ("ducenarius") for the Palmyrene queen. In fact, there is no evidence that the Palmyrenes exercised any real influence in Antioch before around 270 C.E., while Paul held the bishopric from 261 and was formally deposed (though he refused to relinquish "the church house") in 268/69. Millar does allow the possibility that there may have been some influence on Paul by Judaism or by some native Syrian Christian traditions, but he cautions that there is almost no evidence to
support such a supposition. And it is certainly significant, as Bardy points out, that the letter of the Council of Antioch that condemned Paul contains not a word about his "Judaism," which would later become the standard accusation.

What, then, was the origin of the later assertion of Paul's "Jewishness"? John Chrysostom's statements about the Samosatan are typical and instructive. The reason he calls Paul a Jew is simply because of the latter's "low" christology; he does not hint of any actual Jewish connection. Epiphanius observes that the Samosatans did not practice circumcision or observe the Sabbath; the reason they deserved the name "Jews" is purely the fact that their theology sounded "Jewish" in orthodox ears. Possibly Paul's supposed connections with the Semitic rulers of Palmyra helped the slander along. Probably, too, there were Jews in Antioch who prudently sought good relations with the new regime. But in all of these possibilities and probabilities there is nothing which would count as evidence for specific influence of Judaism on Paul's thought or practice, nor for positive relations between his Christian supporters and the local synagogues.

From the time of Ignatius to the flourishing of Lucian's school, then, we may surmise that active contact between Christians and Jews continued. But only at one point, Domnus' conversion around 200 C.E., is there any firm evidence. We have to remember, as both Downey and Corwin stress, that there were without doubt numerous "house churches" in the early decades of Christianity in Antioch, and that this division into small, natural groupings, each of which would evolve its own leadership, would facilitate growth and persistence of diversity in doctrine and practice. Most likely some previously existing groupings, related to networks of clientela, kinship, and of course ethnic and language groups, affected the formation of these early Christian congregations. Some of these groups were closer to Jewish traditions, thought, and exegesis than others. But none of them emerges into clear light in the extant sources, nor can any straight lines be drawn from early ones to later; for example, from the Judaeo-Christians opposed by Ignatius to the Paulists or the Arians. Fortunately, from the fourth century much more evidence is at hand.
The Fourth Century

Constantine's pro-Christian policy obviously marked a shift in the political situation which worked increasingly through the fourth and fifth centuries to the advantage of the Christians and the detriment of the Jews. In 315 conversions to Judaism were forbidden anew, and subsequent legislation proscribed the kinds of situation which would facilitate proselytism, such as intermarriage and Jewish ownership of gentile slaves. During the fourth century, however, the new legislation did not yet attack the fundamental rights of the Jewish community, which continued to be protected by most of the emperors and the imperial officers in the province. Its aim seems rather to have been the isolation of the Jews, and even that aim does not seem to have been achieved until the turn of the century brought much harsher measures against them.

During the same period a more subtle and pervasive shift in the foci of power was taking place. The letters and orations of Libanius give an unusually full picture of the changes, as seen by a deeply interested participant, and Liebeschuetz has described them brilliantly in his monograph. The social and economic distance was growing between the higher and lower classes of the old urban order, and both ends of the scale were subject to increased pressures. The artisans and shopkeepers in the city had to cope with heavy taxes and, at intervals, rapid inflation; peasants in the plain, unless they were able to secure the help of a more or less honest patron, were reduced to serfdom. At the other end, the curial class was being squeezed; the council was reduced to a fraction of its earlier size as many landowners escaped from its heavy financial duties either by selling their land or by obtaining an imperial appointment immune to conciliar duties. A small number of principales connived in this in order to concentrate land and power in their own hands. However, a new aristocracy was developing at the same time, composed of former imperial officials (honorati), both civilian and military.

These shifts brought with them new opportunities for both upward and horizontal mobility. As the century passed, Christians seem to have been in a position to take more and more
advantage of them. There were, for example, a number of Christians among Libanius' students, all of them of families that were well off. The rhetorical training they were receiving was still a sure means of advancement, envied by those who could not afford it. Incidentally, only one Jew is identifiable in Libanius' school, the son of the Patriarch already mentioned. Yet Libanius did have acquaintances and clients in the Antiochene Jewish community; is it only accidental that we do not hear of their sons taking this traditional road to success?

Libanius, however, complains that pupils are deserting him for the newer and surer ladders to the top: the study of law, Latin, and even shorthand. He might also have mentioned the church, for those who lacked the means for rhetorical schooling were able to use the bishops' schools and, in place of the old-boy system of the rhetors, the new connections between the church itself and the imperial court. The new form of patronage, both ecclesiastical and military, could occasionally work to the benefit of oppressed groups, like the Jewish peasants of Libanius. That these happened to be Jews is quite incidental to Libanius' discussion of the case; countless others, by his own report, were using the military patrons in similar ways. There were doubtless Jews, Christians, and pagans among them. Further, a new figure was emerging whose power, first in the rural areas, later even in the city, could rival even that of the generals: the monk. The Jews had nothing quite like this, although in Babylonia the rabbis in this period and even earlier sometimes functioned very much like magi; and in Antioch, as we shall see, Jews commanded attention as adepts in both religion and magic.

These shifts in the relations of power have to be seen also within a more general picture of unsettled social and economic conditions. During the fourth century as a whole, Antioch appears to have been very prosperous. But that general affluence not only was very unequally distributed, it was also punctuated by occasional severe shortages and violent swings in the economy--like the sharp inflation in the time of Julian. As Peter Brown has discerned, it was a time when new
Institutions were being formed, and in the meanwhile inarticulate forms of power had their opportunity, though they must clash with the articulate forms of the old order. In such a time, also, resort to occult means of explanation and influence was attractive: the urbane, rational Libanius was accused four times of sorcery and believed himself on one occasion a victim of black magic. Moreover, the emerging forms of articulate power, tied as they were to the imperial service, tended to be in conflict with the local, urban loyalties of the conservative aristocracy. That is the reason why upward mobility was linked with horizontal mobility: success in the civil service or the military required loyalty to the central authorities and a sharp eye for the next plum appointment, wherever it might be. The Christians, who from the beginning had developed effective practical forms of cosmopolitanism and, by the fourth century, an elaborate international organization, were in a way ideally suited to take advantage of this situation. For this reason the hostility toward them on the part of the old urban aristocracy was quite understandable.

But the trans-nationalism of the Christians was in large measure directly inherited from Judaism, and in earlier years, as we have seen, the urban Jews were skillful in trading on Roman law and Roman power to protect their local rights and opportunities. Why were they unable to retain these advantages in the latter part of the fourth century? What forces had dealt them weaker hands than the Christians in the game of power? There is no simple answer to these questions; it is no adequate explanation merely to name Constantine or to point to the anti-Jewish legislation of later Christian emperors, for these were themselves in part responses to the facts of Christian power. This much can be said: in the late fourth century Christians and Jews were competitors for power and influence in the new society of the eastern Empire, and the advantage of the Christians brought the direct decline of the Jews.

At one revealing point they are pitted directly against one another by imperial power: in the religious reform of Julian. It seems curious that Julian would have thought the Jews a natural ally for his program to restore pagan worship to
the Empire, but so it was. Downey even suggests that one of the reasons why Julian decided to make his residence in Antioch at the beginning of his reign was in order to win support from the large Jewish community there.\textsuperscript{145} It was during his stay in Antioch, at any rate, that he decided to rebuild the Jerusalem temple. According to Ammianus Marcellinus (23.1.2) he put an Antiochene, Alypios, in charge, with ample funds at his disposal. The attempt was unsuccessful, because some disaster, perhaps an earthquake, interrupted work as soon as the old foundations had been uncovered—naturally the Christians interpreted this as divine intervention, and later accounts expand the miraculous features.\textsuperscript{146} Julian himself, speaking in retrospect of the failure, shows some bitterness and makes it clear that the attempt would not be renewed.\textsuperscript{147} Why, then, did he undertake it, especially since he frequently makes remarks showing that he regarded Judaism as far inferior to paganism?\textsuperscript{148} Vogt has shown that in the Neoplatonic tradition in which Julian was schooled, the alliance of paganism with Judaism against Christianity was not unprecedented. It first appears vividly in Celsus, who in his dialogue of a Jew refuting Jesus makes most of the points raised by Julian.\textsuperscript{149} In the third century, with Porphyry's attack on Christianity, the common front became still clearer.\textsuperscript{150} This tradition explains the source of intellectual legitimation of Julian's alliance, but not its purpose. Chrysostomus Baur's suggestion, that Julian depended on Jewish financing,\textsuperscript{151} is advanced without any evidence to support it, and looks like a reading of later practices back into the fourth century. We might speculate that Libanius' connections with the local Jewish leaders and his friendship with the Patriarch may have influenced the Emperor, who was a friend and onetime pupil of the rhetorician. Unfortunately, Libanius' letters from the time when Julian was in Antioch have not been preserved— one of the few gaps in his voluminous correspondence—and there is no mention of Julian's relationship with the Jews in those that survive. Chrysostom says that the attempted reconstruction followed Julian's admonition to the Jews to resume their ancestral sacrifices, for they told him they were not permitted by their law to do so outside
Jerusalem. That tallies well with what Julian himself says in two places. In his letter appointing the pagan priest Theodorus to oversee and reform all temples in Asia, he holds up the Jews as models of religious fervor who ought to be emulated by the pagans, while contrasting the "disease of the Galileans." And in his tract "Against the Galileans," he says:

...the Jews agree with the Gentiles, except that they believe in only one God. That is indeed peculiar to them and strange to us; since all the rest we have in a manner in common with them--temples, sanctuaries, altars, purifications, and certain precepts. For as to these we differ from one another either not at all or in trivial matters....

Julian wanted to link the Jews and pagans together as defenders of ancient traditions and cultivators of the rites and ceremonies which, for the Roman, constituted and manifested religio. They had to form common ranks against the Christians, whose great fault in Julian's eyes was their destruction of the links with the past--even their own Jewish past. While the evidence does not permit us to be very precise, it is worth asking what this alliance would have meant in the context of fourth-century Antiochene society. The insults which Julian received upon his arrival in Antioch made it plain that he could expect little support from those who were presently in power in the city. Indeed, his rather eccentric crusade led to something like an inversion of the ordinary connections. The old pagan aristocracy, whose primary loyalty had always been to the city first and the Empire only when need be, now had to be his first resort; Libanius is the perfect example. The newly wealthy and powerful classes which had been created by the central government, beginning especially with Diocletian's reforms that multiplied the bureaucracy, were now largely in the hands of Christians. Correspondingly, the Jews were also in a peculiar position. Their traditional alliance had been with the central government rather than with the local, but since Constantine that relationship, while not entirely destroyed, was more and more precarious. Meanwhile, the wealthier members of the Jewish community found more in common with the old Greek aristocracy than with the honorati.
Among the leadership classes of the city, pagan and Jew found themselves similarly excluded from the revised channels of power, while the pagan emperor found those same channels of power recalcitrant to his will. Thus the seemingly improbable religious alliance joins people who had been forced by a social and political shift to become bedfellows. This is not to say that the religious factors are mere disguises of the social facts, for it was precisely Julian's deeply held beliefs and his puritanical reform measures that brought about the alliance. The point is rather that the religious and social factors are inextricably knitted together.

On the ideological side, there was one further reason why support for the Jews, and particularly the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple, were attractive to Julian. From his Christian training he was doubtless familiar with the apologetic topos which made the destruction of the temple and the apparently permanent interruption of the sacrificial cultus a sign that God willed for his promises to pass at that moment from the Jews to the Christians. What better way to refute the Christians than to rebuild the temple and reestablish the cultus? Unfortunately the failure of the attempt appeared so dramatically to confirm the Christian claim that it became itself a regular part of subsequent Christian arguments against the Jews.\textsuperscript{157}

Shortly after the end of Julian's reign, Antiochene Christians begin to manifest increasing hostility toward the Jews, which could be construed as a backlash against Julian's use of the Jews against the Christians.\textsuperscript{158} It was at this time that the Synagogue of the Hasmonean Martyrs was seized by the Christians and made into a church,\textsuperscript{159} the first of many such incidents.\textsuperscript{160} And twenty-three years after Julian's death, John Chrysostom, newly ordained to the priesthood, began a series of eight sermons against the Jews in his native Antioch.\textsuperscript{161} The highly rhetorical invective of these sermons, combining elements of popular pagan anti-semitism with anti-Jewish exegetical traditions from the Christian apologists, established Chrysostom as "le maître de l'imprécaition anti-juive...sans conteste...."\textsuperscript{162} Two of the homilies (actually
one very long sermon interrupted by hoarseness) make particular reference to Julian's restoration project. Chrysostom compares the outburst of flame that stopped the rebuilding of the foundations with what happened to Aaron's sons, who were burned up when they sought to offer sacrifice illegitimately. The miracle, like the Jews' defeats under Vespasian and Titus, under Hadrian, and again under Constantine, proved that the temple had been destroyed in accordance with God's will, making it clear to all "that the wreath belongs indubitably to the church." Chrysostom thus draws the conclusion which is implicit in the anti-Jewish polemic of the Christian apologists from Pseudo-Barnabas and Justin—if not indeed from the Acts of the Apostles—on: the Jews' rejection of Jesus as Messiah meant the end of their role in the history of salvation, and the destruction of their city and temple was God's public pronouncement of their rejection, fulfilling Jesus' prophecy in Matt 24:2. Consequently there seems hardly any limit to his invective. Jewish souls, like Jewish buildings, are haunts of demons (PG 48.847; 852B; 861A; 940B); no Jew worships God (PG 48.847B); Jewish festivals are no better than theatre spectacles, occasions of "gluttony and drunkenness, sexual license," and "dancing barefoot in the agora" (1.2, 846B; 1.3, 848B; 6.6, 912B-913A; 7.1, 916; 8.1, 927). To be sure, much of this belongs to stereotyped insults of the rhetorical tradition, but there are ominous new elements. In the first of these homilies Chrysostom urges his congregation to use every means possible, including force if necessary (καὶ βλαν ποιὲσαι, καὶ όβροςαςι) to save a brother from "the trap of the devil, and to separate him from the fellowship of the Christ-killers" (PG 48.849A). He may not have been the first to use this last dreadful term, but he uses it with deadly seriousness.

Nevertheless, Chrysostom's aim in these homilies is not an attack on the Jews as such, but the deterrence of Christians from participating in Jewish rites. Far from representing a popular hostility toward Judaism among Christians in Antioch, Chrysostom's imprecations reveal the exact opposite: a widespread Christian infatuation with Judaism. Seven of the eight homilies are timed to precede the High Holy Days of autumn;
the remaining one (No. 3) concerns Passover. The reason, as Chrysostom explains, is that large numbers of Christians are drawn to observe the "spectacle" of these festivals and fasts and even to participate in them (1.1, 844). Not only at festival time, however, but throughout the year the synagogues appear to some Christians as awesome, numinous places. Chrysostom relates the case of a Christian matron required by a man, also claiming to be a Christian, to go to the synagogue to take an oath for some business transaction, since "many had told him that oaths taken there were more awesome" (1.3, 847B-848A). Chrysostom has also heard that many believers go to the synagogue in Daphne for incubation when they are ill (1.6, 852A). The sanctity of the synagogue seems in the mind of these Christians to stem particularly from the presence of the scrolls of the Torah in the ark, for Chrysostom takes pains to refute this notion, and ridicules these arks, which are such feeble substitutes for the implements of the former Temple (6.7, 914A-915A; 1.5f., 850B-852A). So strong is the attraction of the Jewish rites that some Christians in Antioch— or at least one known to Chrysostom—have been circumcised (2.2, 858B-860A; cf. 1.8, 855B). What is most interesting here is that it is not simply a case of conversion to Judaism, for the man regards himself as still a Christian. It is Chrysostom who, appealing to Galatians 5:3, insists that the man has in fact become apostate, but even he still calls him a "brother," hidden in Judaism "like an animal in the bushes" (857B).

Marcel Simon, who has made a very careful study of Chrysostom's anti-Jewish polemic, concluded that Chrysostom was responding to an active proselytizing effort mounted by the Jews. That is doubtful. True, Chrysostom can say things like, "The Jews, worse than any wolves, prepare at the approach of their festivals to attack the flock" (4.1, 871B), but that is exceptional. Chrysostom sometimes is carried away by his own metaphors; in one of the last of the anti-Jewish homilies he admits to his congregation that, like a gentle animal that has acquired the taste for human blood, he has come to lust for combat against the Jews (6.1, 903B). The dominant note in the homilies is not that the Jews are aggressors, but that they are
ungodly and that Christians should restrain their own and their brothers' strange attraction to them. The recurrent themes in Chrysostom's sermons show that there are three principal factors which lead Christians to become "infected" with the "disease of Judaism":\(^{171}\) (1) the great festivals and fasts of the Jewish year exerted great power; (2) the Jews and their places of worship were endowed with a numinous aura, expressing itself, for example, in miraculous healing;\(^{172}\) (3) they were after all the people of the Old Testament, still observing the impressive rites and celebrations found in the Law, and prominently displaying the sacred scrolls in their synagogues. So many Christians are caught up in the attraction of Judaism that Chrysostom warns in September 387 not to say how many, lest the public reputation of the church suffer (8.4, 933). The remedies which Chrysostom prescribes also support the impression that he feared Christian fascination with Judaism more than active Jewish recruitment of Christians. He does not yet urge attacks on the Jews as such, even though there are ominous notes in his polemic which, when read in medieval Europe, would look quite different than they did in fourth-century Antioch. Rather, he undertakes to isolate the Jews from the church. On the one hand, he undertakes to convert the numinous halo of the synagogues into a taboo. He does not deny that healings take place in the synagogues, but asserts that they are accomplished through evil powers (1.6f., 851B-855B; 8.5-7, 935-41). He insists over and over again that the synagogues are "dens of thieves" and "lairs of demons"; they are no different from pagan temples (1.6, 851B); the festivals no different from the theatre, which is forbidden to Christians (4.7, 881B). He warns husbands not to permit their wives to go there; "Are you not afraid they will return from there possessed of demons?" (2.3, 861A). Even the Christ-killer theme serves the same purpose: Christians found in the company of Jews run the risk of guilt by association, just as after the Riots of the Statues many innocent bystanders were dragged into court and punished, simply because they were present where the mischief took place (6.6, 913 middle). On the other hand, he urges each Christian to become the policeman of his brother's conscience, "to track
down and win back" those Christians infected with Judaism (2.1, 857A). The sermons are intended to equip them all with arguments, which they can use "like a bridle" to seize anyone they see running to the synagogue and "lead him into the church" (6.7, 915A; cf. Hom. 8 passim). Not to do so would be as irresponsible as for a soldier finding a Persian sympathizer in his camp to fail to report it to his commander (1.4, 850A).

From the end of Julian's reign until the expulsion of Jews from Antioch in the seventh century, there was a rising campaign to contain and isolate the Jewish community. Inside the church this was carried out by invective like Chrysostom's and, not long after, incitement to violence against the Jews. Outside, pressure on the Christian emperors brought changes in the imperial legislation to the same effect. These attempts to insulate Christians from Jewish influence cannot be regarded as simply a reaction against Julian's short-lived Jewish-pagan front. On the contrary, the direct impetus comes from the discovery by ecclesiastical leaders of a very strong "Judaizing" movement within the church. The picture which emerges from Chrysostom's sermons is of a naive infatuation with Jewish rites benignly tolerated or ignored by those who do not participate. It is only he, the zealous young ascetic priest, who sees mortal danger. Can the Jewish sympathizers be identified? Sometimes it is supposed that they were found chiefly among the Arians or Neo-Arians. Chrysostom and subsequent church writers do use the term "Jew" as a pejorative for these and other heretics, but that does not prove that they saw themselves in that light. The fact that Jews are reported to have taken sides occasionally in the Arian-Athanasian conflict in Alexandria may also be only orthodox slander or, if true, local opportunism. Chrysostom interrupted a series of sermons against the Anomoeans to begin his attacks on Judaizing Christians and, while he excuses this shift by saying that the Anomoeans are after all "akin to the Jews" (Hom. adv. Jud. 1.1, PG 48.845), he does not suggest anywhere that they are the ones "infected with Judaism." On the contrary, he talks about members who are in communion with his own church; otherwise the recurrent
appeal for mutual vigilance and correction would be meaningless. Simon, following Chrysostom, says that the Christian Judaizers were principally to be found among women and the relatively uneducated. That may be, but such assertions are common coin in ancient attacks on religious deviance, so they should not be taken too literally. Thus we do not obtain any clear idea just who the Christians were who were flocking to synagogues in Chrysostom's day.

Perhaps, indeed, it is more profitable to ask what was the source of the anti-Jewish sentiment. Perhaps it is Chrysostom himself and other leaders of the church who are exceptional. Chrysostom is a strikingly complex figure, for he combines in his person two utterly divergent cultures: the aristocratic world of Greek rhetoric and the ascetic Christianity of the monks in the hills. Yet in this period the two had one thing in common: advancement, whether construed in spiritual terms or in terms of a career, was achieved by means of talent, discipline, and personal exertion, within the context of connections which were more personal than institutional. Now consider the observations by Peter Brown that, where articulate and inarticulate forms of power meet, in the realm where it is charismatic authority that counts, accusations of witchcraft arise. Rhetoricians who lose their following and chariot drivers who are upset accuse one another of sorcery; the monks combat a world with devils filled; and Chrysostom portrays the synagogue and the individual Jew as "full of demons."

The Canons of Laodicea responding to a similar situation prohibit any intercourse with Jews, e.g., "celebrating festivals with them," "keeping the Sabbath," "eating unleavened bread" during the Pasch, bringing gifts on festival days. Christians were urged to work on the Sabbath and to read the Gospels as well as the Jewish Scriptures on Saturday (Canons 16, 29, 37, 38). The Apostolic Constitutions (2.61; 4.17; 6.27) forbid Christians to enter the synagogues of the Jews and prohibit participation in "Jewish feasts," and order them to close their ears to Jews who say "you are unclean because of nocturnal pollutions" or "menstruation."
The existence of large numbers of Judaizing Christians in this period is evidence not only of the continuing attraction of Judaism to outsiders, but of the strength and vitality within the Jewish communities in Syria and in Antioch. Other than the cities already mentioned, e.g., Apamaea, Laodicaea, other cities close to Antioch with Jewish communities are Ihmestar near Chalcis (Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica 3.7.16), Aleppo (CIJ 819), Cyrhhus (Theodoret wrote a commentary on Daniel directed against the Jews, PG 81, 1255-1546), Emessa (see Juster I, 197). That the Jews in Apamaea would build and decorate a synagogue in the last decade of the fourth century, some ten years after Theodosius' edict Cunctos populos making the Empire officially Christian, is testimony not only to their status within the Greek-speaking cities of the later Roman Empire but also their confidence in the future. That these hopes and expectations should be disappointed by later events is no evidence that they were misplaced in the fourth century. To the historian looking back from the perspective of a Christian civilization, the events in the fourth century appear to be moving swiftly and inexorably, but neither Jew nor Christian could see this in the fourth century even as late as the last decade. Elias Bickermann writes,

The contemporaries of Chrysostom did not yet know that they were opening the Christian period. Julian was yesterday, the persecutors the day before yesterday. Ambrose knew some magistrates who could boast of having spared Christians. At Antioch the catholics had just endured the persecution of Valens where unbelievers of every sort dominated the capital of Syria. The army, composed of peasants and barbarians, could acclaim tomorrow another Julian, another Valens, even another Diocletian.
NOTES

CHAPTER I


3. Surveys of the history of the Jewish community in Antioch during Hellenistic and Roman times can be found in S. Krauss, "Antioche," Revue des Études Juives 45 (1902) 27-49; C. H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," JBL 51 (1932) 130-60; B. Lurie, The Jews in Syria [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Association for Biblical Research in Israel, 1957); and G. Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria (Princeton University Press, 1961), passim. The Kraeling article, though over forty years old, is the most comprehensive; Krauss gives more information from Talmudic and Midrashic sources; Lurie, somewhat too general and superficial, is useful because he had access to epigraphic sources unknown to Kraeling, and he discusses Antiochene Jewry in relation to Jewish communities in other Syrian cities. Downey is helpful on specific points, but his comments are scattered throughout the book. Rabbinic references to Antioch are also discussed in the articles "Antioch" and "Daphne of Antioch," Encyclopedia for Talmudic Geography [in Hebrew], ed. Phinhas Na'aman (Tel Aviv: Joshua Chachik, 1972) 1.87-102.


5. Josephus claims that it implied formal citizenship (πολίτεια), granted already by the founder and remaining in force "to this very day" (Ant. 12.119). Most scholars doubt that the Antiochene Jews as a group would have enjoyed legal citizenship, any more than Alexandrian Jews (the point disputed by Apion, Ag.Ap. 2.39), who sought it in vain under Roman rule until Claudius rejected their petition conclusively. See H. I. Bell, Jews and Christians in Egypt (Greek Papyri in the British Museum 6; London: British Museum, 1924) 10-19. Kraeling (139) thought 2 Macc 4:9, where Jason offers money for Antiochene citizenship for Jerusalem Jews, presupposed similar rights already for Jews living in Antioch, but that does not follow. On the question of "Antioch-in-Jerusalem," see E. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer (Berlin: Schocken, 1937) 59-65, and V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1959) 161-69.
Kraeling (139) saw here a contradiction with *Ant.* 12.119 (cf. also Thackeray's note at *J.W.* 7.44 in the Loeb edition).

p. Sanh. 10:6, 29c; *Pesikta Rabbati* 31:10; Krauss, 30.

See below on the synagogue dedicated to the martyrs.


8 See below on the synagogue dedicated to the martyrs.

9 See, for example, the decree concerning the Jews in Sardis, *Josephus, Ant.* 14.259.


11 Malalas, *Chronographia* 50.10 (ed. Dindorf, pp. 244.15-246.2); Kraeling, 148; Downey, *History*, 192-95. See also Smallwood, 176, n. 111, and 360f.

12 Kraeling thinks the two accounts are doublets of one event (150f.), but Downey (*History, Excursus* 4, 586f.) effectively defends Josephus' version.

13 For a later period (fourth century) there is ample evidence for the practice of presenting such petitions to an official on his arrival: see J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: University Press, 1972) 208-19 and his appendix on the claque, 278-80.

14 E.g., Tacitus, *Histories* 5.


18 See especially *Codex Theodosianus* 12.1.157-158; Linder, 95-110; Avi-Yonah, 161-66.

19 Ep. 1251. For a translation, see below, p. 60.

20 For a discussion of M. Schwabe's quite different interpretation, see below.
24 See below, p. 55.


28 See below, pp. 53-54.

29 Kraeling, 136.

30 Liebeschuetz, 40-41, 92-96.

31 In fact Kraeling uses 15% for his calculations.

32 Apparently no remains of synagogues were found in the Princeton-French Academy excavations, even though the site of the Daphne synagogue, which Malalas says was pulled down to make way for a theater (Downey, History, 206f.), was excavated, producing fragments of the theater (D. N. Wilbur, "The Theatre at Daphne," Antioch-on-the-Orontes [Publications of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity] 2, ed. R. Stillwell [Princeton, 1938] 57-94).

33 Josephus, J.W. 7.44, says that the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes restored to the Jews in Antioch the brass votive plaques which had been seized from the Jerusalem temple, "to be installed in their synagogue." Downey (History, 109) doubts the trustworthiness of the report, but the existence of an Antioch synagogue in that period is not thereby called into question.

34 Downey, History, 544, n. 179; cf. p. 109 and the map, plate 11.

35 Kraeling makes the identification, p. 140, and Downey seems to concur, as does M. Simon, "La polémique anti-juive de S. Jean Chryostome et le mouvement judaïsant d'Antioche," in Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves 4 (= Mélanges P. Cumont) (1936) 414. See also the pioneering work of Card. Rampolla [y Tindaro], "Martyre et sepulture des Machabées," Rev. de l'art chrétien 4e sér., 10 (1899) 302, 383-87.

37 Downey, History, 499 and 237.

38 Chrysostom preached four sermons there and Augustine (Sermo 300.3) spoke of its (recent) acquisition (Simon, "Polémique," 414; Rampolla, 387-92, 457-58).


40 p.Shek. 6, 50a; b.Shek. 6b. This story may have been suggested by the meeting with Mark Antony of a hundred delegates from Jerusalem in 42/41 B.C.E., to oppose the accession of Herod and Phasael (Josephus, J.W. 1.243). It does not necessarily imply anything about the Jewish community in Daphne. Kraeling finds evidence for a Jewish settlement there from the report in 2 Macc 4:33f. that Onias took refuge in a pagan shrine at Daphne (p. 141).

41 Hom. ad Iud. 1.6 (see below, p. 95).

42 Kraeling, 141-43. Following ancient convention but not the compass, Kraeling places the plain to the east of Antioch; it should rather be north or northeast: see Downey, History, Excursus 9; although J. Lassus (Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 5.140) insists that the ancient practice, in which the main street was designated West-to-East, was not an "error," but only a convention. H. H. Tanzer, The Villas of Pliny the Younger (N.Y.: Columbia, 1924) points out that the cardinal compass points were generally avoided in the sitting of ancient cities, though the deviation of 22° West of true North she cites is not enough to explain the Antioch streets' deviation, which parallels the river.

43 "R. Leazar ben R. Jose says: 'Rice of the Hulat of Antioch is permitted as far as BORO'" (some mss. read 'as far as Beirut'); t.Dem. 2:1 (ed. Liebermann, p. 68); cf. p.Dem. 2:1, 22d.

44 Kraeling, 141-43. Josephus tells of a Babylonian Jew named Zamaris who with a retinue of 500 mounted archers and a hundred kinsmen (Kraeling calls him an "emir") had settled in "a place called Οὐσαλαοδ" when Saturninus was governor of Syria. Later Herod the Great moved him to a village he was founding in Batanaea (Ant. 17.23-29).
Much less to fancy that the road, 20 stadia long, paved by Herod (Josephus, J.W. 1.425) was built to connect this "suburb" with the city (Kraeling, 144f.). Josephus clearly is describing the main street of Antioch itself, "once shunned on account of the mud" but paved by Herod "with polished marble, and, as a protection from the rain, adorned...with a colonnade of equal length." Cf. Downey, History, 173f. and, on excavations in this street, J. Lassus, Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 5.

Deut. Rab. 4.8; Lev. Rab. 4.3.

L. Harmand, Libanius: Discours Sur les patronages (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955) 73-87. His argument is accepted by Liebeschuetz (44), who points out, however, that the estate would therefore not have been fortified like the farm near the wilderness at Et-Touba, the plan of which Harmand uses as an illustration (p. 142).

Or. 47.4-6. For translation, see below, pp. 67-68.

Harmand, 138f.

Libanius, Or. 47.13. Liebeschuetz (45) thinks their situation may have been like that of Jewish peasants in Babylonia, where the landlord controlled the crops the tenant could grow and even the time of the harvest.

See the letters in Chapter III and the discussion below, pp. 11ff.

We do not find anything in Libanius' account to justify Downey's description of them as "very orthodox" (History, 447).


Liebeschuetz, 44.

Or. 47 passim; note especially §§19-21, where he insists that the only proper patron and judge of peasants, as of slaves, is the owner. That is, he takes for granted their reduction to serfdom, and grandly asserts that the owner's noblesse oblige is the only protection they need.

Harmand (chap. 6) discusses in some detail the probable form of Libanius' complaint and its legal basis.

Cf. Liebeschuetz, 66, and above, n. 55. Liebeschuetz, 71-73, points out that in the period Libanius describes in Or. 47 the situation was aggravated by a depression following the battle of Adrianople.

Liebeschuetz has described the transition very effectively. For the place of the church, in both its formal and "charismatic" opportunities, see P. Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man," JRomSt 61 (1971) 80-101, and T. Kopeček,

59 Ep. 1251 (Foerster); below, p. 60.

60 These are translated below, Chapter III.

61 On which see below, pp. 27-30.

62 On the philhellenism of the patriarchal family, beginning with Judah ha-Nasi, see M. Simon, Verus Israel (Paris: Boccard, 1948) chap. 10.

63 See the thorough discussion of these letters by M. Schwabe, "Letters of Libanius to the Patriarch of Palestine" [in Hebrew], Tarbiz 1/2 (January, 1930) 85-110.

64 Above, n. 35.

65 Kraeling, 135. But how can Kraeling be certain that the ἀναθήματα sent by Antiochene Jews to the Jerusalem temple (Josephus, J.W. 7.45) were gold, or that they were necessarily made by Jewish metalsmiths? On shopkeepers, see Chrysostom, PG 51.176 (a homily from Antioch, contra Migne).

66 Liebeschuetz, 52-61.

67 See below, Chapter II.

68 p. Sanh. 3:2, 14a.


71 Sifre Num. 84 (22a, ed. Friedmann).

72 p. Ber. 5:1, 9a.


74 Was Barnabas therefore one of the ἀναθήματα (11:20)? So E. Schwartz conjectured. Was he in fact the founder or leader of the group that founded the Antiochene church? Cf. Haenchen, 314.


Josephus, J.W. 1.425; see n. 45 above.


Mag 10:1, 3 (bis); Rom 3:3 (with Χριστιανός as var. lect.); Philad 6:1. Elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers only in Mart Polyc 10:1, τὸν τοῦ Χριστιανοῦ...Λόγον; cf. V. Corwin, St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (Yale Studies in Religion 1; New Haven & London: Yale, 1960) 189. In general, Ignatius likes compounds in Χριστ-. According to Kraft's index he is also the only "Apostolic Father" to use the noun Χριστιανός (7x), also used fairly often by second-century apologists Justin, Aristides, and Athenagoras. Also Χριστιανός, Trall 6:1; Χριστομαθία, Philad 8:2; Χριστόνομος or Χριστόνυμος, Rom inscr.; Χριστόφορος, Eph 9:2.

Ad Autol. 1.1, trans. R. M. Grant, Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolycum (Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford: Clarendon, 1970). He goes on, "I bear this name beloved of God in the hope of being useful (εὐχρηστοῦ) to God. It is not the case, as you suppose, that the name of God is offensive." The statement is the more remarkable since Theophilus does not elsewhere mention "Christ" or "Jesu" in his apology. He takes up the question again in 1.12, this time combining his play on Χρηστός with examples of "anointing" that makes objects "useful." "Do you not want to be anointed with the oil of God? We are actually called Christians just because we are anointed with the oil of God."

We pass over the account in Acts 11:27-30 of the Antioch congregation's famine-relief for Jerusalem. If the report could be taken at face value, it would afford evidence for the early importance of the Antioch church and of its strong ties with Jerusalem. However, the internal difficulties with the passage and the problems involved in attempts to harmonize it with Paul's reports of trips to Jerusalem in Galatians 1-2 make its historical value precarious.

Codex D has the intervening group from Jerusalem "command" Paul and his associates to come.

At least that is the most natural reading of Gal 2:4.

The "Western" text is undoubtedly secondary.

Acts 21:25 does have James refer to a letter which he and the Jerusalem elders have sent, containing the "Jerusalem decree." Some commentators have identified this letter with the action by the James party mentioned in Gal 2:11 and have surmised that the author of Acts has mistakenly or deliberately presented it as an action of the Jerusalem Council for the sake of a more harmonious picture. See the standard commentaries.

Note the inclusio formed by the commissioning, 13:2f., and the report, 14:26-28.

Antioch is also absent from the deuteroPauline literature, for 2 Tim 3:11 probably depends on Acts 13:50 and therefore refers to Pisidian Antioch.


Schütz, 151f.

Downey (History, 278) thinks the separate groups existed before Peter's arrival, but I do not think that can be read out of μετὰ τῶν ἐδοχΩν οὐνησιων. Paul, at least, wants the reader to believe that division is an innovation.

οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς who were "feared" by Peter (Gal 2:12) are evidently Jewish Christians.


"Jesus and the Gospels," 34. Recruitment was more often from rural areas, so the villages may have been affected more than the city. Josephus in fact tells us that Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea were exceptions at first to the general wave of anti-Jewish feelings and action at this time (J.W. 2.479).

As L. E. Keck pointed out in his response at SBL 1975.

See above, pp. 4-5.

One may also ask whether the Jewish-Christian group may have been strengthened by refugees from Jerusalem; cf. Downey, History, 286f.


1:2, trans. K. Lake (Loeb).


Tr. Lake; or perhaps, "fables that were unprofitable to those of old," treating τοις παλαιοῖς as a substantive.

κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμόν; var. lect. νόμον Ἰουδαϊκόν, νόμον Ἰουδαϊσμόν.

Corwin, 61-64; R. M. Grant, "Jewish-Christianity in Antioch in the Second Century," _Rech.Sci.Rel._ 60 (Daniélon Festschrift, 1972) 101. Corwin thinks the Antiochene Judaizers resembled the Qumran sect and must have been of Essene background; Grant agrees that "the more extreme Judaizers had affinities with Qumran." The evidence adduced seems too slim, however, to be confident about this identification.

Particularly emphasized by Grant, "Jewish Christianity in Antioch." Grant also argues, however, that gnostics like Saturninus (in Antioch in Hadrian's time) formed a front opposing the kind of Judaeo-Christianity represented later by Theophilus (p. 105).

According to Justin, _1 Apol._ 26.4.

S. Laeuchli, "The Drama of Replay," in _Searching in the Syntax of Things_ (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974) 89. On the other hand, there are indications in Ignatius letters that he presupposes such use in the churches. Beside the possible allusions to the LXX in Eph 5:3 (Prov 3:34, but perhaps via Jas 4:6 or 1 Pet 5:5); Eph 15:1 (Ps 33:9; 148:5 or Jdt 16:14); Magn 15:1 (Prov 18:17); Magn 13:1 (Ps 1:1); Trall 8:2 (Isa 52:5), Eph 19:2f. sounds as if Ignatius were familiar with the Abraham aggadah, in which the appearance of the star heralding the patriarch's birth signalled the destruction of astrology. The prayer in Trall 12:3 may be an allusion to Deut 31:26. The phrase εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγέλειν in Philad 5:2, when compared with the similar expression in 9:1-2 suggests that "the prophets" refers to the OT, not Christian prophets. Indeed 5:1-2 may be a reference to Ignatius' scripture canon, in which "the Gospel" and "the Apostles" stand alongside "the prophets." In Philad 8:2 Ignatius has argued with those who insist on proving everything from the ἄρχετοι,
but his own γέγοραται must accept the appropriateness of scripture arguments, even though he rejects the hermeneutics of any who do not begin with christology.

109 R. M. Grant, "Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus," in After the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967) 136 (originally in HTR, 1947). Grant, who depends for this judgment mainly on research by L. Ginzberg, cites numerous examples here (136-41) and in the notes to his translation (see n. 81 above).

110 After the New Testament, 129.

111 One example may illustrate the relationship and difference. Like Philo and the rabbis, Theophilus knows traditions that seek to explain the different names of God, especially θεός = ὦ θεόν and κύριος = κύριον. (On the development of these traditions, see A. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven [SJLA 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977] and the paper by N. A. Dahl and A. Segal at the 1975 Annual Meeting of SBL.) Theophilus is closer to Philo than to the rabbis in depending entirely on the LXX in his explanation of κύριος as referring to God's rule (κυριεύειν) of the universe, and in connecting θεός with τίθημι and equating it with God's creative power. However, he adds yet another etymology, from θειός, and goes on to mention other "names," πατήρ, δημιουργός, ποιητής, θεοστός (Ad Autol. 1.4). One of the traditional motifs taken up by Theophilus is illustrated by an Antioch mosaic. In his exposition of the creation story, Theophilus says that the eschatological restoration of man will also bring gentleness among the animals (Ad Autol. 2.17). This seems to be the theme of the Philia mosaic in which four pairs of animals, one carnivore, the other gentle, face each other on sides of a rectangle (Doro Levi, Antioch Mosaic Pavements [Princeton: University Press, 1947] vol. 2, Pl. LXXII). The exegetical basis is presumably Isa 11:7, quoted explicitly in a similar mosaic from the "hall church" at Ma'in in Madaba, Transjordan (Levi, 1.318ff.), and Levi thinks the animal pair in the synagogue at Beth Alpha probably has the same meaning.

112 3.9, trans. Grant.

113 Theophilus constructs "syntheses" of OT and NT passages which may be intended to counter Marcion's "Antitheses" (Grant, After the NT, 144). According to Eusebius, HE 4.24, he also wrote a tract against Marcion, now lost.

114 On the notion of the διατάγματα, suggested already in Diognetus, Aristides, and Barnabas, and receiving its classic expression in the Didascalia, see Simon, Verus Israel, 114-17.

115 Trans. Grant, italics added. This claim on the Jewish scriptures is of course important for Theophilus' apologetic, for Autolycus thinks "that our scriptures are new and modern" (3.1).

Verus Israel, 436.

HE 7.32.2, trans. Lake. It is often supposed that he assisted Lucian in the latter's famous recension of the Greek Bible, but there is no direct evidence of this. Grant thinks both Lucian and Dorotheus "studied with Jewish teachers" ("Anaphora," 93).

HE 6.12.1. Domnus, he says, "had fallen away from the faith of Christ, at the time of the persecution, to Jewish will-worship (θεολοθρησκεία)." It is not clear which persecution is meant—not likely the measures taken against Christianity by Septimius Severus while Serapion was bishop, since these forbade conversion to either Christianity or Judaism (Downey, 305). Possibly then Domnus had defected in the time of Marcus Aurelius. The use of the rare word θεολοθρησκεία is doubtless dependent on Col 2:23 and shows that the Christians are still looking for scriptural models for their opposition to Judaism—but this word is likely Eusebius' rather than Serapion's.

Iou6aioc...πρόσωπον Χριστιανοῦ περιφέρουν; Exp. in Ps. 109.2 = PG 55.267. Cf. Simon, Verus Israel, 123.

Hist. Arianorum ad monach. 71 = PG 25.777B, cited by F. Loofs, Paulus von Samosata (TU, 3d series 14/5; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924) 18, who has assembled all the significant sources. See also G. Bardy, Paul de Samosate (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents 4; Louvain, 1923) 23f., 32, 382-84.

Loofs, 20-34; Bardy, 23f., 32, 172-74, 384.

As stated explicitly by Bar Hebraeus I: cui gratissimae Pauli sententiae extiterunt; cited by Loofs, 32f.

See, besides Loofs and Bardy, Downey, History, 310-15. Loofs, however, thinks it "unwahrscheinlich" that Zenobia elevated Paul to the office of ducenarius. No credence is to be given to late reports that she was even responsible for his installation as bishop, though Bardy accepts this (197).

Bardy, 194.

Downey, History, 311.


Bardy, 384.

Exp. in Ps. 109.1 = PG 55.265.

Haer. 65.2; Bardy, 32. Epiphanius says they are called "second Jews" (δεύτεροι Ἰουδαίοι).
It is another question, which cannot be taken up here, just which groups of Christians in Antioch and vicinity rallied to Paul's cause. Do the allegations about his social climbing, made by the Council letter (Eusebius, *HE* 7.30.7) suggest a difference in social class between the Paulists and the Catho­lics? (cf. T. Kopeček). Paul's chief opponent was the presbyter Malchion, who was head of a rhetorical school and hence probably of relatively high socio-economic class (see P. Petit, *Les étudiants de Libanius* [Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1957])—in effect thus a member of the Greco-Roman "establish­ment."

Downey, *History*, 277f.; Corwin, 49, 76f., 85f.

Ignatius' preoccupation with the question of unity is implicit testimony to this diversity; cf. Corwin, 85f.


See n. 14 above.

Of 100 students whose religion is ascertainable, Petit finds 12 Christians, most of them from Cappadocia and Armenia (only two from Antioch). All Libanius' students were from the three highest provincial classes, and the Christians were all of the top two, sons of either imperial officials or *curiales*. They are thus examples more of the results than of the process of upward mobility (Petit, 113-17 and Tables I and II). An example not counted by Petit (since this person's study with Libanius is not confirmed in the authentic letters of Libanius) was John Chrysostom, whose father and grandfather had served in the *officium* of the *magister militum per orientem*, but who aspired by his rhetorical training to a still higher career in the civil service (see A. H. M. Jones, "St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education," *HTR* 46 [1953] 171-73).

See Liebeschuetz, 50 and 247-51.

For the case of the Neo-Arians, demonstrated by Kopeček, see n. 58 above.

See above, pp. 9-11.

Brown, "Holy Man"; the cases of Aetius and George in Kopeček. In a different way Paul of Samosata presented an earlier example. The council's accusation that he intervened in lawsuits for money parallels the kind of accusation Libanius would make against military patrons, and suggests the kind of mediation which patrons of both the older and newer types were
expected to provide. Libanius, Or. 30 (Pro templis). 8, says the monks, who have led attacks on pagan shrines, "eat more than elephants." Harmand (28 n. 3) compares this with Libanius' words about the gluttony of military patrons.


144 On Libanius' primary loyalty to the city, and the city as focus of conservative views of society, see Liebeschuetz, 12f.

145 Downey, History, 381f.


147 Ep. 89b (Bidez-Cumont) 295C; ET in the Loeb ed. by W. C. Wright, 2.296-339. Vogt even thinks Julian's parody of judgment oracles by Jewish prophets, "Tremble, be afraid, fire, flame, death, a dagger, a broad-sword!" may allude to the "fire" which sprang from the earth to stop the restoration, but he has misread the passage. Julian is not talking about contemporary prophets in Antioch who persuaded him to undertake the futile project, as Vogt believes (50, cf. 47, 59), but the OT prophets, who make the profanation of pagan temples "a reproach against us."

148 E.g. the first portions of "Against the Galileans" (in vol. 3 of the Loeb ed.).

149 Origen, C.Cels. 1.28-71; 1.1-79; for ET, see H. Chadwick, Origen: Contra Celsum (Cambridge University Press, 1953).

150 Vogt, 9-18.

151 John Chrysostom and his Time (London & Glasgow: Sands, 1959 [The 1st German ed. was 1919-30]) 1.66. Contrast Simon, Verus Israel, 241 and n. 1, who points out that there was no economic basis for anti-semitism in antiquity. The role of "money lovers" in ancient stereotypes was played rather by Egyptians and Phoenicians.
This homily was delivered twenty years after the event. The "Letter to the Jewish Community" attributed to Julian (No. 240 Bidez-Cumont = No. 51 in the Loeb ed.) asks the Jews to pray for him, "in order that, when I have successfully concluded the war with Persia, I may rebuild by my own efforts the sacred city of Jerusalem, which for so many years you have longed to see inhabited, and may bring settlers there, and, together with you, may glorify the Most High God therein" (trans. Wright, Loeb). This letter, however, is probably a forgery, despite Wright's defense of it: so Schwartz, Klimek, Geffcken, Bidez-Cumont; see esp. Vogt, 64-68. If so, only a single line of his authentic letter to the Jews remains (quoted by Lydus, De mens. 4, p. 110.4, ed. Wünsch = Ep. 134, Bidez-Cumont): "I shall with all enthusiasm raise up the temple of the Most High God."

See his Misopogon and the Julianic orations of Libanius, the latter conveniently collected and translated in vol. 1 of the new Loeb edition by A. F. Norman.

Liebeschuetz has aptly described the significance of this alliance: "Belief in the city as the essential form of social organization, and in the value of the cults of the city are different aspects of the same attitude of cultural conservatism" (13).

Cf. Brock, 105; Lewy, 4-6.


Rampolla, 387-88; Simon, "Polémique," 414; cf. above, n. 36.

Baur, 1.52, accepts as factual the report by Ambrose, Ep. 40.15 Ad Theodosium, that the Jews under Julian had burned several churches in Damascus, Alexandria, Gaza, Askalon, Beirut, and elsewhere.

PG 48.843-942. For translations of two of them, see below, Chapter V.

Simon, "Polémique," 256.

Hom. adv. Jud. 5 and 6, PG 48.899B-901B, 905A-907A. The sermons were delivered on 28 and 30 September 388.

900A, 900B-901A.

Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. Χριστοκτόνος, gives examples from *Apoc. Pauli* 49; *Const. Ap*. 2.61.1; 6.25.1; *Athenasius fr.* (PG 26.1224B), and *Proclus*, *Constant. Or.* 12.2 (PG 65.789A), as well as several instances from Chrysostom. Most of these, however, seem to refer to those actually involved in Jesus' death, such as Caiaphas, rather than the nation as a whole. But Chrysostom likes to quote Matt 27:25. It is possible that this is another instance of the influence of Syriac Christianity on Chrysostom, for Ephrem regularly uses the words ᵐɘ сохрани and ṣaqopować, "crucifier," as synonyms for "Jew" (R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* [Cambridge: University Press, 1975] 41).

See especially 1.5 (PG 48.850A–851B), 2.3 (862A); and 6.2 (907A).


"Polémique," passim; cf. *Verus Israel*, 256–64. See also Baur, 1.274–76.

"C'est véritablement une campagne de propagande, amplement orchestrée" (*Verus Israel*, 336).

1.1, 844; 1.8, 855B; 3.1, 862; 5.12, 904; 7.6, 926B–927A; 8.9, 941f. Julian had spoken of the "disease of the Galileans," *Ep*. 89 Bidez-Cumont = 20 Loeb, 454B. A common pejorative term for false opinion; similar language is found already in the Pastoral Epistles.

It is well known that the Jews had a reputation as magicians in antiquity; see, e.g., Simon, *Verus Israel*, chap. 12. "Throughout this age the Jews share with Persians and Chaldaeans a reputation as expert sorcerers second only to the Egyptian past masters" (A. A. Barb, "The Survival of Magic Arts," in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* [Oxford-Warburg Series; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963] 118). (In private conversation Barb has ventured the guess that in both Antioch and Alexandria, which were apparently the chief centers for the production of magic gems, Jews were responsible for very many, if not most of these objects.) John complains that the Jewish amulets and incantations are attracting Christians because the Jewish magical rites seem to have greater power. That is, the Jewish magicians were probably more successful than the pagan or Christian magicians (*Hom. ad Jud.* 8). It is likely that the Jews who practiced magic were devout and pious and saw no contradiction between the use of magic and Jewish religion. Magic helped them deal with fears, anxieties, sicknesses, and to soften the abuse and mistreatment lower class citizens received from the wealthy and powerful. The recently discovered book of magic from this period written in Hebrew, the *Sepher HaRazim* (ed. Margalioth [Margulies])
[Jerusalem: Judah Lev Fund, 1966]), was produced by a person without power and influence, dependent on the whims and desires of those in authority. He uses magic to impress "kings," the "head of a city," a "judge," or "military officer," or a "rich or famous woman" (Sepher HaRasim 1.218-20; 2.45-47; 2.133-34).

173Cf. J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (London: Soncino, 1934) 150-95. Simon (*Verus Israel*, 272f.) says Parkes goes too far in claiming that anti-semitism was imposed from above by the ecclesiastical hierarchy; it was also a popular movement. But he agrees that there was also a popular philo-Judaism, and that Christian anti-semitism was above all a defensive reaction to it.


175"Polémique," 405.

176Sozomen reports that he studied under Libanius, and Chrysostom's rhetorical style makes that believable. See Baur, 1, chap. 4, esp. pp. 22f., and Jones (n. 137 above).

177Palladius says he lived four years with an old Syrian monk, practicing self-mortification. Baur thinks this may have been Carterius, and the time with him that period which Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Maximum (later bishop of Isaurian Seleucia) spent in the Asketerion of Diodorus (1.109f.). Though ascetic Christianity was especially identified with the Syriac-speaking population, it had already begun to penetrate the urban, Greek-speaking church, particularly the anti-Arians. Diodorus and Flavian, the two laymen who became leaders of the pro-Nicene faction, became closely allied with rural monasticism, although their own background was aristocratic with classical training. Under Meletius they introduced the antiphonal chanting of Psalms from the villages into the churches of Antioch. Theodoret reports that they were joined in the struggle against the Arians by a Syriac-speaking hermit from Edessa, the "Persian" Aphrahat, and later, during Meletius' second or third exile, by another Osroenean holy man, Julian (*Relig.hist. 2* and 8 [PG 82.1317C-D and 1368C-76C] and *HE* 4.25-27 [GCS 44, 2nd ed. 1954]). As a youthful eyewitness, Theodoret's report cannot be ignored, yet this Aphrahat, who came to Antioch ca. 360 and remained there until his death after 400 (S. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum*, vol. 3 [Mödling bei Wien: St. Gabriel, 1938] 278-80; A. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne* ] Paris: Boccard, 1959] 267-76), is an obscure figure. He is not to be confused with the well-known Syrian church leader and author (A. Vööbus, "Aphrahat," *JAC* 3 [1960] 153).

178Brown, "Sorcery" (above, n. 143).

179"Les Maccabées," 82.
CHAPTER II
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES

Excavations in Antioch in the 1930s yielded little information about Jewish life in the city. But a number of inscriptions from other locations do shed light on the Jewish community in Antioch in the fourth century. They are the following:

(1) Several dedicatory inscriptions from the mosaic floor of a synagogue built in Apamea, a neighboring city in Syria, in the last decade of the fourth century. The donors mentioned in two of the inscriptions are from an Antiochene Jewish family. (2) A tomb at Beth She'arim, the Jewish burial ground in Galilee. This tomb was owned by members of the same Jewish family, and inscriptions found there indicate that some Antiochene Jews were buried (i.e., re-buried) at Beth She'arim. (3) A very fragmentary inscription from Tiberias in Galilee mentioning Jews from Antioch. Besides these inscriptions we have also included another inscription from Apamea mentioning a Jewish hazzan, i.e., deacon or minister (diakonos) and a dedicatory inscription from a Christian church built at Antioch at approximately the same time the Jewish synagogue was built in Apamea.

APAMEA

1. Ἐπὶ τῶν τιμιωτάτων ἀρχισυναγώγων Εὐσεβίου καὶ Νεμίου καὶ Φινέου καὶ Θεοδόρου γερουσιάρχου καὶ τῶν τιμιωτάτων πρεσβυτέρων Εἰσαχίου καὶ Σαυλοῦ καὶ λοιπῶν, Ἰλάσιος ἀρχισυνάγωγος Ἀντιοχείων, ἐποίησεν τὴν ἱερὰν τοῦ ψηφίου πό(δας) ρν', ἐτοὺς γυν' ἑυδοκέους ζ'. Εὐλογία πάσι.

At the time of the most honored archisynagogoi Eusebius and Nemios and Phineos, and Theodoros the gerousiarch, and the most honored presbys Eisakios and Saulos and the rest, Ilasios, archisynagogos of the Antiocheians, donated the mosaic entryway, 150 feet, in the year 703, the seventh of Aydynaios [January 7, 391]. Blessing on all.

2. Ἰλάσιος Εἰσακίου ἀρχισυναγωγός Ἀντιοχε-ων, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας Φωτίου συμβίου καὶ τέκνων καὶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας Εὐσταθίας πενθερᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ μνήμας Εἰσακίου καὶ Ἑδεσίου καὶ Ἡσυχίου προγόνων, ἐποίησεν τὴν ψήφωσιν τῆς ἱσόδου. Ἐπόθην καὶ ἔλεος ἐπὶ πάν τὸ ἡγιασμένον υἱῶν πλῆθος.

Ilasios son of Eisakios, archisynagogos of the Antiocheians, for the well-being of Photion his wife and his children, and for the well-being of Eustathia his mother-in-law, and in memory of Eisakios and Edesios and Hesychios his ancestors, donated the mosaic entryway. Peace and mercy on all your holy people.

Text in Lifshitz, No. 39; Sukenik, No. 2; Frey, No. 804.

3. Ἐπὶ Νεμία ἀζύανα καὶ τοῦ διάκονος ἐψηφώθη ἢ πρόσθεσις [τοῦ] ναοῦ ἐστος ψ' Ἄδστρου θ'.

At the time Nemias was ἡαζαν, i.e., minister, the vestibule of the temple was set in mosaic, in the year 703, the 9th of Dystros [March 9, 391].

Text in Lifshitz, No. 40; Sukenik, No. 6; Frey, No. 805.
BETH SHE'ARIM

1. Ἀψὶς
Αἰδεσίου
γερου(σ)ίαρχου
Ἀντιοχέως

Burial chamber of Aidesios, the gerousiarch of Antioch.

Text in M. Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, Beth She'arim (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 1973-74), No. 141.

2. Εἰσίν εν τῇ ἀ-
ψηλῇ κρηπί-
δες ἡξι᾽
διαφέρου-
σαι Αἰδεσίῳ

There are in the burial chamber six tombs belonging to Aidesios.

Text in Schwabe-Lifshitz, No. 142.

3. Αἰδεσίῳς

Text in Schwabe-Lifshitz, No. 143.

4. Ἡσυχίς

Text in Schwabe-Lifshitz, No. 144.
TIBERIAS

Here lies Leontina
daughter of Samuel the ge[rousiarch, 
wife of] Thaumasios [archisynagogos] 
of the Antioch[eians]
seventy [years].


ANTIOCH

At the time of our most holy bishop Flavian and the most devout administrator and presbyter Eusebius, Dorys the presbyter, fulfilling a vow, donated the mosaic exedra. In the month of Dystros 435 [March 387].

Text in Jean Lassus, "L'Eglise Cruciforme," in Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 2.38-39. The term exedra refers to one of the four arms of the church which was cruciform in shape. This inscription was found on the mosaic pavement of the north arm.
NOTES

CHAPTER II

1Only one Jewish inscription was reported, a marble funerary slab roughly inscribed with a menorah and the Greek letters ΡΟΑΒ (Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 2.150f., No. 24). Downey (ibid.) offers several possible explanations of the word, which seems most likely Aramaic. No. 111, with its paraphrase of 1 Kdms 16:4, could as easily be Christian as Jewish; see L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie 3/1 (Paris: Institut Francais d'Archeologie de Beyrouth, 1950) 442, and Levi, Antioch Mosaic Pavements, 1.320.

2Lifshitz reads Νευνεου; we follow Sukenik in this instance.
CHAPTER III
LETTERS OF LIBANIUS CONCERNING THE JEWS

Among the more than 1500 letters of Libanius which have survived are nine which bear directly upon the situation of Jews in Antioch and in Palestine in the fourth century. The first one, numbered 1251 in Foerster's edition, gives a tantalizing glimpse of the internal organization of the Jewish community in Antioch and of its relations to officials and persons of influence in the pagan world.¹ In it we see Libanius persuaded by the Jews of his own city to use his influence on their behalf with his long-time acquaintance Priscianus, who has just become governor of the province Palestine. It was written in 364 C.E., when Libanius was fifty.

Some twenty-five years later, in the last years of his life, Libanius carried on an extended correspondence with someone called "the Patriarch" (in one letter, "the Patriarchs"). Eight of his letters to this figure are extant, dated 388 to 393 C.E. Although some earlier scholars had thought that the Patriarch might have been a Christian bishop, Moshe Schwabe's careful investigation² has confirmed Otto Seeck's view³ that the Jewish נציב in Tiberias was meant. The sources make it more difficult to say who held that position in the years 388-393. Seeck identifies Libanius' addressee with the Gamaliel mentioned by Jerome (Ep. 57.3, PL 22.570) shortly before 395 C.E., whom he thinks identical with the Gamaliel mentioned in 415 C.E. in Cod. Theod. 16.8.22. Schwabe, however, thinks the earlier reference is more likely to Gamaliel ben Hillel, the later to his grandson. But he observes that the dating of both is sufficiently uncertain that Judah, son of Gamaliel ben Hillel, cannot be excluded.

The text followed is that of Richard Foerster in the Teubner edition of Libanius' works. Schwabe's Hebrew translation as well as his comments in the article mentioned above have been very helpful.
Libanius, Ep. 1251 (Wolf 1342) 364 C.E.
To the same

(1) Some disturbance has arisen among our Jews because (of a rumor that) a certain wicked old man is going to come into office, whom they had expelled when he held it previously, because he had made the office into a tyranny. They are of the opinion that the chief of their officials will order this done (again) at your behest. For (they think) that you accepted the old man's petition without knowing his character, which not even age has been able to amend. (2) Those who are agitated believe the matter to be as stated, and, while they were unable to convince me of it, they did succeed in compelling me to write. Please forgive both me and them—me for having yielded to so many, them because they suffered what is common to crowds, to be easily deceived.

Libanius, Ep. 914 (Wolf 832) 388 C.E.
To the Patriarch

(1) Of the things mentioned in the letter, some I already knew, others I have just learned. And my grief has been increased by this additional information contained in the letter. Who would not be distressed that such a race suffers for so long? (2) But no one has written to us to defend those who are wronging you. Indeed, even if many had done so, I would have done nothing nor would I have wronged myself by wronging you. (3) But as for the one who you believe will become a magistrate in our city and who you think is somewhat close to us, an untrue report has deceived you as it has us. However, we have stopped being deceived, and so now must you, if indeed you have not done so already.

Libanius, Ep. 917 (Wolf 835) 390 C.E.
To the Patriarch

(1) This second letter on behalf of Ammonille comes because the former one was in vain, owing to the power of those who are mistreating the woman. (2) So please share the concern I expressed in the first letter and honor this one, lest we need yet a third!
Libanius, Ep. 973 (Wolf 892) 390 C.E.

To the Patriarch

(1) While the badge of office does make Philippian great in our eyes, it is also his zeal for virtue which enhances him, as does the person who would grant benefits to your cities out of friendship for Philippian. (2) He further becomes great in this, that he passionately desired your friendship and wanted to obtain it for himself through a letter from me. So let him enjoy his favorite pursuits and be enrolled as a friend; let him delight in what he will say about future events before they happen. (3) I, too, can make you rejoice by what was said to me about you by one who nobly shows his parentage, Siburius. For he brought my praise of you to a stop with greater praise of his own.

Libanius, Ep. 974 (Wolf 893) 390 C.E.

To the same [the Patriarch]

(1) I did not send this letter in order that the good Euthymius might acquire your friendship, for he has it already, but that it might increase as a favor to me. For I know that you will want to honor the letter for him, just as you will many others in similar cases. (2) Now the man is just the sort to help those who need an advocate, and he is accomplished in rhetoric and law, but he carries an empty wallet, though he would like to carry one that is not empty. Next to Fortune, it is you and the governor who have this in your power; you do especially, more than someone who has the responsibility of governing.  

Libanius, Ep. 1084 (Wolf 1004) 393 C.E.

To the Patriarch

(1) You were ready anyway, I think, even if I wrote you nothing, to be concerned about the affairs of Theophilus, a man most wise and most just, who wakes and sleeps in the midst of books. You, the members of that race, are of the same sort. You are accustomed to help everyone, especially the best, caring for some indeed simply because they are human beings, but particularly for those who live virtuously. (2) So,
fearing lest you should think either that I am not his friend or that I neglect my friends, I am sending this letter, not to persuade one who is already convinced, but that I may win your esteem by assisting such a person. (3) May his affairs then turn out right for him—my profit will be your letter. Rather, I shall gain two things: both the letter which I shall have and the defeat of those who are abusing him who imitates the son of Lysimachus.  

Libanius, Ep. 1097 (Wolf 1017) 393 C.E.

To the Patriarchs (sic)  

(1) I am aware of many things which have been done by this Theomnestus in accord with my wishes. But I have not repaid him for these favors until now, when I found the opportunity to do so through this letter. To be sure, he requested it, but I gave it with the thought that I am not altogether despised among you. (2) Oh, yes, there were some who said this and even tried to prove it. But my memory of your many and magnificent deeds made it impossible for them to convince me of this. (3) Grant the favor, then, and do not disturb Theomnestus' old age, which wants to remain settled rather than to go abroad. And you must not fear that I shall ask many other favors—I probably do not even have many days yet to live. (4) Thus I pray that he will obtain the greater boon, i.e., to remain, but if there is something preventing that, then I ask the second best, that he see his own land again as quickly as possible.

Libanius, Ep. 1098 (Wolf 1018) 393 C.E.

To the same  

(1) Your son came with ability to learn; indeed, through the rhetorical power of Argeus he had something in common with me even before he saw me. He has not attained anything more noble, but perhaps it will be profitable for him to see many cities— as it was for Odysseus. (2) I entreat you to forgive his flight and not to treat him harshly or to make him despair, for that could cause sorrow, which, we see, becomes an obstacle even for those who earnestly desire rhetorical training.
Libanius, Ep. 1105 (Wolf 1025) 393 C.E.

To the Patriarch

As long as Hilarius\textsuperscript{13} behaves badly, we are both grieved, he as well as I. None of these things ought to have happened, nor ought there to be so much talk in the cities about what occurred. Yet, since he was destined to fall into this situation by ill fortune which compelled an intelligent man to sin---for a man like you, who avoids treating people badly but is accustomed rather to doing good, would not have publicly accused him without cause---become, then, Achilles to his Telephus\textsuperscript{14} and by your kindness heal the results of anger. Thus give everyone reason to say that you have restored the foremost of our households which had suffered great damage.
CHAPTER III

1 Just what the situation was which the letter presupposes, however, is a matter of controversy. See above, pp. 7f.

2 "Letters of Libanius to the Patriarch of Palestine" (in Hebrew), Tarbiz 1/2 (January, 1930) 85-110.


4 The previous letter is addressed to Priscianus, evidently an old friend of Libanius. Otto Seeck (Die Briefe des Libanius, 103) thought Priscianus had not ever been in a position to perform the sort of favor asked here. But Seeck had only the edition of Wolf, which lacked the word 'Ιουδαίων (found in abbreviated form only in the Vatican ms., but accepted by Reiske and Foerster). M. Schwabe ("A New Document relating to the History of the Jews in the Fourth Century C.E.: Libanius ep. 1251 (F)" [in Hebrew], Tarbiz 1/3 [April, 1930] 108-11 shows that Priscianus had just moved from Cilicia, where he had been praeses, to become proconsularis palaestinae. Letter 1250, in fact, is a warm letter of congratulation on the new post. From evidence in several other letters Schwabe is able to date these two letters to late summer 364 C.E., thus agreeing with Seeck's date (p. 430).

5 Schwabe ("Letters of Libanius to the Patriarch," 107) takes ξυραττόν as 3 pl. rather than 1 sg., even though the following ηδόκουν is unambiguously 1 sg. Hence he translates: Οί άνθρώποι τῆς Ιουδαίας, "They would have been accomplishing nothing."

6 Schwabe: "will rule our land" (ἡδόκοι). In his commentary (p. 94) he identifies the post specifically with the consularis Syriæ.

7 Nevertheless, Libanius at the same time gave Euthymius a letter for the same purpose addressed to Siburius, proconsul of Palestine (Ep. 975).

8 Aristides, the statesman of ancient Athens (cf. Or. 20.35). Libanius also brings Theophilus' situation to the attention of Prisco, a teacher of rhetoric somewhere in Palestine (Caesarea?), in Ep. 1085.

9 The plural is strange, but conjectured emendation to the singular (Wolf, Reiske) is not acceptable, since the plural forms of address are consistent through the body of the letter (Seeck, 465). Foerster thinks the plural could stand for τις πατριότης καὶ τῷ συνεδρίῳ; cf. Schwabe, "Letters of Libanius," 99-102. The Vatican and Leiden mss. lack the definite article; Sinaiticus reads τοῖς ἀφοσιεύσασιν Ἄντιοχείας (!).
10 Given the plural address of the previous letter in the collection, this superscript is problematical.

11 The mss. read, "The boy came to you," but the context requires the sense given here. Either οὖν is to be understood as a possessive dative or we should accept Reiske's emendation to οὐ.

12 Argeus was a teacher of rhetoric in Pamphilia, to whom Libanius wrote several letters (Seeck, 84). Schwabe ("Letters of Libanius," 103) supposes that he must have moved in the two years since Libanius last wrote to him to a place nearer to Tiberias.

13 Hilarius, who had been Libanius' pupil, pleaded Antioch's case with the emperor Theodosius after the riot of 387. Soon thereafter he was made proconsul of Palestine, where apparently he committed some misdeed which led to a criminal process against him. This letter makes it clear that the Patriarch himself was the delator or one of those who prosecuted the case. See Seeck, 178f., s.v. "Hilarius VII."

14 Wounded by Achilles, Telephus was then cured by him, in accord with an oracle.
CHAPTER IV

LIBANIUS' ORATION ON SYSTEMS OF PATRONAGE

The importance of Libanius' forty-seventh oration, Περὶ τῶν προστασιῶν, has long been recognized by those who seek to understand the shifting social relationships in the eastern Empire during the fourth century. Several things in the speech are also pertinent to the particular problems of a social history of Christianity and Judaism in Antioch: the general picture of the ways in which new forms of patronage were replacing the traditional prerogatives of the aristocracy, the tensions between the curial class and the military and governmental administrations, and especially the case of the Jewish peasants who had worked Libanius' land "for four generations."

We have followed the text printed by Louis Harmand, Libanius: Discours Sur les patronages, which in turn is almost identical with Foerster's. The following translation is independent, though we have naturally been greatly assisted by Harmand's French version as well as by his excellent commentary. A. F. Norman's fine translation, in the second volume of his edition of Libanius: Selected Works in the Loeb Classical Library, reached us too late to be taken into account.

* * * * * *

1. If I had not seen you for a long time and in myriads of circumstances, O king, rejoicing in the good of your subjects and wishing that none should be injured by another, I would perhaps have advised myself to remain silent and would not have bothered or annoyed one who would not gladly listen (to me). But since your natural disposition gives me hope that I shall please you by what I say and persuade you and gain the reputation of goodwill toward you, I have come gladly and eagerly to offer counsel, counsel which will seem yours rather than mine, since it belongs to the one who gives power to what is said by adding action, without which speech is vain. 2. I know the violent men, O king--they are the ones who benefit from the misfortunes of others--I know that they are both numerous and
powerful. I think, too, that they will be angry with me and will seek to take revenge on me, but that they will never obtain it so long as your noble person is protected by the gods who marvel at your life. For (I know) that you will not want to abandon your counselor and that when you try to help him you will not fail. Why then should I be silent out of needless fear, when I have such security?

3. I would wish both officers commanding whole armies and their subordinates commanding detachments to prosper and to live in happiness—all of them—but certainly not to make profit from evil deeds nor to cause others to be audacious in all kinds of ways. And many such things are happening today. Listen, O king, and learn.

4. There are large villages, each with multiple owners. These rely for protection on the soldiers stationed there, not in order to avoid mischief, but to be able to commit it. The soldiers are paid with the things which the earth yields, wheat and barley and the fruit of trees, or with gold or coin. Hiding behind the hands of the soldiers, then, those who have made these gifts have bought the license to do anything. And now, these are the crimes and troubles they cause to their neighbors: appropriating land, cutting down trees, robbing, slaughtering, butchering, devouring. Then, when they see those to whom these things belonged weeping, they laugh while feasting sumptuously. They are so far from fearing that anyone will inquire into these affairs that they add threats to their deeds and will not refrain from other crimes. 5. These things appear terrible to you, your majesty, but you have not heard the gravest, if indeed daughters are more important than goats and sheep, for they do not even spare them. Why then should I speak more about blows and insults, and how women drag other women by the hair, and how they render wells useless to their owners by the things they throw in them, and how they divert rivers and by them destroy gardens too? And about how they feed the soldiers, some more, some less, who usually sit in the midst of the villages and doze over plenteous wine and meat, so that, if one of the injured parties, smarting with pain, should defend himself, and if a blow should chance to strike a soldier, it would mean
death for the one who struck, with no explanation given to him from anywhere? For he must submit to the soldier in all his drunkenness, putting up with everything, and the laws must not come into the picture. 6. This has even made brigands of peasants; this has put iron into their hands, not the iron which is friend to the soil, but that which kills. For, as their power grows through the presence of the garrison, their audacity also increases, for the village police, as the proverb says, "see such men and do not see them." For they know that it would be costly to help those who are laid low because of the patron. Oh, yes, "patron" is the name which they apply to such crimes, a name appropriate, in my opinion, rather to those who by means of just assistance deliver to safety powerless victims of injustice.

7. But this patronage does everything to the contrary. It gives power to harm others, among whom are those who collect the taxes. I wish they were here with me to cry out all that they have suffered. Certainly this would be accompanied by tears from men who have been reduced from happiness to poverty. You ask to learn how this happened, O king? Those who collect the taxes, who have this as their work and assigned service, come to these villages which have been fortified by the generals. Then they make their request, at first gently and with low voice, but when they are scorned and ridiculed, then they speak up more loudly and indignantly, as is quite reasonable for those who fail in their lawful duties. Then the collectors threaten them with the prefects—in vain, since the latter are inferior to those who exploit the villages. Then they seize them and begin to drag them along, but (the villagers) show that they have stones. 8. Then, getting wounds instead of taxes, the collectors return to the city, showing by the blood on their clothing what they have suffered. Further, while they have no one who is angry (on their behalf)—for the power of the one who has taken the pay-off does not allow that—these unfortunates hear that they must pay up or be flogged if they refuse. Since they are compelled to do this, despairing of the produce of the fields and fearing further wounds, since they have no gold or silver, in tears they sell their female slaves
and even their retainers, the sons of their own nurses, even when these implore their seller, grasping his knees. 9. They go into the fields, not as formerly, with their children, but with the buyers, intending to sell. A common table is set for them; the seller sees the price of the land come to equal the tax. As he abandons the estate of his father—sometimes also of his grandfather—glancing at their tombs he salutes them by kissing his hand and, deeming himself to have their forgiveness, he departs. Then comes concern about food for himself and his wife and children; then, when none appears from anywhere, the necessity for begging. 10. Thus a councilor is erased from the council, not as a sponge wipes away letters, but because he no longer has a livelihood. These things make the councils smaller rather than larger, the members of each fewer rather than more. By this the whole city is injured. For even if it fares well in its other parts, but this part limps, the other parts too are diminished, and the affairs of the empire are diminished. For it is through its subjects that the empire either grows or the opposite. Surely then the councils are harmed by these fine patronages, by injury of the councils the cities are harmed, and by the injury of the cities even the armies are harmed. And these are not a matter of indifference to you, O king, for through them you are able to capture and not to be captured, to be feared and not to fear. Do away with such patronages, then, which our enemies would wish on us.

11. The quest for a patron is found not only in those farms which have more than one owner, each of whom possesses a small section, but also in those with a single owner. And these add the pay-offs (made to the military patrons) to the loss of the owner, since they raise the money and give it out of the amount by which they have cheated him. Moreover, the villages belong even to the illustrious, who have the means to extend a hand to those in trouble. But I believe it is in pursuit of evil doing, and not to avoid suffering, that they are buying the influence of certain persons. As they use this influence over a long period of time, even against their own masters, when they urge them to do (the work) which the land
requires, they oppose them with a fierce look, as if they were beyond any obligation and work only if they please and do not intend to touch the soil unless they persuade themselves to do so. 12. Those who first showed such audacity quickly got many imitators who followed their wicked example. So (the owners) take them to court and file a complaint, but they have men who also defend their case. And the defender outweighs the laws, so what is seen is a pitiful spectacle. What is this? Cries of the owners about the land, insolent tongues, a multitude of advocates, contests, judgments, victories. And one goes away, bowed to the ground; the others follow, jeering him. That is the sort of thing, O king, that has also happened to us.

13. Some Jews--of that famous people--who have worked our land for a long time, four generations, were seized with the desire to be no longer what they had been. They took it upon themselves to shake off the old yoke and henceforth to dictate the terms by which we were to employ them. Since we could not tolerate that, we sued them. When the judge learned who they were, whom they had been drunkenly abusing, and in whom they put their hopes, he had some of them put in double bonds, both jailed and fettered, and he ordered others to be brought to testify to the facts. After he had said this, he became angry with me when I suggested releasing them, and turning about, he went off in one direction, but the others, resorting to the trick of many, took themselves to the house of the general, their shield against justice. And (with them went) barley and wheat and ducks and fodder for horses. 14. And he (sc. the general) ordered that those who had abandoned their duty should be excused, and the other [sc. the judge] knuckled under and obeyed. Thus the judge was what he was not, but was not what he was: instead of a judge, he became a defense attorney. Consequently, he dragged us into court day after day, sending one (bailiff) after another, treating arbitrarily what was already said, complaining about what was not yet said, eager to show the kind of favoritism that is hateful to the gods. And it was so clear that he would abandon justice for favoritism, that those who were going out of his place one night said to some friends of mine whom they chanced to meet that my case had been
decided and the victory would belong to the opponents. 15. And the next day it became apparent that this was the way things were. For the rhetors on our side sat listening, since they had to keep silent when liberally equipped with strong arguments, while those on the side of the opponents, in the judgment of everyone present, had no weak argument in matters lacking substance. When the sentence was delivered, just as the helmet and breastplate willed, the one who announced it kept on prosecuting himself, for his conscience would not permit him to be quiet, and to all who entered, though they accused him of nothing, he kept swearing all kinds of oaths that the right judgment had certainly been made. For he deemed it a lesser evil to commit impiety toward the gods than to speak out on anything the general wanted kept quiet. 16. I should have thought that the latter would have feared to mistreat the righteous rather than to have people find out how he exercised his command in these matters. If it was just, why would he be ashamed? If unjust, why does he desire such? But if justice could not be maintained even for me, I who labor exceedingly over speeches, and have been honored by letters from you, and who would have the grief of my disciples (for comfort), what use is there in taking up the subject of others, who have none of these advantages?

17. I have related this to demonstrate the way in which many patrimonies have been destroyed by these defections of the peasants. For in every city there are such peasants, such animals, such bribes, such pacts, such profits, such losses, such rejoicings, such dejections. And indeed there are not a few from other farms, where the way is not open for such violence, who have abandoned wives and children and who betake themselves to those strongmen, those fortresses, in order to enjoy that illegal power. And even if the prosecutor happened to be a member of the general's entourage, after saying that he had an interest in the defendant, once he had overpowered the accuser, he would take off. 18. Whose responsibility is it to put a stop to these evasions? Whose to protect the farms for those who inherited them? The task, O king, is yours. It is from you that the gift ought to come. It is yours to suffer somewhat
and to heal rather than to overlook the creeping jealousy. Rather, since this has already been overlooked for a long time, it must be halted somewhere.

19. Now someone will ask me on behalf of these peasants whether it will not be legitimate for them to obtain help for themselves. Help that is not unjust, I would certainly agree, but help by criminal means, certainly not. First of all they should obtain the help that comes from the gods, which comes by prayers and religious rites. Then there is the help which belongs to those who, even though driven away by damaging floods, will render a service by making an opportunity for themselves. It is also possible for them to make the owners of the property more humane toward them, so that in some cases they would remit debts, in others even grant gifts, and so that, if they should require legal arbitration between them, he (the landlord) would take the role of judge, unless he should appeal to a superior court. 20. But not all forms of aid are to be used, if they are not in accord with the law, or if they render me incompetent over my own possessions. There are cities among us, O king, on our borders with the barbarians. Suppose a city, harmed by another through some strife and contention, were to call on allies from the neighboring barbarians—would it be doing something tolerable and noble and worthy of praise rather than punishment? In my opinion it would be better for it even to be overthrown and to become a tomb for its citizens than to attain the victory in such a way. For even if it needed some additional assistance in order to prevail, that ought to come from within the empire and from fellow citizens. 21. For a slave [oiketēs], though deserving justice for whatever he has suffered, does not have the right to attach himself to this one or that one, to look to and stand supplicating someone not his master, while forsaking his lord. For then he would no longer belong totally to his master, but he would make no small part of himself the property of his helper by apportioning to him not only his goodwill but the powers of his body as well. To be sure, even this person ought to receive justice, but receive it through his master. Judgment obtained through another often might defraud the master of his slave, since he stands despised for his slave's having obtained help from someone else.
22. But, they say, what if the owner of the farm should fall short of what is needed and a more powerful personage should be required? Then let the peasant speak to the owner, the latter to the superior, and let your request be to the owner, his to the other. And you would benefit from this, while the owner would suffer no harm, when the arrangement for these things is fixed. For (the officials) certainly would not obey and cooperate with these rustics who live with cows far from the cities, if they would not even pay heed to their masters. Nor would they think it right to take advice from the peasants and not from the masters, even though there was no difference. But it is not the same thing for the owners to make gifts to the powerful for the sake of the workers as for the workers to make gifts against the interest of the owners. For the former secures the possessions of the owners, while the latter does not permit any confidence, as though one were standing on quicksand. 23. Furthermore, not a few of these (owners) may also possess influence, from which it is possible for them to help others. Why then is it not enough for them—rather for both them and their troubles—that the generals satisfy their greed through them? For if they were making their profits through the owners, they would certainly not think of using the owners' property against them. But since they did want to do that, they acted against the prominent citizens, then against myriads of others, in order to do those things I have gone through earlier. Therefore they deny the right even to live to those who, while they have acquired a fine position of power, have done so without use of arms.

24. There's nothing terrible, they say, about adding protectors. That this is not at all the case has been shown (above) in what I said about domestic slaves. In my opinion the same is to be said about the peasants. For even if the power of those to whom they belong should be sharply reduced by God, it would be better for them to conform their lives to their owners' weakness and to bear their fortune patiently, than to purchase this kind of power and to disgrace their owners. A woman who belonged to two men would be in a stronger position, too, but you would not be happy about her having the
one in marriage, the other in adultery. Even though it be the case that the adulterer is much wealthier, and from him the woman would get much more than from the one who took her in marriage! Well then, shall we put up with her saying that one doesn't equal two, nor great, small, nor handsome, ugly? For in this way that which most of all sustains life, the law of marriage, will vanish.

25. Now someone will say, in the manner of those who always flatter the authorities, that less money would accrue to the generals, if someone were to check this flood. And why would it be so terrible if the present illegal gains were stopped? The proper consideration is not whether they will make less, but whether the situation would become more just than the present, and whether it would free from an evil reputation those who are appointed to lead the army. For that would be beneficial alike to those who cheat and to those who are cheated: to the latter no longer to be cheated, to the former no longer to cheat.

26. "The generals will be despondent if they are prevented from making this fine harvest." Yes, for also thieves, burglars, cutpurses, graverobbers, and those who pillage temple treasures, all these grieve because of the punishment which is due for their respective crimes. They grieve, but the laws cry out what they shall suffer when caught. To be sure, they (the laws) do not remove audacity altogether, but this audacity (which they do remove) is not slight. And no one is so desperate that he would dare to say, "O king, let us abolish the laws which prevent these crimes, so that we may not make trouble for those who are kept by them from getting rich, nor may seem to begrudge anyone wealth." 27. So then, let no way be open, even to the generals for corrupt profits, nor let one fix his attention on these while neglecting the share of the small property owners. For what secures the power of the Romans and keeps their enemies afraid is not the constant need, day and night, of new coffers for the generals for their accumulating wealth. Indeed, it is not by wealth that one becomes a better general, but by virtue and skill and love of glory and by fearing censure more than death. 28. Nor would a person suited to command be
someone who is able to count up a great amount of money, but someone who can count up a great amount of booty and captives and trophies, such as my ancestors could look upon. One of those, after exercising the highest of commands for a long time, was scarcely able to buy a single field, and of other things not especially praiseworthy, he had eleven domestic slaves, a dozen mules, three horses, and four Laconian dogs. And nevertheless he struck terror into the hearts of the barbarians. He married my aunt, who had a large dowry, but his gift to her was his fame. Once married he never caroused at banquets, nor did he ever, during the time he was a general, either give or receive invitations to them, but he commanded his stomach no less than his soldiers. But as for the generals today, what corrupts them is living in the midst of such abundance that it makes them lovers of life rather than lovers of honor, and persuades them to flee from the noble dangers to the opportunities for revelry. 29. Therefore all of you ought to provide the generals with the opportunities not for getting rich, but for showing that they are lovers of great deeds. As it is now, they can see only one thing, money, and every possible pretense for getting it is quickly seized, and such great mountains of gold and silver pile up in their houses, as more and more is constantly being added, that when some of the (soldiers) assigned (to guard) it hear how much they possess, they cannot believe it. Yet in your own treasuries, which ought to be filled, since they belong to the government, rather than those of private persons, almost the entire floor is visible, since only a little is covered. Yet, even though you know both of these facts, you do not draw on their funds at all for your wars, but rather abstain from these deposits even though there is a reason which calls for their confiscation. 30. I should like to put the question to them here before the throne, what this great quantity of money means to them, and what the sense is of the piles. Surely they would not say that it was for their daughters or their sons, or for the weddings of either, or for opportunity for advancement to the top posts, or any other innocent expenditure. Force them, then, even anyone who is unwilling, to come to that expenditure which it is not safe
to think of even in a dream. If someone thus thought less of you, he would be a greater benefactor to you than if he gave you everything. 31. But if they cannot stop taking, if this necessity is a disease, why, there are many streams which flow for them, bursting from many fountains and often making each of them into a Midas or a Cinyras or the like. The gifts of their clients amount to as much as they could possibly receive, yet they take an equal amount from the food provisions of their troops. They are able to make the departed still live and to feed themselves in the name of the dead. 32. As great as these (sources of income) are, there are still greater Pactolus: the gold which by rights would have remained in the hands of the soldiers but which has passed to those of the generals. This makes the fighting men poor and disheartened, as they wear pieces of sandals and what passes for a cloak. Often it is their stomachs which pay the tax, so that they enter battle with famished bodies. 33. Still other tricks are devised that are not inferior to gold-bearing earth. Slowness in deciding on an honor which, while not ancient, has penetrated all the same; then this caused anger, and then the reconciliations made money. And there is money also from the following: a soldier provokes a loiterer, mocking him and irritating him with insults, seizes him, drags and pulls him about. Then he himself is touched perhaps, but the action hardly seems equal, for such a person must not use either voice or hand against the soldier. The one compelled to suffer is arrested and is (placed) in the guard house. 10 So he buys the right not to be beaten to death. Many acts of this sort are sown and reaped every day, but they are small in comparison with that which is yet to be mentioned. That is the price of the magistrates: gold by the camel load. And I shan't even mention the money which passes each year from your palace to theirs. 34. Why is it necessary, after so great a shower of profits, to make men miserable who have nothing but their fields? Why is it necessary to assist those who increase their holdings by impious means? Indeed, there are many unjust methods, for just means do not even issue from the authorities, but by far the most unjust device of all is this: Let us say that my father left me some land—or my mother, or their
parents, or I bought it myself—in which I had peasants who behaved sensibly and worshipped Fortune for the humane treatment they received from me. Then you get hold of them, drive them mad, set in motion hopeless hostilities, and reduce well-born men to destitution.

35. But these people would never willingly bridle their own insatiable desire, O king. Rather the matter requires your wisdom and genius. For you alone could be physician for an unbearable wound. But do not think you will hear from me about a law which would restrain the ones and help the others. For the law is written and stands on the books, decreed by him who quenched tyranny and halted the Scythian fire. It is very important to me in my opposition to the things which are being done, that through the law there agrees with my statement a king who is "godlike," as Homer says, in soul rather than in body.

36. Why then have I been so zealous about these matters, when there has long been a law about them on the books? Not to draft a law, which would be ridiculous, but to see that the one written is not in vain. For it is written in vain--yes, in vain, O king--so long as there are some people who apply to patrons, others who accept them; some who do not seek supporters in the fray, others who do so. For those things which would be done if there were no law prohibiting them take place despite prohibition—and so the (mis)deed is enormous and its (ill) fame everywhere. 12 37. I beseech you to enforce the law by punishing those who do not obey it. Otherwise what good is the code, when it is in no way superior to the men who have been described, 13 who would do nothing? This is not only a loss for the king's subjects, it is not good for the author of the law if it is regarded as invalid. But shall he who trespasses the law of that other fellow 14 pay his penalty, while he who disobeys yours go scot free? Will he remain faithful to your other laws, but be above this one, which derives from the same mind and the same purple? 38. Put some muscle in this law, and make it really law instead of a bare name. If you do not wish to do that, repeal it. For it is better that it should not be on the books than to be published but disregarded. But
may I never see that happen; rather may that law be immortal with your progeny, and may the prosecution of those who have committed injustice bring improvement to all else.
NOTES

CHAPTER IV


4 This translation is suggested by A. J. Malherbe, taking οὐδὲν ὄσενες as an ironic litotes and ὀμιλ, as frequently, the opposite of ὀμίλα, "substance."

5 This sentence is far from clear. Compare the various attempts to construe it cited by Harmand (pp. 35f., n. 7), none of which, including his own, is completely satisfactory. We follow a suggestion by A. J. Malherbe.

6 Suggestion of A. J. Malherbe.

7 The text is uncertain--with Foerster we follow Reiske's emendation, but read ἀὑτῶν for Reiske's ἀὑτῶν--and it is not clear what Libanius meant to say.

8 Suggestion by A. J. Malherbe. The sentence is hard to make sense of and may be corrupt. Reiske emends the text to, "If someone makes them subordinate to you..."; Harmand suggests the whole sentence is an aside to the generals, so one would translate the received text something like, "If someone cuts you down to size...."

9 The Pactolus River, in which according to legend Midas washed off his lethal touch of gold, is proverbial for its gold-bearing sands.

10 Lit. "among the standards."

11 Gothic; see Harmand, ad loc.

12 These last phrases are loosely connected with the sentence; they could perhaps be applied to the king's work and fame, as Harmand understands, but better, in malam partem, to the misdeeds of the military patrons and their infamy.

13 Or "Men in pictures"; cf. Harmand and Norman, the latter pointing out a pun in γραμμάτων/γεγραμμένων.

14 Reiske takes this as an allusion to Christianity, a suggestion Harmand thinks possible. But it could as well refer to the Jews, ὅ ἰσινα being Moses, which is perhaps more likely in view of Libanius' bitterness about his rebellious Jewish workers.
John Chrysostom, later to become bishop of Constantinople, was born in Antioch ca. 349 C.E. As a young man he joined the church and was ordained to the presbyterate in 386 C.E. by Flavian, one of the catholic bishops in the city. During his years as presbyter in Antioch (386-398) he preached regularly in the churches there. Most of his sermons from this period are homilies on books from the Bible, festive addresses on days honoring the saints and martyrs, or sermons for liturgical feasts. During the first two years of his presbyterate, however, he preached several series of polemical sermons directed at the Arians, who continued to wield influence within the city, and the Judaizers among the Christians. In August 386 he had begun to preach against the Arians, but several days later he interrupted this series and began to preach against the Judaizers. These sermons were prompted by the imminence of the Jewish festivals, specifically Rosh Hashannah, Yom Kippur, and Sukkoth. Some Christians in Antioch celebrated the festivals with the Jews and John hoped to dissuade them from doing so. After the Jewish festivals were passed he returned to his sermons against the Arians. But early in the following year during the Quadragesima, and again in the fall, in each case prior to the celebration of Jewish festivals, he preached against the Judaizers. In the course of fourteen months he preached eight sermons on the Jews and Judaizers. Some dispute exists about the precise chronology of the sermons, but they appear to have been preached as follows: Homily 1 and 2 in autumn 386; Homily 3 in late winter 387 (dealing with the Pasch); Homilies 4-8 in autumn 387. We have translated the first of these sermons preached prior to Rosh Hashannah in 386 and the last preached after Sukkoth in 387.

John's sermons Adversus Judaeos were first edited by David Hoeschel at Augsburg in 1602 and have been continually reedited until 1862 when M. P. Migne reprinted the edition published by Montfaucon in Paris in 1718. A modern critical edition does
not exist. Normally a critical edition should precede a translation, but the vast number of Chrysostom manuscripts has required that the manuscripts first be catalogued before new editions are undertaken. Robert Carter, who has been engaged in this project, has urged scholars to refrain from new editions until this task is completed. Thus far a number of volumes listing the manuscripts have appeared, and a study of the available material to date indicates that the *Homilia Adversus Judaeos* were not transmitted as a unit. Further examination of the manuscript tradition may give us insight into the relation of the various sermons to one another. Even the printed editions vary considerably in the order they print the sermons; it was not until Montfaucon that the present numbering and order were introduced.

The sermons were translated into French by M. L'Abbé J. Bareille in the nineteenth century, but this translation was made from the Latin translations of Hoeschel, Fronton de Duc, and Erasmus. An English translation was made by C. Mervyn Maxwell as a dissertation at the University of Chicago in 1966, and an English translation will be published in the future by Paul Harkins. We have chosen to translate Homily 1 and Homily 8 because they yield the greatest information about the Jews in Antioch in the latter half of the fourth century.

The text on which our translation is based can be found in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 48 (Paris, 1862), cols. 839-942.
1. (col. 843) Today I wanted to finish the topic we were discussing recently and to show as clearly as possible that God is incomprehensible. Last Sunday I spoke in detail and at length on this topic and at that time I brought forth the testimony of Isaiah, of David, and of Paul. From Isaiah I cited the words, "Who can describe his generation?" (Isa 53:8). The psalmist, giving him thanks because of his incomprehensibility, says, "I will praise you, for you fill me with awe and your works are wonderful" (Ps 139:14). And again, "Such knowledge is beyond my understanding, so high that I cannot reach it" (Ps 138:6). And Paul, chary of inquiring into the essence of God, speaks only of his providence, and only of a single aspect of his providence, namely that which is seen in the calling of the gentiles. Gazing on God's providence as a vast and yawning sea, he cries out, "O depth of wealth, wisdom, and knowledge in God: How unsearchable his judgments, how untraceable his ways!" (Rom 11:35).

Although these testimonies were sufficient proof, I was not satisfied with the prophets; nor did I stop with the apostles. I went up to heaven itself and displayed the chorus of angels singing, "Glory to God in highest heaven, and on earth peace, good will to men" (Luke 2:14). Moreover you heard the seraphim, trembling and filled with awe, cry out, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa 6:3). To which were added the cherubim, crying, "Blessed is the glory of the Lord in his place" (Ezek 3:12).

(844) Three testimonies from earth, three from heaven declare the unapproachable glory of God. When I finished and the proof was irrefutable, the congregation broke into thunderous applause shaking the building and setting the people afire with enthusiasm. I was delighted not because they were praising me, but because they glorified my Lord. Your applause and your praise showed what love you have for God. Just as affectionate
servants, when they hear someone praising their master love the one who praises him because they love him too, so also you did the same on Sunday. The excessiveness of your applause showed your love for the Lord.

Today I wanted to return to the same contest. For if the enemies of truth have not had their fill of blaspheming their benefactor, how much more have we not been satiated with honoring the supreme God. But what can I do? Another more terrible sickness beckons and our tongue must be turned to heal a disease which is flourishing in the body of the church. First we must root this out and then return to those who are outside of the church. We must first heal our own members and then busy ourselves with outsiders.

What is this sickness? The festivals of the wretched and miserable Jews which follow one after another in succession—Trumpets, Booths, the Fasts—are about to take place. And many who belong to us and say that they believe in our teaching, attend their festivals, and even share in their celebrations and join in their fasts. It is this evil practice I now wish to drive from the church. (845) Sermons against the Anomoeans [Arians] can be delivered at another time and the delay would not work any harm. But if those who are sick with Judaism are not healed now when the Jewish festivals are "near, at the very door" (Matt 24:33), I am afraid that some, out of misguided habit and gross ignorance, will share in their transgressions, and sermons about such matters would be pointless. If the offenders are not present to hear what we say today, afterward medicine would be applied in vain because they would already have committed the sin. This is the reason I am in a hurry to take up this matter before the festivals. That is the way doctors do things. They deal with the most urgent and acute sicknesses first.

Of course this struggle [with the Jews] is related to the previous struggle [with the Anomoeans]. And since there is kinship between the impiety of the Anomoeans and the impiety of the Jews, there is a relation between the present and the former controversies. For that which the Jews have long charged
us, the Anomoeans also accuse us. What do they charge? That by calling God his own father Jesus claimed equality with God (John 5:18). This accusation—though not really an accusation—is rather an attempt to eliminate this text and its meaning completely, if not with the hand, then with the mind.

2. Do not be surprised if I have called the Jews wretched. They are truly wretched and miserable for they have received many good things from God yet they have spurned them and violently cast them away. The sun of righteousness rose on them first, but they turned their back on its beams and sat in darkness. But we, who were nurtured in darkness, welcomed the light and we were freed from the yoke of error. The Jews were branches of the holy root, but they were lopped off. We were not part of the root, yet we have produced the fruits of piety. They read the prophets from ancient times, yet they crucified the one spoken of by the prophets. We had not heard the Holy Scriptures, yet now we worship the one about whom the prophets speak. This is why they are wretched, because when others embraced and welcomed the good things given to them, the Jews refused them.

They were called to sonship, but they degenerated to the level of dogs. But we who were dogs were by the grace of God able to cast off our former irrationality to be elevated to the dignity of sons. How do I know this? "It is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs" (Matt 15:26). Jesus was speaking there to the Canaanite woman and he called the Jews "beloved children" and the Gentiles "dogs." But note how the order is reversed later; they have become "dogs" and we are "beloved children." Paul said this about them, "Beware of those dogs and their malpractices. Beware of those who insist on mutilation—'circumcision' I will not call it; we are the circumcised" (Phil 3:2-3). Don't you see how those who were formerly beloved children have become dogs?

Do you want to know how we who were once dogs have become beloved children? "To all who received him, he gave the right to become children of God" (John 1:12). Nothing is more miserable than those who always kick against their own salvation.
When it was required to keep the law, they trampled it under foot; now when the law has been abrogated, they obstinately observe it. What could be more pitiful than people who provoke God's anger not only by transgressing the Law but also by observing the Law. This is why the Scripture says, "You stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart; you always fight against the Holy Spirit" (Acts 7:51). They not only transgressed the Law, but they want to observe it at the wrong time. They are rightly called "stiffnecked" for they did not bear the yoke of Christ although it was neither grievous nor burdensome but gentle. "Learn from me, for I am gentle and humble hearted," and "Bend your necks to my yoke, for my yoke is good to bear, my load is light" (Matt 11:29-30).

Nonetheless they did not bear it; they smashed it and broke it. "Ages ago you broke your yoke and snapped your traces" (Jer 2:20). It was not Paul who said these things, but the prophet, using "yoke" and "traces" as symbols of dominion because the Jews rejected the Lordship of Christ. "We have no king but Caesar," they said (John 19:15). When you broke the yoke and snapped the traces, you cast yourself out of the kingdom of heaven and subjected yourself to human rulers.

Consider with me how the prophet intimates that they are unmanageable. For he did not say, "You threw off my yoke," but "you broke my yoke." This is the shortcoming of wild animals, unused to the reins, who refuse to be tamed. Where does this stiffness come from? From gluttony and drunkenness. Moses himself said, "Israel ate, and he was well fed and grew fat, and the beloved became recalcitrant" (Deut 32:15). Just as animals, when they are allowed to eat as much as they want, grow fat and become stubborn and hard to hold, and neither the yoke, nor the bridle, nor the hand of the driver can restrain them, so also the Jewish people, by drunkenness and overeating have been driven to the ultimate evil. They have kicked up their hooves refusing to bear the yoke of Christ and to draw the plow of his teaching. One prophet intimated this when he said, "Israel has run wild, wild as a heifer" (Hos 4:16). Another called Israel an "unbroken calf" (Jer 31:18).
Such animals, unfit for any useful work, are fit only for slaughter. This is what has happened since they made themselves unsuitable for any task. They are suited only for slaughter. This is why Christ said, "Those enemies of mine who did not want me for their king, bring them here and slaughter them" (Luke 19:27).

You should have fasted, 0 Jew, when your drunkenness was doing you such harm, and when your gluttony bred impiety, but not now. Now the time for fasting is past. Fasting has become abominable. Who says these things? Isaiah cries out with a loud voice, "Is not this what I require of you as a fast? says the Lord." Why? "Since your fasting leads only to wrangling and strife, and dealing vicious blows with the fists" (Isa 58:4, 5). If your fast was abominable when you beat your fellow servants, how can your fast be acceptable when you murder your master? What logic is there to that?

One who fasts should be restrained, subdued, humble, not drunk with anger. Are you still beating your fellow servants? Once their fasting led only to wrangling and strife, now it leads to wanton violence and extreme licentiousness, to dancing with naked feet in the marketplace. They are supposed to be fasting but they are really having a drunken party. Listen to what the prophet says about fasting: "Sanctify a fast" (Joel 1:14). Don't make a pompous spectacle of fasting. "Announce a day of abstinence; gather the elders" (Joel 1:14). But they gather rabble—effeminate men and prostitutes, and they drag the crowd from the theater and the actors to the synagogue.

(847) There is no difference between the theater and the synagogue. I know that some condemn me for daring to say that the synagogue is no different from the theater, but I reply that it is audacious of them to disagree with what I said. Condemn me if I declare this on my own authority, but if I cite the words of the prophet, accept what I say.

3. I know that many have high regard for the Jews and they think that their present way of life is holy. That is why I am so anxious to uproot this deadly opinion. I said that the synagogue is no better than the theater and I submitted proof from the prophet. The Jews are not more trustworthy than the
prophets. What did the prophet say? "Yours was a harlot's brow, and you were resolved to show no shame" (Jer 3:3). A place where a prostitute offers her wares is a house of prostitution. But the synagogue is not only a house of prostitution and a theater, it is also a hideout for thieves and a den of wild animals. "Your house has become for me a hyena's den" (Jer 7:11). But it is not simply the den of a wild animal but of an unclean one at that. Further, "I have forsaken my house, I have cast off my inheritance" (Jer 12:7). When God leaves, what hope of salvation remains? When God forsakes a place it becomes a dwelling place for demons.

Surely they say that they worship God. Away with such talk! No Jew worships God. Who says these things? The son of God. "If you knew me you would know my father as well. You know neither me nor my father" (John 8:19). What testimony can I offer that is more trustworthy than this one?

If they are ignorant of the Father, if they crucified the son, and spurned the aid of the Spirit, can one not declare with confidence that the synagogue is a dwelling place of demons? God is not worshipped there. Far from it! Rather the synagogue is a temple of idolatry. Nevertheless some go to these places as though they were sacred shrines. I am not imagining such things. I know them from my own experience.

Three days ago (believe me, I am not lying) I saw a noble and free woman, who is modest and faithful, being forced into a synagogue by a coarse and senseless person who appeared to be a Christian (I would not say that someone who dared to do such things was really a Christian). He forced her into a synagogue to make an oath about certain business matters which were in litigation. As the woman passed by she kept calling out for help, hoping someone would stop this lawless show of force (for she would not be allowed to participate in the sacred mysteries [Eucharist] if she went into the synagogue). Enraged and burning with anger, I roused myself and rescued her from this unjust abduction so that she would not be dragged into such lawlessness. When I asked her abductor whether he was a Christian, he admitted he was. I reproached him severely, accusing him of stupidity and complete lack of understanding, and I told him
that he was no better than a jackass if he thinks that one can worship Christ and at the same time drag someone to the haunts of the Jews who crucified him.

Then I went on to exhort him further. First I said that it is not permissible to make oaths at all, or to require someone else to make an oath, as the holy gospels teach. (848) Further, one should not force an unbaptized person to do such a thing much less a woman who is baptized and a faithful Christian. Then, as I expunged with many arguments these erroneous ideas from this soul, I asked him why he had walked by the church and dragged this woman to a gathering place \( \text{συνεδρια} \) of the Hebrews. He replied that many had told him that oaths which were taken there were more awesome. When I heard this I shouted at him and was again consumed by anger. But then I began to laugh. When I saw the villainy of the devil, and with what skill he was able to deceive men, I groaned. When I thought of the gullibility of those who are deceived I was filled with anger. But when I saw just how great was the stupidity of those who were deceived, I could only laugh.

I tell you these things and recount my experience because your attitude to people who do such things as well as to those to whom they are done is insensitive and unfeeling. If you see one of your brothers falling into such sins, you consider it to be someone else's trouble not your own. And if someone accuses you, you attempt to defend yourself by saying, "What business is it of mine?" or "What do I have in common with that person?" uttering words of utter contempt with the cruelty of satan. Do you realize what you are saying? You are a man and you share the same human nature. Even more, if one must speak about sharing the same nature, you have one head, Christ, and you dare to say that you have nothing in common with your own members. How can you confess Christ to be the head of the church? For the head knits together all the members, ensuring that each looks after the other and that all are united. If you have nothing in common with your limbs, neither do you have anything in common with your brother, nor do you have Christ as your head.
The Jews frighten you as though you were little children and you don't even realize it. For just as coarse slaves will show ridiculous and terrifying masks to children (the masks themselves are not terrifying, but they appear so to childish minds) and make them laugh loudly; so also the Jews terrify simple Christians. How can the Jewish synagogues be considered worthy of awe when they are shameful and ridiculous, offensive, dishonored, and contemptible?

4. Our places of worship, however, are not of this sort; they are truly places of awe and are filled with religious fear. For where God, who has authority over life and death, is present, that place is terrifying. For there one hears countless sermons about eternal punishments, about fiery rivers, about the poisonous worm (cf. Isa 66:24; Mark 9:48), about unbreakable chains, about outer darkness. But the Jews have not the faintest idea of such things, living for their stomachs, all agape about the present, no better off than pigs and goats, ruled only by licentiousness and excessive gluttony. One thing only they know—how to stuff themselves and get drunk, to come to blows over dancers, and to get beat up in brawls over chariot drivers. Tell me, are these things holy and awesome? Who would claim this? How can they appear awesome to us, unless one considers dishonored servants who have lost their privileges and been banished from their master's house more worthy of respect than servants who are held in honor and good favor? But that is not the way things are—they simply aren't. If an inn is not more august than the halls of kings, so a synagogue is less honorable than any inn. (849) For it is not simply a gathering place for thieves and hucksters, but also of demons; indeed, not only the synagogue, but the souls of Jews are also the dwelling places of demons. And at the conclusion of this sermon I will try to prove this to you. This is why I ask you especially to remember my words. I am not saying these things to show off or to win your applause, but to heal your souls. What is there left to say if there are as many doctors as there are sick?

There were only twelve apostles, and they won the whole world. The greater part of this city is Christian, yet there
are some who are sick with Judaism. What sort of defense can we who are healthy put up? Of course the sick deserve the blame themselves; but we who overlook their infirmity are not completely free of blame; it is inconceivable that they would remain ill if we gave them our full attention. In anticipation of that, I am now saying these things, that each of you can attempt to persuade your brother, whether by force, by striking him, by insulting him, or by arguing with him. Do anything to rescue him from the devil's snare and deliver him from the fellowship of Christ killers. Tell me: if you see someone in the marketplace being led away and who has been condemned justly, and you had authority to release him from the hands of his executioners, wouldn't you do everything to free him from his sentence? But now you see your brother being dragged unjustly and iniquitously to the pit of destruction not by an executioner but by the devil, and you don't make the slightest effort to rescue him from that iniquity. What kind of excuse can you offer? That he is stronger and more powerful. Show him to me. I would rather have my head cut off than allow him to enter the doors of the church if he is contentious and will not change his ways. What do you have in common with the "free Jerusalem," with the "heavenly Jerusalem?" You chose the earthly; be a slave just like she is. For "she and her children are in slavery" (Gal 4:25), as the apostle says.

Do you fast with Jews? Then take off your sandals with the Jews and go barefoot into the marketplace and join in their disgraceful and ridiculous behavior. But you'd be too ashamed and embarrassed to do this. If you are ashamed to participate in their indecorous dances, are you not ashamed to participate in their impiety? What kind of mercy do you expect to receive when you are only a half-Christian? Believe me—if I see anyone sick with this disease I would rather have my head cut off than overlook them. On the other hand, if I don't know anything about them, God will forgive me. I want each of you to mull over these things; don't consider this thing to be a peripheral matter.

Haven't you noticed that in the mysteries the deacon frequently calls out, "Acknowledge one another"? In saying this
he entrusts you with the responsibility of carefully examining your brother. Do the same things with those about whom you have question. If you know someone who is judaizing, grab him and take note of him, so that you yourself will not be exposed to peril. In frontier army camps, if someone is found among the soldiers who sympathizes with the Barbarians or the Persians, not only is he in danger, but also anyone who knew him and did not report him to the general is in danger. Since you belong to the camp of Christ, carefully examine and take pains to see whether someone is mixed in with you from the other side; make clear to them, however, that you do so not to kill them or punish them, as they do in the army, nor to take vengeance on them, but to deliver them from error and impiety and make them completely one of us. But if you refuse to do this and conceal what you know, you can be assured that you will receive the same punishment as the judaizer. For Paul does not only correct and punish those who do evil but also those who tolerate evildoers. And the prophet condemns not only those who steal but also their accomplices. For if someone has knowledge of an evildoer and protects and hides him, he only gives greater opportunity for his indulgence and allows him to do evil with less restraint.

5. But we must return again to the sick. Do you realize that those who are fasting have dealings with those who shouted, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" (Luke 23:21); and with those who said, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matt 27:23, 25)? If a band of would-be revolutionaries were apprehended and then condemned, would you dare to go to them and talk with them? I certainly don't think so! Is it not absurd to be zealous about avoiding someone who sinned against mankind, but to have dealings with those who have affronted God? Is it not folly for those who worship the crucified to celebrate festivals with those who crucified him? This is not only stupid—it is sheer madness.

But since there are some who consider the synagogue to be a holy place, we must say a few things to them as well. Why do you reverence this place when you should disdain it, despise it and avoid it? "The Law and the books of the prophets can be
found there," you say. What of it? You say, "Is it not the
case that the books make the place holy?" Certainly not! This
is the reason I especially hate the synagogue and avoid it,
that they have the prophets but do not believe in them, that
they read these books but do not accept their testimonies.
This makes their effrontery all the worse. Tell me, if you see
a distinguished man, one who is honored and respected being led
into a tavern, or into a den of robbers, and he is assaulted
there and beaten up by a bunch of drunks, would you admire the
tavern or the robber's den because once a noble and distin­
guished man had been there and was beaten up by drunks? I
doubt it! Instead, for this very reason, you would all the
more hate it and avoid it. The same applies to the synagogue.
They brought the prophets and Moses with them into the syna­
gogue, not in order to honor them but to insult and dishonor
them. When they say that the prophets and Moses did not know
about Christ, nor did they say anything about his coming, what
greater insult can there be against these holy men? When they
accuse them of not knowing their Lord, they make them accom­
plices in their impiety. For this reason we should all the
more hate them and their synagogue because they offend these
holy men.

But why am I speaking about books and places? In times of
persecutions executioners seize the bodies of the martyrs to
beat and whip them. Are their hands holy because they have
touched the bodies of holy men? Far from it! Such hands, al­
though they have held the bodies of the saints, remain impure
for the very reason that they have held them for evil ends.
Similarly, those who handle the writings of the saints (851)
and mistreat them no less than executioners mistreat the bodies
of the martyrs—should they be venerated for this reason? Is
not this the height of irrationality? For those who seize
bodies for the purpose of harming them not only are not sancti­
fied by touching them, but they are made even more cursed. How
much less are writings read with unbelief able to help those
who read them. Indeed the extent of their impiety is evident
in that they possess the books with evil intentions. They
would not be worthy of such condemnation if they did not possess
the prophets; they would not be so unclean and impure if they did not read these books. Now they are deprived of any forgiveness, because they possess the heralds of truth and have maliciously resisted them as well as the truth. For this reason they are impure and accursed, because having the prophets at their disposal they consult them with an evil purpose. Therefore I beg you to shun them and avoid their gatherings.

The harm to our weaker brethren is not a small matter, nor is the opportunity for them to flaunt their arrogance a minor matter. For when they see you, who worship the Christ who was crucified by them, observing Jewish customs and reverencing Jewish ways, how can they not think that everything done by them is the best? How can they not think that our ways are not worth anything when you, who confess to be a Christian and to follow the Christian way, run to those who degrade these same practices. It is written, "If a weak character sees you sitting down to a meal in a heathen temple—you who have knowledge—will not his conscience be emboldened to eat food consecrated to heathen deity?" (1 Cor 8:10). And I say: If a weak character sees you arriving at a synagogue to watch them blow trumpets [for the New Year festival]—you who have knowledge—will not his conscience be emboldened to marvel at the Jewish practices? One who falls is punished not only because of his own fall but also for tripping others up. Similarly, the one who stands firm is honored not only for his virtue, but also because he inspired others to emulate him. Therefore stay away from their gatherings and from their synagogues and do not praise the synagogue on account of its books. Rather, hate it and avoid it for that very reason, for they have mangled the saints because they do not believe their words and they accuse them of extreme impiety.

6. That you may learn that books do not make a place holy and that the disposition of those who gather there defiles it, let me tell you a story from ancient history. When Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was collecting books from all over the world, learned that among the Jews there were books which philosophized about God and the best way of life, he sent for men from Judaea and commissioned them to translate these books. Ptolemy
placed the books in the temple of Serapis. He was a Greek and this translation of the prophets is in use to this very day. Now then, are we to consider the temple of Serapis holy because of these books? Of course not! While books do have a holiness of their own, they do not impart it to a place if those who frequent it are defiled. You should think about the synagogue in the same way. Even if there is not an idol there, demons inhabit the place. (852) And I say this not only about the synagogue here in the city but also about the one in Daphne. For the pit of destruction there, which they call Matrona's, is even more evil. For I heard that many of the faithful have gone up there to practice incubation in the shrine. But I should not be calling such people "faithful". Both the shrine of Matrona and the temple of Apollo are equally impure to me.

If someone condemns my audacity in speaking this way I condemn his utter madness. Tell me, if demons dwell there, is it not a place of impiety even if there is not a statue of an idol standing there? Where Christ-killers gather, the cross is ridiculed, God blasphemed, the father unacknowledged, the son insulted, the grace of the Spirit rejected. Indeed is not the harm even greater where demons are present? In a pagan temple the impiety is open and obvious and can hardly seduce or deceive one who has his wits about him and is soberminded. But in the synagogue they say that they worship God and abhor idols. They read and admire the prophets and use their words as bait, tricking the simple and foolish to fall into their snares. The result is that their impiety is equal to that of the Greeks, but their deception is much worse. They have an altar of deception in their midst which is invisible and on which they sacrifice not sheep and calves but the souls of men. In a word, if you admire the Jewish way of life, what do you have in common with us? If the Jewish rites are holy and venerable, our way of life must be false. But if our way is true, as indeed it is, theirs is fraudulent. I am not speaking of the Scriptures. Far from it! For they lead one to Christ. I am speaking of their present impiety and madness.

But it is now time to show that demons dwell in the synagogue and not only in the place but also in the souls of the
Jews. "When the unclean spirit comes out, it wanders over the deserts seeking a resting place. If it finds none, it says, 'I will go back into my own house.' So it returns and finds the house unoccupied, swept clean and tidy. Off it goes and collects seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and they all come in and in the end the man's plight is worse than before. This is how it will be in this generation" (Matt 12:43-45).

Can you see that demons inhabit their souls and that the present demons are worse than before? But that is hardly surprising. Then they sinned against the prophets; now they insult the Lord of the prophets. Tell me, how can you gather together in a place with men possessed by demons, whose spirits are so impure, and who are nurtured on slaughters and murders--how can you do this and not shudder? Instead of exchanging greetings with them and addressing one word to them, ought one not rather avoid them as a pestilence and disease spread throughout the whole world? Haven't they been the cause of all kind of evil? Haven't the prophets wasted many words condemning them time after time? What kind of tragedy, what manner of lawlessness has not been hidden in their blood guiltiness? "They sacrificed their sons and daughters to demons" (Ps 106:36), ignoring nature, forgetting the pangs of birth, trampling on childrearing, turning the laws of kinship upside down, and they became wilder than wild beasts. (853) Wild beasts often give up their lives and disregard their own safety to protect their young. But the Jews, without any compulsion, slaughtered their offspring with their own hands to appease the avenging demons who are enemies of life itself. Which of these things astonish more? Their impiety or their brutality and inhumanity? That they sacrificed them to demons? Their licentiousness has overshadowed the lechery of animals. Listen to what the prophet says about their intemperance. "They became as lusty stallions; each neighed after his neighbor's wife" (Jer 5:8). Instead of saying, "Each desires his neighbor's wife," he expresses vividly their inborn madness and licentiousness by using the sound of animals.

7. What more can I say? Rapacity, greed, betrayal of the poor, thefts, keeping of taverns. The whole day would not suffice to tell of these things. But you ask, "Aren't their
festivals holy and venerable?" Even these they have made impure. Listen to the prophet, or rather, listen to God who is repelled by their festivals: "I hate, I spurn your feasts" (Amos 5:21). God hates them and you have fellowship with them. Furthermore, he did not say this feast or that one, but all of them. Don't you realize that he hates worship by means of kettledrums, and lyres and psalteries and other musical instruments? "Spare me the sound of your songs," he says. "I cannot endure the music of your lutes" (Amos 5:23). God says "Spare me" and you run off to hear trumpets. Are their sacrifices and offerings not an abomination? "If you offer me wheat cakes they are useless; the reek of sacrifice is abhorrent to me" (Isa 1:13). How can the reek of sacrifices be abhorrent and the place not be abhorrent? When was it abhorrent? Before they committed the height of iniquity, before they killed their Lord, before the cross, and before the abomination of killing Christ. Is it not much more abhorrent now? What is more fragrant than incense? God does not look at the nature of the gifts but the disposition of those who offer them and in this way he judges the offerings. He looked at Abel and regarded his gifts with favor. "But he looked at Cain and did not receive his sacrifices" (Gen 4:5). He had no regard for Cain and his sacrifices. Noah brought sacrifices to God, sheep and calves and birds, and Scripture says, "The Lord smelled the soothing odor" (Gen 8:21). That is, he accepted the offerings. God has, of course, no nostrils because the divine is incorporeal. Moreover there is nothing fouler than the smoke and odor of burning flesh which comes from offerings, yet God accepts the sacrifices of one and rejects those of another in order that you might learn that God is concerned about the disposition of those who offer. The odor and smoke of one he calls an odor of sweetness, but the incense of the other he calls an abomination since the disposition of the latter is full of foul odors.

Don't you realize that because of those who enter it God rejects the temple with its sacrifices and musical instruments and festivals and incense? He has shown this especially through his actions, first handing it over to the Barbarians, later destroying it completely. Likewise even before the
catastrophe he cried out through the prophet saying, "You keep saying, 'This place is the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord!' This catchword of yours is a lie, put no trust in it. It will do you no good" (Jer 7:4).

(854) The temple does not sanctify those who enter, but those who enter make the temple holy. If the temple was of no benefit even when the cherubim and the ark were present, how much less value is it when it is deprived of all these things, when God has turned his back completely and there is even greater reason for his enmity. What sort of folly, what kind of madness, to participate in the festivals of those who are dishonored, abandoned by God, and provoked the Lord? If someone killed your son, tell me, could you bear the sight of him? Could you stand to hear his name? Would you not rather flee from him as from an evil demon, as from the devil himself? They killed the son of your Lord, and you dare to gather with them in the same place? When the one who was killed by them honors you by making you a brother and fellow heir, you dishonor him by revering his murderers, those who crucified him, and by attending their festival assemblies. You enter their defiled synagogues, you pass through impure gates, and you share in the table of demons. That is what I am persuaded to call the Jewish fast after the God-slaying. What else can one call those who set themselves against God than worshippers of demons?

Are you hoping to be healed by demons? When Christ allowed demons to enter the swine (Matt 8:31ff.), without a moment's notice they drowned the swine in the sea. Do you think they will spare you because you are human? Would that they did not kill, would that they did not plot against us! However, if they drove man out of paradise and deprived him of his celestial glory, do you think they will heal his body? That is ridiculous! Foolish myths! Demons know how to scheme, to harm, but not to heal. If they do not spare the soul, tell me, will they spare our bodies? If they drive men out of the kingdom, will they attempt to deliver them from diseases? Have you not heard the word of the prophet (i.e., the word of God through the prophet), that they can neither do harm nor good? Even if they
are able to heal and wish to—which is impossible—you must not exchange a small and fleeting benefit for an interminable and eternal loss. Will you have your body healed only to lose your soul? Hardly a good bargain. You anger God who created your body and beseech your enemy to heal you.

Might it not happen that a man devoted to Greek superstition, but skilled in medicine, could lead you easily to worship his gods? For the Greeks (through their skill) have often driven out many diseases and restored many sick people to health. What shall we make of this? That this is reason to have converse with impiety? Of course not! Listen to what Moses said to the Jews. "If a prophet or a dreamer appears among you and offers you a sign or a portent and calls on you to follow other gods whom you have not known and worship them, even if that sign or portent should come true, do not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer" (Deut 13:1-2). What he means is this: If a prophet arises among you, he says, and does a sign or raises the dead, or cleanses a leper, or heals a cripple, and after doing the sign he invites you to embrace a false religion; don't trust him just because he did a sign. Why? "God is testing you through him to discover whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and soul" (Deut 13:13). (855)

Whence it is evident that demons do not heal. If once in a while God allows healing to take place, it is to test you. This is not because God is ignorant of you, but that you might be trained to stay clear from demons even when they heal. And why am I speaking of the healing of the body? If someone threatens you with hell unless you deny Christ, pay no attention to him. If someone promises you a kingdom only if you apostasize from the only son of God, avoid and despise him. Become a disciple of Paul and emulate the sentiments which the blessed and noble soul of the apostle expressed: "For I am convinced," he said, "that there is nothing in death or life, in the realm of spirits or superhuman powers, in the world as it is or the world as it shall be, in the forces of the universe, in heights or depths—nothing in all creation that can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 8:38-39). Neither angels, nor anything in the realm of spirits or
superhuman spirits, nor the world as it is or the world as it shall be, nor anything in all creation could separate Paul from the love of God in Christ Jesus. And the healing of the body separates you! What kind of mercy can we expect? Christ is surely more terrifying to us than Gehenna and more desirable than a kingdom.

If we become sick, it is better to remain sick than to fall into impiety simply to be healed of our illness. For if a demon heals us, the healing does us more harm than good. It helps the body, that insignificant part of man which will surely die in a short time and rot, but it damages your immortal soul. Just as slavedealers show sweets and cakes, dice and similar things to small children to entice them and deprive them of their freedom and even of their lives; so also demons, promising to heal the sick limbs of our body, completely destroy the health of the soul. Let us not give in, brethren; rather let us seek to free ourselves from all manner of impiety. Could not Job, urged by his wife to blaspheme God, have been delivered from the calamity which was brought on him? "Curse God," she said, "and die" (Job 2:9). But he chose rather to suffer and to waste away, to bear that intolerable calamity than to blaspheme and be delivered from his present misfortunes. Imitate Job. If a demon promises to release you from a myriad of evils which beset you, don't trust him, don't give in, just as the righteous Job did not give in to his wife. Choose rather to endure the illness than to lose your faith and the health of your soul. God is not abandoning you when he often allows you to get sick; rather he wishes to make you an object of admiration. Keep strong then that you might hear the words, "Do you think I am speaking to you for any other reason than to show that you are a righteous man?" (Job 40:8).

8. There are still many other things to say, but to ensure you will not forget what has been said I will end this oration with the words of Moses. "I summon heaven and earth to witness against you this day" (Deut 30:19). If someone who is present or someone who is absent goes to watch the blowing of trumpets or enters the synagogue, or visits the shrine of Matrona, or shares in the fast, or keeps the Sabbath, or observes any other
Jewish custom, be it significant or insignificant, "I am innocent of the blood of all of you" (Acts 20:26). These words will stand you and me in good stead in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ; if you heed them they will give you great confidence; if you spurn them, (856) and you do not expose those who dare to do such things, these same words will turn against you and become your stern accusers. "For I have kept back nothing; I have disclosed to you the whole purpose of God" (Acts 20:27). In a word I have deposited money in the hands of bankers. Your responsibility is to let that deposit increase, to put to use for the salvation of your brothers what you have heard. It is disagreeable and burdensome to have to denounce those who have sinned in these ways. But it is also tedious and burdensome to keep silent. This same silence which angers God brings destruction both on those of you who conceal [your brothers] as well as those among them who escape notice. How much better to incur the enmity of your fellow servants than to provoke the Lord's anger. For if your brother is angry with you now he cannot hurt you and will thank you later, because you helped him to be healed. But if you are silent, supposedly doing your fellow servant a favor—which of course will only hurt him—God will condemn you eternally. So that, if you are silent you make yourself an enemy of God and you hurt your brother; but if you denounce him and expose him, God will be gracious, you will win your brother back, and you will earn a devoted friend, who has learned by experience of the favor you have done him. Don't think you are doing your brothers a favor, if, when you see them participating in such absurd matters, you don't reprove them vigorously. If you lose a coat, don't you consider not only the one who stole it but also anyone who knew he did it but did not denounce him? Aren't both considered enemies? Our mother whom we both share has not lost a coat but one of our brothers. The devil abducted him and holds him now in Judaism. You know the kidnapper and you know the victim. You see me as a torch, setting afire the word of our teaching, dashing about and looking everywhere. Are you going to stand there mute, saying not a word? What kind of forgiveness do you expect to receive? How else can the church think about you
except as one of the worst of its enemies, a hostile spoiler? God forbid that anyone who heard this advice would be guilty of the sin of betraying a brother for whom Christ died. Christ poured out his blood for him. But you can't even bring your­self to utter a word on his behalf. Come now, I exhort you! Leave this place at once and set out on the hunt. Each of you bring me one of those who are sick with this disease; rather--God forbid that there should be so many sick--two or three of you, or groups of ten or twenty, bring me one, so that on that day when I see the prey trapped in the net, I can set a more bountiful table for you. If I see you putting into effect the advice given you today, I will attend to their healing with high enthusiasm, and both you and they will profit more. Don't make light of what I say. Women should go after women, men after men, slaves after slaves, freemen after freemen, children after children. In a word--let everyone join with diligence in the hunt for those afflicted with this disease and then return to our next service to receive our praise. But you are worthy of more than my eulogies for you will deserve a splendid and ineffable reward from God, a reward which far exceeds the labors of those who are successful.

May we well earn this reward by the grace and loving kind­ness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and forever, to ages unending. Amen.
1. (col. 927) The fast of the Jews—or should I say the drunkenness of the Jews—is past. It is possible to be drunk without wine, just as it is possible for a sober person acting like a drunk to revel in profligacy. Were it not possible to be drunk without wine, the prophet would not have said, "Woe to those who are drunk but not with wine" (Isa 29:9). If it were not possible Paul would not have said, "Don't get drunk with wine" (Eph 5:18). Since it is possible to be drunk in other ways he said, "Don't get drunk with wine." It is certainly possible to get drunk with anger, with unnatural lust, with avarice and vanity, and with innumerable other passions. Drunkenness is nothing else than displacement of right reasoning, derangement, the loss of spiritual health.

Not only then is one who drinks large quantities of strong wine said to be drunk, but also someone who nurtures any kind of passion in his soul—this person is most assuredly drunk. A man who loves someone other than his wife, who spends his leisure time with prostitutes, is drunk. Just as a man who has lost his senses by drinking much strong wine begins to jabber like a coarse slave and is unable to tell one thing from the other; so also someone who is filled with unbridled lust, as another is with strong wine—this person can only mutter vulgarities. Everything he says is shameful, corrupt, coarse, and ridiculous; his perception goes haywire, and he is blind to the very things which are before his eyes. For the woman he desires to defile lives always in his imagination and he behaves like someone who is deranged and has lost his wits. He reminds one of the kind of person seen at assemblies and banquets, who, no matter what the time or place, seems oblivious to everything around him even though numerous people speak to him about many things. His thoughts are only on that woman and his dreams are filled with sin. Like a trapped animal he is suspicious and fearful of everything.

Likewise, a person overcome with anger is also drunk. His face becomes swollen, his voice harsh, his eyes bloodshot and
his mind is darkened. His reason disappears as though thrown in the sea; his tongue trembles, his eyes are out of focus and his ears deceive him. When anger afflicts the mind it is much worse than any strong wine, creating a storm whose violence is as un-controllable as the surging sea.

If someone seized by desire or anger is drunk, how much more is an irreligious man who blasphemes God, (928) opposes his laws and obstinately refuses to give up such ill-timed contentiousness—how much more is this person drunk and insane? His condition is more pitiful than that of drunken revelers or of the demented even if he does not seem to realize it. It is especially characteristic of drunkenness to be unaware that one is acting disgracefully, just as what is especially terrifying about madness, is that the sick do not know they are sick. Similarly, the Jews who are presently drunk do not realize they are drunk. So then, their fast which is more shameful than any drunkenness has passed; yet we should not relax our solicitude for our brothers, nor consider it out of place to be concerned about them in the days to come.

When the battle is over and the enemy put to rout, what do the soldiers do? They do not return immediately to their tents, but first return to the battle field, carry off their comrades who have fallen and bury the dead; but if they see any lying among the corpses with signs of life, not mortally wounded, they carry them off and bring them carefully into the tents, pull out the arrow, summon the doctor, wash the wound clean of blood, apply medicine, and take care of whatever other things are necessary to lead them back to health. Similarly, since we by the grace of God have pursued the Jews, armed against them with the prophets, let us now return and look all about lest any of our brothers have fallen or been swept away by the fasts or have joined with them in celebrating their festivals. Let us hand no one over for burial but carry them all home to be healed. In ordinary battles, a person falls only once, and when his life is taken it is impossible for him to be regained for the army and to be brought back to life; but in the present war, in this conflict, even if someone receives a mortal wound, it is possible, if we wish, with the help of God's grace, to
return him to life once again. For we are not speaking here of
the death of the body, as in the previous instance, but the
death of resolution and will. If our resolution dies, it can
be resurrected. When the soul is dead it can be persuaded to
(929) return again to its proper life and to recognize its Lord.

2. Let us not be weary, brothers, nor discouraged; let us
not lose heart. Let no one say to me: "Before the fast it was
necessary to secure everything, to do whatever we could; but
now, after the fast, after the sin is committed, after they
have done the lawless deed, what is to be gained?" If someone
knows what it means to look after his brothers, he also knows
that now, especially, is the time to exert effort and show the
greatest zeal. We should keep the brother safe not only before
he sins, but after he has fallen we should also stretch out the
hand. For if God had been doing this, i.e., if he kept us safe
only before we sinned but neglected us after we sinned and
allowed us to remain in our sin for good, none of us would ever
have been saved. But he did not do this, because he is merciful
and gentle and is especially desirous of our salvation; after
we sinned he demonstrated great solicitude. Because he was
concerned about Adam before he sinned, he said to him, "You may
eat from every tree in the garden, but not from the tree of the
knowledge of good and evil; for on the day that you eat from
it, you will certainly die" (Gen 2:16-17). Note, then, by the
pliability of the law, by the abundance of his gifts, by the
threat of coming punishments, by the promptness of his chastis­
ing (for he did not say "after one, or two, or three days" but
"on the same day which you eat you will surely die"), in every
way which he could care for man, he did so. Nevertheless,
when, after such solicitude and instruction, such exhortation
and kindness, man fell and refused to hear the divine commands,
God did not say: "Why bother? What's the use? He ate, he fell
into sin, he transgressed the law, he trusted the devil, he
despised my command, he was afflicted, he became mortal and was
handed over to death, and he came under judgment. Why must I
speak to him any longer?" But he did not say these things. He
came to him at once, spoke with him, comforted him, applying
another medicine, labor and the sweat of his brow. God did not
stop doing all the things he was engaged in until he had raised up the fallen nature, redeemed it from death and led it to heaven. Indeed he endowed the fallen nature with greater benefits than it had lost, thereby teaching the devil that he had gained nothing from his plot except to drive mankind out of paradise; for in a little while he will see mankind in heaven intermingled with angels.

He did the same with Cain. He looked after him before he sinned, warning him, saying, "You have sinned, be quiet; his recourse is to you and you will rule him" (Gen 4:7). What wisdom and understanding! You are afraid, he said, that Abel will take from you the prerogative of the first born, because of the honor I showed him, and that he will usurp the authority which belongs to you. For first born are supposed to be more honored than second born. Be confident and unafraid; don't anguish over this matter: "His recourse is to you and you will rule him." (930) What he means is this: Maintain your honor as the first born, and be a refuge to your brother and a shelter and patron; rule and dominate him. But don't murder him, and don't commit any lawless slaughter. Nevertheless he did not listen, nor did he keep silent; instead he committed the bloody act, and smeared his right hand with the blood of his brother's throat. What happened then? Did God say: "Away with him for good. What's the use? He committed murder, he killed his brother, he despised my admonition, he dared to commit reprehensible and unforgivable slaughter, although he had enjoyed such concern, such instruction and counsel. All these things he drove from his mind and turned them to naught. Should I not desert him and abandon him for good because he is not worthy of any consideration on my part?" But God neither said nor did this. He came to him again and corrected him, saying: "Where is your brother Abel?" He did not allow him to deny what he had done, but he urged him to confess the deed willingly. When Cain said, "I don't know," he said, "Your brother's blood is crying out to me" (Gen 4:10). The thing itself proclaims the bloody act. What was his reply? "My punishment is heavier than I can bear; you have driven me today from the earth, and I must hide myself from your presence" (vs. 14). What he means
is this. I have committed a greater sin than can be excused, pardon, or forgiven, and if you wish to avenge what has happened I will be abandoned by all, bereft of your aid. What did God say? "No, if anyone kills Cain, Cain shall be avenged sevenfold" (vs. 15). "Don't be afraid of this," he said. "You will live for a long time, and if someone kills you, he will be liable for many punishments," for the number seven in the Scriptures signifies infinite magnitude. Since Cain was subjected to extensive punishment, to anguish and trembling, to groaning and faintheartedness, to physical paralysis, he said: "Whoever kills you and delivers you from these torments will bring punishment on himself." And if that seems harsh and severe, it is nevertheless a proof of great solicitude. Since he wanted to make men who lived after these things happened wise, he who is able to deliver Cain from sin devised this type of punishment. For if he had killed him immediately, the one who committed the sin would have vanished and his sin would have disappeared with him. Those who lived later would have no knowledge of it. But now, since he was allowed to live for a long time trembling with fear, he became a teacher to everyone who comes to know about him. By his appearance and his trembling body, he exhorts everyone not to do such things so that they will not undergo what he underwent. As a result of these experiences Cain became better. The trembling and the fear, his company with anguish, his bodily weakness holding him in bondage, did not permit him to commit such a shameless crime again. He was reminded continuously of his former act, and in this way his soul learned greater moderation.

3. While I was speaking the idea occurred to me to ask: why, after he confessed his sin, condemned what happened, admitted that his sin was unforgivable and unworthy of pardon, (931) why were his sins not blotted out (although the prophet said, "First set forth your transgressions, that you may be justified" [Jer 43:26]), but instead he was condemned? However, Cain did not say the words which the prophet commanded. The prophet did not simply say, "Set forth your transgressions," but rather, "First set forth your transgressions," which means, "Don't simply set forth [your transgressions] but be the first
to set them forth," i.e., don't wait to be accused and condemned. He was not the first to set forth his transgressions; he waited until he was accused by God. Indeed, when he was accused he denied it. But once his sin was exposed, then he owned up to it, which is hardly a confession.

Therefore, brethren, when you sin, don't wait for condemnation from someone else. Before you are accused and condemned, acknowledge what has happened, so that if someone else accuses you later, it will not be the result of your confession but of someone else's accusation. For this reason it is said, "The just man is the first to accuse himself" (Prov 18:16). Therefore it is not sufficient simply to accuse oneself, but one must be the first to accuse oneself and not await the accusations of others.

Peter, therefore, after his grievous denial, did not take long to remember his sin. Although no one accused him, he acknowledged his transgression and wept bitterly. Thus he blotted out his denial so that he became the first of the apostles and was entrusted with responsibility for the whole world.

But now to return to the subject at hand. What I have been saying in this address has demonstrated sufficiently that we ought not neglect our fallen brothers, nor despise them, but that we should watch over them before they sin, and after they have sinned, we should show even greater solicitude for them. This is what doctors do. They give instructions to healthy people about maintaining their health and warding off any illness. But they do not ignore those who disregard their instructions and become sick; indeed they give special attention to these so that they might deliver them from their illnesses. Paul did the same thing. He did not ignore the man who committed incest (1 Corinthians 5) after he had sinned and committed the grievous fault. And this was a crime found not even among the gentiles. But even this man who, like an animal, resisted the reins, refused any remedy, who jumped about kicking up his heels, Paul did not ignore but brought him back to health. He led him back to be united to the body of the church once again. He did not say to himself: "What can be gained? What's the use? He committed incest, he sinned, he does not want to put away
licitiousness; he is puffed up, haughty, and his wound is incurable. Let us leave him alone and have nothing to do with him." He did not say such things. Indeed for this very reason he exercised enormous solicitude when he saw him slipping into that despicable evil. He did not cease terrifying him with threats, chastening him in whatever way he could, by himself and with the help of others; he used every effort to bring him to acknowledge his sin and to admit his transgression, so that eventually he might deliver him from every defilement.

(932) Imitate that Samaritan mentioned in the gospel, the one who showed such concern for the man who had been wounded. A Levite and then a Pharisee passed him by, but neither stopped and looked at the man lying there. They mercilessly and inhumanly left him and went on their ways. But a certain Samaritan who had nothing in common with him whatsoever did not rush by; he stopped and had compassion on him. He provided him with oil and wine, placed him upon his ass, brought him to an inn, gave some money to the innkeeper. He even promised more money later to heal someone with whom he had nothing in common. He did not say to himself: "What business is this of mine? I am a Samaritan, I have nothing in common with him. Besides we are far from the city and he is unable to walk. What if he is not strong enough to make the whole journey. Then I will have to carry his corpse and may be seized for his death and be accused of homicide." When people see a wounded man lying by the road gasping for breath, they often pass by in a hurry. The reason for this is not that they are unwilling to carry a wounded man, or to spare him money—they are afraid that if the man dies they will be dragged before a judge and charged with murder. But this gentle and kind man did not fear any of these things. He ignored them all and placed the wounded man on his ass and brought him to an inn. He was afraid of none of these things, neither the danger, nor putting out his own money, nor anything else. If the Samaritan was kind and gentle toward a man he did not know, what excuse can we give if we neglect our brothers who are to be found among greater evils? For those who now fast with the Jews have fallen among bandits, indeed among those who are worse than any bandit, and who do greater harm to
their victims. They not only tore off their coats, and inflicted wounds on their bodies, as bandits did to the man in the gospel; they also wounded the soul, afflicting it with many hurts, and then went away letting their victims lie in a sea of impiety.

4. Don't ignore such a tragedy, nor mercilessly pass by this lamentable spectacle. If others do so, don't you do the same. Don't say to yourself: "I am a man of the world. I have a wife and children. This is the business of priests and monks." The Samaritan did not say: "Where are the priests? Where are the Pharisees? Where are the teachers of the Jews?" But as though he had found an extraordinary prey, he seized the opportunity. And you, when you see someone who is sick either in body or in soul, don't say: "Why doesn't so and so and so heal him?" Rather, get rid of his sickness and don't ask others to give account of their negligence. Tell me, if you find a piece of gold lying on the ground, do you say to yourself: "Why didn't so and so and so pick it up?" Don't you rush to pick it up before any one else does? You should regard your fallen brothers in the same way and think that, in looking after them, you have found a treasure. For if you let the teaching of the Word drip down on your brother like oil, if you bind him with gentleness, if you heal with patience, you will have riches far greater than any treasure. (933) "If you utter what is precious instead of what is worthless, you shall be as my mouth" (Jer 15:19). Can anything be compared to this? For what neither fasting, nor sleeping on the ground, nor vigils, nor anything else can do, the salvation of one's brother can accomplish. Just think how often and in how many ways your mouth has sinned, how many shameful things it has uttered, how many blasphemies, how many abuses it has belched forth, then you will surely not hesitate looking after someone who has fallen. Through this one virtuous act, you can cleanse yourself of defilement. What do I mean by "cleanse"? You can make your mouth into the mouth of God. What can equal such an honor? It is not I who promise such things. It was God himself who said it: "Save one person and your mouth will be as holy and pure as my mouth."*

*This is a paraphrase of Jer 15:19, cited several lines earlier, not another biblical citation.
Therefore don't neglect your brothers. Don't look around and say: "Look how many are fasting with the Jews, how many have been swept away." Rather make it your business to look after them. If there are many who are fasting with the Jews, don't parade it about, beloved, don't make a spectacle of the church's misfortune. If someone says, "Many are fasting," shut him up so that the rumor does not spread. Say to him: "I haven't heard a thing. You're mistaken and not telling the truth. Perhaps you have heard of two or three who were snatched away and you are only saying that it is many." Then after you have muzzled your accuser, don't overlook those who have fallen, so that the church will be doubly secure—rumors will no longer be noised about and those who were swept away will be led back to the sacred flock.

Therefore don't look around and say, "Some have sinned." Rather be zealous only to straighten out those who have sinned. For it is a reprehensible practice only to condemn our brothers and not to be concerned about them; to ridicule the sins of the weak but not to cure them. Let us get rid of this evil practice, for the harm it brings is not a small thing. Why do I say that? Someone heard one of you saying, "Many fasted with the Jews," and without looking further into the matter, passed the report on to someone else. Again, without looking into it further, he repeats the same thing to someone else. Then little by little this rumor increases, bringing on the one hand, much disgrace to the church and, on the other hand, helping not a whit those who are lost. Instead it causes injury to these as well as to many others. Even if there are but a few, by the many rumors we make them into many; those who stand firm we weaken, and those about to fall, we shove. For if a brother hears that many have fasted, he will be more negligent; and if a weak person hears such things, he will run after the mob that has already fallen. Don't take any pleasure in this or any other failing, even if many are sinning; for the result will be that people will parade about saying that there are many. Instead, bridge your tongue and restrain yourself.

Don't say to me that many have fasted; rather set them straight. I have not wasted so many words just to accuse the
many, but to reduce the many into a few; or better, not into a few, but that you might rescue them. Don't parade one's failures about; correct them. (934) Since there are many who go around talking about such things and who are interested only in this, even if the number is small, they make people think that many are involved. So, even if there are many defectors, the "big mouths" can be silenced, their sails trimmed, and those who are concerned about the defectors can easily straighten them out and no one will be harmed by the rumor. Haven't you heard what David said when he mourned Saul? "How are the powerful fallen! Tell it not in Gath, proclaim it not in the streets of Ashkelon, lest the Philistine women rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised exult" (2 Sam 1:19-20). If he does not want something so well known published abroad lest it give pleasure to his enemies, how much more should we not spread such things to the ears of outsiders, nor even to those among us, lest our enemies rejoice on hearing them, and our own people stumble when they learn about them. Let us rather contain the rumor and fence it in on all sides. Don't say to me: "I only told one person." Keep the rumor to yourself. Just as you cannot keep silent, so whoever hears it will not be able to hold his tongue.

5. What I have been saying applies not only to the present fast, but to countless other sins as well. Let us consider not only whether many are being swept away, but how we might bring them back. Don't exaggerate the strength of our enemies and minimize our own strength. Don't let them appear strong and ourselves weak. Do just the reverse. Rumors can make or break one's spirit: where enthusiasm is absent a favorable rumor can lift one up; but where enthusiasm is already present, an unfavorable rumor can in turn destroy it. For this reason I urge that those reports favorable to our cause be allowed to spread and be made to appear weighty, but that we curb those which abuse our brothers. If we hear something favorable, let everyone know about it. If unfavorable or harmful, let us keep it to ourselves and make every effort to destroy it.

Let us look all around, let us search out and see where the defectors are. Even if it is necessary to enter someone's
home, don't shrink back. If a defector is unknown to you, and you have never had anything to do with him, ask around and inquire who his friend or acquaintance might be, someone he especially trusts. Take his friend along when you enter his house. Don't be ashamed or embarrassed. If you were going into his house to ask for money, or to receive a gift from him, it would be natural to be embarrassed; but if you have gone there because of his salvation, the motive for your visit wipes away any blame. Sit down and speak with him, but begin with another topic so that he does not suspect you came to set him straight. Then say, "Tell me, do you agree with the Jews who crucified Christ and who blaspheme him to this day and call him a transgressor of the law?" Surely he will not dare say—if he is a Christian, and even if he has been judaizing countless times--"I agree with the Jews." But he will cover his ears and say to you, "Of course not; hush up, man." When you have gotten him to agree to this, continue with the topic and say, "Tell me, how can you participate in their activities? How can you join in their feasts, or fast with them?" Next, accuse the Jews of ingratitude. Tell him of every transgression, which I have narrated to your charity in recent days, and which has been proven from the place, from the time, from the temple, (935) and from the predictions of the prophets. Show him how the Jews do everything without purpose and in vain, that they will never return to their former way of life and that it is illegitimate to keep their former way of life outside of Jerusalem. Besides these things, remind him of Gehenna, of the terrible judgment seat of Christ, of the final reckoning; don't let him forget that we will have to account for all we have done and that there will be no little punishment for those who have dared to do such things. Remind him of what Paul said, "When you seek to be justified by way of law, you have fallen out of the domain of God's grace" (Gal 5:4). And again, threatening, "If you receive circumcision, Christ will do you no good at all" (Gal 5:2). Tell him that Jewish fasting, just like circumcision, casts the one who fasts out of heaven even though he might have a thousand other good deeds. Tell him that we
are Christians and are called Christians for this reason, that we obey only Christ, not that we run to his enemies.

If some healing remedies are shown to you, and someone says that they are able to heal, and for this reason he goes to the Jews, expose their magical tricks, their spells, their amulets, their potions. The Jews appear incapable of healing in any other way; for they do not truly heal. Far from it! I'll go even further and say this: if they truly heal, it is better to die than run to the enemies of God and be healed in this way. What profit is it if your body is healed but your soul lost? What does one gain if he gets relief in the present life only to be sent into eternal fire in the life to come? To prevent them from saying such things, listen to what God says. "If a prophet or a dreamer appears among you and offers you a sign or a portent and calls on you to follow other gods whom you have no known and worship them, even if the sign or portent should come true, do not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer. God is testing you through him to discover whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and soul" (Deut 13:1-3). What the text means is this: if a certain prophet would say, "I am able to raise the dead or heal the blind, but submit to me and let us worship demons and adore idols"; and if the one who says such things is able to heal the blind, or raise the dead, God says, "Don't believe in him for that reason." Why? Because God is tempting you; he allows him to do such a thing, not because he does not know your character, but that he might give you an occasion to show that you truly love God. For a lover, even if someone who can raise the dead to life attempts to separate him from his beloved, will not desert his beloved. If such things were spoken to the Jews, how much more are they said to us whom he led to a better philosophy, to whom he opened the door of Resurrection and commanded not to dwell on present things, but to place all our hope on the life to come.

6. But what do you reply? "My body hurts and the pain oppresses me." You have, however, not yet experienced anything like what Job underwent, not the least part of it. After losing all his flocks and herds, as well as everything else, his
servants were snatched away. And all this happened in one day in order that the trials themselves as well as their constancy might overwhelm this valiant man. After all of these things had happened, he was afflicted with a deadly disease—he saw worms swarming all over his body. And the calamity of this just and faithful man, this pious man who held himself back from evil, became a public spectacle to all who passed by. But this was not the end of his troubles. His distress increased day and night, and a strange and incredible kind of hunger assailed him. "For food I eat fodder," he said (Job 6:6). Scorn, mockery, scoffing and ridicule became his daily lot. "My servants," he said, "and the sons of my concubines, revolt against me. My dreams are filled with terror, my thoughts surge like the raging sea. And my wife, promising deliverance from all these evils, says, 'Curse God and die'" (Job 2:9). "Blaspheme him," she says, "and you will be delivered from the evils which beset you." What happened? Did her advice change the mind of that holy man? On the contrary, it only encouraged him more so that he rebuked his wife. He chose rather to suffer the pain, to undergo the hardship, and to endure a thousand devils than to be delivered from his many evils by blaspheming God.

Likewise, the man who had been sick for thirty-eight years, and who went each year to bathe in the pool, was rebuffed each year and was not healed (John 5). But each year he saw others delivered from their infirmities because they had friends who could look out for them. He who was destitute of friends went unnoticed and was constantly passed over. But he did not run to diviners, nor did he go to charmers or wear amulets. He relied solely on the help of God, and for this reason he was finally healed in a marvelous and extraordinary way.

Lazarus also passed all his years in hunger, sickness and loneliness, not just thirty-eight years, but his whole life (Luke 16). He died lying in the doorway of a rich man, despised, scorned, starved, food for dogs. His body was so weakened that he was not able to scare away the dogs who attacked him and licked his wounds. But he too did not see incantations, nor did he tie amulets on his body or use charms; he did not engage a sorcerer for himself nor did he do any of
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the other things which were forbidden. He chose rather to die amidst these evils than forsake even the smallest part of his devotion to God. What kind of excuse will we give, if, when we suffer and undergo such misfortunes because of fever or bodily hurts, we run to the synagogue and invite sorcerers with their potions to come to our homes? Have you not heard what the Scripture says? "My son, if you aspire to be a servant of the Lord, prepare yourself for testing. Set a straight course, be resolute. In disease and poverty trust in him. For as gold is assayed by fire, the Lord proves men in the furnace of humiliation" (Sir 2:1, 2, 5). If you beat your servant and, if, after receiving thirty or fifty blows, he begs to be freed and flees from your authority or goes to the house of people who hate you and provokes them against you, tell me, would such a servant be forgiven? Will anyone defend him? Not for a moment. Why not? Because a master has a right to punish his servant. (937) But there is another reason. If he must run away, he should not run to your enemies nor to those who hate you but to your close friends.

7. Therefore, when you see God punishing you, don't flee to your enemies the Jews only to provoke God; go to his friends the martyrs, the holy ones, who are pleasing to him and who approach him with great confidence. Why am I speaking of servants and masters? A son cannot run to someone else if his father beats him, nor can he deny his kinship to his father. If a father beats his son, if he drives him from his table, if he throws him out of the house, if he punishes him in every conceivable way, the laws of nature and the laws instituted by men require that all these things be borne dutifully. No one will excuse the son if he disobeys or does not bear up. If the child who is beaten bitterly laments all that has happened to him, everyone will say to him that it was his father and master who beat him, and he has authority to do whatever he pleases. You must bear up under everything without complaining. So it is that servants put up with masters, and sons with fathers, even though they are often punished unjustly. But you refuse to put up with God who corrects you, God who has more authority than any master, who loves you more than a father, who does
nothing out of wrath, and who does everything for your benefit. Yet if you have a minor illness, you immediately turn away from his authority and run to demons and flee to the synagogues. What sort of forgiveness awaits you hereafter? How can you beseech him again? Indeed, who is able, even if he is as bold as Moses, to intercede for you? There is no one! Have you not heard what God said about the Jews to Jeremiah? "Offer up no prayer for this people; for even if Moses and Samuel stood before me, I would not listen to them" (Jer 7:16; 15:1). There are certain sins which are beyond forgiveness and incapable of pardon. Let us not, then, bring such wrath on ourselves.

Even if they think they can abate the fever by incantations, it is not really alleviated, for they instill a yet more terrible fever in your conscience. Each day your mind goads you and your conscience assails you saying that you have sinned, broken the law, and transgressed your covenant in Christ. For the sake of a minor sickness, you have forsaken the faith. Are you the only one to have suffered these things? Have not others suffered more terrible things than you? None, however, have dared to do what you did. You are flaccid and corrupt, sacrificing your own soul. How will you defend yourself before Christ. How will you call on him in your prayers? Afterwards, with what kind of conscience will you enter the church? With what eyes will you look at the priest? With what hands will you touch the holy table? With what ears will you listen to the reading of the Scriptures?

The pricks of reason and the plagues of conscience will remind you of these things every day. What sort of health can we have when such accusers dwell within us? (938) If you can hang on for a little while, if you deride those who want to murmer incantations or tie an amulet on your body, if you can insult them by throwing them out of your house, you will at once get relief from your conscience. Even if you have been burning with fever a thousand times, your soul brings a relief which is better and more delightful than pure fresh water. For after receiving an incantation, even if you are healed, you continue to be more miserable than those who have fever, because you are thinking about your sin. Therefore even if you
still have fever, and suffer many evils, but have eluded these perverse men, you are better off than those who are completely healthy, for your soul exults and is happy and joyful, your conscience praises you and accepts you and says, "Well done! Well done, servant of Christ, faithful man, athlete of the faith, who prefers to die in torment than to desert the faith entrusted to us." On the final day you will take your place alongside the martyrs. For as they chose to be whipped and tortured that they might gain honor, so today you chose to be flogged and tortured by fever and by your pains rather than submit to impious incantations and amulets. Since you are nurtured by such hopes you are insensitive to the evils which assail you.

Even if this fever does not do you in, another surely will. Even if we do not die now, eventually we will die. We have been fated with a corruptible body, not to be attracted to impiety by its passions but that through its sufferings we might learn to delight in piety. This corruption, and the mortality which belongs to the body, will redound to our credit if we are vigilant. It will give us boldness before God on that final day, and not only on that day but also in our present life. When you have forcibly driven the enchanters from your house, everyone who hears about it will praise you and marvel, saying to one another, "This person who was sick and afflicted, even though he was exhorted, encouraged and advised to make use of magical incantations, did not succumb but said, 'It is better to die than to betray the faith.'" When people hear this they will be amazed at such things, and they will glorify God with loud applause. Will this not bring greater glory to you than many statues, more reknown than many portraits, and more distinction than any honor? Everyone will praise you and congratulate you and crown you, and they themselves will become better. They will imitate you and emulate your courage, and if someone else does what you did, you will be rewarded for you were the first to exhibit such zeal.

There will not only be praise for your accomplishments, but also swift relief from your sickness. Your noble decision will itself persuade God to be gracious, and the saints,
rejoicing in your zeal, will offer prayers for you from the depth of the heart. If such are the present rewards of courage, consider now what kind of crown you will receive when all the angels and archangels are present. Then Christ will come and, taking your hand, lead you to the front of that theatre and with everyone listening, say, "This is the man who once was overcome by fever." (939) Countless numbers of people encouraged him to deliver himself from his sickness; but on account of my name and his awe of me, and in order not to displease me in any way, he chased away and insulted all those who promised to heal him by magic. He chose rather to die from his sickness than to betray his devotion to me." For if Christ singles out those who gave the thirsty to drink, who clothed the naked, and fed the hungry, how much more will he single out those who chose to endure fever for his sake. The two are not equal. To endure severe illness is much greater than giving bread or one's coat. For as great as the labor is, so splendid will the crown be.

Whether one is healthy or sick, let us pay attention to these things and talk them over with one another. If we find that we are coming down with an unbearable fever, let us ask ourselves: If we were accused of a crime and brought before the judge, and then strung up and flogged on our sides, would we not have to endure it without hope of gain or any reward? Now consider this: Let the reward of perseverance be set before you, that reward which is capable of exciting a fallen spirit. Fever is cruel; but compare fever with the fire of Gehenna. If you choose to bear the sickness through thick and thin you will certainly escape the fire of Gehenna. Remember what the apostles suffered. Remember the just who were continually in tribulation. Recall blessed Timothy who was never relieved of his sickness and lived with a congenital illness. Paul referred to this when he said, "Take a little wine for your digestion, for your frequent ailments" (1 Tim 5:32). If this just and holy man, entrusted with a mission to the whole world, who raised the dead, drove out demons, who healed countless sicknesses in others, endured such terrible calamities, what excuse will you offer, you complainer, you who are troubled by intermittent illnesses? Have you not heard what the Scriptures say? "For
the Lord disciplines those whom he loves; he lays the rod on every son whom he acknowledges" (Heb 12:6). How many have often desired to receive a crown of martyrdom? This same crown of martyrdom is prepared. For martyrs are not made only when someone is ordered to sacrifice and chooses to die rather than sacrifice; whenever someone does something which can only lead to death, clearly that is martyrdom.

8. In order that you might know that this is true, recall how John the Baptist died and for what reason, and how Abel died. Neither of these saw fire burning on a sacrificial altar, nor a pagan statue, nor was either ordered to sacrifice to demons. John, simply because he denounced Herod, had his head cut off, and Abel, who honored God with a greater sacrifice than his brother, was murdered. Have they been deprived of the crowns of martyrdom for that reason? Who would dare say this? Most assuredly the manner of death itself is evidence enough to demonstrate to everyone that they belong among the first rank of martyrs. If you wish to know God's sentence concerning them, listen to what Paul says. For what he says is clearly spoken by the Holy Spirit. "I believe that I too have the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 7:40). (940) What then did he say? He begins with Abel, about whom he said that he offered a greater sacrifice to God than Cain, yet died because of it; next he speaks of the prophets, and finally comes to John. "They were put to the sword; some were tortured" (Heb 11:35, 36). And after enumerating the many and various kinds of death, he continues in the following way: "And what of ourselves? With all these witnesses to faith around us like a cloud, we must throw off every encumbrance, and run with resolution" (Heb 12:1). You see that he called Abel a martyr, and Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob martyrs as well. They all died for the sake of God. As Paul says, "Every day I die" (1 Cor 15:31).

Not that Paul actually died. He endured death only by his intention. And so it is with you. If you shun incantations, spells, and charms, and you die from sickness, you are truly a martyr, because when others were promising deliverance through impious means, you chose death rather than impiety. These things are said by us against those who boast and say "demons
heal." That you might know that this is not true, listen to what Christ said about the devil: "He was a murderer from the beginning" (John 8:44). God calls him a murderer and you run to him as though he were a doctor. What reply will you have, tell me, when you are accused of thinking that the sorcerers of the Jews are more to be trusted than the word of Christ? When God says that the devil is a murderer, they say, setting themselves against the divine decree, that he can heal sicknesses. But you accept their charm and incantations, showing by what you do that you believe they are more trustworthy than he is, even if you do not say this in so many words.

If the devil is a murderer, it is evident that those who serve him are demons. Christ taught you this through his own deeds when he allowed them to enter into a herd of swine. The demons threw that whole herd of swine into the lake that you might learn that they would do the same things to men, i.e., immediately choke them if God allowed it. But now he holds them back and restrains them and does not allow them to behave in this way. For when they received power, they used it against the swine. If they did not spare the swine, how much less will they keep away from us. Do not allow yourselves, beloved, to be seduced by their tricks, but be firm in the fear of God.

How then can you go into a synagogue? If you make the sign of the cross on your brow, the evil power which dwells in the synagogue flees. But if you do not make the sign of the cross, at once you put aside your weapons at the doors. Finding you naked and unarmed, the devil will afflict you with countless evils. But why do we insist on saying these things? It is apparent from the way you enter the synagogue that you realize it is a terrible sin to go into that evil place. You are anxious to escape notice when you go there, and you ask servants and friends and neighbors not to say anything to the priests, and if someone squeals on you, you are angry. (941) How ridiculous to try and hide from men when God, who is present everywhere, sees you? How dare you commit this transgression without shame. Do you not fear God? At least give heed to the Jews. With what sort of eyes do you look at them?
And with what kind of mouth do you speak with them, confessing to be a Christian yet running to their synagogues and asking help from them? Don't you realize how they ridicule you, how they mock you and make jokes and scoff? Aren't you aware that you are shamed and disgraced, if not in public, certainly in the minds of the Jews?

9. Tell me, then, can one tolerate such things? Can you put up with them? Even if one had to die a thousand deaths, and endure fatal injuries, would it not be much better to endure all these terrible things than to be an object of ridicule and mockery and to live with an evil conscience? I say these things not simply for your hearing but that you might heal those who have this sickness. Just as we complain about those who are weak in faith, so also we blame you for not wishing to correct those who are weak. Do you think, beloved, that the only thing expected of you when you come here is that you listen to what is said? You are just as liable to condemnation, if after hearing the sermons, you go out and do nothing. This is what it means to be a Christian, to imitate Christ and obey his laws. What did he do? He did not sit in Jerusalem and call the sick to come to him—he went about in cities and villages, healing the sickness of the body as well as the sickness of the soul. Although he could have sat in one place and attracted everyone to himself, he did not do this. He gave us an example to travel about and seek out those who are lost. He also intimates this through the parable of the shepherd (Luke 15:4-6). He did not sit down with the ninety-nine sheep to wait for the errant one to return to him, but he himself went out, found him, and after finding him he returned home bearing him on his shoulders. Don't you see doctors doing this same thing? They do not force the sick to be carried to their houses lying on their beds, but they go to them. Do the same, beloved, realizing that the present life is brief, and unless we take advantage of the opportunities before us now, we will not be saved then. It can often happen that one soul which is gained can wipe away a great number of sins and be a reprieve for us on that day.
Consider why the prophets and apostles, why just men and angels were often sent out and why the Son of God himself came to our aid. Was it not to save men? Was it not to lead the errant back? You do the same according to your ability; (942) show fervent zeal and forethought to the task of bringing back the errant. I will not cease exhorting you to do these things in every synaxis [Eucharist]; whether you pay attention or not I will not stop reminding you. This is God's law for us, whether someone hears or does not hear—to carry out this ministry. But if you hear and do what has been said, the efforts we have expended will bring us satisfaction; but if you are indifferent to what we have said and neglect our words we will be deeply saddened. Besides, there will be no danger for us due to your disobedience, because we have done everything required of us. But even though we are in no danger because we have done all that was expected of us, we are disturbed to think that you will be condemned on that day. Your listening will not be without peril if deeds are not appended to the listening. Listen how Christ accused the teachers who hid his word and even frightened those who were disciples. He said, "You ought to have put my money on deposit," and he added, "and on my return I should have got it back with interest" (Matt 25:27). He showed that after listening (i.e., after the money was deposited), it was necessary that those who received the teaching earn interest on it. The interest from teaching is nothing else than proof by deeds. Since, therefore, we deposited the money for your hearing, it is necessary that you hand over interest to the master, and this interest is the salvation of your brothers. Thus, if you only hold on to the things we have said and make nothing out of them, I am afraid you will receive the same condemnation that the man received who buried the talent in the ground. For this reason his hands and his feet were bound and he was cast into outer darkness. He did not offer to others what he had heard. That we might not suffer the same things, let us imitate the one who received five talents, and the one who received two talents, whether it be words or goods or physical exertion or prayer, or whatever must be expended for the salvation of the neighbor. Let us not
hesitate so that each of us, multiplying the talent God has given in his own way, may be able to hear that blessed voice: "Well done my good and faithful servant. You have proved trustworthy in a small way. I will now put you in charge of something big. Come and share your master's delight" (Matt 25:21). May this happen to all of us by the grace and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory and power to the Father together with the Holy Spirit, to ages un-ending.
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