The Origin and Meaning of *Ekklēsia* in the Early Jesus Movement

Ralph J. Korner

BRILL

The Origin and Meaning of *Ekklēsia* in the Early Jesus Movement

Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

VOLUME 98

The Origin and Meaning of *Ekklēsia* in the Early Jesus Movement

By

Ralph J. Korner

Contents

Foreword

There is no doubt about the importance of the word *ekklēsia* as we seek to understand the identity of early Christ-followers. This was the term that Paul chose to designate these early and formative communities on an on-going basis. It was a term with a long past, and in using it, they gave it a very prominent and significant future. But as a term, *ekklēsia* has been much neglected in New Testament Studies. There have been other studies, but this work by Dr Ralph Korner is a comprehensive, full-length work devoted to helping us to understand the varied background and meaning of the term.

This study makes a rich contribution to research in many ways. Firstly, it draws not only on literary sources, but also on over 1800 uses of the word *ekklēsia* in inscriptions. The detective work involved in finding and analyzing all these inscriptions means future scholars are much in Dr Korner's debt! The range of uses of *ekklēsia* in these inscriptions is brought into the discussion in a new and very enlightening way. In examining this evidence, Dr Korner asks how Greco-Roman readers might have perceived Christ-followers, both socially and politically, when they used the term *ekklēsia*. Secondly, this study examines the use of *ekklēsia* in the context of Roman Imperial ideology. What were the implications, in the political sphere, of Christ-followers designating themselves collectively as *ekklēsiai*? Thirdly, Dr Korner provides a comprehensive analysis of how *ekklēsia* is used in Jewish contexts. As part of this discussion, he shows that some Jewish sources use *ekklēsia* as a term for an actual, gathered group, and discusses the connotations of the term in this context.

Fourthly, and related to the previous points, Dr Korner discusses which was the first non-civic group in antiquity to adopt *ekklēsia* as a self-designation for their group. Fifthly, the study investigates the question of which community of the early followers of Jesus was the first to use *ekklēsia* as a permanent self-designation for their group. What does the adoption of the term say about the identity of the Christ-followers who used it? Finally, given that Paul uses *ekklēsia* as a designation for groups that were made up of both Jews and Gentiles, it is argued that Paul's use of *ekklēsia* for Christ-believing groups that included Gentiles reinforces the continuity of these groups with ethnic Israel. Hence it is argued that the use of *ekklēsia* as a collective self-designation for a group with Jewish roots does not reflect a supersessionist ideology.

This is a very careful piece of scholarship, which is well-argued, carefully constructed, and very thorough. It is characterised by an encyclopaedic knowledge of the ancient sources relating to the use of *ekklēsia*, by careful argumentation

and judicious weighing of the evidence, an exhaustive knowledge of past and present debates about the topics covered and by lucid presentation. Dr Korner has advanced the discussion significantly and has given us a foundational work for all future discussions of this important and influential term.

Professor Paul Trebilco
Department of Theology and Religion, University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

Epigraphy: Primary Sources

Agora 15	Meritt and Traill, 1974
Agora 16	Woodhead, 1997
Agora 17	Bradeen, 1974
Agora 19, Horoi	Lalonde, 1991
Agora 19, Leases	Walbank, 1991
Agora 19	Langdon, 1991
Agora 21	Lang, 1976
Amyzon	McCabe, 1991
Aphrodisias	McCabe, 1991
BMC Lydia	Head, 1901
Bosch, Quellen Ankara	Bosch, 1967
Cabanes, l'Épire	Cabanes, 1976
CIG	Boeckh, Franz, et al., 1828–77
CIJ/CII	Frey, 1936–1952
CIRB	Struve, et al., 1983
CPJ	Tcherikover, Fuks, et al., 1957–64
EKM 1.Beroia	Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos, 1998
Ephesos	McCabe, 1991
Epigr. tou Oropou	Petrakos, 1997
FD III	Bourguet, Colin, et al., 1929–
IAlexandriaK	Kayser, 1994
Gonnoi	Helly, 1973
Halikarnassos	McCabe, 1991
Hornblower, Mausolus	Hornblower, 1982
IAsMinLyk I	Benndorf and Niemann, 1884
IBouthrotos	Cabanes and Drini, 2007
ID/IDelos	Durrbach, Roussel, et al., 1926–1972
IDid/IDidyma	McCabe, 1985
IEph	McCabe, 1991
IG	Kirchoff, Hiller von Gaertringen, et al., 1873–; 1924–
IG I²	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1924
IG I³	Lewis and Jeffery, 1981–
IG II	Koehler, 1877–1895
IG II²	Kirchner, 1913–1940
IG III	Dittenberger, 1878–1882

IG IV ^{2}	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1929
IG IV ^{2},1	Hiller von Gaertringen 1929
IG VII	Dittenberger, 1892
IG IX,1	Dittenberger, 1897
IG IX,1 ^{2}	Klaffenback, 1932–1968
IG IX,2	Kern, 1908
IG X,2	Edson, 1914
IG X,2.1	Edson, 1972
IG XI,4	Roussel, 1914
IG XII,1	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1895
IG XII,3	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1895
IG XII,5	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1903–1909
IG XII,Suppl	Hiller von Gaertringen, 1939
IG XIV	Kaibel, 1890
IGLAM/LBW	Le Bas and Waddington, 1870; repr., 1972
IGLSyrie I	Jalabert and René Mouterde, 1929
IGR III	Cagnat et al., 1902–1906; repr., 1975
IGRR	Cagnat, Toutain, et al., 1911–1927
IGSK	Ameling, Blümel, et al., 1972–
IGUR	Moretti, 1968–1990
IHerapJ	Judeich, 1898
IIasos	McCabe, 1991
IKourion	Mitford, 1971
IK Kios	Corsten, 1985
IK Laodikeia am Lykos	Corsten, 1997
ILS	Dessau, 1892–1916
IMagn	McCabe, 1991
IMagnMai	Kern, 1900
IMT	Barth and Stauber, 1993
IMT Adram Kolpos	Barth and Stauber, 1993
IMT NoerdlTroas	Barth and Stauber, 1993
IMT SuedlTroas	Barth and Stauber, 1993
IMylasa	McCabe, 1991
IosPE I ^{2}	Latyshev, 1916
IK Pessinous	Strubbe, 2005
IPrusaOlymp	Corsten, 1991–1993
Iscr. di Cos	Segre, 1993
ISelge	Nollé and Schindler, 1991
ISmyrna	McCabe, 1988
IScM III	Avram, 2000

IThess I	Decourt, 1995–
IvO	Dittenberger and Purgold, 1896
JIGRE	Horbury and Noy, 1992
LSCGS	Sokolowski, 1962
LSCG	Sokolowski, 1969
MAMA	Calder, Herzfeld, et al., 1928–93
MAMA III	Keil and Wilhelm, 1931
MAMA XI	Balance, 2014
IMilet	Wiegend, Kawerau, et al. 1889–1997
Miletos	McCabe, 1984
Mon. Ant.	Monumenti antichi (Milan)
OGIS	Dittenberger, 1903–5/1960
Pan du désert	Bernand, 1977
Peek, Asklepieion	Peek, 1969
RECAM II	Mitchell, 1982
Rigsby, Asylia	Rigsby, 1996
RIChrM	Feissel, 1983
Samos	McCabe, 1986
Sardis VII	Buckler and Robinson, 1932
Schwenk, Athens Alexander	Schwenk, 1985
SE	Alpers, Halfmann, et al., 1995
SEG	Hondius, Woodhead, et al., 1923–
SGDI II	Baunack, Collitz, et al., 1885–1899
SIG[3]	Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen, et al., 1915–1924
Sinuri	McCabe, 1991
St. Pont. III	Anderson, Cumont, et al., 1910
TAM	Kalinka, Heberdey, et al., 1920–
TAM II	Kalinka, 1920–1944
TAM III	Heberdey, 1941
TAM V,1	Hermann, 1981 and 1989
Teos	McCabe, 1985
Tit. Calymnii	Segre, "Tituli Calymnii," *ASAtene* 22–23, (1944–1945 [1952]): 1–248

Epigraphy: Secondary Sources

AE	*L'Année épigraphique.* Cagnat, Merlin, et al., 1888–
AGRW	Ascough, Harland, Kloppenborg, 2012

ASSB	Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, 2008
BE	*Bulletin epigraphique.* Haussoullier, Reinach, et al., 1888–
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (Paris)
GRA	Kloppenborg and Ascough, 2011
Meletemata	Kentron Hellenikes kai Romaikes Archaiotetos (Ethnikon Hidryma Ereunon). Athens 1985–
Hesperia	*Hesperia.* Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens
Historia	Historia (Milan)
JÖAI	Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien (Vienna)
MbBerlin	*Monatsberichte der preussischen (deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin)
MDAI(A)	*Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts.* Athenische Abteilung (Berlin)

Greek Writers

Aeschin.	Aeschines
Arist.	Aristotle
Dem.	Demosthenes
Dio Chrys.	Dio Chrysostom
Diod. Sic.	Diodorus Siculus
Hor.	Horace
Philostr.	Philostratus
Plut.	Plutarch
Polyb.	Polybius
Suet.	Suetonius
Tac.	Tacitus
Thuc.	Thucydides
Xen.	Xenophon

Introduction

1.1   *Ekklēsia* as Christ-follower Sub-Group Identity

Before "church," there was *ekklēsia*.[1] Before the *ekklēsia* of first-generation Christ-followers, there was the *ekklēsia* of Israel in the Septuagint (LXX).[2] Before all Jewish uses of the word *ekklēsia*, there was the civic *ekklēsia* of classical Athens.

The use of *ekklēsia* terminology within the 1st century Jesus Movement displays both continuity and discontinuity with earlier Greek and Jewish sources.[3] In Greek literary and epigraphic sources, *ekklēsia* is most frequently used in reference to the public gathering ("assembly") of the citizenry (*dēmos*)

---

1   The Greek word often translated "church" in modern versions is *ekklēsia*. Its meaning in the ancient world was simply "assembly." As such, I will generally avoid using the anachronistic term "church" throughout this study and either transliterate the Greek word (*ekklēsia*) or translate "*ekklēsia*" as "assembly" or "meeting."

2   I use the term "Christ-followers" in technical fashion for members of the Jesus movement during the first century CE. I will use the term "Christian" only in reference to Late Antique Christ-followers. I use the term "Christ-follower" rather than "Christ-believer" because it represents not just beliefs, but also practice. Regarding the need to avoid anachronistic designations, see Paul Trebilco, *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 3; Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ 38* (2007): 457–512, esp. 482–88; and Anders Runesson, "Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and Theodotius I," in *Exploring Early Christian Identity* (WUNT 226; ed. B. Holmberg; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 59–92.

3   I use the term "Jewish" congruent with Mark Nanos who suggests: "the adjective 'Jewish' is used both to refer to those who are Jews ethnically and to the behavior generally associated with the way that Jews live, albeit variously defined, such as by different interpretations of Scripture and related traditions, different views of who represents legitimate authority, and different conclusions about what is appropriate for any specified time and place. The behavior can be referred to by the adverb 'jewishly,' and as the expression of 'jewishness.' In colloquial terms, one who practices a Jewish way of life according to the ancestral customs of the Jews, which is also referred to as practicing 'Judaism,' might be called a 'good' Jew" ("Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become Jews, But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus," *JJMJS* 1 [2014]: 26–53, esp. 27–28).

of a *polis* (e.g., "city-state")[4] but also for a temporary collective identity ("congregation") that is assumed by the *dēmos* during the course of that public gathering ("assembly"). Continuity with Greek sources is evident in the fact that early Christ-followers used the word *ekklēsia* as a name for the gatherings ("assemblies) of their communities in, for example, Jerusalem and Corinth. Discontinuity is evident not least in the practice of one sub-group of the early Jesus Movement (Pauline Christ-followers) who adopted *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective identity rather than only as a temporary one.[5]

Jewish sources use *ekklēsia* with a broader semantic range than do Greco-Roman sources. While some writers use *ekklēsia* for public civic-style assemblies, at least two Jewish literary works include the concept of *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity. A supra-local group identity surfaces in the LXX: *ekklēsia* as the entire ethno-religious nation of Israel. A local group identity surfaces in Philo: *ekklēsia* as a semi-public association of diasporic Jews in Egypt.[6]

---

4   Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that scholarly consensus defines a Greek *polis* as "a community of citizens rather than a territory ruled by a government" ("City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity," in *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 108; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996], 169–196, esp. 169 and 192). P. J. Rhodes and David M. Lewis note the challenges inherent in trying to identify whether the enacting community of a decree (i.e., ἔδοξεν τῆι …) is a *polis*. He says that a community could be a *polis*, or "a smaller unit within a *polis* or a larger unit containing *poleis*, or some other kind of body. A *dēmos* may be the body of citizens of a *polis*, or of a federation of *poleis*, or it may be a smaller unit within a *polis* … A dependent community may call itself a *kome* or a *chorion*; it may call itself a *dēmos* or a *koinon* or it may even call itself a *polis*" (*The Decrees of the Greek States* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], 102).

5   For example, Paul's ministry is associated with trans-locally connected *ekklēsiai* (Rom 16:4, 5, 16; 1 Cor 16:1). See further in my discussion of Paul's trans-locally connected *ekklēsiai* in 4.3.3. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *A Trans-local Parallel Political Organization?*

6   Anders Runesson helpfully clarifies the three social levels on which 'religion' "played out" in antiquity: "a. Public level (civic/state/empire concerns); b. Semi-Public level/Association level (voluntary groups/cults and their concerns); c. Private level (domestic, familial concerns)" ("Was there a Christian Mission before the 4th Century? Problematizing Common Ideas about Early Christianity and the Beginnings of Modern Mission," in *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions* [ConBNT 47; ed. M. Zetterholm and S. Byrskog; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012], 205–47, esp. 213). Semi-public/association synagogues are for members and sympathizers only (Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* [ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001], 213–32). One could call these a Jewish form of Greco-Roman voluntary associations known as *thiasoi* or *collegia* (Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 354, 480). Two examples of association synagogues (but not called "*ekklēsia*") in the land of Israel are Philo's reference to the Essenes (*Prob.* 80–83), and the community associated with the 1st century CE synagogue in Jerusalem mentioned in the Theodotus inscription (*CIJ* II 1404; see John S.

Continuity with Jewish sources is evident in the fact that early Christ-followers used *ekklēsia* both as a designation for their communal gatherings ("assemblies") and as a permanent name for a local community ("congregation"). Discontinuity in *ekklēsia* usage between early Christ-followers and the LXX and Philo surfaces both at the supra-local and local levels. First, it does not appear that the word *ekklēsia* functioned as a universal/supra-local identity for all sub-groups in the early Jesus Movement, at least not until into the 2nd century CE. Second, while Philo gives no indication that the *ekklēsia* association he describes is more than a local phenomenon, Paul's acknowledged writings give clear indication that his communities formed an empire-wide network of trans-locally connected *ekklēsiai*.[7]

In light of the semantic range of the word *ekklēsia* in Greek and Jewish sources, one can adduce a variety of political, social, and ethno-religious benefits that would have accrued to those Christ-followers who adopted *ekklēsia* terminology. It is my intention in this study to explore those benefits in relation to one specific sub-group of the early Jesus Movement—those communities which Paul designated collectively on an ongoing basis as *ekklēsiai*.

There are at least four areas of research, particularly as they apply to Paul's use of the word *ekklēsia*, which still bear further investigation. The first relates to a methodological lacuna. Most studies which analyze *ekklēsia* usage among early Christ-followers privilege literary sources, such as Greek writers, Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, and early Christ-follower sources. Some studies include Greek epigraphic sources, but none exhaustively so.[8] This is problematic not least since at least 1800 mentions of the word *ekklēsia*

Kloppenborg, "Dating Theodotus (*CIJ* II 1404)," *JJS* [51.2]: 243–80). An example of an association synagogue which is based in Jerusalem but comprised of diasporic Jews is found in Acts' mention of the "synagogue of the Freedmen" (Acts 6:9). See further in Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127/1 (2008): 95–132, esp. 112; idem, "Behind the Gospel of Matthew: Radical Pharisees in Post-War Galilee?" *CurTM* 37:6 (December 2010): 460–471, esp. 463.

7   The seven undisputed letters of Paul, listed in canonical (not compositional) order are: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.

8   Epigraphy means "a writing upon" and has reference to any process (e.g., etching, inscribing, writing with ink) by which words are 'permanently' placed upon a material (e.g., stone, wood, papyrus, pottery). Inscriptions are a sub-set of epigraphy. When it comes to sourcing epigraphic examples electronically, unless otherwise noted, I have accessed them from the website of the Packard Humanities Institute (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main; accessed beginning May 22, 2010). The same decree is not infrequently found replicated in multiple inscriptions with different titles. As such, when I state that the word *ekklēsia* occurs "x" amount of times, I do not mean to say thereby that there are "x" amount of extant *ekklēsia*

are extant in the Greek inscriptional record up to 35 CE. It is only with the rise of electronic resources that it has become possible fully to mine this treasure-trove of information relative to *ekklēsia* usage in extant epigraphical sources.[9] My electronic search of Greek epigraphic evidence allows for more definitiveness in my assessment as to whether any Greco-Roman semi-public associations pre-date the early Christ-followers in having self-identified collectively as an *ekklēsia* (see Chapter 2).

A second area of *ekklēsia* research requiring further exploration relates to the third player in Paul's identity construction project—Roman Imperial ideology.[10] As William Campbell emphasizes, and Mikael Tellbe clearly demonstrates, the matrix of Jewish and 'Christian' contexts is incomplete by itself as a paradigm for understanding group identity formation among sub-groups of Christ-followers. The Roman *imperium* is the third micro-identity which

---

references within the inscriptional record, but only that the word *ekklēsia* is listed at least "x" amount of times in the database of inscriptions of the Packard Humanities Institute.

9   My epigraphic data derives from a searchable database I created of the extant inscriptional occurrences of the word *ekklēsia*. This spreadsheet is largely based upon an electronic search of morphologically tagged inscriptions stored in the website sponsored by the Packard Humanities Institute (hereafter PHI). (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main; accessed beginning Nov. 2010).Whenever I use the transliterated lexeme *ekklēsia* in reference to epigraphic evidence, the resultant data reflects the collated evidence from five Greek lexemes (ἐκκλησία, ἐκλησία, ἐκκλησίη, ἐκκλεσία, and ἐγκλησία), and their morphological variations. Approximately 2100 inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* (5th century BCE to the 11th century CE) have been inputted into my epigraphic database. It is to be noted that because any one inscription may be known by different titles its content may appear more than once in PHI. Thus, any statistics I cite relative to the number of *ekklēsia* occurrences in the inscriptional record reflect the number of times the word *ekklēsia* occurs in the database of PHI (and other sources not incorporated by PHI). Thus, for example, the previous statement "2100 inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* (5th cent. BCE to the 11th cent. CE)" indicates merely the number of times *ekklēsia* occurs within the database of PHI, not necessarily the number of times the word *ekklēsia* actually occurs across differentiated inscriptions throughout the extant epigraphic record.

10   William S. Campbell explores the reality of what it meant for Paul's mission to grow within a tripartite context: "Christians," Jews, *and* Roman civic authorities. Campbell approvingly cites Tellbe's study of how tripartite interactions account for the differing self-understanding and identity of the "Christian" communities in Thessalonica, Rome, and Philippi. Paul's theology cannot be reduced to simply a Jewish-"Christian" dialogue. Imperial ideology is an equal partner in his "theologizing" (*Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity* [London: T&T Clark, 2006], 69; cf. Mikael Tellbe, *Paul Between Synagogue and State: Christians, Jews and Civic Authorities in 1 Thessalonians, Romans, and Philippians* [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001]).

Paul, in particular, needed to account for in his creation of a new macro-identity for his diasporic, multi-ethnic communities.[11] This leads some scholars to presume that Paul's adoption both of a political identity (*ekklēsia*)[12] and of political terminology (e.g., *kyrios, sōtēr*) reflects a political movement that was, at its foundational level, counter-imperial.[13]

I will suggest that such an ideological assumption bears reassessment in light of an emerging consensus among ancient historians on politics in the Greek East during the Imperial period (27 BCE–284 CE).[14] The exponential rise

---

11   The three micro-identities with which Paul had to deal are: (1) a Jewish Christ-follower who, through his ethnically Judean heritage is a part of historic Israel and its covenantal status with God, but who through faith in the Jewish Christ, has become a part of the new covenant available to historic Israel; (2) a gentile Christ-follower who, given his ethnically gentile heritage is excluded from historical Israel and its covenantal status with God, but who through faith in the Jewish Christ, has become part of the new covenant that is available to historic Israel; and (3) both the Jewish and the gentile Christ-follower who together live within Greco-Roman society, one which is permeated with Roman imperial ideology.

12   Richard A. Horsley comments that "Paul evidently understood the *ekklēsia* of a Thessalonica or Corinth not as a 'cultic community,' but as the political assembly of the people 'in Christ' in pointed juxtaposition and 'competition' with the official city assembly ... he was building an international political-religious movement also known by the political term ἐκκλησία ... 'acceptance and integration into society at large' would have been the last thing Paul wanted for his assemblies" ("Building an Alternative Society: Introduction," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* [ed. R. A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997], 206–14, esp. 209, 210). Horsley reiterates that same thought elsewhere: "it is clear that the [Pauline Christ-follower] movement thought of itself in political terms as an *ekklēsia* ... an 'assembly' alternative to the established city-assembly" (*First Corinthians* [ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998], 14).

13   See, for example, John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan L. Reed (*In Search of Paul: How Jesus' Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom* [New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005]), Brigette Kahl (*Galatians Re-Imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished* [PCC; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010]), and Richard A. Horsley ("Paul's Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society," in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl* [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000], 371–95; idem, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly," in *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church* [ed. E. Adams and D. G. Horrell; Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 227–240).

14   See, for example, Onno van Nijf's summary ("Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age: Introduction and Preview," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 1–26).

in euergetism, otherwise known as benefaction,[15] during the early Imperial period is testimony to the development of a political culture[16] which informally enfranchised the political influence of a middle stratum (e.g., voluntary associations) in Imperial Greek cities.[17] The existence of such a political culture in the Greek East, particularly in Asia Minor, forms the basis upon which I suggest that if an Imperial period non-civic group (e.g., voluntary association)[18]

---

15   For an extensive list of epigraphic references to Imperial period benefactions, see Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (GCRW; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 160–66. Examples of euergetism include fund distributions, festival sponsorships, and the construction of public buildings (e.g., agoras, theatres, odeia, baths/gymnasia, stoas, temples).

16   For example, Onno van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (DMAHA XVII; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997); idem, "Public Space and the Political Culture of Roman Termessos," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 215–242; Arjan Zuiderhoek, "On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City," *GRBS* 48 (2008): 417–445; idem, *Politics of Munificence* (2009). See 4.3.5. *Paul's Ekklēsia Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

17   I follow Onno van Nijf's definition of "Imperial Greek city" as a city (*polis*) in the Greek East during the first three centuries CE, that is, between the reigns of Augustus and Diocletian ("Politics, Culture and Identities: Towards a Political History of the Imperial Greek City," keynote address presented Oct. 22 at *Urban Dreams and Realities: An Interdisciplinary Conference on the City in Ancient Cultures* [Oct. 21–22, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB], 1).

18   I use the word "non-civic" as an umbrella term both for unofficial groups, such as voluntary associations, and for official groups such as 'boards' in charge of administering temples or other similar institutions, and age-based 'organizations' connected with the gymnasia (e.g., *epheboi, gerousia*). Philip defines "associations" as "social groupings in antiquity that shared certain characteristics in common and that were often recognized as analogous groups by people and by governmental institutions. Associations were small, unofficial ("private") groups, usually consisting of about ten to fifty members (but sometimes with larger memberships into the hundreds), that met together on a regular basis to socialize with one another and to honour both earthly and divine benefactors, which entailed a variety of internal and external activities" (*Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* [New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009], 26). See a more extensive yet concise definition of "associations" in David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland, "Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah," *JGRJCh* 5 (2008): 200–21, esp. 202, 203. John S. Kloppenborg provides a select list of 50 voluntary associations with details given for each as to the type of association (e.g., *oregeōnes, thiasōtai*) and the size of its membership ("Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups," *EC* 4, no. 2 [2013], 183–215, esp. 209–214).

self-designated as an *ekklēsia*, it could have been perceived as a positive, rather than as a counter-imperial, participant in the Roman empire. The widespread "*ekklēsia* discourse" evident among Second Sophistic writers such as Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, and Theon reinforces this possibility.[19] In Chapter 2, I will explore this political culture with a view to applying my findings in Chapter 4, wherein I explore the political implications of Pauline Christ-followers being designated collectively as *ekklēsiai*.

A third area of *ekklēsia* research involves a desideratum identified already in 1999 by Donald Binder. Binder includes Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* within his discussion of "what we might imprecisely label 'sectarian synagogues,' those synagogues belonging to the Essenes, the Theraputae, and the Samaritans."[20] He writes that "the emergence and development of the Christian *ekklêsia*, [however], deserves an examination beyond what can be given in this study."[21] Anders Runesson, Donald Binder and Birger Olsson take an important step in this direction in their synagogue sourcebook where they claim that the word *ekklēsia* is one among many synagogue terms used within Jewish sources. They can do little more therein, however, than to provide a cursory analysis of each occurrence.[22]

In Chapter 3 (*Ekklēsia in Jewish Sources*) I build extensively upon their observations. I will examine seven Jewish sources which use the word *ekklēsia* (the LXX, Ben Sira, Judith, 1 Maccabees, Josephus, Philo, and the apostle Paul). Their combined witness suggests that *ekklēsia* was actual group terminology adopted by some Jews in Judea and in Egypt. Within these Jewish sources, the word *ekklēsia* can be said to denote semi-public voluntary associations as well

---

19   For example, Giovanni Salmeri, "Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor," in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy* (ed. S. Swain; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 53–92; idem, "Reconstructing the Political Life and Culture of the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 197–214; Anna Criscinda Miller, "*Ekklesia*: 1 Corinthians in the Context of Ancient Democratic Discourse," (PhD diss., Harvard University, July 7, 2008). See 4.3.5. *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

20   Donald Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (Atlanta: SBL, 1999), 24.

21   Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 24.

22   Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), esp. 159–63, 328.

as public assemblies, within which are addressed a broad range of issues relevant to all members of a regional community.[23]

In Chapter 4, I identify how pre-existing uses of the word *ekklēsia* for Jewish voluntary associations, in particular, contributes to the scholarly debate. First, since Greek sources do not use *ekklēsia* as a title for semi-public associations, it becomes problematic for scholars to claim that Greek backgrounds formed the primary basis upon which Paul chose to designate his semi-public associations as *ekklēsiai*. Second, since at least one Jewish source seems to use *ekklēsia* as a title for a semi-public association (Philo), Paul's identity construction project of permanently locating his multi-ethnic *ekklēsia* associations within a Jewish heritage finds an important precedent.

A fourth lacuna within *ekklēsia* research relates to the need for a more extensive assessment of how Paul's designation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* solved a key ethno-religious conundrum. If gentiles could not collectively assume the designation "Israel," but yet, through faith in the Jewish *Christos*, could share in historic Israel's covenantal benefits, then Paul's ethnically diverse communities required another inherently Jewish group identity which could integrate gentiles qua gentiles[24] into theological continuity with Torah observant Jews qua Jews.[25]

To that end, in Chapter 4, I will assess six ways in which Paul's incorporation of gentiles into the new dyadic identity *ekklēsia* reinforces their theological continuity with ethno-religious Israel.[26] The first three are by lexical

---

23   In his survey of 1st century CE sources, Lee Levine notes that the public *synagōgē* building was used for "the entire gamut of [public] activities connected with any Jewish community … [such] as a courtroom, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions [such as public Torah reading, rituals, festival observance]" (*The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* [2d ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005], 29). See also Richard A. Horsley ("Synagogues in Galilee and the Gospels," in *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress* [ed. H. C. Kee and L. H. Colick; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999], 46–69) and Runesson ("Behind the Gospel of Matthew," 463).

24   By "gentiles qua gentiles" I mean that gentiles could become fully constituted followers of the Jewish *Christos* without being required to become Jewish proselytes and/or or take up any one, or all, of the Jewish covenantal identity markers such as circumcision, dietary restrictions, and festival observances.

25   See my discussion of Paul's phrase "Israel of God" (Gal 6:16) in 4.4.1.3.

26   Philip Esler is one example of a Pauline scholar who contends that the term *ekklēsia* was chosen expressly to distinguish Christ-followers from their Jewish roots, that is, from "the Synagogue" (*Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003]).

association (the *ekklēsia* of Israel as well as Jewish semi-public associations and public assemblies named *ekklēsia*). The other three are by literary depiction. Paul theologically transforms his *ekklēsiai* into three examples of Jewish sacred space: the temple of God, the body of the Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred Jewish synagogue wherein occurs metaphorical manumission from sin.

To my knowledge, there has not yet been a study which integrates all six of these ethno-religious and theological depictions of Paul's *ekklēsiai* when assessing questions relative to the "the parting of the ways" between 'Christians' and Jews. Such a six-fold depiction can be said to minimize the perception that Paul was supersessionist relative to other forms of Judaism.[27] I will suggest that the appropriation of *ekklēsia* terminology by *intra muros* groups within pluriform Second Temple Judaism[28] forms a crucial background, not least on the institutional level, by which to problematize scholarly suggestions that

---

27   Terence L. Donaldson provides a helpful typology of various supersessionist approaches expounded throughout history. His particular focus, though, "is to provide a more finely-drawn typology of the various ways in which groups of Christ-believers in the first formative century and a half conceived of their relationship to the phenomenon of 'Israel' in its various dimensions" ("Supersessionism and Early Christian Self-definition," *JJMJS* 3 [2016]: 1–32, esp. 10). Leonhard Rost is an early 20th century proponent of supersessionism. He claims that early Christ-followers were supersessionist in their adoption of *ekklēsia* because it expressed their conviction that they were the new Israel, the true people of God (*Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament* [BWANT 4, Folge Heft 24; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938], 154). Some scholars who lean towards a supersessionist approach differ from Rost in that they still see continuity in salvation history between the 'Church' and historic Israel, such that Torah observance and faith in Christ are compatible (J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 508; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], 237; Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 306).

28   When I speak of "Judaism," I follow the definition of "common Judaism" offered by E. P. Sanders. Sanders defines "*common* Judaism [as being] that of the ordinary priest and the ordinary people ... *Common* is defined as what is agreed among the parties, and agreed among the populace as a whole" (*Judaism: Practice and Belief—Early Roman Period (63 BCE to 66 CE)* [Philadelphia: TPI, 1992], 11–12). More specifically, "common Judaism" is the convergence of four beliefs among 1st century CE Jews: "belief that their God was the only true God, that he had chosen them and had given them his law, and that they were required to obey it" and that "the temple was the visible, functioning symbol of God's presence with his people and it was also the basic rallying point of Jewish loyalties" (*Judaism*, 241).

Pauline *ekklēsiai* were "parting ways" with the *Ioudaioi* (Jews),[29] that is, with Judaism(s), 'Jewishness,' or Jewish organizational forms.[30]

1.2   Christ-follower *Ekklēsiai*: Three Investigative Questions

As becomes apparent from my discussion of the four lacunae in *ekklēsia* research, three issues will receive focused attention in the balance of this study. These investigative priorities can be framed as three questions: (1) Which non-civic group in antiquity was the first to self-designate as an *ekklēsia*? (2) Would Greco-Roman outsiders readily have perceived the adoption of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity by Pauline Christ-followers as being reflective of counter-imperial ideology? (3) Was Paul's designation of his Christ-followers as *ekklēsiai* a supersessionist move or did it, conversely, identify those self-same Christ-followers with a Jewish heritage, and perhaps even, as *intra muros* communities of pluriform Second Temple Judaism? I begin this "*ekklēsia*-stical" journey with a review of the *status quaestionis* for each of above three questions.

1.2.1   Ekklēsia *as Group Identity: Precursors to Early Christ-Follower Usage?*
The search within Greco-Roman and Jewish sources for precursors to early Christ-follower usage of the term *ekklēsia* as a sub-group identity has found limited success. The combined witness of John Kloppenborg, Richard Ascough, and Philip Harland initially interpreted five inscriptions as suggesting that four Greco-Roman associations adopted *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity

---

29   Throughout this study, I will use the term "Jewish" rather than "Judean," in contradistinction to Steve Mason's approach. Mason asserts that Ιουδαϊκός is better translated as "Judean" rather than the traditional "Jewish" ("Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism," 457–512). For a judicious critique of Mason's position, particularly as it relates to (1) Mason's "terminological distinction between ancient contexts … and the late antique and modern situation," and (2) "the name of the place associated with Jew," see Runesson "Inventing Christian Identity," 64–70.

30   For suggestions that the ways parted by the end of the 1st century CE, see the essays in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). For opinions that Christ-followers and Jews continued to exhibit social interaction in their dealings with one another even into the Late Antique period, see the collection of essays in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (ed. A. Becker and A. Yoshiko Reed; Tübingen/Minneapolis: Mohr Siebeck/Fortress, 2003/2007). See also, Stephen Spence (*The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study* [ISACR 5; Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004]).

(*IGLAM* 1381–82; *IDelos* 1519; *Samos* 119; *OGIS* 488).[31] In due course, they have reversed some of their initial findings. Collectively, they now acknowledge that none of those five inscriptions use *ekklēsia* as a collective identity, and that only two of those five inscriptions were inscribed by voluntary associations (Tyrian merchants, *IDelos* 1519; a gymnastic association, *Samos* 119). Within those two inscriptions, *ekklēsia* is used only as a name for the assembly of each inscription's sponsoring community. My epigraphic research will add a third example of a non-civic group which named their assembly as an *ekklēsia*: the *syngeneia* ("family clan") of Pelekōs (*Sinuri* 73/8; 4th cent. BCE).

The unsuccessful search among Greek inscriptions for a semi-public association which self-designates collectively as an *ekklēsia* finds greater success within at least one Jewish source. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson identify such an *ekklēsia* reference in Philo (*Virt.* 108). My research will provide further substantiation of their assessment. As the earliest extant witness to a community using *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity, *Virt.* 108 implicitly locates that community in early 1st century CE Alexandria.

A corollary question also receives attention by scholars: which sub-group in the early Jesus Movement was the first to self-designate collectively as an *ekklēsia*? The arguments of Paul Trebilco and George H. van Kooten encapsulate the two primary interpretive approaches. Trebilco makes at least two claims. First, he forwards pre-Pauline, Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Judea as being the first sub-group in the Jesus movement to self-designate collectively as *ekklēsiai*.[32] Second, he postulates that their inspiration for doing

31 John S. Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch, Churches, and Collegia," in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity* (ed. B. H. Maclean; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 212–38, esp. 231; Richard Ascough, "Matthew and Community Formation," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Studies* (ed. D. E. Aune; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 97–126, esp. 113; Philip Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 106 and 182; idem, *Dynamics of Identity*, 44.

32 Paul Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57 (2011): 440–460. In this, Trebilco (Ibid., 440, 442–444) follows on from Andries du Toit who states that "the ἐκκλησία title originated within Greek-speaking early Christian circles in Jerusalem, spreading from there to Antioch" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*: Interculturality in the Shaping of Paul's Theology," *NTS* 55 [2009]: 121–143, esp. 133). See also, Lucien Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder/London: Nelson, 1959), 95–117; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus* (FRLANT 87; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965), 211 n. 2; W. G. Kümmel, *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus* (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968) 16–19; W. Schenk, "Die ältesten Selbstverständnisse christlicher Gruppen

so derived from how the LXX used the word *ekklēsia*. Van Kooten differs with Trebilco on both fronts.[33] First, he forwards Paul as being the initial Christ-follower to appropriate *ekklēsia* as a group designation.[34] Second, he states that Paul's primary inspiration for doing so was the prevalence, and continued political relevance, of civic *ekklēsiai* throughout the Greek East of the Roman empire.[35] With this assertion, van Kooten locates himself within the trajectory of other political interpreters of Paul's *ekklēsiai* like Dieter Georgi, Karl Donfried, and Richard Horsley, to name a few.[36]

There is substantive evidence for each of the above viewpoints, making any claims of a definitive answer challenging, to say the least. I will suggest, though, that there is room for one more interpretive approach. In line with van Kooten, I too will forward Paul as being the first Christ-follower to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent group designation. I will argue, however, that neither the ancient supra-local *ekklēsia* of the LXX (Trebilco) nor the contemporary *ekklēsiai* of Greco-Roman *poleis* (van Kooten) were sufficient precedents for Paul' s group identity construction project: Paul's semi-public associations were neither a supra-local entity nor were they only temporarily designated as *ekklēsiai* (as

---

im ersten Jahrhundert," *ANRW* II 2/2: 1357–1467; J. Roloff, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (GNT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 82–83; idem, "ἐκκλησία, ας, ἡ," *EDNT* 1.410–415, esp. 411–12; Rost, *Die Vorstufen*, 154. Rost argues that Jesus was the first to designate his followers collectively as an *ekklēsia*.

33   George H. Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley," *NTS* 58/4 (Oct. 2012): 522–48.

34   "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 536.

35   Van Kooten states that the "Graeco-Roman political meaning [of *ekklēsia*] in the sense of 'civic assembly' was decisive in its adoption by Paul, and that Paul wishes to portray his community as an alternative organization existing alongside the civic assemblies" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 522; cf. also 532–35). Other scholars who assert the preeminence of Greek backgrounds by which to explain New Testament appropriations of *ekklēsia* as a group designation include Erik Peterson (*Die Kirche* [München: Beck, 1929], 14–15, and nn. 18–19), Jürgen Becker (*Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 427). See also Wayne O. McCready, who assesses the socio-religious value for Paul's gentile mission of the Greco-Roman backgrounds to the word *ekklēsia* ("*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 59–73).

36   Dieter Georgi, *Theocracy in Paul's Praxis and Theology* (trans. David E. Green; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); Karl Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Richard A. Horsley, ed., *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International/New York & London: Continuum, 1997).

were the *dēmoi* who met in civic *ekklēsiai*). Rather, I will suggest that it is the existence of a Jewish *ekklēsia* association in the diaspora (Philo's Alexandria) that would have been a seminal precedent for Paul's project of trying indelibly to tie his diasporic *ekklēsia* associations into their Jewish heritage.

1.2.2   Ekklēsia *as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?*

There are numerous political interpreters of Paul who explore how his political terminology, not only his use of the term *ekklēsia*, intersects with Roman Imperial ideology. Opinions diverge, however, when it comes to determining if Paul's use of terms and concepts from a Greco-Roman political milieu reflect a pro-imperial,[37] a neutral-imperial,[38] or a counter-imperial message.[39] Horsley is a leading voice in the polyphonic chorus of scholars who explore how Paul negotiated the demands of imperial ideology upon his theocratic communities.[40] Four aspects of Paul's ostensibly counter-imperial ideology are generally forwarded: the Gospel of Imperial salvation,[41] patronage and power,[42]

---

37   Bruno Blumenfeld claims that "Paul upholds political sovereignty and reaffirms the authority of the state while making it fully compatible with faith" (*The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* [JSNTSup 210; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001/London: T. & T. Clark, 2003/2004], 283–84, see also 391).

38   Seyoon Kim asserts that Paul uses political language simply as a *lingua franca* through which more effectively to communicate the message about Jesus the *Christos* (*Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008]).

39   Counter-imperial interpreters of Paul's acknowledged writings include: Robert Jewett (Romans); Richard Horsley (1 Corinthians); Davina Lopez, Brigitte Kahl (Galatians); Peter Oakes (Philippians); and Karl Donfried (1 Thessalonians).

40   Other examples of Richard Horsley's edited works include *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), and *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008).

41   The Gospel of imperial salvation was disseminated through the emperor cult which came into existence during the reign of Augustus (27 BCE–14 CE). The imperial cult was more prevalent in the Greek East, dominated public space through dedicated buildings and statues, and, through its integration of traditional Greek religion, created a pervasive presence of imperial munificence and salvation.

42   Patronage and power were both a means of social control and social cohesion. Patronage involved reciprocal exchanges of goods and services, with mutual-aid societies known as *collegia* (or *thiasoi*) being the focus of such reciprocity.

an alternative Gospel,[43] and the assemblies (*ekklēsiai*) of an alternative international society.[44]

Given this four-fold ideological milieu, Horsley identifies the rhetorical target of Paul, and thus of his *ekklēsia* communities, as being the Roman *imperium* in all of its political and religious expressions. He cites the Corinthian correspondence as an illustrative case in point. Horsley claims that Paul's rhetoric in the Corinthian correspondence de-constructs the three-legs of imperial ideology: the patronage system, the imperial cult, and the rhetoric of peace and concord (*pax romana*). Paul is said to achieve this deconstruction by constructing his Corinthian Christ-followers into an alternative socio-political community. Two examples follow.

First, in contrast to the Roman patronage system, Horsley claims that the Corinthian *ekklēsia* is organized by egalitarian principles.[45] Second, Horsley suggests that Imperial authority is challenged by at least five social functions within the Corinthian *ekklēsia*: (1) a trans-local network of missionally-united, household-based *ekklēsiai*; (2) communal affairs that are adjudicated autonomously of local authorities (e.g., lawsuits); (3) isolation from "fundamental forms of social relations in the dominant society" (e.g., abstinence from eating food offered to idols); (4) the embodiment of radically different economic relations (avoidance of patronage); and (5) the initiation of an economic practice that was "unprecedented and probably unique in antiquity" (the collection for poor Christ-followers in Jerusalem).[46]

Donfried reinforces Horsley's counter-imperial perspectives on Paul's communities with evidence from 1 and 2 Thessalonians.[47] One of his arguments is of particular note. Donfried focuses upon Paul's *adscriptio*: "to the *ekklēsia*

---

43   If one assumes that Paul's terminological and definitional parallels with Roman imperial ideology are intentional (e.g., *euangelion, sōtēria*), then the possibility arises that Paul's gospel includes counter-imperial elements. Some elements include Paul's apparent disdain for Roman imperial "peace and security" (1 Thessalonians), his proclamation of impending doom for "every rural ruler and every authority in power" (1 Corinthians) such that "this [republican imperial] world is passing away."

44   Paul's *ekklēsiai* in Asia Minor and Greece, which self-presented in many ways as Greco-Roman voluntary associations, incorporated alternative social patterns than those associated with the hierarchical social stratification that was intrinsic to Imperial period Roman society.

45   Horsley, "1 Corinthians," 251. See also Richard Horsley, "Building an Alternative Society," 206–14, 213; idem, *First Corinthians*, 163–65.

46   Horsley, "Building an Alternative Society," 206–14; idem, *First Corinthians*, 36.

47   Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (2002).

thessalonikeōn in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."[48] He contends that Paul's anomalous phrase *ekklēsia thessalonikeōn* ("of the Thessalonicans") displays counter-imperial rhetoric. The word *thessalonikeōn* is a "city-ethnic" (*nomen gentilicium*).[49] Paul's use of a "city ethnic" rather than of the toponym itself (e.g., "which is in Thessalonica") is atypical in his acknowledged writings. Donfried notes, though, that it is typical for Thessalonican coins of the late Hellenistic and early Roman period to use the "city-ethnic" *thessalonikeōn*. The imperial context of these coins is obvious on the obverse side where upon are displayed the heads of Julius Caesar, Augustus, and Gaius along with the legends *Theos, Kaisar Sebastos*, and *Gaios Sebastos Huios*, respectively.[50] From this numismatic evidence Donfried draws the conclusion that Paul's *adscriptio* functions implicitly as a subversive political statement: "the apostle is clearly distinguishing and separating two types of assemblies in Thessalonica, each comprising different groups of people with substantially different allegiances and loyalties."[51] He identifies Paul's phrase "*tei ekklēsia(i) thessalonikeōn*" (1 Thess 1:1) as being "primary among these ... language and thought-patterns that these former pagans were familiar with and which still surround them and encircle them."[52] Donfried suggests that Paul's mimicry of the Thessalonican "city-ethnic" implies that he views his Christ-followers as the true *ekklēsia* of Thessalonica, which would have been a patently counter-imperial statement. There is one problematic omission, however, in Donfried's assessment of the numismatic evidence, which I will address in Chapter 4.

Leif Vaage takes a different tack. He does not focus upon Paul's purported counter-imperial intentionality but rather upon the inevitability of a clash between the Roman *imperium* and the empire-wide association of Christ-follower *ekklēsiai*.[53] This socio-political clash develops, in his mind, not because Christ-followers intentionally sought to usurp Roman political structures and

---

48   The Greek text of 1 Thess 1:1 (cf. 2 Thess 1:1) reads, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.

49   Regarding a *nomen gentilicium*, Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that one "way of viewing the *polis* was the habit to call it by the city-ethnic in the plural [e.g., *polis* of (οἱ) ἀμπρακιῶται] rather than using the toponym itself [e.g., *polis* of ἀμβρακία]" ("City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity," in *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 108; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996], 169–196, 169 and 192).

50   Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica*, 140–41.

51   Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica*, 143.

52   Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica*, 143.

53   Leif E. Vaage, "Why Christianity Succeeded (in) the Roman Empire," in *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity* (SCJ 18; ed. L. E. Vaage; Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2006), 253–78.

authority. Rather, it develops because Christ-followers used political terms and concepts, like *ekklēsia*, that germinated into political aspirations that eventually grew to fruition in Constantine's 'Christian' empire. Vaage believes that "Christianity's cultural destiny was, in fact, decisively shaped by the fact that so much of its core religious vocabulary is expressly political and so frankly imperial."[54]

Georgi focuses his "neutral-imperial" rhetorical analysis of Paul's "*ekklēsia* ideology" upon its intersection with municipal politics rather than with the *imperium*. He views Paul's assemblies as being "in competition with the local political assembly of the [city's] citizenry"[55] in that they form an "alternative social utopia" which reflects three "central ideals of Hellenistic society": "its libertarian and democratic universalism, its socially egalitarian pluralism, and its urban basis."[56] In this, Georgi views the Pauline *ekklēsiai* as reflecting a civic ideology which is directed against oligarchic rule and hierarchical society rather than against the Roman empire itself.

Van Kooten follows the lead of Georgi in also labeling the Christ-follower *ekklēsia* as a "neutral-imperial" alternative society. His distinctive contribution lies in his claim that the alternative society of Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* paralleled three levels of political organization: municipal/regional,[57] provincial,[58] and empire-wide.[59] Van Kooten does not follow Horsley, though, in claiming that counter-imperial ideology lies behind any attempts by Pauline *ekklēsiai* to become politically organized.

---

54   Vaage, "Why Christianity Succeeded," 255.

55   Georgi, *Theocracy*, 31, 51, 57.

56   Georgi, *Theocracy*, 51. See also, Karl P. Donfried, "The Imperial Cults of Thessalonica and Political Conflict in 1 Thessalonians," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (ed. R. A. Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: TPI/New York & London: Continuum, 1997), 215–23.

57   In each city wherein Christ-followers reside, van Kooten claims that Paul creates an antithesis between his *ekklēsia* and the civic *ekklēsia* (1 Cor 1:2; 11:6; 2 Cor 1:1; Rom 16:1; 1 Thess 1:1; 2:1).

58   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 536. Van Kooten sees a provincial level of organization in the phrases "the *ekklēsiai* of Galatia" (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2), "the *ekklēsiai* of Asia" (1 Cor 16:19), "the *ekklēsiai* of Macedonia" (2 Cor 8:1), and "the *ekklēsiai* of Judea" (Gal 1:22; cf. 1 Thess 2:14).

59   Van Kooten states that there appears to be a "universal, even global notion of ἐκκλησίαι, [which] was unparalleled in the Greek world and the Roman empire" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 537). He specifically cites Rom 16:4 in this regard and claims that it indicates "an alternative, non-ethnic, global community, which takes the form of a collective of assemblies from the nations … the political overtones [of which] cannot be missed" (Ibid., 537).

My focus in this study, however, is not upon the more general topic of Paul's political ideology. Rather, my focus is specifically upon Paul's adoption of one particular political identity for his communities—the Greek democratic institution *par excellence*, the *ekklēsia*. My interpretive assessment of Paul's "*ekklēsia* ideology" mirrors Georgi's more neutral-imperial, counter-*polis* approach, but uses Imperial period epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor to explore how Paul's *ekklēsia* associations could have been perceived as constructive political participants within *polis* life.

1.2.3   Ekklēsia *as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?*

Paul's Jewish heritage brings to the fore the need also to consider ethno-religious optics when assessing Paul's rationale for adopting a permanent *ekklēsia* identity for his multi-ethnic, diasporic communities. My analysis of *ekklēsia* occurrences in Jewish sources (Chapter 3) provides data from which I seek to answer my third investigative question. Restated, this question reads: "Did Paul perceive Jews and gentiles within his *ekklēsiai* as having superseded ethno-religious Israel in God's salvation history?"[60]

One position is called supersessionism.[61] Broadly defined, the term "supersessionism," otherwise known as "replacement theology"[62] or "fulfillment theology," holds that the "promises and covenants that were made with the nation of Israel … now allegedly belong to another group that is not national Israel."[63] There are two interpretive options. First, the view championed by Ernst Käsemann sees discontinuity between the 'Church' and historic Israel.[64] Thus, Torah observance and faith in Jesus as Messiah are incompatible. Second, J. D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright spearhead the view that there is continuity in salvation

---

60   Christopher Zoccali cogently summarizes the various positions taken by scholarship relative to the relationship between the 'Church' and Israel (*Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present* [Salem, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010]).

61   See, for example, Rost, *Die Vorstufen*, 154.

62   Bruce K. Waltke ascribes to a "replacement theology" in which "national Israel and its law have been permanently replaced by the church and the New Covenant" ("Kingdom Promises as Spiritual," in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments* [ed. J. S. Feinberg; Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988], 263–87, esp. 274). See also Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy, Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 101.

63   Michael Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel?* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2010), 10.

64   Zoccali, *Whom God Has Called*, 23ff. See, for example, Käsemann's work *Leib und Leib Christi* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1933).

history between the 'Church' and historic Israel.[65] Thus, Torah observance and faith in Christ are compatible for Jews who have become Christ-followers.

N. T. Wright disagrees with those who would place his view squarely into the supersessionist camp. His ostensibly "middle view" holds that those Jews who do not believe in Jesus as their *Christos* "have not been 'replaced' or 'disinherited' or 'substituted'."[66] He calls his approach "incorporative christology."[67] He posits that, for Paul, Jesus is the continuation of Israel in the latter days, and that all Christ-followers, whether messianic Jews or gentiles, together compose latter-day Israel.[68] Wright affirms only one redeemed people of God/family of Abraham with Jesus the *Christos* being the *only* eschatological mediator of salvation.[69] He does not posit a two covenant system (Torah and Jesus),[70] such that Paul is "a rabbi who affirms the ongoing election of ethnic Israel but holds that God has sent Jesus Christ as a special way of salvation for the gentiles."[71] Even if one agrees with Wright's contention that his view is not supersessionist, his theological claim still appears to have socio-cultural ramifications.

---

65   Dunn, *Theology*, 508; Wright, *Climax*, 237; Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles*, 306.

66   N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2 vols.; Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 4; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 2.1212.

67   Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.825–34. Wright states: "Paul's fresh understanding of Jesus as the summing-up of the divine purpose for Israel drove him back to the scriptures, not least to the story of Abraham and, behind that, the story of Adam, and to glimpse in both of them the notion, and in the Abraham story a linguistic way of expressing this notion, that the vocation and/or destiny of people could be bundled up within the vocation and/or destiny of that one person" (Ibid., 2.828).

68   The importance of this topic to Wright is evident in the fact that he dedicates his largest chapter of his two volume work to it (Chapter 10: "The People of God, Freshly Reworked"; 268 pages) and a significant section of the next chapter (Chapter 11: "God's Future for the World, Freshly Imagined"; 225 pages) (Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.774–1042 and 2.1043–1268, respectively).

69   Wright claims that "Paul sees Jesus as the one who has been established as Messiah through his resurrection, drawing Israel's history to its strange but long-awaited resolution, fulfilling the promises made to Abraham, inheriting the nations of the world, winning the battle against all the powers of evil and constituting in himself the promise-receiving people, so that all 'in him' might receive those promises, precisely not in themselves but insofar as, being 'in him', they are incorporated in the True Jew, the one in whom Israel's vocation has been fulfilled" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 830).

70   For one example of a "two-covenant" perspective, see Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2009).

71   While not adhering to a two covenant view, Charles H. Cosgrove helpfully provides a concise summary of that view (*Elusive Israel: The Puzzle of Election in Romans* [Louisville: Westminster Press, 1997], 1).

Specifically, Wright's view that the family/people of God/Abraham are a homogenous entity raises the question as to the value that Jewish ethnic identity would have held within the multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* of Paul's Christ-followers.

There is also a post-supersessionist position. Supporters of this perspective contend that the 'Church' does not displace or replace historic Israel, but rather is emplaced within Israel. This position is taken by scholars of the so-called "Radical Perspective on Paul,"[72] also known as the "Beyond the New Perspective on Paul" (BNP)[73] and, more recently, as the "Paul within Judaism Perspective."[74] They argue that Israel and the 'Church,' that is, the universal, multi-ethnic community of Christ-followers, are distinct yet covenantally related socio-religious entities.[75] As such, so the argument goes, by faith in the

---

72 Kathy Ehrensperger, *That We May Be Mutually Encouraged: Feminism and the New Perspective in Pauline Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 39; Magnus Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 127–63; Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian*, 216.

73 For a discussion of the similarities and differences between scholars in the New Perspective and Beyond the New Perspective (BNP) 'camps,' along with a carefully nuanced comparative analysis of different views within the BNP 'camp,' see J. Brian Tucker, *Remain in Your Calling: Paul and the Continuation of Social Identities in 1 Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 7–10. BNP scholars include, but are not limited to, William S. Campbell, Kathy Ehrensperger, Anders Runesson, Magnus Zetterholm, Mark Nanos, David Rudolph, Pamela Eisenbaum, John Gager, Stanley Kent Stowers, Lloyd Gaston, Krister Stendahl, Markus Barth, Markus Bockmuehl, and J. Brian Tucker (Tucker, *Remain in Your Calling*, 8).

74 See especially, Mark Nanos, "Introduction," in *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 1–29. See also, Anders Runesson, "The Question of Terminology: The Architecture of Contemporary Discussions on Paul," in *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 53–78.

75 David Rudolph argues for the inclusion of a Messianic Jewish perspective in Christian theology ("Messianic Jews and Christian Theology: Restoring an Historical Voice to the Contemporary Discussion," *Pro Ecclesia* XIV/1 [2005]: 58–84). Rudolph envisions a five-fold post-supersessionist perspective which Messianic Jews would bring to Christian theology: "(1) God's covenant fidelity to the Jewish people, (2) that Jesus was Israel's Messiah and participated in the unique identity of the God of Israel, (3) that the *besorah* (gospel) was for Jews and Gentiles, (4) that Jesus-believing Gentiles were full members of God's people without becoming Jews, and (5) that Jesus-believing Jews should continue to live as Jews in keeping with Israel's calling to be a distinct and enduring nation" (http://www.mjstudies.com/; accessed 1.29.2012).

Jewish Christ, gentiles qua gentiles share with Torah observant Jews qua Jews in God's salvation history with historic Israel.[76]

As William Campbell succinctly states, "The church and Israel [are] related but separate entities which should not be dissolved or merged in such a way that the sub-group identity of the one is lost or unrecognized."[77] Campbell argues that Pauline Christ-followers would not have seen themselves as some sort of new, a-cultural, universal association which is disconnected from its Jewish roots, but rather as Jews and other ethnicities who, while ethnically diverse, are united under the transforming influence of Christ, and who express that diverse unity within their individual cultures.[78] Campbell contends, therefore, that Paul is a non-sectarian, Jewish reformist who sought to establish groups that were theologically united with, yet socially distinct from, the greater synagogue community, but who still accepted Jewish ethno-religious identity markers in their worship of the Jewish *Christos*.[79]

Denise Buell also affirms a post-supersessionist interpretation of Paul's views. Her particular focus is upon countering claims that Paul's ideology

---

76   Zoccali states that Nanos and Campbell appear to presume that "while the church existed for Paul under the umbrella of Israel, in as much as it consists of Jewish and gentile Christ followers it can equally be seen as a larger entity encompassing both Israel and the nations" (*Whom God Has Called*, 135). See Mark Nanos ("Challenging the Limits that Continue to Define on Paul's Perspective on Jews and Judaism," in *Reading Israel in Romans: Legitimacy and Plausibility of Divergent Interpretations* [ed. C. Grenholm and D. Patte; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000], 212–24, esp. 221) and Campbell (*Paul*, 138). For a volume which extensively explores the inter-relationship between 1st century CE Jewish Christ-followers and a Jewish heritage, see *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007), esp. 3–418.

77   Campbell, *Paul*, 101. Campbell notes that one cannot merely distinguish Israel from the Church in the conviction that God's purposes for historical Israel are not yet fully realized (*Paul*, 99). One must rather establish to what degree Israel and the (predominantly gentile) Church are mutually distinct entities in Paul's theology.

78   For an assessment of Campbell's argument, see Ralph J. Korner, on-line review of William S. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*, Bryn Mawr Classical Review (2009.07.42).

79   Campbell, *Paul*, 66. Campbell makes this point very clear in his analysis of Paul's discussion on the weak and the strong in Romans 14:1–15:13. Campbell states that Paul "feels obliged to make it clear that accommodation to those living a Jewish way of life, far from being in conflict with his gospel, is demanded by it, if the conviction of fellow Christ-followers so requires" ("The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?" in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11* [ed. F. Wilk and J. R. Wagner, with the assistance of F. Schleritt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 171–95, esp. 188).

contained the supersessionist seeds of some 2nd century CE Christ-followers who conceived of themselves as a "third race." These later Christ-followers downplayed the importance of ethnic and racial identity, and in some cases even erased it. Buell states that Paul's conversionist paradigm of affirming "Christian collective self-definition in ethical/racial terms" directly counters any perception that he somehow devalued Jewish identity among his *ekklēsiai*.[80]

1.2.4   *Pauline* Ekklēsiai: *A Thesis Statement*

In this Introduction, I have summarized the *status quaestionis* in three areas of scholarship relative to Paul's permanent designation of his Christ-followers as *ekklēsiai*. Going forward, I will interact with those three questions. In Chapter 2, I will address the Greco-Roman backgrounds which inform answers to my first two investigative questions (i.e., which was the first *ekklēsia* association in antiquity? What are the counter-imperial implications of an association self-designating as an *ekklēsia*?). In Chapter 3, I will explore Jewish sources which relate to answering my first and third investigate questions (i.e., which was the first *ekklēsia* association in antiquity? What are the supersessionist implications of an association self-designating as an *ekklēsia*?).

In Chapter 4, I will integrate the conclusions from Chapters 2 and 3 for the purpose of assessing their intersection points with Paul's *ekklēsia* ideology in his acknowledged writings. For the reader's benefit I replicate my thesis statement in advance here: Paul's diasporic communities, the first associations in the early Jesus Movement to self-designate permanently as *ekklēsiai*, (1) reflect civic ideology, (2) for the creation of an alternative society, (3) that is not counter-imperial, (4) nor a trans-local parallel political organization. Rather, Paul's *ekklēsia* communities are trans-locally connected associations: (1) with an inherently Jewish heritage, yet which are socially accessible to Greco-Romans, (2) and which could have been viewed as pro-'democratic', counter-oligarchic participants in the ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse," (3) of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor.

In sum, I will seek to demonstrate in the ensuing pages that Paul's designation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* presents them as associations with a Jewish heritage who inculcate a civic ideology that is three-fold: it is pro-*dēmokratia*, counter-oligarchic, and not counter-imperial.

---

80   Denise Buell, *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 164.

Ekklēsia in Greek and Roman Sources

2.1 Introduction

My specific focus here in Chapter 2 is on examining the way in which the word *ekklēsia* is used in Greek and Roman sources dated from the 5th century BCE up to, and including, the 2nd century CE.[1] My purpose in this is three-fold. First, I will assess whether a non-civic group, which self-designated collectively as an *ekklēsia*, could have been perceived by Roman authorities as being politically seditious. Such an assumption gains greater purchase if civic *ekklēsiai* in the Greek East still retained sufficient democratic power (*dēmokratia*) to have been perceived as a political threat by Rome.

A second political assumption requiring attention is the view of some scholars that Greek civic *ekklēsiai* were 'secular' institutions; they did not mix politics with religion. This leads some to conclude that, since Jewish synagogues mixed religion and politics, any Jewish writer (e.g., Josephus) who calls a Jewish assembly an *ekklēsia* is not using authentic Jewish terminology but rather is viewing it through Greek eyes.

Third, I will reinforce the research of John Kloppenborg and Philip Harland that there is no extant example of a Greco-Roman non-civic group (e.g., an association) using *ekklēsia* as a permanent group designation. I accomplish this through an investigation of all references to the word *ekklēsia* within the Greek inscriptional record (5th century BCE to 35 CE).[2] The importance of supplementing literary artifacts[3] with material evidence is emphasized by Harland.[4] He makes the point that only archaeological evidence, particularly epigraphic evidence, allows for the emergence of a "grass roots level" perspective on non-elite life within Greco-Roman society, a perspective which is too easily masked

---

1 There are at least 1858 *ekklēsia* mentions in the inscriptional record which are dated from the 5th cent. BCE up to and including the 2nd cent. CE.

2 There are at least 1780 *ekklēsia* mentions in the inscriptional record which are dated from the 5th cent. BCE up to 35 CE.

3 Unless otherwise noted, text copied from Greek literary works is taken from the Perseus website (http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/; accessed beginning November 2010).

4 Harland emphasizes the need to add local archeological and epigraphic materials as evidence for associations in the world of early Christ groups and Judean gatherings (*Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* [New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009], 2).

by literary texts that are the product of social elites.[5] Both Greek[6] and Roman authors[7] display a literary *tendenz* towards elitist ideological representation. This *tendenz* suggests the need for supplementary epigraphic evidence. It also gives warrant for granting to epigraphic sources a greater primacy of place relative to literary witnesses.[8] This foregoing rationale undergirds my methodological choice to provide as extensive a study as possible of epigraphic occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* and to use that research as a primary basis from which to ascertain how Greco-Romans might have perceived Christ-follower *ekklēsiai*.

In mining the epigraphic record, though, I affirm four limitations that are noted by Robert Sinclair relative to conclusions one can draw from inscriptional evidence.[9] First, public inscriptions only represent the "tip of the epigraphic

---

5   Harland, *Dynamics*, 2, 3.

6   One Greek literary example is Aristotle's corpus, wherein, while writing about the *boulē* and *ekklēsia* of 4th century Athens, he substitutes original 5th century terminology. Susanne Carlsson cogently compares the historical value of literary sources and epigraphic sources (*Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States* [HE 206; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010], 17–18): "In contrast to ancient literary sources which are often written many years after the course of events they describe and which are known only from medieval manuscripts, inscriptions are original texts and thus constitute not only sources, but also archaeological artefacts."

7   One Roman example is official documents of the Julio-Claudian era which portray a rather negative view of voluntary associations as being subversive social entities which were in need of control.

8   In contrast to elitist Roman literary sources, the inscriptional record predominantly paints a positive picture of the involvement of voluntary associations in Greco-Roman societal life. See the studies by Jean-Pierre Waltzing (*Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'empire d'Occident* [Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique 50; 4 vols.; Brussels: Hayez, 1895–1900]); Francesco M. De Robertis (*Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano* [Bari: Adriatica, 1938/ repr., 1971]); and G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981). For descriptions of inscriptional content from associations in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, see Philip Harland (*Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], esp. 1–112), John S. Kloppenborg and Richard Ascough, eds. (*Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Vol. 1 of *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* [BZNW 181; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011]), and Richard Ascough, Philip Harland, and John Kloppenborg, eds. (*Associations in the Greco-Roman World: a Sourcebook* [Berlin/Waco: de Gruyter/Baylor University Press, 2012]).

9   Robert K. Sinclair, *Democracy and Participation in Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 86.

iceberg," so to speak.[10] Second, a statistical analysis of only extant stone or bronze inscriptions neglects a much larger body of epigraphic evidence, which is either lost to posterity, given the happenstance nature of archaeological discoveries, or permanently lost through decay and destruction.[11] Third, since stone *stelae* are not infrequently of a fragmentary or eroded nature, a historian cannot *prima facie* assume that the epigraphist has correctly reconstructed the text.[12] Fourth, variations in terminology and decree formulae may still reflect a similar provenance and compositional date.[13]

---

10   Public display was reserved for more important decisions such as alliances with foreign states. An exponentially greater number of inscriptions were archived, and, thus, ultimately lost to posterity. As such, any socio-historical conclusions reached relative to public inscriptions will of necessity reflect only a limited cross-section of that *polis*' actual socio-political reality. Athenian records of the *boulē* after 405/4 were organized into a centralized public archive within the old Bouleterion, which now became known as the new Metroon. See the discussion by T. Leslie Shear, Jr. ("Bouleterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens," in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 95; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995], 157–90, esp. 173–89).

11   Civic decrees were engraved and written not only on stone and bronze, but also on less durable materials, such as wooden tablets and papyrus. Their increased susceptibility to decay over time means a treasure trove of insights into ancient socio-political life has been forever lost. The clearest statement that copies of decrees were written on wooden tablets is found in *IG* I³, 165 ADD, lines 6–11 (430–420 BCE?).

12   Carlsson notes that there are two divergent approaches taken by schools of thought involved in editing inscriptions. The one school does "small restorations of occasional letters without any need of defence" and the other follows the "'Principle of Extreme Freedom' where attention is focused not on the exact wording but on what one thought was the original substance" (*Hellenistic Democracies*, 19).

13   I offer two sets of examples not noted by Sinclair. The first set involves the use of two different morphemes within the same inscription for the same case of definite article (e.g., τᾶ and τᾶι) and its accompanying noun (e.g., ἐκκλησία and ἐκκλησίαι, respectively): *IG* XII, Suppl 139 (167? BCE; Aegean Islands, Lesbos, Nesos, and Tenedos, Ionia—Miletos); ἐν τᾶ ἐκκλησία and ἐν τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι (See also *IMT NoerdlTroas* 4 [2nd cent. BCE; Asia Minor, Troas, Lampsakos (Lapseki)] and *IMilet* I 3, 146A [209/208 BCE; Asia Minor, Ionia, Ephesos, Notion, Klaros]). The second set involves different morphemes of the same definite article occurring in different inscriptions linked by similar timeframes and regions: (1) 2nd half of the 1st cent. BCE: ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησί[α]ν (*FD* III 1:463; central Greece, Phokis, Delphi) and ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκλησίαν (*SEG* 55:608; Thessalia, Pelasgiotis—Larisa); and (2) 2nd half of the 1st cent. CE: ἐπὶ] [τὰν ἐκ]κλησίαν (*BCH* 52 (1928) 174[2]; central Greece, Phokis, Delphi); and εἰς τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἐκκλησίαν (*IG* II² 1028; Attica, Athens).

2.2   Civic *Ekklēsiai* in the Imperial Period: The Politics of Oligarchy, Hierarchy, and Democracy

My first investigative focus in Chapter 2 can be re-stated as a question: "How might a non-civic group, which adopted civic terminology, specifically the word *ekklēsia*, have been perceived, socially, by Greco-Roman outsiders and, politically, by Roman authorities?" Two taxonomical issues require clarification before one can answer this question: (1) three Greco-Roman civic institutions require definition; and (2) three key political players in Imperial period *poleis* require identification.

2.2.1   *Greco-Roman Civic Institutions*

An Imperial period *polis* in the Greek East had three primary institutional bodies for political decision-making: the council (*boulē*),[14] the people (*dēmos*),[15] and the assembly (*ekklēsia*).[16] Beginning with the Classical period, members of

---

14   Imperial period *boulai* were not infrequently of similar size to their classical Athenian ancestor—500 councilors (*bouleutai*)—and often mimicked the Athenian political year. In classical Athens, 50 *bouleutai* were drawn from each of the ten *phylai* ("tribes") of Attica. Each *phylē* presided over the affairs of the Athenian city-state for a 35 (or 39 day) period called a *prytaneia*. During each *prytaneia*, the presiding tribe designated 50 *bouleutai* to act as *prytaneis*. These 50 *prytaneis* gave oversight to the other 450 members of the *boulē*, and thus over each *ekklēsia* held during their *prytaneia*. Although the Athenian *dēmos* was sovereign, its *boulē* was the chief power broker among the official political institutions of the state, including the magistrates (*archontes*) (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1322b12–18). See further in Robert K. Sinclair (*Democracy and Participation in Athens* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 105, 229) and in Mogens Hermann Hansen (*The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987], 220).

15   The word *dēmos* generally refers to "the whole mass of clans assembled under one rule, whether it was conceived in terms of the country or its inhabitants" (Gustave Glotz, *The Greek City and Its Institutions* [New York: Barnes and Noble, 1929/1969], 9). The *dēmos* constituted an *ekklēsia* when it assembled together as the body of the full citizenry in Athens for the purpose of conducting civic business. The full citizenry, or *dēmos*, was comprised only of males (Sinclair, *Democracy*, 15). The δῆμος enacts decrees (e.g., ἔδοξε δήμωι) that are motioned and approved within an ἐκκλησία (*ekklēsia*). See further in P. J. Rhodes, "Epigraphical Evidence: Laws and Decrees," in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24–27, 1994, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, vol. 2 (HFM 72; ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1995), 91–112, esp. 93.

16   Although not a political institution, *per se*, there was one more important governing institution in classical Athens, and in other democratic *poleis*. It was the *dikastēria* or popular courts. In classical Athens, each *dikastērion* consisted of several hundred jurors (*dikastēs*)

the *boulē* (*bouleutai*) had administrative oversight of civic, foreign and regional affairs. They reported their recommendations during an *ekklēsia* by bringing forward resolutions (*probouleumata*) for ratification or revision by the *dēmos*.[17] Each *probouleuma* was placed on the agenda (*programma* or *prographē*) of the *ekklēsia*.

The *ekklēsia* represents a different political category than either the *boulē* or the *dēmos*. An *ekklēsia* is a juridically defined event during which members (*ekklēsiastai*) of the *dēmos* assemble in a particular time and location to carry out specific governmental functions.[18] Usually the two terms are clearly differentiated.[19] Not infrequently, though, the referent for the term *ekklēsia* is

---

each of whom was chosen by lot from a pool of 6000 jurors. Private actions had a jury of 201 or 401 *dikastai*, while most public actions were heard by 501 *dikastai*. The popular courts of ancient Athens heard civil and criminal cases and "examined the magistrates, passed judgement in political trials and sometimes reviewed the decrees of the people and the laws (*nomoi*) of the *nomothetai* to see if they were unconstitutional. The people's court met between 150 and 200 times a year" (Hansen, *Athenian Assembly*, 211).

17   P. J. Rhodes and David M. Lewis note that "proposers of probouleumatic decrees had to be members of the council" (*The Decrees of the Greek States* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], 28). A comment by Aeschines (389–314 BCE) problematizes that view with respect to Athenian democracy in the mid-4th century. Although no inscriptional corroboration survives, Aeschines (III. *Ctes.* 125–27) suggests that a citizen who was not a member of the *boulē* could influence the enactment of a decree. In order to do so, a citizen who was not a councilor (*bouletēs*) would need first to find a sponsoring *bouletēs*. The amenable *bouletēs* would put forward that citizen's motion as a *probouleuma* to the *boulē*. The other option would be for the sponsoring *bouletēs* to present the non-member and his proposal before the gathered *ekklēsia* in an open *probouleuma*.

18   Each member of the Athenian *ekklēsia* was called an *ekklēsiastēs* (ἐκκλησιαστής) (Plato *Gorg.* 452e, *AP.*25a; Aristotle *Pol.*1275a26, *Rh.*1354b7). To be considered an *ekklēsiastēs*, one, firstly, had to be a citizen of the Athenian *polis*, and not less than eighteen years of age (Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.1). Since new citizens (*epheboi*) usually had to do two years of military service before being enrolled on the register of a deme, one normally did not participate in an *ekklēsia* until the age of 20 (Glotz, *Greek City*, 152; see also Hansen's definition of *ephebos* in *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology* [trans. J. A. Crook; Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999], 354). One also, secondly, had to be free of any legal suspicion (e.g., *atimia*). *Atimia* was imposed on Athenians who were negligent in their civic duties or indebted to the state. A person under *atimia* was deprived of the right to legal protection, the right to enter the market-place and the sanctuaries, and all political rights (Hansen, *Athenian Democracy*, 350). Each *ekklēsiastēs* had the right to attend, speak and vote (Hansen, *Athenian Assembly*, 212; see also, idem, *Athenian Democracy*, 353).

19   Three inscriptional examples of a differentiation in meaning between *boulē* as "council," *dēmos* as "people," and *ekklēsia* as "meeting" are: (1) *IG* XII,1 3 (Rhodes, 1st cent. BCE or

left ambiguous, such that it can refer either to the public assembly (*ekklēsia*) or to the *dēmos* for the duration of its gathering in that public assembly.[20] The terms *boulē* and *dēmos*, on the other hand, only refer to continuously existing groups of human beings.[21] Interaction between *boulai* and *dēmoi* within *ekklēsiai* is described in both literary and epigraphic sources dated from the 5th century BCE into the Imperial period. Literary sources include, but are not limited to,[22] Plato (429–347 BCE),[23] Xenophon (*c.* 430–355 BC),[24] and Plutarch (*c.* 46–120 CE).[25] Epigraphic sources span the centuries (5th cent. BCE to the

---

CE): [ἔδοξεν τῶι δ]άμωι ἐν τᾷ ἐκ⟨κ⟩λησίᾳ ἐν τῶι Ἀρταμιτίωι μηνί·; (2) *Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 184, 144 (Ankyra/Ankara, N. Galatia, n.d.): [… φυλὴ ἐνάτη Ἱε]ρὰ Βουλαία ἀνέστησεν ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτῆς εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν ἀναγορευθέντα ἐν ἐκλησίᾳ ὑπό τε βουλῆς καὶ δήμου. φυλαρχ(οῦντος) Νεικηφόρου Ἀλεξάνδρο[υ]; and (3) *Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 265, 202 (Ankyra/Ankara, N. Galatia, n.d.): τειμη[θέ]ντα ἐν ἐκλησίαις ὑπ[ὸ] [β]ουλῆς κὲ δήμου ἀνδρι[ά]σι κὲ ἄλλαις τειμαῖς.

20   Of the over 1896 inscriptional *ekklēsia* references (5th cent. BCE to 3rd cent. CE), at least 507 are ambiguous enough to be read as identifying either a public assembly (*ekklēsia*) or the *dēmos* while they are gathered together in assembly. Their occurrence by region is as follows: Aegean Islands (25×; late 5th cent. BCE–100 BCE); Asia Minor (177×; 332 BCE–160 CE); Attica (159×; 403 BCE–40 BCE); central Greece (83×; 341 BCE–117 CE); North Shore of the Black Sea (15×; 275 BCE–210 CE); Northern Greece (23×; 400 BCE–1 CE); Peloponnesos (13×; 303 BCE–130 BCE); Scythia Minor (7×; 230 BCE–100 CE); and Thrace (5×; 300 BCE– 200 BCE).

21   In many locales in Peloponnesos and in the northwest of Greece, the body of citizens fictively called themselves "the *polis*" ("city"). For example, an enactment decree made by the *politai* of Orchomenus in Arcadia reads, "resolved by the *polis*" (*ISE* 53, *SEG* 33:317) and "resolved by the *boulē* and the *polis*" (*SEG* 33:391) (Rhodes, "Epigraphical Evidence," 95).

22   Greek writers who reference an *ekklēsia* are: Aeschines, Andocides, Appian, Apollodorus, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Athenaeus, Demades, Demosthenes, Diodorus, Dinarchus, Diogenes Laertius, Euripides, Herodotus, Hyperides, Isaeus, Isocrates, Lucian, Lycurgus, Lysias, Pausanias, Plato, Plutarch, Polybius, Pseude-Xenophon, Strabo, Theophrastus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. The number of their combined references to a civic *ekklēsia* totals at least 1063.

23   Plato writes about a civic *ekklēsia* 13 times. For example, *Laws* book 8, section 850b: καὶ πιστεύῃ πείσειν βουλὴν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν, ἤ τινα ἀναβολὴν τῆς ἐξοικήσεως ("and if he believes that he can persuade the Council and Assembly to grant his request") (*Plato. Platonis Opera* [ed. John Burnet; Oxford University Press, 1903]).

24   Xenophon mentions a civic *ekklēsia* 20 times (*Xenophon. Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 2 [2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921/repr. 1971]).

25   Plutarch speaks of a civic *ekklēsia* 142 times. One wonders, though, whether his descriptions of the classical *ekklēsia* more reflect *praxis* within *ekklēsiai* of his day. For example, Plutarch claims to be authoritative even in his description of Solon's reforms (*Solon* 16.3: … καὶ τὸν Σόλωνα τῆς πολιτείας διορθωτὴν καὶ νομοθέτην ἀπέδειξαν, οὐ τὰ μέν, τὰ δ'

early 3rd cent. CE),[26] and hail from geographically diverse regions such as the Aegean Islands (e.g., Delos),[27] central Greece (e.g., Delphi),[28] and Asia Minor (e.g., Pisidia[29] and Caria[30]).

Since the words *ekklēsia* and *dēmos* are often used interchangeably, enactment decrees which mention either term, but not the *boulē*, imply an autonomous exercise of political authority by the people.[31] This type of decree is called a non-probouleutic, or ecclesiastical decree (e.g., *edoxen tōi dēmoi*).[32]

οὐχί, πάντα δ᾽ ὁμαλῶς ἐπιτρέψαντες, ἀρχάς, ἐκκλησίας, δικαστήρια, βουλάς. ([3] "They also appointed Solon to reform the constitution and make new laws, laying no restrictions whatever upon him, but putting everything into his hands, magistracies, assemblies, courts-of-law, and councils") (*Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives*. [trans. Bernadotte Perrin; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/ London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914]).

26   For inscriptional references to the civic *ekklēsia* during, and surrounding, the 1st century CE, see Appendices 1–3.

27   For example, *IDelos* 1502 (Delos, 148/7 BCE) reads, δεδόχθαι τεῖ [βουλεῖ τοὺς λαχόν]τας προέδρους εἰς [τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἐκκλησίαν] χρηματίσαι περὶ [τούτων.

28   For example, *FD* III 4:47 (Delphi, 98 CE) reads, θεός. τύχᾳ ἀγαθᾷ. ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς Τ. Φλαουίου Σωκλάρου, μηνὸς Ἐνδυσποιτροπίου ζ, ἐν προσκλήτῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δόγμα βουλῆς καὶ δήμου.

29   For example, *Mon. Ant.* 23.1914.259,172 (Pisidia, Sagalassos, 4th/3rd cent. BCE) reads, ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Τ(ίτον) Αἴλιον Αὐρηλιανὸν Τυδέα τὸν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, ἀρχιερέα τῶν Σεβαστῶν, υἱὸν βουλῆς, υἱὸν ἐκκλησίας, υἱὸν πόλεως, φιλόπατριν.

30   For example, *BCH* 1972, 435–36 (Caria, found at Aphrodisias, 2nd/1st cent. BCE) reads, δεδόχ[θαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι,] κυρωθέντος τοῦδε τοῦ ψη[φίσματος· ... στεφ[α]νῶσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῆι ἐκλ[ησ]ίαι θαλλοῦ στ[ε]φάνωι·.

31   The enactment formula is but one of five standardized elements within enactment decrees: the enactment formula (ἔδοξεν τῆι ...; "resolved by ..."), the proposer of the motion ("X" εἶπεν; "'X' proposed"), the motivation clause (ἐπειδὴ ...; "since ..."), the motion formula (δεδόχθαι ...; "Let it be resolved ..."), and the substance (the action to be taken) (Rhodes and Lewis, *Decrees of the Greek States*, 551–52). See also the detailed discussion of decrees by B. H. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine* (*323 B.C.–A.D. 337*) (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002), 215–27.

32   For detailed definitions of bouleutic, probouleutic, and non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decrees see Roger Alain De Laix, *Probouleusis at Athens: A Study in Political Decision-Making* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 195–98 and Sinclair, *Democracy*, 94, 229. A non-probouleutic decree implies that the decision reached in the *ekklēsia* did not derive from a *probouleuma* of the *boulē*. Examples from the Greek East wherein the people (*dēmos*) on their own are stated to have made a decision include: *IPrusaOlymp* 1006–1011 (all 1st or 2nd cent. CE); *ISmyrna* 676 (117–138? CE); *TAM* V.2 1264 (Hierocaesarea, 25? CE); *ISelge* 31 (late 1st/early 2nd cent. CE), 32 (Imperial); *IKourion* 87 (113/4 CE); and

There are three potential non-probouleutic decrees from the 1st or 2nd centuries CE which use the word *ekklēsia*.[33] There are a much greater number of non-probouleutic decrees, though, which use the word *dēmos*.[34]

This data implies not least two things. First, the paucity of epigraphic examples from the early Imperial period in which popular assemblies (*ekklēsiai*) exercised political autonomy does not necessarily equate into a concomitant paucity of authority for the *dēmoi*. The three non-probouleutic *ekklēsia* inscriptions simply represent the tip of the inscriptional iceberg, so to speak, with respect to the number of non-probouleutic decrees issued by *dēmoi* during the Imperial period. Second, this *kratos* of the *dēmos* also challenges any word-concept confusion in which one might be tempted to claim that the lack of 1st century CE inscriptional evidence for the word *ekklēsia* indicates general disuse of civic *ekklēsiai* by *dēmoi*. The issuance of a non-probouleutic decree by a *dēmos* would have required a formally convened civic assembly.

IGLSyrie I 167 (Nicopolis, Imperial; cf. Arjan Zuiderhoek, "On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City," *GRBS* 48 [2008]: 417–445, esp. 419 n. 3).

33   There are no extant examples of 1st cent. BCE inscriptions within which the word *ekklēsia* occurs either in an enactment formula (ἔδοξεν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ) or in a motion formula (δεδόχθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; "Let it be resolved by the *ekklēsia*"). There are three such occurrences within 1st and 2nd cent. CE inscriptions, but their fragmentary nature precludes any definitive readings. Only *SEG* VII 2 hails from Asia Minor proper (Parthia, Susiana, Seleucia on the Eulaeus [Susa]; 21 CE/ Parthian year 268, Audnaeus 17). See its discussion by Robert K. Sherk ("The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV. The Register Part III: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor (continued)," *ZPE* 93 [1992]: 223–272). *SEG* VII 2 is a letter from Artaban III, king of Parthia, to Seleucia approving the election of a city treasurer. It reads, βασιλευόν[τος Σελευκου, ἔτους] ϛλʹ καὶ ρʹ, μη[νὸς- - -], ἐν Σελευκ[είαι δὲ τῆι πρὸς τῶι] Εὐλαίωι Λ[ῴου- - -, ἐπὶ] Ἀμμωνί[ου. ἔδοξε τῆι ἐκκλησίαι. The other two correlations of the word *ekklēsia* within either an enactment formula or a motion formula are from Kos and Arsa (Scythia Minor): *Iscr. di Cos EV* 75bis (Cos and Calyma, Kos—Kos, 1st or 2nd cents. CE; [— — ἔδο]ξε τ[ᾶι ἐκκλησίαι(?) — —]); *IScM* III 34, (Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis [Mangalia]—Arsa; 50–100 CE; [ἔ]δοξε τᾷ ἀρχι[ερα] τικᾷ [ἐκ(κ)λησίᾳ]).

34   An example of a non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decree from Asia Minor in which only the *dēmos* is mentioned comes from Cyzicus (*Syll*³ 798 = *IGR* IV 145; Mysia, 37 CE). Therein, the *dēmos* commissioned the *archontes* to draft and propose a decree, which was then discussed and passed at a later meeting (Rhodes and Lewis, *Decrees of the Greek States*, 416). An example from the 2nd century CE has the *dēmos* electing the city's treasurers (*tamiai*) (*ISmyrna* 771; *c.* 117–138 CE). Of note is one non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decree which uses both terms *ekklēsia* and *dēmos* but not synonymously (*IG* XII,1 3, Rhodes, 1st century [BCE or CE]; [ἔδοξεν τῶι δ]άμωι ἐν τᾷ ἐκ⟨κ⟩λησίᾳ ἐν τῶι Ἀρταμιτίωι μηνί·).

Even if the decree of a *dēmos* does not explicitly mention an *ekklēsia* one can presume nonetheless that such a demotic decree was made within an *ekklēsia*. Unfortunately, a full analysis of the data relative to non-probouleutic decrees of *dēmoi* lies beyond the scope of this thesis—my study is focused upon early Christ-followers. They self-designated as *ekklēsiai* not as *dēmoi*.

The confluence of the three civic terms (*boulē, dēmos, ekklēsia*) within one inscription indicates a population centre called a *polis* ("city-state").[35] Onno van Nijf uses the term "Imperial Greek city" to indicate a *polis* in the Greek East during the first three centuries CE, that is, from the reign of Augustus up to, and including, Diocletian (27 BCE–284 CE).[36] The governance model of Imperial Greek *poleis* continued to use all three Classical-era political institutions (*boulē, dēmos, ekklēsia*), yet, as a rule, without the concomitant *dēmokratia* that empowered their Classical ancestors.[37]

2.2.2   *Political Players in Imperial Greek Cities*

Arjan Zuiderhoek identifies three public, and often competing, dimensions to civic politics in Imperial Greek cities: "The sources point to a strong element of oligarchy as well as to a continuing tradition of popular politics, against a background of a growing social and political hierarchisation."[38] Van Nijf adds a fourth: "political culture."[39] Political culture is the social expression of the

---

35   Rhodes notes that only inscriptions of a *polis* mention both a *boulē* and a *dēmos* in the enactment formula (e.g., ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι). This is because only a (larger) *polis* has a *boulē* and, along with it, a legislative procedure called *probouleusis*. By contrast, some smaller cities (e.g., in Arcadia) do not appear to have had a *boulē* ("Epigraphical Evidence," 94).

36   The start of Octavian/Augustus' reign can be placed either in 31 BCE, after his defeat of Mark Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium, or in 27 BCE when Octavian officially became Augustus by award of the Senate. Diocletian reigned from 284 BCE until 305 BCE.

37   Onno van Nijf also notes at least five distinctive architectural features of an Imperial Greek city: (1) a theatre; (2) an *odeion*; (3) a gymnasium; (4) monumental stoas on the agora; and (5) a large collonaded street, which van Nijf calls, somewhat tongue in cheek, "the ultimate fashion statement of the era" ("Public Space and the Political Culture of Roman Termessos," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 215–242, esp. 217).

38   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 418.

39   Onno van Nijf defines "political culture" as a "'menu of approaches' developed in political science, but adopted also by historians involving both the ideals and the operating norms of a political system. Political culture includes subjective attitudes and sentiments as well as objective symbols and creeds that together govern political behaviour and give structure and order to the political process" ("Political Culture in the Greek City after

underlying mentality and practices that inform political practice. It is particularly evident in inscriptions of Asia Minor *poleis*.[40]

The first dimension of Imperial period political life in the Greek East was civic governance by oligarchs. Oligarchs represent the top of the social hierarchy. They also came to predominate in the *boulē* where council membership was restricted to property holders who passed the census qualification.[41] Aelius Aristides (mid-2nd cent. CE) calls oligarchs "the most important and powerful" people (*megistoi kai dynatōtatoi*) from across the Empire.[42] New councilors technically could no longer come from the *zeugetai* or *thetēs* census classes, as in Athens of old,[43] but

---

the Classical Age: Introduction and Preview," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 1–26, esp. 5). Two other scholars who also argue that politics permeated cultural forms and religious life are Stephen Mitchell ("Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor," *JRS* 80 [1990]: 183–193) and H. W. Pleket ("Political Culture and Political Practice in the Cities of Asia Minor in the Roman Empire," in *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* [ed. W. Schuller; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998], 204–216).

40   For example, van Nijf, "Public Space," 215–242.

41   Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that while participation in the *ekklēsia* was usually open to all citizens, "the holding of (major) offices only was restricted to [natural born citizens] who passed the census qualification" ("The Hellenic Polis," in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation*, vol. 21 [ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s, 2000], 141–88, esp. 166). See also, A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 180; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 720 (on *Ep.* 10.110.2); C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, MS/London: Harvard University Press, 1978), 96; Friedemann Quass, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens* (UPSEHRZ; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993), 343, 383; Pleket, "Political Culture," 206; Tonnes Bekker-Nielsen, *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia: The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2008), 174.

42   Aelius Aristides emphasizes the high status of these provincials associated with Rome: "Many in each city are citizens of yours no less than of their fellow natives … There is no need of garrisons holding acropolises, but the most important and powerful in each place guard their countries for you" (*Or.* 26.64).

43   Solon founded democratic rule in Athens (late 590's BCE). He divided the citizenry into four census classes: *pentakosiomedimnoi* (producers of at least 500 'bushels' or *medimnoi*, of grain per year), *hippeis* (knights or cavalrymen—300 and more *medimnoi* per year), *zeugitai* (hoplites—200 and more *medimnoi* per year), and *thētes* (labourers—under 200 *medimnoi* per year) (Sinclair, *Democracy*, 2). For a nuanced analysis of the socio-economic dynamics associated with each census class in classical Athenian society, see Jeffrey A. Writers, *Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 78–85. Writers sub-divides "hoplites" into two categories ("lower hoplites," "upper hoplites"), and

only from respectable elite families.[44] In reality, the fact that urban elites were "heavily stratified internally" brings Zuiderhoek to state that there were "lower echelons of the bouleutic order ... [consisting of] a group of well-to-do non-elite citizens from whom these new councilors could be recruited."[45] Where popular elections still existed, such as for magistrates, it was the *bouleutic ordo* which drew up the list of potential candidates.[46] Zuiderhoek states that oligarchization developed to such a degree that councilors sat for life and they and their families "increasingly came to have a corporate identity as a ruling class, and began to refer to themselves collectively as the βουλευτικὸν τάγμα, the bouleutic order (or *ordo decurionum*)."[47] In Bithynia, at the very least, these socio-political elites even received constitutional recognition under Roman *leges provinciae*.[48]

Rome 'deputized' the oligarchic elites as rulers of each *polis* on its behalf. This indirect approach is evident in an inscription from Oinoanda (Oenoanda) in Lycia (Asia Minor). It describes the organization of a festival processional during Hadrian's reign (*SEG* 38:1462; 124–125/126 CE).[49] The involvement of

---

names the top 1,200 richest Athenians "Trierarch-Oligarchs." He sub-divides this category into the "Lower 900 Trierarch-Oligarchs," the "290 of the 'Three Hundred'" and the "Top 10 Trierarch-Oligarchs" (*Oligarchy*, 79–83).

44   Pliny *Ep*. 10.79 (Bithynia and Pontus). For council membership in other *poleis* in the Greek East, see Quass (*Die Honoratiorenschicht*, 384–94) and Stephen Mitchell (*Anatolia I* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 88–89 [Galatia]).

45   Arjan Zuiderhoek, "Oligarchs and Benefactors: Elite Demography and Euergetism in the Greek East of the Roman Empire," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 185–196, esp. 190–91. Zuiderhoek argues that it was "conditions of high mortality" which gave rise to this strategy for keeping "the *ordo* at a fixed numerical strength" (Ibid., 191). He names some of the urban non-elites who were candidates for the lower echelons of the *bouleutic* order: "rich craftsmen, traders, manufacturers, owners of medium sized estates, perhaps even professional men such as doctors, teachers, and rhetoricians" (e.g., a gymnastic trainer [*paidotribes*] in Smyrna [*ISmyrna* 246]; a shipowner [*naukleros*] councilor in Nikomedeia [*TAM* IV.1.304]) (Ibid., 191).

46   Pleket, "Political Culture," 206. With respect to the *boulē* in Prusa (early 2nd cent. CE), Bekker-Nielsen notes that "the social standing of its members and the fact that the council united almost all the powerful and wealthy men of the city meant that in addition to its probouleutic function, it was often the real locus of decision-making" (*Urban Life*, 67).

47   For example, *CIG* 4411a, b, 4412b; *RECAM* II 195; *SEG* 33:1123; See Quass (*Die Honoratiorenschicht*, 388 n. 170) and Pleket ("Political Culture," 205–206).

48   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 429. For example, see especially Pliny the Younger's summary of the *lex Pompeia* of 65 BCE for Bithynia and Pontus (*Ep*. 10.79).

49   At 117 lines, *SEG* 38:1462 is by far the longest record of the establishment of a quadrennial, or, in Greek terminology, a penteteric agonistic ("sacred crown") festival. This particular

Roman elites amounted only to the granting of official approval and to being given assurances that neither civic nor state revenues would be required for the successful implementation of the new quadrennial sacred crown festival. The local *dēmos* took full control of festival planning and of enacting all arrangements. Mitchell notes that "few imperial documents more clearly indicate the division of responsibility between a city and the central authorities."[50]

The Romans not only indirectly supported these Greek models of civic governance within existing *poleis*, they also built new Imperial Greek cities. This does not necessarily mean, though, that the Romans encouraged *dēmokratia* itself. Rather, the *boulai, ekklēsiai*, and magistrates of new *poleis* were heavily weighted towards oligarchy. This type of scenario unfolded in Egypt during Hadrian's rule with his construction of a Greek *polis* known as Antinoopolis or Antinoë (130 CE).[51] Robert Sherk notes that, although privilege was extended to citizens, there is no indication that non-elite citizens enjoyed a greater degree of political influence than elsewhere in Egypt.[52]

---

festival was endowed by one of Oinoanda's eminent citizens, C. Iulius Demosthenes, with the approval of emperor Hadrian. See Richard Wörrle (*Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonisticschen Stiftung aus Oinoanda* [BAG 39; München: C. H. Beck, 1988], 4–17), Mitchell ("Festivals," 183–193), Guy MacLean Rogers ("Demosthenes of Oenoanda and Models of Euergetism," *JRS* 81 [1991]: 91–100), Onno van Nijf (*The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* [DMAHA XVII; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997], 131–46, 191–206), and Arjan Zuiderhoek ("The Ambiguity of Munificence," *Historia* 56 [2007]: 196–213, esp. 205–206).

50   Mitchell, "Festivals," 188.

51   For a full bibliography and discussion of items such as the city's foundation, excavations, citizenship, and institutions, see M. Zahrnt, "Antinoopolis in Ägypten: Die hadrianische Gründung und ihre Privilegien in der neueren Forschung," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.10.1 (ed. H. Temporini; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 669–706.

52   Sherk writes that Hadrian "organized [Antinoopolis] as a typical Greek city and granted its citizens special privileges, freeing them from the obligation to perform the liturgies in the other cities. It had magistrates, boule and demos. The eponymous official was almost certainly a prytanis" ("Eponymous Officials," 267). Bell identifies other privileges allotted to the citizens of Antinoopolis, each of whom considered themself a "New Greek." Examples include the granting of citizenship to children from the marriage of an Antinoite male and an Egyptian woman, exemption from tax on sales of real property and slaves, and exemption from the poll tax (and thus eligibility for service in the legions), allotments of land, and, not least by 151 CE, the right of Imperial support for children of Antinoite citizens, if registered within the first 30 days of birth (H. I. Bell, "Antinoopolis: A Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt," *JRS* 30.2 [1940], 133–47, esp. 142–43).

As a rule, oligarchs slowly increased their stranglehold on the formal, and even more importantly, on the informal reins of power as the Imperial period progressed. One strategy was particularly effective in broadening their regional standing and deepening their Imperial influence. Judith Perkins notes that oligarchs from across the Greek East created informal trans-local alliances between their *poleis* based upon educational, cultural, and political commonalities.[53] She observes that "the elite proclaimed their superiority through their *paideia* and their civic benefactions, [a strategy which] … naturalizes and legitimates political and economic dominance."[54] On the flip side, the wide use of benefaction by elites implicitly affirms the high degree of political influence still held by the main beneficiary of that oligarchic munificence—the *dēmos*.

Formal alliances among oligarchs also developed. A. D. Macro identifies the most prestigious in Asia Minor as being "the *koinon* of Asia."[55] He anachronistically describes it as an exclusively religious organization which oversaw the provincial imperial cult[56] situated in Pergamon.[57] An imperial

---

53   Judith Perkins states that "across the territories of the Greek east, the Greek elite shared educational and cultural interests that allowed them to cement their solidarity and to constitute a group identity of *pepaideumenoi*, the educated, of persons from divergent locales and different ethnicities. These educated persons also acquired, it seems, a system of allegiances and attitudes that constituted them not only as the educated, but also as an empire-wide power elite, a ruling 'class,' positioned to administer empire" (*Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* [RMCS; New York: Routledge, 2009], 23–24).

54   Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities*, 25.

55   The seven *poleis* of the *koinon* of Asia were Sardis, Cyzicus, Philadelphia, Laodicea, Lycum, Miletos, and Tralleis (A. D. Macro, "The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Imperium," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. 2, Principat. Bd. 7 [Politische Geschichte; ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980], 658–97, esp. 671).

56   Macro, "The Cities of Asia Minor," 674–75. See also, Harland, *Associations*, 121–25. Simon Price notes that prior to Domitian's time, only three provincial imperial cults had ever existed in Roman Asia (Pergamon, 29 BCE; Smyrna, 23 CE; Miletos, *c.* 40 CE), with one of those being discontinued after the death of Gaius (Miletos). Ephesos dedicated a cult to the Sebastoi (i.e., Titus, Vespasian, and Domitian) in the late first century CE (*Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984], 249–74 ["Catalogue of Imperial Temples and Shrines in Asia Minor"]). See also Steven J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 27–28.

57   Pergamon was one of the seven *poleis* where Revelation's addressees lived (Rev 2:12–17). Three other *poleis* in the *koinon* of Asia also contained a community to which the book of Revelation is addressed (Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea; Rev 3:1–22).

cult, however, was more than a religious institution; it was inherently political.[58]

Oligarchs were not the only ones who formed trans-local alliances. Two non-civic associations appear also to have done so. Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, following on from Diskin Clay, claims that Epicurean associations tended toward this strategy.[59] Gillihan suggests that the "Epicureans' sense of membership in an alternative commonwealth was surely reinforced by the existence of *oikoi* spread throughout the Mediterranean world, counterparts to the *poleis* and territories of state order."[60] Gillihan does have a point, but needs more evidence by which to make that point. It is true that the writings of Diogenes of Oenoanda confirm that a network of Epicurean communities, as originally envisioned by Epicurus, did exist into the mid-2nd century CE. Clay states that Diogenes "provides us with all the information we possess concerning the lost Epicurean community of Oenoanda,"[61] as well as of a number of "Epicureans active in Rhodes and in mainland Greece."[62] Clay claims,

---

58   Even if the regular functions of the *koinon* dealt only with the imperial cult, there was a significant political dimension inherent in its cultic responsibilities. A key political element involved making representations to the emperor. This included determining which *poleis* were included, whose officials were authorized, and what sorts of honours were given.

59   Epicureans enacted their fictive commonwealth of world citizens through the establishment of trans-local networks of local groups, which Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, not unproblematically, claims "formed alternative commonwealths whose territory and towns mirrored, even rivaled, those of empires" (*Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* [STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012], 95). Gillihan bases his comments on the work of Diskin Clay, *Paradosis and Survival: Three Chapters in the History of Epicurean Philosophy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1992), 232–55 (*Civic Ideology*, 100).

60   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 101. Gillihan claims that "schools in different cities attempted to implement the same teachings and practices" and that such a trans-local *praxis* "seems to have been Epicurus' own design" (Ibid., 100). He cites examples of Epicurus founding three schools during his lifetime (*c.* 341–270 BCE), one each in Mytilene, Lampsacus, and Athens. By the 2nd century BCE, schools were established in Laodicea, Cos, and Rhodes. In the 1st century BCE, Cicero complained that Epicureans had "occupied" Italy (*Tusc.* 4.6–7) (Ibid., 101).

61   Clay, *Paradosis*, 247.

62   Clay, *Paradosis*, 245. Before Diogenes' inscription came to light in Oenoanda, he "was completely unknown" (Ibid., 245). Only one Epicurean listed by Diogenes of Oenoanda was previously known (L. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Avitus, 144 CE). The others listed are Antipater (of Athens), Theodoridas of Lindos (Rhodes) and Menneas, Carus, Dionysius, and Niceratus of the *polis* of Rhodes. Clay postulates that formal trans-local connections

however, that trans-local connections between these *individual* Epicureans also implies trans-locally connected Epicurean communities which interacted through personal visits and epistolary correspondence.[63] For Gillihan to then base his conclusion upon Clay's inference places into question Gillihan's view that Epicurean *communities* formed "counterparts to the *poleis* and territories of state order." If a trans-local network of communities did exist, though, then the Epicureans mirror another non-civic association which clearly employed a trans-local strategy: Christ-followers in Roman Asia, who were aligned with the apostle Paul (e.g. the *ekklēsiai* of Asia)[64] and with the prophet John mentioned in Revelation (the seven *ekklēsiai* of Asia).[65]

A second political 'player' in Imperial Greek cities grew out of the ideological shift away from *isonomia* ("equality of political rights") towards hierarchical politics. Van Nijf calls this socio-political phenomenon "*ordo*-making": "Public ceremonies in the Greek East reinforced a hierarchical conception of society within which identity was derived from membership of a status group

---

stand behind these names particularly since "in addressing Antipater, Diogenes calls Theodoridas 'our companion' … and in addressing Menneas, he speaks of 'our' Dionysius" (Ibid., 245).

63　Gillihan notes that "in his letter to Antipater, Diogenes writes of travels to Rhodes, Athens, Chalcis, and Thebes, and about Epicurean friends (*philoi*) in those places" (*Civic Ideology*, 101). Clay notes that at least two letters survive from Diogenes' epistolary corpus: "a letter to Dionysius of Rhodes (NF 58) who was already known (fr. 51 Chilton), and a long letter Diogenes addressed to his associates in Rhodes concerning an Epicurean by the name of Niceratus" (*Paradosis*, 241). Diogenes speaks of the decision of the Epicureans in Rhodes to send Niceratus "to us" (*pros hēmas*). Clay, while acknowledging that "we" might be a euphemism for "me," suggests that "it is likely that his use of the first person plural reflects Epicurus' own practice of writing letters first to an individual and then to a group of friends associated with the individual … Such was the practice of St. Paul" (Ibid., 242). Clay cites the work of Adolf Harnack on "the importance of letters in the mission and expansion of Christianity" as a way of connecting trans-local communities (*Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* I [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924], 382–86) (*Paradosis*, 242).

64　1 Cor 16:19. See George van Kooten for his view that Paul "seems to hint at a conscious paralleling of the Roman provinces which points to an alternative structure of the Roman empire" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley," NTS 58/4 [Oct. 2012]: 522–48, esp. 542). He sees this provincial level of organization as being implicit in Paul's phrases "the *ekklēsiai* of Galatia" (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2), "the *ekklēsiai* of Asia" (1 Cor 16:19), "the *ekklēsiai* of Macedonia" (2 Cor 8:1), and "the *ekklēsiai* of Judea" (Gal 1:22; cf. 1 Thess 2:14) (Ibid., 536).

65　Rev 1:4.

constructed along the lines of a Roman *ordo*."[66] This resulted in the *honestiores* being "decidedly less ordinary than others."[67] This hierarchic restructuring, far from muting the voice and diminishing the influence of the *dēmos*, actually served to contribute to the political vitality of the popular assembly by enfranchising what Scheidel calls a "substantial 'middle.'"[68]

One type of non-elite, non-civic group with a "middle" status appears to have thrived particularly well within the hierarchization of *polis* life: professional associations or *collegia*.[69] *Collegia* developed intrinsic ties with the bouleutic elite through their networks of euergetism and patronage, their participation in hierarchically arranged festival processions,[70] their privileged

---

66   Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 245. Van Nijf states that beginning with the late Hellenistic period a number of wealthy and powerful elite families in the Greek East "re-invented themselves as a separate status group, as an (ideally) hereditary *ordo* of *honoratiores* claiming to be the repositories in the community of *genos, arête* and *chremata* (pedigree, virtue, and money)" (*Civic World*, 134; see also 163, 187, 217).

67   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 429. The *honestiores* consisted of Roman senators, knights, and municipal decurions from the provinces, as well as military veterans.

68   Perkins, citing Scheidel, notes that, since only 1 per cent of the population of the Roman empire could be considered *honestiores*, "it is perfectly possible to reconcile the dominance of a disproportionately affluent elite with the presence of a substantial 'middle'" (Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities*, 5).

69   Zuiderhoek uses the phrase "politically vocal middling stratum" in reference to "urban-based manufacturers and traders (whether of the local, regional, or interregional variety)—in short, precisely the people we would expect to find in the urban professional *collegia*, and to whom the Romans referred as the *plebs media*" ("Political Sociology," 437). See also John S. Kloppenborg ("Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 16–30), van Nijf (*Civic World* [1997]), Harland (*Dynamics of Identity* [2009]), and A. Gutsfeld and D. A. Koch, eds. (*Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006]).

70   The replication of *polis* hierarchy in festivals and processions is most clearly seen in the festival foundation established by C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oenoanda (Oinoanda) in Lycia in 124/5 CE (*SEG* 38:1462, see further in n. 49 [Ch. 2]). The replication of *polis* hierarchy is also evident in Ephesos (104 CE). Gaius Vibius Salutaris donated over 30 silver figures which were carried in a bi-weekly procession by almost 300 persons for display, not honorific worship, to the theater (103/104 CE; *IEph* 27 A–G). Elizabeth Gebhard notes that the figurines, each about a meter tall, included nine of the goddess Artemis, and others of Trajan along with personifications of the Roman senate, the Roman people, the Ephesian *boulē, gerousia, ephebes, dēmos,* and of the six civic tribes ("The Theater and the City," in *Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I* [ed. W. Slater; Ann Arbor:

seating in theatres,[71] and their receipt of cash handouts in public distributions that were proportionally larger per capita than those received by the *politai* or *plebei*.[72] The elitist connections of some associations in Roman Asia extended beyond the equestrian class and into the senatorial order itself.[73]

The third public player in Imperial period politics was the popular assembly, or in other words, the *dēmos* when gathered together *en ekklēsia*. During the Imperial period most of the inscriptional decrees enacted by the *dēmos* through the *ekklēsia* relate primarily to euergetism.[74] This predominance of honorific decrees does not, though, necessitate the corollary conclusion that the *ekklēsia* only filled a ceremonial role.[75] On the contrary, Zuiderhoek argues that,

> the organisation of benefactions usually meant that decisions had to be made which touched on many and widely different areas of civic life—for instance, public construction, festive and religious life, public finance,

---

University of Michigan Press, 1996], 113–28, esp. 121–23). See also Guy MacLean Rogers, "The Assembly of Imperial Ephesos," *ZPE* 94 (1992): 224–29.

71   Seat inscriptions reinscribe the Imperial practice of hierarchical organization by marking places for citizens according to rank and position. Gebhard lists theaters from across the Greek East in which seat inscriptions are found: "at the Theater of Dionysus at Athens, Delphi, Megalopolis, Heraclea, Lyncestis, Miletus, Termessus, and Aphrodisias" ("The Theater and the City," 113). These date primarily to the Imperial period. While seats nearest the front were given to the *bouleutai* (councilors), non-elite civic associations of various types, particularly the urban professional *collegia*, also had reserved seating. See also D. B. Small, "Social Correlations to the Greek Cavea in the Roman Period," in *Roman Architecture in the Greek World* (ed. S. Macready and F. H. Thompson; London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1987), 85–93; and Onno van Nijf, *Civic World*, 216–40.

72   *IGR* III 800–802.

73   Harland, *Associations*, 151. Examples of associational connections within the equestrian class include the purple-dyers at Hierapolis honouring a procurator (*epitropos*) who is an assistant to the proconsul of provincial Asia (*IHierapJ* 42 = *IGR* IV 816) and the physicians at Ephesos (*IEph* 719, early 2nd cent. CE). Senatorial connections surface in the joint honouring of Augustus' grandson Gaius by the people of Assos (northwest Pergamon) and the association of Roman businessmen (*IAssos* 13; 1 BCE–4 CE).

74   See Appendices 2 (*Ekklēsia* in First Century CE Inscriptions) and 3 (*Ekklēsia* in Second Century CE Inscriptions).

75   Zuiderhoek notes that "provincial elites in the Greek East were certainly not powerful enough to force assemblies into submission and have them merely applaud and rubber-stamp pre-arranged decisions" ("Political Sociology," 422).

civic administration, relations with Roman governors and/or emperors, and so on.[76]

2.2.3   *Political Authority of the Popular Assembly* (Ekklēsia) *in the Imperial Period*

Aside from the political influence which the *dēmos* exerted in the process of honouring benefactors, there are other indicators of the political vibrancy and influence of Imperial period *ekklēsiai*. Merely citing the fact of their existence is not one of those indicators.[77] Rather, one must establish the degree to which those *ekklēsiai* were democratically relevant.[78] When assessing their formal power, one must broaden the search criteria, at the very least, to include inscriptional references to democratic 'code-words' (*dēmokratia, autonomia, eleutheria*), democratic functions[79] (e.g., voting by lot, accountability of public officials), and democratic forms (*boulē, ekklēsia, dēmos*).

Sviatoslav Dmitriev (2005),[80] Volker Grieb (2008) and Susan Carlsson (2010) all studied epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor during the Hellenistic and

---

76   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 422.

77   Of the approximately 2100 inscriptional mentions of the lexemes ἐκκλησία, ἐκλησία, ἐκκλησίη, ἐκκλεσία and ἐγκλησία (5th cent. BCE–11th cent. CE), 52 are datable with certainty to the Imperial period (27 BCE–284 CE). Imperial period inscriptions, however, only use the lexemes ἐκκλησία and ἐκλησία. Organized by century, the number of *ekklēsia* occurrences are: 1st cent. BCE (3 [or 4]×); 1st cent. CE (22 [or 21]×); 2nd cent. CE (15×); 3rd cent. CE (12×).

78   For example, although the classical Athenian practice of holding the "ordinary assembly" (ἐκκλησία κυρία) is still evident in at least two 1st century CE *poleis* (Epidauria, Peloponnesos [*Peek, Asklepieion* 35(2) = *IG* IV²,1 84]; Pontus, Paphlagonia [*St.Pont.* III 141]), one cannot assume thereby that the ἐκκλησία κυρία of the Imperial period exercised similar functions to its namesake in classical Athens.

79   Herodotus (*Histories*; 431–425 BCE) lists three essential features that distinguish classical Athenian *dēmokratia* from monarchial rule. Herodotus focused on: (1) the use of the lot to select officials; (2) the accountability of officials to the *dēmos*; (3) the decision-making power (*kratos*) of the popular assembly (*ekklēsia*) (*Hist.* 3.80.6, cf. 82.4, cf. 6.43.3; Arist. *Pol.* 1279b21–2). See Raphael Sealey (*Essays in Greek Politics* [New York: Manyland Books, 1967], 272–77) and Martin Ostwald (*Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy* [Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969], 107–13, 178–79).

80   Sviatoslav Dmitriev states that "even though the political activity of the people's assemblies became extinct, the people retained, albeit formally, the final say in administrative and political matters … At the same time, the people remained an important social force whose attitudes had to be taken into consideration by the members of the local élite, and Roman authorities still treated Asian cities as communities by addressing letters to their

Roman periods.[81] They each contend that, even though generally the *dēmos* continued to be consulted by ruling authorities, *dēmokratia* ceased to be a viable political system in Asia Minor, especially in the coastal cities, sometime between *c.* 150 BCE and the time of direct Roman rule in 129 BCE. With respect to Athens, Philippe Gauthier argues that Athenian citizens continued to be involved politically, even in democratic ways, up to the dawn of the *basse époque hellénistique* which he situates *c.* 150 BCE.[82] Christian Habicht concurs but extends the time of active political life in Athens to the late Hellenistic period (*c.* 150–30 BCE).[83] Thus, in relation to *formal* indicators, *dēmokratia* seems to have deteriorated to a large degree in Imperial Greek cities.

There are at least four other factors, however, which appear to problematize any assumptions of extensive democratic malaise. Three derive from epigraphic evidence and the fourth from literary sources. First, the Athenian *ekklēsia* continued to inscribe decrees beyond 30 BCE, even well into the 3rd century CE.[84] Second, inscriptional evidence attests to the democratic *praxis* of the

---

'council and the people'" (*City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* [Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005], 330).

81   Susanne Carlsson focuses on epigraphic occurrences of the words *dēmokratia, eleutheria*, and *autonomia* (*Hellenistic Democracies* [2010]). Volker Grieb, on the other hand, looks for the survival of those three elements in historical events that demonstrate the active participation of the *dēmos* ("demokratischen Praxis") and the pursuit of independent foreign policy initiatives ("aussenpolitischen") (*Hellenistische Demokratie: Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen* [HE 199; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008]). Unfortunately, although Carlsson's work was published after that of Grieb, she does not interact with his work, much of which would have provided her with supportive evidence.

82   Philippe Gauthier specifically studied Athenian civic honorary decrees (*Les cités grecques et leur beinfaiteurs* [Athens & Paris, 1985]; idem, "Les cités héllenistiques: epigraphie et histoire des institutions et des regimes politiques," in *Πρακτικά τοῦ Η᾽ διεθνοὺς συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς ἐπιγραφικῆς (Ἀθίνα, 3–9 Ὀκτωβρίου 1982) τομος Α.* (Athens: 1984), 82–107; idem, "Les cités héllenistiques," in *The Ancient Greek City-State* [HfM 67; CPCActs 1; ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993], 211–31).

83   Christian Habicht, "Ist ein 'Honorationemregime' das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?" in *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (BAG 47; ed. M. Wörrle and P. Zanker; München: C. H. Beck, 1995), 87–92.

84   The latest extant Athenian decree formalized during an *ekklēsia kyria* dates to 20/19 BCE (*Clinton, Sacred Officials* 50; D14/*SEG* 30:93; ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν Μηνόφιλος). See also *Agora* 16 335/*IG*² 1051+1058 (30–22/21 BCE). For a detailed analysis of *Agora* 16 335/*IG*² 1051+1058, see Benjamin D. Merritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 36, no. 1 (1967): 57–100, esp. 66–68. Merritt notes that the content of *IG*² 1051 reflects "dealings with the klerouchs in Lemnos" and recounts the Athenian decision to send four emissaries with the text of a decree to Lemnos, one of whom was a herald (κῆρθξ) of the *boulē* and *dēmos* (Ibid., 68, 67, respectively). Decrees of Athenian *ekklēsiai*, though not

four jurisdictional responsibilities of the classical Athenian *dēmos* within civic *ekklēsiai*.[85] This fact is most prevalent in inscriptions from Asia Minor. Van Nijf forwards 2nd century CE Termessos as one particularly illustrative example. He claims Termessos "was technically still a democracy."[86] In terms of formal democratic institutions, van Nijf notes that Termessos had a regular assembly (*ennomos ekklēsia*) in which probouleutic recommendations of the *boulē* were considered by upwards of 4500 citizens.[87] Van Nijf could have strengthened his case for the democratic vitality of Termessos even further by noting, firstly, that, in comparison to other Imperial Greek *poleis* in Asia Minor, Termessos is the only one which convened an *ennomos ekklēsia*,[88] and, secondly, that its declaration of an ecclesiastical/non-probouleutic decree implies a high degree of political autonomy for the *dēmos* of this *ennomos ekklēsia*.[89]

---

ekklēsia kyria decrees, are extant into the late Imperial period (up to 230 CE). Examples include: *SEG* 15:108 (124 CE; ἐὰν δὲ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τις μηνύσῃ, ἐπάναγκες ὁ στρατηγὸς τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ βουλὴν ἀθροισάτω, εἰ δ᾽ ὑπὲρ τοὺς πεντήκοντα ἀμφορεῖς εἴη τὸ μεμηνυμένον, ἐκκλησίαν·); *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 165, 10 (179–180 CE; an honorific decree for the Roman emperor; ὀρθῶς δὲ ἐποιήσατε καὶ ἐπιστε[— c.6 —]ε ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰς ἐκκλ[ησίας —]), and *SEG* 30:82/*SEG* 21:506/*SEG* 33:137/*IG* II² 1064 (c. 230 CE; [εἰσκαλεῖσ]θαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ θέατρον διὰ τῶν πρυτάνεων ἀεὶ ἐπὶ προεδρίᾳ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ θυσιῶν καὶ [σπον][δῶν τῶν ἔν τε πομ]παῖς πάσαις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις γεινομένων αὐτόν).

85 Glotz lists the four jurisdictional responsibilities of the classical Athenian *dēmos* as being legislation, oversight both of executive power and foreign policy, and political control of judicial power (*Greek City*, 162). Three of the four jurisdictional realms enacted within the context of civic *ekklēsiai* during the 1st century CE include: (1) legislative functions such as the pronouncement of imperial favours to political regions (*IG* VII 2713, Akraiphia) and of honorific decrees (*Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 76,72, Ankyra [Ankara]; *IScM* III 31, Kallatis [Mangalia]); (2) executive functions such as the decision to purchase olive oil (*IG* XII,1 3, Rhodes); and (3) judicial functions such as the manumission of slaves (*FD* III 6:31, *FD* III 6:27, *BCH* 108 [1984] 366,4 [all from Delphi]). See Appendix 2 for all 1st century CE inscriptional attestations of the word *ekklēsia*.

86 Van Nijf, "Public Space," 234.

87 Van Nijf bases his estimate on the fact that the theatre in which the *dēmos* met in assembly contained seating for *c.* 4500 people ("Public Space," 234).

88 There is only one other extant mention of an *ennomos ekklēsia* in Asia Minor (and the only plural reference anywhere in the inscriptional record). It comes from Mysia but it pre-dates the Imperial period (*IGR* 4.292, 75–50 BCE; cf. *MDAI(A)* 32 [1907]: 243, 244). It reads, in part, ἐπ[ι]θύειν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν λιβανωτὸν ἔν τε ταῖς βουλαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐννόμο[ις], [ὅταν] παρατυγχάνηι.

89 See n. 32 (Ch. 2) for an explanation of the term "ecclesiastical/non-probouleutic decree." *TAM* III 4 reads, in part, μηνὸς Σωτηρίου δεκάτῃ γ᾽ ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκλησίᾳ ἔδοξε τῶι δήμωι προβούλων γνώμηι.

The democratic *kratos* of the *dēmos* of Termessos is further reinforced in its exercise of formal jurisdictional responsibilities. The assembly debated issues included in the traditional agenda of the classical Athenian *ekklēsia kyria*.[90] Van Nijf cites examples such as "the appointment of magistrates, financial affairs, civic subdivisions (including the introduction of new *phylai*), construction works (roads and cisterns), food-supply, and the organization of games and festivals."[91] Termessos even involved itself in foreign policy initiatives by providing auxiliary troops and sending embassies to Rome.

A third indicator of widespread *kratos* for the *dēmos* during the Imperial period is the burgeoning political culture in Asia Minor. Van Nijf states that the post-Classical *polis* "lost little of its political and cultural significance in worlds dominated by Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors."[92] Van Nijf identifies three non-institutional aspects of vibrant political culture: festivals, monuments of leadership,[93] and emotive communities.[94] The unspoken underlying

---

90 The principal *ekklēsia* (i.e., ἐκκλησία κυρία) of classical Athens had an all-embracing program which included: votes of confidence (ἐπιχειροτονία; *epicheirotonia*) with respect to the magistrates (*archontes*); discussion of military preparedness and of issues related to food security, consideration of accusations of high treason (εἰσαγγελίαι; *eisangeliai*), reports of confiscated property and of determinations made with respect to disputed inheritance claims (Glotz, *Greek City*, 85; Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 43.4–6).

91 Van Nijf, "Public Space," 234.

92 Onno van Nijf, Richard Alston, and Christina Williamson, "Introduction: The Greek City and Its Religions after the Classical Age," in *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (GRHSGCCA 3; ed. R. Alston, O. M. van Nijf, and C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming), 1–20, esp. 3. They claim further that "the essays in van Nijf and Alston (2011) repeatedly stress … and Alston and van Nijf (2008) showed, the post-Classical period retained vibrant and complex political cultures, the institution of the *polis* spread over a far greater region than in the Classical period, and the economic complexity and the abilities and strategies of the *poleis* to manage and provide for their resident communities were, if anything, enhanced … It is evident that the *polis* did much more than just persist—it flourished" (Ibid., 3). The two cited works are: Onno M. van Nijf and Richard Alston, eds., *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (GRHSGCCA 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2011); and Richard Alston and Onno M. van Nijf, eds., *Feeding the Ancient Greek City* (GRHSGCCA 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2008).

93 For van Nijf's discussion of festivals and monuments of leadership in political culture see: (1) *Civic World*, 131–148 (festivals) and *Civic World*, 73–130 (honorific inscriptions); (2) "Political Culture," 11–14; and (3) "Public Space," 217–23 (monumental politics).

94 Van Nijf observes that "when a writer of the Second Sophistic wanted to get to the *essence* of a community he would naturally focus on the *emotional climate* in which social and political transactions took place" ("Politics, Culture and Identities: Towards a Political History of the Imperial Greek City," keynote address presented Oct. 22 at *Urban Dreams and Realities: An Interdisciplinary Conference on the City in Ancient Cultures* [Oct. 21–22, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB], 11 [author's emphasis]).

goal of political culture appears to have been the avoidance of *intra-polis* conflict through preservation of the *status quo*.

Euergetism, or benefaction, was a key strategy in maintaining *status quo* and undergirds two of van Nijf's three elements of political culture (monumentalism and festivals). Acts of munificence served both internal and external political functions during the Imperial period.[95] Internally, euergetism allowed the lines of political influence between the oligarchic elite and the *dēmos* to flow in both directions.[96] Zuiderhoek terms euergetism "the politics of redistribution."[97] The *dēmos* distributed power and prestige to the oligarchs in exchange for the distribution of material and social 'wealth' from the oligarchs. Zuiderhoek notes that public rituals associated with euergetism,

> did much to ease possible tensions arising from this political configuration by creating a dynamic exchange of gifts for honours which allowed the elite to present itself as a virtuous, benevolent upper class, while simultaneously allowing the *demos* [*sic*] to affirm (and thereby legitimate) or reject this image through the public allocation of honours.[98]

Externally, "the politics of redistribution," as enacted by the oligarchic elite, served to prevent outside interference in civic affairs. The prospect of Roman intervention was a real one,[99] especially given the fact that, as Zuiderhoek notes, power sharing between the oligarchic elites and the popular assembly

---

95   See Zuiderhoek for his study of how high mortality rates and short lifespans affected the demography of social elites. He hypothesizes that public euergetism served an important private function for elites in memorializing their family lineage ("Oligarchs and Benefactors," 185–196).

96   Van Nijf argues that the public use of honorific language implicitly pressures the honorand to live up to the public impression created of him or her. In this way, the *dēmos*, through individuals and/or collectives such as voluntary associations, plays an active role in the process of political identity construction even without having been formally granted any official political office or even role. The practice of monumentalism exponentially increased in the Greek East during the Imperial period (van Nijf, *Civic World*, 73–130; "Public Space," 217–23).

97   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 435.

98   Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 444. See Zuiderhoek for charts on the frequency with which different types of benefaction were given (e.g., types of buildings, categories of benefaction-types) (*The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* [GCRW; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 76–80).

99   Plutarch, *Mor.* 814F–815A. Fear of Roman intervention is explicitly cited as the reason for dismissing an 'illegal' *ekklēsia* that was hastily assembled in Ephesos (Acts 19:23–41, esp. vv. 39–41).

"seems often to have been an uneasy one."[100] This ongoing need for the negotiation of power resulted in civic disturbances that are widely attested throughout the Greek East during the first two centuries CE.[101] Giovanni Salmeri provides details of many of the conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated *boulē* and the *dēmos*.[102] Somehow conflict had to be mediated in order to avoid direct Roman intervention in the local affairs of *poleis*. The rise in the frequency and generosity of public and semi-public benefaction, or euergetism, appears to have mitigated the development of undue conflict.

Zuiderhoek states that this three-way tug of war involving imperial authorities, civic elites, and popular assemblies "helps to explain the remarkable proliferation of euergetism we see in the eastern provinces during the first two centuries."[103] By appeasing the expressed and perceived demands of the popular assembly, euergetism facilitated civic harmony. Zuiderhoek even goes so far as to claim that,

> to a large measure, the well-being and stable functioning of the Empire depended on the vitality of its cities … [hence] euergetism's contribution to civic socio-political stability may well have been one of the keys to the survival and flourishing of the Roman imperial system as a whole during the first two centuries AD.[104]

---

100 Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 442. He sees the genesis of this uneasy relationship in the fact that there was "the cohabitation of oligarchisation, hierarchisation, and a continuing measure of active popular politics (fuelled quite possibly by a politically vocal middling stratum within the *demos*)" (Ibid., 442).

101 Zuiderhoek cites examples of civic unrest, though not of revolt, throughout the Greek East during the Imperial period: (Sardis) Philostr. *Letters of Apollonius* 56; (Aspendos) Philostr. *V.Apoll.* 1.15; (Smyrna) Philostr. *V.Soph.* 1.25; (Rhodes) Aelius Aristides, *Oration to the Rhodians: Concerning Concord* (*Or*. 24); (Tarsus) Dio Chrys. *Or*. 34.16–20; (Nicaea) *Or*. 39; (Prusa) *Or*. 46, 47.19, 48.9 ("Political Sociology," 442 n. 61). See also Giovanni Salmeri who provides an extensive summary of the many conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated *boulē* and the *dēmos* ("Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor," in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy* [ed. S. Swain; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 53–92, esp. 73–86).

102 Salmeri provides an extensive summary of the many conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated *boulē* and the *dēmos* ("Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life," 73–86).

103 Zuiderhoek, "Political Sociology," 435.

104 Zuiderhoek, *Politics of Munificence*, 5.

Literary sources provide a fourth countervailing factor for claims of democratic malaise in Imperial Greek cities. A vibrant "*ekklēsia* discourse"[105] surfaces in the 1st century CE literary works of Plutarch,[106] Dio Chrysostom,[107] and Theon.[108] Within the writings of Plutarch and Dio, Anna Crescinda Miller defines their "*ekklēsia* discourse" as including

> *topoi* familiar from classical literature, such as idealization of an empowered citizen body and the speech of the assembly ... were applied not only to historical assemblies of the past, or theoretical assemblies of the imagination, but also to the assemblies that were meeting in Greek cities of the first century.[109]

----

105   See Giovanni Salmeri, "Reconstructing the Political Life and Culture of the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 197–214). Salmeri notes four key differences and five substantive similarities between Imperial period and classical Athenian *ekklēsiai* ("Reconstructing," 206).

106   Plutarch (*c.* 46–120 CE) was born in Chaeronea (Boeotia) in central Greece. Dio Chrysostom (*c.* 40–*c.* 115) is also known as Dion of Prusa or Dio Cocceianus. He was born in Prusa, a town in Bithynia.

107   See John Ma ("Public Speech and Community in the *Euboicus*," in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy* [ed. S. Swain; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000], 108–24); Anna Crescinda Miller ("*Ekklesia*: 1 Corinthians in the Context of Ancient Democratic Discourse" [PhD diss., Harvard University, 2008], 4–5); Giovanni Salmeri ("Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life," 53–92).

108   Aelius Theon was from Alexandria and probably lived during the mid to late 1st century CE. See further in Ruth Webb, "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (ed. Yun Lee Too; Boston: Brill, 2001), 289–316, esp. 289–92. Anna Crescinda Miller contends that Theon wrote the *progymnasmata* before 95 CE, that is, the point at which Quintilian cites Theon on *statis* theory ("*Ekklesia*," 30 n. 35). She cites the argument of George Alexander Kennedy (*Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric, Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 10* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 1). Miller does not, however, consider the perspective of Malcolm Heath who claims that arguments for an early date for Theon's *Progymnasmata* are inherently weak, especially given the fact not only of its popularity in late antiquity, but also that it was translated into Armenian ("Theon and the History of the *Progymnasmata*," GRBS 43/2 [2002]: 129–160).

109   Miller, "*Ekklēsia*," 4–5. See Christina Kokkinia on "*ekklēsia* discourse" in Aelius Aristides (early 2nd cent. CE) ("The Governor's Boot and the City's Politicians. Greek Communities and Rome's Representatives under the Empire," in *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis: Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich: Akten der Tagung an der Universität Zürich, 18.–20.10.2004* [ed. A. Kolb; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006], 181–90).

Ruth Webb defines the purpose of Theon's *progymnasmata* as being the preparation of the student for rhetorical repartee within the real world as a citizen in the *ekklēsia*.[110] Participation within an *ekklēsia*, however, required more than simply political acumen. Religious ritual was also germane to *polis* politics in the Greek East during the Imperial period.

2.2.4   *Religion and Imperial Period* Ekklēsiai

In many respects, in the ancient world politics and religion[111] were integral parts of the same cultural whole.[112] This integration existed both on the private and public levels of life.[113] Onno Van Nijf, Richard Alston, and Christina

---

110   Webb, "*Progymnasmata*," 289–92. *Topoi* raised in the classical Athenian *ekklēsia* are also given priority as *progymnasmata* students spoke in their imagined *ekklēsia* (e.g., the danger of tyrants, tyrannicide as a heroic act, provision of justice and equality for the poor over against the oppression of the rich; cf. Dem. 21.124–127; also Thuc. 2.37).

111   Bruce Malina states that "the social institutions known as religion and economics did not exist as discrete, self-standing, independent institutions in antiquity. In antiquity, there were only two focal, freestanding social institutions: kinship and politics, yielding domestic economy, domestic religion, political economy, and political religion" ("Social-Scientific Approaches and the Gospel of Matthew," in *Methods for Matthew* [MBI; ed. M. A. Powell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 154–93, esp. 170). Steve Mason identifies six culturally intrinsic aspects of 'religion' which were integrated into the warp and woof of everyday life in early antiquity: *ethnos*, cult, philosophy, kinship traditions/domestic worship, astrology/magic and voluntary association (*collegia/thiasoi*) ("Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ 38* [2007]: 457–512, esp. 482–88). See also Brent Nongbri who claims that in antiquity there was no conceptual category that could be designated as "religious" as opposed to "secular" (*Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013]).

112   For a critique of Mason's view of "religion," see Daniel R. Schwartz, *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014). Schwartz offers 14 examples from Josephus where the Greek word *threskia* is best translated as "religion" rather than as a religious activity such as "worship," "cult," or "ceremony" (Ibid., 91–99). For a judicious critique of Nongbri's conceptual paradigm, see Jack C. Laughlin and Kornel Zathureczky, "An Anatomy of the Canonization of Asadian Genealogy: A Case Study," *SR* 44/2 (June 2015): 233–52. Laughlin and Zathureczky contend that "a context-specific historical hermeneutic, with the potential to generate multiple conceptions of religion (as such), not only evades tendencies to reify 'religion' through its use as a universally applicable category (religion as a *sui generic* category) but also resists what Strausberg (2010) calls a 'reverse-*sui-generis*-rhetoric' which treats religion as a uniquely anomalous category" (Ibid., 235–36).

113   Paula Fredriksen argues not only that "religion" was integrated into everyday life but that "religion" was in fact integrally tied to ethnicity: "in Mediterranean antiquity, cult defined

Williamson note that "it is quite clear that religion [e.g., patron *polis* gods] continued to play an important role in the way that cities represented their identity both to their own inhabitants and to the outside world."[114] This religious representation in political decrees is prevalent throughout the inscriptional record. Religious terminology within enactment decrees abounds from the time of classical Athens until the end of the Imperial period.[115] Inscriptional examples of religious terminology include the offering of sacrifices (*thysias*), addresses to the gods (*theoi*), lists of religious professionals (*hiereis*), and the public display of enactment decrees set up within Greek temples (e.g., Zeus, Pythian Apollo, Artemis, and Serapis/Asklepios).[116]

---

ethnicity and ethnicity defined cult" ("Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 [2010]: 232–52, esp. 234).

114 Van Nijf, Alston, and Williamson, "Introduction: The Greek City," 5. The integral union of *polis* and religion is evident in the multiplicity of temples, shrines, festivals, banquets, and religious rituals that reinforced *polis* hierarchies, and the regulation and administration of (public) religion by the *polis*. On the intermingling of religion and politics specifically within the 'political culture' of Imperial period Asia Minor, see Onno van Nijf, "Political Games," in *L'organisation des spectacles dans le monde Romain: huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique LVIII; ed. K. M. Coleman, J. Nelis-Clemént, P. Ducrey; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2012), 47–95, esp. 61, 63, 64, 71–76; van Nijf, Alston, and Williamson, "Introduction: The Greek City," 4–10 (section entitled, 'Polis *religion*' and *the post-Classical* polis).

115 Of the more than 2100 inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* (5th cent. BCE to 11th cent. CE), at least 675 contain religious terminology. Of those 675, 600 are dated from the 5th cent. BCE to the 2nd cent. CE. On the integral union of politics and religion, see the extensive discussion by Susan Guettel Cole ("Civic Cult and Civic Identity," in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24–27, 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 2 [HfM 72; ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1995], 292–325) and a response by Walter Burkert ("Greek *Poleis* and Civic Cults: Some Further Thoughts," in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 95; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995], 201–210).

116 Examples of religious phraseology which occurs within late Hellenistic and Imperial period inscriptions that mention an ἐκκλησία (and related lexemes such as ἐκλησία) include: (1) 1st cent BCE, Athens (*IG* II² 1030): τοῖς θεοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὑπέρ τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶ[ν]; (2) 1st cent. CE, Epidauros in Peloponnesos (*IG* IV², 1 84): τε τῆι Ἀθήνησιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ πρώτων ἀνδρῶν, ἱερέων καὶ ἱερειῶν τῆς προσωνύμου τῆς πόλ[ε]ως θεοῦ καὶ ἱεροφαντικῶν· ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι τῆι ἱερᾶι ἐν τῶι τεμένει τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ; (3) 2nd cent CE, Oinoanda in Lycia (124–125/26 CE; *SEG* 38:1462): ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος δημαρχικῆς· ἀρχιερέως τῶν Σεβαστῶν· ιβ′ θυσία τ[οῦ πα]τρῴου Ἀπόλλωνος· καὶ τοὺς πατρίους θεοὺς εὐσεβείας ἐν τῇ ς [εβαστ]ῇ τοῦ Δείου μηνὸς καὶ συν πομπεύοντα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄρχουσι· προπομπεύσουσι τὰς σεβαστικὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὴν [τοῦ] πατρῴου ἡμῶν θεοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τὸν π[ροδ]ηλούμενον ἱερὸν βωμόν· ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς βοῦν.

While religious rituals were part and parcel of the political activity of *ekklēsiai* in the Imperial period, the flip side was also true, both of political officers and of institutions. In Philadelphia, following the great earthquake of 17 CE, one of its magistrates is designated a priest of emperor Germanicus in honour of Rome's five year remittal of tribute.[117] Some institutional *ekklēsiai* in central Greece became part and parcel of socio-religious ceremonies, specifically those through which slaves were manumitted.[118] The formal ratification of a slave's manumission normally was tied to a sacred institution such as a temple,[119] with occasional ratification in a civic *ekklēsia*.[120] This public

117   Colin Hemer cites numismatic evidence in this regard (Nos. 51, 52, of Caligula) (*The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986/1989], 157). The religious commitment of a Philadelphian magistrate to the emperor is politically reinforced in his self-styled designation as φιλόκαισαρ (*BMC Lydia*, lxxxv; coin no. 54) and φιλόπατρις (*BMC Lydia*, lxxxv; cf. also the much later *CIG* 3422.4) (Ibid., 157 n. 18).

118   Greek manumission is not emancipation, though, since not infrequently the "freedperson" (*apeleutheros*) was still enjoined through a *paramonē* clause to "remain with" his/her previous owner until that owner died (e.g., *parameinatō*, *FD* III 6:31, ca. 20CE; παραμενέτω δὲ Τρυ[φ]έρα Νίκωνι πάντα τὸν τᾶς ζωᾶς αὐτ(οῦ) χρόνον ποιοῦσα τὸ ἐπιτασσόμενον ἀνενκ[λ] ήτως). There are 302 manumissions inscriptions from central Greece that include a *paramonē* style clause (παραμονῇ; παραμενέτω; παραμεινάτω; παραμ(ε)ίνασαν). Six from the region of Phokis (Delphi) include both the word *ekklēsia* and a *paramonē* style clause: *FD* III 6:31 (Delphi, 1–20 CE), *FD* III 6:27 (Delphi, 1–20 CE), *IG* IX,1 193 (Tithora, beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE), *IG* IX,1 126 (Elateia, 2nd cent. BCE), *IG* IX,1² 3:712 (Locris, W.; Phaestinus, mid-2nd cent. BCE), and *FD* III 2:120 (Delphi, n.d.). Gibson clarifies that "service for the life of the former owner was the most common *paramonē* obligation, but a variety of other arrangements were possible. These include providing service for a limited number of years (*SGDI* 1742), maintaining a grave site (*SGDI* 1775, 1796, 1801, 1807), providing replacement slaves (*SGDI* 1717), learning a trade (*SGDI* 1899 and 1904), serving a designated party after the original owner's death (*SGDI* 1742, 1747, and 1884), and agreeing to live in a specific town (*SGDI* 1774 and 1801)" (*The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House* [TSAJ 75; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999], 40 n. 26).

119   Elizabeth Leigh Gibson notes that over 1300 manumission inscriptions from central Greece have been recovered. These span four centuries and recount release ceremonies at the temple of the Pythian Apollo (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 37). Under priestly oversight, a slave's (*doulos*) status was changed (e.g., *aphēkē eleutheron*; "set free") into that of a "freedperson" (*apeleutheros*). The official redemption payment (*timas*) (whether figurative or literal) is not infrequently made to a god in a temple, most often to the Pythian Apollo in the temple at Delphi (e.g., *FD* III 6:31 [Delphi, 1–20 CE]; for the Greek text, see Appendix 2: *Ekklēsia* in First Century CE Inscriptions.

120   There are fifteen mentions of an *ekklēsia* within Greek manumission inscriptions. These date between the 2nd century BCE and the 1st century CE. The breakdown of *poleis* by

setting allows the *dēmos* to become a witness, thereby ensuring that common knowledge of the new status of the recently manumitted slaves was disseminated.[121]

The interpenetration of religion into politics also flowed in the other direction. In some Hellenistic-era inscriptions from Asia Minor, religious figures became *polis* officers.[122] In one instance the chief priest is given the political office of eponymous *archōn*, that is, the chief magistrate of the *polis*. Sherk cites one example from the 2nd century BCE *polis* of Laodicea-by-the-Lycus (Phrygia) in which "it [is] probable that a priest was eponymous"

---

region is as follows: Phokis (Delphi, 6×; Elate[i]a, 6×; Tithora, 1×), Boeotia (Phastinos, 1×), and W. Locris (Phaestinus, 1×). Eleven inscriptions date to the 2nd cent. BCE, three to the 1st cent. CE, with one being undatable. The three 1st cent. CE inscriptions all hail from Delphi, as does the one that is undatable. Of the ten 2nd cent. BCE inscriptions, two are from Delphi. The use of an *ekklēsia* to legitimate a slave's manumitted status finds metaphorical parallel in Paul's depiction of *ekklēsia* members as manumitted slaves (Romans, 1 Corinthians). In Chapter 4, I expound further upon Paul's manumission theology, particularly as it intersects with Jewish manumission protocol among synagogue communities on the north shore of the Black Sea during the time of the Bosporan Kingdom (1st–4th cents. CE).

121   For the concept of "common knowledge" within Imperial Greek cities and the role of public spectacles for the spread of religio-political knowledge, see Onno van Nijf's discussion of the "game theory" of Michael Suk–Young Chwe (*Rational Ritual: Culture, Coordination, and Common Knowledge* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001]) ("Political Games," 61–70, 73–75). Public manumission ceremonies, which include the witness of the *dēmos en ekklēsia*, are particularly fitting contexts within which to spread common knowledge for the ultimate benefit of the newly manumitted slaves. Van Nijf notes that "for collective action, it is important that people know that other people agree with them, for only then are they inclined to take a common course of action. Accordingly, in this view, political legitimacy depends on general agreement between the rulers and the ruled, on common knowledge that everyone will take the written and unwritten rules of the political game seriously ... A public ritual is first and foremost an occasion where all the members of a community are required to be present in one place and jointly to learn the cultural information contained in the spectacle" ("Political Games," 63).

122   For example, Diodorus Siculus describes Pessinous in Asia Minor as being, in essence, a "priest-state" for Cybele (Maria Grazia Lancellotti, *Attis, Between Myth and History: King, Priest, and God* [RGRW 149; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 71–72). See also Angelo Verlinde, *The Sanctuary Site at Pessinus. The Genesis, Development and Taphonomy of a Roman Temple in Central Asia Minor in Light of its Phrygian-Hellenistic Predecessors and Byzantine Afterlife* (MOA 7; Leuven/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014). For inscriptional evidence, see Johan Strubbe, *The Inscriptions of Pessinous* (IGSK 66; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 2005).

(*MAMA* VI 10).[123] This ideology even continued into the early decades of the 1st century BCE (*MAMA* VI 18).[124]

These two inscriptions take the concept of priest as *archōn* one exponential step further, however: they equate the priest/*archōn* with the very *polis* itself. Sherk comments that "the eponymous priesthood is that of a ἱερεὺς τῆς Πόλεως, i.e. a personification of the city itself."[125] Thus, not only is a priest in that region of Phrygia considered the chief *polis* official but he is even regarded as the embodiment of the *polis* itself. This sacralization of a *polis* is also mirrored elsewhere, to a lesser degree, in at least seven inscriptional occurrences of the phrase *ekklēsiai* (*hiera ekklēsia*).[126] This concept also finds parallels in at least two 1st century CE New Testament writers.[127]

---

123   Sherk, "Eponymous Officials," 224. Laodicea consisted of a large population of Jews, whose descendants had been transplanted there from Babylon by Antiochus III, the Great (2nd cent. BCE). The enduring significance of the Laodicean Jewish community even into the 1st century CE is seen in Cicero's comment that, as part of their annual contribution, they had tried to send nine kilograms of gold to the Temple in Jerusalem, all of which was confiscated by the Romans (*Pro Flacco* 28–68).

124   Sherk, "Eponymous Officials," 224.

125   Sherk, "Eponymous Officials," 224.

126   There are at least seven extant inscriptions within which a *polis* attributes a sacral dimension to its civic *ekklēsia* ("*hiera ekklēsia*"). Four are dated to the Hellenistic era and three to the Imperial period. The Hellenistic-era examples are: (1) *IMT Adram Kolpos* 715 (Andros, Lamyra, Mysia, Asia Minor, 106 BCE): δεδόχθαι τῆι ἱερᾶι ἐκκλησίαι; (2) *IMT Adram Kolpos* 716 (Taylieli, Mysia, 168–160/59 BCE): δεδόχθαι τῆι ἱερᾶι ἐκκλη[σίαι·; (3) *IG* XII,5 722+[1] (Andros, Cyclades, Aegean Islands, 2nd/1st cent. BCE): δεδόχθαι τῆι ἱερᾶι ἐκκλησίαι. The sentence δέδοχθαι τῆι ἱερᾶι ἐκκλησίαι can be translated as, "let it be resolved by the sacred assembly"; (4) *IEph* 1570 (2nd cent. BCE[?]): [—] [ἱε]ρᾷ ἐκλησίᾳ [—] ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ πρυτάνε[ως. There are two decrees from Imperial-period Ephesos which attribute a sacral dimension to a civic *ekklēsia*: (1) *IEph* 2902 (found at Ephesos, Imperial period; honorary inscription for *kosmēteira* [no name]): [—]ερα κοσμή[τειρ— φιλο]τείμως· οὗ τει[μῆς ἕνεκα — ἐν τῇ ἱε]ρᾷ ἐκλησίᾳ [—] ἐψηφίσαντο [— προγόν]ων λειτουρ[γῶν, τοῦ μὲν πάππου — τ]οῦ δὲ πατρὸς [—]αλασ[—]; and (2) *IEph* 959 (found at Ephesos, Imperial period; thanksgiving [to Artemis] by *neopoios* [no name], husband of Pomp[eia] Aphroeisias): χρυσοφορήσ[αν]τος ἔτη ἑξήκον[τα,] νεοποιήσας α[ὐ]θαίρετος κατὰ σὴν ἀρετήν, καθὼς περιέχ[ει] τὰ ὑπομνήματ[α] τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκκλησί[ας,] σὺν καὶ τῇ συνβίῳ μου Πονπ(ηΐᾳ) Ἀφροδεισ[ι]άδι καὶ τοῖς τέκνοι[ς] μου Ῥουφείνῃ καὶ Ῥουφείνῳ καὶ τῷ συνγενεῖ. The seventh inscriptional example of a *hiera ekklēsia* is also dated to late Imperial period Asia Minor, but no city is identifiable: *IDid* 305 (a *prophētēs* inscription for [no name], *agonōthetēs* of Megala Didymeia Kommodeia and [Pythia] Panionia): ταύτας τὰς [—] [— ἱε]ρᾷ? ἐκκλησ[ία —] [— τῇ πατρ]ίδι ἐκ τ[ῶν ἰδίων?].?

127   The sacralization of *polis* and *ekklēsia* in Imperial period *poleis* is metaphorically paralleled by seven 1st century CE Christ-follower communities in Roman Asia, one

2.2.5 *Summary: Civic* Ekklēsiai *in the 1st Century* CE

Given the foregoing, to what degree, then, did civic *ekklēsiai* possess *kratos* in the 1st century CE, particularly in Asia Minor? Generally, the enactment of intra-*polis* politics within civic *ekklēsiai* was not overshadowed by direct interference from Rome. In many respects, Rome co-opted the existing oligarchs in service of Roman rule. Euergetism became the primary strategy that oligarchs employed to avoid popular discontent, and, thus, Roman intervention. These socio-political elites, though, are but one of four key dimensions in the civic politics of the Greek East during the Imperial period. The other three are a socio-political hierarchy, a political culture, and the popular assembly (*ekklēsia*).

The hierarchal restructuring of the Greek East did not mute the voice of the popular assembly. Rather, somewhat counter-intuitively, it contributed to the political vitality of the civic *ekklēsia* by enfranchising professional associations or *collegia*. Honorific monumentalism became the professional associations' contribution to the "politics of redistribution," and, thus, to their ability to influence the bouleutic elite.

The popular assembly also frequently used honorific decrees to influence oligarchs. Their laudatory content served rhetorically to pressure the oligarchic honorand to live up to those expectations. At least one popular assembly in the Greek East wielded direct political influence: the *ennomos ekklēsia* of Termessos exercised jurisdictional responsibilities continuous with those assumed by the classical Athenian *ekklēsia*.

Given the apparently laissez-faire attitude of Roman authorities with respect to democratic governance at the level of the local *polis*, the primary ideological target of the popular assembly cannot have been Rome but rather its 'deputies,' the oligarchic elites. The existence of a political culture in Asia Minor meant that a vibrant "*ekklēsia* discourse" only served to further the *pax Romana*, rather than to threaten it. As long as order was maintained, Rome was not overly particular about how a *polis* self-governed.

Rome's promotion, and even construction of, Imperial Greek cities, along with their concomitant democratic apparatii, coupled with its lack of interference in vibrant displays of democratic life in Imperial Greek cities, brings at least one conclusion to the fore. As a rule, it would seem that Roman

---

community of which was located in Ephesos. The seven *ekklēsiai* of Christ-followers, to whom the book of Revelation is addressed, are symbolically depicted as together forming one sacred *polis*, the Jewish temple-*polis* called the New Jerusalem (Rev 1:4; 21:9, 10). On Paul and the sacralization of his *ekklēsiai*, see 4.4. Ekklēsia *as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?*

authorities would not have viewed the adoption of civic terminology (e.g., *ekklēsia*) by non-civic groups as being reflective of oppositional rhetoric, much less of a seditious ideology. Roman intervention was directed more towards disorderly behaviour. This hypothesis will be tested when, in my next section, I examine inscriptional decrees of Greco-Roman non-civic groups, at least one of which pre-dates early Christ-followers in calling its semi-public assembly an *ekklēsia*.

2.3   Non-Civic *Ekklēsiai* and Associations

Voluntary associations are non-civic groups that, while particularly ubiquitous in the Imperial period, already existed in the fourth century BCE.[128] The range of association types meant that they were known by a variety of designations.[129] My focus here is to explore which Greco-Roman voluntary associations appropriated *ekklēsia* terminology, whether *ekklēsia* was used simply as a name for an association's "members-only" assembly or also as its group designation, and

---

128   Harland identifies at least five types of non-civic associations based upon their principal social networks: (1) household connections; (2) ethnic or geographic connections; (3) neighbourhood connections; (4) occupational connections; and (5) cult or temple connections. Harland adds one caveat. He emphasizes that these five categories cannot be applied rigidly to a taxonomy of associations since "these webs of connections certainly overlap, and several can play a role in the membership of a particular association" (*Associations*, 29; see also David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland, "Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah," *JGRJCh* 5 [2008]: 200–21, esp. 202, 203).

129   Greco-Roman voluntary associations were called collegia in Latin, and in Greek by terms such as *orgeōnes, thiasoi, melanephoroi, eranistai, synergasia, synergion, syngeneia, taxis, phylē, hairesis, kollegion, syllogos, synteleia, synedrion, systema, synodos, koina* and *koinon* (van Nijf, *Civic World*, 8–10). Some voluntary associations appropriated multiple identities depending on their socio-cultural needs. For example, Saittai's association of linen weavers "appears to have been known both as a *synergasia* (the name used in six surviving funerary inscriptions) and as a *homotechnon*, both names referring to occupational identity. This association is also, however, described as a *plateia* (emphasising its territorial basis), and perhaps as a *phyle*, referring to the political status of its members" (van Nijf, *Civic World*, 10). See Albert Baumgarten for a comparison of the organizational structures and functions (e.g., commensality, literacy) of Greco-Roman associations and Jewish sects (e.g., Essenes, Pharisees) ("Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Jewish Sects," in *Jews in a Greco-Roman World* [ed. M. Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], 93–111).

if the adoption of *ekklēsia* terminology could have been viewed suspiciously by Roman authorities.

2.3.1 The Non-Civic Ekklēsia: *A Meeting or a Permanent Group Designation?*

Use of the term *ekklēsia* by Greco-Roman voluntary associations is only evident in epigraphic sources, not in papyrological or literary sources. At least thirteen of the papyri that have been preserved were written by voluntary associations.[130] Only one refers to an assembly convened by an association, but in this case the word translated "assembly" is *syllogos* (P. Mich. 5:243).[131]

Relative to epigraphic sources, previous scholarship has identified five decrees in which the word *ekklēsia* purportedly is used by a voluntary association: IGLAM 1381–1382, OGIS 488, McCabe 1986, no. 119/*Samos* 119 (hereafter *Samos* 119), and Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271/*IDelos* 1519 (hereafter *IDelos* 1519). All five, at some point, have even been cited as evidence of a voluntary association self-designating as an *ekklēsia* (Kloppenborg, Ascough, Harland).[132]

---

130 The thirteen papyri are: Hib. 99 (?BCE; a receipt), P.Duk.inv. 624 v (199–100 BCE), P.Mich. 5:246 (*c.* 43–49 CE; contributions to a guild of Harpokrates), P.Mich. 5:243 (14–37 CE; a guild ordinance during the reign of Tiberius), P.Mich. 2:121 (42 CE; a collection of abstracts of contracts [*eiromenon*], after August 28, 42 CE), P.Mich. 5:244 (43 CE; a guild ordinance of the *Apolysimoi* of Tebtynis, Egypt), P.Mich. 5:245 (47 CE; a guild ordinance), P.Lund. 4:11 (169–170 CE; a cultic association of Dioskouren ["Kultverein der Dioskouren"]), P.Oslo 3:183 (200–299 CE; fragment, perhaps concerning games), P.Oslo 3:144 (270–275 CE; list of contributors to an association), SB. 22:15787 (300–399 CE; official letter; nomination of Liturgists), P.Cair.Masp. 2:67158 (568 CE; contract of an association), and P.Cair.Masp. 2:67159 (568 CE; contract of an association).

131 P.Mich. 5:243 (14–37 CE) mentions a *syllogos*: ἐὰν δέ τινι ζ σύλλο[γ]ος παραγγελῆι καὶ μὴ παραγένηται, ζημιούσθω ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς κώμης δραχ(μὴν) μίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς πόλεω(ς) δραχ(μὰς) τέσσαρας ("If anyone receives notice of a meeting [*syllogos*] and does not attend, let him be fined one *drachmē* in the village, but in the city four *drachmai*"). P.Mich. 5:243 lists various provisions concerning the monthly dues and other obligations of each member, as well as the penalties and fines that they would eventually receive. See Arthur Boak's edition of P.Mich. 5:243, 244 in *Papyri from Tebtunis, Part II: Michigan Papyri, Vol. V* (ed. E. Husselman, A. E. Boak, and W. F. Edgerton; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1933–1944) and in his "Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt," *TAPA* 68 (1937): 212–20 (http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;5;243; accessed March 5, 2012).

132 (1) John Kloppenborg has, at one time, claimed that three epigraphic occurrences of *ekklēsia* designate the collective identity of a voluntary association: IGLAM 1381–1382 and *IDelos* 1519. He wrote that "some associations *were* [author's emphasis] called ἐκκλησία, as is clear from [IGLAM 1381–1382 and Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271]" ("Edwin Hatch, Churches, and

Regarding *IGLAM* 1381[133] and *IGLAM* 1382,[134] Le Bas originally wondered ("peut-être"), but did not conclude, whether each records an instance of *ekklēsia* being used as a collective designation for a non-civic association.[135] Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland each originally made conclusive what

<hr />

Collegia," in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity* [ed. B. H. Maclean; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 212–38, esp. 231); (2) Richard Ascough argues that, "Despite McCready's claim that 'there is little evidence that voluntary associations or clubs used the word *ekklesia* as a community designation,' there are a few examples: one from Samos (E. G. L. Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen* [Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1896/repr. 1969], 116 n. 3); *OGIS* 488 (Kastollos near Philadelphia, 2nd century CE); *IGLAM* 1381 (Aspendus [Pamphylia]); *IGLAM* 1382 (Aspendus); *IDelos* 1519 (196 BCE)" ("Matthew and Community Formation," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Studies* [ed. D. E. Aune; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 97–126, esp. 113). Ascough is here engaging with Wayne O. McCready ("*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 59–73); (3) Philip Harland also initially mirrored the claims of Kloppenborg and Ascough in his statement that "the self-designations of some groups also reflect the vocabulary of the *polis*, such as the associations that called themselves an assembly (*ekklēsia*) at Aspendos in Cilicia [*IGLAM* 1381–82] and on the island of Delos [Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271]" (*Associations*, 106 and 182). Harland has since changed his stance with respect to *IDelos* 1519/Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271 (*Dynamics*, 44–45); (4) A wrestling school (ἀλειφομένοις) in Samos is the fourth example of an association that purportedly self-identifies collectively as an *ekklēsia* (*Samos* 119) (Ascough, "Matthew and Community Formation," 113).

133   *IGLAM* 1381–82 is from Aspendos in Pamphylia (Asia Minor), which is located just inland from the Gulf of Antalya, approximately halfway between Tlos and Lamos. Both *IGLAM* 1381 and 1382 use the phrase *euphēmon ekklēsian* (εὔφημον ἐκκλησίαν), which is otherwise unattested in epigraphic sources. *IGLAM* 1381 reads, Ζήνοων [Θεοδώρου ἀρχιτ]έκτων τοῦ θεάτρου ἀνέθηκεν. ἀ[πέδωκεν εἰς ἀγῶνα] γυμνικὸν γενέθλιον τοῦ θεάτρου πρισχείλια, [καὶ εἰ]ς εὔφημον ἐκκλησ[ίαν ἐχαρίσατο κήπους πρὸς τῷ ἱπποδ[ρόμῳ ...].

134   *IGLAM* 1382 reads, ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησεν Ζήνοων[α] Θεοδώρου ἀρχιτέκτοντα τοῦ θεάτρου [καὶ] τῶν τῆς πόλεως ἔργων ... καὶ εἰς εὔφημον ἐκκλησ[ίαν ἐχαρίσα]μενον κήπους π[ρὸς τῷ] ἱπποδρόμῳ....

135   Philippe Le Bas, co-editor of *IGLAM* II, suggests that the phrase "εὔφημος ἐκκλησία signifie peut-être une assemblée non politique, une reunion de plaisir" (Philippe Le Bas and William Henry Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure* [2 vols.; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1870/Reprinted 1972], 2.336).

Philippe Le Bas merely suggested.[136] Kloppenborg has since reversed his initial conclusion, although not yet in print.[137]

The *crux interpretum* for IGLAM 1381–82 revolves around the translation of the phrase *euphēmon ekklēsian*. Liddell and Scott offer three definitional categories for *euphēmon*. The third ("laudatory, panegyrics") emphasizes the civic nature of the *ekklēsia* in IGLAM 1381–82. Translating *euphēmon* as "laudatory" brings to mind a civic *ekklēsia* within which *polis* officials publicly honour a civic benefactor.[138] Such an honorary civic backdrop comes to the fore in IGLAM 1381–82. The *boulē* and *dēmos* of Aspendus are said to honour (*eteimēsen*) Zenon, son of Theodorus who, as chief craftsman (*architektōn*) of the theatre and of the public works, donated (*apedōken*) three thousand (*trischeilia*[?]) denarii.[139] Thus, IGLAM 1381 clearly identifies the *euphēmon ekklēsian* as being the formal assembly of a *polis* (Aspendos), not as being the regular assembly of a non-civic group. The same conclusion holds for IGLAM 1382.

A not dissimilar conclusion seems possible for OGIS 488 (2nd century CE).[140] This inscription speaks of an *ekklēsia* of local citizens from the village (*kōmē*) of

---

136   See n. 132 (Ch. 2) (Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch," 212–38, esp. 215–16; Ascough, "Matthew and Community Formation," 113; Harland, *Associations*, 106). In a subsequent book, Harland makes that comment less conclusive, but he does not rescind it: IGLAM 1381–1382 "may involve an association that was called an 'assembly'" (*Dynamics of Identity*, 44).

137   In an email to Ralph Korner (August 11, 2011), John Kloppenborg indicated that he has changed his initial stance regarding *ekklēsia* usage in IGLAM 1381–82 (and IDelos 1519). He wrote "There are certainly other associations that use either *ekklesia* or, more commonly, *agora*, meaning assembly or meeting, but in none of these cases is it the 'name' of the association." Kloppenborg's expertise in inscriptional matters related to Greco-Roman voluntary associations is undeniable. See his edited publications on associational inscriptions in the Greek East from 4th century BCE to the 4th century CE: (1) Kloppenborg and Ascough, eds., *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace* (2011); and (2) Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, eds., *Associations in the Greco-Roman World* (2012).

138   Polybius' *Historiae* is cited as an example of *euphēmos* being used with the meaning of "laudatory" or "panegyric" (31.3.4). It reads, in part, ἐπανελθόντας εὐφήμους λόγους ποιήσασθαι περί τε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ καθόλου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν.

139   It would seem that πρισχείλια is an unknown *hapax* or else a misspelling for τρισχίλια (3000). χίλια (1000) is spelled χείλια ın Ionic inscriptions. Ionia is also a region in Asia Minor.

140   See the discussion of OGIS 488/TAM V,1 222 by Richard Ascough in "Matthew," 113; idem, *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians* (WUNT 161; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003), 74 n. 12.

Kastollos.[141] Kastollos is located in Roman Asia near the *polis* of Philadelphia.[142] Richard Ascough claims that *ekklēsia* is used as a collective designation for a non-civic group.[143] It seems more likely, though, that *ekklēsia* is the name of an assembly. *OGIS* 488 reads:

> In the village of Kastollos of the Philadelphians, after an assembly (*ekklēsia*) was held by the *gerousia* and by the rest of the villagers, and after the councilors resolved to divide up a field that lay within the boundaries of their village, in the place called Agathon's, a field that was bounded by hills, since all the villagers ...[144]

The word *ekklēsia* appears simply to indicate the name of a meeting. Additionally, the context of *OGIS* 488 places into question whether the *gerousia* and the

---

141 Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that "*kome* [*sic*] is traditionally rendered by village but, like *polis*, it has a whole range of meanings and is commonly used to denote a village in the socio-economic sense without any constitutional or political functions" ("*Kome*. A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements hich were not *Poleis*," in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 95; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995], 45–82, esp. 50). He comments further that "a *kome* may or may not have had a political organization of its own, and it may or may not have been a unit in the political organization of the *polis* or region to which it belonged" (Ibid., 61). Examples of towns called both *poleis* and *kōmai* include Helisson (Arkadia; early 4th cent. BCE), Megaris (4th cent. BCE, *polis*; 200 BCE, *kōmē*), and Smyrna, Mantineia and Phokis which, through *dioikismos*, were broken up into *komai* (Ibid., 73–78). *Komai* "are completely absent from the non-Dorian Peloponnese, Attica, the north-eastern part of Hellas, the islands of the Aegean, and all the colonies" (Ibid., 81). They "abound in Western Greece, in the Peloponnese, in Macedon, and along the coast of Asia Minor" (Ibid., 69).

142 Independent attestation of Kastollos' existence ranges from 330 BCE to 300 CE. Chaniotis, Corsten, Stroud, and Tybout note that "Kastollos was a village on Philadelphia's territory" and was "located in the mountainous area northeast of Philadelphia, between Bebekli and Başibüyük" (A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud, and R. Tybout, *SEG vol. 53, pt. 2* [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 345). Strubbe claims that "Karakuyu Mevkii ... ca. 25 km. north-east of Alaşehir ... has been identified with Kastollos on epigraphical basis (G. Petzl, *EA* 26, 1996, 11–12)" (Johan H. M. Strubbe, ed., *Arai Epitymbioi: Imprecations Against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor* [Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Gmbh, 1997]).

143 Ascough, "Matthew," 113; idem, *Paul's Macedonian Associations*, 74 n. 12.

144 Translation by Patrick Hogan. *OGIS* 488 in its entirety reads: Ἐν Καστωλλῷ χώμῃ Φιλαδελφέων, γενομένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν χωμητῶν πάντων, καὶ βουλευσαμένων αὐτῶν διελέσθαι τὸν ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς ἀγρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ὁροις τόπῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Ἀγάθωνος μάνδραις ὄντα ὀρεινόν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες οἱ χωμῆται--]. See further Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, 116 n. 3.

villagers of Kastollos are a non-civic group.[145] Kastollos is a *kōmē*, which, as a rule, does not possess a *boulē* or an *ekklēsia*.[146] By convening an *ekklēsia*, however, the *kōmē* of Kastollos does self-present as a *polis* with a surrogate *boulē* (i.e., *gerousia, bouleusamenoi*).[147]

Three other factors support a *civic* context for OGIS 488. First, Kastollos is "of the Philadelphians" (*philadelpheōn*). In other words, it is a dependency of the *polis* of Philadelphia. *Philadelpheōn* is a "city ethnic" (*nomen gentilicium*).[148] This coheres with the view of Mogens Hermann Hansen that "the term *kome* [*sic*] could be used about a political community which was in some respects

---

145   Based on a study of Imperial period inscriptions from Anatolia, D. H. Hogarth adduces that (1) "the Gerousia had a recognized 'political' position in the civic organisation, and was not merely a social club" and (2) "we can say with fair assurance that the Gerousia under the Empire was a close, privileged body of limited numbers, probably 100 [over the age of 50] or thereabouts on an average, and originally elected by the civic assemblies, the βουλή and ἐκκλησία, with which it afterwards ranked … we infer that no class, except foreigners or slaves, was ineligible; for both freedmen and persons of doubtful parentage might be included (cf. Εὐτύχης πατρὸς ἀδήλου" at Sidyma) as well as women in exceptional cases" [see TAM II.1, 176; 2nd cent. CE] (D. G. Hogarth, "The Gerousia of Hierapolis," *JPhil* 19, no. 37 [1891]: 69–101, esp. 70 and 72, respectively). William M. Ramsey makes four key observations regarding the Gerousia in Imperial period Phrygia, a region to the east of Lydia (*The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest*, vol 1, Pt. 1 [Aberdeen: 1895, repr. 2004]). First, "the Senate [*boulē*], the *Demos* and the *Gerousia* often united in the preamble to honorary decrees" but that this fact does not mean "all were political in character; for we find occasionally the Senate, *Demos, Gerousia* and *Neoi* [who met as an exercise club in a gymnasium] united in such honorary decrees" (Ibid., 110 and 110 n. 2, respectively). Second, "the inscriptions show what importance was attached in Asia Minor to the care of tombs, and the Gerousia, as the body most trusted in these cases, became very wealthy corporations" (Ibid., 109). Third, "a resolution of the *Gerousia* had some analogy to a *senatus auctovitas*, a decree vetoed by a tribune and therefore devoid of legal force, yet having the weight naturally attaching to the mere opinion of a body so influential and respected" (Ibid., 112). Fourth, the *gerousiai* in Asia Minor had "as a rule, some building as their centre, a clubhouse and meeting-house combined." Examples in Asia Minor include a basilica (Thyatira), a "Gerousia" (Nikomedeia; Plin. *ad Traj.* 33), a stoa (Teos), a "Gerontikon" (Nysa), and most commonly a gymnasium (e.g., Sidyma) (Ibid., 112).

146   See Hansen, "*Kome*," 45–82. See n. 35 (Ch. 2) where P. J. Rhodes notes that only a (larger) *polis* has a *boulē*.

147   Note that the term *bouleutai* (councilors) is not used, but rather the participle (*bouleusamenōn*, "those who gave counsel/those who were councilors").

148   See n. 49 (Ch. 1) for the definition of a "city-ethnic" by Mogens Hermann Hansen.

a dependency ruled by a major *polis* but in other respects had a substantial amount of self-government, and thus could be called a *polis* as well."[149]

Second, Christoph Schuler, following Wilhelm Dittenberger, suggests that the *gerousia* of Kastollos, while not a *boulē* proper, does designate village elders with civic responsibilities.[150] He cites *OGIS* 488 as being but one example of an official corporate body of *geraioi* (sometimes, but not always, designated as a *gerousia*) which was constituted within many Imperial period Anatolian village communities and whose function resembles that of the *boulē* of a *polis*.[151] Third, the clause *genomenēs ekklēsias* can be said to allude to the fuller expression *ekklēsias kyria genomenēs*,[152] which R. M. Errington contends is technical terminology that indicates the existence of a quorum within a civic assembly,

---

149   Hansen, "*Kome*," 73–74.

150   Christof Schuler writes, "Bemerkenswert ist die Rolle der Gerusie, die in Kastollos und Orkistos mit der Einberufung der Gemeindeversammlung bzw. deren Vorsitz sehr ähnliche Funktionen wahrhahm ... Dazu merkte bereits Dittenberger an, daß diese dörfliche Gremium, das für ihnnoch <<unum exemplum *gerousias* pagi>> war, seiner Funktion nach der *boulē* einer Polis entsprach" (*Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* [München: C. H. Beck, 1998], 227; Cf. Wilhelm Dittenberger, ed., *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae. Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*, vol. 2 [Leipzig: Hildesheim, 1903–5/repr. 1960], 121–22 or http://www.archive.org).

151   Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen*, 227. Michael Ballance notes that there appear to be only two inscriptional examples wherein "the γεραιοί are distinguished from the other οἰκήτορες ('inhabitants') of a village." Both hail from Imperial period Roman Asia (*OGIS* 488 and *MAMA* XI 294) (http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-294.html [University of Oxford and the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents]; accessed April 2, 2013). *MAMA* XI 294 is an honorific inscription of the "elders and all the inhabitants" of a village on the territory of Ikonion. It reads, K̲A̲N̲A̲I̲O̲[- - -] εων γεραιοὶ κα[ὶ πάν]τες οἱ οἰκή[τορες] Μάνιον Πασικ[ράτους] 5 τὸν ἑαυτῶν εὐ[εργέ]την τῷ τε ει[..*4–5*..] τηρίῳ καὶ τῷ [..*4–5*..] ἐτε̲ί̲μ̲η̲σ̲α̲ν̲ [*vac.* (?)]("... the elders and all the inhabitants honoured Manius son of Pasik[rates], their benefactor, with the [...] and the[...]"). See also, P. Thonemann, ed., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua XI: Monuments from Phrygia and Lykaonia recorded by M. H. Balance, W. M. Calder, A. S. Hall and R. D. Barnett* (JRSM 12; London: Roman Society Publications, 2013). Peter Thonemann (Wadham College, Oxford) comments that *MAMA* XI is "a corpus of 387 inscriptions and other ancient monuments, 292 of which are unpublished, from Phrygia and Lykaonia recorded by Sir William Calder (1881–1960) and Dr. Michael Ballance (†27 July 2006) in the course of annual expeditions to Asia Minor in 1954–1957" (http://www.currentepigraphy.org/2012/09/24/mama-xi/; accessed April 3, 2013).

152   The complete sentence in *OGIS* 488 reads, γενομένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν χωμητῶν πάντων.

particularly in Asia Minor (4th to 2nd cents. BCE).[153] Evidence that the simpler collocation *genomenēs ekklēsias* can carry the same legal connotation as does *ekklēsias kyria genomenēs* is found in four other Asia Minor inscriptions, the latest of which dates to the *terminus ad quem* of Errington's examples of the clause *ekklēsias kyria genomenēs*.[154] If the fact that the *ekklēsia kyria* is no

---

153   R. M. Errington notes 54 inscriptions from Asia Minor which contain the clause ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες (or οὔσης) ("ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες," *Chiron* 25 [1995]: 19–25). These decrees date from 367/66 BCE to *c.* 140 BCE. At least two are undatable (*Samos* 14 and 61; ἐκκλησίας νομαίας οὔσης). An additional 4 inscriptions outside of Asia Minor date to the 2nd century CE. I would add three observations that are not included in Errington's conclusions. First, not only civic bodies, but at least one non-civic group, the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs (*Sinuri* 73/8, Caria; 350/344 BCE), use the formulaic ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες ([ἔδοξεν] Πελεκωδος συγγενεῦσι [συ]νελθοῦσι πᾶσιν· vacat [ἐκκλ]ησίης κυρίης γενομένης) (see my fuller discussion of *Sinuri* 73/8 in n. 179 [Ch. 2]). Second, at least one more Asia Minor inscription dates after 140 BCE (*TAM* II 168; Lycia, Hippokome; 2/1 cent. BCE; [ἐπὶ ἱ]ερέ[ως Τ]ο[άλλεως τοῦ] [Πειγάσεω]ς μηνὸς Ἡρα[ιῶνος? . .] [ἐν' τοῖ]ς ἀρχαιρεσίοις ἐκλησ[ία]ς κυ[ρί][ας γεν]ομένης ἔδοξεν Ἱπποκωμητῶ[ν][τῆ βο]υλῆ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἀρχόντων). Third, Hellenistic-era Thessaly is alone in substituting the Athenian-style adjective κυρίας with ἐννόμου within the clause ἐκκλησίας γινομένης. There are only three extant examples of the collocation ἐκκλησίας γινομένης ἐννόμου. They are *IG* IX,2 259 (Thessaliotis—Kierion: Sophades; 117 BCE; ἐκκλησία⟨ς⟩ [γενομέ]⟨ν⟩ης ἐννόμου), *IThess* I 16 (Thessalia [Thessaliotis]—Kierion: Sophades; 125 BCE; ἐκκλησία⟨ς⟩ [γενομέ]⟨ν⟩ης ἐννόμου), and *SEG* 25:687 (Thessalia [Magnesia]—Korope; Hellenistic period). *SEG* 25:687 recounts regulations concerning the cult of Zeus Akraios.

154   *MbBerlin* 1880:646 (Cappodocia, Hanisa [Kültepe]; 2/1 cent. BCE). In *MbBerlin* 1880:646 a quorum is clearly indicated through the notation that a vote was taken (*cheirotonian*) in the assembly: ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν γεγενημένην ἐν βουλῆι καὶ ἐκλησίαι χειροτονίαν ὑπάρχειν αὐτὸν εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου καὶ στεφανοῦσθαι ἔν τε τοῖς Διοσσωτηρίοις καὶ Ἡρακλείοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς κατὰ μῆνα καὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν δημοτελέσι συνόδοις [national assembly] χρυσῶι στεφάνωι. The three Asia Minor occurrences, other than *OGIS* 488/*TAM* V,1 222, are: (1) *Magnesia* 94/*IMagn* 13+ p. 295 (3rd cent. BCE; found at Magnesia Mai, Caria; "Honorary decree of [boule] and de[mos] [of Magnesia (Mai.)] for Thessalos ..."): στεφανηφ⟨ο⟩ροῦντος Μο[ι]⟨ων⟩[ίδου] ... π]⟨ρ⟩οέ[δρω]ν ἐ[π]ισ[τατοῦν][τος Δι]αγόρου τ⟨οῦ⟩ Ζωπύρο[υ, γραμ][ματεύον]τος Συμμάχου ... ⟨ἐ⟩[κκλ]ησί[ας γενομέ][νης; (2) *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 1 (267 BCE; Phrygia, Laodikeia Lyk. [Eski-Hissar]): βασιλευόντων Ἀντιόχου καὶ [Σ]ελεύκου ... ἐπ' Ἑλένου ἐπιμελητοῦ ⟨16τοῦ⟩16 τό[πο]υ· ἐκκλησίας γενομένης ἔδοξε Νεοτειχείταις καὶ Κι(16δ)16διοκωμίταις; and (3) *TAM* II 262 (256 BCE; Xanthos, W. Lycia): βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου Σωτῆρος ... ἐ[κ]κλησίας γενομένης ἔδοξε Ξανθίων τῆι πόλει. Outside of Asia Minor, and at the beginning of the 1st century CE, at least one Macedonian inscription continues to use the clause *genomenēs ekklēsias* as an indicator of a legal assembly (*Meletemata* 11 K2; 1 CE; see also *SEG* 35.744—cf. *SEG* 42.579; 46.754; 55.694). Its opening line reads, ἔτους · η΄ καὶ μ΄ · καὶ · ρ΄ οἱ πολιτάρχαι προβουλευσαμένων τῶν βουλευτῶν καὶ γενομένης ἐκκλησίας εἶπαν ἐν τῶι δήμωι·

longer extant in Asia Minor inscriptions after 99 CE indicates its disuse as a po-
litical designation,[155] then it is not surprising if the simpler *ekklēsias genomenēs*
replaced the full quorum clause *ekklēsias kyria genomenēs* during that same
timeframe.[156] Irrespective of historical questions, the *gerousia* in Kastollos did
not leave the status of a quorum open to question. All doubt is removed in the
explicit mention that both the *gerousia* and "all the rest of the villagers" (*tōn
loipōn chōmētōn pantōn*) attended the now legislatively authoritative *ekklēsia*.

   This enfranchisement of a *kōmē* with local jurisdictional responsibilities
also is not unexpected in Kastollos' "post-edict of Domitian" world. In 92 CE
Domitian decreed that at least half of the vineyards in the Greek East were to
be cut down and replaced with corn. Philadelphia and its surrounding *kōmai*,
with their rich volcanic soil, would have been among some of the hardest hit
regions. Viticulture was the agricultural foundation of the Philadelphians.[157]
Hemer notes that, given the two factors of ongoing earthquake repairs and a
depressed viticulture, "for most of the [2nd] century the state had probably
reverted largely to the older Lydian pattern of agricultural villages 'outside'
the city."[158] This being the case, 2nd century CE Lydian villages, including
Kastollos, would have gained more political autonomy, thereby necessitating
greater jurisdictional authority for governance over matters of local concern
(e.g., field boundaries).[159] This falls into line with the observation of Hansen

---

155   The phrase *ekklēsia kyria* is found over 50 times in Asia Minor inscriptions (starting in 367
      BCE), with the latest dating to 99 CE (*St.Pont.* III 141, Pontus and Paphlagonia; Διὶ Στρατίῳ
      [ὁ δῆμος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ] κυρίῳ ἐπὶ τῆς συν αρχίας Πομ[πωνίου — — — — τοῦ(?)] Κανδίδου,
      νεωκορούντος γ΄ [— — — — — — — — ο]υ Ἀγριππιανοῦ, ἐκ τῶν συν(λ)ε[λεγμένων
      χρημάτω]ν. ἔτους ρα΄.). The phrase *ekklēsia kyria* predominates in Athenian inscriptions
      with over 250 occurrences. The latest dates to 20/19 BCE (*Clinton, Sacred Officials* 50,D14/
      SEG 30:93) (see n. 84 [Ch. 2]).

156   The phrase *ekklēsias genomenēs* is extant in at least two late Imperial period inscriptions,
      but from a region north of Asia Minor: *IosPE* I² 44 and *IosPE* I² 47 (200–210 CE; Olbia,
      north shore of the Black Sea). *IosPE* I² 44 reads, [ἐπὶ ἀρ]χ[όντων τῶν περὶ —], [μηνὸ]ς
      Θα[ργηλιῶνος —, ἐκκ]λησί[ας γε]νομέν[ης πανδήμου, εἰ]σηγη[σαμένων τῶν συνέ]δρων. *IosPE*
      I² 47 reads, ἐπὶ ἀρχόντ[ων τῶν περὶ τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος, μηνὸς Ἀπα]τουρεῶνο[ς — — — —,
      ἐκκλησίας γενομένης πανδήμου, εἰσηγγη]σαμένων [τῶν συνέδρων, ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος εἶπεν·

157   Hemer, *Letters*, 155–56. This fact is numismatically attested in images of cornucopiae (e.g.,
      BMC Lydia, no. 54 of Caligula), of ears of corn (no. 56 of Claudius), of Demeter (no. 71 of
      Marcus Aurelius), of Dionysos (e.g., no. 66 of Trajan), and of bunches of grapes (no. 64 of
      Domitia).

158   Hemer, *Letters*, 159.

159   Schuler notes the lack of a *polis* council in villages within Roman Asia, and the govern-
      ing authority accorded the popular assembly: "in den meisten Dörfern gab es dagegen
      kein Äquivalent für den stadtischen Rat, und die ersammelten Mitglieder verkörperten

that a relative degree of political autonomy was enjoyed by some Asia Minor *kōmai*.[160] If Kastollos enjoyed such autonomy then it helps explain why it is one of only two inscriptions (*OGIS* 488, Lydia; *MAMA* XI 294, Phrygia) in which a *gerousia* and the villagers of a *kōmē* are inscriptionally differentiated within the context of a formal enactment decree.[161] By naming their village assembly an *ekklēsia*, the formal nature of their village decree is enhanced, which, when coupled with differentiation of the *gerousia* from the villagers, presents Kastollos as a *polis* that contains the political equivalents of a *boulē* (*gerousia*) and a *dēmos* (villagers). The *ekklēsia* convened by this *kōmē* is, thus, implicitly affirming the legal right of the *kōmē* of Kastollos autonomously to divide the field called *Agathōn*.

The fact that the *gerousia* of Kastollos was involved in a land transaction is not out of character either: a roughly contemporaneous *gerousia* in Ionia used land transactions as a source of income.[162] The close association of Asia Minor *gerousiai* with *gymnasia*[163] opens up the possibility that *OGIS* 488 may even recount the division of land for the purpose of constructing a *gymnasium*[164] and/

---

deshalb allein die *chōmē* oder die *katoixia*. Wenn die *chōmē* einen Beschluß faßte, so standen dahinter eben die Gemeindemitglieder und keine andere Instanz außer ihnen. Sie brauchten deshalb nicht also *dēmos* identifiziert werden" (*Ländliche Siedlungen*, 226).

160 See Hansen's comments on *kōmai* in n. 141 (Ch. 2).

161 *OGIS* XI 488 and *MAMA* XI 294 both date into the Roman Imperial period. See n. 151 (Ch. 2) for Ballance's comments.

162 Gaston Deschamps and Georges Cousin analyse an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander during the time of Hadrian. It describes, among other things, how the *gerousia* (*to systēma tōn presbyterōn*; lines 3–4) used land possession and exploitation as a source of income (*IMagn* 316) ("Inscription de Magnésie du Méandre," *BCH* 12 [1888]: 204–223). Deschamps and Cousin state that "le σύστημα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων est le meme corps que la γερουσία" (Ibid., 211) and that this *gerousia* gains income for local *philanthrōpa* from "le rendement des terres et des industries dépendant de la gérousia" (Ibid., 214). The second part of the inscription (lines 30 to 67) provides a list of philanthropic acts.

163 See n. 145 (Ch. 2) for examples of the type of clubhouses/meeting-houses used by *gerousiai* in Asia Minor. The gymnasium was their most common meeting place (e.g., Sidyma) (Ramsey, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 112).

164 Dinsmoor describes the interrelationship between the Hellenistic and Roman period *palaistra* and gymnasium: "the gymnasium proper was the open [or enclosed] athletic ground for running, jumping, and throwing, while the name palaestra was given to the enclosed structures wherein wrestling and the like were practised" (William Bell Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of Its Historic Development* [New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1950], 320). The gymnasium is well attested beginning already in the 3rd century BCE (M. L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* [Berlin: 1887], 234 n. 46; cf. Arch. Pap. Xiii 1938, 29 n. 3).

or a *palaistra*.[165] While these last two points represent inference rather than evidence, I would suggest that the combined weight of all the evidence tips the scale in favour of seeing a municipal-style, village-wide decision-making process at work in OGIS 488. It does not appear that a non-civic group living within the *kōmē* of Kastollos effected this transaction in a semi-public *ekklēsia*.

The decree in *Samos* 119 also incorporates a *gerousia* and the word *ekklēsia*, but does so within the decree of a non-civic group, the association of *aleipho-menoi* ("gymnasts").[166] The *aleiphomenoi* of Samos *synagō eis ekklēsian* within the *palaistra* of the *gerousia* in order to enact an honorific decree (*psēphisma*) for a benefactor (*euergetēs*).[167] Harland notes that the phrase *eis ekklēsian*

---

165   Wrestling schools (*aleiphomenoi*) met within *palaistrai*. A *palaistra* was not necessarily part of a *gymnasium*, since a *palaistra* could function independently of a *gymnasium*. No *gymnasium*, though, could function without a *palaistra*. Beginning with the Hellenistic era, the architecture of a typical *palaistra* entailed a rectangular court demarcated by colonnades outside of which were adjoining rooms for dressing-rooms, baths, lectures, and the like (Dinsmoor, *Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 320–21). Dinsmoor notes that the size of the inner court varied but typically ranged from 104 sq. ft. (Delos) to 135 sq. ft. (Olympia) (Ibid., 320). Frederick E. Writer suggests that "there is no reason to believe that 'urban' gymnasia in larger cities ... were much larger in scale; doubtless when additional facilities were needed, civic authorities ... [prioritized] building additional smaller gymnasia rather than a single very large complex" (*Studies in Hellenistic Architecture* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006], 130).

166   *McCabe 1986*, no. 119/*Samos* 119 remains undated. Its opening line reads, ἐπὶ Λευκίππου· Ληναιῶνος ζ′· ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῆι γεροντικῆι παλαίστραι, συναχθεῖσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν (Donald F. McCabe, *Samos Inscriptions. Texts and List.* The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986], no. 119). See earlier publications of *Samos* 119 by Paul Frédéric Girard ("Inscriptions de Samos," BCH 5 [1881]: 477–91, esp. 480) and Louis Robert ("Inscriptions de Lesbos et de Samos," BCH 59 [1935]: 471–88, esp. 476–77). Girard notes that the stele now known as *Samos* 119 was found near Tigani ("Inscriptions de Samos," 480).

167   Samos is an island near the coast of Asia Minor, across the Aegean Sea from Athens. Samos has long-standing ties with Athens, not least as a cleruchy (365 BCE). A cleruchy was an ancient Athenian colony in which the cleruchs, or settlers, maintained their political allegiance to Athens and retained their Athenian citizenship. Two Athenian cleruchies (Delos, Samos) are associated with inscriptional evidence of a Greco-Roman association which names its semi-public assembly an *ekklēsia* (IDelos 1519; *Samos* 119). Schweigert notes that "there were three cleruchic expeditions to Samos: 365/4, 361/0, and 352/1" ("The Athenian Cleruchy on Samos," AJP 61.2 [1940]: 194–98). In 189 BCE, the Romans placed Samos under the rule of their vassal, the Attalid kingdom, which was a Hellenistic kingdom of Pergamon (Asia Minor). Just over fifty years later, Samos became part of Roman Asia when that Imperial province was officially established in 133 BCE upon the passing

refers to an assembly of the gymnastic association.[168] As such, the opening line of *Samos* 119 can be translated as follows: "With Leukippos presiding; on the seventh day of the month of Lenaion it was resolved by the athletes in the *palaistra* of the elders, who were gathered (*synagō*) in an assembly (*ekklēsia*)." Richard Ascough goes one step further and claims that *ekklēsia* is the collective self-designation of the *aleiphomenoi*.[169] Harland's evaluation appears preferable, though. The other 19 inscriptional pairings of *synagō* with *ekklēsia*, including the two more from Samos (*Samos* 4, 120), use *ekklēsia* only in reference to a civic assembly ("gathered together in an *ekklēsia*"), not to a group designation ("gathered as an *ekklēsia*").[170]

IDelos 1519 also mentions an *ekklēsia* that was held by a non-civic group, in this case, the Tyrian Herakleistai (153/2 BCE).[171] The Herakleistai are an association (*koinon, synodos*) of merchants, shippers, and warehousemen

---

of the heirless Attalus III. Roman hegemony was not established in the province, however, until after the defeat in 129 BCE of the (perhaps) illegitimate son of Eumenes II of Pergamon, who had sought to reestablish an independent Attalid kingdom ("Asia, Roman province," *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* [3d ed.; ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996], 163, 189–90). Iain Spence notes numerous instances in Samos' history which demonstrate its enduring commitment to Greek democratic rule (*Historical Dictionary of Ancient Greek Warfare* [HDWRCU 16; Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002], xxix, xxxv, 188).

168   Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 45 n. 75.

169   Ascough, "Matthew," 113.

170   There are 20 collocations of *synagō* with the word *ekklēsia* across 14 inscriptions. Seven of those fourteen inscriptions come from Asia Minor (195 BCE–1 BCE), all of which are honorary decrees, with fully three hailing from Samos (*Samos* 14, 119, 120). Of the fourteen inscriptions, only *Samos* 119 employs the preposition *eis*. There are four other Samian inscriptions which use the word *ekklēsia*, but not with the verb *synagō* (*Samos* 12, 21, 61, 122/ *SIG*³ 976). Only one of those four employs the preposition *eis* (*Samos* 21), but it pairs *eis tēn ekklēsian* with the verb *parerchomai*, not with *synagō* (παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν).

171   *IDelos* 1519, lines 1–2 = *CIG* 2271 = Foucart no. 43 (153/2 BCE; island of Delos). *IDelos* 1519 reads: ἐπὶ Φαιδρίου ἄρχοντος, Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος ὀγδόει, ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· Διονύσιος Διονυσίου ἀρχιθιασίτης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Πάτρων Δωροθέου τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνόδου, ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἀνανεωσάμενος τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι εὔνοιαν εἰς τὴν σύν[ο] δον . . . . . . δεδόχθαι τῶι κοινῶι τῶν Τυρίων Ἡρακλειστῶν ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων ἐπαινέσαι Πάτρωνα Δωροθέου καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτόν. See also, August Boeckh, Johannes Franz, Ernst Curtius, A. Kirchhoff, Hermann Roehl, eds. *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum* (4 vols.; Berlin: Reimer, 1828–77); P. Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs—thiases, éranes, orgéons, avec le texte des inscriptions relative à ces associations* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1873), 223–25; Franz Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38; Leipzig: Teubner, 1909/repr., Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen

in Delos.[172] At the time *IDelos* 1519 was inscribed, Delos was a free port having been restored by Rome to its former status as a cleruchy of Athens (167/6 BCE).[173] John Day notes that the association of Tyrian Herakleistai was one of the two most important non-Roman associations at Delos during the time of the Athenian cleruchy. The Poseidoniasts of Berytus were the other.[174]

In *IDelos* 1519, the Tyrians enact an honorific decree for a benefactor, ostensibly during an *ekklēsia*. Kloppenborg and Harland have both reversed their initial stance that the word *ekklēsia* is used as a collective designation for the Tyrian association.[175] They now translate *ekklēsia* as "assembly/meeting."[176] In this regard, then, *IDelos* 1519 recounts the successful outcome of a decision reached in the Tyrians' *ekklēsia* ("assembly") to send an embassy to Athens for permission to construct a sanctuary for Herakles. This view is reinforced in the Tyrians' mimesis of stock civic terminology from Athenian inscriptions, specifically the standard opening lines of an enactment decree.[177] Three of the five

---

Republik, 1967), 332; Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch," 212–38, esp. 231; Ascough, "Matthew," 113; Harland, *Associations*, 106; idem, *Dynamics of Identity*, 44–45, 111.

172   Scholars date *IDelos* 1519 either to 153/2 BCE or to 149/148 BCE. See Monika Trümper's discussion in "Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos. The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 49–100, esp. 55 nn. 21 and 22.

173   Trümper, "Non-Delians," 49. John Day observes that between 144 and 126 BCE all extant inscriptional evidence of an Athenian cleruchy ceases (*Greek History: An Economic History of Athens Under Roman Domination* [New York: Columbia University Press/Arno Press, 1942/repr. 1973], 75).

174   Day notes that by 110 BCE, the Poseidoniasts built an extensive complex northwest of the Sacred Lake (*Greek History*, 67). Their complex of buildings includes shops/storerooms, a club-house, and various rooms dedicated to religious observances. For precise archeological descriptions of the Poseidoniasts' complex, see Trümper, "Non–Delians," 53–58.

175   Initially, both Kloppenborg and Harland interpreted the word *ekklēsia* in *IDelos* 1519 as referring to a group designation (Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch," 231; Harland, *Associations*, 106 and 182).

176   Kloppenborg has rescinded that initial estimation by email (see n. 137 [Ch. 2]). Harland reverses his 2003 opinion in a later book (2009): *IDelos* 1519 "recounts the outcome of a particular assembly (ἐκκλησία) of the members of the association, who are also called 'society members' (θιασίται)" (*Dynamics of Identity*, 111).

177   The opening line of *Epigr. tou Oropou* 297 serves as an example of the standard opening line(s) of an Athenian-style enactment decree (McLean, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 219–220). *Epigr. tou Oropou* 297 (332/1 BCE; Oropos in Boiotia, central Greece) is an honorific decree of Athens for Phanodemos, son of Diyllos. Its opening line reads, θεοί. ἐπὶ Νικήτου ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος ἐνάτης πρυτανείας, ἧι Ἀριστόνους Ἀριστόνου Ἀναγυράσιος ἐγραμμάτευεν, Θαργηλιῶνος ἑνδεκάτει, τρίτηι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας.

standard Athenian terms are evident along with one other common term—
ekklēsia.[178] This political mimicry of civic terminology by a Delian voluntary
association is not surprising given that, during that time, Delos was a cleruchy
of Athens.

There is one other potential inscriptional example, not previously noted by
scholars, of a non-civic group using *ekklēsia* terminology: *Sinuri* 8/73 (4th cent
BCE; Asia Minor, Caria).[179] The group behind *Sinuri* 73 is a *syngeneia*, not a

---

McLean notes that, aside from the occasional invocation (e.g., θεοί; "to the gods"), the
standard opening for an Athenian-style decree contains at least five elements. Any com-
bination of these five provide dating details for the enactment formula (ἔδοξεν τῆι ...)
which follows. First, the name of the eponymous magistrate is given followed by his title
in the genitive (e.g., ἐπὶ Νικήτου ἄρχοντος; "during the archonship of Nikētos"). Second, in
Athens, the name of the prytanizing tribe is given (e.g., ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθηίδος; "during the
[*prytany*] of [the tribe] Erechthēidos"). Third, the ordinal sequence of the *prytaneia* is
stated (e.g., ἐνάτης πρυτανείας; "of the ninth *prytaneia*"). Fourth, the day of the month is
given (τρίτηι καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας; "on the thirty-third day of the *prytaneia*"). Fifth,
other officers are cited, such as the secretary of the prytany or of the *boulē* (ἧι Ἀριστόνους
Ἀριστόνου Ἀναγυράσιος ἐγραμμάτευεν; "when Aristonous, son of Aristonos, of [the deme]
Anagyrasios was secretary"). McLean observes that "the name of the secretary gave offi-
cial sanction to public documents and became a means of identifying and dating decrees,
in the same way we might assign a document an identification number for easy refer-
ence" (Ibid., 219). McLean does not add a sixth element, which also often occurs in the
standard opening lines of an inscription. At least 1064 Athenian inscriptions mention, in
their opening lines, that a formal *ekklēsia* had been convened.

178   *IDelos* 1519 follows two of the five recurring elements in the standard opening line of an
Athenian-styled inscription, with a third evident later in the inscription. In order, *IDelos*
1519's correlation is as follows: (1) the eponymous magistrate is named (ἐπὶ Φαιδρίου
ἄρχοντος); (2) there is no name of the prytanizing tribe since Delos does not have a pry-
tany system; (3) there is no ordinal sequence of the tribe since Delos does not have a
prytany system; (4) day of the month (Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος ὀγδόει); and (5) other political of-
ficers are not cited, contrary to normal civic *praxis*. Rather, political officers are cited well
after the opening lines in lines 45–47 (ἐπιμελὲς δὲ ἔστω τοῖς καθισταμένοις ἀρχιθιασίταις
καὶ ταμίαις καὶ τῶι γραμματεῖ). A sixth political element in a standard opening line is also
evident in the Tyrian honorific decree: enactment within an *ekklēsia*. The Tyrians met *en
ekklēsia* within the temple of Apollos: ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. Citing a loca-
tion for the *ekklēsia* (ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι) also mimics Athenian inscriptional *praxis*. Examples of
locations for Athenian *ekklēsiai* in the mid-2nd century BCE include: ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι (e.g.,
IG II² 905, 175/4 BCE; 135 occurrences in the 2nd cent. BCE); ἐμ Πειρ[αιεῖ (e.g., *Agora* 16
290[1], 170/69 BCE; 46 occurrences in the 2nd cent. BCE); ἐν Διονύσου (e.g., *IG* II² 896, 186/6
BCE; 4 occurrences in the 2nd cent. BCE).

179   I thank Christina Williamson for bringing this inscription to my attention. *Sinuri* 73
(350/344 BCE) is numbered "*Sinuri* 8" by PHI. *Sinuri* 73 is published and discussed by

polis or a *koinon*. A *syngeneia* is a kinship-based group, whether biological or mythical.[180] Louis Robert claims that the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs is a non-civic group.[181] He postulates that this 4th century *syngeneia* of Pelekōs is a family clan generationally in charge of the temple of a Carian deity named Sinuri.[182] His conclusion is based upon the common occurrence of the family toponym "Pelekōs" in the list of eponymous priests in Caria (*Sinuri* 5, 73).[183] The *syngeneia* of Pelekōs did not use *ekklēsia* as a group designation. The family clan identifies only its semi-public meeting as an *ekklēsiē kyriē*.[184] If Errington is

---

Louis Robert, *Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa. Première partie* (Les inscriptions grecques; Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul 7; Paris: De Boccard, 1945). Louis Robert examines *Sinuri* 73 further in "Décret d'une *syngeneia* Carienne au sanctuaire de Sinuri," *Hellenica* VII (1949): 59–68, esp. 64–65. *Sinuri* 73 is an honorary decree of the "*syngeneis* of Pelekos for [...]s (?) Nesaios" in Sinuri. It includes a curse in the case of a violation. PHI notes other citations of *Sinuri* 73 in BE 1944: 168; Wilhelm, SAWW 224, IV (1947): 3–5, 11–20 (= Akadschr. III 251–253, 259–268); BE 1948: 215; and BE 1950: 181.

180   For an extensive analysis of *syngeneiai* in both literary and epigraphical sources, see Lee E. Patterson (*Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* [Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010], esp. 109–123 for epigraphic evidence of kinship diplomacy). Patterson examines the role that kinship myth plays in the construction of political and cultural identity. Mythic kinship in the realm of politics is evident when a Greek *polis* claims *syngeneia* with other Greek *poleis* in order to create deeper socio-political ties. For example, the decree of Allaria (200 BCE) confirms friendship (*syngeneis*) with, and *asylia* of, Teos (*LW* 73, *Teos* 3, *ICret II Allaria* no. 1 [ll. 4, 12]). It reads, ἐπειδὴ Τήϊοι φίλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχοντες ψάφισμα καὶ πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλαν⟨61⟩61[51τες]51 παρ' ἁμὲ Ἀπολλόδοτον καὶ Κωλώτην.

181   Robert writes, "La syngeneia, avant d'être dans lès cités hellenisées une subdivision de la tribu, a du être une cellule indépendante de la vie politique dans lès campagnes de la Carie" (*Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri*, 93).

182   The sanctuary of Sinuri was located just a few miles east of Mylasa. Robert writes, "C'est difficilement une coïncidence fortuite quele permier nom sur la liste des prêtres de Sinuri no. 5 soit celui d'un Πελλεκως Πελλεχως ou Πελλεχως semble avoir été à la fois, ce qui ne peut surprendre, au milieu du IVᵉ siècle, le chef du clan familial (συγγενεῖς Πελεχωδος) et le prêtre à vie de Sinuri, dont la parenté—frères ou descendants—conserva héréditaire-ment le sacerdoce pendant de longues générations" (*Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri*, 95).

183   Robert, *Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri*, 95.

184   The text of *Sinuri* 73 is found in *Hornblower, Mausolus* M5. The 15 lines read: [ἔδοξεν] Πελεκωδος συγγενεῦσι [συ]νελθοῦσι πᾶσιν· vacat [ἐκκλ]ησίης κυρίης γενομένης EN . [. c.4 .] ι, Νησαιωι καλῶι κἀγαθῶι vacat [γεγ]ενημένωι εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐμπε[δώσαντι?] [. c.4 . τὴ]ν ἐντολὴν τὴν Ἰδριέως καὶ Ἄδα[ς καὶ?] [. c.6 . .]ασθαι ἀδελφὸν ἑαυτῶν αὐ[τόν τε] [καὶ ἐκ]γόνους το[ὐ]ς τούτο[υ] εἰς τὸν ἀ[εὶ χρόνον] [μετέ]χοντα πάν[των ὅσ]ων? κα[ὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις μετα] [δίδοτ] αι Πελεκωδος συγγε[νεῦσι καὶ] [δεδόσ]θαι αὐτῶι E . . EN . φ[όρ]ῳ[ν?] [πάν]των ἀτέλειαν πλὴν ἀπομ[οίρας·] [ἐὰν δ]έ τις ταῦτα παραβαίνη ἢ ἄκυρα π[οιῆ,] [ἐπικα]τάρατος ἔστω αὐτός τε καὶ τὰ τού[του] [πάν]τα ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου.

correct, then the legally binding nature of decisions reached during their *ekklēsiē kyriē* is implicitly reinforced in their use of the inscriptional formula *ekklēsiēs kyriēs genomenēs*.[185] The term *ekklēsiē kyriē* alludes back to the *ekklēsia kyria* held once every 36 (or 39) days in classical Athens (4th century BCE to 322 BCE),[186] the derivative assemblies of which continued in Athens,[187] and beyond,[188] some even into the Imperial period.[189]

---

185   See n. 153 (Ch. 2) for Errington's contention that inscriptional occurrences of the clause ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες (or οὔσης) indicate an official quorum for *ekklēsiai* across the Greek East from 367/66 BCE until at least *c*. 140 BCE ("ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες," 19–25).

186   By at least 355 BCE, classical Athens convened four types of *ekklēsia* (*kyria, nomimos, synklētos*, and *archairesia*) (Hansen, *Athenian Assembly*, 41–44). The principal *ekklēsia*, whose roots extend into the 5th century BCE, was called *ekklēsia kyria* (*Ath. Pol.* 43.3–6). It was convened ten times in the year, that is, once each *prytaneia* (Hansen, *Athenian Assembly*, 25–28). See n. 90 (Ch. 2) for a description of the all-embracing program of an Athenian *ekklēsia kyria*. Literary sources (e.g., *Ath. Pol.* 43.4–6) suggest that the three supplementary *ekklēsiai* in each *prytaneia* were generally designated "lawful" *ekklēsiai* (*nomimoi ekklēsiai*) (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 43:3; Aeschin., *Emb.* 72). Athenian inscriptions, however, make no mention either of a *nomimos ekklēsia*, or of the semantically related *ennomos ekklēsia*. Inscriptions with *ennomos* are predominantly found in central Greece between the 2nd cent. BCE and the 2nd cent. CE (Phokis and Thessaly; 36×). Other inscriptions with *ennomos* come from the Aegean Islands (7×), and Asia Minor (Pergamon in Mysia, 1×; Termessos, 1×). Acts' use of the phrase τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Acts 19:39) for the regular assembly of Ephesos is unattested in the inscriptional record. There is only one inscription extant from Asia Minor which uses the phrase τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. It dates to the 2nd century CE and comes from Termessos (*TAM* III 4). The adjective *nomimos* occurs once each in central Greece (Delphi, 185–175 BCE) and Asia Minor (Ephesos, 104 CE). The term *ekklēsia kyria* first appears epigraphically in *IG* I² 42, 22 (446/45 BCE). It is more regularly attested beginning in 336/35 as part of the *prytaneia* system described in the *Athenaion Politeia* (cf. *IG* II, 2 330). There are at least 1064 extant inscriptional mentions of ἐκκλησία in Athenian epigraphy. These are dated from the 4th cent. BCE until the 2nd cent. CE. Extant adjectival modifiers for the *ekklēsia* in Athens include κυρία (253), πρώτη (123×), ἐπιοῦσαν (102×), ἀρχαιρεσίαι (3×; *IG* II² 892, 188–87 BCE; *IG* II² 954, pre-159 BCE; *IG* II² 955, 159 BCE), καθήκουσαν (2×; *IG* II² 971, 140–39 BCE), σύγκλητος (2×; *IG* II² 945, 168–67 BCE; *IG* II² 911, 169–68 BCE).

187   See n. 84 (Ch. 2) for details on the Imperial period Athenian *ekklēsia kyria*.

188   Examples of non-Athenian *poleis* which adopt the title *ekklēsia kyria* for their civic assemblies include Kios (*IK Kios* 1; Bithynia, Asia Minor; 4th cent. BCE), Telmessos (*Clara Rhodos* 9:183; Lycia, Asia Minor; 258–256 BCE), Delos (*IDelos* 1502; Aegean Sea; 148/7 BCE), and Olympia (*IvO* 52; Peloponnesos, 138 BCE).

189   There are three inscriptional occurrences of the term *ekklēsia kyria* from the Imperial period: *Clinton, Sacred Officials* 50,D14/*SEG* 30:93 (20/19 BCE); *Peek, Asklepieion* 35(2) (Peloponnesos, Epidauros; 40–42 CE); *St.Pont.* III 141 (Asia Minor, Pontus and Paphlagonia, Amasia, 98/99 CE; for text see n. 156 [Ch. 2]).

By the Hellenistic period, however, only a civic entity known as *syngeneia* is inscriptionally extant in Sinuri (*Sinuri* 24a/*Sinuri* 22). This Hellenistic-era civic *syngeneia* appears to be some sort of political subdivision of Mylasa.[190] This means that its *ekklēsia* ("*kyrias ekklēsias*") had been transformed into a public institution for the entire community.[191] This development leaves only *IDelos* 1519 (and potentially *Samos* 119) as a Hellenistic-era, or later, inscription wherein a non-civic association names its semi-public meeting *ekklēsia*.

2.3.2   *The Non-Civic* Ekklēsia: *Politicization of Association Life?*

The foregoing analysis indicates that there does not appear to be inscriptional attestation of a community of people using the word *ekklēsia* as a collective designation prior to the 1st century CE.[192] At most, the word *ekklēsia* identifies the semi-public assemblies of three non-civic groups: the Samian wrestlers (*Samos* 119), the Tyrian Herakleistai (*IDelos* 1519), and the Sinurian cultists (*Sinuri* 73/8). Only the latter unequivocally predates Roman hegemony in the east. The honorary decree of the association of Samian wrestlers is not datable with certainty, while the Tyrian Herakleistai can be dated to the mid-2nd century BCE. Thus, at the very least, one of the three non-civic groups lived under Roman hegemony, though not under direct Roman rule. This still leaves open, though, the question as to how Romans in the 1st century CE might have perceived a non-civic group which enacted decrees within an *ekklēsia*.

---

190   Other Mylasan tribal clans around the same timeframe also self-describe as civic organizations called *syngeneiai*. Robert Sherk identifies two 2nd century BCE inscriptions which use the word *syngeneia* as a collective civic designation for the entire tribal clan, not simply for a family clan. The enactment formulae use *phylē* and *syngeneia*: *IMylasa* 108 (2nd cent. BCE; ἔδοξε τῶν Ὀτωρκονδέων φυλῆι); and *IMylasa* 123 (3rd/2nd cent. BCE; ἔδοξε τῆι Ὀγονδέων συγγενείαι) ("Eponymous Officials," 232).

191   *Sinuri* 24a (*Sinuri* 22 in the PHI website) is dated by Louis Robert into the Hellenistic period. In its entirety it reads: [—] Λέο[ν][τος —] κυρίας [ἐκκλησίας —] [—] . ΔΗΙ [—] ΩΝΠΑ [—]ΣΑΝ.

192   See also the discussion by Young-Ho Park of *ekklēsia* occurrences in the inscriptions of Greco-Roman associations. He too argues against the view that *ekklēsia* was used as a group self-designation, but rather contends it was used only as the title for an association's formal meeting. His argument, however, could have been strengthened on two fronts. First, he could also have investigated *OGIS* 488 and *Sinuri* 73 rather than only *Samos* 119, *IDelos* 1519, and *IGLAM* 1381–82. Second, he does not challenge the view of, for example, Kloppenborg that *IGLAM* 1381–82 is the decree of a non-civic association rather than a civic body (*Paul's Ekklēsia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in their Politico-Social World* [WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014], 56–60, esp. 59).

2.3.2.1   Roman Perceptions of Voluntary Associations

In general, voluntary associations were perceived by the Romans with partic-
ular unease. Suetonius notes that Julius Caesar dissolved "all *collegia* except
those of ancient foundation" during 47–46 BCE when he was seeking to so-
lidify his power base.[193] Roman prejudice towards voluntary associations con-
tinued even into the Imperial period.[194] Suetonius discusses the draconian
measures of Octavian (later known as Augustus) in the late 30's BCE to redress
the "anti-social practices that endangered public order" in Italy following the
resolution of the civil wars.[195] At the other end of the Roman empire, and over
a hundred years later, Pliny, the governor of Bithynia-Pontus in northern Asia
Minor (111–113 CE), wrote to the emperor Trajan requesting that he be allowed
to agree to the formation of an association of firefighters at Nikomedia. Trajan
denied the request and reminded Pliny that,

> we must remember that it is societies like these which have been respon-
> sible for the political disturbances in your province, particularly its towns.
> If people assemble for a common purpose, whatever name we give them
> and for whatever reason, they soon turn into a political club (*hetaeriae*).[196]

There is one type of association—Greek gymnastic associations—which
gained particular disapproval from Roman elites, especially from the senato-
rial class. If the Samian *aleiphomenoi* lived during the early Imperial period,
then Roman distaste may have been directed at them also. Plutarch, perhaps
tongue in cheek, describes Roman prejudice towards Greek preoccupation
with public nudity, specifically within *gymnasia*.[197] The displeasure of Cato
and Cicero, however, is unrestrained in their "ferocious denunciations of Greek

---

193   *Julius* 42; cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 14.213–16.

194   See Harland's regionally nuanced discussion on tensions and conflicts between civic
      authorities and associations (*Associations*, 161–73).

195   Translated by Rolfe (1913 [LCL]), with adaptations by Harland (*Associations*, 165).
      Brigandry had been on the rise, with some bands mimicking association terminol-
      ogy (*titulo collegi novi*, "the title of a new association"). As a result, Octavian, soon to be
      Augustus, "disbanded all associations [*collegia*], except such as were of long standing and
      formed for legitimate purposes" (*Divine Augustus*, 32:1–2).

196   Pliny, *Epistles* 10.34, translated by Rolfe (LCL). See also Harland, *Associations*, 137; Macro,
      "Cities of Asia Minor," 658–97; and Dmitriev, *City Government*, 308, 309.

197   Plut. *QR* 40. W. J. Slater notes that "the attack on athletics is as old as Euripides and Plato"
      ("Pantomime Riots," *CA* 13, no. 1 [Apr. 1994]: 120–44, esp. 134 n. 82).

gymnastic nakedness."[198] Elitist denunciations need to be taken with a grain of salt, however, since private *praxis* among Roman elites sometimes differed.[199]

This Roman prejudice against *gymnasia* and their *aleiphomenoi* would have received particular reinforcement during and after the Pantomime Riots in Rome (14–15 CE), which followed upon the death of Caesar Augustus.[200] Pantomimes specialized in a form of calisthenics that was taught in the *gymnasium*, known as *cheironomia*. *Cheironomia* was "designed to create graceful and rhythmic movements … which were the same as those for which the pantomimes were famous or notorious."[201] The fact that *cheironomia* was also practiced by *aleiphomenoi* may have positioned them, in the public eye, with the pantomimes through guilt by association.

2.3.2.2   The *Aleiphomenoi* of Samos (*Samos* 119)

If the Samian *aleiphomenoi* existed around the time of the Pantomime Riots, or, for that matter, any time after Samos became part of the province of Roman Asia (129 BCE), and if Roman authorities would have viewed with suspicion the adoption of *ekklēsia* terminology by a non-civic group, then one would not expect political terminology in *Samos* 119. Yet the word *ekklēsia* does occur, and it does so within the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian*, which suggests a *terminus post quem* for *Samos* 119 of the mid-2nd century BCE, that is, the period of Roman ascendancy in the Greek East.

Samos 119 is in select company, within the inscriptional record, when it comes to using the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian*,[202] and alone

---

198   Cicero, *Resp.* 4.4.4. Additional critique can be found in Pliny, *Ep.* 4.22.7; Hor. *Od.* 3.24.51, *Sat.* 2.2.10; Tac. *Ann.* 14.14–15, 20–21; Pliny, *NH* 15.19, 29.26; *Paneg.* 13.6; Mart. 7.32; Luc. 7.270; Suet. *Dom.* 4. See Slater, "Pantomime Riots," 134 n. 84.

199   Slater observes that one of the most distinguished men of Caesarean Rome, L. Munatius Plancus, acted out a Greek mythological theme in a pantomime at a private occasion in Egypt, and apparently with his elite audience's approval (Vell. Pat. 2.83.2) ("Pantomime Riots," 136).

200   Slater notes that this riot was significant enough that six historians mention it: Tac. *Ann.* 1.77; Dio 57.14.10; Vell. Pat. 2.126.2; Suet. *Tib.* 34.1; Zos. 1.6.1; possibly also, Valerius Maximus (2.4.1) ("Pantomime Riots," 125 n. 32).

201   Slater, "Pantomime Riots," 133–34. *Cheironomia* involves silent, expressive gesticulation also used in pantomime performances. For *cheironomia* in the *palaistra* see, for example, Plato, *Leg.* 814–15; Plut. *Mor.* 747A; Dio Prus. 32.20; Galen, *De Sanit. Tuend.* 6.325.1; Diod. Sic. 1.16.1; Athen. 14.629b–c; Polyb. 9.20.6; Synes, *De Insomniis* 20.

202   In each of the 302 inscriptional examples where the phrase *eis ekklēsian*, with or without the article *tēn*, occurs, that prepositional phrase refers to public, not semi-public, assemblies which are open to citizens of a *polis*. The latest extant example of the phrase *eis* (*tēn*)

in its pairing of *eis ekklēsian* with *synagō*.[203] If one broadens the syntactical search criteria to an investigation of instances in which *synagō* is paired only with the noun (*ekklēsia*), then a two hundred year compositional window for *Samos* 119 opens.[204] There are fourteen inscriptions which together pair *synagō* with the word *ekklēsia* twenty times. Of the seven inscriptions which hail from Asia Minor, four date between 195 BCE and 1 BCE, and the other three inscriptions, which are from Samos, are undated (*Samos* 14, 119, 120). If this syntactical correlation between the three Samian and four Asia Minor inscriptions also reflects a correlation in compositional timeframe, then, at the earliest, *Samos* 119 dates to the 2nd or 1st centuries BCE.

A 2nd century BCE *terminus post quem* also accords with Greek literary evidence. The collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* is found with some frequency in Greek literary sources, specifically in the writings of Polybius,[205] Diodorus

---

ekklēsian is in an honorary decree by the *boulē* of Ephesos in 104 CE (*IEph* 27E/*IEphesos* 153). Of the 302 juxtapositions of *eis* and *ekklēsian*, 233 are articular (*eis tēn ekklēsian*). The article *tēn* is reconstructed in 86 cases and *eis* in 131 instances. Only six inscriptions use the simple anarthrous phrase *eis ekklēsian* without any adjectival qualifiers. One of those six is *Samos* 119.

203   See Appendix 4 (Synagō *and* Eis Ekklēsian: *Greek Sources*). The verbal pairings associated with the six inscriptional occurrences of *eis ekklēsian* are as follows: *Samos* 119 (Samos, Aegean Islands, undatable; ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῆι γεροντικῆι παλαίστραι, συναχθεῖσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν· "resolved by the wrestlers/gymnasts ... to gather together in [an] assembly"); *IEph* 1383 (Ephesos; συνελθόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν); *IMT NoerdlTroas* 7/*IK* 6,7 (Troas, Asia Minor, 100–66 BCE; καθ᾽ ὃ τιμηθήσεται προξενίαι Διονυσόδωρος ἐξενεγκεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν); *SEG* 13:458 (Thasos, Aegean Islands, 2nd/1st BCE; καθ᾽ ὃ τιμηθήσεται προξενίαι Διονυσόδωρος, ἐξενεγκεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν); *IMYL* 135/*Mylasa* 11 (Mylasa, 5th BCE–2nd CE; ἀπεγράψαντο ἔφοδον εἰς βουλὴν κα[ὶ ἐκκλησίαν ποιούμενοι); *IMilet* I 2/*Miletos* 9 (Miletos; οἱ μὲν θεοπρόποι εἰσαγγειλάτωσαν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν).

204   There are seventeen inscriptions in which the verb *synagō* is paired with the noun *ekklēsia*. None of these seventeen come from Attica, with only four hailing from Hellas proper (Macedonia, Thessaly, and Peloponnesos). The seventeen inscriptions are: *Aphrodisias* 2 (*BCH* [1972]: 443–45); *EKM* 1. Beroia 1; *IMT Adram Kolpos* 732; *IC* II xii 20; *Ilasos* 4.33–110; *IosPE* I² 33; *IvO* 52; *Milet* I 3, 145; *Meletemata* 11 K1; *Rigsby, Asylia* 52c; *Samos* 4; *Samos* 119; *Samos* 120; *Sardis* VII,1 8 (*IGRR* 4.1756); *SEG* 25:687; *SEG* 47:1280; *SEG* 51:1055. Only *Samos* 119 pairs *synagō* and *ekklēsia* (unmodified, anarthrous) within a prepositional phrase (*eis ekklēsian*).

205   Polybius (*c.* 203–*c.* 118 BCE; Arcadia of Macedonia) uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* at least 13 times. He pairs *synagō* five times with the unmodified phrase *eis ekklēsian* (*Hist.* 1.45.2; 5.1.6; 22.10.10; 22.12.5; and 23.5.16). Polybius began to write his "universal history" around 167 BCE and recounted events only up to the destruction of the cities of Corinth and Carthage in 146 BCE.

Siculus,[206] Josephus,[207] Plutarch,[208] and Pausanias.[209] These writings date somewhere from the time of Roman ascendancy (mid-Hellenistic) into the Imperial period.[210] Of these five writers, Josephus most frequently collocates *synagō* with *ekklēsia* (13 of his 48 *ekklēsia* references)[211] and he appears to do so in technical fashion.[212] Eleven of those thirteen pairings use the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian*.[213] In each of those eleven passages Josephus

---

206   Diodorus Siculus (Sicily) wrote between 60 and 30 BCE. He juxtaposes *synagō* with *ekklēsia* at least eighteen times. He pairs *synagō* four times with *eis ekklēsian* (14.38.4; 15.74.5; 16.10.3; 17.94.5).

207   Josephus (37–100 CE, Jerusalem), originally known as Joseph ben Matityahu, but after the Jewish Revolt as Titus Flavius Josephus, uses *ekklēsia* a total of 48 times. He pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia* fourteen times. Of these fourteen pairings, he uses the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* eleven times.

208   Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE; Chaeronea, Beoetia) uses *synagō* with *ekklēsia* at least fifteen times. Of these, seven times he pairs *synagō* with the prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* (*Aemilius Paulus* 11.1; *Casear* 19.2; *Caius Marius* 33.3; *Fabius Maximus* 3.4; *Lycurgus* 29.1; *Pericles* 33.5; 43.2).

209   Pausanias (2nd cent. CE; Lydia) pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia* only once. This sole occurrence is the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* (*Description of Greece* 4.5.6).

210   Greek writers who pair *synagō* with the noun *ekklēsia*, but not with the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian*, are: Thucydides (c. 460 BCE–c. 395 BCE; *Pelop. War* 2.60.1), Xenophon (c. 430–354 BCE; *Anabasis* 1.3.2), and Demosthenes (384–322 BCE; *Letters* 1.5).

211   Josephus uses the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* twenty-five times, eleven of which occur with the verb *synagō*. The other prepositional phrases used by Josephus to indicate an assembly of people are εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (4×), εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας (1×), ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (1×), ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1×), and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίας (1×).

212   Josephus does pair verbs other than *synagō* with the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* (i.e., *epeimi, synkaleō, synerchomai, athroizō, proagō, proeimi*). Josephus' collocation of the verb *epeimi* and *ekklēsia* (4×; *A.J.* 6:86; 8:222, 358; *Vita* 268), for example, is consistent with Greek inscriptional *praxis* for denoting the formation of an assembly of people. Inscriptional evidence of this *praxis* comes from Athens and its cleruchies (162× [e.g., Athens, 135×; Delos, 160–145 BCE, 18×]) and literary evidence of this *praxis* is found among Athenian and non-Athenian writers (e.g., Thuc. *Pelop. War* 1.139.3; 4.118.14; 6.8.2; Lysias, *Against Erat.* 12.72; Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 10.1). The verbs, other than *synagō*, which Josephus uses (*epeimi, synkaleō, synerchomai, proagō, proeimi*) are also found in Greek literary and inscriptional sources for indicating the assembly of people into a civic *ekklēsia*.

213   There are two instances in which Josephus pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia*, but not with *eis ekklēsian*. They are found in *A.J.* 4:176 and *A.J.* 16:62. In *A.J.* 4:176 Josephus uses *ekklēsia* as a collective designation for Israel itself ("Moses gathered the congregation [*ekklēsia*] together near Jordan"). In *A.J.* 16:62, Josephus writes: "[Herod] gathered all the people (*pandēmon*) together in an assembly [*ekklēsia*]." Josephus also uses the articular phrase εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and its plural form εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας, a total of five times. These five articular prepositional phrases, though, are not paired with the verb *synagō*.

mentions a public *ekklēsia* being convened by the overseeing official of a Jewish community.[214]

The other four non-Athenian writers also appear to use the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* in technical fashion. In each of the seventeen combined usages by Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Pausanias, the official functionary who calls a group of people together (*synagō*) into a formal assembly (*eis ekklēsian*) is the presumed head of that group (e.g., general, king, ambassador).[215] Polybius describes two instances in which Greek *polis* officials rebuffed Roman officials who illegally tried to call an *ekklēsia*. His use of the clause *synagō eis ekklēsian* in his description of those two historical situations would have given particular emphasis to the irony inherent in that Roman move.

In books 22 and 23 of his *Histories*, Polybius mentions four elites who summon (*synagō*), or attempt to summon, a people into an assembly (*eis ekklēsian*). Two are juridically entitled to do so (the general Himilco, King Philip of Macedon).[216] The other two are not (Caecilius and Flamininus). These latter two are Roman emissaries of the Senate. They each presume the juridical power of an *archōn* in their desire to adjudicate between the Achaean league and the Spartans. The first emissary, Quintus Caecilius, attempts to summon (*synagō*) the Achaeans to a formal assembly (*eis ekklēsian*).[217] The Achaeans do not obey. Polybius reports that they stand on ceremony and claim

---

214 Josephus pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia* for formal assemblies of Jews called by Moses (*A.J.* 3:188; 4:36, 63, 142, 309), Joshua (*A.J.* 5:72, 93), Ahab (*A.J.* 8:368), Jehoshaphat (*A.J.* 9:8), Mordecai (*A.J.* 11:228), Ptolemy (*A.J.* 13:114), Herod (*A.J.* 16:62), and Queen Salome (*B.J.* 1:666).

215 Diodorus Sicilus mentions four officials: Herippidas, Dionysius, Dion, and Alexander the Great. Plutarch describes six: Julius Caesar, Caius Marius, Fabius Maximus, Lycurgus, Pericles, and Pompey. Instead of an individual, Pausanias mentions a ruling group, the Messenian kings.

216 *Hist.* 1.45.2 and 5.1.6, respectively.

217 *Hist.* 22.10.10, 11: [10] ὁ δὲ Καικίλιος ὁρῶν τὴν τούτων προαίρεσιν, ἠξίου τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῷ συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. [11] οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἄρχοντες ἐκέλευον αὐτὸν δεῖξαιτὰς ἐντολάς, ἃς εἶχε παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου περὶ τούτων. τοῦ δὲ παρασιωπῶντος, οὐκ ἔφασαν αὐτῷ συνάξειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ([10] "Caecilius, seeing how this meeting was disposed, demanded that the popular assembly should be summoned to meet him; [11] but the magistrates asked him to show them the instructions he had from senate on the subject; and, when he made no reply, refused to summon the assembly; [12] for their laws did not allow it unless a written request was presented from the senate stating what matters it desired to submit to the assembly"). English text from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Polybius/22*.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

that Caecilius' request is unlawful according to their laws.[218] Only an Achaean *archōn* has that authority and only if "a resolution has to be passed regarding war or peace."[219] Polybius can be said rhetorically to reinforce the presumptuous nature of Caecilius' demand by attributing to him an illegal attempt to *synagō* Achaeans *eis ekklēsian*.

A *terminus ad quem* of *Samos* 119 in the early Imperial period can be postulated given that the juxtaposition of *synagō* with *ekklēsia* is inscriptionally extant between 5 and 1 BCE (*Sardis* 7,1 8; IGRR 4.1756). The latest occurrence of the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* is found in a 2nd century CE literary work, Pausanias' *Descriptions of Greece*.[220] If the clause *synagō eis ekklēsian* in *Samos* 119 allows for a compositional range from the rise of Roman hegemony in the Greek East to Imperial rule in Asia Minor, then one could conclude that the

---

218   In his final use of the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian*, Polybius recounts the visit of another Roman emissary to the Achaeans, subsequent to Caecilius' visit. Flamininus also requests that they formally summon an assembly (*synagō eis ekklēsian*). He too is rebuffed for the same procedural reason used by the Achaeans in stonewalling his predecessor Caecilius. Polybius writes (*Hist.* 23.5.16): [16] ἐπεὶ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ναύπακτον ἔγραψε τῷ στρατηγῷ καὶ τοῖς δαμιουργοῖς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, κελεύων συνάγειν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ([13] "However, he appeared now in Greece with Flamininus, [14] convinced that he had only to show his face when the affairs of Messene would be arranged as he wished. [15] But Philopoemen, well knowing that Flamininus had no instructions from the senate regarding the affairs of Greece, kept quiet awaiting his arrival, and when, [16] on disembarking at Naupactus, he wrote to the strategus and damiurges of the Achaeans, ordering them to call the general assembly of the Achaeans, they replied that they would do so upon his informing them on what subjects he wished to address the Achaeans; [17] for that was the course imposed on the magistrates by their laws"). English text from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Polybius/23*.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

219   *Hist.* 22.12.5: [5] Ἀπελογήθησαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Καικίλιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχόντων οἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρέσβεις ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ, φάσκοντες οὐθὲν ἀδικεῖν αὐτοὺς οὐδ' ἀξίους ἐγκλήματος ὑπάρχειν ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ συνάγειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ([5] "The envoys from Achaea also spoke in the Senate defending their magistrates against Caecilius. They maintained that the magistrates had done nothing wrong and were deserving of no censure in not having summoned the assembly to meet, [6] the Achaean law being that the popular assembly is not to be summoned unless a resolution has to be passed regarding war or peace, or unless anyone brings a letter from the senate. [7] Their magistrates had therefore been right on that occasion; for while they had desired to summon the Achaeans to a general assembly they were prevented from doing so by the laws, as Caecilius was neither the bearer of letters from the senate nor would he show to their magistrates his written instructions"). English text from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/olybius/22*.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

220   See Appendix 4 (Synagō *and* Eis Ekklēsian: *Greek Sources*).

aleiphomenoi were not fearful of negative political repercussions in their adoption of *ekklēsia* terminology.

2.3.2.3   The Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos (*IDelos* 1519)

The Tyrian Herakleistai also appear not to fear repercussions from Romans, even though, in three ways, they mimic Athenian political terminology and processes. The first two have already been discussed: they enacted an honorific decree within an *ekklēsia* and they mimic four of the six elements of an Athenian-style enactment decree.[221] The third is the Tyrians' use of embassy selection protocol employed only a few years earlier by the *dēmos* of Delos (*IDelos* 1498). *IDelos* 1498 describes how the *dēmos* held a civic *ekklēsia* (*ekklēsia kyria*) in their *ekklēsiastērion* within which they voted upon delegates (*presbeis*) for an embassy they wished to send to the Athenian *boulē* and *ekklēsia*.[222] The Tyrian Herakleistai also adopt civic protocols for the non-civic mission of their association's embassy to Athens (*IDelos* 1519). This correlation between *IDelos* 1498 and *IDelos* 1519 appears not yet to have been noted by previous scholarship.

Wisely, though, the Tyrians avoid perceptions of pretentiousness by not replicating the full name of the civic assembly for Delos[223] and Athens[224]—*ekklēsia kyria*. Instead, they choose the simpler term *ekklēsia*. Given their intent to gain approval for the construction of a temple to Herakles, the fact that the Tyrians' mimicked both Athenian-style enactment decree formulae (e.g., *ekklēsia*) and Delian embassy selection protocol suggests that such political terminology was perceived by the Tyrians as aiding rather than as hindering their cause before the Athenian *boulē* and *ekklēsia*.

---

221   See n. 31 (Ch. 2) for details on the five standardized elements of enactment decrees.

222   *IDelos* 1498 (160–150 BCE) reads, ἐπὶ Ἀρισταίχμου ἄρχοντος, Γαμηλιῶνος δεκάτει ἱσταμένου· ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῶι ἐκκλησιαστηρίωι· Μένανδρος Μενάνδρου Μελιτεὺς εἶπεν· ... χειροτονῆσαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις ἤδη τρεῖς οἵτινες ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀθήνησιν βουλὴν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν παρακαλέσουσι τὸν δῆμον.

223   The civic assembly of Delos, which existed concurrently with the Tyrian Herakleistai, is called an *ekklēsia kyria* in *IDelos* 1498 (160–150 BCE) and in *IDelos* 1502 (148/7 BCE).

224   Of the over 250 occurrences of the phrase *ekklēsia kyria* in Athenian inscriptions (4th cent. BCE to 1st cent. BCE) at least 22 are dated to the 2nd century BCE. Examples include: *Agora* 15 170 (190/89 BCE); *IG* II² 897 (185/4 BCE); *Agora* 15 183 (182/1 BCE); *IG* II² 989 (140/39 BCE); *IG* II² 989 (mid-2nd cent. BCE); *IG* II² 1008 (118/7 BCE); *IG* II² 1011 (106/5 BCE).

It would not be unexpected for the Tyrians to have publicly displayed their honorific decree.[225] The Roman governing authorities would have expected Delians to demonstrate allegiance to Athens; non-Delians may have been another matter. The fact, however, that the non-Delian Tyrians still felt free publicly to display allegiance to Athens by using expressly political terminology suggests that they did not fear recrimination on the part of the Romans. Their Berytian counterparts even demonstrate that it was possible for non-Delians to cultivate positive relations with the Romans both for political and economic reasons.[226] These facts speak to Roman perceptions of non-civic groups in Delos using civic terminology; suspicion does not appear to have been one of their responses.

2.3.3 *Political Terminology: Associations as "Cities Writ Small"*

Even though extant evidence of *ekklēsia* usage by non-civic groups is rare, their use of other political terminology is more common.[227] Kloppenborg highlights Paul Foucart as being one of the first to observe that "associations imitated the structure of the *polis*."[228] As such, Kloppenborg suggests that a

---

225   The practice of publicly displaying, rather than archiving, civic honorific decrees is prevalent already in the Classical period but predominant by the Imperial period. Association decrees were also posted publicly, not least honorific decrees. One Imperial period example is the Theodotus inscription on the pre-70 CE synagogue in Jerusalem (John S. Kloppenborg, "Dating Theodotus (*CIJ* II 1404)," *JJS* 51.2 [2000]: 243–80). Membership lists also were made public: "in the case of Attic, Macedonian and Asian associations, their names could be found on a stele" (John S. Kloppenborg, "Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups," *EC* 4, no. 2 [2013]: 183–215, esp. 208).

226   Trümper notes that the Berytians allowed Romans to hold membership, and they even received substantial benefaction from a Roman banker Marcus Minatius Sexti filius (*IDelos* 1520; post-153/52 BCE). He was accorded many honours such as "two portraits in the clubhouse, a seat or couch of honor at banquets, a feast with blood sacrifice, a banquet in his honor, and the privilege to invite guests to various festivals" ("Non-Delians," 56–57; see also *AGRW*, no. 224). In later years the Berytians even dedicated a statue and an altar to the goddess Roma for her "benefaction" (*IDelos* 1778, 1779; 130–69 BCE; see *AGRW*, nos. 226 and 227, respectively), and an honorary decree for the Roman Praetor Gnaeus Octavius for his benefaction (*IDelos* 1782; pre-128 BCE or pre-87 BCE; see *AGRW*, no. 228).

227   Regarding the ostentatious use of civic terms by Greco-Roman associations, see, for example, Fransiczek Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (École Française d'Athènes; Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers de l'école et de divers savants 10; Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1969), 338.

228   Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch," 212–38. See also, idem, "Collegia and *Thiasoi*," 16–30. Harland (*Associations*, 106) cites Jean-Pierre Waltzing's observation that associations were, in numerous ways, "a veritable city within the city, a small country within the large one

Greco-Roman voluntary association could be called a "city writ small."[229] Even Roman associations (the *Romaioi*) in Greek *poleis* adopted a type of mini-city terminology.[230] Harland notes one example of civic mimesis as being "cross-overs in [civic] titles such as 'overseer' or 'bishop' (*episkopos*), 'elders' (*presbyteroi*), 'servant'/'deacon' (*diakonos*), and 'patroness' (*prostatis*)."[231]

What rationale drove this political impetus in non-civic groups? From the perspective of positive benefits, Kloppenborg contends that civic mimesis allowed many non-elite *politai*, particularly in the Imperial period, whose socio-economic status excluded them from participation in the *boulē* and other official political offices, to gain socio-religious status within the confines of

---

(cf. Foucart 1873 50–51; Dill 1956:269; Lane Fox 1986:85)" (*Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'empire d'Occident* [Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, 50; 4 vols.; Brussels: Hayez, 1895–1900], 2:184). Harland states that a sociological rather than a political rationale lay behind the reason why "many associations ... mirror civic organization" (*Associations*, 106).

229   "Collegia and *Thiasoi*," 26–27.

230   See Onno van Nijf, "Staying Roman—Becoming Greek: Associations of Romaioi in Greek Cities" (paper presented at *Associations in Context*, Copenhagen Associations Project, Copenhagen, October 11–13, 2012). In Latin texts they are called *cives romani qui ... negotiantur* (the Romans who are doing business) or the *Romani consistentes* (the Romans who are resident). In Greek inscriptions their names include *hoi Romaioi, hoi Romaioi pragmateuomenoi* and *hoi Romaioi katoikountes* (for a complete list of Greek inscriptional names, see Ibid., 1). Van Nijf argues that Roman associations played a key role in the spread of the Imperial cult(s) and in the representation of Roman Imperial power in Greek *poleis*. They "began to play the role as a kind of symbolic or ideological intermediaries" (Ibid., 20). The associations of Romans disappear from the record after 212 CE when the Constitutio Antoniniana granted Roman citizenship to all free citizens in the empire. Clubs for Romans then became redundant "as every Greek was now a Roman" (Ibid., 21). See also R. M. Errington, "Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic," in *Alte geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. K. Christ, P. Kneissl, and V. Losemann; Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1988), 140–57.

231   Harland, *Associations*, 182 (see 299 n. 4 for the actual epigraphic references). Harland notes further: "the internal organization of many associations and guilds mirrors civic organization, with positions of leadership including secretary (*grammateus*), treasurer (*tamias*), president (*epistatēs*), and superintendent (*epimelētēs*; cf. Poland, *Geschichte*, 376–87)" (*Associations*, 106). Kloppenborg agrees with Edwin Hatch's suggestion that "ἐπίσκοπος ... along with ἐπιμελητής was a key title for a financial administrator in associations and in the *polis*. The terms 'elders' (πρεσβύτεροι) and 'bishops' (ἐπίσκοποι) referred to the same persons, but to different roles: as members of the council they would be called πρεσβύτεροι, but as administrators they were ἐπίσκοποι" ("Edwin Hatch," 214).

"a *polis* writ small."[232] With respect to negative rhetoric, mimicry of civic structures facilitated critique of the Roman *ordo* with its hierarchical politics and policy of restrictive access to political office.

There are at least two reasons why political self-depictions by socio-religious associations (*thiasoi*) do not necessarily express anti-Roman ideology. First, Ascough notes that even though voluntary associations "often took their nomenclature from the civic institutions [it was] more often not in direct competition but in the sense of 'imitation as flattery'."[233] In this respect, political mimicry could simply reflect an impulse analogously to replicate Athenian-style *dēmokratia* within a non-civic context. Second, many inscriptional examples of voluntary associations self-presenting as fictive *poleis* pre-date the rise of Roman hegemony in the Greek East. Thus, since the original rationale for the adoption of civic terminology by voluntary associations was not anti-Roman, the continuation of that practice into the Imperial period need not necessarily reflect anti-Roman sentiments either. If there is any inherent rhetoric of resistance in the mimesis of political institutions by non-civic associations, it would have been directed first and foremost against municipal expressions of oligarchic privilege and social-political hierarchy, rather than against the Roman *imperium*.

2.3.4   *Summary: Non-Civic* Ekklēsiai *and Associations*

There is no extant epigraphic evidence of an association using *ekklēsia* as a group title.[234] There are, however, three extant inscriptions whose non-civic groups designate their semi-public assembly as an *ekklēsia* (*Samos* 119, *IDelos* 1519, *Sinuri* 73). At least one can be dated with confidence to the period of

---

232   Kloppenborg explains the socio-political value which *collegia/thiasoi* would have held for non-elites: "As a polis writ small, the collegium provided a social setting in which persons who normally could never aspire to participation in the *cursus honorum* of the city and state could give and receive honors, enjoy the ascribed status that came with being a *quinquennalis* or *mater*, have a feeling of control over at least the destiny of the collegium, and enjoy regular banquets" ("Collegia and *Thiasoi*," 26–27).

233   Richard Ascough, "Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Pauline Christian Communities: Overcoming the Objections," in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (ed. A. Gutsfeld and D. Koch; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006), 149–181, esp. 159 n. 47.

234   Although Young-Ho Park also argues that no voluntary association self-designated collectively as an *ekklēsia*, he appears to undermine that conclusion when he later states, "In the case of *ekklēsia*, however, it is hardly ever used to refer to small groups"; by saying "hardly ever" Park seems to imply that at least one example thereof is extant (*Paul's Ekklēsia*, 61).

Roman ascendancy (*IDelos* 1519; 153/2 BCE). The use in *Samos* 119 of the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* implies a *terminus post quem* for the Samian *aleiphomenoi* of the mid-2nd century BCE and a *terminus ad quem* of the Imperial period. Both of these non-civic groups replicate Athenian-style political terminology (i.e., enactment decree formulae, *ekklēsia*) in garnering socio-political benefits (temple construction, benefaction). Their self-presentation as "cities writ small" does not appear to reflect anti-Roman sentiments or concern over stirring up Roman suspicion.

2.4   Conclusion: Chapter 2

My primary focus in Chapter 2 was upon examining the way in which the word *ekklēsia* was used in the Greco-Roman world from the 5th century BCE up to, and including, the 2nd century CE. This provides a socio-historical backdrop against which better to understand the socio-political implications that attended those early Christ-followers who designated both their communities and their semi-public assemblies as *ekklēsiai*. I had two primary goals: first, to investigate whether any non-civic group prior to the 1st century CE adopted the word *ekklēsia* as their permanent group identity and, second, to ascertain whether Roman authorities would have viewed the appropriation of *ekklēsia* terminology by a non-civic group as a political threat.

My examination of Greek literary, papyrological, and inscriptional sources did not find evidence of a non-civic group self-designating as an *ekklēsia*. Inscriptional decrees do indicate, though, that some non-civic groups named their semi-public meeting an *ekklēsia*. The unprecedented extent to which I examined *ekklēsia* occurrences in the inscriptional record gives warrant for limiting that number to three non-civic groups: the Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos, the *aleiphomenoi* of Samos, and the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs.

My research is the first to integrate recent scholarship on the political culture of Imperial period Asia Minor for the purpose of understanding the political implications of a non-civic group self-designating as a civic entity, specifically as an *ekklēsia*. It has become clear that, generally, *dēmoi* of Imperial Greek cities had, to a large extent, lost the *kratos* necessary for the formal exercise of classical Athenian *dēmokratia* through their civic *ekklēsiai*. Nevertheless, the civic *ekklēsia* continued to play an important role in the construction of a political culture, especially in Asia Minor, wherein the influence of the *dēmos* became a positive factor in the spread of oligarchic munificence. This political culture included not only widespread festivals and

monumentalism but also a ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse," each of which continued into the 3rd century CE.

Voluntary associations, as a "substantial 'middle,'" became a mediating influence between the *dēmos* and the bouleutic elite through, for example, the establishment of networks of euergetism and patronage and their participation in hierarchically arranged festival processions. Given that voluntary associations frequently adopted political terminology for their organizational structure, without undue negative reaction from the Romans, it seems improbable that, by also self-designating as an *ekklēsia*, such a voluntary association would have raised Roman suspicions, even if in so doing they self-presented as a "city *doubly* writ small," so to speak. It seems more probable, rather, that an *ekklēsia* association would have been perceived as making a positive attempt, albeit an ostentatious one, at integrating themselves into the grass roots "*ekklēsia* discourse" which had sprung up throughout Imperial period Asia Minor.

As far as the extant evidence is concerned, this identity construction step was taken in the 1st century CE by upwards of five groups who self-identified as *ekklēsiai*. I have already identified four groups which could be called a "city doubly writ small": the Christ-follower sub-groups named *ekklēsia*, which were associated with Paul, John the Elder (Johannine epistles), John the prophet (Revelation), and Matthew. A fifth group is spoken of in Jewish sources. It is to an investigation of these sources that I now turn.

Ekklēsia in Jewish Sources

3.1 Introduction

Aside from Greco-Roman *ekklēsiai*, Jewish sources are another 'competitor' in the *ekklēsia* identity construction game. There is a long history of *ekklēsia* usage within Jewish Second Temple literature such as the Septuagint (LXX), Philo and Josephus. If the word *ekklēsia* is a Jewish synagogue term, as Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson suggest,[1] then synagogue research intersects with three of the questions I ask in this study: (1) Which non-civic group was first in antiquity to adopt *ekklēsia* as a collective identity?; (2) Is an *ekklēsia* group identity expressive of counter-imperial rhetoric?; and (3) Is the adoption of *ekklēsia* as a collective self-designation by an association with Jewish roots (early Christ-followers) reflective of supersessionist ideology?

3.2 *Ekklēsia* and Synagogue Terminology in the 1st Century CE

Synagogue research has come of age to such a degree in the last twenty-five years that Lee Levine characterizes the results of that research as a "deluge of synagogue-related material."[2] The breadth and depth of this "synagogue-related material" brought Levine to revise and update his seminal study a scant five years later.[3]

---

1 Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 159–63, 328.

2 Lee Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (2d ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), ix. Two seminal contributors to synagogue research include Ishmar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. R. P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1993) and Samuel Krauss, *Synagogale Altertumer* (Berlin-Wien: Benyamin Harz, 1922).

3 Lee Levine's first edition of *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* was published in 2000 (New Haven: Yale University Press). Examples of the "deluge of synagogue-related material" are detailed by Runesson, Binder and Olsson. They cite (1) three edited volumes of essays; (2) ten comprehensive monographs; and (3) a number of specialized studies (*The Ancient Synagogue*, 5 nn. 8–11).

3.2.1   *History of Synagogue Scholarship*

This plethora of publications has come to challenge many long-held assumptions about the ancient "synagogue."[4] Years prior to Levine's book, Dan Urman and Paul Flesher already noted that synagogue studies were undergoing more than one paradigm shift; they claimed that "many paradigms are shifting."[5] Cross-disciplinary paradigm shifts are taking place through the emergence of new evidence for synagogue buildings,[6] the revisiting of old archeological 'facts,'[7] the re-reading of textual material in light of archaeological discoveries, and the development of debate around issues such as the origin of the 'synagogue,'[8] the function of the 'synagogue,'[9] and whether 'synagogues' are to be understood as buildings or gatherings, or both.[10]

---

4   Some well-respected, yet dated, works include W. Schrage, "συναγωγή," *TDNT* 7.797–841; Schürer, *HJP* 2.423–54; and E. M. Meyers, "Synagogues," *ABD* 6.251–60.

5   Urman, Dan and Paul V. M. Flesher, eds. *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1.xvii.

6   In 1998 Ehud Netzer discovered a building in Jericho which he considers to be a synagogue. Anders Runesson agrees, as long as the building is understood as the edifice of an association, not a public, synagogue ("The Origins and Nature of the 1st Century Synagogue," *Bible and Interpretation* [July 2004]; http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Runesson—1st -Century_Synagogue_1.htm). Lee Levine, who defines synagogues as public institutions, disagrees. Levine argues that it is a Hellenistic-Roman villa ("The 1st Century C.E. Synagogue," 70–102).

7   The synagogue at Capernaum has been the focus of scholarly debate for almost a century. A key issue revolves around the dating of the limestone synagogue and the black basalt remains underneath. See Anders Runesson, "Architecture, Conflict, and Identity Formation: Jews and Christians in Capernaum from the 1st to the 6th Century," in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition* [ed. J. Zangenberg, H. Attridge, and D. Martin; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], 231–57).

8   See esp. Anders Runesson's comprehensive analysis of the scholarly debate on 'synagogue' origins (*The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* [ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001], 67–168). See also, H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), 213–45; Heather Mackay, "Ancient Synagogues: The Continuing Dialectic Between Two Major Views," *CurBS* 6 (1998): 103–42; Levine provides an analysis of more recent contributions in "The 1st Century C.E. Synagogue," 70–102; idem, *Ancient Synagogue*, 22–28.

9   Synagogal functions include: (1) religious activity (e.g., public Torah reading, rituals, festival observance); (2) social aspects such as council meetings, law courts, schools, treasuries (see Horsley, "Synagogues," 46–69; Levine, *Ancient Synagogue* [2005]; Anders Runesson, "Behind the Gospel of Matthew: Radical Pharisees in Post-War Galilee?" *CurTM* 37:6 [December 2010]: 460–71, esp. 463).

10   Stephen Catto's synagogue study is an example of research in which architectural and communal aspects are integrated (*Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue: A Critical Analysis of Current Research* [LNTS 363; London: T&T Clark, 2007]).

Runesson, Binder and Olsson identify four heuristic categories, or "four broad aspects," for the organization of previous synagogue research, and with which all future research must engage: spatial, liturgical, non-liturgical, and institutional.[11] Spatial aspects involve the integration of architectural, artistic and iconographic evidence. Comparative analyses figure prominently in this respect and include the relationships between Jewish synagogues and Greco-Roman temples,[12] the temple in Jerusalem,[13] Christ-follower house communities,[14] and voluntary associations of the Greco-Roman world.[15] Liturgical aspects are religious activities which took place within early synagogue contexts. Although public reading of Torah is a well-established fact,[16] prayer during early synagogue worship is still a topic of debate.[17] Other questions relative to liturgical practices in the synagogue include whether public fasts and festivals were observed and even how magic and mysticism were

---

11   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 7–10. See also Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 34–35.

12   Elizabeth Leigh Gibson, *The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House* (TSAJ 75; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999), 124–52.

13   Donald Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (Atlanta: SBL, 1999).

14   Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (London/ New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); Edward Adams, "First-Century Models for Paul's Churches: Selected Scholarly Developments since Meeks," in *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-five Years Later* (ed. T. D. Still and D. G. Horrell; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009), 60–78, esp. 63–68, 71–73.

15   Albert Baumgarten, "Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Jewish Sects," in *Jews in a Greco-Roman World* (ed. M. Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 93–111.

16   Some sources which mention Torah in relation to public readings, teaching, or storage locations in synagogues include: (1) Philo *Somn.* 2.127; *Opif.* 128; *Hypoth.* 7:11–13; *Legat.* 156, 157, 311–313; *Mos.* 2.215–216; *Contempl.* 30–31 (cf. 28); *Prob.* 80–83; (2) Josephus, *B.J.* 2.289–92; *A.J.* 16.43–45, 164; *C. Ap.* 2.175; (3) the New Testament: Mark 1:21, 39; Matt 4:23; 9:35; Luke 4:15, 16–30, 31–33, 44; Acts 9:20; 13:5, 14–16; John 6:59; 18:20; Cf. 1 Tim 4:13.

17   See Levine's concise survey of scholarly opinion on whether public prayer was known in pre-70 CE Judea (*Ancient Synagogue*, 162–69). Potential references to prayer include those made by Josephus (*A.J.* 14.260; *Vita* 295; *C. Ap.* 1.209), Philo (*Spec.* 3.171), and Matthew (Matt 6:5). Lester Grabbe provides a concise bibliography of research related to prayer and synagogues (*A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. Vol. 1: *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* [London: T&T Clark, 2004], 1.236–37). See also Rod Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (EJIL 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) and Jeremy Penner, *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 104; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

integrated.[18] Non-liturgical aspects, also known as social aspects, are communal activities previously considered to be the domain of public municipal institutions such as council halls, treasuries, law courts, public archives, and schools. Levine is the major proponent of understanding ancient synagogues as public institutions.[19] Institutional aspects involve synagogue leadership and operations and answer two primary questions: is any party in charge of the synagogue (e.g., Pharisees)[20] and what is the role of women in synagogue leadership and benefaction?[21]

Runesson, Binder, and Olsson also identify "two problems related to the ancient synagogues that need to take into account all four areas: the origin and nature of ancient synagogues."[22] Synagogue origins have been sought in every time period from the age of the Patriarchs to the Late Imperial period,[23] and in every region of the Mediterranean, with an eye to identifying which confluence of historical, social, political, economic, and religious factors led to the emergence of "the synagogue." Runesson, Binder, and Olsson succinctly summarize the scholarly perspectives on the 1st century CE "synagogue." They ask if "the synagogue," not simply the term *synagōgē*, is best viewed

> as an informal gathering of people (Kee 1990)? As a public formal gathering, but not in specific purpose built edifices (Horsley 1999)? As a public assembly in a purpose-built edifice (Oster 1993)? Was the Jewish home the primary model giving the synagogue its unique character (Claußen 2002)? Or are we dealing with a semi-public, voluntary association,

---

18   For example, on festivals see Daniel Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

19   Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 1–6, 29.

20   See, for example, Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127/1 (2008): 95–132, esp. 108–110; idem, "Behind the Gospel of Matthew," 463.

21   Two key contributors are Levine (*Ancient Synagogue*, 499–518) and Bernadette Brooten (*Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* [BJS 36; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982]; idem, "Female Leadership in the Ancient Synagogue," in *From Dura to Sepphoris: Studies in Jewish Art and Society in Late Antiquity* [ed. L. I. Levine and Z. Weiss; Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series, 2000], 215–23). Other contributors include: Binder, *Into the Temple Courts* (1999); Anders Runesson, "Women Leadership in the Early Church: Some Examples and an Interpretive Frame," *STK* 82.4 (2006): 173–83 (in Swedish; English summary); and Philip Harland, *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009), 82–86, 95–96.

22   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 10.

23   See Levine's review of synagogue origins scholarship (*Ancient Synagogue*, 21–44).

similar to, or indeed within the same category as the Graeco-Roman *collegia* (Hengel 1971, Richardson 2004, Harland 2003)? Did the synagogue parallel Graeco-Roman temples—but without animal sacrifices (Flesher 2001)? Or was the Jerusalem temple the blueprint for the institution, the latter functioning as a (non-sacrificial) extension of and supplement to the former (Binder 1999)? Did the Egyptian *Per Ankh*, an institution closely related to both temples and associations, stand as a model for the synagogue (Griffiths 1995)? Or should we rather focus on local administration, viewing the first century synagogue as a communal institution with a religious dimension (Levine 2004)? Or again, does the evidence lead us to the conclusion that synagogue terms could refer to two types of institutions—both public communal assemblies *and* Jewish voluntary associations—and that, consequently, the meaning of 'synagogue' was still fluid at this time (Runesson 2001)?[24]

In this study I will follow Anders Runesson who integrates two trajectories in his synagogue research: first, that a number of different synagogue terms were used for a gathered community and for the building within which that community gathered, and, second, that this breadth of synagogue terminology was used for two types of institution—the public synagogue and the association synagogue.

3.2.2 Ekklēsia *in the History of Synagogue Scholarship*
One lacuna in synagogue studies still exists: an analysis of the word *ekklēsia* as a Jewish synagogue term.[25] This possibility was first clearly acknowledged by Donald Binder (1999) and Anders Runesson (2001).[26] It was reiterated in the synagogue sourcebook of Runesson, Binder, and Olsson (2008).[27] In order for this acknowledgment to move to accepted fact, however, a comprehensive analysis is still required of how *ekklēsia* is used within Jewish contexts in reference to a gathered community. My ensuing discussion provides a start in that direction.

---

24   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 11–12. See the Bibliography for the publication information of each scholar cited in the quotation (Ibid., 295–311).

25   Levine does not investigate *ekklēsia* as a synagogue term either in the original or revised versions of his book *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. In her most recent tome, Rachel Hachlili also does not appear to treat the word *ekklēsia* as a synagogue term, at least insofar as the absence of *ekklēsia* references in her subject index would seem to indicate (*Ancient Synagogues—Archaeology and Art: New Discoveries and Current Research* [Leiden: Brill, 2013]).

26   Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 24; Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 171–72, 356–57.

27   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, esp. 159–63, 328.

When it comes to "synagogue" terminology by which buildings and/or gatherings of Jewish communities are identified, a number of terms, including *ekklēsia*, apply. Anders Runesson notes that "what in English is translated 'synagogue' went under several different names in antiquity," that is, 17 Greek terms, 5 Hebrew terms and 3 Latin terms, some of which overlap.[28] Architectural space within which Jewish communities meet is described with terms such as *proseuchē* ("house of prayer"),[29] *didaskaleion*

---

28   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 10 n. 21. For a list of all Greek words used of Second Temple synagogues see Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 171–73; idem, "Persian Imperial Politics, the Beginnings of Public Torah Readings, and the Origins of the Synagogue," in *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001* (ConBNT 39; ed. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), 63–89, esp. 66. For extensive descriptions of each term as used by Jewish communities, see Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 91–151. For primary texts, see the index of synagogue terms in Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 328. For methodological issues, see Anders Runesson, "The Origins of the Synagogue in Past and Present Research—Some Comments on Definitions, Theories, and Sources," *ST* 58 (2004): 60–76.

29   Evidence from Josephus and Philo suggests that *proseuchē* is used synonymously for some sort of physical structure in which Jews assemble for prayer (Philo; *Legat.* 132) and/or public decision making (Josephus). Josephus mentions *proseuchai* both in Alexandria (*C. Ap.* 2.10; *ASSB*, no. 22) and in Judea (*Vita* 276–81, 294–295; *ASSB* no. 43). In *Vita*, Josephus' Judean *proseuchai* are purpose-built structures for public communal gatherings, not primarily for association-specific gatherings. This is clear from his comment that the *proseuchē* in Tiberias was spacious enough to contain approx. 600 persons into which a large part of the populace as well as the entire *boulē* ("council") of Tiberias (*Vita* 284) gathered (*B.J.* 2.641). Levine comments on the three-fold significance of Josephus' description: (1) this is the only instance of a Judean synagogue being referred to as a *proseuchē*; (2) to date, synagogues of such monumental size are known only from the Diaspora; and (3) it was used socio-politically in a "pivotal communal role" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 53–54). With respect to diasporic synagogues, the first attestation of Egyptian synagogues under the name *proseuchē* comes from the third quarter of the third century BCE (Hengel, "Proseuche und Synagoge," 27–54). In Delos (Aegean Sea), building GD 80 has been identified as a synagogue building used first by Samaritans (3rd and early 2nd cents. BCE) and then by Jews (late 2nd to mid–1st cents. BCE). Two Samaritan honorific inscriptions appear to refer to it as a *proseuchē* (e.g., *IDelos* 2329). See Monika Trümper, "Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos. The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 49–100, esp. 61–63. Although Trümper's essay is published in 2011, her research is current only to 2004. See also Trümper, "The Oldest Original Synagogue Building in the Diaspora: The Delos Synagogue Reconsidered," *Hesperia* 73 (2004): 513–98.

("school"),[30] *hieron* ("temple" or "sacred place"),[31] *topos* ("place"),[32] *sabbateion*,[33] *bet ha-midrash* ("house of study"),[34] *oikos* ("house" or "room")[35] and *synagōgē* ("synagogue").[36] Communal gatherings are referenced by

---

30   Philo indicates that the term *didaskaleion* can be used synonymously with *proseuchē* (*Mos.* 2.214–16). See also, *Spec.* 2.62 ("in every city thousands of schools") and *Dec.* 40 ("the schools of the holy laws") (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 209).

31   For example, Philo mentions *ta hiera* ("the temples"; *Deus* 8), which Binder interprets as referring to synagogue buildings (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 202). *CIJ* 1433 (*JIGRE* 9; 2nd cent. BCE) makes mention of a sacred enclosure, *hieros peribolos*, that was attributed to a synagogue in Ptolemaic Egypt (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 186). Josephus uses the plural morpheme *hierois* to describe "sanctuaries set on fire" by the Romans in Jerusalem (70 CE) (*B.J.* 7.144). The plural form militates against an identification of the *hierois* with the Temple. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson conclude that "a) Josephus used *hieron* to refer to synagogue buildings, and b) that the Romans destroyed many of these assembly places—or 'sanctuaries' as Josephus describes them—during the First Jewish Revolt" (*ASSB*, no. 62).

32   Josephus (*A.J.*14.259–61) mentions a Roman decree (2nd cent. BCE) in which Jews in Sardis were granted their own area (*topos*) to conduct business and even religious gatherings (e.g., *euchai kai thysiai*). See also *A.J.* 14.235 where a decree of Lucius Antonius (49 BCE) states that Jews "from earliest times … have had a private association [*synodos*] and a place [*topos*] of their own" (*ASSB*, no. 114). Tessa Rajak notes, though, that architectural details for the *topos* are ambiguous and could be either "a synagogue, a plain civic building or even just an outdoor area" ("Synagogue and Community in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora," in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* [ed. J. R. Bartlett; London/New York: Routledge, 2002], 22–38, esp. 29).

33   In *A.J.*16.162–65, Josephus implies that a *sabbateion* is a structure of some sort. In his report of Augustus' decree of 2–3 CE, Josephus writes "If anyone is caught stealing their holy books or holy monies from a synagogue [*sabbateion*] … he shall be regarded as sacrilegious and his property shall be confiscated to the public treasury of the Romans" (*ASSB*, no. 120). See also David Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC 52A; Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 165.

34   Runesson notes that "the rabbis and their predecessors, among which surely the Pharisees was one group, was a voluntary association whose institution was the *bet hamidrash*" (*Origins of the Synagogue*, 486). In *m. Ter.* 11:10 the *bet hamidrash* is a building: "They may kindle oil of priest's due, that must be burnt, in the synagogues (*bate knesiot*) and in houses of study (*bate midrashot*) and in dark alleys and for sick people by permission of a priest" (see Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 105; Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 223–34).

35   Rajak observes that although *oikos* was commonly used among Greco-Roman voluntary associations (e.g., guilds, clubs), "for readers of the Greek Bible, *oikos* carried reverberations, for it operated as the normal translation of the Hebrew *bayit*, a ubiquitous designation for the post-exilic Temple" ("Synagogue and Community," 29–30).

36   Levine notes that it was not until the 2nd century CE that "'synagogue' had become a universal term for the building in which communal activities were held" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 1).

terms such as *syllogos* ("meeting"),[37] *ekklēsia* ("assembly"),[38] *laos* ("people"),[39] *politeuma* ("community"),[40] and *synagōgē* ("a gathering").[41] Of all synagogue

---

Prior to that time, Levine states that "it is entirely possible that some communities initially met on premises other than a 'synagogue' building or called their central institution by another name" (Ibid., 1). Josephus uses *synagōgē* in reference to a physical structure in *Jewish Wars* (*B.J.* 2.285, 289 [Caesarea]; *B.J.* 7.44 [Antioch]). The only occurrence of the word *synagōgē* in *Antiquities* is in *A.J.* 19.304–305. Therein, Josephus records the response of the Roman governor of Syria to King Agrippa's lobbying attempt on the behalf of the Jews of Dora. In his subsequent decree against the citizenry of Dora, Petronius accuses them of forbidding Jews from assembling in the *synagōgē* (*ASSB*, no. 193). For Josephus' references to synagogue structures or assemblies, see the Sources index in Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 322.

37   The Greek noun *syllogos* is a sociological term that means "a meeting for a specific purpose, whether for deliberations, consultations, etc. There is some kind of mutual activity." *Syllogos* is not specific to, nor identifying of, any particular socio-religious group (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 201). Regarding the Therapeutae, Philo mentions that they met for a *syllogos* ("general assembly") every seventh day (*Contemp.* 30–33; 30–45 CE).

38   Runesson, Binder and Olsson claim that Philo uses *ekklēsia* three times in reference to a contemporaneous synagogue entity (*Spec.* 1.324–25, *Deus.* 111, and *Virt.* 108) (*ASSB*, nos. 201, 202, 203, respectively). Ben Sira and Josephus use *ekklēsia* for public gatherings in the land of Israel. The use of *ekklēsia* by all three Jewish authors will be explored later in this chapter.

39   Runesson comments that, in *CIJ* 776, *laos* "refers to the local community, and not, as the common usage, to the people as a whole" ("Persian Imperial Politics," 66 n. 14).

40   Josephus speaks of Jews in Alexandria constituting a *politeuma* which in some fashion mirrors Greek governance models (e.g., monarchies, oligarchies; *C. Ap.* 2.164–165; cf. *A.J.* 1.13) and Greek community organizations (*A.J.* 1.5). At least two inscriptions mention a group of Judeans in Egypt who self-identify as *politeuma*. Both are from Berenike in Cyrenaica. *IBerenike* 18 dates to the 1st cent BCE (March 30; = *SEG* 16 (1976), no. 931 = *CJZ* 70). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg translate *IBerenike* 18 as, "The leaders of the corporate body (*politeuma*) of the Judeans in Berenike resolved ..." (*AGRW*, no. 305). The second inscription from Berenike most likely dates to 24 CE (*IBerenike* 17 = *CJZ* 71 = *IGRR* I 1024). It recounts honours ascribed to a Roman provincial official: "Furthermore in performing his governorship in a useful way for the Judeans of our *politeuma*, both individually and as a group ..." (Ibid., 192, no. 306). A distinctive feature of the *politeuma* reference in *IBerenike* 17 is that "it seems that the same group also referred to itself as a 'synagogue' in later decades" (*IBerenike* 16) (Ibid., 192). *IBerenike* 16 (55 CE; = *CZJC* 72 = *SEG* 17 [1977] no 823) reads: "It seemed good to the synagogue of the Judeans in Berenike that they should inscribe on a monument of Parian stone the names of those who contributed toward the restoration of the synagogue (*synagōgē*)" (Ibid., 192).

41   A clear example is found in *CPJ* I.138 (*ASSB*, no. 170), which reads, in part: "at the assembly [*synagōgē*] that took place in the prayer hall [*proseuchē*]." Richardson notes that

terms, *proseuchē* and *synagōgē* occur most frequently within Jewish sources.[42] Given the well-established usage of *proseuchē* and *synagōgē*, what would bring a Jewish community to adopt *ekklēsia* terminology instead? An analysis of their respective semantic domains offers at least one clue.

Evidence from Josephus and Philo suggests that *proseuchē* is a physical structure within which Jews publicly assemble for prayer, Torah reading (Philo, Josephus)[43] and/or for public decision making (Josephus).[44] Jutta Leonhardt highlights an even more specific role for Alexandrian *proseuchai* in Philo's day. She states that they primarily functioned as locations within which Jews could "show reverence to their benefactors" for their euergetism through the reciprocity of communal "praise and thanksgiving."[45]

Aside from describing "prayer halls," Runesson notes that the word *proseuchē* was also used of structures such as "the temple in Jerusalem,[46] earlier Jewish

---

"*proseuchē* refers to the building and *synagōgē* refers simply to the 'gathering'" (*Building Jewish in the Roman East*, 116).

42   Levine notes that "Neither of these terms [*proseuchē* and *synagōgē*] was uniquely Jewish, as both were borrowed from pagan culture ... [but] certainly by the first century C.E., they had become largely associated with the Jewish community" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 2). Evidence for Greek usage of *synagōgē* is found as early as the 5th cent. BCE in the writings of Thucydides of Athens (*c.* 460–396 BCE). Its basic sense is of a "gathering" or "union" (*Thuc.* II.18.3 [Attic ξυναγωγή]) (Schrage, *TDNT* 7.797–852, esp. 798).

43   See n. 29 (Ch. 3) within Philo's comments on the Jewish pogrom in Alexandria (*Legat.* 132).

44   See n. 29 (Ch. 3) where Josephus attests to the use of the term *proseuchē* in Alexandria (*C. Ap.* 2.10), in Judea (*Vita* 276–81, 294–295), and in Halicarnassus (*A.J.* 14.257–58). Josephus affirms that a Judean *proseuchē* can be used both for political (*Vita* 276–81) and religious activity (*Vita* 294–295). Stephen Catto claims that Josephus' use of the word *proseuchē* in *A.J.* 14.258 does not refer to a building ("Does προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* 14.257–58, Mean 'Build Places of Prayer'?" *JSJ* 35 [2004]: 159–68). For a discussion on the use of *proseuchē* in Acts regarding a structure in Philippi (Acts 16:13, 16), see Catto, *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue*, 186–89.

45   Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 76, 77. See also Heather A. McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 67–69, 71–73. Rather than viewing Jewish displays of "praise and thanksgiving" for euergetism as evidence of reverence for living patrons, Susan Sorek argues that the common epigraphic formula "remembered for good" signals a memorial to a deceased donor, particularly in the late antique era (*Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine* [SWBA 2/5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2010]).

46   1 Macc 7:37; Mark 11:17/Matt 21:13/Luke 19:46.

shrines,[47] and 'synagogues,'[48] in the latter case most frequently in the Diaspora,"[49] particularly in Egypt. Philo's *proseuchē* is a regional synonym in Egypt for *synagōgē*.[50] With respect to Egyptian inscriptions, Levine notes that the word *synagōgē* occurs only once,[51] while *proseuchē* does so ten times.[52] The word

---

47 1 Macc 3:46. Aryeh Kasher notes that early Hellenistic *synagōgai* in Egypt could be viewed as sacred structures: Arsinöe "already had an organized Jewish community in the early days of the Ptolemaic settlement program as definitely proven by a dedicatory inscription in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes I and his family from a local synagogue (*CPJ* 3.1532A =*SB*, 8939) … the fact that the synagogue land was marked 'sacred land' is itself illuminating, as the first editor of the papyrus notes. The synagogue was certainly recognized as a holy place [the synagogue land was listed as ἱερὰ γῆ in the Ptolemaic registry] by the authorities along with other sacred sites allotted suitable land and designated as sacred" (*The Alexandrian Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* [TSAJ 7; rev. ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985], 138).

48 Philo, *Flacc.* 122; *Legat.* 156. See also n. 29 (Ch. 3) for two Samaritan honorific inscriptions from Delos (250–175 BCE and 150–50 BCE) which mention the construction and dedication of a *proseuchē* (*IDelos* 2329), which later was used by Jews for their synagogue (1st cent BCE).

49 Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 429.

50 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 188. Philo uses *proseuchē* 18 times in his writings (see further in Hachlili, *Ancient Jewish Art*, 18). An inscription found in the Gabbary section of Alexandria (*JIGRE* 13=*CIJ* 2.1432; 37 BCE[?]) "is one of three existing examples of Egyptian synagogue benefactions made solely by individuals (cf. *JIGRE* 28, 126; Nos. 152, 172)" (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 186). It reads, in part, "Alypus built the prayer hall [*proseuchē*]."

51 *CIJ* 2.1447 (=*JIGRE* 20; 1st cent. BCE–1st cent. CE; *ASSB*, no. 146). See Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 83 n. 8, 87 n. 41 and Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 111–14.

52 The ten *proseuchē* inscriptions from Egypt are: *CIJ* 2.1440 (= *JIGRE* 22; Schedia, 246–221 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 158); *CIJ* 2.1449 (= *JIGRE* 125; lower Egypt, 246–221 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 171); *CIJ* 2.1443 (=*JIGRE* 27; Athribis, 180–145[?] BCE; *ASSB*, no. 151); *CIJ* 2.1444 (=*JIGRE* 28; Athribis, 180–145[?] BCE; *ASSB*, no. 152); *CIJ* 2.1442 (=*JIGRE* 25 [1422 in Schürer]; Nitriai, 144–116 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 156); *CIJ* 2.1441 (=*JIGRE* 24; Xenephyris, 144–116 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 159); *CIJ* 2.1433 (=*JIGRE* 9; Alexandria, 2nd cent. BCE; *ASSB*, no. 143); *CIJ* 2.1432 (=*JIGRE* 13; Alexandria, 36[?] BCE; *ASSB*, no. 144); and *JIGRE* 126 (Alexandria, 36[?] BCE; *ASSB*, no. 172). In Arsinoë–Crocodilopolis in the Fayum, one inscription and two papyrii from the same period also use the word *proseuchē*: *CIJ* III.1532A (=*JIGRE* 117; 246–221 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 150); *CPJ* I.129 (May 11, 218 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 147), and *CPJ* I.134 (late 2nd cent. BCE; *ASSB*, no. 148). A 2nd century CE papyrus from Arsinoë–Crocodilopolis affirms the continued existence of *proseuchai* in that region (*CPJ* 2.432=P.Lond. III 1177; 113 CE). See also the concise discussion by Richardson of all the inscriptions and the two Hellenistic-era papyri (*Building Jewish in the Roman East*, 115–16). For a discussion of *CPJ* 2.432 see Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 138.

proseuchē is also found four times within papyri.[53] In every Egyptian source the word *proseuchē* refers to a physical structure.[54] It is never used as a collective designation for a Jewish community.

The semantic range of *synagōgē* ("assembly"), by contrast, is broader.[55] *Synagōgē* is used for: (1) a public village or town assembly in the land of Israel;[56] (2) a type of voluntary association,[57] that is, a semi-public assembly of Jews, both in Israel and in the diaspora;[58] and (3) a building in which an assembly of Jews meets.[59]

---

53   *CPJ* I.129, *CPJ* I.134, *CPJ* I.138, *CPJ* II.432. See Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 83 n. 10; *ASSB* nos. 147, 148, 170, 149, respectively.

54   A clear example is found in *CPJ* I.138 (*ASSB*, no. 170). It reads, in part, "at the assembly [*synagōgē*] that took place in the prayer hall [*proseuchē*]." Levine states that the most common type of *proseuchē* inscription is the dedicatory type (*Ancient Synagogue*, 83). For example, "On behalf of king Ptolemy and queen Berenice his sister and wife and their children, the Jews [dedicated] the *proseuchē*" (*CIJ* 2.1440=*JIGRE* 22; Schedia, 246–221 BCE; *ASSB*, no. 158).

55   Graham Twelftree provides an assessment of 1st century CE synagogues in light of archeological, inscriptional, and literary sources ("Jesus and the Synagogue," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* [4 vols; ed. T. Holmen and S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2011], 3105–3134).

56   Public synagogues existed only where Jews were in charge of town and city administration (cf. *m. Ned.* 5:5). Some of the functions of public synagogues are those "that contemporary western culture would regard as more properly belonging to municipal institutions. These included council halls, law courts, schools, treasuries, and public archives" (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 8; see primary sources cited on p. 8 n. 17). But Runesson notes that public synagogues also included religious elements: "since religion was not thought of as separate from other spheres of society, including politics, Torah was read publicly and discussed on Sabbaths" (Runesson, "Behind the Gospel of Matthew," 463). Leadership of a public synagogue was not dominated by one specific group such as Pharisees or 'early rabbis,' not even after Temple destruction in 70 CE. Runesson states that "individuals and groups could use public meetings to promote their own understanding of religious traditions and Jewish law, and how they should be implemented in contemporary society" ("Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations," 112).

57   See n. 18 (Ch. 1) for Philip Harland's definition of associations (*Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 27–28).

58   For examples of semi-public association synagogues, see n. 6 (Ch. 1).

59   Neither the LXX nor the Pseudepigrapha use *synagōgē* for a place of assembly (*TDNT* 7.798–841; Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 92–111). Archaeological finds, however, do. Possible synagogue buildings in pre-70 CE Israel have been suggested at Gamla, Herodium, Masada, Modi'in, Qumran, and, perhaps, Capernaum (Twelftree, "Jesus and the Synagogue," 3110; on the Capernaum synagogue, see esp. Runesson, "Architecture, Conflict, and Identity

The term *synagōgē*, then, can refer both to a physical structure and to the temporary group designation of Jews while gathered within that physical structure. It took until the Roman period for *synagōgē* "to be largely associated with Jews and with the practice of Judaism."[60]

Understanding the semantic domain of *synagōgē* in Jewish usage does little to explain the types of activity which took place within the *synagōgē* during the gathering of the *synagōgē*. Runesson states that the institutional origins of the Jewish *synagōgē* appear to be the "supra-local and official institution [that began] ... when public torah readings were first initiated" during the Persian period (e.g., Artaxerxes I).[61] This Persian period public institution appears to presage the public synagogues in the Land during the 1st century CE. These public synagogues are depicted as being open to all Jews of a particular region and among whom civic, administrative, social and religious activities occurred.[62]

Semi-public synagogue associations, on the other hand, did not develop until the Late Hellenistic period with the rise of "non-official institutions [voluntary associations] dedicated to communal reading and study of torah."[63] These synagogue associations, with their restricted memberships, were modeled

---

Formation," 231–57). The use of *synagōgē* as an unequivocal reference to a building is also found in inscriptions that predate the Temple's destruction in 70 CE. The most notable of these are: (1) the Theodotus *synagōgē* dedication in Jerusalem (*CIJ* II 1404; See John Kloppenborg's refutation of Kee's argument for a post-70 date ["Dating Theodotus (*CIJ* II 1404)," *JJS* (51.2): 243–80]); and (2) the three public inscriptions from Berenike (Cyrenaica) (*CJZ* 70–72; cf. B. Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives: répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues* [CRB 7; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1967], 100). Tessa Rajak notes that the latter of the three inscriptions from Berenike (i.e., *CJZ* 72) "is interesting in featuring the two senses of *synagogue* in close proximity in its opening phrase, first as the community responsible for the resolution which is being recorded and then in connection with the furnishing donated by the honorands (*episkeue tēs synagōgēs*)" ("Synagogue and Community," 32).

60   Rajak, "Synagogue and Community," 26.

61   Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 479.

62   In his survey of 1st century CE sources, Levine notes that the *synagōgē* building was used for "the entire gamut of [public] activities connected with any Jewish community ... [such] as a courtroom, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 29).

63   Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 479–80.

after the "general pattern of the *thiasoi* or *collegia* [voluntary associations] of the Graeco-Roman world."[64]

3.2.3 *Summary:* Ekklēsia *and Synagogue Scholarship*

Of the numerous synagogue terms used by Second Temple Jews, two predominate: *proseuchē* and *synagōgē*. *Proseuchē* only refers to a structure within which a Jewish community meets. *Synagōgē* is used both of a structure and of the community which meets within that structure. *Ekklēsia* does not ever refer to a physical structure. This would have made *ekklēsia* an attractive term for any community which wished to avoid having their collective membership either identified with, or terminologically tied to, a specific structural location. The question still to be investigated is whether, in Jewish circles, *ekklēsia* functioned as a designation for a public institution, for a semi-public meeting, and/ or for the group designation of a Jewish voluntary association.

3.3 *Ekklēsia* and Public Jewish Assemblies

Runesson's argument for the existence of two types of synagogue communities (public and semi-public) forms a helpful interpretive grid through which to examine *ekklēsia* usage in Jewish sources. In this section I explore *public* Jewish assemblies called *ekklēsiai*. In the following section I will investigate if any *semi-public* Jewish synagogue associations self-identified as *ekklēsiai*.

3.3.1 *The Septuagint (LXX) (Hellenistic Era)*

The earliest reference within Jewish literature to an *ekklēsia* is found in the LXX. Therein, it refers both to the ancient supra-local community known as Israel and to individual gatherings of its people. The LXX uses *ekklēsia* to

---

64   Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 480. For an extensive investigation of Greco-Roman voluntary associations, see Onno van Nijf (*The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* [DMAHA XVII; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997]). For a list of scholarly resources relative to understanding the *ekklēsiai* of early Christ-followers as a voluntary association see Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 480 n. 57. See also the extensive list provided by John S. Kloppennorg, "Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups," EC 4, no. 2 (2013), 183–215, esp. 187 n. 13.

translate only *qāhāl*,[65] while *synagōgē* translates both *qāhāl*[66] and *ʿēdâ*.[67] In total, *ekklēsia* occurs 103 times in the LXX[68] and *synagōgē*, 221 times.[69] *Qāhāl* is used predominantly for assemblies of various kinds, including those of the people of Israel. It can refer either to a meeting or collectively to those who are meeting ("congregation").[70] The primary referent for *ʿēdâ* appears more

---

65   The noun קָהָל occurs 122 times in the HB (Fabry, "קָהָל," *TDOT* 12.546–61, esp. 549). The LXX
      translateds קָהָל as ἐκκλησία 68 times. In the four cases where *ekklēsia* translates lexemes
      other than *qāhāl*, K. L. Schmidt notes that the morphemes are Hebrew equivalents from
      the stem *qhl*: 1 Kgs 19:20/1 Sam 19:20 (לְהֲקָה), Neh 5:7 (קָהִלָּה), Ps 25:12/26:12 (מַקְהֵלִים), and
      Ps 67:27/68:27 (מַקְהֵלוֹת) ("ἐκκλησία," *TDNT*, 3.501–34, esp. 520). Regarding the morpheme
      לְהֲקָה Schmidt states that "the same radicals are found in a different sequence. Either we
      are to assume that this is also a derivative of קהל or it may be that we have dittography in
      relation to לָקַחַת, which comes shortly before" (*TDNT* 3.520).

66   The noun קָהָל is translated as συναγωγή 36 times. Of the 23 occurrences of קָהָל in Genesis–
      Numbers it is never translated by ἐκκλησία, but rather always by συναγωγή. (Fabry, *TDOT*
      12:561). One example of קָהָל being translated both as ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή is found in
      LXX Ps 39:9, 10, respectively (HB Ps 40:10, 11). Therein, the two occurrences of the Hebrew
      phrase קָהָל רָב are rendered as ἐκκλησία μεγάλη (39:10) and συναγωγὴ πολλή (39:11). See
      Schrage, *TDNT* 7.797–852, esp. 802.

67   There are 149 occurrences of עֵדָה in the HB (*BDB* 417a; "עֵדָה," *HALOT* 2.789–90). Fabry
      notes that "with few exceptions *ʿēdâ* is indeed generally rendered as *synagōgē* 132 times."
      Two exceptions are ἐπισύστασις (11×) and πλῆθός (4×) (*TDOT* 12:561). Schrage lists other
      Greek words which translate עֵדָה. Some examples are Ἰσραηλ (Num 4:34), υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ
      (Num 3:7), συστροφή (Judg 14:8a) and παρεμβολή (Num 17:11) (*TDNT* 7:803). Fabry notes
      that the noun עֵדָה is never translated as ἐκκλησία (*TDOT* 12: 561).

68   The number of occurrences of ἐκκλησία per book in the LXX are: Deuteronomy (9);
      Joshua (2); Judges (6); 1 Samuel (2); 1 Kings (4); 1 Chronicles (8); 2 Chronicles (24); Ezra
      (5); Nehemiah (6); Judith (4); 1 Maccabees (5); Psalms (10); Proverbs (1); Job (1); Sirach
      (13); Micah (1); Joel (1); Lamentations (1). The *Psalms of Solomon* (10:6) adds the only
      other occurrence of ἐκκλησία within the corpus of Jewish writings prior to the turn of the
      Common Era. Out of this total of 104 ἐκκλησία occurrences, only 2 are in the plural (LXX
      Ps 25:12, 67:27).

69   Schrage, *TDNT* 7.798–852, esp. 803. A little more than half of the total occurrences of
      συναγωγή (221) translate עֵדָה (132). Altogether, 20 of the 221 occurrences of *synagōgē* in
      the LXX translate 16 different Hebrew words other than *qāhāl* and *ʿēdâ* (Schrage, *TDNT*
      7.802).

70   Koehler and Baumgartner cite three primary categories for קָהָל: a contingent or assembly,
      including the congregation assembled for worship, the post-exilic cultic community, and
      miscellaneous meanings such as "crowd" and "angelic assembly" ("קָהָל," *HALOT* 3.1078–
      80). *BDB* subdivides the meaning of *congregation* into four categories: (a) of Israel (e.g.,
      Exod 12:6); (b) restored community in Jerusalem (e.g., Ezra 10:8); (c) of angels (Ps 89:6);
      and (d) more generally, company/assembled multitude (e.g., Gen 28:3). To the category of
      congregation of Israel I would add 2 Chron 1:3 ("Then Solomon, and the whole assembly

consistently to be the people who are assembled.[71] The word *'ēdâ* is regularly used of the people of Israel in the wilderness,[72] but *qāhāl* and *'ēdâ* "can in fact be used with no real difference in meaning."[73]

When the LXX translates either *qāhāl* or *'ēdâ* with *synagōgē*, it does not refer to a place of meeting (i.e., synagogue building), unlike some later Jewish sources (e.g., *CIJ* II 1404; the Theodotus *synagōgē*).[74] While *synagōgē* predominantly means the whole congregation of Israel, it has at least four other referents: (1) a local congregation; (2) a formal assembly/meeting; (3) a gathering of many sorts;[75] and (4) Jacob and his progeny who, as *synagōgai ethnōn* ("gatherings of nations"), are assured of spreading throughout the earth.[76] This last

---

with him [*kōl haqāhāl*], went to the high place that was at Gibeon") and 2 Chron 31:18 ("the genealogical enrollment [of the priests] included all their little children, their wives, their sons and their daughters, for the whole assembly [*lĕkāl qāhāl*], for they consecrated themselves faithfully in holiness"). One wonders if the LXX translator has the Greek civic *ekklēsia* in mind when he does not translate this *qāhāl* (2 Chron 31:18), which includes women and children, with *ekklēsia* but rather uses *plēthos* ("multitude," "number") instead.

71   Koehler and Baumgartner note that the majority of עֵדָה occurrences refer to the "national, legal and cultic communities" with some referring to a throng or gang or to a family or friendship circle (*HALOT* 3.1079). *BDB* ("עדה," 417a/5712, noun fem.) defines עדה as meaning "congregation" (i.e., people and animals). The meaning of עדה as *congregation of Israel* includes: (a) the *congregation of Israel* generally (e.g., Hos 7:12) and (b) in a technical sense for the *congregation of Israel* of the Exodus (115×).

72   For example, Exod 16:1; 17.1; Num 1:2, 18.

73   I. Howard Marshall, "New Wine in Old Wine-Skins: V. The Biblical Use of the Word 'Ekklēsia,'" *ExpT* 84 (1972–73): 359. See also, J. Y. Campbell, *'The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word EKKΛHΣIA,' Three New Testament Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 44–45. While both *qāhāl* and *'ēdâ* are used as a collective identity (ongoing and temporary) for the people of religio-ethnic Israel, when reference is made to an assembly of people, the word *qāhāl* predominates.

74   See n. 59 (Ch. 3) on archaeological evidence for buildings called *synagōgē* used by Jews.

75   Some examples cited by Schrage include the "collecting" of revenues (Sir 31:3), a "bringing in" of the harvest (Exod 34:22, cf. 23:16), a "gathering" of young men (Jer 6:11), and the "gathering" of a diverse array of items such as a pile of stones (Job 8:17) and water (Lev 11:36) (*TDNT* 7.802–805).

76   LXX Genesis translationally differentiates the three occurrences of *qāhāl* within the divine promise to make Jacob/Israel into a *qāhāl* of *'amim/goyim* (Gen 28:3; 35:11; 48:4) from the fourth occurrence, which refers only to an assembly for counsel (Gen 49:6). Within Genesis, the translator(s) only uses *synagōgē* to translate the *qāhāl* of *'amim/goyim*. He/they substitute(s) *boulē* for the *qāhāl* of counsel in Gen 49:6. Interestingly, in Gen 28:3, 35:11, and 48:4, the translator revises the singular *qāhāl* to read the plural *synagōgai*, and uses only *ethnōn* to translate the two Hebrew words *'amim* and *goyim*.

usage by the diasporic translator(s) may be ideological in nature. If the readers of the LXX saw in the phrase *synagōgai ethnōn* a veiled reference to their own *synagōgai* which had spread throughout the diasporic world of the *ethnōn*, then these diasporic Jews could have viewed themselves as being the fulfillment of God's original promise to their patriarchal namesake ("Israel").[77] As in the case of the phrase *synagōgai ethnōn*, the LXX also appears to use *ekklēsia* ideologically on at least one occasion. The translator of 2 Chronicles appears syntactically to infer that only Judah, and not Israel, is *hē ekklēsia*.[78]

There are at least four ways in which the word *ekklēsia* is differentiated from *synagōgē* in the LXX. While *synagōgē* translates *qāhāl* throughout Genesis–Numbers, *ekklēsia* does not do so until LXX Deut 4:10.[79] Second, while both words can be used of a collective identity, *ekklēsia* far outnumbers *synagōgē* when referring to gatherings of people. Third, when referring to a "gathering,"

---

77 Viewing diasporic synagogue communities as being part of God's original plan for Israel's progeny would be particularly comforting theology for those diasporic Jews for whom life in the Diaspora was perceived as evidence of divine punishment, even abandonment. Donald Verseput claims that there was a prevalent notion within Second Temple Judaism that "the very existence of the Jewish Diaspora was … evidence of divine displeasure from which only national repentance and divine mercy could bring relief" ("Genre and Story: The Community Setting of the Epistle of James," *CBQ* 62/1 [2000]: 96–110, esp. 100). He identifies a sub-genre of Jewish epistolary literature that developed in order to comfort and call diasporic Jews to holy living. He calls it a "Covenant Letter to the Diaspora." He suggests five exemplars: Jer 29:1–23; The Epistle of Jeremiah; 2 Macc 1:1–9; 1:10–22:18; *2 Baruch* 78–86, and the epistle of James (Ibid., 101).

78 The implicit identification only of Judah, and not of Israel, as *hē ekklēsia* is evident in the appositional construction in LXX 2 Chron 30:24. It reads, "For Hezekiah set apart for Judah, even the congregation (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ)." In the next verse (30:25), the Chronicler applies the term *ekklēsia* to Judah in contradistinction to other Israelites: "And all the congregation (πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία), the priests, and the Levites rejoiced, and all the congregation of Judah (πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ιουδα), and they that were present of Jerusalem, and the strangers (οἱ προσήλυτοι) that came from the land of Israel, and those dwelling in Judah."

79 Young-Ho Park suggests that political motivation lies behind the Pentateuch's dedicated translation of *qāhāl* by *ekklēsia* only within LXX Deuteronomy (e.g., Deut 4:10 [τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας]; 9:10; 18:16). He states that "it is notable that the emphasis on the centrality of Jerusalem and the significance of the *ekklēsia* are often found in the same context." He cites other examples, outside of the Pentateuch, such as the climactic moments in Chronicles (Temple dedication) and in Ezra-Nehemiah (the restoration of Jerusalem). Thus, since "Deuteronomy … is undeniably Jerusalem-centric," Park suggests that the ascription of an *ekklēsia* identity to the gathering of Israel by the LXX translator reinforces the validity of the contemporary *ekklēsia* that operates in the Jerusalem of the translator's day (*Paul's Ekklēsia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in their Politico-Social World* [WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014], 94).

ekklēsia does so only of people, not of animals or items. Fourth, *ekklēsia* occurs with a greater number of locutions tied to God or to God's people.[80] This semantic flexibility in the word *ekklēsia* suggests its functionality as a name for a gathering of, or as a group designation for the collective whole of, God's people, the Jews.

Evidence that the word *ekklēsia* is used for both types of referents is found outside of the LXX. Apocryphal writings, Philo, and Josephus each use *ekklēsia* for public gatherings of Jews, while Philo alone suggests that a semi-public association of Alexandrian Jews self-designated collectively as an *ekklēsia*. I will address the existence of public *ekklēsiai* in Judea and in the Diaspora first.

3.3.2 *Public Assemblies in Hellenistic-Era Judea (Judith, 1 Maccabees, Sirach)*

3.3.2.1 *Ekklēsia* in Judith

The book of Judith, which ostensibly recounts 8th century BCE events, makes mention of a public *ekklēsia*. This *ekklēsia* is presented as a specially constituted assembly of Jews during a time of national emergency (6:16, 21; 7:29; 14:6).[81] It purportedly included "all their young men and women" (6:21). The author's identification of this assembly as an *ekklēsia* is anachronistic, not least since the original Athenian *ekklēsia* did not come into existence until two centuries later. Given that Judith was composed sometime during the Hasmonean period,[82]

---

80 When referencing God, examples of *ekklēsia* phraseology in the LXX include: "the assembly of God" (Neh 13:1; MSS S and L read κυρίου instead of ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ); "the assembly of the Lord" (Deut 23:1, 2, 3[2×], 8; 1 Chron 28:8; Mic 2:5), and "the assembly of the Most High" (Sir 24:2). The phrase "in the assembly of holy ones" (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων) is found in LXX Ps 88:6, wherein ἅγιοι means angels. *Ekklēsia* is used of an assembly for worship in Ps 21:23, 26. When referencing God's people, examples of *ekklēsia* phraseology include: "all the assembly of Israel" (Deut 31:30; 3 Kgs 8:14, 22, 55, 65; 1 Chron 13:2, 4; 2 Chron 6:3[2×], 12, 13; 7:8; 10:3; 1 Macc 4:59; Sir 50:13); "all the assembly of the sons of Israel" (Josh 8:35; Sir 50:20); "the assembly of the people of God" (Judg 20:2); "all the assembly of Judah" (2 Chron 23:3; 30:24, 25); "the assembly in Jerusalem" (2 Chron 30:2; 1 Macc 14:19); "the assembly of faithful [soldiers]" (1 Macc 3:13); and "the assembly of the people" (Jdt 14:6).

81 The four passages in Judith read: (6:16) "They called together all the elders of the town, and all their young men and women ran to the assembly (συνέδραμον … εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν)"; (6:21) "Uzziah took him [Achior] from the assembly (ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας) to his own home"; (7:29) "Then great and general lamentation arose throughout the assembly (ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας)"; (14:6) "When [Achior] came [from the house of Uzziah] and saw the head of Holofernes in the hand of one of the men in the assembly of the people (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ)."

82 Majority opinion places the compositional date of Judith "in the Maccabean era (in a broad sense)" (Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press,

the ostensible *ekklēsia* of the 8th century BCE Israelites has two potential models: either Greek *ekklēsiai* of the Hellenistic period or a Hasmonean-era public synagogue assembly in Judea named *ekklēsia*. The latter option seems preferable; unlike Greek *ekklēsiai*, Judith's *ekklēsia* allows women to participate (6:16). This egalitarian motif is also the case in the public Jewish *ekklēsiai* described in two other Hasmonean-era literary works: 1 Maccabees and Sirach.

3.3.2.2   *Ekklēsia* in 1 Maccabees

The occasional nature of Judith's public *ekklēsia* is consistent with the *ad hoc* nature of the *ekklēsiai* mentioned in the Hasmonean-era literary work known as 1 Maccabees.[83] Two of the five *ekklēsia* usages in 1 Maccabees (1 Macc 5:16; 14:19) refer to an occasional, public, religio-political assembly convened by the Maccabees.[84]

The first such assembly is called an *ekklēsia megalē* (1 Macc 5:16).[85] Jonathan Goldstein questions the authenticity of the phrase. He states that since "Judas and his band were outlaws and were probably regarded as such by the high priest and the national Council of Elders … it is best not to render the Greek by words which imply the meeting of a fully constituted body."[86] Goldstein

---

2002], 132). Both the *terminus a quo* and *ad quem* of Judith is said to be the time during which the *gerousia* existed in Judea. It is first mentioned in the charter of Antiochus III (*c.* 200 BCE) and later disbanded by the Romans in favour of a *boulē* (Ibid., 133). See Otzen for a list of scholars who date Judith either to the pre-Maccabean (post-300, *c.* 200, or *c.* 180 BCE), the Maccabean or early Hasmonean (167–*c.* 110 BCE; majority opinion), or to mid- to late Hasmonean or early Roman, periods (minority view) (Ibid., 132).

83   The compositional date of 1 Maccabees lies somewhere between the rule of John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE) and the desecration of the Temple by Pompeii (63 BCE) (Harold Attridge, "Historiography," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [CRINT II; ed. M. E. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984], 157–84, esp. 157).

84   1 Macc 5:16 and 14:19, respectively, read as follows: "a great assembly (ἐκκλησία μεγάλη) was called" and "And these were read before the assembly (ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας) in Jerusalem." The other three *ekklēsia* occurrences in 1 Maccabees are found in 2:56 ("Caleb, because he testified in the assembly [ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ]"), 3:13 ("including a body of faithful soldiers [ἐκκλησίαν πιστῶν] who stayed with him"), and 4:59 ("Then Judas and his brothers and all the assembly of Israel [πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ισραηλ] determined").

85   1 Macc 5:16 reads in full: "When Judas and the people heard these messages, a great assembly was called (ἐπισυνήχθη ἐκκλησία μεγάλη) to determine what they should do for their kindred [in Galilee and Gilead] who were in distress and were being attacked by enemies."

86   Jonathan Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 299.

does not explain, however, why the phrase *ekklēsia megalē* need necessarily suggest a "fully constituted body." The absence of *ekklēsia megalē* in the Greek inscriptional record until the Late Antique period, where it is used only of purpose-built structures for Christ-follower meetings,[87] suggests that the author of 1 Maccabees does not intend, thereby, a reference to a pre-existing Greco-Roman political institution. He may, however, intend an allusion to a Jewish *ekklēsia megalē*, one which did comprise a "fully constituted body." That Greek phrase occurs five other times in the LXX. In two of the historical books, *ekklēsia megalē* simply refers to the large (*megalē*) gathering of people at the dedication of the Solomonic Temple (LXX 3 Kgs 8:65; LXX 2 Chron 7:8).[88] 1 Macc 5:16 may also be using it in the same sense—"a greatly attended assembly." The two references to an *ekklēsia megalē* in Psalms read the same both in Hebrew (Ps 22:26; 40:10) and in Greek (LXX Ps 21:25; 39:9).[89] In contrast to the primarily political setting of 1 Macc 5:16, however, the two Psalms presume a religious setting, such as the Temple.

There is a political context, though, for at least one of the *ekklēsia megalē* occurrences in the LXX. The reference in LXX Neh 5:7 implies "a fully constituted body" not least with judiciary powers, but at most of an *ad hoc* nature.[90]

---

87   There are six extant examples of *ekklēsia megalē* within the inscriptional record. All are only Late Antique Christian references: *Inscr. Aeg. Thrace* 390 (Thrace, Paisoulai-Maximianoupolis; 6th cent. CE?); *SEG* 38:1856 (Egypt or Nubia; post-474/491 CE); *Asdracha, Inscr. Byz.* (AD 49/50A) 281,112 (Thrace, Hadrianopolis [Edirne]; 575–577 CE); *SEG* 44:588 (Thrace, Hadrianopolis [Edirne]; 576–577 CE); *IEph* 1373 (Ionia, found at Ephesos; fragments of a Christian text referring to the Church of John; n/d); *Miletos* 629 (Ionia, Miletos; a building inscription for the church of the archangel Michael; 602/606 CE).

88   LXX 3 Kgs 8:65 reads, "So Solomon held the festival at that time, and all Israel with him—a great assembly (ἐκκλησία μεγάλη)." The parallel passage (LXX 2 Chron 7:8) confirms that *ekklēsia megalē* only has reference to the size of the group, and not to an official political institution. 2 Chron 7:8 reads, "At that time Solomon held the festival for seven days, and all Israel with him, a very great congregation (ἐκκλησία μεγάλη σφόδρα)."

89   In both LXX Ps 21:25 and LXX Ps 39:9, the Hebrew prepositional phrase *běqāhāl rāb* (Ps 22:26; 40:10) is translated as *en ekklēsia megalē* (LXX Ps 21:25, παρὰ σοῦ ὁ ἔπαινός μου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ; LXX Ps 39:9, εὐηγγελισάμην δικαιοσύνην ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ). Both the Hebrew and Greek can be translated either as "in the great assembly" or as a temporary collective designation, "in the great congregation" (NRSV).

90   LXX Neh 5:7 reads, "After thinking it over, I brought charges against the nobles and the officials; I said to them, 'You are all taking interest from your own people.' And I called a great assembly (ἐκκλησίαν μεγάλην) to deal with them."

If the implied reader of 1 Macc 5:16 presumed an allusion to LXX Neh 5:7, then Judas Maccabeus implicitly gains political continuity with Nehemiah. Like the Maccabean *ekklēsia megalē*, Nehemiah's *ekklēsia megalē* also occurred at a seminal point in the history of the Jewish nation. During that public *ekklēsia*, he decisively gained lasting political authority through the acquiescence of the Judean elite to his demands that their use of indentured slavery and property confiscation be discontinued and that property and family members be restored to their fellow Jews.[91] This exalted political status for Nehemiah that was accorded him at the *ekklēsia megalē* of his day implicitly lends political legitimacy to the later Judas Maccabeus who through his *ekklēsia megalē* self-presents as a head of state, not as a brigand.

The second mention of a public *ekklēsia* in 1 Maccabees occurs at another decisive point in the history of the Jewish nation. In 1 Macc 14:20–23, the Spartans send a message of condolence on bronze tablets to Simon Maccabeus on the occasion of the passing of his brother Jonathan (143/142 BCE).[92] Therein, the Lacedaemonians renew their alliance and ostensibly present themselves as Abrahamic descendants[93] ("our brothers"; 1 Macc 14:20).[94] These tablets

---

91   LXX Neh 5:1–13.

92   This account in 1 Macc 14:19 accords with Greek *praxis* whereby decrees are cast in bronze *stelai*, engraved on wooden tablets, or written on papyrus, and then archived out of public view (Robert K. Sinclair, *Democracy and Participation in Athens* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 93; also Alan S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* [MnemosyneSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1977], 31 n. 40).

93   Louis Feldman finds a Jewish precedent for the Spartans' geneaological presupposition. Feldman states that Josephus "proudly quotes the non-Jewish writer Alexander Polyhistor, who reports that, according to Cleodemus the prophet, also called Malchus, two of Abraham's sons by Keturah joined the great hero Heracles in his campaign against Libya and Antaeus, the giant son of Earth, and that Heracles actually married the daughter of one of them, who became the ancestor of the barbarians called Sophakes (*A.J.* 1.165) (*Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998], 237). He notes further that "perhaps there is some connection between this and the statement in 1 Macc 12:10, 20 and 14:20 and 2 Macc 5:9 and *Ant.* 12.226 (the letter of Areios, the Spartan king to Onias), that the Spartans were regarded as descended from Abraham" (Ibid., 237 n. 36).

94   The practice of reinforcing kinship ties, even mythical ones, reflects the *praxis* of *syngeneia* between Greek *poleis* and *phylai*. For epigraphic evidence of kinship diplomacy, see Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*, 109–123.

were read out "before the *ekklēsia* in Jerusalem" (1 Macc 14:19).[95] The LXX uses *ekklēsia* here as a temporary collective designation, which is consistent with Greek literary and inscriptional *praxis*, and implies here a technical use of the term *ekklēsia*.

While 1 Macc 14 does not specifically identify the *ekklēsia* that was convened for the Lacedaemonians as being an *ekklēsia megalē*, Samuel Rocca suggests that such an institution existed in Jerusalem during the early Hasmonean period. Rocca claims that the term *ekklēsia megalē* was "coined by Simon in 141 BCE, [and] clearly reflects the democratization of society."[96] He locates its rise to when "the *gerousia* lost much of its power to the great assembly, *ekklēsia megalē*."[97]

Rocca's conclusions appear open to question, not least on two fronts. First, the term *ekklēsia megalē* does not actually occur in 1 Maccabees 14 nor is it associated with Simon Maccabeus in any other Jewish literary work.[98] Second, although there is a "great assembly" associated with Simon Maccabeus, the author of 1 Maccabees calls it a *synagōgē megalē* instead (1 Macc 14:28).[99] The context speaks of a leadership vacuum after Jonathan's death, which resulted in a *synagōgē megalē* being convened by "the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country." Simon was elected high priest, military commander, and ruler (1 Macc 14:25–49). Since the 19th century, scholarship has questioned the technical nature of the term *synagōgē megalē*, especially since it does not recur within other Jewish writings such

---

95   The Greek reads, ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ιερουσαλημ.

96   Samuel Rocca, *Herod's Judea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World* (TSAJ 122; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 262.

97   Rocca, *Herod's Judea*, 262.

98   Rocca appears to derive his conclusions from the comments of Abraham Schalit since he does not cite any primary textual sources (cf. Abraham Schalit, "Domestic Politics and Political Institutions," in *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 B.C.E. to 67 B.C.E.* [WHJP 6; ed. A. Schalit; New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972], 255–97, esp. 257–59).

99   1 Macc 14:28 reads, "in the great assembly (ἐπὶ συναγωγῆς μεγάλης) of the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country, the following was proclaimed to us."

as Philo, Josephus, or the Apocrypha.[100] Rather, scholarly consensus favours translating *synagōgē megalē* simply as "a great gathering."[101]

The remaining three *ekklēsia* occurrences in 1 Maccabees refer to a group, rather than to the meeting of a group: "a body of faithful [soldiers]" (1 Macc 3:13); the historical *ekklēsia* of Israel in the desert (1 Macc 2:56); and a Maccabean-era group designation which alludes back to the *ekklēsia* of Israel during David and Solomon's day (1 Macc 4:59; *pasa hē ekklēsia Israēl*).[102]

The collective designation of Judas Maccabeus' followers as *pasa hē ekklēsia Israēl* (1 Macc 4:59) serves a clear rhetorical function in the Maccabean Temple

---

100   There is a rabbinic tradition which associates the term "great synagogue," or more precisely "the Men of the Great Synagogue" (*Gen. R.* 35:2), with events related to Ezra's leadership, as they are described in Nehemiah 8–10. *Avot* 1:1 chronologically locates the Men of the Great Synagogue between the Prophets and the Zugot (the Pharisaic leaders after the Maccabean victory). Simon II, the Just (High Priest, 219–199 BCE), is considered one of their "remnants" (see Hugo Mantel, "The Men of the Great Synagogue," *HTR* 60/1 [1967]: 69–91, esp. 69). Mantel notes four positions scholars take on the reliability of this Tannaitic tradition: (1) those who reject an early date for the Great Synagogue (H. E. Ryle), or who doubt its institutional status (H. Englander, E. Bickermann, Y. Gutman); (2) those who "identify the Great Synagogue as the official government in Jerusalem, under the presidency of the high priest" (N. Krochmal, S. Levy, L. Herzfeld, S. Sachs, D. Hoffman, S. Krauss); (3) those who claim that "Great Synagogue" was a title given to assemblies of key leaders, "which met in times of high national crises in order to decide on crucial issues" (e.g., Ezra, Simon II, and the assembly which authorized rebellion against Rome [66 CE]); and (4) Finkelstein who suggests that the Great Synagogue "was associated with a non-official religious movement ... called Keneset Ha-Hasidim ... a synonym for Pharisees (M. Yoma VII, 1; M. Zabim III, 2; M. Bek. V, 5, etc.) ... [who established the] Keneset ha-Gedolah, meaning Great Court (usually translated as Great Synagogue)" (Ibid., 69–70). Mantel sides with Finkelstein but offers two caveats: he dates the origin of the term Keneset at least a century and a half after Ezra's time and he redefines Keneset as "association" instead of as "an official, public court." He notes that "what remains to be pointed out is that the Jewish sects in Palestine itself, such as the Keneset, which was equivalent to the Pharisees, and its supreme council, the Keneset ha-Gedolah, were modeled in their organization on the Hellenistic religious and social associations" (Ibid., 75). Mantel identifies twelve similarities between the Keneset and Greco-Roman voluntary associations (Ibid., 75–91).

101   J. A. Selbie, "The Great Synagogue," in *A Dictionary of the Bible: Volume IV, Part II: Shimrath–Zuzim* (ed. J. Hastings; 1898; repr., Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2004), 643–44, esp. 634.

102   In 1 Macc 4:59 Judas Maccabeus, his brothers, and his victorious followers (*pasa hē ekklēsia Israel*), after having purified and re-dedicated the Temple, "determined that every year at that season the days of dedication of the altar should be observed with joy and gladness for eight days, beginning with the twenty-fifth day of the month of Chislev."

rededication narrative. Informed hearers/readers of the narrative would have recognized an allusion to the phrase *pasa hē ekklēsia Israēl* which occurs in the account of the Solomonic Temple dedication ceremony (LXX 2 Chron 6:3).

In 2 Chronicles 6–7, the Chronicler relates Solomon's dedication of the Temple before *pasa hē ekklēsia* Israēl, with the concomitant descent of God's glory (LXX 2 Chron 7:1–3).[103] The motif of Temple (re-)dedication is common to both 1 Maccabees and 2 Chronicles. Thus, an informed reader of 1 Maccabees could have seen a rhetorical agenda in the lexical and thematic commonalities. This reading strategy would situate the description of the Maccabean rededication ceremony as a "type-scene," or "type-narrative," of the Solomonic Temple dedication.[104] Such an intertextual reading implies that God's glory did in fact descend at the Temple rededication led by the Maccabean brothers and that it did so in a fashion consistent with that which occurred at the Temple dedication led by Solomon. Such a "type-narrative" reading implicitly confers religious legitimacy onto the Maccabeans, which also, thereby, elevates their political status in the newly independent nation of Israel.

This coupling of religious validation for the Maccabeans right to rule along with the according of political legitimacy to the Maccabean revolt through the

---

103   The same prepositional phrase is found both in LXX 2 Chron 6:12 and 13 within the account of Solomon's prayer of dedication for the Temple ("in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel" [ἔναντι πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ισραηλ]). Accusative and nominative forms of only the nominal phrase each occur in 2 Chron 6:3 ("he [King Solomon] blessed all the assembly of Israel while all the assembly of Israel stood" [εὐλόγησεν τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ισραηλ, καὶ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ισραηλ παρειστήκει]).

104   Robert Alter uses the term "type-scene" for a conventional way in which a significant episode in a hero's life is literarily presented (*The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York: Basic Books, 1981], 51–52). One common "type-scene" is a hero's betrothal. Conventional elements include the hero journeying to a distant land, meeting an eligible girl at a well, the girl rushing home to announce the hero's arrival, the hero being honoured with a meal, and a betrothal being subsequently concluded. Instances of this "type-scene" are said to occur in Gen 24:10–31 (Abraham), Gen 29:1–20 (Jacob), Exod 2:15b–21 (Moses), Ruth 2 (Ruth), and 1 Sam 9:11–12 (Saul). Robert Alter also explores the "type-scene" conventions evident in the stories of Esau and Jacob, Tamar and Judah, and Joseph and his brothers (*The World of Biblical Literature* [New York: Basic Books, 1992], 114–17). Paul R. Noble expands upon Alter's insights but uses the term "type-narrative" in relation to these three stories "which each manipulates a set of shared motifs in such a way as to provide meaningful variations on essentially the same underlying plot. Thus, although each story has a narrative integrity of its own, its full significance can only be grasped when it is read intertexually with the other two, since only then can the relevant motifs be identified and the individuality of their handling in each story be appreciated" ("Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-biblical Allusions," *VT* 52 [2002]: 219–52, esp. 233).

allusional use of the phrase *ekklēsia megalē* (1 Macc 5:16; LXX Neh 5:7), suggests strongly an intentional rhetorical strategy by the author(s) of 1 Maccabees relative to his/their use of the word *ekklēsia*. Such a rhetorical move stands alone within the Jewish apocrypha and among subsequent writers who mention *ekklēsiai* (Philo, Josephus). One possible exception may be found in Paul's Galatian epistle, which I will discuss in Chapter 4.

One other point can be made relative to the semantic domain of the word *ekklēsia* as it is used in 1 Maccabees; it has implications for one's interpretation of the roughly contemporaneous book of Judith. The use of *ekklēsia* in 1 Macc 14:19 for an occasional, public, religio-political assembly in Jerusalem, not least by the time of Simon Maccabeus, makes it possible that Judith's regional, public *ekklēsia* is also modeled after a Hellenistic-era synagogue assembly, rather than only after a Greco-Roman *ekklēsia*. If so, then Judith's mention of women and young men taking part in the 8th century BCE *ekklēsia* may actually mirror *praxis* in synagogue assemblies named *ekklēsiai* that were contemporaneous with the author of Judith.

The public nature of the *ekklēsia* in 1 Maccabees (5:16; 14:19) is also evident in another Hasmonean-era Jewish writing—Sirach. Not only that, but one even finds strands of continuity between both Sirach's and 1 Maccabees' allusions back to the Solomonic Temple dedication (Sir 50:13, 20; 1 Macc 5:16).

3.3.2.3   *Ekklēsia* in Sirach
The Judea of Ben Sira's timeframe (*c.* 200 BCE) appears to have contained public assemblies of Jews which were called *ekklēsiai*, at least insofar as the witness of Sirach,[105] the Greek translation of Ben Sira's original Hebrew text,

---

105   Sirach is the Greek name of the author (Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach; Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιραχ Ελεαζαρ; 50:27). In Hebrew his name is Yeshua ben El-azar ben Sira. Ben Sira's grandson translated Sirach into Greek sometime after 132 BCE while living in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy VIII Physkon Euergetes II (145–116 BCE). King Euergetes reigned in Alexandria from 170–163 (co-regent with Ptolemy VI Philometor who reigned from Memphis) and 145–116 BCE (sole regent) (Margaret Bunson, *Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* [rev. ed.; New York: Facts on File, 2002], 108, 346; see also, John G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* [The Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974], 7). In the Prologue, Ben Sira's grandson states, "I came to Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of [Ptolemy] Euergetes." For more detailed dating discussions see, for example, David S. Williams, "The Date of Ecclesiasticus," *VT* 44, no. 4 (1994): 563–66, and Patrick Skehan and Alexander DiLella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AYBC; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 8–9.

is concerned (*c.* 132 BCE).[106] Therein, the grandson of Ben Sira ascribes the designation *ekklēsia* to the Judean assembly known in Ben Sira's Hebrew text as *qhl*. In Sirach there are thirteen occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* and seven of the word *synagōgē*.[107] Three *ekklēsia* occurrences mirror LXX usage in referring to the supra-local *ekklēsia* of Israel (46:7; 50:13, 20).[108] The other ten occurrences are not used as a group designation. One refers to "the gathering of a mob" (26:5). The other nine speak of a publicly accessible meeting located in a particular region, within which religio-political matters are addressed.[109]

---

106   Approximately two-thirds of the Hebrew text of Ben Sira is extant. Small fragments of Ben Sira in Hebrew were found in Qumran cave 2 (2Q18) and 4 (e.g., 4Q525, late 1st cent. BCE), with the text of 39:27–44:17 being discovered at Masada. The rest of the Hebrew text of Ben Sira derives from copies of early medieval manuscripts from the Cairo genizah (11th or 12th century CE) (3:6–16:26; 30:11–38:2; 39:15–51:30). Although some text was preserved at Qumran, Ben Sira does not reflect any of the themes, style, and preoccupations of the Qumran wisdom texts. It uses the sapiential tradition modeled on the biblical Proverbs (see John Kampen, *Wisdom Literature* [ECDSS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], esp. 341–64). For facsimiles of the restored Hebrew text, see Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997). For a precise inventory of the Cambridge Ben Sira Genizah manuscripts see Stefan C. Reif, "The Discovery of the Cambridge Genizah Fragments of Ben Sira: Scholars and Texts," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. P. C. Beentjes; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 1–22, esp. 22. For a complete list of Ben Sira manuscripts from Qumran and Masada see Corrado Martone, "Ben Sira Manuscripts from Qumran and Masada," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* [ed. P. C. Beentjes; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997], 81–94.

107   Sirach uses the word *ekklēsia* in 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 24:2; 26:5 ("the gathering of a mob"); 34[31]:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; and 50:13, 20. Ben Sira speaks of a *synagōgē* as a place for legal judgments (41:18, ἀπὸ συναγωγῆς καὶ λαοῦ περὶ ἀνομίας) and as a community before which to show deference (4:7, "Endear yourself to the congregation" [προσφιλῆ συναγωγῇ σεαυτὸν ποίει]). As in the LXX, Sirach uses *synagōgē* to refer to ancient Israel (24:23; 46:14) and to smaller groupings, specifically to godless groups (16:6, ἐν συναγωγῇ ἁμαρτωλῶν; 21:9, συναγωγὴ ἀνόμων; 45:18, συναγωγὴ Κωρὲ).

108   The NRSV translation of Sir 46:7 lacks precision. It implies that the rebellious people were known as an "assembly." Rather, the Greek text differentiates between the rebellious people and the assembly before whom Moses and Caleb opposed the rebels ("when they stood before the assembly to oppose the rebellious people" [ἀντιστῆναι ἔναντι ἐκκλησίας κωλῦσαι λαὸν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας]).

109   Theophilo Middendorp concludes that the two terms used for assembly in Sirach (*qhl* and *'dh*) refer to public assemblies in Jerusalem which are focused primarily on political

Runesson sees in each of these nine *ekklēsia* occurrences a reference to some sort of institution contemporaneous with the author.[110]

These nine references raise a three-fold question. Does Ben Sira's grandson accurately report the name of an early 2nd century Judean synagogue assembly or does he anachronistically retroject the name of a late 2nd century Egyptian or Judean synagogue assembly? In other words, was Ben Sira's *qhl* known as *ekklēsia* by early 2nd century BCE Hellenistic Judeans, or is his grandson ascribing to the earlier Judean *qhl* the name of one of three contemporaneous institutions in his own day (*c*. 132 BCE): a civic *ekklēsia* in the Greek East, a Jewish *ekklēsia* in Egypt, or a Jewish *ekklēsia* in Judea?

Sirach's nine regional assemblies named *ekklēsia* share a number of similarities with Greek *ekklēsiai* in their exercise of juridical, political, and religious functions. One juridical issue with which Sirach's *ekklēsia* is tasked is that of judging adultery (23:24).[111] Adultery also was an item of jurisprudence for the Athenian *ekklēsia*, at least until 355 BCE.[112] Politically, Sirach's *ekklēsiai* parallel

---

matters after the supposed fashion of Hellenistic-era *ekklēsiai* (*Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus* [Leiden: Brill, 1973], 155–62). Sirach carefully maintains the distinction created in the LXX by only translating *qhl* with *ekklēsia* and using *synagōgē* for *'dh* (Ibid., 155–56, 159). Burton Mack claims that this translational distinction does not necessarily indicate an institutional distinction. Sirach is not necessarily implying that either 2nd century Judea or Egypt knew of a complimentary, or competitive, public institution to the *ekklēsia* which was known as *synagōgē* (*Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985], 79).

110 Runesson, *Origins of the Synagogue*, 312–13.

111 Sir 23:22–24: "the woman who is unfaithful to her husband … will be dragged before the assembly (εἰς ἐκκλησίαν)." Skehan and di Lella suggest that the adulteress is "brought to the public place (of scourging) alluded to in the alternative translation of v. 21b" (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 325). Claudia V. Camp's feminist reading of Ben Sira questions whether Sir 23:22–24 reflects actual Judean institutional *praxis* ("Honor and Shame in Ben Sira: Anthropological and Theological Reflections," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* [ed. P. C. Beentjes; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997], 171–188, esp. 183–86). She views Ben Sira's use of *ekklēsia* discourse as a rhetorical device meant to vindicate male honour (44:1–11; ch. 50), judge female shame (24:22–24) and, by gender association, to tarnish another woman, Lady Wisdom (Sir 24:12, 20–23). For an alternative interpretation of Lady Wisdom's loss of pre-eminence, see Shannon Burkes Pinette, "The Lady Vanishes: Wisdom in Ben Sira and Daniel," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins* (ed. D. C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 160–72.

112 Cases of public morality, such as adultery, were brought forward within the Athenian *ekklēsia* for consideration as high treason by private individuals (*eisangelia eis ton dēmon*)

Greek *ekklēsiai* as public forums within which respected community members voice their opinions[113] and where honour and praise is bestowed upon the blameless.[114] Theophilo Middendorp claims that it is encomiastic speech which is evident in Sirach's assemblies, not simply rhetoric appropriate to deliberation and jurisprudence.[115] Since *encomium* is a distinctively Greek *praxis*, Middendorp asserts that the Greek *ekklēsia* is Sirach's primary model.

Burton Mack demurs. He advises caution when viewing Ben Sira's public assemblies through Greek eyes. He gives two reasons for seeing a Jewish heritage behind Ben Sira's use of *ekklēsia* for a public assembly. First, Ben Sira's most panegyric passage, the hymn about Simon II (ch. 50), within which are found two *ekklēsia* references, "does not correspond fully to the form of the Hellenistic encomiastic speech."[116] Second, Mack states that, notwithstanding Ben Sira's appreciation for "Hellenistic models of social governance, education, cultural forms, and thought, [he] has not destroyed essentially Jewish concerns for theocracy, Torah, tradition, and wisdom."[117] For Mack, the model for Sirach's *ekklēsia* has decidedly Jewish roots. If so, is Ben Sira's grandson then thinking of Jewish *ekklēsiai* in Judea or in Egypt?

Patrick Tiller states that Sirach's *ekklēsiai* are differentiated from Greek civic *ekklēsiai* in that they "were not regular, legislative bodies."[118] In his mind, this

---

until at least 335 BCE (Mogens Hermann Hansen, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987], 212).

113 For example, Sir 15:5 (Lady Wisdom "will open his mouth in the midst of the assembly" [ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας/קהל]); Sir 21:17 ("The views of a prudent man are sought in an assembly [ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ]") and Sir 38:33 ("They do not occupy the judge's bench [ἐπὶ δίφρον δικαστοῦ], nor are they prominent in the assembly [ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ]").

114 Sir 34[31]:11 (The blameless rich person's "prosperity will be established, and the assembly [ἐκκλησία/ל[ה]ק] will proclaim his acts of charity"). Public proclamation of civic benefaction is prevalent in 1st century BCE Greek honorary decrees (See Appendix 1). These were enacted within an *ekklēsia*. An inscription contemporaneous with Simon the high priest (Sirach 50) is *Milet* I 3, 145 (Asia Minor, Ephesos[?]; 200/199 BCE). It is an honorary decree for a local citizen, Eudemos Thallionos, who established and regulated administration of school.

115 Middendorp, *Stellung*, 160–62.

116 Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic*, 81.

117 Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic*, 79.

118 Patrick Tiller cites four examples of "various assemblies where one could speak … but [which] were not regular legislative bodies." These are in Sir 15:5, 34[31]:11, 44:15 and 50: 13, 20 ("Sociological Settings of the Components of *1 Enoch*," in *The Early Enoch Literature* [ed. G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 237–56, esp. 247). Tiller does cite one potential example of a regularly constituted assembly (7:14). This example is problematic, however, since this verse does not use the word *ekklēsia* or its Hebrew equivalent

fact suggests that Sirach is describing a Judean institution, not one located within a Greek *polis*.[119] Sirach's ostensibly Judean *ekklēsiai* are not simply forums for political and juridical activity, however. In three *ekklēsia* references they also reflect religious *praxeis* (Sir 24:2; 50:13, 20). In Sirach 24 items of a religious nature are central, while in Sir 50:13 and 20 *ekklēsia* is used as a collective identity, one which alludes back to Solomon's dedication of the Temple. Each of these two religious contexts warrants further investigation.

3.3.2.3.1   Ekklēsia *in Sirach 24*

In Sir 24:2, Lady Wisdom is said metaphorically to speak within "the assembly of the Most High (*en ekklēsia hypsistou*) … in the presence of His hosts."[120] This *ekklēsia* appears to be a heavenly one given that the term "His hosts" (*dynameōs autou*) can refer to heavenly hosts such as angels.[121] Middendorp suggests an alternative explanation. He sees Sirach's use of *hypsistos* ("Most High") as being a euphemism for the Tetragrammaton (YHWH). This prevents offense with Hellenistic Jewish readers who avoid direct equivalents like

---

qhl. Sir 7:14 reads, "Do not babble in the assembly of the elders" (ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων [עדת שרים]) (Ibid., 247). Although Goldblatt argues that Josephus uses *plēthos* to refer to an *ekklēsia*, Tiller does not cite Goldblatt as analogous support for his reading of Ben Sira's *plēthos* as an *ekklēsia* (David M. Goldblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-government in Antiquity* [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994], 115).

119   Tiller maintains this to be the case even in Sir 38:32 where the words *ekklēsia* and *boulē* are juxtaposed (*eis boulēn laou*) ("Sociological Settings," 247). Ben Sira speaks of Judean artisans: "Yet they are not sought out for the council of the peoples (εἰς βουλὴν λαοῦ) nor do they attain eminence in the public assembly (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ)" (38:32, 33). Skehan and Di Lella note that artisans, are not "prominent in the assembly (vv. 32c–33a) [for the simple reason that] … they are not trained for civic or religious leadership in general … [and] not trained in wisdom" (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 451).

120   Sir 24:2 reads, "Wisdom praises herself, and tells of her glory in the midst of her people. In the assembly of the Most High [ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑψίστου] she opens her mouth, and in the presence of his hosts she tells of her glory."

121   Precedent for such an interpretation is found in LXX Ps 88:6 where the "holy ones" most naturally refers to angels ("Let the heavens declare your wonders, O Lord, and your truth in the assembly of the holy ones (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων)." Skehan and Di Lella contend that the personages identified by the phrases "'the assembly of the Most High' and 'his host' are indeed the angelic attendants at God's throne, where Wisdom personified is also said to reside" (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 331). Lester L. Grabbe states that 24:2 is evidence of Ben Sira's acceptance of the existence of angels. He cites other potential examples of this belief in 17:32, 42:17, and 45:2 (*Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* [London and New York: Routledge, 2000], 222).

kyrios.[122] Middendorp suggests, therefore, that the *ekklēsia hypsistou* in Sir 24:2 is simply symbolic language for a formal gathering of 2nd century BCE Jews. If so, then to what type of assembly does Sirach's *ekklēsia hypsistou* refer?

Andries du Toit sees it as being both local and religious in nature. He notes, first, that Sir 24:2 shifts the Deuteronomic definition of *ekklēsia kyriou*: "the term which traditionally had an inclusive, supra-local connotation, now refers to a local assembly."[123] Second, he states that "the fact that it is called an ἐκκλησία ὑψίστου rather points towards a primarily religious occasion."[124] If so, then 24:2 differentiates itself from Hellenistic-era Greek inscriptions in using *ekklēsia* for a local meeting of a religious character.[125]

Richard Horsley views Sirach's *ekklēsia hypsistou* as political rhetoric not as religious euphemism. He asserts that "the hymn in Sirach 24 articulates something ... more political, or rather more political-religious."[126] His rationale comes from Sir 24:8–12 where Wisdom's universal distribution (Sir 1:9–10, "poured ... upon all the living") is geo-politically particularized "in (the Temple in) Zion, [with her having] assumed authority/power in Jerusalem."[127] Thus, he claims that "this declaration grounds the Jerusalem temple-state as a way of legitimating the established political order."[128]

If, as per du Toit and Horsley, Sir 24:2 reflects a symbolic description of an earthly *ekklēsia*, then it aligns with Mack's contention that the model for

---

122   Middendorp, *Stellung*, 158.

123   Du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*: Interculturality in the Shaping of Paul's Theology," *NTS* 55 (2009): 121–143, esp. 136.

124   Du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 136. Du Toit does acknowledge that since local governance is by a priestly aristocracy, "we should not differentiate too strictly between political and religious meetings" (Ibid., 136).

125   Although religious ceremony was part and parcel of each Athenian *ekklēsia* from its inception, the Hellenistic-era *ekklēsia* in Athens, or elsewhere in the Greek East, perfunctorily mention religious elements but the rest of the inscriptional text deals with civic issues. For example, (1) *Agora* 15 199 (Athens, 175/4 BCE): ὑπὲρ [ὧν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν] οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Κεκροπίδος ὑπὲρ τῶν θυσιῶν ὧν ἔθυον τ[ὰ πρὸ τῶν ἐκκλησι]ῶν τῶι τε Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Προστ[α]τηρίωι καὶ τεῖ Ἀρτέμιδι τε[ῖ Βουλαίαι καὶ τεῖ] [Φ]ωσφόρωι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θε[οῖ]ς οἷς πάτριον ἦν·; (2) *IG* II² 1042 (Athens, 41/0 BCE): ὑπ]ὲρ τῆς θυσίας ἣν ἔθυσ[εν μετὰ τῶν ἐφή][βων ἐν τῶι πρυτανείωι; τοῖς ἄλλοις [θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον; γεγονέναι πᾶσι τοῖς θύμα[σι τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ σωτή]ρια; (3) Additionally, the seven *ekklēsiai* within the inscriptional record which were called "sacred" (*hiera*) appear to have dealt predominantly with civic issues, not with religious ones (see n. 126 [Ch. 2]).

126   Richard A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 146.

127   Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries*, 147.

128   Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries*, 147.

Sirach's *ekklēsia* has decidedly Jewish roots.[129] Wisdom's identification with the Torah (24:23)[130] allows one to postulate that in 24:2 (and 15:5) Sirach speaks of a public synagogue.[131] Therein, Sirach describes a publicly accessible assembly in which Jews gather to hear the exposition of (religio-political) Torah by Lady Wisdom through the mouth of her human representative for the purpose of making decisions on matters of community interest.

3.3.2.3.2   Ekklēsia *in Sirach 50*

In contradistinction to Sir 24:2, the word *ekklēsia* in Sir 50:13 and 20 does not refer to a meeting of people but rather to a collective designation—*pasa ekklēsia* (*huiōn*) *Israēl*.[132] The preposition *enanti* ("before") in Sir 50:13 reinforces the fact that the *ekklēsia* therein refers to a gathered community. In Sir 50:13, the high priest Simon II (219–196 BCE)[133] presides at the altar "before the whole assembly of Israel" (*enanti pasēs ekklēsias Israēl*).[134] Simon is

---

129   See Mack's comments relative to nn. 430 and 431.

130   For a discussion on the origin and nature of wisdom, see Daniel J. Harrington, *Jesus ben Sira of Jerusalem: A Biblical Guide to Living Wisely* (Interfaces; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 31–32.

131   The *ekklēsia* in Sir 15:5 may also presume a religio-political context. Lady Wisdom is said to open the mouth of "whoever fears the Lord … and holds to the law" (15:1). Harrington notes that in 15:1 "Ben Sira summarizes his whole theological outlook in one sentence … [He] links his three favorite theological concepts: fear of the Lord, the law, and wisdom" (*Jesus ben Sira*, 111). Richard J. Coggins describes the scribe's audience as "the assembly gathered in the sacred tradition and for worship, [which] would fit in very well with what we know of the synagogue from a somewhat later period" (*Sirach* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998], 72).

132   Sir 50:13 reads, ἔναντι πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ισραηλ, while Sir 50:20 slightly revises the Greek of 50:13 (and the Hebrew text of 50:20b) to read, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ισραηλ. The Hebrew text of 50:1–28 is only available in MS B on pages B XIX recto, B XIX verso and B XX recto. Ben Sira uses the word *qhl* in both verses as indicated in MS B XIX verso (50:11a–22b [T-S 16.314 verso]). Both Sir 50:13c and 50:20b read the same: כל קהל ישראל. For facsimiles of Sirach 50 in Hebrew, see Otto Mulder (*Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel* [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 69).

133   Simon, or Simeon II, is the son of Onias (Yohanan). He served as high priest from 219–196 BCE and most likely died a few years prior to when Ben Sira was written (Harrington, *Jesus ben Sira*, 62). Skehan and Di Lella note that "Simeon II was given the title 'the Righteous' or 'the Just' because he was the last of the priestly house of Zadok to observe the Law faithfully" (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 550).

134   Sir 50:20 slightly revises the original Hebrew of 50:20b to read, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ισραηλ. Otto Mulder explains this male-oriented revision as reflecting post-exilic ideology since in pre-exilic *ekklēsiai* "women, children and foreigners were commonly included

inextricably connected with God's glory in grandiose fashion (50:5; "how glorious he was!"). In this, he provides a fitting climax to Ben Sira's "catalogue of biblical heroes ... [who are] generally manifestations of the glory of God" (chs. 44–49).[135] The "glory" motif associates each biblical hero with "the theme of the covenant and the cultic complex of the Israelite priesthood, temple worship, and sacrifice."[136] Simon's status as the climactic biblical hero (50:1–21) is further reinforced in his allusional connection to the Solomonic Temple cult (LXX 2 Chron 6:12, 13) through his altar ministry "before all the assembly of Israel" (*enanti pasēs ekklēsias Israēl*, 50:13). The rhetorical benefits of such an allusion appear also to have been appropriated by the author of 1 Maccabees (4:59).

In Sir 50:20 the grandson of Ben Sira is not as faithful to his base text (LXX 2 Chron 6:12, 13) as he is in Sir 50:13; he adds the word "sons" to the phrase *pasēs ekklēsias Israēl*.[137] The word "sons" also does not appear in the Hebrew, at least insofar as the Cairo genizah text of Ben Sira is concerned (11th or 12th century CE).[138] Otto Mulder claims that the addition of "sons" in 50:20 provides a more specific sense of "institutionalized cultic community." This brings Sir 50:20 more into continuity with post-exilic descriptions of an exclusively male cultic community (e.g., 1 Chron 29:10; cf. 28:1).[139] One example Mulder cites is the Chronicler's description of the Solomonic Temple dedication wherein only elders, heads of tribes, and leaders of the ancestral houses apparently are in attendance (2 Chron 5:2).[140] By contrast, in pre-exilic texts Mulder says "women, children and foreigners were commonly included" in *ekklēsiai*.[141]

(Josh 8:35, 1 Kgs 8:14). After the exile this tends to restrict the perspective to the institutionalised cultic community in 1 Chron 29:10, 2 Chron 30:25, Neh 8:3. In spite of the limited character of the difference between G and H here, the expression nevertheless presents a completely different reality in the community in the temple" (*Simon the High Priest*, 298).

135   Harrington, *Jesus ben Sira*, 128.

136   Harrington, *Jesus ben Sira*, 128.

137   Sir 50:20 reads, in part, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ισραηλ.

138   The word בני ("sons") does not occur in the Hebrew text of B XIX verso (50:11a–22b [T-S 16.314 verso] (Mulder, *Simon the High Priest*, 69).

139   Mulder, *Simon the High Priest*, 298.

140   Within the account of Solomon's dedication of the Temple, the simple phrase *pasēs ekklēsias Israēl* occurs in LXX 2 Chron 6:3, but in conjunction with the preposition *enanti* in LXX 2 Chron 6:12, 13.

141   Mulder, *Simon the High Priest*, 298. One exception not explained by Mulder is 2 Chron 31:18, where wives and children of priests appear to be included in the *qāhāl* (*lĕkāl qāhāl*), but where the LXX translates *lĕkāl qāhāl* with *eis pan plēthos* ("multitude," "number"), instead of with *eis pan ekklēsian*. If this represents a translational *tendenz*, then the translator is implying that women and children should not be considered a part of the *qāhāl/*

There is another way to explain Sirach's addition of the word "sons." Outside of Sir 50:20, there is only other occurrence in the LXX of the collocation "all the *ekklēsia* of the sons of Israel" (LXX Josh 8:35).[142] The end of Deuteronomy forms the historical backdrop for the context of Joshua 8. As Moses' life concludes, he and Joshua recite to "all the assembly of Israel" (LXX Deut 31:30)[143] the words of a song which warns against apostasy (LXX Deut 32:1–43). Not long thereafter, apostasy does occur resulting in the initial defeat of the Israelites at Ai (Josh 7:1–6). After their second attack is victorious (Josh 8:10–17), Joshua leads the people in a time of recommitment (Josh 8:30–35). He reinscribes the Mosaic Law upon stone and then reads "all the words of the law, blessings and curses ... in the hearing of all the assembly of Israel [*kol-qᵉhal yiśrāʾēl*], and the women, and the little ones, and the aliens who resided among them" (Josh 8:34, 35).[144] As in Sirach, LXX Josh 8:35 adds the word "sons" (*huiōn*) to the same Hebrew phrase (*kol-qᵉhal yiśrāʾēl*) and translates it as *pasēs ekklēsias huiōn Israēl*.

If Sirach's addition of *huiōn* (50:20) intends an allusion back to Joshua's time when Israel recommitted to Torah faithfulness (LXX Josh 8:34, 35), and if Simon's blessing of "all the *ekklēsia* of the sons of Israel" with "the blessing of the Most High" (50:21) is meant to allude back to Joshua's blessing (and cursing) of *pasēs ekklēsias huiōn Israēl* (LXX Josh 8:34, 35),[145] then Sirach reinscribes

---

      ekklēsia of Israel, especially of its priestly component. This possibility seems to be reinforced by the fact that the LXX translator chooses to remove "little children and women" from his translation, yet leaves "sons and daughters." Another possible interpretation is that suggested in the NRSV translation wherein the word *qāhāl* is translated "multitude," which translation the LXX also employs by using *plēthos*. Both the LXX and the NRSV indicate that the priests and their households are "the whole multitude" which was enrolled by genealogy for the purpose of being on the distribution list for receipt of the priestly portions of food and goods.

142   LXX Josh 8:35 reads, ὅ οὐκ ἀνέγω Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ ὦτα πάσης ἐκκλησίας υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, τοῖς ἀνδράσιν καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶν καὶ τοῖς παιδίοις καὶ τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς προσπορευομένοις τῷ Ἰσραηλ.

143   LXX Deut 31:30 reads, ἐλάλησεν Μωυσῆς εἰς τὰ ὦτα πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ἰσραηλ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ᾠδῆς ταύτης ἔως εἰς τέλος.

144   The unpointed Hebrew text of Josh 8:35 reads the same as in Sir 50:20 (כל קהל ישראל).

145   The epithet "the Most High" (50:21) is clearly identified as the Jewish "God Most High" four verses earlier (50:17; *theos hypsistos*). The phrase *theos hypsistos* occurs in numerous Jewish sources. In the LXX the phrase *theos* (*kyrios*) *hypsistos* (articular or anarthrous) is found 20 times (e.g., Gen 14:18–22; Job 31:28; Ps 7:18; 56:3; and Dan 5:1). Some Jewish inscriptions (2nd to 4th cents. CE) from the Bosporus Kingdom also refer to a *theos hypsistos*. See Gibson's discussion of the full invocation θεῶι ὑψίστωι παντοκράτορι εὐλογητῷ, which is

his grandfather's attempt to promote Torah faithfulness among the original Judean readership with his own attempt to call his contemporary Alexandrian readership to Torah observance. If Sirach's Greek speaking readership connected those allusional dots, then they may even have viewed the aristocratic high priest Simon II as a counterpart to Moses (Sir 45:2) and Joshua (Sir 46:1), thus, enhancing Simon's status as a religious Torah teacher and political nation builder (Sir 50:1–4).[146] If Sirach alludes to LXX Josh 8:35, then, contrary to Mulder, Sir 50:20 does not implicitly promote a post-exilic, patriarchal, public *ekklēsia* within which women, children and foreigners were excluded. This being the case, Sirach places his *ekklēsia* at odds with the "male citizen only" demographics of a Greek civic *ekklēsia*. This would make Sirach's *ekklēsia* an inclusive precedent for any early Christ-followers who required a historical model of an *ekklēsia* within which unrestricted social interaction between men and women, at the very least, was prioritized (e.g., Gal 3:28).

This still leaves open the question, though, as to why Ben Sira and his grandson would need rhetorically to 'construct' a grandiose aristocratic high priest who walks in the shoes of Moses and Joshua. Ben Sira's grandson writes in tumultuous times, both from the perspective of religious and political change. He writes from Alexandria in the 38th year of the reign of Ptolemy VIII Physkon

---

found in three inscriptions *CIRB* 1123, 1125, 1126 (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 106–23). *CIRB* 1123 begins with, "To Theos Hypsistos, all powerful, blessed" and ends with, "under Zeus, Ge ["Earth"], and Helios ["Sun"]." One cannot extrapolate from these facts, however, the corollary conclusion that all instances of the phrase *theos hypsistos* refer to the Jewish God. Its use is not distinctive of Jews. Non-Jews denoted Zeus or other transcendent gods as *theos hypsistos* (Gibson, *Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 109–11). Bosporan examples from Tanais include *CIRB* 1277 (173–211 CE) and *CIRB* 1283 (228 CE). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg note that "there is no evidence pointing to the presence of Judeans at Tanias" (*AGRW*, nos. 91 and 92). Paul Trebilco, in his study of Jews in Asia Minor, contends that, since Greco-Romans also denoted Zeus or other transcendent gods as θεὸς ὕψιστος, Jews decreased their use of that epithet in public settings (*Jewish Communities in Asia Minor Society* [SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 142–44).

146   Tiller notes that "it is clear from the characterization of Simon that the high priesthood has taken over the functions of kingship (fortifications and water supply; cf. 48:17 and 50:2–4), while remaining focused on the temple-cult" ("Sociological Settings," 247). The consolidation of political and religious power into the hands of the high priest is not out of character for Hellenistic-era Judea. During the Ptolemaic reign (301 BCE–198 BCE), the high priest in Jerusalem functioned as a religio-political regent responsible for the oversight of the Temple-state of Judea.

(*c.* 132 BCE),[147] during a time when his grandfather's homeland, Judea, continued to be under Seleucid control (Demetrius II Nicator; 147–125 BCE),[148] and in the same year that civil war broke out in Egypt. The people of Alexandria, who were loyal to Cleopatra II, the estranged wife of Ptolemy VIII, revolted against the rest of Egypt, which was loyal to Ptolemy VIII and his new wife (and *daughter*), Cleopatra III.[149] This civil war lasted sixteen years (132–116 BCE).

The literary enhancement of the role of the Judean high priest by Ben Sira's grandson may reflect counter-Ptolemaic rhetoric. Aside from the internecine conflict and incestuous marriage associated with Ptolemy VIII's reign, Ben Sira's grandson may also have reacted negatively to a specific religious development associated with Onias IV, the grandson of Simon II. Sometime after arriving in Egypt,[150] Onias IV gained approval from Ptolemy VI Philometor (169–145 BCE) to build a temple-fort at Leontopolis near Memphis (*c.* 154 BCE).[151] Its height purportedly paralleled that of the Temple in Jerusalem.[152] Josephus contends that Onias planned thereby to cause a schism with the Temple in Jerusalem. John J. Collins calls this view "highly implausible."[153] In fact, Collins contends

147   Ptolemy VIII Physkon Euergetes II reigned from 170–163 (co-regent with his brother Ptolemy VI Philometor) and from 145–116 BCE (sole regent).

148   Demetrius II Nicator successfully fought together with his father-in-law Ptolemy Philometor against Alexander Balas, usurper to the Seleucid throne, for control of Coele-Syria in the decisive battle at Antiochia on the Ainoparus (146 BCE).

149   J. G. Manning, "Ptolemies," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* (7 vols.; ed. M. Gagarin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 5.60–62, esp. 5.61.

150   For a survey of scholarly opinions on whether it was Onias III (167 BCE; *B.J.* 1.31–33; 7.420–36) or Onias IV (162 BCE; *A.J.* 12.9, 387–88) who fled to Egypt, see John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 69. He notes that "Josephus' account is riddled with contradictions and implausibilities" (Ibid., 69).

151   *B.J.* 7.426. Josephus states that Memphis was 180 furlongs (36 km) away. This places the temple in the nome of Heliopolis. Collins states that "Onias the general was identical with Onias the priest, and that his settlement in the land of Onias was a military colony … [and] he was allowed to build his temple as a reward for his service [to Philometor]" (Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 69).

152   *B.J.* 7.426–432, esp. 427: "Onias built a fortress and a temple … a tower … to the height of sixty cubits." The Temple in Jerusalem was also said to be 60 cubits in height. See a survey of archaeological findings in Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 121–32.

153   Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 71. Josephus writes that "by building this temple he [Onias] should draw away a great number [of Jews from Jerusalem] to himself" (*B.J.* 7.431). Arnaldo Momigliano agrees (*Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975], 118). Collins disagrees, especially since "if Onias wanted

that "there is no record that [Onias'] temple was ever a bone of contention."[154] Any ill will between the Alexandrian Oniads and the Hasmoneans had dissipated by the time of Ananias, the son of Onias IV, who Josephus states intervened on behalf of Alexander Jannaeus before Queen Cleopatra III (142–101 BCE).[155]

Historical realities notwithstanding, Ben Sira's grandson may have viewed things quite differently. Since he lived in Alexandria, his political loyalties may have been so firmly planted in Cleopatra II, and his Torah-based ideological worldview so inextricably linked with his grandfather's, that he could not countenance an incestuous Ptolemaic king whose brother had granted permission to construct a 'rival' Jewish temple in Leontopolis. His Greek translation of Ben Sira allusionally connects the Jews in Simon II's day with the Hebrews who witnessed the dedication of the Solomonic temple (*pasa ekklēsia Israēl*). This adds rhetorical force to Ben Sira's laudatory depiction of the *Judean* Temple's high priest, a high priest whose political sympathies did not lie with the Ptolemies.[156] Tiller adds one more observation that raises the political profile of the Judean high priest in Sirach even further. He notes that Sirach "never, or almost never, mentions the *gerousia*" as playing a role during *ekklēsiai*.[157]

In sum, Sirach appears to describe a public synagogue institution in Judea, not least in nine of his thirteen references to an *ekklēsia*. Therein, he depicts a publicly accessible meeting, one that is contemporaneous with, or earlier than, himself, and within which juridical, political, and religious matters are addressed.

---

to set up a temple that would be a center for Egyptian Jewry and rival Jerusalem, he would have set it up in Alexandria" (*Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 71).

154 Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 71. Collins states that "it is noteworthy that, despite the flagrant violation of Deuteronomic law posed by a temple outside of Jerusalem, later Rabbinic Judaism stopped short of condemning the Oniad temple outright … (*Menachot* 13:10). The Talmud confirms this view and adds explicitly that the temple of Onias was not idolatrous" (Ibid., 72).

155 Josephus claims that Ananias said to Cleopatra III, "For I would have you know that an injustice done to this man [Alexander Jannaeus] will make all of us [Alexandrian and Judean] Jews your enemies" (*A.J.* 13.354).

156 One other example of an earlier Jewish literary work from Egypt that reflects pro-Temple rhetoric is *Sib. Or.* 3. Collins writes that "the hypothesis that *Sib. Or.* 3 was composed in circles close to the younger Onias [IV] accounts satisfactorily for all aspects of the work [such as] … enthusiasm for the Ptolemaic house … [and] the strange silence … on the Maccabean revolt" (*The Apocalyptic Imagination* [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 124).

157 Tiller, "Sociological Settings," 246.

3.3.2.3.3   *Four Interpretations of* Ekklēsia *in Sirach*

Sirach's translation of Ben Sira's *qhl* with *ekklēsia* may reflect rhetoric more than reality. Four interpretive options arise. Is Ben Sira's grandson viewing the Judean *qhl* through the lens of a Greco-Roman *ekklēsia*, an Alexandrian Jewish *ekklēsia*, or a Judean *ekklēsia*, or is he simply translating *qhl* as *ekklēsia* due to translational constraints?

Greco-Roman *Ekklēsia*?

Du Toit, following Middendorp, claims that Sirach's Judean *ekklēsiai* are anachronistically presented along the lines of Greek civic *ekklēsiai*.[158] If that is true, then the word *ekklēsia* in Sirach is not the actual name used by Judean Jews for their publicly accessible assemblies. This makes *ekklēsia* surrogate terminology by which an Alexandrian Jewish readership, one familiar with Greek *ekklēsiai*, is able more readily to understand how public assemblies in faraway Judea function. This implies that Greek and Judean public institutions (i.e., synagogues) were functionally equivalent.

Alexandrian Jewish *Ekklēsia*?

It is also possible that, concurrent with the reign of Ptolemy VIII, Jewish semi-public assemblies named *ekklēsia* were actually convened in Alexandria. If so, then Ben Sira's grandson is viewing the Judean *qhl* through the lens of a Jewish synagogue association in Alexandria called *ekklēsia*. While there is no extant evidence for the existence of Jewish *ekklēsiai* in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy VIII, such an institution does appear to surface almost two centuries later. Runesson, Binder and Olsson suggest that three *ekklēsia* references in Philo describe Jewish synagogue communities in Alexandria.[159]

Judean *Ekklēsia*?

A third possibility is that Sirach's use of the word *ekklēsia* reflects actual Greek terminology used by Jews in Judea contemporaneous with Sirach's time (*c.* 132 BCE), or with Ben Sira's time (*c.* 200 BCE). The latter option is somewhat counter-intuitive. It requires Ben Sira's use of the Hebrew word *qhl* to be secondary rather than original. If Yeshua ben El-azar ben Sira, however, is constructing a Torah-based symbolic universe to counter a Hellenistic worldview,

---

158   Du Toit notes that "Sirach basically has the meeting of a Greek δῆμος in mind. Nevertheless, the Jewish theocratic idea is not yet abandoned. This is clear from 24.2, where he changes the traditional ἐκκλησία κυρίου to ἐκκλησία ὑψίστου in order not to offend Greek-oriented readers" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 135–36). See also, Middendorp, *Stellung*, 172.

159   *ASSB*, nos. 201–203 (*Virt.* 108, *Spec.* 1.324–325, *Deus* 111, respectively).

then one can understand why, in the politically tumultuous times of his day, he might choose to describe a public assembly in Judea, which the Jewish authorities of his day call *ekklēsia*, with a Hebrew term instead (*qhl*). In so doing Ben Sira implicitly re-casts that contemporary Judean assembly into continuity with the ancient Israelite *qhl*, a Hebrew community that was faithful to the Mosaic Law.

<div align="center">

Ekklēsia as Translational Conundrum?
</div>

A fourth interpretive option may simply be that Ben Sira's grandson felt constrained by lexical considerations to translate *qhl* with *ekklēsia* rather than with *synagōgē*. In other words, since the LXX uses *synagōgē* to translate two Hebrew terms (*qhl, ʿdh*), but uses *ekklēsia* only for one (*qhl*), Sirach ensures that his readership in Alexandria, where the translation of the LXX first began, has no possibility of misunderstanding his grandfather's original wording; Sirach translates *qhl* with *ekklēsia*. There is a semantic consequence, though, to this terminological choice. In the LXX, *synagōgē* translates more precisely the type of assembly to which Sirach regularly refers—a meeting in the generic sense—while *ekklēsia* refers more consistently to one particular assembly— the supra-local *ekklēsia* of Israel and its meetings.[160] Sirach appears to take pains to avoid that confusion. He does not use *ekklēsia* in a supra-local sense. Rather, he applies the term *ekklēsia* to a local public assembly, one that is only occasionally convened, and then only within certain regions of Israel's geo-political boundaries (e.g., Jerusalem). In this, Ben Sira's *qhl*, which was translated as *ekklēsia* by his grandson, is presented as a public synagogue institution, complete with religious (e.g., Torah reading) and administrative (e.g., judicial, political) elements.

While all four options are possible, one seems preferable—*ekklēsia* as a public synagogue institution in Judea around 132 BCE. One factor in particular tips the scales in favour of such a view. If the *ekklēsia* in 1 Macc 14:19 is a public institution which existed in Jerusalem during Simon Maccabeus' day (*c.* 141 BCE), then it is not unreasonable to assume that only nine years later when Ben Sira's grandson emigrates from Judea to Alexandria and there translates *qhl* with *ekklēsia* that he is doing so because actual *ekklēsiai* in Judea, especially in Jerusalem, still existed.

---

160   The LXX translates קהל as *ekklēsia* in Deuteronomy (except 5:22), Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. In the rest of the LXX קהל is translated by *synagōgē*.

3.3.3   *Public Assemblies in 1st Century CE Judea (Josephus)*

Josephus uses *ekklēsia* 48 times.[161] He mirrors its use in the LXX for "a summoned assembly."[162] This summoned assembly can consist of all Hebrews/Jews in a particular region,[163] or of a sub-group of a larger community.[164] In both cases, Josephus implies that once an *ekklēsia* is dismissed, it ceases to exist as a communal identity.[165] In order to indicate a legally sanctioned assembly, Josephus pairs *ekklēsia* with verbs also used by Greek sources.[166] Josephus most clearly indicates a formally constituted assembly by conjoining *eis ekklēsian* with *synagō* (11×).[167] His eleven references are consistent with Greek literary

---

161   Josephus uses the word *ekklēsia* forty times in *Antiquitates judaicae* (*Jewish Antiquities*), seven times in *Bellum judaicum* (*Jewish War*), and once in *Vita* (*Life*). The 48 *ekklēsia* references are: *Antiquitates judaicae* 3.84, 188, 292, 300, 306, 307; 4.22, 24, 35, 36, 63, 142, 176, 309; 5.72, 93, 105, 110, 111; 6.86, 222; 7.370; 8.122, 222, 358, 368; 9.8, 10, 250; 11.172, 228; 12.164; 13.114, 216; 14.150, 252; 16.62, 135, 393; 19.332; *Bellum judaicum* 1.550, 654, 666; 4.159, 162, 255; 7.412; and *Vita* 268. Josephus lived from *c.* 37–97 CE.

162   Josephus most commonly uses the prepositional phrase εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, and its variations (εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν [4×], εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας [1×]) to indicate an assembly of people (30×). Of this total, the anarthrous prepositional phrase is used 25 times. Other prepositional phrases used by Josephus to indicate an assembly of people are ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (1×), ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1×), and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίας (1×).

163   Two examples are *A.J.* 3.84 ("He called the multitude into an assembly [*ekklēsia*] to hear what God would say to it [the assembly of people]") and *B.J.* 7.412 ("after gathering all the Jews into an assembly [*ekklēsia*]").

164   Three examples are *A.J.* 6.222 ("and after coming to Samuel and finding an assembly [*ekklēsia*] of prophets of God"), *A.J.* 8.222 ("Then Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, made an assembly [*ekklēsia*] of the two tribes"), and *A.J.* 16.393 ("after bringing into an assembly [*ekklēsia*] three hundred officers who were under an accusation").

165   Three examples are *A.J.* 3.306 ("and when the assembly [*ekklēsia*] was dispersed, they [the men], their wives, and children continued the lamentation"), *A.J.* 8.122 ("After the king had spoken these things to the multitude, he dispersed the assembly [*ekklēsia*]") and *A.J.* 14.150.

166   Josephus collocates *synagō* with *ekklēsia* (not only *eis ekklēsian*) for formal assemblies of Jews called by: Moses (*A.J.* 3.188; 4:35, 63, 142, 309), Joshua (*A.J.* 5.72, 93), Ahab (*A.J.* 8.368), Jehoshaphat (*A.J.* 9.8), Mordecai (*A.J.* 11.228), Ptolemy (*A.J.* 13.114), Herod (*A.J.* 16.62), and Queen Salome (*B.J.* 1.666). Josephus' collocation of the verb ποιέω and ἐκκλησία to denote the formation of an assembly of people (*A.J.* 6.86; 8.222, 358; *Vita* 268) also mirrors Greek inscriptional and literary *praxis* (e.g., Thuc. *Pelop. War* 1.139.3; 4.118.14; 6.8.2; Lysias, *Against Erat.* 12.72; Plut., *Cleomenes* 10.1; *IMT NoerdlTroas* 4 [Troas, 2nd cent. BCE (?)]; *Syll.*³ 622 [Delphi, 185–175 BCE]).

167   For full text of the prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* in its eleven pairings with *synagō* plus its eleven pairings with verbs which speak only of convening or entry, see Appendix 5 (*Verbs with* Eis Ekklēsian: *Josephus*). Feldman notes that Josephus' collocation of *ekklēsia*

praxis in that they always depict the person who gathers (*synagō*) the *laos* into an *ekklēsia* as being a high-ranking (religio-) political dignitary of that *laos*.[168] The other verbs paired with *eis ekklēsian* can also indicate a legitimate assembly into which people are called by an official community leader.[169] Only twice does *eis ekklēsian* occur without a verb. In both instances an unauthorized *ekklēsia* is convened for the purpose of inciting rebellion, first, against Moses

and *synagō* for indicating the convening of a regular assembly (e.g., *A.J.* 3.188 and 4.176) accords with the practice of other Greek writers (*Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities 1–4* [trans. and commentary Louis Feldman; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 341 n. 87; 393 n. 527). He does not, though, compare occurrences of *ekklēsia* and *synagō* with or without the preposition *eis*, nor does he provide corroborative evidence for his case from Plutarch who numerous times uses the same formulation (ἐκκλησίαν … συναγαγών) in reference to the convening of civic *ekklēsiai* (e.g., *Dion* 33.2; 48.2; *Timoleon* 10.2; *Caesar* 19.2; *Lycurgus*, 6.2; 29.1; *Caius Marius*, 33.3; *Amilius Paulus*, 11.1; 30.4; 36.2; *Agis* 9.1; *Camillus* 42.4; *Cato the Younger*, 18.1; *Lives, Caius Marcius Coriolanus* 26.3). See further in Appendix 4. The eleven occurrences of verbs of convening or entry that are paired with the prepositional phrase εἰς ἐκκλησίαν are *synkaleō* (3×), *kaleō* (1×), *proagō* (1×), *synerchomai* (2×), *athroizō* (2×), *proeimi* (1×), and *hēkō* (1×).

168   See Appendix 4. *Synagō* is paired with *eis ekklēsian* in Polybius (5×), Diodorus Siculus (4×), Plutarch (7×), Pausanias (1×), and in only one inscription (*Samos* 119). *Synagō* is paired with the simple noun *ekklēsia* 47 times in Greek literary works, and 18 times in Greek inscriptions. None of these eighteen inscriptional examples come from Attica, with only four hailing from Hellas proper (Macedonia, Thessaly, and Peloponnesos). Ben Sira's sole mention of the anarthrous *eis ekklēsian* is juxtaposed with the lexically related compound verb *exagō* and is set within the context of a formal synagogue meeting in which juridical matters, specifically adultery, are addressed (Sir 23:24).

169   Of Josephus' 25 *eis ekklēsian* occurrences, 4 are found in *Jewish War*, and 21 in *Antiquities*, with 16 of those referring to biblical timeframes (e.g., Moses, Joshua, David, Mordecai; see Appendix 5). The public nature of these assemblies is made even more explicit by Josephus in *A.J.* 4.309 where Moses is said to gather (*synagōn*) *eis ekklēsian* not just men, but also women and children, and even slaves. The intermingling of persons of different gender, legal status, and citizenry status was rare, at best, within Greek civic *ekklēsiai*. Each of Josephus' 6 remaining references to community leaders gathering people *eis ekklēsian* refer to a public meeting of Jews convened within Judea or Galilee for the enactment of business related to local matters. The six places where Josephus uses the phrase *eis ekklēsian* in relation to a purportedly official gathering of Jews are found in *B.J.* 1.654 (Herod, Judea; πρόεισιν), *B.J.* 1.666 (Queen Salome, Judea; συνῆγον), *B.J.* 4.162 (Ananus, Judea; συνελθόντος), *B.J.* 7.412 (Alexandria; *hoi prōteuontes tēs gerousia*; ἀθροίσαντες), *A.J.* 16.393 (Herod, Judea; προαγαγών) and *A.J.* 19.332 (Simon, Judea; no verb). Aside from Josephus' 25 usages of the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian*, four times he also uses the articular phrase *eis tēn ekklēsian*, whether in the plural (*A.J.* 3.292; ἐχρῶντο) or in the singular (*A.J.* 3.307, συντρέχουσι; 4.24, ἧκεν; 4.35, συνῆλθον). Each describes a formal assembly of the people of Israel during biblical timeframes.

(*A.J.* 4.22), and, second, against King Agrippa (*A.J.* 19.332).[170] Josephus implicitly reinforces the illegal nature of each *ekklēsia* by avoiding any mention of a verb of summoning/convening/ entry. In *A.J.* 19.332, for example, Josephus speaks of a man named Simon, a renegade leader in Jerusalem, who illegally calls together an *ekklēsia* during the king's absence. He convenes that *ekklēsia* so as to enact a decree excluding Agrippa from the Temple.[171]

Josephus' use of *ekklēsia* terminology raises the question as to whether it is *etic* or *emic* terminology relative to his Judean referents.[172] Du Toit argues that Josephus' view of *ekklēsia* is "thoroughly Hellenized," meaning that his interpretive template for Jewish assemblies is the Greek civic assembly.[173] "Exhibit A," so to speak, in du Toit's case is Josephus' practice of not following the LXX in modifying *ekklēsia* with the two genitival constructs "of the LORD" (*kyriou*) or "of God" (*theou*) when speaking of the *ekklēsia* of Israel. Louis Feldman mirrors du Toit's view. He sees a solely political dimension in Josephus' use of the word *ekklēsia*. He cites as evidence the fact that Josephus incorporates political procedures from Greek civic *ekklēsiai* into his descriptions of the communal

---

170   See Appendix 5 for the Greek text of *A.J.* 4.22 and 19.332.

171   Josephus does not pair a verb with the phrase πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ("multitude into an assembly"; *A.J.*19.332).

172   Kenneth Pike first used the neologisms "*emic*" and "*etic*" from analogy with the linguistic terms "phonemic" and "phonetic." He states that "descriptions or analyses from the *etic* standpoint are 'alien' in view, with criteria external to the system. *Emic* descriptions provide an internal view with criteria chosen from within the system. They represent to us the view of one familiar with the system and who knows how to function within it himself" (*Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour* [Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954], 153; see also, idem, *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate* [Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1990]). Marvin Harris provides a further nuance relative to Pike's original definition of the terms *emic* and *etic* when applied to the study of cultural systems (*Cultural Materialism* [updated ed.; Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2001], esp. 37–40). Within the context of *ancient* societies, April D. DeConick helpfully describes an *emic* term as "a word actually used by ancient people to describe their experiences" ("What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?" in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* [Symposium 11; ed. A. D. DeConick; Atlanta: SBL, 2006], 1–24, esp. 2). DeConick defines an *etic* term as one that reflects "a modern typology, [it is] contemporary analytic vocabulary that we are imposing on the ancients in order to investigate their religiosity" (Ibid., 2). She notes the functionality of an *etic* term: "it serves the modern scholar heuristically as a taxonomy aiding our engagement in historical investigation and research. It is a comparative analytic tool created and employed by outsiders to the culture and imposed on insiders" (Ibid., 2).

173   Du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 134 n. 68.

praxeis of the *ekklēsia* of Israel in the desert.[174] Steve Mason indirectly corroborates the "Hellenized" readings of these two scholars. Mason claims that Josephus' emphasis on the *politeia* of Israel in *Antiquities* brings him regularly to use Greek political language for Israel and her constitution.[175] Josephus' main impulse in this regard is said to be his desire to use terminology that was familiar to his target audience: Greek speakers in Rome.[176]

Even if one grants Josephus' definition of *ekklēsia* as being "thoroughly Hellenized,"[177] it would not be solely political for at least three reasons. First, Greek civic *ekklēsiai* were not solely political; they integrated religious and political issues.[178] Second, one of the public *ekklēsiai* in the Land described by Josephus expressly concerned itself with religious matters: the *ekklēsia* convened by Simon against King Agrippa (*A.J.* 19.332). The incorporation of religious issues in that *ekklēsia* accords with Levine's definition of a public synagogue.[179]

---

174   Regarding Josephus' recounting of Moses' orders to Korah and his followers (*A.J.* 4:35; Num 16:6–7), Louis Feldman observes that "Moses makes a proposal to the multitude, and they give their free consent [which shows that] Josephus continues to use Greek political vocabulary when he describes this meeting as an assembly (ἐκκλησία)" (*Flavius Josephus*, 341 n. 87).

175   Stephen Mason, "Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (*Ant.* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus' *Judean Antiquities/Life*," in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives* (JSPSup 32; ed. S. Mason; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 64–103, esp. 80–87. For example, in *A.J.* 3.84, Josephus cites Moses as saying that God "has suggested … an order of political government (*politeia*) [for you]."

176   The Greek civic *ekklēsia* was well known to Josephus' Hellenistic Jewish and/or gentile audience. Given that the word *synagōgē* was already in use in a more specialized sense for Jewish gatherings or buildings, it is not surprising that Josephus only uses the word *synagōgē* eight times. Six times Josephus uses *synagōgē* in reference to a building (*A.J.* 19.300, 305[2×]; *B.J.* 2.285, 289; 7.44). The other two times are to a collection of water (*A.J.* 15.346) and of books (*A.J.* 1.10). Elsewhere Josephus replaces the word *synagōgē* with *ekklēsia* whenever the LXX context for the occurrence of *synagōgē* does not speak of a building within which Jews gathered.

177   Du Toit states that Josephus' "ἐκκλησία is thoroughly Hellenized" because the modifying phrase κυρίου/θεοῦ "is completely lacking" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 134 n. 68).

178   See my discussion in 2.2.4 on the integration of religious ritual within the agendas of Greco-Roman civic *ekklēsiai*.

179   For further details regarding the communal nature of public synagogal entities, especially among rural areas in Israel, see Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 1–6. He states that "Because of its centrality and importance in the community, the synagogue played an integrative role in ancient Jewish society. The inclusiveness of its activities, ranging from social to religious and from political to educational, underscores this fact" (Ibid., 5). See also Andrew Krause who argues that in a post-70 CE world Josephus' cultural and spatial rhetoric

Third, a fusion of religion and politics is clearly implied in the only time that Josephus uses *ekklēsia* as a collective designation. In *A.J.* 4.176, Josephus calls the theocratic community of Israel, as it is about to enter the Promised Land, simply an *ekklēsia*. In so doing, he avoids attaching either of the religious modifiers usually added by the LXX ("of the LORD/*kyriou*" or "of God/*theou*).[180] Did Josephus assume that his Hellenized readers would understand the religio-political nature of that community simply through the word *ekklēsia* itself?[181] Even if that was not his understanding, it is still difficult to maintain that Josephus reflects "Hellenized" usage here: there is no Hellenistic precedent for a religio-political *community* permanently being designated as an *ekklēsia*. As will be seen, the only possible precedents are Jewish, whether the LXX, association synagogues located in Egypt (Philo) and Judea (Paul), or the *ekklēsiai* of early Christ-followers.[182]

The *ekklēsiai* mentioned by Josephus range in location from Judea to the Diaspora, excluding Galilee. Within Judea, Josephus mentions the existence of a public *ekklēsia* in Jerusalem during Herod's reign. Rocca calls it "the General Assembly," although there is no adjectival qualifier in Josephus' Greek text to warrant such a distinctive title.[183] He contends that its value to Herod lay in its

---

consistently presents the synagogue as a supra-local rallying point for Jews throughout the empire who wish to practice and disseminate their customs and Law (*Synagogues in the Works of Flavius Josephus* [AJEC97; Leiden: Brill, 2017]).

180   *A.J.* 4.176 reads, "Moses gathered the *ekklēsia* (ἐκκλησίαν … συναγαγών) near the Jordan." Elsewhere, Josephus speaks of the people of Israel being gathered into an *ekklēsia*, but not of the people of Israel being called an *ekklēsia* (cf. *A.J.* 3.84, 188, 300, 307; 4.22, 24, 35, 36, 63, 142, 176, 309).

181   In 47 out of Josephus' 48 usages of the word *ekklēsia*, he refers to an assembly of all Israelites or Jews gathered in a certain place, or to a gathering of a local assembly either of a sub-group of Israelites (e.g., prophets; *A.J.* 6.222) or of Jews (100 prominent men; *Vita* 268).

182   For an extensive analysis of Josephus' familiarity with New Testament concepts and content, see Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003). Mason does not note, though, that Josephus' unmodified use of *ekklēsia* for the *ekklēsia* of Israel (*A.J.* 4:176) requires a source other than the LXX. Pre-existing Greco-Roman usage does not use *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective identity for a group of people, only some Jewish or early Christ-follower communities do.

183   Rocca cites three instances in Josephus of what he calls Herod's "General Assembly" (*A.J.* 15.381, *A.J.* 16.393–94, and *B.J.* 1.150) (*Herod's Judea*, 266). From Rocca's capitalization of the word "General" one would expect a Greek equivalent to be found in Josephus' text. Such is not the case; *ekklēsia* is unmodified. In *A.J.* 16.393–94 and in *B.J.* 1.150, Herod brings into an *ekklēsia* (*eis ekklēsia* and *en ekklēsia*, respectively) his son Tero, the barber Tryphon, who along with Alexander, were accused of plotting an insurrection. The *laos* carried out

function as a sounding board for his policies and for assessing his level of popularity among the Judean populace (e.g., *A.J.* 16.62).[184] This political strategy is not atypical of earlier Hellenistic rulers who "liked to demonstrate that their rule derived from the people."[185] E. P. Sanders argues that Herod convened this assembly only when he desired to legitimate instances of capital punishment.[186] Rocca differs. He presumes, without documentation, that "Herod convened this assembly on more trivial occasions not mentioned by Josephus."[187]

Josephus also uses *ekklēsia* to designate a Jewish assembly in Alexandria. He mentions that "principal men of the *gerousia*" (*hoi prōteuontes*) convened an *ekklēsia* (*B.J.* 7:412).[188] The *prōteuontes* called the *ekklēsia* to debate the fate of *sicarii* who had fled to Alexandria after the fall of Masada. Eleanor G. Huzar notes that a Greek civic *ekklēsia* had not existed in Alexandria since before the Julio-Claudian period (29 BCE–68 CE).[189] Thus, either Josephus is using Greek

---

the execution. In *A.J.* 15.381 Rocca identifies "the multitude" (*plēthos*) as another instance of Herod's "General Assembly." In *A.J.* 15.381 Herod calls the *plēthos* together (*synkaleō*) before initiating work on the Temple Mount. Goldblatt presumes that this *plēthos* constituted an *ekklēsia* since the multitude was invited and it played a public role (*Monarchic Principle*, 115). There is a second, and final, mention of *plēthos* in Josephus, but Rocca does not mention it (*B.J.* 1.648–650). According to Goldblatt, Josephus speaks of Herod convening an assembly to judge those accused of being responsible for pulling down the eagle from the entrance to the Temple precincts.

184   Rocca, *Herod's Judea*, 266. He surmises that "the Herodian *ekklēsia* was probably convened *ad hoc* and consisted entirely of free men of military age, perhaps divided between priests and laymen as in the *ekklēsia megalē* called by Simon" (Ibid., 266–67).

185   Rocca, *Herod's Judea*, 266. Rocca notes that diasporic precedence is provided by the "Ptolemies in Alexandria, who abolished the *boulē* but conserved the *ekklesia*" (Ibid., 266 n. 69). Rocca directs the reader to the study by "Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellenistique*, II, 440–45, 522–27, 537–39" (Ibid., 266 n. 69).

186   E. P. Sanders, Judaism: *Practice and Belief—Early Roman Period* (*63 BCE to 66 CE*) (Philadelphia: TPI, 1992), 483–84.

187   Rocca, *Herod's Judea*, 266 n. 71.

188   *B.J.* 7.412 reads, "but when the principal men (οἱ πρωτεύοντες) of the [Jewish] senate [in Alexandria] saw what madness they were come to, they thought it no longer safe for themselves to overlook them. So they got all the Jews together to an assembly (ἀθροίσαντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους), and accused the madness of the Sicarii."

189   Eleanor G. Huzar, "Alexandria and Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.10.1 (ed. H. Temporini; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 619–68, esp. 656–63. Huzar also notes that Augustus disbanded the *boulē*. Huzar cites PSI 1160 (20/19 BCE) as evidence that a *boulē* existed prior to Augustus' conquest of Alexandria (Ibid., 667 n. 202). The Alexandrians sent delegates to Augustus early in his reign (*c.* 20/19 BCE, perhaps again in 13 CE) to request the reestablishment of the *boulē* (Ibid., 667). The *koina tōn archontōn* was the Roman replacement for, but with lesser

ekklēsiai outside of Egypt as his literary template for the Jewish assembly in Alexandria, or he is referring to an actual Jewish assembly that was named *ekklēsia*. Philo lends credence to the authentic nature of Josephus' Alexandrian *ekklēsia* when he speaks of a publicly accessible *ekklēsia* for Alexandrian Jews that was convened decades earlier (*Spec.* 1.324–25; pre-45 CE).[190]

Aside from Philo's works, there is a second reason why Josephus may be historically accurate in his use of *ekklēsia* for Alexandrian synagogue assemblies. Josephus demonstrates insider knowledge in his description of another Jewish political institution: the *gerousia* ("senate" or "council"; *B.J.* 7:412). Both Greeks[191] and Jews[192] in Alexandria had a *gerousia* as their chief leadership council. The Jewish *gerousia* was established for the *politeuma* ("community")[193]

---

authority than, the defunct *boulē*. This council was presided over by a board of the *prytaneis*, the executive board of the city. Huzar notes that the *prytaneis* was wholly subservient to the Roman Prefect, with the major officials being directly appointed and the lesser officials closely supervised (Ibid., 661).

190   *Spec.* 1.324–25 reads, "Thus, knowing that in the assemblies (*en tais ekklēsiais*) there are not a few worthless persons who steal their way in and remain unobserved in the large numbers which surround them...." See further in 3.4.1 on Philo's use of the word *ekklēsia*.

191   Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 172. Kasher gives a summary of the scholarly *status quaestiones* on the Alexandrian *gerousia*. The *gerousia* for the Greeks of Alexandria was either "a public institution operating mainly in matters of religion which sometimes took part in the administration of the city ... [or] a body representing a social organization, such as 'older citizens' or 'younger citizens,' which at most had some political influence in the life of the city" (Ibid., 172). Huzar concurs and adds that the Greek *gerousia* had 173 members ("Alexandria and Aegyptum," 662). Kasher notes that "the important point here is that the Greek community organization in Alexandria had a *gerousia*, just as the Jewish *politeuma* had, and in that respect had no advantage. This fact is evidence of *isopoliteia* that the Jews enjoyed according to Josephus" (*Alexandrian Jews*, 172).

192   Kasher also cites Philo as evidence that a Jewish *gerousia* existed alongside the Greek one (*Flacc.* 74, 80; "our *gerousia*"). He notes that "the first-person possessive adjective ["our"] is clear evidence that there was more than one *gerousia* in Alexandria, and this is confirmed by some epigraphical and papyrological material" (*Alexandrian Jews*, 253). The Jewish *gerousia* was comprised of a council of 71 elders (*genarchai*) who were connected in some fashion with the gymnasium (Philo, *In Flacc.*, 73ff) (Huzar, "Alexandria and Aegyptum," 661; see also Arnaldo Momigliano, review of S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charles-Worth, *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. X. The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.–A.D. 70, JRS* 34 [1944]:109–16, esp. 114–15). Kasher provides a select bibliography of evidence for a Jewish *gerousia*: "Momigliano, *JRS* 34 (1934) [*sic!* 1944] 114–115; El-Aggadi, *JEA* 50 (1964) 164–69, Musurillo, 108–110, Fraser, vol. 1, 95; vol. 2, 176–177 nn. 14–16 (where extensive bibliographic details are found)" (*Alexandrian Jews*, 172 n. 18).

193   In two roughly contemporaneous Egyptian inscriptions, Runesson, Binder and Olsson translate the word *politeuma* as "community" (*CJZ* 70 = *CIG* 3.5362; 8–6 BCE; *CJZ* 71 = *CIG*

in Alexandria well before Josephus' account of the *sicarii*. The Jewish *gerousia* was formally instituted after the death of their ethnarch (10/11 CE) by decree of Caesar Augustus (12 CE).[194]

By way of overview, Josephus uses all three of the most common synagogue terms: *synagōgē*,[195] *proseuchē*,[196] and *ekklēsia*.[197] Of these, only *ekklēsia* is never used by Josephus in reference to a physical structure. He uses *ekklēsia* in reference to public meetings, but not as the self-designation of a semi-public Jewish voluntary association.

3.3.4   *Summary:* Ekklēsia *and Public Jewish Assemblies*

A number of conclusions can be reached with respect to *ekklēsia* occurrences in Judith, 1 Maccabees, Ben Sira, and the writings of Josephus. With respect to the Hellenistic-era writings (Judith, 1 Maccabees, Ben Sira), three conclusions seem warranted. First, each mentions a public gathering in Judea which was called *ekklēsia*. These *ekklēsiai* appear to have addressed the political, juridical, and possibly religious concerns of regionally defined communities.[198] Second, 1 Maccabees (4:59; 14:19) and Sirach (50:13, 20) are alone in their use of *ekklēsia* as a temporary collective designation for Jews during the time in which they are gathered in assembly. Third, *ekklēsia* is used in *etic* fashion in Judith wherein a Judean *ekklēsia*, which is contemporaneous with the author, appears to

---

3.5361, *SEG* 16.931; Oct. 24, 24 CE) (*ASSB*, nos. 131, 132). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg also translate *politeuma* in *CJZ* 70 and *CJZ* 71 with a term denoting a non-civic "community": "the term *politeuma* (translated 'corporate body' in this volume), which can also be used in reference to a body of citizens (as at Chios), is attested for associations of various types" (*Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, 190). The word *politeuma* disappears in favour of *synagōgē* in *CJZ* 72 (= *SEG* 17.823; Dec 3, 55 CE). Harland notes that a comparison of these three Greek inscriptions from Berenike demonstrates that groups of Jews in Berenike (Cyrenaica) "employed somewhat interchangeably the designations 'the corporate body [*politeuma*] of Judeans in Berenice' and 'the synagogue [*synagōgē*] of Judeans in Berenice'" (*Dynamics of Identity*, 41). With respect to *CJZ* 72, Runesson, Binder and Olsson note that it "contains several striking features. The most striking is the sudden disappearance of the terms *politeuma* and *amphitheatron* in reference to the Jewish community and its civic center. In lieu of these, the word *synagōgē* appears now for the first time referring to the congregation in line 3 and the building in line 5" (*ASSB*, no. 133).

194   Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 254 (cf. Momigliano, review of S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charles-Worth, 114–15).

195   See n. 36 (Ch. 3) for Josephus' use of *synagōgē* in reference to physical structures.

196   See n. 29 (Ch. 3) for Josephus' use of *proseuchē* in reference to physical structures.

197   See n. 31 (Ch. 3) wherein it is noted that Josephus also uses the term *hieron* for a synagogal structure in Jerusalem (*B.J.* 7.144).

198   E.g., Jdt 6:16, 21; 1 Macc 5:16; 14:19; Sir 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 38:33; 39:10.

be retrojected into the narrative timeframe of 8th century BCE events. Sirach uses *ekklēsia* when ostensibly describing some early 2nd century BCE public Judean synagogue institutions. In reality, however, this practice may reflect a Seleucid-era Judean institution named *ekklēsia*, one that is contemporaneous, at the very least, with the translation of the Hebrew text of Ben Sira into Greek (132 BCE).

A public Jewish synagogue institution appears to have continued within Judea well into the 1st century CE, at least insofar as the witness of Josephus is concerned, although it is possible that he is using *ekklēsia* in *etic* fashion for the benefit of his Greco-Roman reading audience. The interrelationship between each of the three synagogue terms found within Josephus' writings (*synagōgē, proseuchē, ekklēsia*) can be encapsulated as follows: Josephus' *ekklēsiai* may have been constituted within a *proseuchē* or a *synagōgē* after being convened by the leadership of a local *synagōgē*. As is the case with Judith, 1 Maccabees, and Ben Sira, in Josephus' writings the word *ekklēsia* does not refer to a physical structure,[199] while *synagōgē* can. In these four Jewish writings, a consistent pattern repeats itself: the gathered community of Jews, known as *synagōgē*, make decisions relative to local administrative, judicial, social, and religious matters during the course of a *publicly* accessible *ekklēsia* gathering.

3.4   *Ekklēsia* and Semi-Public Jewish Institutions

In the Jewish sources examined thus far, a *public* (civic) *ekklēsia* has primarily been in view. In this section, usages of the word *ekklēsia* for *semi-public* (non-civic) Jewish synagogue communities will be examined. Both Ben Sira[200]

---

199   The practice in the LXX of using *ekklēsia* only to indicate assemblies of people, and not the physical structures within which those people meet, is consistent with Greek *praxis* in the Classical, Hellenistic and Imperial periods. In Chapter 2 (*Ekklēsia* in Greek and Roman Sources), I note that the word *ekklēsia* did not identify physical structures within which the *ekklēsia* met. The *ekklēsia* met in locations such as the agora (Athens), the Pnyx (Athens), or the *ekklēsiasterion* (Priene).

200   As one who dedicated himself to the life of a "scribe" (Prologue, 39:1–11), Ben Sira invites his less educated readers to "draw near to me, you who are uneducated, and lodge in the house of instruction" (51:23; ἐγγίσατε πρός με, ἀπαίδευτοι, καὶ αὐλίσθητε ἐν οἴκῳ παιδείας) for the purpose of Torah education (51:24–28). The Greek phrase translated "house of instruction" (*oikos paideias*) derives from the Hebrew phrase *beit midrash*. Ben Sira's description of what appears to be a dedicated structure for religious education presages later rabbinic usage of the same phrase ("house of study/learning") to identify the structures within which they facilitated Torah education. In *m. Ter.* 11:10 the *bet hamidrash*

and Philo[201] mention cultically-focused synagogue associations, but as will be seen, only Philo designates one as an *ekklēsia*.

3.4.1 *Egyptian Jewish Semi-Public Associations Named* Ekklēsia? (*Philo*)

Philo uses the word *ekklēsia* twenty-three times. Nineteen *ekklēsia* occurrences are set within the context of Israel's desert wanderings, with fifteen of those referring directly or indirectly to the giving of the law in Deuteronomy 23. Du Toit views these fifteen *ekklēsia* references as "self-evident designations ... [with] a cultic connotation,"[202] with only one being used of a local congregation (*Virt.* 108).[203] In this Philo maintains the emphasis of LXX Deuteronomy 23 in which "the focus shifted to the *group* who attended these meetings."[204] Du Toit

---

may very well be a building, which brings Runesson to claim that "the rabbis and their predecessors ... [were] a voluntary association whose institution was the *bet hamidrash*" (*Origins of the Synagogue*, 486; see also 223–34; cf. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 105). Runesson claims that the community which meets in Sirach's "house of instruction" reflects "the earliest evidence for this type of institution [Jewish voluntary association] in the land" of Israel (*Origins of the Synagogue*, 314, 318).

201   Philo speaks of Essenes (Judea) and Theraputae (Egypt) "because they are models of Judaism according to his ideals" (see *Hypothetica* 11, 18 and *Prob.* 88–91) (Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [CRINT II; ed. M. E. Stone; Assen/ Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984], 233–82, esp. 248). For Philo, the Essenes are ideal examples of the practical life, and the Theraputae of the contemplative life (Borgen, "Philo," 248). For a fuller discussion of areas of agreement between Essenes and Theraputae, see Samuel Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism* (New York: Ktav, 1972), 194–96. One essential contrast is that, unlike the Essenes, the Theraputae allowed women a role in cultic activities, at least insofar as their presence in Sabbath meetings would seem to indicate (*De Vita Contempl.* 32 f). The Theraputae read "twice every day, at morning and at evening ... and the interval between ... they take up the sacred scriptures and philosophize concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy" (*De Vita Contempl.* 27–28).

202   Du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 136.

203   Du Toit states, though, that irrespective of the localized use of *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108, "there seems to be a correlation between the local Jewish community and the Jewish people as a whole. To join a local ἐκκλησία means becoming a part of the Jewish people" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 137). Another one of Philo's nineteen cultic references (*Her.* 251) may indicate a synagogue assembly within which the words of the Exodus account are being read: "And, again, in Exodus, in the *ekklēsia*, [we read]" (καὶ ἐν Ἐξαγωγῇ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν).

204   Du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 137 [author's emphasis]. Du Toit claims that in LXX Deut 23 the *ekklēsia kyriou* is "understood as a closed group with boundary markers and entrance requirements ... the ἐκκλησία κυρίου is no longer a one-off assembly; it has acquired a permanent existence of its own and the meeting aspect has become supplementary" (Ibid.,

disavows the possibility that Philo's nineteen *ekklēsia* references to the Israel of the desert tradition, including the *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108, indicate a contemporary Jewish synagogue community or meeting.[205] The final four of Philo's twenty-three *ekklēsia* mentions refer to other incidents during the Exodus. These four do not refer to ethno-religious Israel. Du Toit rightly identifies three as only speaking of "public meetings in the Greek sense," not of ancient or contemporary Jewish assemblies.[206] The fourth (*Aet.* 13) refers to the Platonic conception of a "divine assembly" of the gods.[207]

Philo's awareness of *ekklēsia* terminology not only stems from his familiarity with the LXX, nor only from his awareness of *ekklēsiai* in Greek *poleis* other than Alexandria.[208] Philo seems to have had first-hand experience of an *ekklēsia* and of at least two other Jewish governance models in Alexandria: the *gerousia*[209] and the purported "great synagogue."[210] Runesson, Binder and

---

135). He also cites a similar semantic development in LXX Neh 13:1–3 where "separating those of foreign descent from the ἐκκλησία actually means excommunication from the people of Israel" (Ibid., 135).

205 Du Toit, *"Paulus Oecumenicus,"* 136. Direct or indirect references to Deuteronomy 23 are found in *Conf.* 144(2×); *Deus* 111; *Ebr.* 213(2×); *Leg.* 3.8, 81(2×); *Migr.* 69; *Mut.* 204; *Post* 177; *Somn.* 2.184, 187; *Spec.* 1.325; *Virt.* 108. Of these, five contain direct quotations from Deut 23 (*Conf.* 144; *Ebr.* 213; *Leg.* 3.81; *Post.* 177; *Somn.* 2.184; cf. *Virt.* 106). Exodus references occur in: *Dec.* 32, 45; *Her.* 251; and *Post.* 143.

206 Du Toit, *"Paulus Oecumenicus,"* 136. In *Abr.* 20, *Prob.* 138, and *Spec.* 2.44, Philo recounts political institutions among Greco-Roman *poleis* of his day, excluding Alexandria: (*Abr.* 20) "the bad man runs about through the market-place, and theatres, and courts of justice [*dikastēria*] and council halls [*bouleutēria*], and assemblies [*ekklēsias*], and every meeting [*syllogon*] and collection of men [*thiason anthropōn*]"; (*Spec.* 2.44) "in all the cities which they inhabit, avoid all courts of justice [*dikastēria*], and council halls [*bouleutēria*], and market-places [*agoras*], and places of assembly [*ekklēsias*]"; (*Prob.* 138) "for what other object are councils [*boulai*] and assemblies [*ekklēsiai*] convened nearly every day."

207 *Aet.* 13 reads, "some say that the world has been proved by Plato in the Timaeus to be both uncreated and indestructible, in the account of that divine assembly [*dia tēs theoprepous ekklēsias*] in which the younger gods are addressed by the eldest and the governor of them all."

208 Within the context of asking "what other object have Greece and the nations of the barbarians ever had in all the continual seditions and wars," Philo answers "for what other object are councils (*boulai*) and assemblies (*ekklēsiai*) convened nearly every day, rather than about freedom" (*Prob.* 138).

209 Josephus also makes mention of an Alexandrian *gerousia* (*B.J.* 7.412; *hoi prōteuontes tēs gerousia*).

210 See Levine's discussion of Philo's mention of "the largest and most magnificent [synagogue] in the city" of Alexandria (*Embassy*, 134) (*Ancient Synagogue*, esp. 90–96). Philo (*Embassy*, 133) mentions that the synagogue was "lavishly decorated with, inter alia,

Olsson posit that three of Philo's *ekklēsia* mentions refer to a contemporary, local Jewish group in Egypt which designates either its meeting or the community itself as an *ekklēsia* (*Virt.* 108, *Spec.* 1.324–25, *Deus* 111).[211] Scholarly opinion is divided, though, as to whether the three *ekklēsia* references are simply part of Philo's historical narrative on the Israel of the desert wanderings (e.g., LXX Deut 23) or whether they refer to actual institutions contemporaneous with Philo. I begin my analysis with *Virt.* 108, a passage most consistently identified by scholars as designating a Jewish non-civic institution in Alexandria during Philo's day.

3.4.1.1 *De virtutibus* 108

In *Virt.* 108 Philo refers back to Deut 23:8, 9 on how sojourners are to be treated, specifically new converts.

> If any of them should wish to pass over into the Jewish community [τὴν Ἰουδαίων πολιτείαν], they must not be spurned with an unconditional refusal as children of enemies, but be so favoured that the third generation is invited to the congregation [εἰς ἐκκλησίαν] and made partakers in the divine revelations [λογῶν θειῶν] to which also the native born, whose lineage is beyond reproach, are rightfully admitted.[212]

Two questions arise. First, is Philo's rewritten citation of LXX Deut 23:8, 9 meant as instruction for his contemporary audience?[213] If so, then, second, is Philo's *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108 a public meeting of all Jews within a specific

---

insignia, shields, golden crowns, stelae, and inscriptions honoring emperors" (Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 90). The specific phrase "great synagogue" is used of the Alexandrian synagogue only in late antique writings such as Tosefta Sukkah 4.6 and Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah 5.1, 55 A–B. The Tosefta describes the main hall with the basilica-style term *dyplastoon* (a stoa within a stoa, or double stoa) (see Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 92–93). For rabbinic evidence on the great synagogue in Alexandria, see George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era–The Age of Tannaim* (Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1930), 3.91f.

211   The full citations, respectively, are On Virtue (*De virtutibus*) 108, The Special Laws (*De specialibus legibus*) book 1, sections 324–25, and That God is Immutable (*Deus ist immutabilis*) 111. See *ASSB*, nos. 201–203 (esp. see each of the "Comments" sections).

212   *ASSB*, no. 203; translation by Runesson, Binder and Olsson.

213   LXX Deut 23:8, 9 reads, οὐ βδελύξῃ Ιδουμαῖον, ὅτι ἀδελφός σού ἐστιν, οὐ βδελύξῃ Αἰγύπτιον, ὅτι πάροικος ἐγένου ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ, υἱοὶ ἐὰν γενηθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, γενεὰ τρίτη εἰσελεύσονται εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου. A translation of MT Deut 23:7, 8 (NRSV) reads, "You shall not abhor any of the Edomites, for they are your kin. You shall not abhor any of the Egyptians, because

section of, say, the Delta quarter, or does it refer to the collective designation of a Jewish voluntary association? In order to address these two questions, the immediate literary context of *Virt.* 108 and its relationship to Philo's political theory bear investigation. Philo's *De Virtutibus* has four component parts: On Courage (1–50), On Philanthropy (51–174), On Repentance (175–186), and On Nobility (187–227). *Virt.* 108 is found within the section of On Nobility entitled On Philanthropy (also called "On Humanity"). Therein, Philo argues that "humanity is the virtue closest to piety and is its sister, and even its twin (*Virt.* 51)."[214]

Virt. 108 concludes a topic begun at *Virt.* 80—*philanthropia* ("love of people," "charity"). Three types of people are considered worthy of Jewish *philanthropia*: members of the same nation (*hoi homoethneis*), incomers (*hoi epēlutai*), and settlers (*hoi metoikoi*). Philo appears to use the term *hoi epēlutai* (incomers) in reference to proselytes: "abandoning their kinsfolk by blood, their country, their customs and the temple and images of their gods … they have taken the journey to a better home … to the worship of the one and truly existing God" (*Virt.* 102).[215] This Philonic concern for the acceptance of proselytes is also mirrored by Josephus (*C. Ap.* 2:261). Philo enjoins love for the third group called *metoikoi* as well. As foreigners (*metoikoi*) living in a land that is not their own, they live in an alien state (*Virt.* 105), just as Israel also once did in Egypt.

In *Virt.* 102–108 Philo narrows his focus to one specific ethnic group—the Egyptians. He quotes LXX Deut 23:8 as a rationale for showing *philanthropia* to Egyptians (*Virt.* 106): "you shall not abhor an Egyptian because you were a sojourner in Egypt." In *Virt.* 108 he again refers to Deut 23:8 but this time on how to treat one very specific subset of Egyptians. He entreats his Jewish readership to focus their *philanthropia* upon the ostensibly new converts to their community.

---

you were an alien residing in their land. The children of the third generation that are born to them may be admitted to the assembly of the Lord."

214   Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 70.

215   For a fuller discussion on Philo's use of οἱ ἐπηλύται for proselytes see Peter Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 256–259. See also, Sandmel who mentions, without any apparent need for argumentation, that *Virt.* 102–104 "speaks of proselytes" (*Philo of Alexandria*, 71). Walter T. Wilson situates *Virt.* 108 in the context of Borgen's comments on Philo's three-fold conversionist paradigm (Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 208–216). Wilson states that Philo's use of the phrase "passing over" and his concept of repentance entails conversion and includes "three basic components: the acceptance of monotheism, moral reform, and a new identity predicted on one's relationship to God" (*Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues* [PACS 3; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011], 362–63).

How much warrant, in fact, is there for postulating a contemporary referent for Philo's *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108? Some scholars, while conceding that *Virt.* 108 refers to a localized group, identify that group only as a local congregation of Israel during the desert wanderings.[216] By contrast, Walter T. Wilson, in his seminal study of *De Virtutibus*, presumes a contemporary readership when translating *Virt.* 108.[217] His primary rationale for such a translation derives from what Klaus Berger has already observed.[218] Given that the word *ekklēsia* occurs in obvious parallelism both with Egyptian converts and with the phrase *pros tēn Ioudaiōn politeian*, and since the word *politeia* is not used in LXX Deuteronomy for the Israelites in the desert, it is probable that Philo is writing about the *politeia* of his Jewish contemporaries in Alexandria.

This, then, also makes Philo's references to an *ekklēsia* and to Egyptian converts contemporary commentary. Peder Borgen too is of this opinion. He categorically states that "it is evident that Philo does not only refer to the Laws of Moses as such, but that he also applies Deut 23:8 to the concrete Jewish community in his own time, since he writes 'into the community of Jews (πρὸς τὴν Ἰουδαίων πολιτείαν).'"[219] Samuel Sandmel also agrees, but for different reasons. He notes "two curious factors of omission" in Philo's political discussions: (1) the political affairs in Judea (e.g., Maccabeans, Herod the Great); and (2) David as king.[220] Given Philo's silence on both points, Sandmel infers that "Philo is concerned more with the situation of the Jewish community in Alexandria as part of a unique *politeuma* than with the Judean situation and experience."[221]

---

216   See K. Berger, "Volksversammlung und Gemeinde Gottes. Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia,'" *ZThK* 73 (1976): 167–207, esp. 190; du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 136–37; and Paul Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57 (2011): 440–460, esp. 448.

217   Wilson translates *Virt.* 108 as: "And if any of them should want to cross over to the Jewish polity, they are not to be scorned unyieldingly like the children of enemies, but are to be treated in such a manner that the third generation is invited into the congregation and granted that share of the divine oracles into which the native- and noble-born are also rightfully initiated" (*Philo of Alexandria*, 65).

218   Berger, "Volksversammlung," 190.

219   Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 249. Kåre Fuglseth concurs. He writes that "when it comes to the admitting of new participants of the Jewish community in Alexandria, Philo argues that Egyptians who wanted to become proselytes may do so (*Virt.* 106–108)" (*Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran* [NovTSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 327).

220   Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 103.

221   Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 103–104. Sandmel contextualizes the description of the Jews as a *politeuma* (e.g., *Virt.* 108) within Philo's political theory that requires a differentiation

Aside from Philo's reference to Egyptian converts and to "the Jewish polity" (*tēn Ioudaiōn politeian*), four other factors suggest contemporary commentary in *Virt.* 108. First, Philo makes a syntactical change from his base text of LXX Deut 23. He removes the adjectival qualifier *kyriou* from the phrase *eis ekklēsian*.[222] The ambiguity of this simpler phrase would have allowed Philo's readership to assume that a contemporary institution (*ekklēsia*), not necessarily only the assembly of Israel in the desert (*ekklēsian kyriou*), was in view. This reading strategy is probable given that there is no inherent contradiction between ancient peoples' understanding of *ekklēsia* as an historic or as a contemporary institution; they did not possess a historical-critical perspective.[223] Thus, Philo's readers would have thought of their own contemporary *ekklēsia* when they read of the *ekklēsia* in the desert. For them, the former was in continuity with the latter.

---

of "men" into three categories: "The Jews, in his view, comprise a *politeuma*, which we might translate as a 'political' entity. In part, Jews dwelled in the Dispersion, among non-Jews; in part, Jews dwelled in Judea where Gentiles in some abundance were to be found. Accordingly, Philo's thought about Jews as a *politeuma* required him to distinguish among a host population, and transient or permanent outsiders" (Ibid., 102).

222   Du Toit notes a semantic shift in the meaning of ἐκκλησία κυρίου that begins with LXX Deut 23 and continues into Lam 1:10: "In Deut 23, where this phrase [ἐκκλησία κυρίου] occurs five times, several *entry conditions* [author's emphasis] are stipulated. It seems likely that ἐκκλησία is here understood as a closed group with boundary markers and entrance requirements. The ἐκκλησία is becoming an entity which is not restricted to the occasion of the meeting event, but outlives it. This becomes even clearer in the tradition emanating from Deut 23. In Neh 13.1–3, separating those of foreign descent from the ἐκκλησία actually means excommunication from the people of Israel. The ἐκκλησία κυρίου is no longer a one-off assembly; it has acquired a permanent existence of its own and the meeting-aspect has become supplementary. The same may be true of Lam 1.10" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 135).

223   With respect to Greek "history," in the Introduction to their recent edited volume, John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver state that classicists are now less interested in "what actually happened and more in what the Greeks believed to have happened" and how such beliefs affected contemporary social identity construction and socio-political developments (*Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians* [ELS 6; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012], 12). In his review of this volume, Bernd Steinbock concurs. He claims that "the last three decades have seen a sharp rise in studies which seek to situate the accounts of the Greek historians within their contemporary ideological and communicative framework" (review of John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver, eds., *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, BMCR 2013.10.53).

Second, in contrast to LXX Deut 23, Philo emphasizes the local, rather than the supra-local nature, of the *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108.[224] Third, Philo makes contemporary commentary in at least one other place within the literary context for *Virt.* 108, that is, within On Philanthropy (*Virt.* 80–108). Oppenheimer views Philo's mention of Temple tithes needing to be paid to the priest (*Virt.* 95) as being an implicit commentary on Jewish practice current in Philo's day. In *Spec.* 1.156, however, Philo makes clear that he is aware that ancient Hebrews did not tithe to priests. Therein, he correctly states that their tithe was directed to the Levites.[225] Fourth, Runesson, Binder and Olsson claim that the "instruction" mentioned in *Virt.* 108 implies contemporary Alexandrian *praxis*:

> The natives of the land, who were descendants of God's people, had the right to be instructed in divine words. The verb *hierophanteisthai* means 'to be initiated in, to be instructed in.' The sojourners received the same right. The formulation is reminiscent of Philo's descriptions of the activities in the prayer halls.[226]

If one allows that Philo is speaking of a contemporary institution in *Virt.* 108, then a second question arises: Is the *ekklēsia* therein a meeting of Alexandrian Jews which is publicly accessible, a semi-public meeting of a voluntary association, or a collective designation for a voluntary association? The text by itself is ambiguous. What is clear, though, is that Philo's *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108 has one essential characteristic. It is a forum for ethno-religious activity and its practice of "initiating" sojourners within an *ekklēsia* is congruent with religious activities in prayer halls that Philo describes elsewhere.

The binding nature of this new religious identity for Egyptian converts finds reinforcement in another syntactical change made by Philo to his base text. He changes the verb of entry/initiation from *eiserchomai* (LXX Deut 23:8) to *kalēo* (*Virt.* 108). The compound form *eiserchomai* (LXX Deut 23:8) is not paired with the word *ekklēsia* in Greek inscriptions, only the related compound forms

---

224 Du Toit notes that there seems to be "a correlation between the local Jewish community and the Jewish people as a whole [such that] to join a local ἐκκλησία means becoming part of the Jewish people" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 136–37).

225 Ahron Oppenheimer, *The 'Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic–Roman Period* (ALGHJ VIII; trans. I. H. Levine; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 39–40 nn. 46, 47.

226 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 263.

eperchomai and *synerchomai* are.[227] Philo follows the more common practice found in Greek literary sources, and in at least one extant inscription, wherein *kaleō* is juxtaposed with *ekklēsia*.[228] Semantically, *kaleō* carries with it the sense of a legal summons to an official judicial or legislative body,[229] especially when paired with the word *ekklēsia*.[230] The sole inscriptional example of this formula also speaks of a summons before a legislative body.[231] Josephus replicates this syntactical formula in his use of both the simple and compound

---

227   As is to be expected, when the compound verb *eperchomai* occurs with a preposition, it is *epi* not *eis*. Only one extant inscription pairs the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* with an *erchomai* compound verb. In this case, however, it is *synerchomai*, not the *eiserchomai* of Philo's base text (LXX Deut 23:8, 9). *IEph* 1383/*Ephesos* 149 (Ionia, found at Ephesos) is a decree of the *boulē* and *dēmos* of Ephesos concerning the celebration of holidays. It reads, καὶ τανῦν συνελθόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ θυσ[ίας —] [— μη]νὸς ἐπικαλουμένας ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς στεφανηφορού(ν)των κα[—] [— συ]νφέροντος. See Josef Keil's discussion in *JÖAI* 30.1–2 (1937): 197–200.

228   The simple verb καλέω is collocated with ἐκκλησία in: Diod. Sic. 15.75.1; Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.14.2; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.6; and Thucydides, *Pelop. War*, 8, 97. The compound verb συγκαλέω is used by Polybius when describing the convening of an ἐκκλησία of the army by one of its generals (*Hist.* 11.27.5).

229   LSJ, "καλέω," A.4, "as a law-term, *summon* … before court": Dem. 19.211 (καλεῖν ἔμ᾽ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον); A.I, "call, summon": Homer, *Od.* 1.90 (εἰς ἀγορὴν καλέσαντα); *Il.* 10.195 (ὅσοι κεκλήατο βουλήν). LSJ cites Richard C. Jebb who notes that, "the Homeric βουλή consists, not of all the chiefs, but of a select number, specially summoned" (*Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments, with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose. Part VII: The Ajax* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907], 749).

230   Compound verbs forms of *kaleō* (παρακαλέω and ἐπικαλέω), when paired with the word ἐκκλησία, also signify official civic occasions. Only παρακαλέω, however, functions as a verb of entrance/initiation, and then only once (*IG* XII,3 1270; παρακληθεὶς ἐν τᾶι ἐκλησίαι ὑπὸ τῶν κτοινετᾶν συντελέσαι ἰ[δ]ίαι τὰ ἔργα ἐπαγγείλατο καὶ συνετέλεσε). Of the other eight inscriptions which juxtapose παρακαλέω with an *ekklēsia* reference, five use παρακαλέω in the more restrictive sense of exhorting or encouraging a person who has already entered the *ekklēsia* (ἐπέρχομαι) to enact a specific course of action (e.g., *IMT SuedlTroas* 579; ἐπελθὼν ἐπ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν παρακαλέσει φίλους ὄντας). Of these five inscriptions, four pair παρακαλέω with ἐπέρχομαι (*Miletos* 26, *Teos* 40, *Tit. Calymnii Test.* XIII, *IMT SuedlTroas* 579) and one with συνέρχομαι (*IEph* 1383). The verb ἐπικαλέω is juxtaposed with *ekklēsia* in *IEph* 1383/*Ephesos* 149 (καὶ τανῦν συνελθόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ θυσ[ίας —] [— μη]νὸς ἐπικαλουμένας ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς στεφανηφορού(ν)των κα[—] [— συ]νφέροντος).

231   *IDid* 314/*Didyma* 472 (Ionia, no city mentioned, 2nd cent. BCE[?]): ἐπιτελέσασα δὲ καὶ τοὺς κόσμους ταῖς τε γυναιξὶ καὶ παρθένοις εὐαρέστως, καλέσασα δὲ ἐν τ[ῇ ἐκ]κλησίᾳ [τὰς γ]υναῖκας. Regarding potential definitions of καλέω, LSJ notes that it can be used "as law-term, summon, of the judge, καλεῖν τινας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, cite or summon before the court, D.19.211, etc.; simply καλεῖν ib.212, Ar.v.851, etc." (I. 4.).

forms of *kaleō* in contexts where an *ekklēsia* is legally convened by a community representative.[232]

If Philo intentionally juxtaposes *kaleo* with *ekklēsia* due to the resultant forensic connotation, then his clause *kalein te eis ekklēsian* carries with it a legislative force that reinforces the permanent nature of Egyptian proselytes' membership in the *ekklēsia*.[233] This *ekklēsia* is not simply a semi-public voluntary association. The legal force of *kaleō* implies that the *ekklēsia* in *Virt*. 108 is an official collective, whether a meeting or a non-civic group, that represents the *politeia* of Alexandrian Jews for the purpose of providing ethno-religious instruction.[234] This being the case, then Philo acknowledges the possibility not only that individual Egyptians converted to the *politeia* of the Alexandrian Jews, but that, coincidental with their new dyadic identity, they became part of a local socio-religious sub-group, one which either self-designates as *ekklēsia* or, at the very least, designates its public or semi-public meeting as an *ekklēsia*.

If such an institution was contemporaneous with Philo's day, its existence would have lent additional weight to Philo's philosophical agenda for Moses.[235] By ascribing an *ekklēsia* identity to the nation under Moses' leadership, the LXX serendipitously locates Moses' Israel, at least insofar as Philo's ideological agenda is concerned, as a precursor for later Greek *poleis* which adopt *ekklēsia* as the title for their civic assemblies. Given that (1) Torah is Philo's perfect exemplar upon which all true philosophy is built, including that of the later Greek philosophers, and (2) that 19 of Philo's 23 *ekklēsia* references are to the Israel which receives that Torah in the desert, then Philo's Moses can be said doubly to presage later Greek culture. If Philo's *ekklēsia* in *Virt*. 108 is a contemporary

---

232   *A.J.* 7.370 (συνκαλέω; David calls the ruler of the Hebrews together into assembly); 13.216 (καλέω; Joseph, the nephew of Onias the high priest, convened an *ekklēsia* at the Temple, in which "the multitude" [*plēthos*] confirmed him as their ambassador to the Ptolemaic king).

233   While Philo pairs καλεῖν with ἐκκλησία, at least two Greek literary works pair καλεῖν/κάλεον with two other Greek civic institutions: the *boulē* (Homer *Od*. 10.197; αὐτοὶ γὰρ κάλεον συμμητιάασθαι [see βουλή in 10.195]) and the *dikastērion* (Dem. 19.211, 212; for the functions of *dikastēria* see n. 16 [Ch. 2]).

234   *Virt*. 108ab reads, "a share of the divine words ... being instructed in the will of God."

235   The fact that the LXX translates *qāhāl* with *ekklēsia* only beginning in Deuteronomy and there only for the assembly of the nation of Israel as they hear God speak at Mount Horeb (e.g., Deut 4:10; "the day of the *ekklēsia*") serves implicitly to reinforce one of Philo's ideological goals—to establish Moses, the author of Torah, as the philosopher *par excellence* in whose footsteps later Greek philosophers follow. In *Op*. 8 Philo argues that Moses "had reached the very summit of philosophy" and "had learnt from the oracles of God the most numerous and important of the principles of nature."

non-civic group in Alexandria which prioritizes Torah instruction for Egyptian proselytes, then Philo's Hellenized depiction of Moses derives not simply from an ideological agenda, but ostensibly also from a socio-historical reality.

3.4.1.2   *De specialibus legibus* (The Special Laws) 1.324–25

Spec. 1.324–25 is the second place in Philo's works where Runesson, Binder and Olsson suggest that contemporaneous reference is made to a Jewish *ekklēsia*:

> Thus, knowing that in assemblies (*ekklēsiai*) there are not a few worthless persons who steal their way in and remain unobserved in the large numbers which surround them, it [the law] guards against this danger by precluding all the unworthy from entering the holy congregation (*hieros syllogos*).[236]

The first question to ask is whether Philo is referring here to ancient practice or to a contemporary situation? Philo's differentiation of *ekklēsia* from the *hieros syllogos* ("holy congregation") parallels the Hebrew Bible's differentiation of the assembly of ancient Israelites (*qhl*) from the holy congregation (*qhl* or *'dh*) known as "Israel." This could imply that ancient practice is here being replicated.

There is other evidence, though, which favours a contemporary referent for the *ekklēsiai* of *Spec.* 1.324–25. Borgen notes that *Spec.* 1.324 begins Philo's discussion of who is to be left out of communal life. Among others, Philo lists sexual deviants (Deut 23:1–2) and polytheists.[237] Borgen finds explicit evidence that Philo "has his own contemporary situation in mind" in the fact that Philo concludes section one of *Special Laws* with the phrase "we, the pupils and disciples of Moses" (*Spec.* 1.345).[238] If Philo's "we" includes his contemporary readership, then to what Alexandrian institution might the word *ekklēsiai* refer? Since a civic *ekklēsia* did not appear to exist in Alexandria during the Julio-Claudian era,[239] it is problematic to identify Philo's reference to *ekklēsiai*

---

236   Translated by Runesson, Binder and Olsson (*assb*, no. 210).

237   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that Philo creates five classes of men who, based on his allegorical interpretation of lxx Deut 23, are to be excluded from the *hieros syllogos*: "(1) deniers of the Platonic Forms or Ideas, (2) atheists, (3) polytheists, (4) those who rely on the human mind, or (5) those who rely only on the human senses, making gods of them and forgetting the truly living God" (see also *Spec.* 3.344) (*Ancient Synagogue*, 260).

238   Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 256. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson also contend that, in *Spec.* 3.124–25, Philo uses *ekklēsia* in reference to a contemporaneous institution (*assb*, no. 201).

239   See n. 189 (Ch. 3).

with Greco-Roman public assemblies. It seems more probable that Philo uses *ekklēsia* terminology in *Spec.* 1.324 either to explain to a Greco-Roman audience how a Jewish synagogue meeting works or to speak of an actual Jewish institution in Alexandria.

Du Toit suggests that Philo's *ekklēsiai* are publicly accessible Jewish political assemblies.[240] George H. van Kooten follows suit, but adds a disclaimer:[241] "Philo refers to the political *ekklēsia* as a counter-example to the synagogue."[242] In other words, van Kooten bifurcates the two terms and seems to imply thereby that they represent two mutually exclusive institutions, one for political purposes (*ekklēsia*) and one for religious concerns (*hieros syllogos*).[243] He sees the public nature of the "political *ekklēsia*" implied in the fact that the unworthy can enter it. By contrast the semi-public nature of the 'religious' *hieros syllogos* is evident in the fact that this communal gathering has membership restrictions ("all the unworthy [are precluded] from entering"; *Spec.* 1.325).[244]

---

240 Du Toit states that, "*Abr.* 20; *Prob.* 138 and *Spec.* 1.325; 2.44 refer to public meetings in the Greek sense" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 136). For example, *Abr.* 20 reads, in part, ἀγορὰν καὶ θέατρα καὶ δικαστήρια βουλευτήριά τε καὶ ἐκκλησίας καὶ πάντα σύλλογον καὶ θίασον ἀνθρώπων.

241 George H. van Kooten allows that only the *ekklēsia* in *Spec.* 1.324–25 is a contemporaneous institution. He claims that *Deus* 111 and *Virt.* 108 only "adopt the *ekklēsia* terminology from the LXX but do not prove that their authors technically described the Jewish synagogue meeting as an ἐκκλησία" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley," NTS 58/4 [Oct. 2012]: 522–48, esp. 535).

242 By "counter-example," van Kooten means that "whereas the political ἐκκλησίας are in practice open to all since access cannot be controlled, the holy congregation [i.e., synagogue community] should take precautions so that all of the unworthy are precluded from entering" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 535).

243 Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 535.

244 Another basis upon which van Kooten could have differentiated the *ekklēsia* from a semi-public group is by virtue of the large numbers of people who are said to have gathered *en tais ekklēsiais*. The large numbers of this group runs counter to the average size of a Greco-Roman voluntary association, which Philip Harland says usually numbered from 10 to 50 (*Dynamics of Identity*, 26). A notable exception to the small size of most voluntary associations is the 2nd cent. CE association headed by Pompeia Agrippinilla. She is a priestess of Dionysus from Toree Nova in the Roman West. Her group consists of 400 Dionysian "initiates" (*mystai*) (*IGUR* 160; *c.* 160 CE). They are almost entirely 'household' members, whether familial or servile (*Dynamics of Identity*, 26 and 32; see also, idem, *Associations*, 30). For a detailed discussion of *IGUR* 160, see Bradley H. McLean, "The Agrippinilla Inscription: Religious Associations and Early Church Formation," in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd* (JSNTSup 86; ed. B. H. McLean; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 239–70.

If I have read van Kooten correctly, then his dichotomy suffers on four fronts. First, a purely political *ekklēsia* did not exist in antiquity. One cannot bifurcate "politics" and "religion" in respect of ancient governance institutions. Second, a "political" (i.e., civic) *ekklēsia* did not exist in Philo's Alexandria. Third, if Philo's *ekklēsia* is a Jewish institution, then, *de facto*, it cannot be a "counter-example" to the synagogue. In fact, if this Egyptian *ekklēsia* is analogous to Josephus' Judean *ekklēsiai* then, at the very least, it is a publicly accessible synagogue assembly wherein communal needs relative to local politics, religion, jurisprudence, administration, social life, and economics can be addressed. Josephus seems to imply the existence of such an Alexandrian synagogue assembly when he mentions that the *gerousia* convened an *ekklēsia* there after the fall of Masada. It addressed at least one communal socio-political need: safety and security (*B.J.* 7:412). Fourth, Runesson, Binder, and Olsson suggest that Philo may be using *ekklēsia* and *hieros syllogos* as two descriptors for one Jewish religio-political assembly. Given Philo's ascription of a sacred nature (*hieros*) to the "congregation" (*syllogos*), they conclude, in line with Berger, that "*ekklēsia* and the synonymous *syllogos* ... [probably] refer to some form of synagogue fellowship," that is, Sabbath assembly.[245]

The translation of *hieros syllogos* as "holy congregation" by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson perhaps allows one more conclusion: Philo's *hieros syllogos* is not simply a communal gathering ("Sabbath assembly") but a communal designation. If so, then *Spec.* 1.324–25 may imply that a voluntary association known as *hieros syllogos* sponsored meetings (*en tais ekklēsiais*) which were publicly

---

245   Berger writes, "Für Philo ist *ekklēsia* in seiner Gegenwartsbedeutung vor allem die Zusammenkunft der Gemeinde am Sabbat, und in dieser Institution dürfte sich für das hellenistische Judentum im allgemeinen 'helige Ekklēsia' darstellen" ("Volksversammlung," 173–74, cited in Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 260). Pseudo-Philo uses *ecclesia* (Latin) in reference to Sabbath assemblies (*Bib. Ant.* 11.8). It reads, "Take care to sanctify the Sabbath ... You shall not do any work on it, you and all your help, except to praise the LORD in the assembly [*ecclesia*] of the elders and to glorify the Mighty One in the council [*cathedra*] of older men" (*ASSB*, no. 64; translation by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson). Pseudo-Philo cites Exod 20:8, in reference to the Sabbath, with his phrase "the assembly of the elders," slightly revising LXX Ps 106:32 (HB Ps 107:32) (ὑψωσάτωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λαοῦ καὶ ἐν καθέδρᾳ πρεσβυτέρων αἰνεσάτωσαν αὐτόν). In speaking of the "assembly of the elders," Pieter van der Horst also affirms that "the author presupposes a form of communal Sabbath worship" ("Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship Before 70 CE?" in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction During the Greco-Roman Period* [ed. S. Fine; New York: Routledge: 1999], 16–37, esp. 25). Howard Jacobson points to *Jub* 2:21 as being a parallel (*A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 1:468).

accessible to local Jews. This scenario accounts for two paradoxical facts: there are participants in the meetings (*ekklēsiai*) who are in an unworthy state (e.g., atheists, polytheists),[246] yet participation in the synagogue association is only available to the worthy.[247]

My analysis of *Virt.* 108 and *Spec.* 1.324–25 suggests the conclusion that *ekklēsiai* functioned complementarily with three other Jewish religio-political governance institutions in Alexandria: *gerousia, proseuchē*, and *synagōgē*. What jurisdictional niche might Philo's *ekklēsiai* have fulfilled? By the time of the pogrom (38 CE), Alexandria, not least the Delta quarter, had a sizeable concentration of Jews.[248] Given their numbers, one would expect that a multi-layered administrative system was in place. S. R. Llewelyn follows the majority view that the Jewish *politeuma* ("community") was given oversight by a *gerousia*, which functioned as an oversight council for several synagogues:

> its power [is] notorial (supervision of contracts), judicial (settlement of disputes) and administrative (application of government legislation to Jewish courts). However, the powers of the *gerousia* were not limited to these spheres; it might also police dissent within the community, send envoys to a ruler to represent its interests and vote honours to a benefactor.[249]

A governance system in which a body of community leaders (e.g., *gerousia*) oversees multiple synagogue communities in some sort of "federal" system finds later attestation in an Egyptian *polis* well south of Memphis (*CPJ* 2.432; 113 CE). It is called Arsinoë, and also known as Crocodilopolis. Aryeh Kasher notes that a Jewish synagogue existed there since "the early days of the Ptolemaic

---

246   See n. 237 (Ch. 3) for the identities of the five classes of men who Philo claims should be excluded from the "holy congregation" of Deut 23.

247   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that "The Greek words *hieros syllogos* (without definite article) could also be translated as 'a holy congregation.' Philo often returns to this allegorical interpretation of Deut 23 frequently using the word *ekklēsia* and sometimes also *syllogos*" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 260). By translating *hieros syllogos* as "a holy congregation," Runesson, Binder, and Olsson remove the impression that *hieros syllogos* is a sub-category of *ekklēsia*.

248   *Flacc.* 55; *B.J.* 2.495. Josephus states that the Delta quarter was near the palace and bordered on the sea (*C. Ap.* 2.33–36).

249   S. R. Llewelyn, "The Elders and Rulers (Archons) of the Jews," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published 1986–87. Vol. 9 of New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (ed. S. R. Llewelyn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 69–72, esp. 71.

settlement program."[250] In an official report to Arsinoë's auditor on municipal water usage, two Jewish institutions are mentioned as owing twice the monthly amount that was charged to a nearby bath house.[251] The one institution is called "synagogue of the Thebans."[252] The other is simply called *eucheion*.[253] Kasher claims that "the distinction made suggests that the local Jews at the time were organized into two *landsmannschaft*-type bodies, one of people from Thebes (Diospolic Magna) and the other probably of local people."[254]

The interrelationship between these two synagogue organizations varies depending on how one translates *archontōn Ioudaiōn proseuchēs* (line 57). Kasher favours the translation: "from the Jewish *archontes* for the synagogue of the Thebans … and similarly for the prayer house."[255] This identifies the Jewish community of Arsinoë as being, what Kasher calls, a "federative organisation."[256] Llewelyn nuances Kasher's position. He presumes that "each synagogue or local Jewish community had its own council of elders, and that a federation of councils had a common executive board or committee, the archons."[257] He forwards papyrological (P. Monac. III 49) and literary sources as evidence for an administrative division of roles.[258] Llewelyn states that "the advantage of

---

250   Kasher states that the existence of a synagogue in Arsinoë is "definitely proven by a dedicatory inscription in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes I and his family from a local synagogue (*CPJ* 3.1532A=*SB*, 8939)" (*Alexandrian Jews*, 138). See n. 52 (Ch. 3) for further details on one inscription and two papyrii from Crocodilopolis within which occur two synagogue terms, *proseuchē* and *synagōgē* (*CIJ* III.1532A=*JIGRE* 117; *CPJ* I.129; *CPJ* I.134). A 2nd century CE papyrus from Arsinoë–Crocodilopolis affirms the continued existence of *proseuchai* in that region (*CPJ* 2.432=P.Lond. III 1177; 113 CE).

251   Runesson, Binder, and Olson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 192. They conclude that "the high fees imply elevated water usage—and thus present possible evidence for the observance of ritual ablutions in or near these structures" (Ibid., 192).

252   Προσεθχὴ θηβαίων (*CIJ* 2.432, line 57; see *ASSB*, no. 149).

253   *CPJ* 2.432, line 60. The word εὐχεῖον implies a place of prayer, not unlike the term *proseuchē*. Runesson, Binder, and Olson observe that this is the only extant use of this term for a Jewish community (*Ancient Synagogue*, 328).

254   Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 140.

255   Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 140. If one translates it, as Fuks does, "from the *archontes* of the synagogue of the Theben Jews," then this suggests that the local synagogue (the *eucheion*) did not have *archontes* in leadership (Ibid., 140).

256   Kasher, *Alexandrian Jews*, 140.

257   Llewelyn, "The Elders and Rulers," 71.

258   Llewelyn notes that in P.Monac. III 49 two titles are used for the leadership of a Jewish community in the Ptolemaic *chora* called Heracleopolis: πρεσβύτεροι and ἄρχουσι ("The Elders and Rulers," 69; for full text of the papyrus see, D. Hagedorn, *Griechische Papyri* (*Nr. 45–154): Griechische Urkundenpapyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, Band III

such a system would be to give each community a larger collective voice and more effective representation at the centres of regional administration."[259] If a small Jewish populace in Arsinoë was a "federative organisation," then it seems natural to presume that the more populous Jewish community in Alexandria self-organized under the oversight of a federation of councils led by a common executive board (*gerousia*), under which regionally-centred groups of Jews convened publicly accessible synagogue gatherings (*synagōgai*), some of which may even have been named *ekklēsia*.

3.4.1.3   *Quod Deus ist immutabilis* 111

The third example in Philo of a contemporaneous local assembly named *ekklēsia*, to which Runesson, Binder, and Olsson point, is found in *Deus* 111:

> But there is a different mind which loves the body … Pleasure. Eunuch-like it has been deprived of all the male and productive organs of the soul … debarred from the holy congregation [*ekklēsias tēs hieras*] in which the talk and study [*syllogoi kai logoi*] is always of virtue.[260]

Philo's phrase *ekklēsia tēs hieras* is not LXX terminology; it neither occurs in the base text of *Deus* 111 (LXX Deut 23),[261] nor anywhere else in the LXX. To what, then, might this phrase refer? There are three candidates: the congregation of ancient Israelites, assemblies of contemporary Jews in Alexandria, or an allegorical referent.

[ed. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, R. Hübner and J. C. Shelton; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1986], 8–10). The question is whether these represent different levels of hierarchical power or simply parallel administrative bodies with differentiated functions. Llewelyn does not favour viewing the πρεσβύτεροι as forming the *gerousia*, with the ἄρχουσι being the executive committee within it. Rather he contends that P.Monac. III 49 "seems to see the elders and *gerousia* as separate bodies" (Ibid., 71). He claims that this organizational relationship lies behind the use of the same terms in Ezra 10:8, 14 and 1 Macc 14:28. Both display, what Llewelyn calls, "a separation based on a local/regional basis," that is, the *archons* are regional authorities and the *presbyteroi* are local officials (Ibid., 71). This regional differentiation is even more evident in 1 Macc 14:28 where a list is given of people who witness the conferral of the priesthood upon Simon. Among them are listed the archons of the nation and elders of the countryside (ἄρχοντες ἔθνοθς καὶ οἱ πρεβύτεροι τῆς χώρας). Llewelyn observes that "it is in these last two references that one finds the closest parallels to the federal system alleged to operate in P.Monac. 49 (Egypt)" (Ibid., 72).

259   Llewelyn, "The Elders and Rulers," 71.

260   *ASSB*, no. 202; translated by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson.

261   LXX Deut 23:2, 3, 4, and 9 each only use the phrase *ekklēsia kyriou* not *ekklēsia tēs hieras*.

Philo's related phrase (*ekklēsias hieras*) comes into play when reaching a decision on the best interpretation of *ekklēsia tēs hieras*. *Ekklēsias hieras* is found three times (*Som.* 2.184, 187; *Migr.* 69), with only one instance possibly referring to an Alexandrian synagogue community or its assembly (*Migr.* 69).[262] In *Som.* 2.183–188, Philo recounts the contrasting life stations of two people: the butler of Pharaoh and the Jewish high priest. In his speech, the butler of Pharaoh, while alluding to Deut 23, states that, given his status as a eunuch, he has been "excluded from the assembly (*syllogos*) and sacred meeting (*ekklēsias hieras*) of the people" (*Som.* 2.184). It seems clear that Philo intends here a reference to an Egyptian socio-political institution, but one that is contemporaneous only with the eunuch's day. Philo's second use of *ekklēsias hieras*, which speaks about the high priest, is only allegorical in nature (*Som.* 2.187).[263]

The third occurrence of *ekklēsias hieras* (*Migr.* 69) holds greater promise. It is found in the *Migration of Abraham*, a literary work which interprets Abraham's life allegorically as a journey of the soul from sensuality to reason (e.g., *Migr.* 17–21). Therein, Philo writes regarding atheists and polytheists that "the law banishes them both from the sacred assembly (*ekklēsias hieras*)" (*Migr.* 69). Although he mentions "law," Philo does not justify their banishment by citing a specific commandment of "*the* law," that is, the Mosaic Law. Rather, he pleads his case only by dint of reason. The two types of ungodly people (atheists and polytheists) are compared to two types of animals (two unclean reptiles) and are described as two types of human beings (eunuchs and children of a harlot, respectively). How does this line of argumentation help in clarifying what Philo means by *ekklēsia hiera*? Simply put, one can argue that the timeframe within which "law" exists is the same timeframe within which the *ekklēsia hiera* exists. There are three potential timeframes for Philo's "law."

First, one could suggest that Philo is simply being chronologically consistent in his storyline by not citing Mosaic Law during an Abrahamic timeframe. If this is the case, though, then Philo is being inconsistent on another level. The word *ekklēsia* is not used within LXX Genesis; it only first occurs within LXX Deuteronomy when Moses recounts the law he was initially given at Mount

---

262   Aside from the phrase ἐκκλησία ἱερά, Philo uses four other phrases to interconnect the ἐκκλησία with deity: ἐκκλησία θεοῦ (*Leg.* 3.8; *Ebr.* 213), ἐκκλησία θεία (*Conf.* 144), ἐκκλησία τοῦ πανηγεμόνος (*Mut.* 204; cf. *Leg.* 3.81), and ἐκκλησία κυρίου. Philo only uses ἐκκλησία κυρίου in direct quotations from Deut 23 (*Leg.* 3.81; *Post.* 177; *Ebr.* 213; *Conf.* 144).

263   Philo states that the high priest is one who as "guide and father … is no insignificant part of the sacred assembly (*hieras ekklēsias*) … of the parts of the soul" (*Som.* 2.187).

Horeb.[264] Thus, if one uses the first occurrence of *ekklēsia* terminology to de-limit the timeframe of "law" then the *terminus a quo* of the "law" becomes the time of Moses and the *terminus ad quem* in Philo's day.

Second, if one presumes that the first occurrence of the word *ekklēsia* is the *terminus ad quem* of Philo's "law," then that "law" is in fact "the Law" (i.e., the Mosaic Law). This makes Philo's *ekklēsia hiera* the assembly of Israel at Horeb (Deut 23:2). Such a conclusion is paradoxical, though, given that Philo does not cite a specific Mosaic commandment. Had he done so he would immeasur-ably have solidified, and even settled, his case for the banishment of atheists and polytheists from the "sacred assembly." In fact, Philo's silence here is quite uncharacteristic of his vociferous proclamation elsewhere. In book 1 of *On the Special Laws* Philo uses the first and second commandments of the Decalogue to rail against polytheism and idols.[265]

A third, and perhaps least problematic interpretation, is that Philo avoids pairing "law" with any Mosaic commandments because he intends a more ge-neric reference to legal judgments enacted among Alexandrian Jews in his day. If so, then the *ekklēsia hiera* in *Migr.* 69 is an Alexandrian synagogue commu-nity, or its assembly, although the lack of extant evidence in Jewish sources for an *ekklēsia hiera* places such a conclusion into question. The Greek inscrip-tional record, however, does make mention of a *hiera ekklēsia*. Inscriptional examples of this type of civic institution date from the Hellenistic to the late Imperial periods, and are found in Asia Minor and in the Aegean Islands.[266] Although no conclusion can be reached as to whether Philo had personal knowledge of such an institution, given the random nature of archaeological and inscriptional discoveries one cannot discount outright the possibility that *hierai ekklēsiai* existed closer to, or even in, Egypt.

In sum, it seems that of the three places where Philo uses the phrase *ekklēsia hiera* (*Som.* 2.184, 187; *Migr.* 69), only *Migr.* 69 has any prospect of referring to a contemporaneous Jewish synagogue assembly in Alexandria. This implicitly reinforces the possibility that Philo's analogous phrase *ekklēsias tēs hieras* also refers to a contemporary Jewish institution, perhaps even one which barred eunuchs from communal participation. Contextual considerations within *Deus* 86–121 further that possibility.

---

264   The LXX only first uses the word *ekklēsia* in Deuteronomy 4:10 when speaking of the "day of the assembly" ("when you stood before the Lord your God in Horeb for the day of the assembly [τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας])."

265   See, for example, Borgen's brief content survey of Philo's work, *On the Special Laws,* books 1–4 (*Philo of Alexandria,* 71–73).

266   See n. 126 (Ch. 2) for details on the seven inscriptions which mention a *hiera ekklēsia*.

Borgen notes that, within the broader literary context of *Deus* 111 (*Deus* 86–121), Philo uses a simple question and answer process by which to unravel the meaning of Gen 6:8 ("Noah found grace before the Lord God").[267] Within the immediate context of *Deus* 111 (*Deus* 104–116), Philo focuses upon Noah. He states that Noah (Gen 6:8) represents a lower worthiness, and thus was in need of grace, while Moses (Exod 33:17) was found worthy of grace. Philo adds Potiphar as another example of lower worthiness (*Deus* 111–116). Potiphar becomes an allegorical representation of the "mind," which is also then identified with a lower status (Gen 39:1; Deut 23:2). This mind, which Philo calls Pleasure, is characterized as loving the body and its passions.

People who live on the level of the mind are analogously viewed as eunuch-like slaves of pleasure and passion. These 'slaves' are incapable of receiving the divine message. Because of their lack of virtue, they cannot join "the holy congregation" (*ekklēsias tēs hieras*) whose meetings (*syllogoi*) revolve around the expression and discussion of virtue. Given the allegorical context of *Deus* 111, the *ekklēsias tēs hieras* could simply be symbolic terminology for any Jewish community which lives above the Noachic level of the mind. Young Ho-Park suggests that since Philo broadens the ethical application of terminology such as "eunuchs" beyond the ancient Israelites to all nations, that Philo also then "converts … the Israelite institution 'the ἐκκλησία of the Lord' (Deut 23) to a cosmic article, 'the ἐκκλησία of the ruler of the universe' (ἐκκλησία φοιτᾶν τοῦ πανηγεμόνος)" (*Mut.* 205; cf. *Decal.* 32).[268] Thus, Park asserts that for Philo "the law and the ἐκκλησία in the Old Testament are not institutions only for a nation but the best institution in the whole world."[269]

Be that as it may, Philo's *ekklēsias tēs hieras* might just as readily reflect a localized synagogue community. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that Philo's description of the activity which takes place within the *ekklēsias tēs hieras* ("talk and study … of virtue") reflects the kind of socio-religious *praxis* that is consistent with the "definition of the prayer halls as Philo describes them elsewhere."[270]

The possibility that a Jewish association synagogue would exclude eunuchs is not unknown during the Second Temple period. One case in point is a Hasmonean-era Jewish voluntary association, one of whose writings was

---

267   Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 116. See Borgen's discussion of *Deus* 86–116 (Ibid., 116–18).

268   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 96.

269   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 96.

270   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 262.

found at Qumran.[271] In 4QMMT (4Q394–399) the author(s)/redactor(s) de-
scribes "some of the works of the Torah" (4Q398 14 ii 3), specifically as they
relate to communal *praxis*.[272] One of those works of Torah is to forbid eunuchs
("one with crushed testicles and one whose penis has been cut off"; 4Q394 8
iii 10; 4Q396 i 5; 4Q397 v 1) from entering the *qhl* (the Hebrew term translated
ekklēsia in the LXX).[273]

In sum, the fact that the *ekklēsias tēs hieras* in *Deus* 111 involves itself in is-
sues of religious jurisprudence (e.g., eunuchs, "talk and study") is consistent
with Philo's non-civic *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108, within which the instruction and/or
initiation of Egyptian *epēlutai* ("incomers"/proselytes) takes place. The com-
bined witness of these two passages suggests that Philo conceived of a contem-
poraneous, semi-public synagogue association named *ekklēsia* located within
Alexandria whose membership focused upon Torah instruction both for Jews
and proselytes. Unlike Hellenistic-era Jewish *ekklēsiai* (Judith, 1 Maccabees,
Sirach), Philo's *ekklēsia* is not described as being a public assembly within
which juridical and political issues are also addressed.

---

271   Since the completed publication of the Scrolls, a fuller picture of the residents of Qumran
      has emerged. As such, I do not speak of "the community at Qumran," not least because of
      John Collins' view that "the sectarian movement known from the Scrolls cannot be identi-
      fied simply as 'the Qumran community.' Qumran was at most one of many settlements of
      the sect" (John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the
      Dead Sea Scrolls* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 10). Collins also challenges the common
      perception in scholarship that identifies "the *yachad* with the (celibate) community that
      lived at Qumran" (Ibid., 65). Collins notes that the *Serek* (1QS) "assumes that the *yachad*
      has multiple places of residence" (Ibid., 69). The small group of the *yachad* who lived at
      Qumran is a more religiously strict "elite group [for whom] the intensification of holiness
      is reflected in the retreat to the desert" (Ibid., 73).
272   The identity of the authorial community of 4QMMT is debated. See the helpful overviews
      by Hanna von Weissenberg (*4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning
      of the Epilogue* [STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 17–21; idem, "The Centrality of the Temple
      in 4QMMT," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* [STDJ 90; ed. C. Hempel; Leiden,
      Brill, 2010], 293–305, esp. 293–94) and John Collins (*Beyond the Qumran Community*, 9,
      19–21). The majority of scholars view the authorial community of 4QMMT as being the
      members of the Qumran group or its predecessors (e.g., Strugnell, Eshel, D. Schwartz, and
      Regev). Other options include: (1) the Teacher of Righteousness (Qimron and Strugnell);
      (2) a group with similarities in halakhic practices to the later rabbinic descriptions of
      earlier Sadducees (Schiffman); (3) a group in Jerusalem cherishing a hope of return to the
      Temple (S. Hultgren).
273   Fabry (*TDOT* 12:559) notes that 4QMMT applies various injunctions from Deut 23 (cf.
      4QFlor 1:4) to communal *praxis*. At that period of the sectarians' development, their com-
      munity was known as *qhl* (the Hebrew word which the LXX only translates as *ekklēsia*).

3.4.2 *Judean Semi-Public Associations Named* Ekklēsia? (*Paul*)

Paul's undisputed writings also can be said to use the word *ekklēsia* in reference to a Jewish synagogue community or assembly. When speaking of *ekklēsiai* in Judea, Paul adds a potentially redundant phrase—"in Christ Jesus" (Gal 1:22, "the *ekklēsiai* of Judea in Christ Jesus"; 1 Thess 2:14, "the *ekklēsiai* of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea").[274] Trebilco represents the majority view in his claim that these two passages refer to groups of Greek-speaking Jewish Christ-followers in Judea.[275] It would seem, though, that the pairing of "Judea" with "in Christ Jesus" is superfluous if in Judea only Christ-follower communities self-designate as *ekklēsiai*. Paul's apparent redundancy may simply reflect an explanatory emphasis added to his provincial use of *ekklēsia* for the sake of his Galatian and Thessalonian readers. Alternatively, it may be an indirect reference to non-messianic Jewish *ekklēsiai* that existed in Judea. If the latter option is correct, then Paul is referring either to public Judean assemblies called *ekklēsiai*, which Josephus was later to write about, or to non-civic Jewish synagogue associations.

If Paul is speaking of public Jewish assemblies as they are defined by Levine, that is, of Judean synagogue assemblies which functioned as "courtroom, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions," then a corollary assumption follows.[276] Paul's reference to *ekklēsiai* in Judea implies, then, that entire synagogue communities have come to be "in Christ Jesus." In other words, whole villages in rural Judea have embraced messianic belief in Jesus. The book of Acts does not preclude such a possibility.

The author of Acts records that, soon after the day of Pentecost, upwards of eight thousand Jews in Jerusalem came to faith in Jesus as the Jewish *Christos* (messiah).[277] Most of these new Christ-followers are said to have dwelt in

---

274 Gal 1:22 reads, ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. 1 Thess 2:14 reads, ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

275 Trebilco, "Early Christians," 440–460. Regarding Gal 1:22, and with respect to Paul describing the Christ-follower communities in Jerusalem and Judea as *ekklēsiai*, Trebilco writes that "Paul is referring here to a time three years after his Damascus Road experience (Gal 1.18), and so to a very early period. As Dunn notes, this passage implies that 'Paul's usage was not original to him or to his mission'" (Ibid., 442–43; see J. D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem: Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 2.600).

276 Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 29. See also n. 23 (Ch. 1).

277 Acts records that three thousand Jews came to faith "in Christ Jesus" on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:42) and five thousand soon thereafter (Acts 4:4).

Jerusalem or in the Diaspora.[278] Irrespective of whether this account reflects historical accuracy or ideological rhetoric, the narrative could be said to imply that rural Judeans were also among that number and that upon returning to their villages, a wholesale joining of messianic communities took place. Such an interpretation, however, is tenuous at best, not least given Acts' silence on this point. Silence directly counters the expressed purpose of Acts which is to recount the spread and success of the early Jesus movement "in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end [*sic!*] of the earth" (Acts 1:8). This lacuna in the narrative of Acts makes it highly unlikely that Paul's mention of *ekklēsiai* in Judea (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14) refers to public synagogue communities or assemblies filled with new followers of Jesus the *Christos*. If, rather, Paul is not speaking of *Christ-follower ekklēsiai* in Judea, whether semi-public or public, then he can only be referring to semi-public, non-messianic Jewish voluntary associations.[279] Although such a conclusion also is tenuous, if such an assumption underlies Paul's terminology, then, aside from Egypt, Judea was one more region wherein the word *ekklēsia* came to be used as a permanent group designation by Jewish voluntary associations during the early 1st century CE.

3.4.3 *Summary:* Ekklēsia *and Semi-Public Jewish Institutions*

The word *ekklēsia* appears to be used by non-civic Jewish groups within Egypt (Philo) and possibly even in Judea (Paul). Of the 23 *ekklēsia* occurrences in Philo, scholars most commonly forward the one in *Virt.* 108 as referring to a non-civic institution of Alexandria Jews during Philo's day. This *ekklēsia* is a forum for ethno-religious activity, specifically for the initiation of Egyptian proselytes. It is more than simply an association synagogue since it holds

---

278   The five thousand new Christ-followers ostensibly came from the ranks of those who heard Peter speak in the portico of Solomon (Acts 3:11). Of the three thousand new Christ-followers on the day of Pentecost, many are said to have hailed from the Diaspora ("how is it that we hear, each of us, in our own native language? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs"; Acts 2:8–11).

279   David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland suggest that the Mishnah confirms the existence of Jewish associations in Roman Palestine before 200 CE. The Mishnah does not, though, use the word *ekklēsia* for a Judean 'association.' Instead, Instone-Brewer and Harland claim that "the feminine noun *chavurah* refers to an 'association' of people who meet together for a ceremonial meal" (e.g., Passover meal [*m. Pes.* 7.3, 13; 8:7] and Sabbath meals [*m. ʿErub.* 6.6]) ("Jewish Associations," 208). They state that at least one *chavurah* reference "contains evidence that it originated before 70 CE" (*m. ʿErub.* 6.6; a Sabbath meal 'association') (Ibid., 212).

some sort of official status on behalf of the *politeia* of Alexandrian Jews. This sub-group either self-designates as an *ekklēsia* or designates its meeting as an *ekklēsia*, a meeting that is either publicly accessible or for "members only."

Jewish association synagogues, contemporaneous with Philo and Paul, also appear to use *ekklēsia* terminology. In *Spec.* 1.324–325, Philo mentions a voluntary association, known as *hieros syllogos*, that held meetings (*en tais ekklēsiais*) which were publicly accessible to Jews, irrespective of their state of socio-religious worthiness. Philo seems to indicate that an Alexandrian association synagogue even went so far as to self-identify collectively as an *ekklēsia hiera*. This sacred *ekklēsia* involved itself in issues of religious jurisprudence (e.g., "talk and study" of Torah). Judean synagogue associations, which self-designated as *ekklēsiai*, may also have existed, although the ambiguity inherent in Paul's reference to *ekklēsiai* in Judea prevents any firm conclusion in that regard (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14).

3.5   Conclusion: Chapter 3

It has been my primary intent in this chapter to investigate the use of the word *ekklēsia* within Jewish sources. Seven key literary witnesses have been brought to the stand—the LXX, Judith, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, Josephus, Philo and the apostle Paul.

Regarding Jewish *ekklēsiai* in the land of Israel, Judith, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, and Josephus describe *ekklēsiai* that are public synagogue institutions. The public nature of Josephus' *ekklēsiai* is evident in their functioning as venues for decision-making on issues related to administrative, judicial, and religious matters. Since an *ekklēsia* is not a physical structure, Josephus' *ekklēsiai* may have been convened within the *proseuchai* or the *synagōgai* that he mentions elsewhere. The apostle Paul, at best, can be said only to imply either that Jewish voluntary associations, or public assemblies, called *ekklēsiai* existed in the Judea of his day.

With respect to the possibility that Jewish *ekklēsiai* existed in Egypt during the 1st century CE, three of Philo's *ekklēsia* references appear to denote non-civic Jewish institutions.[280] In *Spec.* 1.324–25, Philo may be describing a publicly accessible assembly (*ekklēsia*) which is convened by a Jewish voluntary

---

280   See n. 18 (Ch. 1) where I clarify that my use of "non-civic" is as an umbrella term both for small, unofficial ("private") groups (e.g., voluntary associations), and for official groups such as age-based 'organizations' connected with the gymnasia (e.g., *epheboi, gerousia*). See also Harland's list of five types of associations (n. 128 [Ch. 2]).

association (*hieros syllogos*). In two others cases, Philo seems to speak of non-civic *ekklēsiai*, whether assemblies or communities, that are responsible for the initiation and religious instruction of Egyptian converts (*Virt.* 108) and/or for religious "talk and study" (*Deus* 111).

Although others have suggested that *ekklēsia* is a synagogue term (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson), my research has attempted to demonstrate the plausibility of that suggestion. If I have succeeded, then it would seem that if a 1st century CE voluntary association with a *corpus mixtum* of Jews and gentiles, or even one with an exclusively gentile composition, adopted an *ekklēsia* identity, its members could have been viewed as being in continuity with a Jewish, and not simply with a Greco-Roman, heritage. This fact has implications for Christ-followers whom Paul collectively designated as *ekklēsiai*. Their sub-group identity, then, not only facilitated their permanent identification with a Jewish heritage, but, as was argued in Chapter 2, also gave their communities socio-cultural relevance within the political culture of the Greek East during the Imperial period. Keeping in mind the preceding analyses of Greek and Jewish backgrounds, I now turn to a re-reading of the "*ekklēsia* discourse" that is found within the New Testament writings.

Ekklēsia in Early Christ-follower Sources

4.1 Introduction

At the outset of this study, I identified three key issues scholars debate with respect to *ekklēsia* usage among first-generation Christ-followers: (1) which subgroup of the early Jesus movement was first to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity; (2) does a collective *ekklēsia* identity entail counter-imperial ideology, either by insider intent or by outsider perception; and (3) given that the LXX identifies historic Israel as an *ekklēsia*, does Paul's identification of his multi-ethnic communities as an *ekklēsia* serve further to integrate them with, or farther to separate them from, historic Israel? In order better to assess these three issues, it is helpful first to map out the various group identities evident in the New Testament writings, along with how the word *ekklēsia* is employed within the New Testament.

4.1.1 *Group Designations in the Early Jesus Movement*

Young-Ho Park suggests that, if New Testament literary usage indicates socioreligious reality, then not all sub-groups of Christ-followers adopted *ekklēsia* as a group designation:[1] (1) some New Testament writings which mention an *ekklēsia* also appear to reference other sub-group identities; and (2) some NT authors do not reference the term *ekklēsia* at all.

Examples of the first category can be said to include the Johannine epistles, Acts, and some Pauline writings. The Johannine epistles make ostensible reference to *hoi philoi* (3 John 6 and 10). The book of Acts alone records that some Christ-followers were called followers of "the Way" (Acts 9:2; 24:14). Acts and some of the Pauline epistles both imply that *hoi hagioi* is an actual sub-group designation adopted by non-Pauline communities in the early Jesus Movement

---

1 Young-Ho Park states that "*ekklēsia* was not the representative term for the Christian community in Paul's time [since] it was not extensively used by the writers other than Paul in his time" (*Paul's Ekklēsia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in their Politico-Social World* [WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014], 94).

(e.g., Acts 9:13; Romans 15:25, 26, 31).[2] Trebilco argues that the Aramaic speaking Christ-followers referenced in Acts originally chose to self-designate as *hoi hagioi* because of that term's historic association with the eschatological "people of the *hoi hagioi*" in Daniel 7.[3] Jewett suggests that Paul addresses the Roman Christ-followers as a sub-group of Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers who self-designate as *hoi hagioi* (Rom 1:7; *klētois hagiois*). Jewett claims that "when the term 'saints' is used as a description of specific Christian groups in contrast to all Christians, it refers to Jewish Christians, loyal to or associated with Jerusalem."[4]

---

2   Commenting on Acts 9:13, Richard I. Pervo implies that the group designation by which (Hebrew) Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem self-identify is the term *hoi hagioi* (*Acts: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009], 248). Richard Bauckham makes that implication explicit: "there is good reason to suppose that it [*hoi hagioi*] goes back to the early Jerusalem church" ("James and the Jerusalem Community," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 55–95, esp. 57).

3   Trebilco claims that "the use of οἱ ἁγίοι as a self-designation originated with Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians in Jerusalem at a very early point" (*Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012], 134). Trebilco explains his rationale: "In any case it is clear he [the author of Acts] does not seem to introduce οἱ ἁγιοι as a self-designation for purposes of variety; that he only uses it four times [Acts 9:13, 32, 41; 26:10] and then only in connection with Jerusalem, Lydda and Joppa, and so with a very limited geographical range, argues against this ... which suggests that he is using a Palestinian source here (either oral or written), which spoke of Christians at Jerusalem, Lydda and Joppa as οἱ ἁγιοι ... [The term] 'the saints' was originally connected with the earliest Jerusalem church ... I also note here that in these four uses, Luke does not include Gentile Christians among 'the saints'" (*Self-designations*, 117). For a detailed discussion of the term *hoi hagioi* and its use as a group identity by early Christ-followers loyal to, or associated with, Jerusalem, see Trebilco, *Self-designations*, 104–37.

4   Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 2007), 114. Jewett cites other examples in Romans 15:25, 26, 31; 1 Cor 16:1 (Ibid., 114; see also Horst Balz, "ἁγίοις κτλ.," *EDNT* 1.17). Some scholars come close to Jewett's suggestion when they say that the phrase κλητοῖς ἁγίοις is "almost titular" (C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975/2006 reprint], 1.69). See also, Ulrich Wilckens (*Der Brief an die Römer* [3 vols.; EKKNT VI; Ostfildern/Einsiedeln/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Patmos/Benziger/Neukirchener, 1982–1997], 1.68 n. 39).

In the second category are those writings which do not reference the term *ekklēsia* at all. 1 Peter only speaks of *christianoi*[5] (1 Pet 4:16).[6] The author of Acts records that the sub-group identity *christianoi* originated in Antioch (Acts 11:26) and was adopted by the community there only after the incorporation of gentiles (Acts 11:19–30; cf. also Acts 26:28). This raises the question as to whether an expressly Jewish identity (*hoi hagioi*) was deemed no longer to be appropriate for the newly *multi-ethnic* community among the Antiochean Christ-followers. The term *christianoi* would have fit well the new socio-ethnic realities of the Antiochean community: the descriptor *christianoi* communicates an indelible rootedness in a Jewish heritage (i.e., *Christos* as the Jewish Messiah), but it has a semantic range broad enough to allow for gentile inclusion (i.e., *christianoi*

---

5 See Paul Trebilco's discussion of the term *ho christianos* (*Self-designations*, 272–97). Extended discussions of *christianos* as a socio-religious sub-group identity within the early Jesus movement include: Heinrich Karpp, "Christennammen," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum; Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt* (29 vols; ed. T. Klauser [Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950], 2.1115–38); Tim Hegedus, "Naming Christians in Antiquity," *SR* 33 (2004): 173–90; Trebilco, *Self-designations*, 272–97; and most recently, the unpublished dissertation of Eric Rowe ("Called by the Name of the Lord: Early Uses of the Names and Titles of Jesus in Identifying His Followers" [Ph.D. diss., The Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, 2012]), 119–57). For specific discussions on the origin of the term *christianos*, see Paul Achtemeier who suggests that "the language of Acts 11:26 implies" that *christianos* is "outsider language," but without further comment (*1 Peter* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996], 313 n. 114). Charles Bigg notes that *christianos* "is of Latin formation," yet without much explanation (*The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* [ICC; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902], 179). Peterson argues that the ending –ανος indicates its origin in a Latin speaking milieu. Peterson suggests it goes back to Roman officials ("Christianus," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen* [ed. E. Peterson; Rom et al.; 1959], 64 –87, esp. 66–77; cited in Reinhard Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [trans. P. H. Davids; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008], 227). Outsiders other than Tacitus who designate early Christ-followers as *christianoi* include Suetonius (*Vit.* 6.16.2), Pliny (*Ep.* 10.96) and Lucian of Samosata (*Alex.* 25; *Pergr. mort.* 11–13, 16). See Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 179; Leonhard Goppelt (*A Commentary on 1 Peter* [EKK; trans. John E. Alsup; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 309); Ernest G. Selwyn (*The First Epistle of St. Peter* [2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1955], 225); and J. Ramsay Michaels (*1 Peter* [WBC 49; Waco, TX: Word, 1988], 268).

6 1 Peter does not use *ekklēsia* terminology when writing to its diasporic addresses in Asia Minor (Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia; 1 Peter 1:1). Christ-followers are referred to individually as Χριστιανός (1 Pet 4:16). *Christianos* only occurs four times within early Christ-follower writings (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16; *Did.* 12:4). *Didache* uses *christianos* in a matter of fact way as insider terminology. *Didache* instructs an itinerant preacher to live "as a *christianos* with you, not idle" (πῶς μὴ ἀργὸς μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν ζήσεται Χριστιανός).

simply indicates followers of the *Christos*; no ethnic heritage is necessarily presumed). The primary apostolic allegiance of the *christianoi*, however, appears still to have been with the Jerusalem apostles (Acts 11; 1 Peter 4:16).

From the foregoing, two inferences can be made within the context of the gentile mission that developed under Paul's apostolic leadership. Paul, firstly, would have wanted a group designation for his multi-ethnic communities that implicitly affirmed the continuation of the social and ethnic identity of each of his *Christos*-followers. At that level, the pluralistic identity *christianoi* would have served his need well. At another level, however, it could not. Since the term *christianoi* implied communal loyalty to the Jerusalem-centered apostles, Paul, secondly, could not designate his communities as *christianoi* if he wished implicitly to tie his Christ-follower communities to his apostolic authority. If *ekklēsia* had not yet been taken as a communal identity by another sub-group in the early Jesus Movement, then it would have served both of Paul's above needs well. Based on New Testament literary usage, Paul's *ekklēsia* identity project appears to have gained the upper hand by the late 1st century CE. *Ekklēsia* ultimately came to predominate as the permanent group designation of choice among other Christ-follower sub-groups (the communities of Matthew, the "elder" John, and the "prophet" John).[7]

4.1.2   Ekklēsia *Usage in the Early Jesus Movement*

There are at least two ways to categorize *ekklēsia* usage within the New Testament. Wayne Meeks represents the first approach and K. L. Schmidt the second. Meeks' approach focuses only on Paul's communities and how he uses *ekklēsia* as a group designation.[8] Meeks identifies six differentially sized Pauline sub-groups.[9] He does not appear to analyze Pauline uses of the word

---

7   Three of the five directly and unequivocally designate their own community/ies as an *ekklēsia* (deutero-Paul, the "elder" John, the "John" of Revelation). Matthew implies that same identity for his Galilean or Antiochean community when he places the word *ekklēsia* onto the lips of Jesus (Matt 16:18; 18:17). As a historiographer, the author of Acts may be using regional terminology familiar to his reading audience/benefactor (Theophilus), rather than the actual terminology by which pre-Pauline Jewish Christ-followers self-described.

8   Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 75.

9   Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 75. Meeks sees the smallest grouping of Christ-followers as being reflected in Paul's expression *hē kat' oikon ekklēsia* (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Phlm 2). The word *oikos* could refer either to private houses or tenement houses. Meeks distinguishes the "house assembly" from five larger assemblies. These five larger assemblies are: (1) "the whole assembly" at any given location (Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 14:23; Phil 4:15); (2) the *ekklēsia* as a

ekklēsia in reference to a semi-public meeting, though.[10] Schmidt takes a more comprehensive approach, one which I follow in this study. He looks at *ekklēsia* occurrences throughout the New Testament and divides their semantic range into four categories:[11] (1) as a title for the semi-public, ritual assembly ("meeting") of early Christ-followers; (2) as a designation for the collective sum of all Christ-followers while gathered together in assembly (e.g., "congregation"); (3) as a permanent collective designation for Christ-followers even outside of their assembly times (e.g., "a church"); and (4) as a reference to the supralocal, or universal *ekklēsia* (e.g., "the Church"), of which regional *ekklēsiai* (e.g., "churches") are local manifestations.

When compared to other New Testament writers, it becomes clear that only Paul's use of the word *ekklēsia* incorporates all six differentially sized groups mentioned by Meeks and includes all four definitional categories identified by Schmidt.[12] Not only is the semantic range of Paul's *ekklēsia* usage the broadest over against other New Testament writers, *ekklēsia* occurrences predominate numerically. Out of the 114 references to the word *ekklēsia* within the New

---

trans-local entity (plural) within one geographical region (1 Cor 16:19, "the *ekklēsiai* of Asia"); (3) the *ekklēsia* as a trans-local entity located across geographical regions but aligned along ethnic or other criteria (Rom 16:4, "the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles"; Rom 16:16, "the *ekklēsiai* of Christ"); (4) the trans-local assembly (singular and articular, *hē ekklēsia*) comprised of a number of local assemblies in any given region (e.g., Act 9:31, "the *ekklēsia* throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria"; Phil 3:6, "a persecutor of the *ekklēsia*"); and (5) the trans-local assembly (singular and articular, *hē ekklēsia*) comprised of the sum total of all assemblies across the Roman Empire (1 Cor 12:28[?]).

10   Pauline usages of *ekklēsia* for "meeting" include occurrences of the anarthrous phrase *en ekklēsia* (1 Cor 11:18; 14:19, 28, 35) and its plural articular variation *en tais ekklēsiais* (1 Cor 14:33b, 34; Pauline authorship is disputed for 1 Cor 14:33b–35).

11   K. L. Schmidt, "ἐκκλησία," *TDNT*, 3.501–34, esp. 3.506.

12   Paul's seven undisputed writings contain 44 of the 114 New Testament occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* (*BDAG*). Paul is the sixth most prolific user of *ekklēsia* terminology in antiquity. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is first with 225 occurrences, followed by Plutarch (142), Diodorus Siculus (101), Demosthenes (76), and Aeschines (57). The Greek writers, however, only reflect two of Schmidt's definitional categories: a meeting of people and a temporary group identity assumed during the course of that assembly, while Paul employs all four.

Testament writings,[13] Paul's acknowledged writings contain 44.[14] The book of Acts is second at 23 occurrences, while the deutero-Pauline letters account for another 18.[15] Thus, Paul, together with later writers who claim some affiliation with him, account for 85 of the *ekklēsia* references in the New Testament.

In fact, when compared to all other sub-groups within the early Jesus Movement (pre-70 CE), only the Pauline sub-groups use *ekklēsia* with Schmidt's third and fourth definitional category ("church" and "the Church"). The writings of the other five New Testament authors who unambiguously attribute a permanent *ekklēsia* identity to a community of Christ-followers each post-date the early Jesus Movement (Matthew, "elder" John, "prophet" John, [deutero-] Paul, the author of Acts).

This growth over time in the appropriation of an *ekklēsia* group identity among 1st century Christ-followers suggests the value of nuancing how one translates *ekklēsia* occurrences in modern English translations. Since all sub-groups of Christ-followers in the early Jesus Movement did not necessarily self-designate as an *ekklēsia*, it would seem inaccurate to identify them with the word "church," given that the English word presumes a translation of the word *ekklēsia*.[16] As such, it would seem prudent to avoid use of the anachronistic term "church" in academic discussions, not least if by that translation scholars intend a reference to a universal *ekklēsia* comprised of all pre-70

---

13   The 144 occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* in the New Testament break out as follows: Matthew (3×), Acts (23×), Romans (5×), 1 Corinthians (22×), 2 Corinthians (9×), Galatians (3×), Ephesians (9×), Philippians (2×), Colossians (4×), 1 Thessalonians (2×), 2 Thessalonians (2×), 1 Timothy (3×), Philemon (1×), Hebrews (2×), James (1×), 3 John (3×), and Revelation (20×).

14   The 44 Pauline usages of *ekklēsia* are found in: Romans (5×; 16:1, 4, 5, 16, 23); 1 Corinthians (22×; 1:2; 4:17; 6:4; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16, 18, 22; 12:28; 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, (vv. 33b, 34, 35; disputed authorship); 15:9; 16:1, 19 [2×]); 2 Corinthians (9×; 1:1; 8:1, 18, 19, 23, 24; 11:8, 28; 12:13); Galatians (3×; 1:2, 13, 22); Philippians (2×; 3:6; 4:15); 1 Thessalonians (2×; 1:1; 2:14); Philemon (1×; Phlm 2).

15   *Ekklēsia* occurs in Ephesians (9×; 1:22, 3:10, 21; 5:23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32), Colossians (4×; 1:18, 24; 4:15, 16), 2 Thessalonians (2×; 1:1, 4), and 1 Timothy (3×; 3:5, 15; 5:16).

16   Not least by 380 CE, when Theodosius I issued an edict that all subjects of the Roman empire should worship the Christian God, was *ekklēsia* used in respect of a religious organization and as religious buildings ("church"). The now official 'religion' of the Roman empire known as "Christianity" was institutionally represented in "the Catholic Church" (*katholikē ekklēsia*) whose almost exclusively gentile congregants gathered in purpose-built structures called "churches." Such a semantic range was completely foreign to how *ekklēsia* ("assembly") was understood from its inception in the late 6th century BCE up to, and including, the 1st century CE.

Christ-followers. It may be time to find a different English term by which to discuss early Christ-follower communities. Perhaps rendering *ekklēsia* as "assembly" or "sacred assembly" would suffice given that these are ambiguous enough to indicate either a semi-public *meeting* of Christ-followers or a semi-public *association* of Christ-followers.

The foregoing discussion of differential *ekklēsia* usage among early Christ-followers accords with the postulate of variegated 'Christianities,' whose communities together exhibit variations: (1) in apostolic loyalties (Matthean, Johannine,[17] Pauline, Petrine); (2) in communal centre points (Asia Minor, Greece, Judea, Rome, Syria); and (3) in epochal timeframes (pre-70 CE, post-70 CE). Attestation for these variegated communities is found in textual, archaeological, and/or inscriptional artefacts.[18]

In sections 3 and 4 of Chapter 4, I will show that Paul's distinctive use of *ekklēsia* (1) as a permanent designation for his individual sub-groups (e.g., local "churches"), and (2) as a collective/universal reference to his trans-locally connected sub-groups (e.g., "the Church") held particular value for positively integrating his gentile and Jewish communities into the socio-political landscape of their Greco-Roman worlds and for incorporating gentiles qua gentiles into the Jewish heritage of Paul's communities.

4.2   Who Were the First Christ-followers to Self-identify as *Ekklēsia*?

Notwithstanding Paul's use of the word *ekklēsia* in greater number and with greater diversity than other New Testament authors, this does not *ipso facto* qualify him as the first Christ-follower to assign his communities such a group identity. Paul Trebilco forwards a different group of Christ-followers as holding the distinction of being the first *ekklēsiai* in the Jesus movement.

---

17   I use the term "Johannine" here for the sake of expediency in referring to the authors of the Johannine epistles and the book of Revelation, not necessarily implying thereby that both sets of literary works are written by the same "John."

18   For example, Bengt Holmberg emphasizes the need for integrating social historical backdrops when reading the Pauline corpus. He calls for a recognition of the fact that Paul's ethical and theological pronouncements need to be situated within the context of "social factors like stratum-specific behaviour patterns operative in the everyday life of these Christians" ("The Methods of Historical Reconstruction in the Scholarly 'Recovery' of Corinthian Christianity," in *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church* [ed. E. Adams and D. Horrell; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 161).

4.2.1 *Pre-Pauline Jewish Christ-followers: Historiography and Provincialism*

Following on from du Toit, Trebilco prioritizes two literary witnesses for substantiating his claim that pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Judea were the first groups in the Jesus movement to self-designate collectively as *ekklēsiai*. He cites the 'historiography' known as the book of Acts (e.g., 5:11; 9:31),[19] and Paul's historiographical statement in Gal 1:13.[20] These two witnesses bear further investigation.

With respect to Acts, Trebilco assumes, along with a number of other scholars,[21] that *ekklēsia* is the *emic* self-designation of first-generation Christ-followers in Jerusalem and Judea.[22] By contrast, other scholars (e.g., Richard

---

19   While the book of Acts can be classified as historiography, Richard I. Pervo cautions against assuming, therefore, that Acts is historically reliable. He states that "although some still associate the author of Acts with Thucydides and Polybius and claim a high level of accuracy for the book, NT scholarship in general has taken at least a step or two back from that position" (*Acts: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009], 14). Pervo notes that Acts has been identified with two sub-categories of the genre of historiography: monograph (Conzelmann) and apologetic historiography (Sterling) (*Acts*, 15–16). Pervo, though, disputes these genre designations by noting ten variances in Acts from the genre of ancient historiography (*Acts*, 17–18). Daniel Marguerat surveys a number of other genre possibilities such as Roman history, Gospel summary, and exaltation of Christian faith (*Lukas, der erste christliche Historiker: Eine Studie zur Apostelgeschichte* [ATANT 91; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2011], 57–67).

20   Acts 5:11 reads, "great fear seized the whole *ekklēsia* [in Jerusalem]." Acts 9:31 reads, "the *ekklēsia* throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace." Gal 1:13 reads, "I was violently persecuting the *ekklēsia tou theou*." Paul Trebilco particularly points to Paul's ascription of an *ekklēsia* identity to the community in Jerusalem (Gal 1:13) as substantive evidence that the later historiography of Acts also uses *ekklēsia* in *emic* fashion for that same community of Christ-followers ("Early Christians," 442–43).

21   J. Y. Campbell, '*The Origin and Meaning*,' 42; J. Hainz, *EKKLESIA. Strukturen paulinischer Gemeinde-Theologie und Gemeinde-Ordnung* (BU 9; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1972), 236, 251; H. Merklein, "Die Ekklesia Gottes. Der Kirchenbegriff bei Paulus und in Jerusalem," *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus* (WUNT 43; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), 301–302; W. Krauss, *Das Volk Gottes. Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 112; M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 83; Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of its First Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 262; Andries du Toit, "*Paulus Oecumenicus*: Interculturality in the Shaping of Paul's Theology," *NTS* 55 (2009): 121–143, esp. 133.

22   Trebilco, "Early Christians," 443. Uncharacteristically, Trebilco appears to dismiss almost out of hand Pervo's claim that the use of *ekklēsia* in Acts is anachronistic (Ibid., 443 n. 12).

Pervo, C. K. Barrett, Joseph Fitzmyer) contend that Acts is using the term *ekklēsia* anachronistically.[23] These scholars presume that the author of Acts is writing after the time of first-generation Judean Christ-followers and is attributing to that original community a group designation which the implied reader(s) of Acts, but not the original community in Jerusalem, adopted. In this they assume that *ekklēsia* in Acts is an *etic* group designation for first-generation Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem. This debate highlights the need for differentiating between *emic* ("insider" language) and *etic* ("outsider" language) terminology when reading historiography.[24] George Brooke cautions against reading historiography simply as 'history,' that is, as accurate historical details. He argues that one must interpret historiography in recognition of the fact that the text is simply "the history of the ideological perspectives of the ancient author."[25] Stuart Beeson concurs. He writes that "texts tell us most about their time of authorship, rather than of the time they describe."[26]

Trebilco does helpfully highlight elsewhere the need for critically evaluating group self-designations, but his evaluative paradigm focuses upon identifying contemporary *emic* perspectives, rather than the *etic* perspectives of later authors. Trebilco's three investigative categories are: "insider language," "outward-facing," and "outsider-used." He defines them as follows: (1) "insider language" is terminology by which the group itself self-designates; (2) "outward-facing self-designations" are those used by insiders when communicating with outsiders; and (3) "outsider-used designations" reflect terminology used by outsiders by which to describe the in-group (*Self-designations*, 10).

23   See Pervo (*Acts*, 134 n. 83); C. K. Barrett (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 1.271); and Joseph Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 325). Fitzmyer writes that "Luke is using the standard term current in his day, as he reflects on this incident and records with hindsight the community's reaction to it" (Ibid., 325). Saldarini suggests anachronism in Acts based on the fact that "only the author of Acts uses the term [*ekklēsia*] of mid first-century believers-in-Jesus in Jerusalem and Antioch" (*Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, 118).

24   Historiography ("a writing about history") is an authorial construct. As such, historiography may or may not say anything valid with respect to actual communal socio-historical realities (George Brooke, "Introduction," in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne* [ed. G. Brooke and T. Römer; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007], 10).

25   Brooke, "Introduction," xiii–xxxvii, esp. xiv. See further in n. 223 (Ch. 3) on how classicists read Greek "history."

26   Stuart Beeson, "Historiography Ancient and Modern: Fact and Fiction," in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne* (ed. G. Brooke and T. Römer; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007), 3–12, esp. 9–10.

Even if Acts is dated pre-70 CE, thereby removing the possibility of *ekklēsia* being used anachronistically, at least two factors favour viewing Acts' attribution of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity to the pre-70 community in Jerusalem as being *etic* terminology. One is the fact that Acts appears to use at least one *ekklēsia*-related term in provincial fashion: the collocation *ennomos ekklēsia* (Acts 19:39).[27] The second factor involves precedents from other historiographers. Josephus, for example, can be accused of provincialism in his use of some Greek political terms.[28] Provincialism entails the use of *emic* terminology from one geographical region to describe a similar institution found in another geographical region, but which is designated by other terminology.[29]

4.2.1.1   Provincialism in Acts: *Ennomos Ekklēsia*

Acts' use of the phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* for the regular assembly of Ephesos (Acts 19:39) is unattested in inscriptions from Ephesos. Within extant epigraphic sources, there are only three adjectival modifiers used for the Ephesian *ekklēsia: nomimon, prōtēn*, and *hierā*.[30] The phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* only occurs twice in other inscriptions from Asia Minor (Mysia and Pisidia),[31] but 43 times

---

27   Acts 19:39 reads, "If there is anything further you want to know, it must be settled in the regular/traditional assembly (ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ)."

28   See the discussion of Josephus' use of *ekklēsia* in 3.3.3. *Public Assemblies in 1st Century CE Judea* (*Josephus*).

29   Donald Binder helpfully differentiates between anachronism, provincialism, and bias (*Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* [Atlanta: SBL, 1999], 89). "Anachronism" is the practice of interpreting earlier architectural and literary artefacts from the perspective of later evidence. "Provincialism" involves the attribution to other geographical regions, or social groupings, the socio-cultural realities of one's own geo-political region. "Bias" entails the interpretation or revision of source material for the purpose either of supporting one's pre-existing suppositions or of creating new ideologically motivated conclusions.

30   A complete list of extant inscriptions from Ephesos which mention an *ekklēsia*, as listed in ascending chronological order, are: 3rd cent. BCE: εἰς τὴμ πρώτην ἐκλησίαν (*Miletos* 37; 212/211 BCE); 2nd cent. BCE: [ἱε]ρᾷ ἐκλησίᾳ (*IEph* 1570/*Ephesos* 3582; 2nd cent. BCE?); 2nd cent. CE: κατὰ πᾶσαν νόμιμον ἐκκλησίαν (*IEph* 27B + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 212; *IEph* 27G + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 602; 104 CE); κα]ὶ νομ[ίμοις ἐκκλ]ησίαις (*IEph* 27A + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 115; 104 CE); κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν (*IEph* 27G + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 602; *IEph* 33/*Ephesos* 828; 104 CE); τιθῆνται κατ' ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ ἐπὶ τῶν βάσεων (*IEph* 28, 29, 30, 34/*Ephesos* 823, 824, 825, 829; 104 CE); Imperial period: ἐν τῇ ἱε]ρᾷ ἐκλησίᾳ (*IEph* 2902/*Ephesos* 1672); καθὼς περιέχ[ει] τὰ ὑπομνήματ[α] τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκκλησί[ας] (*IEph* 959 + Add. p. 23/*Ephesos* 626).

31   The collocation ἐννόμος ἐκκλησία occurs in two Asia Minor inscriptions: *MDAI*(A) 32 (1907) 243,4 (Mysia, Pergamon; 75–50 BCE) and *TAM* III 4 (Pisidia, Termessos; 2nd cent. CE?).

in inscriptions from two regions of Hellas (Phokis and Thessaly).[32] Pauline *ekklēsiai* do not appear to have been established there, only in other regions of Hellas, such as Attica (e.g., Athens),[33] the Peloponnesos (e.g., Corinth),[34] and Macedonia (e.g., Thessalonica, Philippi).[35]

If one assumes that the author of Acts uses the distinctively Hellenic phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* as a literary strategy by which more clearly to communicate with his ostensible dedicatee, Theophilus (Acts 1:1),[36] then is there other evidence in Acts to suggest that Theophilus hailed from in or around Phokis or Thessaly? Acts uses another regionally specific political term (*politarch*) which narrows Theophilus' possible region of origin to just north of Thessaly, specifically to Macedonia.

4.2.1.2   History in Acts: *Politarch*

The author of Acts displays precise knowledge of a distinctive Macedonian political institution in his mention of *politarchs* (Acts 17:6). B. F. Cook notes that "the title 'politarchs' (literally, 'rulers of the citizens') was used in several Greek cities," one of which is Thessalonica.[37] Brad McLean brings greater

---

32   The collocation ἔννομος ἐκκλησία predominantly occurs in inscriptions from central Greece (Phokis [32×; e.g., Delphi, Elateia] and Thessaly [11×]). These inscriptions are dated between the 2nd cent. BCE and the 2nd cent. CE.

33   Surviving inscriptions from Athens do not make mention of an ἔννομος ἐκκλησία. See n. 186 (Ch. 2) for adjectival modifiers used for the Athenian ἐκκλησία. The adjective νόμιμος ("traditional, regular") only occurs once each in central Greece (Delphi, 185–175 BCE) and in Asia Minor (Ephesos, 104 CE).

34   The 18 *ekklēsia* mentions in inscriptions found in Peloponnesos are not modified by any adjectives.

35   Of the 41 *ekklēsia* occurrences in inscriptions found in Macedonia, 29 are by Christians of the Late Antique period. The 12 inscriptions from early antiquity only modify *ekklēsiai* twice, once with νουμηνίαι (200–160 BCE; EKM 1.Beroia 1) and the other time with οἰκειότητα (243 BCE; SEG 12.373, ll. 18–34).

36   This presumes, of course, that Theophilus is a real person rather than only a symbolic term broadly applicable to all Christ-followers (i.e., "lover of God"). Pervo notes that both Bede (*Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, 6) and Origen (e.g., *Hom. In Lucam* 1.10–11) interpret the word "Theophilus" ("lover of God") symbolically (*Acts*, 35). Possible historical referents for "Theophilus" inlcude T. Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Emperor Domitian (Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: a Study of Origins* [London: MacMillan, 1936], 534–55), Theophilus, a son of Annas the High Priest, who was High Priest from 37–41 CE (Richard H. Anderson, "Theophilus: A Proposal," *EvQ* 69:3 [1997]: 195–215), and a Jewish elite holding Roman equestrian status (Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 195).

37   B. F. Cook, *Reading the Past: Greek Inscriptions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 23.

specificity to Cook's observation: "in Macedonia, a single supreme board called πολιτάρχαι dealt with civic and military matters."[38] A woodcut on the Roman arch at Thessalonica confirms the continued use of *politarch* as a title for city officials well into the second century CE (*BMGR* 1877.5–11.1). McLean notes that Beroia (Beroea/Berea) is another Macedonian *polis* which designates its primary magisterial board as *politarchai*.[39] Berea is a *polis* near Thessalonica. The perception of Acts having insider knowledge of Berean and Thessalonican political terminology is further reinforced in the fact that the title *politarch* rarely occurs outside of Macedonian inscriptions. *Politarch* is extant in 36 inscriptions,[40] 34 of which are from Macedonia.[41]

Acts' familiarity with local political terminology from the regions of Thessaly (*ennomos ekklēsia*) and Macedonia (*politarch*) could imply that Acts' intended reader has socio-ethnic ties to both regions. If Theophilus has such trans-local roots, then he most likely was a social elite, or notable. Three factors suggest this possibility.

First, as the dedicatee for Luke/Acts (Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1), Theophilus may have been the writer's benefactor.[42] Second, Fitzmyer suggests that the phrase "most excellent Theophilus" (Luke 1:3) infers that Theophilus holds elite status as a Roman knight (*ordo equester*).[43] Third, Louis Feldman suggests that Theophilus may be of Jewish descent, which could even place him among

---

38 B. H. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine* (*323 B.C.–A.D. 337*) (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002), 311.

39 McLean, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 311.

40 Imperial period Macedonian cities which designate their primary magisterial board as *politarchai* include Thessalonica (up to 2nd cent. CE), Styberra (95 CE), Herakleai (100–150 CE), and Beroia (41–44 CE) (McLean, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 311). There are two non-Macedonian references to a *politarch*: one from Leontopolis in Egypt (*CIJ* 2.1530a/ *Bernand, Inscr. Métr.* 16; early Imperial period), and one from Delphi in central Greece (*FD* III 3:207; 252/1 BCE).

41 McLean provides an extensive list of other terms associated with the principal magisterial board of different *poleis* across the Greek East: *archontes* (Athens, Aphrodisias); *demiourgoi* (Aigina, Salamis, much of Peloponnesos); *ephoboi* (Lakonia); *kosmoi* (Crete); *politarchai* (Thessalonika, Beroia); *prostatai* (Cos); *prytaneis* (e.g., Knidos, Rhodes, Samos, Pamphylia, Cilicia, *poleis* of Peloponnesos); *stratēgoi* (e.g., Kalymnos, Iasos, Miletos, Sardis, Smyrna, most of the Greek cities of Caria, Lydia, Phrygia and Thessaly); *tagoi* (Thessaly); and *timouchoi* (Sinope) (*Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 311).

42 Pervo notes, though, that "the relation between dedication and patronage is too complicated to allow firm conclusions" (*Acts*, 35).

43 Fitzmyer notes that the adjective *kratistos* used in Acts 1:1 (*kratistē Theophile*; "most excellent Theophilus") "was the Greek equivalent of Latin *egregius*, a title often used for the

those Jews in Berea who converted to Christ, some of whom are described as being "men of high standing" (Acts 17:12). Acts mentions that the Jews in Berea "examined the scriptures every day to see whether these things were so" (Acts 17:11). If the author of Acts also wrote the Gospel of Luke (Acts 1:1; cf. Luke 1:1–4), then his description of Berean attention to scriptural detail may explain why the author is so concerned with narratival accuracy in his account for Theophilus.[44]

How probable is it, though, that, as a Jew, Theophilus could also have been a Roman notable, perhaps even with equestrian status? At least two historical precedents exist for such a scenario, with each person playing an important military role for the Romans during the Jewish revolt: Philo's nephew Tiberius Julius Alexander and Flavius Josephus.[45] If Theophilus was a notable of the *ordo equester*, with a primary residence in Berea or Thessalonica, he would have been familiar with the *politarchai*. As noted, this civic governing body had responsibility not just for political matters but also for military affairs. The possibility of Theophilus' trans-local status as both a Berean Jew and as a Berean/ Thessalonican Roman notable provides a fuller basis for understanding Acts' addition of a predominantly Thessalian adjective (*ennomos*) when speaking of an Ephesian *ekklēsia*.

4.2.1.3   The Politics of Historiography: Josephus
The literary strategy of inserting provincial terminology into historiography for the sake of a contemporary readership is mirrored by Flavius Josephus. In his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus describes the religio-political *praxis* of ancient Israelites in terms reminiscent of democratic processes enacted by the *dēmoi*

---

          ordo equester, the 'knights' of Roman society. It is used of the governor Felix in 23:26" (*Acts*, 195).

44   The Gospel of Luke explains that, "since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided, after investigating everything carefully from the very first, to write down an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed" (Luke 1:1–4).

45   Tiberius Julius Alexander abandoned the Jewish religion, became the Roman procurator in Judea in 46–48 CE, and was a not insignificant factor in helping the Romans quell the Jewish revolt of 66–70 CE (James C. VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 138). After his capture by the Romans, Josephus assisted them in convincing the Jews in Jerusalem to surrender.

of 1st century CE Greek *poleis*.[46] There are two ways to interpret Josephus' use of Greco-Roman politics. He either could be using provincial terminology that was familiar to his Greek speaking readership in Rome, or he is retrojecting the actual political *praxis* of Jews in the 1st century CE upon their ancient ancestors, the Israelites of the desert tradition. Either way, Josephus' description of ancient Israelite political *praxis* is an *etic* one in which he uses terminology familiar to his contemporary reading audience as a substitute for the original terminology used by his historical referents.

In sum, the inscriptional record and historiographical works, such as Acts and Josephus' *Antiquities*, highlight the importance of interpreting ancient historical evidence with genre considerations in mind. Such considerations make it possible that the author of Acts uses *etic* terminology more familiar to his implied reader rather than using *emic* terms originally employed by Acts' historical referents. One example of provincialism in Acts could be its use of the term *ennomos ekklēsia*. If this is the case, then it is not improbable that Acts' attribution of the term *ekklēsia* to the pre-70 community in Jerusalem as their collective designation is another example of provincialism, particularly if the implied reader's socio-economic roots are in Macedonia.

4.2.1.4   Group Identity Construction: Jerusalem-Loyal Christ-Followers

A second factor forwarded by Trebilco as evidence that first-generation Jewish Christ-followers used *ekklēsia* as a collective self-designation, is that the original Hellenistic and Hebrew Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem required different group identities. He states, firstly, that the Hellenists needed "to worship separately and to develop significantly different emphases in their theology and practice" than the Hebrew sub-group.[47] From this he concludes, secondly,

---

46   For example, in Josephus' recounting of Moses' orders to Korah and his followers (*A.J.* 4:35; Num 16:6–7), Louis Feldman observes that "Moses makes a proposal to the multitude, and they give their free consent [*cheirotonia*, which shows that] Josephus continues to use Greek political vocabulary when he describes this meeting as an assembly (ἐκκλησία)" (*Flavius Josephus*, 341 n. 87). The word *cheirotonia*, which indicates a free vote by show of hands, occurs at least 47 times in association with an *ekklēsia* in Greek inscriptions. The regions represented include Attica, the Aegean Islands (Delos, Cos), central Greece, northern Greece, Asia Minor (Caria, Ionia, Troas, and Mysia). There are three 1st cent. CE examples (Kalindoia, Macedonia, *Meletemata* 11 K2, 1 CE; and two from Phokis in central Greece [*FD* III 6:27, 1–20 CE; *BCH* 108 [1984], 366, 20–46 CE]). Feldman also notes a syntactical correlation between Josephus and other Greek writers—Josephus' practice of indicating the meeting of a regular assembly with the clause ἐκκλησίαν … συναγαγών (cf. *A.J.* 3:188 and 4:176; Ibid., 393 n. 527).

47   Trebilco, "Early Christians," 440–41.

that the Hellenists also required a different group identity from their Hebrew compatriots, who purportedly self-designated as *hoi hagioi* (e.g., Acts 9:13).[48] According to Trebilco, "the Hellenists' theological conviction that their group was in continuity with that assembly of Yahweh" known in the LXX as the *ekklēsia* of Israel, led them to adopt *ekklēsia* as their new identity.[49]

If Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers were in fact the first sub-group in the early Jesus movement to have chosen an *ekklēsia* identity, why would they not have self-designated as *synagōgē* instead, since the two terms are used more or less synonymously in the LXX?[50] Trebilco points to the fact that, among Jewish communities, only "ἐκκλησία was 'free'";[51] *synagōgē*, which the LXX also uses

---

48   Pervo, in his comments on Acts 9:13, implies that the *emic* group identity for (Hebrew) Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem is the articular, pluralistic term *hoi hagioi* (*Acts*, 248). Paul Trebilco is more explicit. He claims that "the use of οἱ ἁγίοι as a self-designation originated with Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians in Jerusalem at a very early point" (*Self-designations*, 134).

49   Trebilco, "Early Christians," 444. Trebilco claims that "it is more likely that the use of ἐκκλησία in the LXX [rather than the Greek civic *ekklēsia*] was the most crucial factor" for the selection of *ekklēsia* as a collective designation for early Christ-followers (Ibid., 446). This allowed the Hellenists to "express their continuity with the OT people of God" (Ibid., 446). Klaus Berger contends, though, that the evidence is limited by which to connect the NT use of *ekklēsia* with the Israel of the desert period ("Volksversammlung und Gemeinde Gottes. Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia,'" *ZThK* 73 [1976]: 167–207, esp. 185, 186, 204, 206). Berger claims that Hellenistic Judaism (and thus the LXX translators) derived its understanding of *ekklēsia* from civic *ekklēsiai* of the Greek East in the Hellenistic period (321–27 BCE). Du Toit critiques Berger's work since it "still reveals a predisposition towards minimizing the effect of Israelite-Jewish traditions" ("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 133).

50   Trebilco also evaluates whether adjectival terminology associated with the terms *ekklēsia* and *synagōgē* in the LXX made one term more attractive than the other to Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers ("Early Christians," 449). Numerical occurrences within the LXX of the adjectival modifiers *theou* ("of God") and *kyriou* ("of the Lord") are equally distributed between *ekklēsia* and *synagōgē*. Trebilco suggests, therefore, that neither *ekklēsia* nor *synagōgē* offered any great theological advantage to Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in their search for a group identity. The adjectival modifier *theou* occurs only once each with *ekklēsia* (Neh 13:1) and *synagōgē* (Ps 81:1), while *kyriou* is paired seven times each with *ekklēsia* (Deut 23:2, 3, 4[×2], 9; 1 Chron 28:8; Mic 2:5) and *synagōgē* (Num 16:3; 20:4; 27:17; 31:16; Josh 22:16–17 [×2]; cf. also Num 15:14). Greg Beale argues, however, that Paul's use of the phrase *ekklēsia tou theou* (12×) derives predominantly from the singular use of *ekklēsia theou* in Neh 13:1 not from the LXX phrase *ekklēsia kyriou* ("The Background of Ἐκκλησία Revisited," *JSNT* 38 [2015]: 151–168).

51   Trebilco states that "other (non-Christian) Jews *could have* used ἐκκλησίαι for their gatherings, as well as συναγωγή; it simply seems that, as far as we know, none of them were using

to describe Israel, had already been widely adopted by non-messianic Jewish communities.

There are at least three reasons to review Trebilco's reading. First, Young-Ho Park contends that Trebilco neglects to consider the fact that a number of *non-Jewish* associations chose *synagōgē* even though *ekklēsia* was 'free'.[52] Second, one wonders why the original Greek speaking Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem would require an *intra muros* group identity that was different from their Hebrew and/or Aramaic speaking compatriots. Trebilco argues elsewhere that Aramaic speaking Christ-followers countered outsider perceptions of apostasy through their self-designation as *hoi hagioi*. This group identity apparently gave Aramaic speaking Christ-followers theological continuity with eschatological Israel, that is, with the "people of the holy ones" (*hoi hagioi*) in Aramaic Daniel 7.[53] But that only begs the question as to why Greek speaking

---

ἐκκλησία with reference to a contemporary 'assembly' in the same way they were using συναγωγή and thus ἐκκλησία was 'free'" ("Early Christians," 456).

52 Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 61. Park cites *LSJ, s.v.* συναγωγή. See also Wolfgang Schrage, "συναγωγή," *TDNT* 7.797–852. Without naming the inscription, Park forwards *Tabai* 10 as cited in *LSJ, s.v.* συναγωγή. I offer the fuller citation of *Tabai* which reads, καὶ συμβαλόμενον καὶ αὐτὸν πολλὰ καὶ χρήσιμα πρὸς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς γερουσίας ἐπαίνῳ χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ εἰκόνι 10 (Tabai, n.d.; *BCH*, 14 [1890], 625, No. 27/*BE* 1891: 335). Other inscriptions which use συναγωγή in civic, religious, and associational contexts include: (1) *Agora* XV 138 (Athens: Agora, *c.* 210/9–201/0; see also: *IG* II³ 1231; *IG* II² 912: ἐπε][μελήθησαν δὲ καὶ] τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς [τε βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων][ἁπάντων ὧν αὐτοῖ]ς προσέταττον οἵ τε [νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τοῦ δήμου]·); (2) *Iscr. di Cos* ED 149 (Kos, late 4th BCE–*c.* 280 BCE; *Paton-Hicks* 36; *SGDI* III,1 3634; *LSCG* 177; ἵνα ἡ θυσία τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ συντελ[ῆται κα] τὰ τὰ πάτρια, ὀκτωκαιδεκάτηι δ[ὲ ἡ συνα]γωγή, καὶ ἐν ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἡμέρ[αις συντε]λείσθω ὁ γάμος·); and (3) *IK Apameia* (Bith.) u. *Pylai* 35 (Triglia [Zeytinbaği]; οἱ θιασῖται καὶ θιασίτιδες [ἐ]στεφάνωσαν Στρατονίκην Μενεκρ[ά][τ]ου ἱερωτεύσασαν ἐν τῶι η' καὶ ο' καὶ ρ'[ἔ]τει Μητρὶ Κυβέλῃ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι στεφά[ν]ωι γραπτῶι ἐν στήλῃ καὶ κηρυκτῶι σὺν ται[νί]αι καὶ ἄλλωι στεφάνῳ κηρυκτῶι σὺν τα[ινί]αι ἐν τῆι τοῦ Διὸς συναγωγῇ φιλαγαθήσασ[αν]).

53 Trebilco suggests that "after the resurrection, and in the light of the inaugurated eschatology which belief in the resurrection engendered, the earliest Jerusalem Christians used οἱ ἅγιοι as a self-designation as they reflected on Dan 7 in the light of Jesus' use of 'the son of man'" (*Group Designations*, 123). Trebilco acknowledges that a connection to Daniel 7 is problematized by John Collins' observation that the substantival use of *qedoshim* ("holy ones") in Daniel 7, and elsewhere in the HB and DSS, has primary reference to celestial beings (*Daniel* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 313 n. 322; idem, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 123–55). Trebilco comments, though, that "it is not very far from speaking of 'the people of the holy ones of the most High' (Dan 7:27), where 'holy ones' are angels, to assimilating the character (of being 'the holy ones') of the people's angelic patrons and representatives to *the people themselves* and actually calling *the people* 'the holy ones,' although we note that Daniel himself does not

Jews could not also have used *hoi hagioi* as a group designation to gain the same extra-mural benefit? Third, even if perceptions of 'otherness' were instead an *intra*-mural issue between Jewish Christ-follower sub-groups, it still does not necessarily follow that the Hellenists felt the need for a sub-group identity that was different from their Hebrew speaking compatriots. The Greek speaking Christ-follower community in Rome is a case in point. As already mentionted, Robert Jewett suggests that the collective self-designation of that *corpus mixtum* of Jews and gentiles also was *hoi hagioi* (Rom 1:7).[54] If this was the case, then the Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Rome, in their self-designation as *hoi hagioi*, did not in fact adopt a sub-group identity that was different from the Hebrew and/or Aramaic speaking sub-group in their 'mother community' in Jerusalem, irrespective of differing *praxis* in theology and worship between the linguistically differentiated groups.

Given the foregoing, one can conclude that, in the earliest period, Greek speaking Jewish Christ-followers adopted *hoi hagioi*, but not *ekklēsia*, as their group identity. In so doing, the Hellenists, in tandem with their Hebrew speaking counterparts, would have addressed both their intra-mural, and inter-mural, ethno-religious identity needs.

It also seems reasonable to conclude that *hoi hagioi* continued to be used as a sub-group designation for Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers subsequent to the original *hoi hagioi*. Trebilco himself makes that observation when he notes that Paul sometimes uses *hoi hagioi* in a "formulaic way" to reference both

---

do this. But it is no surprise that *1 Enoch*, which is much influenced by Daniel, does do this" (*Self-designations*, 104–37, esp. 105). Trebilco's argument that the term οἱ ἅγιοι could have referred to human beings would have gained greater purchase had he also cited the claim by Crispin Fletcher-Louis that the substantival adjective "the holy ones" in Dan 7:13 is used in reference to human beings, that is, to pious Jews such as priests ("The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as Test Case," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 161–193, esp. 186–92; idem, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [STDJ XLII; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 142 n. 16; 83 n. 82).

54   As already mentioned, Robert Jewett sees the phrase *klētois hagiois* (Rom 1:7) as referring to Jewish Christ-followers in Rome within Jerusalem's circle of influence (*Romans: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 2007], 114). The dative phrase *klētois hagiois* is in simple apposition with the introductory phrase of Paul's address: "to all of the beloved of God [*pasin tois apagētois*] who are in Rome." In similar fashion to 1 Cor 1:2 (see n. 340 [Ch. 4]), the appositional phrase (*klētois hagiois*) is either a theological construct ("to the saints") or a socio-religious sub-group designation ("to the holy ones/*hoi hagioi*").

Hebrew and Greek speaking Christ-followers in Jerusalem ("the holy ones").[55] He points to the Jerusalem collection as one case in point (1 Cor 16:1; Rom 15:25). Jewett implicitly reinforces Trebilco's claim with his suggestion that the Jerusalem-loyal community in Rome self-designated collectively as *hoi hagioi* (Rom 1:7).

This evidence from Paul's acknowledged writings suggests that he does not use the term *hoi hagioi* only as a universal theological construct for all Christ-followers ("the saints"). Paul also uses *hoi hagioi* as a sub-group designation for Christ-followers whose apostolic loyalties lie elsewhere than with himself. The witness not least of Trebilco and Jewett locates these Jerusalem-loyal *hoi hagioi* in at least two centres: Jerusalem and Rome. Later on I will suggest Corinth as another possible centre.

4.2.2   *Paul's Group Identity Construction Project: Greco-Roman Sources*
In contradistinction to Trebilco, George H. van Kooten does not look to Judea for the original community of Christ-followers who adopted a permanent *ekklēsia* identity.[56] He finds that original community in Paul's diasporic communities.[57] While I concur with van Kooten's conclusion, it appears that five of his rationales for arriving at that conclusion are open to question.

First, as already noted, Greco-Roman literary, epigraphic and papyrological sources do not use the word *ekklēsia* in the sense of a *permanent* group identity, whether in civic (political) or non-civic (e.g., voluntary association) contexts.[58] As such, the Greek *ekklēsia* cannot form the primary basis for Paul's

---

55   Trebilco notes the "formulaic way" in which Paul speaks of the Jerusalem collection (*eis tous hagious*; 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1, 12), which, he says, "has suggested to many scholars that οἱ ἅγιοι was originally a self-designation that was used by the Jerusalem church" (*Self-Designations*, 119). Trebilco makes reference to "*TDNT* I: 106; Evans 1975: 30, 54; Woodward 1975: 89–92; Betz 1985:118 n230; Blenkinsopp 2006: 208" (Ibid., 119).

56   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley," *NTS* 58/4 (Oct. 2012): 522–48, esp. 522–27.

57   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 527–36.

58   At most, Greek sources use the word *ekklēsia* in reference to a temporary group identity, but only for as long as the *ekklēsia* ("gathering/meeting") is in session. This continues to be true even into the 1st century CE. In a letter from Artaban III, king of Parthia, to Seleucia approving the election of a city treasurer, the word *ekklēsia* is used in lieu of the word *dēmos* (*SEG* 7:2; 21 CE/Parthian year 268, Audnaeus 17). It reads, βασιλεύον[τος Σελευκου, ἔτους] ϛλ′ καὶ ρ′, μη[νὸς- - -], ἐν Σελευκ[είαι δὲ τῆι πρὸς τῶι] Εὐλαίωι Λ[ῴου- -, ἐπὶ] Ἀμμωνί[ου. ἔδοξε τῆι ἐκκλησίαι· ("resolved by the *ekklēsia*").

inspiration in adopting the word *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity for his non-civic groups.

Second, it does not seem to me that a political term with a Greek background satisfies the primary criterion of Paul's group identity construction project. Paul needed a term, first and foremost, which could indelibly situate his Greco-Roman Christ-followers within the covenantal promises made to Abraham.[59] Additionally, if, Paul was concerned with maintaining Jewish and gentile social and ethnic identities, then his communal designation also needed to be inclusive enough for that socio-ethnic purpose.[60] *Ekklēsia* suited both of Paul's ostensible needs admirably. Notwithstanding its political roots in the Greek *polis*, the ethno-religious roots of the word *ekklēsia* in Jewish literature (e.g., LXX, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees), and potentially in contemporary Alexandrian (Philo) and Judean synagogue communities, also could have been factors in Paul's choice.

Therefore, third, while van Kooten argues that Paul chose *ekklēsia* primarily for its ability to designate trans-local political organizations which paralleled municipal and imperial political structures, I would suggest that Paul's interest in its Greek background lay elsewhere. His group identity construction project required a term with Greco-Roman roots deep enough ideologically to

---

59   I do not assert that *Christos*-following gentiles were included in the Mosaic covenant, only into the Abrahamic promises. It is to be noted that J. D. G. Dunn suggests that "'covenant' was not a major theological category for Paul's own theologizing" ("Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology? Reflections on Romans 9:4 and 11:27," in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology* [ed. S. E. McGinn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 3–19). While this may be true generally, William S. Campbell opts for viewing Abraham as the covenantal father of gentiles. He finds such a conception sufficient to answer the question as to whether Paul uses the Abrahamic tradition as a way of "simply providing his converts with a fictive-family connection to an individual significant only as a 'punctiliar', exemplary believer? Or is he actually relating them to a particular people of God of whom Abraham was the father? Is Paul, in fact, rooting the Gentiles in the ancient stem of Abraham, or is he creating a new people of God?" ("'All God's Beloved in Rome!' Jewish Roots and Christian Identity," in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology* [ed. S. E. McGinn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 67–82, esp. 68).

60   For a detailed argument in favour of the continuation of gentile social and ethnic identities, see J. Brian Tucker, "Intercultural Interaction and Identity Formation in Pauline Tradition: The Continuation of Gentile Identity in Christ" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Atlanta, GA, Nov. 22, 2010); idem, *Remain in Your Calling: Paul and the Continuation of Social Identities in 1 Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), esp. 70–86. Tucker provides an in-depth discussion of various scholary perspectives relative to the continuation of Jewish identity in Christ (*Remain in Your Calling*, 89–114), and of gentile identities in Christ (*Remain in Your Calling*, 115–35).

facilitate, what Dieter Georgi calls, "libertarian and democratic universalism [and] ... socially egalitarian pluralism" among both the Jews and gentiles in his communities (e.g., 1 Cor 7:17–24; Gal 3:28).[61] The word *ekklēsia*, with its roots in Classical Athenian *dēmokratia*, fit the breadth of Paul's ideological needs well.

Fourth, it appears that van Kooten may be leaving himself open to the charge of anachronistically reading Paul in light of Origen. He seems to presume that since Origen views Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* as alternative societies which paralleled the socio-political structures of Greek *poleis* and the Roman *imperium*,[62] that he has faithfully enacted Paul's original intent.[63]

Fifth, even though van Kooten convincingly argues that a collective *ekklēsia* identity need not entail counter-imperial ideology,[64] and that Paul's translocal associations implicitly criticize "the morality of civic assemblies,"[65] his overall argument would have gained strength had he also explored how Paul's *ekklēsiai* constituted an implicit critique of those *polis* politics which validated socio-economic stratification and oligarchic privilege.

4.2.3 Paul's Group Identity Construction Project: Jewish Sources

The five mitigating factors in van Kooten's argument suggest the need for an alternative approach for forwarding Paul as the first Christ-follower to appropriate *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective identity. The first step in exploring this

---

61 Dieter Georgi, *Theocracy in Paul's Praxis and Theology* (trans. David E. Green; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 51.

62 Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 4. Van Kooten claims that a double meaning of *ekklēsia* as political assembly and as the "church" is explicitly alluded to in Origen's *Contra Celsum* 3.29–30 (*c.* 249 CE): "He will be amazed at the one who both planned and had the power to carry into effect the establishment of *the assemblies of God* in all places, living beside *the assemblies of the people* in each city." Van Kooten comments further: "After Origen construes this antithesis between the Christian and the civic assemblies, and even characterizes the relationship of the former to the latter as one of political opposition, he opens up the possibility that both assemblies are not necessarily mutually exclusive (*Contra Celsum* 3.30: 'And so also, if you compare the council of the assembly of God with the council in each city, you may, in future, find that some council members of the assemblies are worthy, if there exists a city of God in the universe, to hold public office in it')" (Ibid., 5).

63 Van Kooten states that "Origen draws the full consequences of the view that Christianity is an assembly of God which parallels the political assembly of the Greek cities of the ancient world (see further 8.5 and 8.74–75). In this I will argue that Origen is not original but follows Paul. The political meaning of *ekklēsia* must have been the first to spring to people's minds" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 5).

64 Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 531, 538–39.

65 Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 535–558, esp. 558.

alternative approach is the need to reassess three Pauline statements wherein Paul appears to designate those whom he formerly persecuted with a permanent *ekklēsia* identity. He ostensibly identifies the Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem, whom the author of Acts describes as being comprised of two sub-groups (Hebrew and Hellenistic), either as *hē ekklēsia tou theou* (Gal 1:13, 1 Cor 15:9) or as *hē ekklēsia* (Phil 3:6).[66]

There are at least three ways to read those historiographical comments of Paul. First, one could follow J. D. G. Dunn and Trebilco who claim that Paul's use of the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* reflects the *emic* terminology of pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem and surrounding regions.[67] Second, one could see anachronism at play. Van Kooten states that there is "no reason why the three references ... [should not contain] a term of different origins that was also retrospectively applied by Paul to the Christian communities which he had persecuted."[68] A third way to read Paul's statements is that they are reflective of provincial terminology. In other words, in order more clearly to communicate with his Diasporic addressees, Paul attributes to the Jewish Christ-followers whom he formerly persecuted the *emic* self-designation of his readers in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi.[69]

Paul's Philippian epistle is an illustrative case in point.[70] In Phil 3:6 Paul anomalously uses the unmodified noun *hē ekklēsia* in lieu of the complete phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* (Gal 1:13; 1 Cor 15:9).[71] Why only in his later

---

66   Gal 1:13 reads, "I was violently persecuting the *ekklēsia* of God (ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ) and was trying to destroy it." 1 Cor 15:9 reads, "because I persecuted the *ekklēsia* of God (διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ)." Phil 3:6 reads, "as to zeal, a persecutor of the *ekklēsia*" (κατὰ ζῆλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν).

67   Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, 2.600. Trebilco concurs with Dunn's assessment. He argues that since in Gal 1:22 Paul is referring to "a very early period ... [it] reinforces the likelihood that ἐκκλησία was first used as a self-designation in Jerusalem and Judea" ("Early Christians," 442–43).

68   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 526.

69   Paul explicitly calls each community an *ekklēsia* in 1 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:2, and Phil 4:15.

70   Paul first came to Philippi on his second missionary journey which is generally dated between 49–52 CE (Peter O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 5).

71   The articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* (and its variations) occurs once in the book of Acts (20:28) and eight times in Paul's authentic letters, twice in the plural: 1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:16 (pl.), 22; 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13; 1 Thess 2:14 (pl.). Within the deutero-Pauline letters the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* only occurs once (2 Thess 1:4) and that in plural form ("Therefore, we ourselves boast of you *en tais ekklēsiais tou theou* ["among the gatherings/congregations of God"] for your steadfastness and faith") (The anarthrous phrase *ekklēsia(s) tou theou* occurs twice in the deutero-Paulines [1 Tim 3:5, 15].) Contra

Philippian epistle does Paul simplify his collective terminology for the Judean Christ-followers whom he formerly persecuted? At least two reasons surface. First, the largely (or exclusively) gentile Christ-follower *ekklēsia*[72] in the Roman colony of Philippi[73] would most likely have been unfamiliar with *emic* designations used by the original Christ-followers in Judea, such as *hoi hagioi* (e.g., Acts 9:13).[74] Even the modifier *tou theou* may not have communicated well given a

---

Schmidt, Ladd, and Harris, none of the nine New Testament occurrences of the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* necessarily refer to a universal, or trans-local, fictive entity which encompasses all Christ-followers, both Jew and gentile, across the Roman Empire (Schmidt, TDNT 3.506; George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* [rev. ed.; ed. D. A. Hagner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 582; Murray Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 132–33). Two occurrences of *hē ekklēsia tou theou* refer to the community of Jewish Christ-followers whom Paul persecuted in Judea (Gal 1:13; 1 Cor 15:9). The other seven occurrences could simply reflect the fact that local groups of Pauline Christ-followers self-identified collectively as an *ekklēsia tou theou* (1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:16, 22; 2 Cor 1:2; 1 Thess 2:14; [2 Thess 1:4]). This fact becomes clear in three of the seven references which locate the *ekklēsia tou theou* within a specific geographical region (*tē ousē en …*; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1; 1 Thess 2:14), and one which speaks of multiple *ekklēsiai tou theou* (1 Cor 11:16).

72 John Reumann notes three indicators of a predominantly gentile population in Philippi. First, there is no archeological evidence for a synagogue. Second, Paul "may echo but never overtly quotes (OT) Scriptures." Third, the existence only of a *proseuchē* in Philippi (Acts 16:16) implies that there was an insufficient number of male Jews available formally to constitute a *synagōgē* (*Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AYB 33B; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008], 4). See also Markus Bockmuehl ("A Commentator's Approach to the 'Effective History' of Philippians," JSNT 60 [1995]: 57–8) and O'Brien (*Philippians*, 5).

73 Following the battle of Actium (31 BCE), some of Octavian's disbanded troops and supporters were relocated to Philippi, which then became known as Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis. All citizens of Philippi were also considered to be citizens of Rome. Even Philippi's constitution, physical layout, and architectural style were modeled on those of Rome (O'Brien, *Philippians*, 4). Reumann succinctly encapsulates the ethno-cultural mix in Philippi with his comment that "Philippi reflected Thracian underpinnings, Hellenistic culture, but dominant *Romanitas*" (*Philippians*, 3). Latin was extensively used and the citizens wore Roman dress. Philippi was governed by Roman law and was given the highest privilege available to a provincial municipality—the *ius Italicum*. This status entitled the Philippians to full property rights (purchase, ownership, transference) and to the right of initiating civil lawsuits. Philippi was headed by two collegiate magistrates, whom the author of Acts identifies as *stratēgoi* (Acts 16:22, 35, 36, 38).

74 In Rom 15:25 Paul does appear to use *hoi hagioi* as a group identity for the original Jewish Christ-followers in Judea and surrounding regions. Unlike the Philippians, however, Paul's Roman readership, with its close ties to the apostolic community in Jerusalem, would

gentile audience's limited familiarity with the LXX and its *ekklēsia tou kyriou*.[75] Second, the inscriptional record is silent as to the existence of a civic *ekklēsia* in Philippi.[76] This epigraphical silence may allow that Paul's *ekklēsia* was "the only *ekklēsia* in town." If so, then his use of *ekklēsia* without a modifier (e.g., *tou theou*) was sufficient in and of itself to describe a Christ-follower *ekklēsia*; his readers would not have assumed he was making reference to a civic *ekklēsia*. Such a conclusion, however, must at best only remain tentative, since, as I note in my Introduction, the happenstance nature of inscriptional evidence does not allow one to presume that an absence of evidence is evidence of absence.

In the final analysis, Paul's use of the unmodified word *ekklēsia* would have been sufficient in and of itself even when speaking in *etic* terms of the Judean Christ-followers whom Paul formerly persecuted. It should be noted, however, that not all of Paul's references to an *ekklēsia tou theou* point towards persecuted first-generation Jewish Christ-followers. In 1 Corinthians Paul uses *ekklēsia tou theou* to designate a contemporaneous sub-group of the Christ-following community in Corinth and beyond. This fact comes explicitly to the fore in 1 Cor 11:16. Therein, Paul not only refers to multiple *ekklēsiai tou theou*, but he may even be differentiating those Christ-follower sub-groups from himself and his communities.[77]

Ephesos appears to be another locale within which a local group of Christ-followers self-identifies as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*. In Acts 20:28, Paul is said to en-join the Ephesian elders to "watch the flock." This "flock," which the Ephesian

---

have been quite familiar with sub-group terminology adopted by the community in Jerusalem.

75   Paul's choice to use *tēn ekklēsian tou theou* when writing about his former persecution of Judean Christ-followers to his gentile addressees in Galatia (Gal 1:13) seems inconsistent with his use only of *ekklēsia* when writing to his gentile addressees in Philippi. If Paul's syntactical variation is intentional, then perhaps it is due to his expressed awareness of the Galatians' familiarity with Jewish ethno-religious tradition, which could imply their concomitant familiarity with the LXX term *hē ekklēsia tou kyriou*.

76   Only two inscriptions commissioned by Late Antique Christians in Philippi mention an *ekklēsia*, and then only with respect to the institutional "Church" (*RIChrM* 233, 379 CE: τῆς καθολεικῆς ἐκλησίας; *RIChrM* 238, 4th–5th cents. CE[?]: πρεσβοιτέρου τῆς Φιλιππισίων ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλησίας).

77   1 Cor 11:16 speaks of multiple *ekklēsiai tou theou* ("we have no such custom, nor do the *ekklēsiai* of God" [οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ]). The other occurrences of the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* in 1 Corinthians also could refer to a specific sub-group in Corinth. They are found in 10:32 ("Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the *ekklēsia* of God") and 11:22 ("Or do you show contempt for the *ekklēsia* of God and humiliate those who have nothing?").

elders are "to shepherd," is ostensibly designated by Paul as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*.[78] In this account the author of Acts implies that Paul refers only to the local association of Christ-followers in Ephesos as *ekklēsia tou theou*, not to the trans-local community of Christ-followers. This being the case, then there appears to be two independent witnesses of the possibility that, not least in Ephesos and Corinth, there existed a sub-group of Christ-followers who self-identified collectively as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*. If Acts' recounting of Apollos' ministry reflects historical reality, then it may be that the primary apostolic allegiance of the *ekklēsia tou theou* in Ephesos and Corinth did not lie with Paul. Given Apollos' deep Jewish roots (Acts 18:24, 28) and his extended stays in Ephesos (Acts 18:24–26) and in Corinth (Acts 18:27–19:1), it does not seem beyond the realm of possibility that the *ekklēsia tou theou* in Ephesos is related to the sub-group of Christ-followers in Corinth who claim to "belong to Apollos" (1 Cor 1:12; 3:4–6).

In sum, two overarching comments can be made in relation to New Testament occurrences of the phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou*. Both Paul (1 Corinthians) and the author of Acts use *hē ekklēsia tou theou* to a contemporary diasporic, and not only to a historic Judean, community of Christ-followers. Second, Paul's three references to the *ekklēsia* (*tou theou*) whom he persecuted need not *necessarily* reflect the *emic* terminology of Paul's victims. It could simply be that Paul speaks of his historical referents in terms that reflect the group identity of his epistolary addressees in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi.

4.2.4   *Summary: First* Ekklēsia *Association in the Early Jesus Movement?*

If one grants the possibility that Paul's historiographical comments employ provincial terminology for the purpose of clearer communication with his reading audience, then Paul could very well have been the first Christ-follower to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective designation. While that determination cannot be made with certainty, another one can. Paul makes at least one distinctive contribution to *ekklēsia*'s semantic domain. He conflates the Greco-Roman civic *ekklēsia* with a Jewish ethno-religious *ekklēsia* (public and semi-public) to form a semi-public, non-civic, *multi-ethnic* association with potential for incorporating, and maintaining, the social and ethnic identities of Greeks, Romans, 'barbarians' and Jews.[79]

---

78   Acts 20:28 reads, "Keep watch … over all the flock [in Ephesos], of which the Holy Spirit has made you elders to shepherd the *ekklēsia tou theou* (ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ) that he obtained with the blood of his own Son."

79   Davina Lopez highlights the fact that to Greeks all non-Greeks were considered 'barbarians' (p. 5), and that to the Romans all nations (*ethnē*), aside from Greeks and Romans,

4.3   *Ekklēsia* as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?

Paul's ascription of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity to his communities would have held socio-political implications for their engagements with Greco-Roman society. The puzzle that is Paul's political ideology has been extensively explored by numerous scholars. As already indicated, it is not my intent to explore Paul's general use of, and allusion to, political terms and concepts. My concern, rather, is to understand more fully how the permanent *ekklēsia* identity of Paul's communities would have been perceived in the Greco-Roman world. The following thesis statement, which I have already highlighted but not yet explicated, summarizes my answers.

I suggest that Paul's adoption of the word *ekklēsia* as a sub-group identity for his Christ-followers: (1) reflects civic ideology (Gillihan);[80] (2) for the creation of an alternative society (Georgi);[81] (3) that is not counter-imperial (*contra* Horsley);[82] (4) nor a trans-local parallel political organization (*contra* van Kooten).[83] Rather, Paul's *ekklēsia* communities are trans-locally connected associations: (1) with an inherently Jewish heritage (Runesson),[84] which are socially accessible to Greco-Romans (McCready);[85] (2) and that could have been viewed as pro-'democratic', counter-oligarchic participants in the ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse" (Salmeri, Miller);[86] (3) of the newly developing political

---

were 'barbarians', that is, "outside of civilization" (p. 101) (*Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul's Mission* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008]).

80   Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012). See 4.3.1. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Alternative Civic Ideology?*

81   Georgi, *Theocracy* (1991). See 4.3.1. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Alternative Civic Ideology?*

82   See 4.3.2. *Paul's* Ekklēsia*: Counter-Imperial Ideology*? For example, Richard A. Horsley, "Paul's Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society," in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 371–95.

83   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 522–48. See 4.3.3. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *A Trans-Local Parallel Political Organization?*

84   Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (CBNTS 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 483. See 4.3.4. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: A *Trans-local Association?*

85   Wayne O. McCready, "*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 59–73. See 4.3.4. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *A Trans-Local Association?*

86   Giovanni Salmeri, "Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor," in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy* (ed. S. Swain; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000),

culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor (Wörrle, Mitchell, Sherk, van Nijf, Zuiderhoek).[87] In sum, by self-designating as *ekklēsiai*, Paul's multi-ethnic communities self-present as associations with a Jewish heritage which inculcate a civic ideology that is both pro-*dēmokratia* and counter-oligarchic.[88]

4.3.1   *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Alternative Civic Ideology?*

The first point in my thesis statement is that Paul intends his *ekklēsiai* to "reflect civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society." By "alternative society" I intend Georgi's paradigm with its three definitional characteristics: "libertarian and democratic universalism, socially egalitarian pluralism, and an urban basis."[89] By "civic ideology" I intend the definition offered by Yonder Moynihan Gillihan: "[civic ideology] designates a comprehensive system of claims about the nature of a state and its relationship to its subjects, as articulated by both the state and its subjects."[90] Gillihan defines "ideology" congruent with that of modern political philosophy: "a system of thought that legitimates the authority of one social group over others … [and] facilitates domination."[91]

Gillihan identifies six essential components of civic ideology. He takes these from the prologue of the *Institutes* of Justinian written in late antiquity (6th cent. CE), but claims that each of the six components is also extant in early antiquity: "(1) piety, or proper understanding of theology; (2) proper

---

53–92; idem, "Reconstructing the Political Life and Culture of the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 197–214; Anna Criscinda Miller, "*Ekklesia*: 1 Corinthians in the Context of Ancient Democratic Discourse," (PhD diss., Harvard University, July 7, 2008). See 4.3.5. *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

87   Onno van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (DMAHA XVII; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997); Arjan Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (GCRW; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). See 4.3.5. *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

88   See my discussion of Pauline and Johannine *ekklēsiai* in "The *Ekklēsia* of Early Christ-Followers in Asia Minor as the Eschatological New Jerusalem: Counter-Imperial Rhetoric?" in *Urban Dreams and Realities in Antiquity: Remains and Representations of the Ancient City* (Mnemosyne, Supplements, History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity 375; ed. Adam Kemezis; Leiden: Brill, 2015): 455–99. See 4.3.5. *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

89   Georgi, *Theocracy*, 51.

90   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 75.

91   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 75.

understanding of natural order; (3) the comparative superiority of one state over others; (4) the historical evolution of a state to mature status; (5) the promotion of justice, and (6) the promotion of human thriving."[92] Civic ideology is implicitly promulgated through literature,[93] visual imagery (public monuments, inscriptional decrees, coins),[94] and dramatic performances (festivals, theatres, amphitheatres).[95] While Gillihan focuses primarily upon how the Covenanters of Qumran adopted and adapted civic ideology to their own ends, my focus here is upon how Paul's *ekklēsiai* reflect civic ideology. In saying "reflect" I intend, thereby, a description of parallels, not necessarily an assertion that Paul intentionally adopted and adapted civic ideology to his own ends.

4.3.1.1   Assimilative Civic Ideology

Gillihan helpfully distinguishes between two main types of civic ideology: assimilative and alternative, both of which were prevalent among voluntary associations. An assimilative response by an association is said to be evident if they accepted "the state's authority and legitimating arguments, and defined their identity and role in terms established by the state."[96] Some ways in which associations expressed assimilative civic ideology was through acceptance of patronage (e.g., honorific inscriptions), regular participation in festivals, collection of taxes from their members, internal policing of participants' behavior, and incorporation of prayers during assemblies.[97]

---

92   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 77–78. Justinian's *Institutes*, a codification of Roman law, are based in large measure upon the Institutes of Gaius, a 2nd century CE work by a Roman jurist.

93   Examples of literary approaches for promoting state civic ideology include imperially commissioned poetry recited at Greek agonistic festivals, that is, artistic and/or athletic competitions (e.g., Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*), Vergil's *Aeneid* (mythological aetiology for Rome's historical and theological legitimation), and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (extolling the virtues of Numa and Pythagoras, Italy's most celebrated philosopher [*Metam.* XIII–XV]).

94   Paul Zanker has demonstrated that in the early Principate imperial ideology was disseminated amongst its populace in a plethora of visual images, whether static ones like monuments or mobile ones like coins (*The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* [trans. A. Shapiro; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1988]). See more recently the study by Davina Lopez on how imperial visual imagery promoted a state ideology that promulgated the status inequity of conquered and vanquished peoples (*Apostle to the Conquered*, esp. 26–55).

95   See also van Nijf's discussion of hierarchically arranged seating within Imperial period theatres (*Civic World*, 209–40 and 257–60 [diagrams of theatre seating]).

96   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

97   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

John Kloppenborg notes that many non-civic associations, both Greek and Roman, even went so far as to assimilate the organizational and regulatory elements of a *polis*.[98] Bruno Blumenfeld claims this was particularly true of associations for whom the *oikos* was the locus of association life.[99] Civic-style regulations are reflected in the *nomoi* by which associations conducted their affairs.[100] Gillihan argues that expressions of allegiance to a *polis* within associational *nomoi* took at least three forms:[101] use of imperial chronology for

---

98   John S. Kloppenborg, "Edwin Hatch, Churches, and Collegia," in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity* (ed. B. H. Maclean; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 212–38. Ramsay MacMullen observes that "at least the larger craft associations constituted in every detail miniature cities" (*Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974], 76). The membership of a *collegium*, like the *plebs* of a town, were subject to the rules and regulations of a codified *lex*. As such they were typically called the *plebs collegii*. State titles were appropriated for *collegium* offices (e.g., *quinquennalis, quaestor, magister*). A veritable moratorium on social stratification was not infrequently in place to the degree that, in some associations, women, freedmen, and slaves were able to join, and even take up leadership positions (Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 90).

99   Blumenfeld contends that, "as public political life shrinks and sheds it relevance, the *oikos* expands its sphere and increases in significance; it itself becomes *a polis*" (*The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* [JSNTSup 210; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001/London: T. & T. Clark, 2003/2004], 113). Blumenfeld's assessment that political life was shrinking in the Greek East during the Imperial period unfortunately only takes into account the state of *dēmokratia* among formal civic institutions such as the *boulē* and the *ekklēsia*. Blumenfeld does not consider van Nijf's contention that informal political culture permeated the life of Imperial period *poleis* in the Greek East.

100   In order to facilitate his seminal study of association ordinances in Roman Egypt, A. Boak heuristically delimits the meaning of *nomoi* to associational bylaws. See Boak's edition of P.Mich. 5.243, 244 in *Papyri from Tebtunis, Part II: Michigan Papyri, Vol. V* (ed. E. Husselman, A. E. Boak, and W. F. Edgerton; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1933–1944) and in his "Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt," *TAPA* 68 (1937): 212–20. In ancient *praxis*, however, the term *nomoi* refers both to state and association laws, or even simply to laws in a general. Hugo Mantel provides a seven point summation of Boak's research on the functions of association *nomoi*. The *nomoi* regulated: (i) the election of the president; (ii) dues; (iii) dates of meetings; (iv) conduct at meetings; (v) mutual assistance; (vi) funerals; and (vii) fines ("The Men of the Great Synagogue," *HTR* 60/1 [1967]: 69–91, esp. 88 n. 124).

101   Gillihan lists the best preserved *nomoi* in chronological order (*Civic Ideology*, 6–7): P.Dem. Lille 29 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 223 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 31178 (cultic association [Osiris, Isis and Serapis?] at Arsinoë; 179 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30606 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 157 BCE); P.Dem. Hamburg 1 (cultic association of Sebek

dating the text,[102] prayer for a ruler's welfare,[103] and citation of state laws to legitimate association activity.[104] Associations with trans-local connections do not display assimilative civic ideology. In this respect, but not in this respect alone, Paul's trans-local association of *ekklēsiai* diverges from assimilative civic ideology.

---

at Tebtynis; 151 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 31179 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 147 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30605 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 145 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30619 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 137 BCE); P.Dem. Prague (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoë; 137 BCE); P.Dem. Berlin 3115 (cultic association of Amon-Ophet at Djeme; *c.* 110 BCE); P.Lond. 2710 (cultic association of Zeus Hypsistos at Philadelphia; *c.* 68–59 BCE); P.Mich. 5.244 (association of the *Apolysimoi* of Tebtynis; 43 CE); P.Mich. 5.243 (unnamed association at Tebtynis during the reign of Tiberius [14–37 CE]); *ILS* 7212 = *CIL* XIV 2112 (cultic association of Diana and Antinoüs at Lanuvium; *c.* 136 CE); *SIG³* 1109 (cultic association of the Iobacchoi at Athens, 178 CE).

102   Effusive praise of the reigning Ptolemaic king is evident in the Demotic *nomoi*. For example, "Year 24, month of *Mesore* of the king Ptolemy and Cleopatra … divine Epiphanies, the priest of Alexander of the divine savior …" (P.Dem. Cairo 30306 1–4; *c.* 157 BCE). In the Roman era sparser dating elements are found in *nomoi* texts. For example, in *ILS* 7212 1 (*c.* 136 BCE), the top reads: "In the consulships of L. Ceionius Commodus and of Sextus Vettulenus Civica Pompeianus, on the day before the 5th day of the Ides of June." Gillihan claims that the use of imperial chronology by *nomoi* texts "signifies associational acceptance of the imperial order" (*Civic Ideology*, 93). Obversely, Gillihan cite examples of social groups who express resistance to state ideology by using an alternative calendar. This is evident in the Damascus Rule wherein the establishment of its "new covenant" is dated in conjunction with the years of Israelite history (CD 1:5–10) (for other examples, see Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 93 n. 57). However, Gillihan does not consider the possibility that use of imperial chronology may simply reflect the use of formulaic literary terminology that is requisite for gaining the hearing of one's intended reading audience. This pragmatic concern need not necessarily imply "associational acceptance of the imperial order."

103   Gillihan (*Civic Ideology*, 93) notes that "theological affirmation of state authority" is evident, for example, in the inscription of the association of Diana and Antinoüs at Lanuvium: "May this be propitious, happy and salutary to the Emperor Caesar Tranajus Hadrian Augustus and to the entire imperial house …" (*ILS* 7212 1.14–15). See further, Arthur E. Gordon and Joyce S. Gordon, eds., *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions: vol. 2, part 1, Rome and the Neighborhood A.D. 100–199* (trans. A. Gordon; Berkeley; University of California, 1965), 63–65.

104   The best example is from the Lanuvium inscription wherein associational statutes are prefaced with a direct quote from *senatus consultum*: "Clause from the *senatus consultum* of the Roman people: These are permitted to assemble, convene, and maintain a society: those who desire to make monthly contributions for funerals may assemble in such a society, but they may not assemble in the name of such society except once a month for the sake of making contributions to provide burial for the dead" (*ILS* 7212 1.11–13, trans. A. Gordon, with modification by Gillihan [*Civic Ideology*, 94]).

4.3.1.2   Alternative Civic Ideology

According to Gillihan, an alternative civic ideology consists of three elements. First, the six major themes of state ideology are critically filtered through that association's own paradigmatic ideological grid. For example, the filters of the Covenanters include "the themes of adherence to Torah, participation in the covenant with God, and human thriving as inheritance of covenantal blessings."[105]

Second, the status quo of civic ideology is challenged through the differentiated organizational and regulatory choices an association makes. Thus, even though voluntary associations in general adopted civic structures and leadership titles, it is their modifications to, or specific rejections of, institutional norms that provided an implicit critique of civic ideology. One way in which some associations rejected the state's right of interference was to deny their members access to the public justice system and, instead, internally to provide imperially sanctioned judicial services.[106]

Third, Gillihan makes the blanket statement that all associations with an alternative civic ideology assisted their members in developing strategies for negotiating the boundaries between association and state. In so doing, they did not reject outright all claims which *poleis*, provincial governors, or imperial authorities had upon their subjects. Some associations even encouraged the direct engagement of their members with state bureaucracy.[107] This impulse towards integrative association with, yet associational differentiation from, the state is a key feature that distinguishes alternative civic ideologues from revolutionary political movements, such as the Jewish *sicarii*.[108]

---

105   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

106   Gillihan cites the seminal work of Mariano San Nicolò which first argued that "from the Hellenistic times onward the imperial authorities granted associations limited but significant juridical authority over members" (*Civic Ideology*, 87–88; see Mariano San Nicolò, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen sur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer* [2 vols.; München: Beck, 1913–15]; idem, "Zur Vereinsgerichtsbarkeit im hellenistischen Ägypten," in *EΠITYMBION Heinreich Swoboda dargebracht* [Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1927], 255–300). Two rules in particular were common within the *nomoi*, or regulations, of voluntary associations: (1) fellow members were prohibited from suing one another in public courts. Lawsuits were arbitrated by a special juridical committee within the association; and (2) brawling among members was subject to internal sanctions. The president was most often the person given the authority to mete out fines or other penalties.

107   For example, the *nomos* of the Athenian Iobacchoi mandated celebratory festivities whenever a member was elected to public office (Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 89).

108   Gillihan notes that "of course revolutionary movements sometimes have alternative civic ideologies, but they may also have assimilative civic ideologies but disagree about who should hold power" (*Civic Ideology*, 80 n. 14).

4.3.1.3   Pauline *Ekklēsiai* as Alternative Societies

In addition to the Covenanters, Gillihan names two other types of associations which he claims promulgated an alternative civic ideology: Pauline *ekklēsiai*[109] and three Greek philosophical schools: Stoics[110] Epicureans,[111] and Cynics.[112] These four are said to have "rejected the arguments of state civic ideology and the state's claims to ultimate legitimacy."[113] The Stoics, Epicureans, and Cynics each created a symbolic universe thought to represent a commonwealth superior to any in existence. The philosophical foundation of each commonwealth evinces the six major themes of civic ideology.

Like the Covenanters, Paul's ideology reflects a not dissimilar concern for faithful participation in a covenantal relationship with God. For him, though, humanity establishes that relationship through faith in the Jewish *Christos*.

---

109   Although Gillihan does not paint John's seven *ekklēsiai* in Roman Asia with this same ideological brush, they too embraced an alternative civic ideology. Their alternative civic ideology, however, was directed more towards the counter-imperial end of the ideological spectrum. See my discussion of the *ekklēsiai* in Revelation ("The *Ekklēsia* of Early Christ-Followers in Asia Minor," 455–99).

110   Stoic civic ideology takes its cue from a preconception of the *kosmos* as the true commonwealth. It is incumbent, therefore, upon all human *poleis* to fall into conformity with this true commonwealth whose citizens are the gods and humans and whose underlying *nomos* is the *nous*, or rather the rationality presupposed in a mind that is in harmony with the law of "right reason" (ὄρθος λόγος) through which all human life can be brought into conformity to nature (κατὰ φύσιν) (e.g., Arius Didymus, *ap.* Eusebius, *PE* 15.15.3–5). This law of right reason is neither a social nor a divine construct, but rather a transcendent principle to which both gods and humans are subject (Chrysippus, Marcian 1 [*SVF* 3.314]). This law of right reason should inform the actions of all humans, since all humans are citizens in the *kosmopolis*. Thus, Stoics prioritized direct political engagement in *poleis* which either rejected or neglected ὄρθος λόγος. See further in Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 114.

111   Epicureans paid special attention to two of the six themes that together constitute civic ideology: nature and justice. Nature endows human nature with a distinct aversion to pain and a concomitant desire for pleasure. The ultimate goal, then, for Epicureans is "a life of tranquility, free from pain" (Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 96). In a societal context, this type of life is possible both individually and collectively only when what Epicurus calls "nature's justice" is enacted on behalf of all (Epicurus, *Key Doctrines*, 31–35).

112   Cynic society is "one comprising humans who choose, through constant discipline (ἀσκήσις), what is in accordance with nature (κατὰ φύσιν) ... [and] since they live in formity to divinely established natural laws, Cynics claim a uniquely intimate relationship with the founders of the *kosmopolis* itself, i.e., the gods" (D.L. 6.37, 72) (Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 108). Cynic civic ideology views every person as a "citizen of the *kosmos*," or as Diogenes defined himself, as a κοσμοπολίτης. As such, a trans-local identity is presumed for citizens of the *kosmopolis*, at least for those who live κατὰ φύσιν, that is, in accordance with natural law, an immutable law that transcends all geo-political boundaries.

113   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

There are at least two more ways in which Paul accords with the leadership of other voluntary associations in having modified, and even rejected, state civic ideology. While civic *ekklēsiai* only accorded political equality to male citizens, irrespective of their socio-economic status and ethno-religious background, Paul mirrored some Greco-Roman associations[114] and Jewish public synagogues[115] in choosing to grant unrestricted social interaction also to women and to slaves (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 7:17–24).[116] Paul also paralleled association *nomoi* in his encouragement of the *ekklēsia* members in Corinth to access juridical services internally, rather than airing internal disputes publicly in the civic justice system (1 Cor 6:1–8).[117] Notwithstanding these correlations, Paul's *ekklēsiai* seem less engaged in civic politics than were other associations: Paul's writings mention only one patronage relationship with an ostensible bouleutic elite (Erastus), and lack any indication of public participation by his communities in festival processions, in public distributions of cash handouts, or in promulgating civic influence through, for example, privileged seating in theatres.

Paul's alternative civic ideology, while paying deference to the state (Rom 13:1–7), disengages from the power dynamics of civic and regional politics (e.g., *dēmos* vs. *boulē*, or *polis* vs. *imperium*). Paul's ideology is focused instead upon reforming the underlying social networks which gave expression to hierarchical civic politics: social stratification (slaves/free, male/female), oligarchic privilege (poor/rich), and ethno-religious prejudice (Jew/Gentile). Paul's politics, thus, are people-centred, not institutionally focused. Given such a

---

114   Women and slaves were given entrance into some Greco-Roman household-based associations. Harland recounts a 1st cent. BCE example from Philadelphia (*ILydiaKP* III 18) (*Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 30). Therein, Dionysios, the head of a household, established regulations for the membership of "men and women, free people and slaves" in his *oikos* ("household").

115   One example of an inscription which recounts the participation of women in synagogues is *IJO* 1/*CIJ* 1.728 (Delos, 1st cent. BCE). Therein, Laodice offers a votive inside the edifice (*ASSB* no. 96). Josephus cites a decree of the people of Halicarnassos (*A.J.* 14.256–58), which also dates to the 1st cent. BCE, in which Jewish "men and women alike … may keep the Sabbaths … and sacred rituals … and may build *proseuchai* ("prayer halls")." If the author of Judith models his 8th century BCE Judean assembly after a public synagogue assembly contemporaneous with his day, then Hellenistic-era Judean public assemblies allowed women to participate. See further, Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127/1 (2008): 95–132, esp. 108–110; idem, "Behind the Gospel of Matthew: Radical Pharisees in Post-War Galilee?" *CurTM* 37:6 (December 2010): 460–471, esp. 463.

116   Gal 3:28 reads, "There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus."

117   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 87–88.

socio-ethnic agenda, Paul's attribution of a political identity (*ekklēsia*) to his non-civic groups may have served to counter any outsider perceptions of socio-political subversiveness among his communities. A collective *ekklēsia* identity provided Paul's multi-ethnic, socio-economically mixed communities with a type of political 'defense mechanism.' It would have been difficult for Roman suspicions to have been aroused over a voluntary association in the Greek East, the socio-religious *praxes* of which portrays it as a paragon of civic order and *dēmokratia*, and the very name of which situates it in the centre of the "*ekklēsia* discourse" in Asia Minor.

4.3.2   *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Counter-Imperial Ideology?*

Paul's adoption of *ekklēsia* terminology notwithstanding, did his ideological differentiation of his diasporic *ekklēsiai* from state political structures entail counter-imperial ideology? As already discussed, some political interpreters of Paul believe so. Such a position, though, must overcome at least five socio-historical challenges.

First, the Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos and the wrestling association of Samos used *ekklēsia* terminology simply as one more way by which to curry political and economic favour with civic authorities and/or Greek notables (e.g., benefactors). Given these precedents, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that Greco-Roman outsiders may also have attributed a not dissimilar motive to Paul's communities who used *ekklēsia* as a permanent designation for their membership assemblies. The possibility of such a perception is increased for Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* located in Asia Minor, particularly given that region's ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse" and its burgeoning culture of benefaction towards voluntary associations.[118]

Second, Richard Horsley's identification of five social functions in Paul's Corinthian *ekklēsia*, which purportedly communicate counter-imperial polemic, appears open to question.[119] To begin with, other "trans-local networks of missionally united" associations were not perceived as a political threat by Roman authorities. Oligarchic families, for one, developed formal and informal trans-local networks whose mission was the retention of power and wealth

---

118   See further in 4.3.5. *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia?

119   See 4.3. Ekklēsia *as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?* Richard Horsley does suggest a sixth factor by which Paul presents a counter-imperial agenda, but it is a literary strategy, not a social function: the use of deliberative rhetoric in the Corinthian correspondence ("1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly," in *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church* [ed. E. Adams and D. G. Horrell; Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 227–240, esp. 237).

through the solidification of educational, cultural, and political commonalities.[120] Although that mission was intrinsically self-serving, these trans-local networks were still pro-imperial in their socio-political functioning.[121] Horsley's point loses weight if pluralistic phrases like "the *ekklēsiai* of Asia" (Rom 16:1; cf. Rev 1:4) simply describe a multiplicity of loosely connected *ekklēsiai* in a particular region, rather than a formal, regional association of *ekklēsiai*.

Horsley also leaves himself open to question in his claim that the autonomous adjudication of communal affairs by Paul's *ekklēsiai* represents counter-imperial ideology. As already noted, this juridical *praxis* was legally granted by Roman authorities to voluntary associations since Hellenistic times. There is little possibility that Romans perceived the enactment of a legal right as an expression of anti-Roman ideology.[122]

Finally, Horsley's ostensible claim that Paul avoided benefaction in Corinth is not without its problems.[123] Paul accepted patronage from Phoebe in Cenchrae (Rom 16:2)[124] and seems to have enjoyed the same both from Gaius and Erastus while writing his Roman epistle in Corinth (Rom 16:23).[125] This

---

120   See 2.2.2. *Political Players in Imperial Greek Cities*.

121   Van Kooten also states that Paul organizes Christ-followers into trans-local communities "as an alternative political structure existing alongside the Greek civic assemblies and the Roman State" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 535). He does not follow Horsley's later trajectory of viewing Paul's trans-local *ekklēsiai* as counter-imperial associations.

122   See n. 106 (Ch. 4) on San Nicolò's claim that associations were granted "limited but significant juridical authority over members" (cited in Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 87–88).

123   Horsley does nuance his claim elsewhere, although he does not make mention of Erastus: "Ironically, while attempting to embody an alternative to the patronage system economically in Corinth, he may have, in effect, established his own little patronage network with the household heads Gaius, Crispus, and particularly Stephanas (1 Cor 1:14–16; 16:15–17)" (Building an Alternative Society: Introduction," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* [ed. R. A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997], 206–14, esp. 213).

124   See Margaret MacDonald's helpful summary of Phoebe and Paul's relationship of "mutual patronage" ("Reading Real Women through the Undisputed Letters of Paul," in *Women in Christian Origins* [ed. Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo; New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999], 191–220, esp. 208–9). See also the discussion by Efrain Agosto on patronage in Roman society ("Patronage and Commendation, Imperial and Anti-imperial," in *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order* [ed. Richard Horsley; Harrisburg, London, New York: TPI, 2004], 103–23, esp. 119–21).

125   Rom 16:2 reads, in part, Phoebe "has been a benefactor [*prostatis*] of many and of myself as well." Rom 16:23 reads, "Gaius, who is host to me and to the whole church, greets you. Erastus, the city treasurer, and our brother Quartus, greet you."

"Erastus" may be the same *aedile* ("treasurer") whose name is found inscribed on a paving stone in Corinth. If so, then this confirms his elite status as a city notable with sufficient personal funds at his disposal to be a source of benefaction for Paul and the Corinthian Christ-follower community.[126]

A third key issue which limits any claim that *ekklēsia* was an inherently counter-imperial identity relates to the democratic authority of civic *ekklēsiai* in Imperial Greek cities. Imperial period inscriptional evidence demonstrates that the *dēmos*, when assembled *en ekklēsia*, did not possess sufficient *kratos* to have been perceived as a direct political threat to Roman hegemony.[127] In fact, the rise of euergetism and of a widespread "*ekklēsia* discourse" in Asia Minor suggests an opposite reality. A non-civic group self-designating as *ekklēsia* would have been perceived as an active and supportive participant in the political culture of that day. At most, the cross-hairs of its pro-*dēmokratia* rhetoric would have been aimed no higher than at the level of municipal (*polis*) or regional (oligarchic trans-national associations) political institutions. One can assume, therefore, that any non-civic group self-identifying as an *ekklēsia* was in little danger of being perceived as a counter-imperial threat.

A fourth and perhaps most telling issue, not least from the standpoint of Egyptian politics, is that, during an era of direct and pervasive Roman governance, some Jews in 1st cent. CE Alexandria appear to have used *ekklēsia* terminology for the public meetings (*Spec.* 1.324–325) of a voluntary association and perhaps even as a group designation for a 'members only' association (*Virt.* 108, *Deus* 111).[128] The distinct possibility that Jewish *ekklēsiai* operated in Alexandria, coupled with the Roman governor's silence as to their existence in his defense before Caesar (*Pro Flacco*) seems instructive. If an *ekklēsia* identity was inherently counter-imperial, then the Roman governor could have pointed at Jewish *ekklēsiai* in Alexandria as being one more just cause for his indifference to the needs of the Jews during the Jewish pogrom in Alexandria (38 CE). Additionally, one would expect Greeks in Alexandria to have viewed the existence of Jewish *ekklēsiai* with some suspicion, if not even outright jealousy, since their *boulē* had been disbanded by the Romans and their civic

---

126   Anthony Thiselton reviews the scholarly debate with respect to connecting the Erastus who is honoured in an inscription for having paved a street in Corinth with the Erastus who appears to be a member of the Corinthian *ekklēsia*, which met in the home of Gaius (Rom 16:23) (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2000], 8–9). He concludes that the evidence is sufficiently credible to suggest that one and the same person may very well be in view (Ibid., 9).

127   See 2.2.3. *Political Authority of the Popular Assembly* (Ekklēsia) *in the Imperial Period.*

128   See Eleanor G. Huzar, "Alexandria and Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.10.1 (ed. H. Temporini; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 619–68, esp. 656–63.

ekklēsiai not reinstated. Yet, in spite of the politically charged atmosphere in Alexandria during the Julio-Claudian era (27 BCE–68 CE), no extant evidence survives over Roman or Greek concern about Jews adopting *ekklēsia* terminology. This silence can be interpreted in at least three ways: (1) Jewish *ekklēsiai* did not exist; (2) they were known only to Jewish insiders; or (3) Greco-Roman outsiders did not view Jewish *ekklēsiai* as an example of polemical rhetoric. If the third option holds true in Egypt, then perhaps Roman authorities elsewhere in the Diaspora may also not have perceived Pauline *ekklēsiai* as being counter-imperial ideologues.

There is a fifth reason why Paul's ideological differentiation of his diasporic *ekklēsiai* from state political structures did not entail counter-imperial ideology. It involves critique of Karl Donfried's counter-imperial assessment of Paul's address in the Thessalonian correspondence ("to the *ekklēsia* of the Thessalonians"; 1 Thess 1:1). Donfried's claims bear revisiting in light of literary, numismatic, and inscriptional witnesses. First, within New Testament literature, the juxtaposition of the word *ekklēsia* with a "city-ethnic" is not unique to the Thessalonian correspondence. It also occurs within Colossians. Therein, (deutero-)Paul requests that his epistle to the Colossians be read "in the *ekklēsia* of the Laodiceans" (Col 4:16).[129] Donfried does not discuss this passage. Since this use of the *nomen gentilicium* in Colossians does not appear to reflect counter-imperial rhetoric, it does not seem unwarranted to posit the same conclusion for Paul's *adscriptio* "to the *ekklēsia* of the Thessalonians."

Second, Donfried's interpretation of numismatic evidence also is open to question. His conclusion would have gained strength had he provided evidence of a "city-ethnic" being paired with the word *ekklēsia*. He does not, however, offer evidence of either a coin with the full phrase "*the ekklēsia of the Thessalonians*" or of an inscription with the full enactment formula "resolved by the *ekklēsia* of the Thessalonians" (*edoxe tēi ekklēsia*[*i*] *thessalonikeōn*).

Even if Donfried had sought such evidence, the epigraphic record would not have assisted him. There is no extant example of the above collocations, nor even of standalone inscriptional references to the civic *ekklēsia* of Thessalonica that pre-date the early Christ-followers.[130] The closest one comes to such evidence is the singular occurrence of the phrase "the *polis* of the Thessalonians" from an early Hellenistic inscription that was found in Delos. As far as the

---

129   Col 4:16 reads, "have it read in the *ekklēsia* of the Laodiceans" (ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ).

130   Of the fourteen inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* which hail from Macedonia, none are from Thessalonica and only four can be dated with confidence before the 1st century CE: *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 36 (243 BCE); *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 41 (243 BCE); *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 37 (2× *ekklēsia*; 200–175 BCE).

epigraphic database of the Packard Humanities Institute is concerned, this inscription provides the only implied mention of a civic *ekklēsia* in Thessalonica before the 1st century CE. It opens with trans-local greetings: "The *polis* of the Thessalonians to the *boulē* and *dēmos* of the Delians: greetings" (ἡ πόλις Θεσσαλονικέων Δηλίων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χαίρειν ·)[131]

Given the fact that pre-1st century CE inscriptional references to the *ekklēsia* in Thessalonica are lacking, this, of course, then also means that there are no extant occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* with a "city-ethnic." The closest one comes is a single inscription which pairs *ekklēsia* with *polis* terminology. It does not use the city ethnic, however. Rather, it pairs *ekklēsia* with the actual name of the city ("of Amphipolis"),[132] not with the *nomen gentilicium* ("Amphipolonians").[133]

If Amphipolis is an exemplar of a Macedonian-wide preference for using the city's name rather than the city ethnic, then one would expect the Thessalonicans to have followed suit. This scenario makes true the reverse of Donfried's argument: Paul's use of the "city-ethnic" (*thessalonikeōn*) with the word *ekklēsia* is atypical of Macedonian inscriptional *praxis*, numismatic evidence notwithstanding. Thus, Paul's variance from extant Macedonian political formulae would have served to lessen, not to increase, outsider perceptions that his *adscriptio* in 1 Thessalonians evinces political rhetoric.

Paul's atypical formulation may even have been confusing to his Thessalonican readership since his pairing of *ekklēsia* with a *nomen gentilicium* only occurs in inscriptions from non-Macedonian *poleis*. These *poleis* are at a fair geographical and chronological remove from Paul's Thessalonican *ekklēsia*. Two inscriptions are from the Aegean island of Kos and date to the 4th century BCE.[134] The other six inscriptions are from the Hellenistic-era and come from Epeiros (Epirus).

Epeiros is located on the Adriatic Sea, across the Pindos mountain range from Thessaly.[135] All six inscriptions from Epeiros collocate *ekklēsia* with a

---

131   *IG* X,2 1 1028/*IG* XI,4 1053/*Meletemata* 22/*Epig. App.* 50 (240–230 BCE).

132   The inscription from Amphipolis is undatable. It contains only two words (ἐκλησ[ία] Ἀμφιπ[όλεω]ς). See *AE* (1932) Chr., 1,2 (Makedonia [Edonis]—Amphipolis; n.d.).

133   Regarding the political purpose of a *nomen gentilicium*, see Mogens Hermann Hansen, "City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity," in *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (HE 108; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996), 169–196.

134   *Tit. Calymnii* 1 (ἔδοξε τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι τᾶι Καλυμνίων); *Tit. Calymnii* 70 ([ἔ]δο[ξε τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι τᾶι Καλυμνίων]).

135   See N. G. L. Hammond for an extensive analysis of the geography and archaeological remains associated with the region of ancient Epirus (*Epirus: The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas* [Oxford: Clarendon

nomen gentilicium within an enactment formula (e.g., *edoxe tai ekklēsiai*). One inscription is dated prior to Epeiros becoming a Roman province in 167 BCE.[136] The other five date from 163 BCE to 136 BCE.[137] One formalizes a treaty[138] and the other four enact proxeny decrees.[139]

Perhaps one reason why Paul mirrors Epirote inscriptional *praxis* is the preeminent position of southern Epeiros, generally, and of its foremost city, Nicopolis, specifically, within the Roman empire. Nicopolis was founded by Augustus himself (28 BCE) in honour of his naval victory (*nikē*) over Antony and Cleopatra in the Ambracian Gulf at Actium (31 BCE).[140] He made it into a free *polis* like Athens or Sparta. Nicopolis eventually became the capital of southern Epeiros and Akarnania thereby becoming the most important *polis* in Western Greece.[141] If the late Hellenistic-era Epirote practice of collocating *ekklēsia* with a "city-ethnic" was still current in the early Imperial period, then a general awareness of Epirote *praxis* could have spread beyond western Greece into the other Hellenic regions Paul visited during his earlier missionary journeys (e.g., Macedonia, Thessaly, Phokis, Achaia). If any of Paul's Hellenic readership were familiar with this Epirote epigraphic *praxis*, they may have assumed that Paul's literary *adscriptio* to the Thessalonians not only replicates an Epirote political formula but also the Epirote predisposition toward pro-imperial leanings.

By way of summary, then, one can say that, while literary considerations ambiguate the claims of Horsley and Donfried, it would appear that the added

---

   Press, 1967]). See also James Wiseman and Konstantinos Zachos, *Landscape Archaeology in Southern Epirus, Greece. I* (Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003), 3.

136 *Cabanes, l'Epire* 541.5 (Dodona, 342–330 BCE): ἔδ]οξε τ[ᾶ]ι ἐκλησίαι {²⁶ἐκκλησίαι}²⁶ τῶν [Μολοσσῶν].

137 *SEG* 35.665 (Ambrakia, 160 BCE): ἔδοξε ταῖ τε βουλαῖ καὶ ταῖ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Ἀμβρακιωτᾶ[ν]; *IBouthrotos* 8 (150 BCE[?]): ἔδοξε τᾶι βουλᾶι καὶ τᾶι ἐ[κ]κλησίαι τῶν Πρασαιβῶν; *IBouthrotos* 9 (*c.* 136 BCE[?]): ἔδοξε τᾶι βουλᾶι καὶ τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι τῶμ Πρασαιβῶν; *IBouthrotos* 10 (post-163 BCE): ἔδοξε τᾶι ἐκλησίαι τῶν Πρασαιβῶν; *IBouthrotos* 11 (post-163 BCE): ἔδοξε τᾶι ἐκκλησίαι τῶ]ν Πρα[σαιβῶν.

138 *SEG* 35.665.

139 *IBouthrotos* 8, 9, 10, 11.

140 Hammond, *Epirus*, 46; Wiseman and Zachos, *Landscape Archaeology*, 2–3.

141 The territory of southern Epiros includes Ambrakia, much of Akarnania, and western Aetolia. There was a forced relocation of many residents from within those regions to Nicopolis (Hammond, *Epirus*, 687; Wiseman and Zachos, *Landscape Archaeology*, 3). See n. 135 (Ch. 4) where one of the inscriptions that use the "city ethnic" is from Ambrakia (*SEG* 35.665).

weight of Greek inscriptional evidence tips the scale away from a counter-imperial interpretation of Paul's choice to designate his communities as *ekklēsiai*.

4.3.3   *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *A Trans-Local Parallel Political Organization?*

The third element in my thesis statement on Paul's ideological presentation of his *ekklēsiai* engages with van Kooten's claim that they formed "a translocal parallel political association" which mirrored three levels of political organization—municipal/regional, provincial, and empire-wide. At least two questions arise. The first question to ask is whether Paul's *ekklēsiai* were translocal in nature. Wayne Meeks affirms their trans-local nature as one way of distinguishing Paul's communities from voluntary associations which Meeks' considers "a self-contained local phenomenon."[142] Richard Ascough emphasizes the opposite. He provides inscriptional evidence that demonstrates translocal activities between regionally differentiated associations.[143] Young-Ho Park seeks to nuance Ascough's claims by noting that his "evidence shows relationships between associations mitigated by the civic authorities rather than direct relationships between remote communities."[144] Park's point appears to be well taken. Ascough's epigraphic evidence does serve, however, not least to demonstrate that the very concept of trans-local relationships between associations held a cultural currency that Paul may have "cashed" in on when, as Park observes, he reinforced shared customs, particular behaviours, and the need to elect common representatives among his regionally diverse *ekklēsiai*.[145] Ascough appropriately notes, though, that the organizational and didactical connections between Paul's *ekklēsiai* did "not necessarily represent a monolithic movement";[146] variations exist among his *ekklēsiai* from different regions.

Second, a careful evaluation needs to be made of van Kooten's assumption that he can construct a three-tiered political perspective upon Paul's concept of

---

142   Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 80.

143   Richard S. Ascough, "Translocal Relationships among Voluntary Associations and Early Christianity," *JECS* 5, no. 2 (1997): 223–41; idem, "Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Pauline Christian Communities," in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im Kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (STAC 25; ed. Andreas Gutsfeld and Dietrich-Alex Koch; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 176–77.

144   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 116. Park questions the trans-local nature of association activity as suggested by Ascough among associations in *IG* II² 337, *IG* II² 1177, and *CIG* 5853 (Ascough, "Translocal Relationships," 228–340).

145   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 116. Park cites the *synētheia* in 1 Cor 11:16 as an example of a shared custom. Park highlights behavioural and organizational commonalities in 2 Cor 8–9.

146   Ascough, "Translocal Relationships," 239 n. 82.

two parallel "commonwealths"[147] or "states."[148] My evaluation of van Kooten's position will suggest that while his political understanding of Paul's *ekklēsiai* is possible, he seems to read the evidence too politically.

Van Kooten depicts the three-tiered trans-local association of Christ-followers as holding two allegiances concurrently: first and foremost to the heavenly *kyrios* and *sōtēr*, Jesus the *Christos*, and secondarily to the earthly *kyrios* and *sōtēr*, the Roman emperor. Van Kooten is not original in this line of reasoning,[149] but he is in his claim that Paul saw his trans-local association of *ekklēsiai* as an empire-wide "commonwealth" or "state."

As previously discussed, van Kooten makes three exegetical moves to support that contention. First, he claims that Paul hints at a provincial level of organization when he adds geo-political descriptors to the plural form of the word *ekklēsia* (e.g., "the *ekklēsiai* of *Galatia*"; 1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2). Second, he envisions a "universal, even global notion of ἐκκλησίαι" by translating Paul's phrase *pasai hai ekklēsiai tōn ethnōn* as "all the *ekklēsiai* from the nations" (Rom 16:4).[150] Third, he then adduces a global meaning for two other pluralized *ekklēsia* references: "all the *ekklēsiai* of Christ" (Rom 16:16) and "all the *ekklēsiai* of the saints" (1 Cor 14:33b).[151] These three interpretations are built upon the foundation of van Kooten's translation of *politeuma* as "commonwealth" (Phil 3:20). There are, however, other possible translations of the word *politeuma*. These translations place into question van Kooten's paradigm of a three-tiered political organization for Paul's *ekklēsiai*.

4.3.3.1   Dual *Politeuma*?

Van Kooten's view that Paul is contrasting the "commonwealth" (*politeuma*) of Christ-followers with the *politeuma* of Rome (Phil 3:20) is dependent on his assumption that Paul reflects "the Stoic notion of two kinds of citizenship, and

---

147   Van Kooten claims that "Paul's contrast between two types of ἐκκλησία is an expression of his view on two types of πολίτευμα [Phil 3:18–20], a distinction which finds its background in the Stoic doctrine of dual citizenship" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 522).

148   In line with other scholars, van Kooten assumes that *politeuma* means "the commonwealth" or "state" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 522). *Politeuma* is not infrequently used of a colony of foreigners or relocated veterans (*CIG* 5361, III add. 5866c; *PTebtynis* 32, 9; 17 [2nd cent. BCE]; *Ep. Arist.* 310).

149   See, for example, Stegemann and Stegemann (*The Jesus Movement*, 263–64, 273–76, 286–87), and McCready ("*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 59–73).

150   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 537.

151   Van Kooten argues that "this universal network of the ἐκκλησίαι of the nations … are then further defined as 'all the ἐκκλησίαι of Christ'" ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 537).

the existence of two commonwealths [*politeumata*]."[152] Three factors question such a presupposition. First, Richard Ascough, Philip Harland, and John Kloppenborg[153] claim that the work of Lüderitz[154] dispels previous scholarly notions that *politeuma* necessarily connotes a body formally recognized by political institutions, such as the citizenry of a *polis*, or a colony of immigrants who are given semiautonomous political status therein.[155] Instead of the translation "citizenship," Gennadi Sergienko claims that Greek and Jewish literary sources use *politeuma* in the more generic sense of "governing authority," rather than in the formal political sense of "citizenship" or "commonwealth."[156]

---

152   Van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ," 528. For detailed discussion by van Kooten of Paul's appropriation of the Platonic-Stoic conception of dual citizenship in his depiction of a heavenly *politeuma*, see, idem, "Philosophical Criticism of Genealogical Claims and Stoic Depoliticization of Politics: Graeco-Roman Strategies in Paul's Allegorical Interpretation of Hagar and Sarah (Gal 4.21–31)," in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (TBN 13; ed. M. Goodman, G. van Kooten, and J. van Ruiten; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 361–85, esp. 372–85.

153   Richard Ascough, Philip Harland, and John Kloppenborg, eds., *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: a Sourcebook* (Berlin/Waco: de Gruyter/Baylor University Press, 2012), 190–91.

154   Gerd Lüderitz, "What Is Politeuma?" in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (TSAJ 21; ed. J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 183–225.

155   Mary E. Smallwood championed the view that *politeuma* was used of "a recognized, formally constituted corporation of aliens enjoying the right of domicile in a foreign city and forming a separate, semiautonomous civic body, a city within the city" (*The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* [Leiden: Brill, 1976], 225). For a survey of subsequent scholarly perspectives on the meaning of *politeuma* as it relates to the Jews of Alexandria during the 1st cent CE, see John M. G. Barclay's excursus on the legal status of Jews in Alexandria (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (*323 BCE–117 CE*) [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996], 62–70).

156   Gordon D. Fee translates *politeuma* as "citizenship" even while acknowledging that "the concept of 'citizenship' itself is poorly attested" (*Paul's Letter to the Phlippians* [NICNT 50; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 378 n. 17). Gennadi A. Sergienko studied about 150 occurrences of *politeuma* in Greco-Roman and Jewish literary sources and came to the same conclusion as Fee: the term "citizenship" is "indeed poorly attested—if attested at all—as the meaning of πολίτευμα" ("*Our Politeuma is in Heaven!": Paul's Polemical Engagement with the "Enemies of the Cross of Christ" in Philippians 3:18–20* [Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2011], 161; see also 231–36). He claims that within Greco-Roman and Jewish literary sources "governing authority" is the more consistent definition employed (Ibid., 167–69).

Second, when *politeuma* occurs in epigraphic sources, recent scholarship contends that *politeuma* is best translated as "community"[157] or "corporate body."[158] Within inscriptions, *politeuma* is not so much a political term ("commonwealth") as it is a sociological term ("social network"). Inscriptional examples of non-civic groups adopting a *politeuma* identity include: associations of soldiers,[159] an association of women constituted

---

157   In their sourcebook on ancient synagogue terms, Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson translate *politeuma* as "community" in two early 1st century CE Egyptian inscriptions (*CJZ* 70 and *CJZ* 71) (*The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* [AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008], nos. 131, 132).

158   Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg also translate *politeuma* in *CJZ* 70 and *CJZ* 71 with a term denoting a non-civic "community": "the term *politeuma* (translated 'corporate body' in this volume), which can also be used in reference to a body of citizens (as at Chios), is attested for associations of various types" (*Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, 190). Philip Harland notes that *politeuma* "was used of regular associations including [two Imperial period] 'corporate bodies' of Phrygians at Alexandria [3 BCE; *IAlexandriaK* 74 = *IG* XIV 701 = *IGRR* I 458] and of devotees of the goddess Sachypsis in the Fayum in Egypt [3 BCE; *SIG*³1107]" (*Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* [New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009], 41). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg translate *IAlexandriaK* 74 as "Gaius Julius Hephaistion, son of Hephaistion, having served as priest of the *politeuma* ('corporate body') of Phrygians, dedicated this to Phrygian Zeus" (*AGRW*, no. 316). For Greek text and translation of *SIG*³ 1107, see Lüderitz, "What Is Politeuma?" 191. Lüderitz comments that "the *politeuma* may have been founded by Harthotes (perhaps through a testamentary act of donation), and it was presided by a προστάτης—in Egypt the most common expression for the chairmen of all kinds of associations and clubs. The *politeuma* had a τόπος in the temple of Sachypsis and was also named after the goddess. All these details would lead to the conclusion that this '*politeuma*' was a club of the type otherwise often called ςύνοδος or κοινόν, commonly termed 'cult association.' This is also the opinion of all scholars commenting on this inscription" (Ibid., 192).

159   A dedicatory inscription (*SEG* 20.499; 112/111 or 76/75 BCE) mentions a *politeuma* of soldiers stationed in Alexandria. *SEG* 20.499 reads, "To Zeus Soter and Hera Teleia, the *politeuma* of the soldiers brought to Alexandria, their chairman Dionysios of Callon and secretary Philippos of Philippos, the founders, ex voto, year 6" (Lüderitz, "What Is Politeuma?" 192). Lüderitz observes that "the *politeuma* of soldiers had a chairman and a secretary—both common posts in antique corporations. Attached to these is the designation κτίσται. A κτίσται in such a context is a founder either of a building (e.g., a temple) or of an association" (Ibid., 192). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg mention three painted graves for soldiers in Sidon (Syria/Phoenicia; early 2nd cent BCE) which designate the association of their living comrades as a *politeuma* ("corporate body") (*AGRW*, nos. 271, 273, 274, respectively): (1) *OGIS* 592 (see also, TH. Macridy, *RevBib* 13 [1904]: 549–50 [A]): "The *politeuma* of Kaunians set this up for Hippolytos(?) and Apollonides, sons of Hermagoras"; (2) TH. Macridy, *RevBib* 13 (1904): 551 (no. 2): "The *politeuma* of the Pisidians of the Termessians

bi-annually,[160] and some Judeans in Egypt.[161] In each of these sources, a civic political agenda does not come to the fore in the voluntary associations' self-description as a *politeuma*.

Third, if one consolidates the semantic range of *politeuma* in literary ("governing authority") and epigraphic ("community/corporate body") sources, then Paul's phrase "our *politeuma* is in heaven" (Phil 3:20) does not describe, in its essence, a trans-local political organization ("commonwealth"). One could see in Paul's phrase a veiled reference to the Greek political model of cleruchy and governing *polis*.[162] Paul speaks elsewhere of a heavenly *polis* that functions as the primary governing authority for his Galatian *ekklēsiai*—the Jerusalem above (Gal 4:26). Could Paul, in not dissimilar manner be implicitly presenting his association in Philippi as a spiritual cleruchy of that same heavenly *polis*? Such an implied political paradigm lends further credence to Sergienko's claim that Paul presents his *ekklēsia* in Philippi as a socio-religious/cultic association (*thiasos*) in concert with other Greco-Roman voluntary associations which use *politeuma* terminology.[163] The key difference for Paul, though, is

---

     near Oenoanda set this up for their own citizen"; (3) ᴛʜ. Macridy, *RevBib* 13 (1904): 551–552 (no. 3): "The *politeuma* of Pinarians set this up for Kartadis son of Hermaktibilos, Lycian. Farewell courageous and painless one!"

160   Lüderitz notes that "in the temple complex of Zeus Panamaros [Stratonicaea, Caria, Asia Minor] … every second year the 'Heraia' was celebrated (the Hera festival), which was a festival of the women. Free and slave women were 'called' by the priests into the temple, the 'Heraion,' and received wine and money … Instead of expressions like 'all the women' three texts mention that 'the politeuma of the women' had been called or received" ("What Is Politeuma?" 189). See further in Gaston Deschamps and Georges Cousin, "Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros," ʙᴄʜ 15 (1891): 169–209, esp. 181 (no. 123), 204–206 (no. 145), and Georges Cousin, "Inscriptions du sanctuaire de Zeus Panamaros," ʙᴄʜ 28 (1904): 20–53, esp. 40 (no. 23). Inscription no. 23 reads, "The generous organizers of the Hera festival having invited the *politeuma* of women, gave to the rest of the women each one denarius, as well to those who came to the city with their husbands." Inscription no. 123 reads, "The priest in the [year] of the Hera festival Menippos Leontos for the adoption of Heirokleus Korazeus [and] the priestess Papiaina Menestheos […] invited also the *politeuma* of women." Inscription no. 145 reads, "Having invited also the *politeuma* of women [to take part] in the Hera festival."

161   *ᴄJz* 70, 71 (Berenice, Cyrenaica). See text in n. 40 (Ch. 3).

162   See n. 167 (Ch. 2) for a discussion of ancient Greek cleruchies.

163   The strength of Sergienko's interpretive move is lessened, however, in view of the fact that there is no extant literary or inscriptional evidence by which to claim that some Philippian associations self-identified as a *politeuma*. Sergienko can only extrapolate such a scenario from the precedent of epigraphic evidence from Egypt and Asia Minor. He presumes, firstly, that since *politeuma* is used as a group designation by some associations

that his *politeuma* in Philippi, which he calls an *ekklēsia*, answers exclusively to a heavenly and not to any competing earthly "governing authority," not least the local Imperial cult. Sergienko concludes that Paul is thus contrasting "our *politeuma*" (a heavenly *politeuma*) with that of "his opponents [i.e., other Christ-followers] who pride themselves on belonging to a local πολίτευμα (voluntary association)"[164] and who "compromised their ultimate allegiance to the heavenly πολίτευμα … in their [continued] allegiance to a different κύριος and σωτήρ, i.e., to the Roman emperor."[165] If Sergienko is correct, then Paul is not aiming his oppositional rhetoric directly at Rome, nor, is he claiming to oversee a trans-local "commonwealth" of *ekklēsiai* which parallels the religio-political entity that is Rome.

4.3.3.2   Three Levels of a Trans-Local Parallel Political Organization?
Not only does van Kooten's foundational assumption seem open to question—his translation of *politeuma* as "commonwealth"—but so do the four exegetical moves he makes within that interpretive paradigm. First, the burden of proof would seem to be on van Kooten to demonstrate that the phrase "the *ekklēsiai* of Galatia" (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2) is not simply referring to multiple *ekklēsiai* within a given region (Galatia). It seems a logical leap to assume that "the *ekklēsiai* of Galatia" refers to a formal association of communities in Galatia which together comprise a regional *koinon*.

Second, van Kooten's politically-oriented translation of *pasai hai ekklēsiai tōn ethnōn* (Rom 16:4) as "all the *ekklēsiai* from the nations,"[166] rather than as "all the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles," while syntactically possible, seems exegetically secondary. The focus of Rom 16:4 is upon Paul's gratefulness for two of his most faithful co-workers, Priscilla and Aquila (16:3), who "risked their necks for my life."[167] Given his status as the apostle to the gentiles (Rom 11:13), one imagines that gentile Christ-followers also would have been grateful for the

---

of soldiers (e.g., *cjz* 70, 71; Egypt) "the word undoubtedly had currency among former servicemen" (*"Our Politeuma is in Heaven!"* 158). This fact leads him then to assume not least that Roman veterans in Philippi may also have formed a *politeuma* association.

164 Sergienko, *"Our Politeuma is in Heaven!"* 160.

165 Sergienko, *"Our Politeuma is in Heaven!"* 18.

166 Van Kooten translates the genitive *tōn ethnōn*, first, as a geo-political reference ("nations") rather than as a socio-ethnic referent ("gentiles"), and, second, as a genitive of separation ("from the nations"), rather than as a partitive genitive ("of the gentiles").

167 Rom 16:4 reads, in part, "to whom not only I but also all the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles (πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν) give thanks."

support of Priscilla and Aquila in Paul's missional work. Thus, the translation "all the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles" seems best as it makes this fact more explicit.[168]

Third, the demographics of Paul's diasporic *ekklēsiai* obviate van Kooten's claim that Rom 16:16 and 1 Cor 14:33b–35 each allude to a universal political organization of *ekklēsiai*. Rather, Paul's modifiers ("of Christ," "of the saints") can be accounted for simply by the fact that his *ekklēsiai* in Rome and Corinth consisted of a *corpus mixtum* of Jews and gentiles. This demographic reality necessitates, then, that Paul use *ekklēsia* descriptors that are sufficiently generic and theologically inclusive enough to incorporate Christ-followers of all socio-ethnic backgrounds. The phrases "*ekklēsiai* of Christ" (Rom 16:16) and "*ekklēsiai* of the saints" (1 Cor 14:33b) accommodate Paul's needs well.

Fourth, the phrase "*ekklēsiai* of the saints" (1 Cor 14:33b) is best translated as "meetings/assemblies of the saints" rather than as "communities/churches of the saints." This is grammatically preferable given that in 1 Cor 14:33b, 34a Paul pairs *ekklēsia* with the preposition *en*, a fact van Kooten neglects to consider. One would then translate *en (pasais) tais ekklēsiais* as "in (all) the assemblies/meetings." There is precedent for such a translation elsewhere in chapter fourteen where Paul pairs the anarthrous *ekklēsia* with the preposition *en* (14:19, 28, 35b). In those instances it seems most appropriate to translate *en ekklēsia* as "in assembly" rather than as "in church." Thus, for example, 1 Cor 14:35b would then read "it is shameful for a woman to speak during the assembly" rather than "in church." This translation mirrors the political protocols of Greek *poleis* which prevented women from speaking during the formal gathering of the *dēmos* in a civic *ekklēsia*. If in 1 Cor 14: 33b, 34a Paul is speaking of an assembly and not of a community, then van Kooten's claim that a universal political organization of *ekklēsiai* is here in view loses its force.

4.3.4   *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *A Trans-Local Association?*

The fourth element of my thesis statement on Pauline communities suggests that, by designating collectively as *ekklēsiai*, they self-present as a trans-local network of communities that could have been perceived by Jews as semi-public

---

168   The fact that *ekklēsiai* existed which consisted predominantly, if not even exclusively, of gentile participants is demonstrated in Paul's Philippian *ekklēsia*. Even if one follows van Kooten in translating *tōn ethnōn* as "of the natiions," Davina Lopez argues that the word "nations" must be understood ethnically, not as a geo-political marker (*Apostle to the Conquered*, 17–25).

synagogue associations.[169] The fact that literary and epigraphic evidence is largely silent as to the existence of Jewish *ekklēsia* associations in the Greek East may indicate that, as a group designation in the Diaspora, *ekklēsia* largely was 'free.'

How might diasporic Jews have viewed a messianic *ekklēsia* association? If they were familiar with the public *ekklēsiai* in Judea mentioned by Josephus, then Paul's multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* could have been perceived as claiming to extend public Jewish society to the Diaspora. This would present his communities as 'satellites' in relation to Jewish civic institutions, and thus as *loci* for the full expression of all facets of Jewish life, including its ethno-religious, social, political, economic, and judicial dimensions.

If, on the other hand, the Egyptian (Philo) evidence is indicative of a wider use of the word *ekklēsia* for Jewish associations, then *ekklēsia* was not 'free' in the Diaspora as a group designation. Nonetheless, even in this scenario, Paul's *ekklēsiai* could have been perceived as extensions of Jewish institutions, but in this case of semi-public synagogue associations named *ekklēsia.*

Either way, the use of *ekklēsia* terminology socially identifies Paul's communities with Jews, Jewishness, and "Judaism," and provides them with a terminological foothold for developing social interaction with diasporic association synagogues.[170] Both Mark Nanos and Donald Binder

---

169   In my section on *ekklēsia* and supersessionism I expand further upon how a Jewish heritage is intrinsic to Paul's portrayal of his *ekklēsia* communities (4.4. Ekklēsia *as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?*).

170   Mark Nanos identifies numerous ways in which Christ-followers in Rome demonstrated social identification with the large Jewish community. He seems to suggest, though, that social interaction between Christ-followers and Jews in Rome is indicated in the social identification of the Christ-followers' "righteous gentiles" with Jewish *praxeis*, such as textual interpretive techniques and worship practices. Examples of social identification forwarded by Nanos include "archeological evidence, shared literature such as hymnals and prayer books, the maintenance and even appropriation of nonrabbinic and apocryphal texts in Christian literature, shared language and idioms, Sabbath observance and food regulations, even the same form of meeting and administrative responsibilities" (*The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996], 69–71). Stephen Spence nuances Nanos' findings in his claim that social identification with Jewish practices, at most, speaks only to some of the *internal* dynamics operating within the Roman Christ-following community. In other words, at most, one can say that Roman Christ-followers inculcated a Jewish *ethos* but not necessarily that *external* social interaction with the Jewish synagogal community also took place (*The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study* [ISACR 5; Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004], 8–11, 61–63).

explore some implications of identifying Paul's *ekklēsiai* as synagogue sub-groups. Nanos focused in upon the Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* in Galatia[171] and ostensibly in Rome.[172] It seems problematic, though, for Nanos to designate the Christ-follower community in Rome[173] as an *ekklēsia*.[174] Binder sets his

---

171   Nanos argues that those in Galatia who opposed Paul were not Christ-followers but emissaries of Jewish communities ("the influencers") who mandated full proselyte conversion for those Gentile Christ-followers who wished to integrate into the broader Jewish community (*The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002], 143).

172   Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans* (1996). Nanos helpfully encapsulates his view in a later publication: "Paul appears to use *ekklēsia* not, as often claimed, to distinguish his groups from *synagōgē*, but rather to signify their identity as subgroups 'meeting' specifically within the larger Jewish communities. The point was not to indicate a rival movement" ("To the Churches Within the Synagogues of Rome," in *Reading Paul's Letter to the Romans* [ed. J. L. Sumney; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012], 15). For other comments relative to the *intramuros* nature of the Roman community of Christ-followers, see Nanos, "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans, *CBQ* 61(1999): 283–304; idem, "To the Churches Within the Synagogues of Rome," 12–16; idem, "Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become Jews, But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus," *JJMJS* 1 (2014): 26–53, esp. 32, 39, 40.

173   I provide here a brief review of scholarship relative to the potential birth and makeup of the Roman community. Acts 2 claims that Jews from a number of regions throughout the Roman empire heard Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost. Some of those who came to faith in Jesus as the *Christos* (2:36–41) include Jews from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Acts 2:9; 1 Peter 1:1) and Judeans/Jews and gentile proselytes from Rome (Acts 2:10; cf. Rom 1:7, *klētois hagiois*). Philip Esler suggests that the "Rome-born Judeans" and "non-Judean synagogue-attenders and reverers of the Judean God (called 'God-fearers' in the NT) … could either have returned to Rome taking the gospel with them or passed it on to Roman visitors to Jerusalem" (*Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 101). For support of Esler's view, see Richard Longenecker who cites evidence from church fathers such as Eusebius (303 CE) and Ambrosiaster (4th cent. CE) (*Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 69–73). Contra Eusebius' contention that Peter introduced the gospel to Rome (*EH* 2.14.6; cf. 2:17.1 and *Chron* 261F), Longenecker favours the view of Ambrosiaster that Jewish Christ-followers, who already lived in Rome did (*Introducing Romans*, 71–73). This view dovetails with Acts' inference that Roman Jews and proselytes who came to Christ on Pentecost returned to Rome and began a community of Jewish Christ-followers.

174   One important nuance that should be brought to bear upon any discussion of the Roman community of Christ-followers, including Nanos', is the recognition that Paul never addresses the entire community as an *ekklēsia*. William Campbell, among others, points out that the only group of Christ-followers in Rome whom Paul specifically addresses

gaze upon Jewish Second Temple texts wherein he situates Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* within his discussion of "what we might imprecisely label 'sectarian synagogues,' those synagogues belonging to the Essenes, the Theraputae, and the Samaritans."[175]

My thesis statement also emphasizes that, although Paul's ascription of an *ekklēsia* identity upon his associations facilitated their perception as Jewish synagogue communities, his *ekklēsiai* were still "socially accessible to Greco-Romans." Scholars, following on from Wayne Meeks,[176] have assessed

---

as *ekklēsia* was a small group who met in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:3–5a), Paul's long-standing compatriots in his mission to the Gentiles (Acts 18:1–21) ("The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?" in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11* [ed. F. Wilk and J. R. Wagner, with the assistance of F. Schleritt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 171–95, esp. 181). Along with Jewett (*Romans*, 61), a number of scholars contend that at least five "house churches" are represented in Paul's greetings section, four of which are headed by gentile leaders. See Wolfgang Wiefel ("The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity," in *The Romans Debate* [rev. and exp. ed.; ed. K. P. Donfried; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991], 85–101, esp. 95–101); Paul S. Minear (*The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans* [Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003], 7); J. D. G. Dunn (*Romans* [2 vols.; WBC 38A, B; Dallas: Word Books, 1988], 2:891); and Peter Lampe ("The Roman Christians of Romans 16," in *The Romans Debate* [rev. and exp. ed.; ed. K. P. Donfried; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991], 216–30, esp. 229–30). The five house congregations are said to be: the *ekklēsia* in the *oikos* of Prisca and Aquila (16:5a), those among the slaves of Aristoboulus (16:10b), those among the slaves of Narkissos (16:11b), *hoi adelphoi* ("the brothers") who are with Asynkritos et al. (16:14b), *hoi hagioi* ("the holy ones") who are with Philologos et al. (16:15b). Jewett cites prosopographic evidence to the effect that gentile leaders were in charge of the four non-*ekklēsia* groups (*Romans*, 953). Bernard Green challenges the concept of multiple Roman congregations altogether with his claim that there was only one *ekklēsia* in first-century Rome (*Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries* [London/New York: T&T Clark, 2010]). This is, of course, problematic if the only Christ-followers in Rome who were part of an *ekklēsia* were those who met in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:3–5a).

175   Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 24.

176   Meeks, *First Urban Christians* (1983). For updated perspectives on Meek's proposals, see both Edward Adams ("First-Century Models for Paul's Churches: Selected Scholarly Developments since Meeks," in *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-five Years Later* [ed. T. D. Still and D. G. Horrell; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009], 60–78), and John S. Kloppenborg ("Greco-Roman *Thiasoi*, the *Ekklesia* at Corinth, and Conflict Management," in *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians* [ECIL 5; ed. R. Cameron and M. P. Miller; Atlanta: Society of Biblical

the organization of Paul's *ekklēsiai* along the lines of four ancient non-civic models: the household,[177] philosophical schools,[178] the synagogue,[179] and the

---

Literature, 2011], 191–205). For a judicious critique of four of Meek's apparent operating assumptions, see Stanley Kent Stowers, "The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. 5 (ed. W. Green; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 149–181, esp. 172. Meeks' application of modern sociological models (i.e., Bryan Wilson's "small groups" sect theory) to ancient groups appears to assume, though, that commensurability is valid across vast reaches of time (1st vs. 20th centuries), geography (Mediterranean vs. North America) and culture (dyadic/collectivistic vs. individualistic cultures). Additionally, his functionalist approach seems reductionist in that he prioritizes Émile Durkheim's focus on ritual to explain social cohesion, while minimally incorporating a Strict Intentionalist perspective which focuses on the cohesive value of a moral community with shared beliefs and values.

177   See Ok-pil Kim, "Paul and Politics: *Ekklesia*, Household, and Empire in 1 Corinthians 1–7," (PhD diss., Drew University, April, 2010).

178   Paul demonstrates ideological affinity with Platonists and Stoics (see George H. van Kooten, n. 147 [Ch. 4], n. 152 [Ch. 4] and Michelle Lee, n. 326 [Ch. 4]). Edward Adams provides a concise survey of those scholars who suggest that Greek philosophical schools are a good paradigm for understanding how Paul organized his *ekklēsiai* ("First-Century Models for Paul's Churches," 73–74). Stanley Stowers highlights "seven closely connected areas in which the Hellenistic philosophies and Pauline Christianity possessed similar features" ("Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?" in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* [ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 81–102, esp. 89). Some common features include: conversion, "a technology of the self" (Ibid., 92), and an emphasis on intellect (Ibid., 93). Stowers does not, however, claim that "Pauline Christianity" was a philosophy (Ibid., 89), only that it shared "the structural features that made it philosophy-like" (Ibid., 100–101).

179   Some of the ways in which Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* are said to identify socially with synagogal gatherings includes functions within worship gatherings such as reading and interpretation of scripture, communal prayer, and commensality (1 Cor 11:17–34; 14:26), the settling of legal affairs within the community (1 Cor 6:1–7), and the collection sent by gentile *ekklēsiai* to the Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem, which somewhat resembles the *praxis* of diasporic synagogues in sending envoys to Jerusalem for the purpose of delivering the Temple tax (Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 80–81; James Tunstead Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 284–88). Burtchaell, not unproblematically, contends that Jewish synagogal officers formed the inspiration for the official leadership of *ekklēsiai*. Examples are said to include *episkopos* (Phil 1:1) as an analogous *archisynagōgos* and the common usage of *presbyteroi* (1 Pet 5:1; Jas 5:14; Acts 20:17). It should be noted, though, that these two titles used by Paul for his *ekklēsia* association officers are also mirrored not least in Greek voluntary associations. This suggests that socio-religious practices within Pauline *ekklēsiai* were also influenced by Greek, not simply by Jewish, associations. For a rather comprehensive list of twelve similari-

voluntary association.[180] Ascough originally supported Meeks' four-fold socio-logical model, with some modifications.[181] Now he challenges any heuristic category that creates a sharp dichotomy between "associations" and "syna-gogues." Rather, he contends, in line with Harland,[182] that "association" is a meta-category within which various taxonomical sub-sets are included based on factors such as kinship, neighbourhood, ethnicity, occupation or cultic expressions.[183] Thus, under the *taxon* "association" are subsumed particular types of associations such as Jewish synagogues (e.g., *proseuchai, synagōgai, ekklēsiai*), Greco-Roman voluntary groupings (e.g., *thiasoi, collegia, synodos, koina*), and Christ-follower groups (e.g., *ekklēsiai*).[184] In line with Ascough's

---

ties between diasporic Jewish synagogue communities and Greek (as well as Egyptian) voluntary associations, see Mantel, "Men of the Great Synagogue," 82–91. Examples include correlations in titles for association officials (e.g., *achisynagōgēs, presbyteros, grammateus*), judicial independence, regulatory *nomoi*, and penalties for disregarding *nomoi*.

180   McCready acknowledges that Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* demonstrate congruency with other 1st century CE models for group life such as synagogues, the "household" (*oikoi*), and philosophical schools ("*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 62).

181   Richard Ascough, *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1998). While Meeks viewed "synagogue" and "associa-tion" as being distinct and separate categories, with "synagogue" best representing Christ-follower groups, Ascough originally argued in the other direction that "association" was a better category than "synagogue."

182   See Harland's identification of at least five types of non-civic associations based upon their principal social networks: (1) household connections; (2) ethnic or geographic con-nections; (3) neighbourhood connections; (4) occupational connections; and (5) cult or temple connections (*Associations*, 29; see also David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland, "Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah," *JGRJCh* 5 [2008]: 200–21, esp. 202, 203).

183   Ascough first moved towards comparing early Christ-follower groups in relation to Greco-Roman "elective social formations," that is, comparing all associational groups with respect to one variable, such as meal practices, leadership dynamics, and so forth ("'Map-maker, Map-maker, Make me a Map': Re-describing Greco-Roman 'Elective Social Formations,'" in *Introducing Religion: Festschrift for Jonathan Z. Smith* [ed. Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon; London: Equinox, 2008], 68–84). Most recently, however, Ascough has argued that single variable approaches are too reductionistic ("Paul, Synagogues, and Associations: Reframing the Question of Models for Pauline Christ Groups," *JJMJS* 2 [2015]: 27–52; see also, idem, "What Are They Now Saying About Christ Groups and Associations?" *CBR* 13/2 [2015]: 207–44).

184   Some scholars affirm that Jewish groups and associations should be categorized under the umbrella term "association" not least because of their organizational patterns, and particularly because of how they are dealt with in legal contexts. One example is Roman

perspective, Kloppenborg provides a helpful nuance for any strict categoriza-
tion of Christ-follower communities as voluntary associations. He argues that
"Graeco-Roman associations are 'good to think with,' not necessarily because
Christ groups were typical associations,[185] but because we have rich data from
ancient associations that can generate heuristic questions for interrogating the
data from Christ groups."[186] Wayne McCready asks the heuristic question as to
how Paul's organization of his communities as trans-locally connected volun-
tary associations,[187] and of his designation of those associations as *ekklēsiai*,
relevantly connects his Christ-followers socio-politically to Greco-Roman cul-
ture. He sees their group identity as having facilitated their missional success

---

legislation under Julius Caesar and Augustus which explicitly saw the need to exempt
Jewish synagogues from restrictive guidelines directed against *collegia*. See Carsten
Claußen (*Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagoge: Das hellenistisch-judischen Umfelt der frü-
christlichen Gemeinden* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002], 224–226, 231), Martin
Ebner (*Die Stadt als Lebensraum der ersten Christen. Das Urchristentum in seiner Umwelt I*
[Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament I,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012], 227–
228), and especially Mikael Tellbe (*Paul Between Synagogue and State: Christians, Jews
and Civic Authorities in 1 Thessalonians, Romans, and Philippians* [Stockholm: Almqvist &
Wiksell International, 2001], 24–63).

185   One variance in the *nomoi* of early Christ-follower communities and Greco-Roman volun-
tary associations is the scheduling of weekly instead of monthly banquets, respectively.
Pilhofer suggests other variances. He does so, though, only by resorting to an argument
from silence which brings him to claim that early Christ-followers, unlike many other
voluntary associations, did not charge membership dues, initiation fees, monthly dues,
or a contribution to a *taphikon* (Peter Pilhofer, "Ökonomische Attraktivität christlicher
Gemeinden der Frühzeit," in *Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt: Greifswalder Aufsätze 1996–
2001* [WUNT 145; ed. P. Pilhofer, with assistance from J. Börstinghaus and E. Ebel; Tübingen:
J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2002], 194–216, esp. 208).

186   John S. Kloppenborg, "Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups," *EC* 4, no. 2 (2013),
183–215, esp. 187.

187   John Kloppenborg provides an extensive list of scholarly resources relative to under-
standing the *ekklēsiai* of early Christ-followers as a Greco-Roman voluntary association
("Membership Practices," 187 n. 13). Since his bibliography is specifically focused on stud-
ies which discuss Christ-followers as a voluntary association, he does not also cite Onno
van Nijf's seminal work, which focuses on understanding the world of Greco-Roman as-
sociations more generally (*Civic World* [1997]).

by providing an air of familiarity for Greco-Roman outsiders,[188] especially those with prior experience of associational life:[189]

> It makes eminent sense that voluntary associations offered an initial reference point that placed churches comfortably within the parameters of Graeco-Roman society—especially when the Jesus movement consciously and deliberately wished to appeal to gentiles. Indeed, the diversity of voluntary associations was an attractive feature, for it allowed experimentation and development by the *ekklēsiai* while at the same time providing a special type of belonging that created a form of community definition that was distinct from the larger society.[190]

While McCready's point relative to the missional relevance of Paul's *ekklēsiai* in the Greek East stands, he fails to assess how their identification as Jewish associations factored into that missional relevance. This lacuna is not accidental, however. McCready claims, incorrectly, that little evidence exists for synagogues, and thus, for Jewish semi-public associations, in the 1st century CE.[191] A more accurate presentation of the evidence would be to state that the missional relevance of Paul's diasporic *ekklēsiai* derived from their social identification with Jewish associations whose social functioning also reflects Greco-Roman cultural dynamics.

---

188 McCready states that "the point to be emphasized is that the concept of *ekklēsia* as a vehicle for claiming universal salvation was matched with a social institution capable of transcending a local village, town, or city to unite the church into a collective whole" ("*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 69). Runesson, Binder and Olson concur: "such a social-institutional setting as the *collegia* [*thiasoi*] may well shed new light on certain theological texts: the fact that men and women, slaves and free, Jews and non-Jews, could interact more freely in many *collegia* than most elsewhere in Greco-Roman society suggests a social institutional interpretive frame for understanding Paul's salvation inclusive theological message to his Diaspora community (Galatians 3:28)" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 13).

189 Inscriptional evidence for voluntary associations paints a picture of them as "groups of people gathering and organizing themselves into an extended family" for the fulfillment of a number of functions such as "athletics, sacrificing to a god, eating a common meal, and regular socializing ... [even] for decent burial of members" (McCready, "*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 62). See Harland for extensive descriptions of fictive kinship relationships employed within voluntary associations (*Dynamics of Identity*, 63–81 ["brothers"], 82–96 ["mothers," "fathers"]).

190 McCready, "*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 69–70.

191 McCready, "*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations," 62–63.

4.3.5 *Paul's* Ekklēsia *Ideology: Counter-Oligarchic, Socio-Ethnic* Dēmokratia*?*

The final two elements in my thesis statement on Pauline *ekklēsiai* relate to the degree of *dēmokratia* and political authority still extant among civic *ekklēsia* in the 1st century CE. I argue that Paul's trans-local network of non-civic voluntary associations, each of which reflect alternative civic ideology, could very well have been perceived as being pro-'democratic,' and perhaps also as counter-oligarchic, participants, but not as counter-imperial ideologues, within the ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse" of the newly developing political culture of the Greek East during the 1st century CE.

4.3.5.1 Pro-*Dēmokratia* Political Culture in the 1st Century CE

By designating his communities as *ekklēsiai* Paul socio-linguistically places them into the centre of a vibrant "*ekklēsia* discourse" taking place within the Greek East.[192] As has already been highlighted in Chapter 2, the literary works of Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, and Theon are replete with references to the contemporary relevance of civic *ekklēsiai* in the ongoing socio-political culture of their day.[193] The provenance of these authors makes Asia Minor, where many of Paul's *ekklēsiai* were located, the geographical hotbed for this politically dynamic concept.

As previously discussed, this "*ekklēsia* discourse" is but one aspect of what Onno van Nijf calls the political culture of Asia Minor. Van Nijf argues that political culture is evident in three non-institutional aspects of cultural life in Asia Minor: monuments of leadership, emotive communities, and festive communities.[194] A political culture facilitated the ongoing need for the negotiation of power between the elite dominated *boulē* and the *dēmos*. In Asia Minor, euergetism by the elite, and honorific reciprocation by non-elites through monumentalism, were two sides of the same political coin, so to

---

192   For a description of socio-linguistic theory, especially as it relates to the book of Daniel, see Anatheia Portier-Young, "Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book," *VT* 60 (2010): 98–115. She applies the work of socio-linguists R. B. Le Page and Andrée Tabouret-Keller who "maintain that every linguistic act is at the same time an act of identity. Recognizing that language serves not only communicative purposes but also social ones, they emphasize the creativity of speakers—and writers—who project a universe through language and 'invite others to share it'" (Ibid., 104). In this regard, Paul's adoption of an *ekklēsia* identity for his Christ-followers would invitingly have projected a democratic universe for those Greco-Roman outsiders who were considering joining his non-civic groups.

193   See my discussion and bibliographic details in nn. 105–110 (Ch. 2).

194   See bibliographic references in nn. 93–94 (Ch. 2).

speak. Their interplay served to maintain *pax* in the *polis* by facilitating the bi-lateral flow of political influence back and forth between the oligarchic elite and the non-elite *dēmos*, thereby averting direct Roman intervention.[195] Both of these political strategies form a backdrop for understanding, among Paul's diasporic *ekklēsiai*, what could be called his socio-ethnic "politics of equality."

4.3.5.2   Pauline *Ekklēsiai* and Political Culture in Asia Minor

It is within the burgeoning political culture of the Greek East, and not in the Roman West, that Paul experienced the greatest success in his gentile mission. There are at least three ways in which Paul's appropriation of an *ekklēsia* identity for his Christ-followers seems to have tapped into that political dynamic in ideologically positive ways.

First, in a very real sense, Paul was a 'political' figure. This characterization grows out of my previous discussion on how politics and religion were integral parts of the same cultural whole.[196] Paul's politics, however, derive from the other-worldly *politeuma* ("governing authority"/"community"; Phil 3:20) of a heavenly *polis* ("the Jerusalem above"; Gal 4:26).[197] Udo Schnelle aptly summarizes Paul's political status: "Pauline theology is political to the extent that the new symbolic universe it mediates directly concerns peoples' lives as citizens, their way of life."[198] This new symbolic universe is described with terminology which a Greco-Roman readership would have found familiar from the political realm of imperial ideology (e.g., salvation, peace, grace, righteousness/justice, and the titles *kyrios* and *sōtēr*).

A second way in which Paul's *ekklēsia* communities self-presented in politically positive ways involves their internal organization. As the *apostolos* of a

---

195   Van Nijf argues that the public use of honorific language implicitly pressures the honorand to live up to the public impression created of him or her. In this way, the *dēmos*, whether individuals or voluntary associations, plays an active role in the process of political identity construction even without having been formally granted any official political office or even role (*Civic World*, 73–130; idem, "Public Space and the Political Culture of Roman Termessos," in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 215–242, esp., 217–23).

196   See 2.2.4. *Religion and Imperial Period* Ekklēsiai. See esp. nn. 111 and 112 (Ch. 2).

197   The semantic range of *politeuma* can include "governing authority" (Sergienko, *"Our Politeuma is in Heaven!"* 167–69) and "community/corporate body" (Runesson, Binder and Olsson, and Kloppenborg, respectively. See n. 193 [Ch. 3]).

198   Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group, 2009), 225 (originally published as *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* [Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2007]).

new symbolic universe, Paul organized his non-civic *ekklēsiai* as socio-religious 'sites' for enacting that symbolic universe within their various *poleis*. Paul's communities demonstrate a "politics of equality," or what I call "socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*." The *dēmokratia* evident within Paul's metaphorical *dēmos*, known as *ekklēsia*, derives from a heavenly *polis*, "the Jerusalem above" (Gal 4:26). In general, Paul's socio-ethnic *dēmokratia* involves the equitable sharing of *kratos* among each *ekklēsia* member, or analogous *ekklēsiastēs* (Gal 3:28).[199] Overall, opportunities for participation within a Pauline *ekklēsia* are presented as transcending barriers of gender, social standing, and ethnic background. Gender does not stand in the way of females being allowed to prophesy and pray when the *ekklēsia* gathers (1 Cor 11:5, 13).[200] Paul also enjoins his *ekklēsia* members to remain in the social (slave/free; 1 Cor 7:21–24) and ethnic (circumcised Jew/uncircumcised Greco-Roman; 1 Cor 7:18–19) station in which they were found at the time of their call (1 Cor 7:17, 20).[201] Given the foregoing, one can say that the range of participants within a Pauline *ekklēsia* stretches beyond that generally found in Greek *ekklēsiai*, particularly with respect to participation of women and slaves.[202] The demographics of Pauline *ekklēsiai* are consistent, though, with semi-public associations, whether Graeco-Roman or

---

199   See n. 18 (Ch. 2) wherein I discuss the designation *ekklēsiastēs* within the context of the Athenian *ekklēsia*.

200   In 1 Cor 11:2–16, Paul does not place into question the right of women to prophesy. He focuses instead upon clarifying an appropriate process for them to do so; they are to wear a headcovering. Elsewhere, Paul affirms the partnership of women in his diasporic mission (Phil 4:2–3, Euodia and Syntyche; Rom 16, Phoebe, Prisca, Mary, Junia[?], the mother of Rufus, Julia, and the sister of Nereus). Scholars who affirm the role of prophetesses within Pauline *ekklēsiai* include David E. Aune (*Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 195–98), Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (*In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* [New York: Crossroad, 1983], 230–33, 294–309), Antoinette Clark Wire (*The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 116–34, 229–32), and Ute E. Eisen (*Women Officeholders in Early Christianity: Epigraphical and Literary Studies* [trans. Linda M. Maloney; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000], 63–87). Pliny implies that female prophets continued to function within Christ-follower communities in Asia Minor into at least the early 2nd cent. CE (*Letter* 10.96.8). He mentions 2 "slave women" (*ancillae*) whom the Christ-followers referred to as *ministrae*, which is Latin for the Greek word *diakonoi* (Eisen, *Women Officeholders*, 173).

201   See n. 60 (Ch. 4) for Tucker's work on the continuation of social and ethnic identities in Christ in Paul's writings.

202   By the 2nd cent. CE, though, "femaleness" in the Greek East had moved in from the political margins. Harland provides numerous examples of inscriptional uses of the terms

Jewish,[203] and with public Jewish synagogues (e.g., Judith, Josephus),[204] not least with respect to the inclusion of women and slaves among their members. As such, Georgi describes Paul's ideological stance as being one of "libertarian and democratic universalism [and] ... socially egalitarian pluralism," irrespective of his community members' social or ethnic standing.[205] Thus, one could say that, within the non-civic "city writ small," which Paul calls the *ekklēsia* of Christ-followers, socio-ethnic *dēmokratia* is depicted as going beyond the *praxeis* enacted within classical Athenian-style *dēmokratia*.

Paul's "politics of equality," while benefiting his *ekklēsia* members socio-religiously and politically, also would have benefited the society within which they lived. It may even be that it was Stoic alternative civic ideology which provided Paul with an example of how to bring "other-worldly" concerns to bear within "this-worldly" societies. Stoics viewed the *kosmos* as the true commonwealth. Stoics sought to bring all earthly *poleis* into conformity with this true commonwealth, the guiding principle, or *nomos*, of which was the *nous*. They defined *nous* as the rationality presupposed in a mind that is in harmony with the law of "right reason" (*orthos logos*).[206] This *orthos logos* is neither a social nor a divine construct, but rather a transcendent principle to which both gods and humans are subject.[207] When a *polis* rejected or neglected this transcendent law, Stoics saw it as their responsibility to intervene in civic politics.[208]

In not dissimilar fashion, Paul takes his socio-political cue from what could be called a '*kosmos-polis*.' In his case it is an eschatological *polis*, the "Jerusalem above" (Gal 4:26). As I have already suggested, from the perspective of Greek politics, one could metaphorically describe Paul's diasporic *ekklēsiai* as being 'cleruchies' (colonies) of the "Jerusalem above."[209] Paul's guiding *nomos* for his 'cleruchies' was not "right reason," as important as that was, but rather the "*nomos* of Christ" (1 Cor 9:21) which guides ethical choices in Paul's proclamation of the gospel of Christ (1 Cor 9:16). Paul's ethics are founded on the

---

"mother" and "daughter" in relation to civic and official organizations (e.g., *polis, dēmos*) (*Dynamics of Identity*, 88).

203   See n. 114 (Ch. 4).

204   See n. 115 (Ch. 4).

205   Georgi, *Theocracy*, 51.

206   For example, Arius Didymus, *ap*. Eusebius, *PE* 15.15.3–5.

207   Chrysippus, Marcian 1 (*SVF* 3.314).

208   Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 114.

209   See n. 162 (Ch. 4). For the definition of a "cleruchy" see n. 167 (Ch. 2).

mandate of love (1 Cor 13:4–8a; Gal 6:2; cf. Gal 5:14: "love your neighbour").[210] Given Paul's priority of inculcating God's love within human affairs, he seems to have focused his socio-political efforts on infusing "agapic communalism," as Jewett calls it, within each of his metaphorical cleruchies (*ekklēsiai*) of the "Jerusalem above."[211] Their internal *praxis* of "agapic communalism" would inevitably have affected the external realities of local oligarchic rule and of *polis* life, particularly when Paul's *ekklēsia* members would try to bring redress to the inequity found in the interplay of social and ethnic identities at municipal levels of Greco-Roman society.[212]

Paul does not appear to be directly involved, though, in bringing redress to the political power imbalances between the *dēmos* and *boulē*, or between the *polis* and *imperium*. Paul's associational *nomos* regarding prayer for the ruling authorities (Rom 13:1–7) is a key touchstone for such a view.[213] Paul's politics

---

210   1 Cor 9:21 reads, "I am not free from God's law but am under Christ's law." Gal 6:2 reads, "bear one another's burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ." Identifying "love" as the essential characteristic of the "law of Christ" is consistent with Paul's previous claim: "the whole [Mosaic] law is summed up in a single commandment, 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself'" (Gal 5:14).

211   Jewett makes clear that the guiding principle behind Paul's honor system was not "love patriarchalism," that is, benefaction based upon hierarchical social stratification (65–66), but rather "agapic communalism" (Rom 13:8a) (*Romans*, 69). This agapic communalism makes Paul's "honor system" one of unrestricted social interaction. Its democratic and egalitarian principles level the socio-economic playing field, so to speak, between the "administrative slaves" and aristocratic patrons within Paul's *ekklēsiai* (Ibid., 60–61, 64–66; on Rom 16:10–11, see 952–53, 965–68). Affecting a breakdown of hierarchical separation among Christ-followers within the public sphere inevitably affects other socio-economic relationships which those self-same Christ-followers have with Greco-Roman outsiders in their social and work worlds.

212   Regarding Paul's concern for the poor and socio-economically disadvantaged see the seminal study by Bruce Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

213   Scholars debate the political, specifically counter-imperial, implications of Rom 13:1–7 from a number of different angles. Schnelle states that "Paul adopts no intentional political stance in the modern sense ... There is no direct anti-Roman or even Roman-critical statement in Paul. On the contrary, Rom 13:1–7, the only direct statement from Paul with regard to the Roman Empire, specifically calls for its authority to be acknowledged" (*Theology of the New Testament*, 225). John Barclay concurs. He writes that "there is no evidence that Paul had the Roman empire or the imperial cult particularly in view, and that, better understood, Paul's theology is deeply political but in a way that makes Rome not a central player in the history of the world, but a bit part, a member of a largely undifferentiated crowd, in a drama governed by much greater and more pervasive [cosmic] powers ... we see Roman propaganda subverted precisely by not being challenged, but

purportedly leave direct political intervention in the hands of a sovereign God (Rom 12:19) who establishes governing authorities with the right to "bear the sword" (Rom 13:4).

Euergetism, or benefaction, is a third way in which Paul tapped into the political culture for socio-religious purposes. Benefaction finds expression both internally within Paul's trans-local network of *ekklēsiai* and externally towards other sub-groups of Christ-followers (e.g., the *hoi hagioi* in Jerusalem; Rom 15:25–31; 1 Cor 16:1–4). As the primary apostolic authority of his *ekklēsiai*, Paul accepted benefaction (Rom 16:2, 23) and encouraged the socio-religious *praxis* of the "politics of equality" within each *ekklēsia*.[214] Paul sought to redress inequities in wealth (rich/poor), social status (slave/free; 1 Cor 7:17–24), ethnic

---

by being subsumed and relativised within a larger framework of explanation" ("Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant to Paul" [paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA., Nov. 16–20, 2007], 3, 19). Both Robert Jewett and Neil Elliott read Rom 13:1–7 counter-intuitively through anti-imperial lenses. Jewett sees Rom 13:1 as "thoroughly subversive" of Roman imperial ideology in that Paul depicts Rome's rise to power as due to God's sovereign choice rather to politico-military might. This sovereign God is the same one who raised Jesus from the dead after he was martyred by the same Roman state that God himself had placed into power. Paul's implied message then is that not just Christ-followers, but even "Christ-killers" must submit to the God of the crucified Christ (Jewett, *Romans*, 789–90; idem, "Response: Exegetical Support from Romans and Other Letters," in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl* [ed. R. Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: TPI, 2000], 58–71, esp. 66–67). Neil Elliott concludes that Rom 13:1–7 gives witness to the pragmatic Paul who in recognition of the dominance of imperial ideology is constrained in his letters so as to protect his reading audience from retaliation by the *imperium* (*The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* [PCC; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008], 152–59; idem, "Romans 13:1–7 in the Context of Imperial Propaganda," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* [ed. R. Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: TPI, 1997], 184–204). Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza critiques Elliott. She claims that since he "makes palatable the rhetoric of [submission in] Romans 13, Elliott re-inscribes Paul's rhetorics of subordination" for situations within which modern interpreters find themselves ("Paul and the Politics of Interpretation," in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl* [ed. R. Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: TPI, 2000], 40–57, esp. 52–53).

214   Paul appears to have accepted patronage from Phoebe in Cenchrae (see n. 125 [Ch. 4]). This problematizes Horsley's claim that Paul sought to "embody radically different economic relations (avoid patronage)" ("1 Corinthians," 251) (see my interaction with Horsley in 4.3.2. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Counter-Imperial Ideology?*).

pre-eminence (Jew, gentile; Gal 3:28),[215] and gender roles (Gal 3:28; Rom 16:1–2; 1 Cor 11:1–16), to name a few.[216]

Externally, Paul promoted euergetism through one unprecedented economic act.[217] Paul orchestrated a sizeable collection among his trans-local *ekklēsiai* for *hoi hagioi* in Jerusalem (e.g., Rom 15:25–31).[218] If in Rom 15, just as in Rom 1:7, Paul's mention of *hoi hagioi* refers to an association of Christ-followers loyal to the apostles in Jerusalem, then this act of financial munificence by Paul's *ekklēsiai* served at least one important socio-religious end. The collection gathered by Pauline Christ-followers would implicitly have served to vitiate any socio-religious conflict that may have been simmering between Jerusalem-loyal and Pauline-loyal Christ-followers. These two sub-groups (*hoi hagioi* and *ekklēsiai*), respectively, were centred in different geographical locales (Jerusalem or Syrian Antioch), gave their loyalties to different apostolic authorities (Peter, James and John or Paul), and generally focused their

---

215   The inclusive and egalitarian impulse in Gal 3:28 is debated among scholars. Some, such as John Barclay and Bruce Hansen, understand Gal 3:28 as supporting a universalism that transcends categories of race/ethnicity/peoplehood. Barclay remarks that for Paul's Christ-followers social identity is no longer central "in the context of their new community" since "the ethnic identity of Paul's converts was simply irrelevant" (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 385). Bruce Hansen demurs but locates disparate ethnic identities into only one ethnicity: Israel. He argues that the baptismal unity formula in Gal 3:28 (and in 1 Cor 12:13; Col 3:11) is Paul's vision of a social unity "of the believers as a new ethnic group patterned on the identity of Israel as re-envisioned through Christ" (*All of You Are One* [London: T&T Clark, 2010], 31; see also 116, 192, 195, 196). On the other hand, some like Denise Buell, J. Brian Tucker, and William Campbell argue to the contrary: Buell comments that by "saying that Christianity is open to all was not mutually exclusive with defining Christians as members of an ethnic or racial group. In many early Christian texts, defining Christians as members of a people reinforces rather than conflicts with assertions of Christian universalism" (*Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* [New York: Columbia University Press, 2005], 138). See also Tucker, *Remain in Your Calling*, 57 n. 116, 144–145 and William S. Campbell, who argues that the word *diastolē* (Rom 3:22; 10:12) could simply mean "discrimination" rather than "distinction" ("No Distinction or No Discrimination? The Translation of Διαστολὴ in Romans 3:22 and 10:12" in *Erlesenes Jerusalem: Festschrift für Ekkehard W. Stegemann* [Lukas Kundert, Christina Tuor-Kurth ed.; Basel: Friedrich Reinhart Verlag, 2013], 146–71).

216   Regarding wealth redistribution, see Longenecker, *Remember the Poor* (2010). He argues that care for the impoverished was integral to Paul's gospel and common practice in the *ekklēsiai* he oversaw. Regarding the redistribution of social and ethnic status, see Tucker, *Remain in Your Calling* (2011).

217   Horsley, "1 Corinthians," 251.

218   See also 1 Cor 16:3; cf. 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8–9.

missional activities upon different target groups (Jews or Jews/gentiles). Paul's collection demonstrates that, in the early Jesus movement, the civic ideology of an alternative society could cross socio-ethnic boundaries for the socio-economic betterment of an affiliated association.[219]

As the organizer of this magnanimous gift, Paul implicitly placed himself in the role of benefactor for the apostles in Jerusalem. Reciprocity from the Jerusalem apostles by means of honour through monumentalism would have been his natural due. There is no indication that Paul either expected or received such reciprocity from the Jerusalem apostles. It may be, however, that in his letter to Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers in Rome (*klētois hagiois*; 1:7), Paul is attempting to cash in on the socio-religious currency 'owed' him by their 'mother' community in Jerusalem. Paul mentions that he will stop in Rome after delivering to Jerusalem the collection that was gathered by his *ekklēsiai* in Macedonia and Achaia (Rom 15:22–31). The hospitality of the Jerusalem-loyal Roman community is then requested (Rom 15:32) before Paul continues on to Spain. By explicitly mentioning the leading role he is playing in organizing the collection for Jerusalem, Paul implicitly reminds the Roman Christ-followers of their own failure to fulfill their obligations to their mother community. In this, Paul rhetorically underscores his right to request reciprocity from the Roman Christ-followers in the form of hospitality and, thereby, to gain their support of his mission of establishing *ekklēsiai* in Spain.

There is a fourth correlation with the political culture of the Greek East. Paul's *ekklēsiai* mirror at least two of its non-institutional aspects: emotive communities and festive communities. Although Asia Minor is the hotbed of political culture, Paul's Corinthian correspondence provides an illuminating example of political culture in action among his Hellenic Christ-followers.

The phrase "emotive community" describes Paul's Corinthian *ekklēsia* in every sense of the word. His Corinthian correspondence attests to a lively debate among upwards of four factions ("I belong to Paul/Apollos/Cephas/Christ"; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:4).[220] They are in debate over *nomoi* that order their

---

219   See the discussion of the Jerusalem collection by Julien M. Ogereau, "The Jerusalem Collection as Κοινωνία: Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity," *NTS* 58 (2012): 360–378.

220   Scholars interpret the factionalism in Corinth along theological, ideological, or personal 'fault lines': (1) C. K. Barrett aligns each leader mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12 with a distinctive theological position ("Christianity at Corinth," 1–27; idem, "Cephas and Corinth," 28–39); (2) Ideological interpretations, on the other hand, relate the divisions to social alignments. Floyd V. Filson champions the view that factionalism developed between rival house congregations in Corinth ("The Significance of the Early House Churches," *JBL* 58 [1939]: 109–12). Gerd Thiessen refines Filson's view by suggesting that wealthy householders

associational life,[221] some of which touch upon the *nomoi* of Greco-Roman voluntary associations.[222] Emotive factors associated with these types of issues undoubtedly were exacerbated simply by virtue of the fact that the semi-public worship assemblies were each called an *ekklēsia*.[223] Within the civic *ekklēsia*, each *ekklēsiastēs* was allowed free expression of their opinion. The Corinthian Christ-followers may also, then, have felt entitled to similar displays of emotion when they gathered *en ekklēsia*, much to the detriment of harmonious *ekklēsia* life.

Not all emotion would have been negative, though. Positive, or festive, emotion would also have been engendered during the time that "members only" *ekklēsiai* were convened. Paul's commitment to socio-ethnic *dēmokratia* allowed for the development of festive community among all members (male or female, slave or free, rich or poor) by means of regular reciprocity in honouring one another through prophesying (1 Cor 11:1–17; 14:1–33), teaching

---

aligned themselves as benefactors for the different persons named in 1 Corinthians, thus, resulting in partisan-based groupings among the Christ-following community (*The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* [ed. and trans. J. H. Schütz; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982], 54–57). For a critique of Thiessen, see Bengt Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 36–37, 40; (3) Personal attachments, instead, become the evaluative grid for John K. Chow and Andrew D. Clarke. They downplay ideological concerns and examine the role which patron-client relationships may have played in the formation of factional groupings in Corinth (Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* [JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 106; Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* [AGJU 18; Leiden: Brill, 1993], 89–95). Along these lines, see also, L. L. Wellborn, "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics," *JBL* 106 (1987): 85–111. Kloppenborg develops the insights of Chow and Clarke into a scenario wherein different sub-groups of *collegia domestica* (patron-based households) or *thiasoi* (cult-based private associations) mix in public meetings, such as common meals ("Greco-Roman *Thiasoi*," 209–212).

221   Conflict surfaces in numerous contexts within Paul's Corinthian correspondence. Infighting among the Corinthian Christ-followers is evident in Paul's use of terms such as *erides* ("rivalries") and *schismata* ("divisions") (1 Cor 1:10–17). Communal meals become venues for *schismata* and *haireseis* ("factions") (1 Cor 11:17–19). Community members are in litigation against one another (1 Cor 6:1–8). Some Corinthian Christ-followers participate in meals in pagan temples, or perhaps even during the meetings of private cultic associations (1 Cor 8–10). Paul's authority is being challenged by those whom he calls false apostles (2 Cor 11:13) and "super-apostles" (2 Cor 11:5).

222   See the discussion of voluntary association *nomoi* (4.3.1. *Paul's* Ekklēsia: *Alternative Civic Ideology?*).

223   Only in Corinth does Paul both designate his community as an *ekklēsia* (e.g., 1:2) and then speak separately of them as regularly convening *ekklēsiai* ("meetings"; 11:18; 14:19, 28).

(1 Cor 14:26), praying (1 Cor 14:14–17), singing (1 Cor 14:14–17; 26), eating togeth-er (1 Cor 11:17–34)[224] and the sharing of spiritual gifts with one another (*charis-mata*; 1 Cor 12:4–11; 14:1–40).

If one re-reads the issues Paul addresses with his Corinthian *ekklēsia* through the lens of a rhetorical-critical reading, then those issues can be re-framed metaphorically using the following civic terminology. As the analogous president (*epistatēs*) of his Corinthian *ekklēsia*,[225] Paul oversees a socio-economically diverse *dēmos* (1 Cor 1:26; 6:9–11).[226] Paul mentions that the fol-lowing 'agenda' (*programma* or *prographē*) items arose formally *en ekklēsia* and informally outside of assembly times: '*eisangelia*' over sexual mores (1 Cor 5:1–13);[227] unwarranted resolution of judicial issues outside of the

---

224   The practice of Corinthian Christ-followers to eat "the Lord's supper" (1 Cor 11:20) whenev-er they gathered *en ekklēsia* (1 Cor 11:18) is significantly more frequent than the usual once a month banqueting schedule among Greco-Roman associations (*collegia*/*thiasoi*) (John S. Kloppenborg, "Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 16–30, esp. 22). See Harland for correlations be-tween the Corinthians' love feast and the socio-religious functions of feasts in voluntary associations (*Associations*, 56–61) and the possibility of "wildly trangressive" behaviour during them (*Dynamics* of *Identity*, 163–69).

225   See n. 106 (Ch. 4). Gillihan cites San Nicolò's work on Hellenistic Egypt which claims that one common rule within the *nomoi*, or regulations, of voluntary associations was that internal brawling among members was subject to internal sanctions. The president was most often the person given the necessary authority to mete out fines or other penalties (*Civic Ideology*, 87–88).

226   Citizens of many socio-economic ranges participated in the Athenian *ekklēsia*. Xenophon somewhat derogatorily, comments on the makeup of the *ekklēsia* of his day: "The fullers or the cobblers or the builders or the smiths or the farmers or the merchants, or the traf-fickers in the market-place who think of nothing but buying cheap and selling dear? For these are the people who make up the Assembly" (*Memorabilia*, 3.7.6). Translation from *Xenophon. Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 2 (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921/repr. 1971).

227   Paul pronounces a judgment of 'exile' upon the sexual offender (1 Cor 5:11–13). Charges of *eisangelia* were brought against adulterers before the *ekklēsia* in classical Athens (see n. 112 [Ch. 3]). There are two types of *eisangelia: eis tēn boulēn* and *eis ton dēmon*. The *eis tēn boulēn* is a public action against magistrates for misconduct while in public of-fice. These cases were heard in the Council of 500 (*boulē*), with serious cases being re-ferred to the *dikastērion* (Mogens Hermann Hansen, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987], 212). A judicial determination could be made by the *ekklēsia* or delegated by the *boulē* to a different judicial sub-committee than the *dikastēria*. The judicial sub-committee which presided over charges of *eisangelia* was comprised of a tribunal of heliasts under the presidency of the *thesmothetai*. By the

ekklēsia (1 Cor 6:1–11);[228] concern over mixed marriages (2 Cor 6:14–18);[229] the status of slaves and masters (1 Cor 7:17–24);[230] the need to receive and to honour benefactors (1 Cor 9:1–18); the role of women *en ekklēsia* (1 Cor 11:1–16; 14:33b–37); assembly protocol for prophetic 'rhetors' and other *ekklēsia* members when gathered *en ekklēsia* (1 Cor 14:1–40); and 'foreign policy' initiatives, such as the collection of financial support for Jerusalem-based Christ-followers (e.g., 1 Cor 16:1–4; Rom 15:25–31) by Paul's trans-local association of Macedonian and Achaian *ekklēsiai* (Rom 15:26).[231] Such a metaphorical re-reading of Paul's instructions to his non-civic *ekklēsiai* underlines the integrated nature of politics and religion within his Christ-follower associations. The concomitant conclusion, however, that Paul pursued a real-world political agenda in competition with civic, regional or imperial authorities, whether of a neutral (van Kooten) or of a counter-imperial (Horsley) nature, is not a necessary corollary.

beginning of the 4th century, even cases of public morality, such as adultery, apparently were brought forward for consideration as *eisangelia* (Gustav Glotz, *The Greek City and Its Institutions* [New York: Barnes and Noble, 1929/1969], 167).

228   See n. 106 (Ch. 4). San Nicolò notes that one common rule within the *nomoi*, or regulations, of Hellenistic Egyptian voluntary associations was that fellow members were prohibited from suing one another in public courts. Lawsuits were arbitrated by a special juridical committee within the association (*Civic Ideology*, 87–88).

229   Paul exhorts the 'citizens' ('*ekklēsiastaí*') of his Corinthian *ekklēsia* not to enter into partnership with 'non-citizens', that is, those whom he calls "unbelievers" (*apistoi*; 2 Cor 6:14, 15). This injunction presumably also includes marriage partnerships. This concern, that only a marriage of two Christ-follower 'citizens' be allowed within the Corinthian *ekklēsia*, mirrors citizenship policy in classical Athens established by Pericles in 451/450 BCE. Aristotle affirms the continuance of this policy in his day (mid-4th cent. BCE) (Arist. *Pol.* 3.1275b). Aristotle notes that qualifications for being considered a natural born citizen had changed from needing only an Athenian father to requiring two Athenian parents who are lawfully wedded (ἐξ ἀστῆς καὶ ἐγγυητῆς).

230   See my discussion of Greek inscriptions in which the manumission of slaves is legitimated by a civic *ekklēsia*.

231   The word *koinon* can denote a trans-local alliance between two or more *poleis* (e.g., "τῶν Βοιωτῶν"; *SIG* 457.10 [Thespiae, 3rd cent. BCE]), or between non-civic groups such as guilds or associations ("τὸ κ. τῶν τεκτόνων"; *POxy* 53.2 [4th cent. CE]) (see also *LSJ*, κοινός, ή, όν, and ός, όν). Oligarchs across the Greek East during the Imperial period developed both formal and informal trans-local alliances. See n. 55 (Ch. 2) for discussion of "the *koinon* of Asia" which Macro anachronistically describes as an exclusively religious institution which oversaw the provincial imperial cult that was situated in Pergamon. Informal alliances between *polis* oligarchs were based upon educational, cultural, and political commonalities (Judith Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* [RMCS; New York: Routledge, 2009], 23–24).

Paul's people-centred civic ideology formed a political 'defense mechanism' for, not necessarily a political movement of, his 'subversive' social networks of Christ-followers.

4.3.6   *Summary: Pauline* Ekklēsiai *and Political Identity*

When it comes to usages of the word *ekklēsia* within Paul's undisputed writings, I have suggested that, on the institutional level, Paul's use of *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective identity reflects civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society that is not counter-imperial, nor a trans-local parallel political organization. Rather, Paul views each *ekklēsia* community as a trans-local Jewish voluntary association that was socially accessible to Greco-Roman participants. Through Paul's use of political terminology, he presents his non-civic *ekklēsia* associations as pro-'democratic', counter-oligarchic participants in the ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse" of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor.

The positive 'political' nature of these new pro-'democratic' communities particularly comes to the fore in the Corinthian correspondence. Paul's two (or three) letters are replete with examples of how comprehensively his new symbolic universe re-orders earthly politics. By prioritizing "agapic communalism" as the social expression of the "*nomos* of Christ" (1 Cor 9:21; 13:4–8a; Gal 6:2; cf. 5:14), love becomes the rationality (*nous*) to which all other human *nomoi*, and thus associations, must conform. Paul's love-based, socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*, thus, undermines socio-economic stratification among the members of his Corinthian *ekklēsia*. Paul's *ekklēsia* politics would also have held external implications. As his *ekklēsia* members lived out a love-based, socio-ethnic *dēmokratia* they would have affected their social and political worlds. Perhaps the time has now come to lay down the counter-imperial brush, not least with respect to the *ekklēsia* ideology Paul espouses in his Corinthian correspondence, and to re-paint Paul's *ekklēsia* identity construction project with more positive socio-political brushstrokes.

4.4   *Ekklēsia* as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?

Not only does Paul's designation of his multi-ethnic communities as *ekklēsiai* situate them within a pro-'democratic' ideology, their group designation also can be said to evoke pro-Jewish rhetoric. It accomplishes this in at least six respects. Three relate to Paul's theological portrayal of his communities as Jewish sacred space (1 Corinthians, Romans). He depicts his *ekklēsiai*: (1) as the body

of the Jewish *Christos* (Messiah);[232] (2) as the living temple of God; and (3) as a sacred synagogue community within which Christ-followers are metaphorically manumitted from enslavement to sin. The other three ways evoke uses of the word *ekklēsia* in Jewish sources. Two I have already explored. The word *ekklēsia* refers to two types of Jewish synagogue communities: semi-public associations in the Diaspora, such as Philo's Alexandrian *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108, or public *ekklēsia* assemblies located in Judea (e.g., Sirach). The other way yet to be explored is the Septuagint's use of the word *ekklēsia* for the historical nation of Israel.

Even if one allows that the combined witness of these six aspects of Jewish identity infers Paul's interest in situating his *ekklēsia* within a Jewish heritage, the question still remains to be asked if Paul's interest thereby was integrative or supersessionist. In other words, is Paul's identity construction project trying further to root his Jewish and gentile communities within religio-ethnic Israel, or is he trying to expropriate the religio-ethnic privileges of historic Israel and locate them within his *ekklēsiai*, the trans-locally connected diasporic communities of an ostensibly "new Israel"?

In order best to weigh the options, Paul's ideology first bears examination to see if there is an inherent malleability in his use of the terms "Jew," "circumcision," and "Israel." If not, then it becomes less probable that Paul's *ekklēsia* usage is also malleable enough for Paul to expropriate the supra-local identity

---

232   John J. Collins notes that one of the earliest usages of the term *Christos* for a coming Davidic king is found in the *Psalms of Solomon*, which can be dated to at least the mid-1st century BCE given historical allusions to the Hasmonean dynasty and the death of Pompey (48 BCE) (*The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 49). Not all Jews in the 1st century CE, whether in Judea or the Diaspora, held messianic expectations. But some did. With respect to Judea, Josephus describes three kingly messianic pretenders (Judas, Simon, Athrongeus) who arrived in the wake of the death of Herod the Great (4 BCE; *B.J.* 2.55f). The sectarians at Qumran expected either one messiah ("the <messiah> of Aaron and Israel"; CD 12.23–13.1; 14.18, 19) or two ("the messiahs of Aaron and Israel"; 1QS 9.11; the priestly messiah and the messiah of Israel; 1QSa 2.11, 20). In *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174 10–11) the sectarian messiah is identified as "the branch of David" (see also 4Q285 5.iii). This identification of a messiah with the Davidic lineage is also evident in *Ps. Sol.* 17:21 ("son of David") and 17:32 (*christos kyrios*). According to Kenneth Atkinson these two titles are only used of messianic kings in post-HB literature ("On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17," in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* [ed. C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000], 106–23, esp. 107).

and covenantal privileges of the *ekklēsia* of Israel (LXX) for his communities. Second, if Jewish usage of the term *ekklēsia* (or of its Hebrew equivalent) allows for its application to a sub-group of Israel rather than only to the supra-local nation of Israel as a whole, then Jews may have perceived a Pauline *ekklēsia* association simply as being another synagogue community within the pluriform Judaism(s) of the Diaspora. Within that institutional paradigm, a diasporic Jew would not have seen an *ekklēsia* association as self-presenting as the replacement/fulfillment of religio-ethnic Israel. I have already suggested that *ekklēsia* did in fact function as an Israelite sub-group identity for at least one semi-public association in Egypt. In this section, I will add the witness of another Jewish semi-public association, this one in the land of Judea, which used the Hebrew word for *ekklēsia* (*qhl*) as its sub-group identity.

By way of summary, then, the combined witness of Paul's ideology and of the existence of Jewish *ekklēsia* associations are the two key factors that will determine if the scales tip in favour of viewing the impulse behind Paul's *ekklēsia* identity project as being non-supersessionist. If so, then at the institutional level, Paul is attempting further to integrate his multi-ethnic diasporic communities in permanent fashion into a Jewish heritage by virtue of their enduring group identity as *ekklēsiai*.

4.4.1   *"Jew," "Circumcision," and "Israel": Malleable Pauline Terminology?*

There are at least four passages which form the *crux interpretum* for determining whether Paul's *ekklēsia* identity project was supersessionist. The four passages are: Rom 2:17–29, Phil 3:3, Gal 6:12–16, and Rom 9–11. The key issue in Rom 2 is whether the ethnic identifier "Jew" is a malleable term which simultaneously can both include non-Jews and exclude Jews who are not followers of Jesus, the Jewish *Christos*. If such a case can be made, then Rom 2 would form a precedent for suggesting that, at times, Paul expands the semantic range of another Jewish term, "Israel," so as simultaneously to include non-Jews and exclude non-messianic Jews. In Phil 3:3 Paul appears supersessionally to spiritualize one key Jewish ethno-religious identity marker: circumcision. Paul's phrases "the Israel of God" (Gal 6:16) and "all Israel" (Rom 11:26) are two prime examples cited by Wright and others that the term "Israel" can demonstrate terminological malleability.[233]

---

233   Bruce Hansen views Gal 6:16 as being a supersessionist statement: Paul "identifies the church with ancient Israel (Gal 6:16; 1 Cor 10:1, 2; 12:2; Col 1:12–14; 2.11)" (*All of You are One*, 41).

4.4.1.1   Rom 2:17–29 ("A So-called Jew")

The key question in Romans 2 is whether Paul broadens the semantic range of the word "Jew" (*Ioudaios*). Such a conclusion seems inevitable if one agrees with the majority consensus that in Rom 2:17–29 Paul addresses an ethnic Jew.[234] If an ethnic Jew is being addressed, then Paul's phrase "so-called Jew" seems to imply that the term "Jew" can now be applied to non-Jews.[235] Matthew Thiessen, for one, disagrees. Building upon the work of Runar M. Thorsteinsson,[236] Thiessen argues that "Paul addresses a gentile, specifically a gentile who has judaized and now thinks of himself as a Jew."[237]

Thiessen rehearses some facts that "that should give pause to any interpreter who believes that in Rom 2:17–29 Paul redefines Jewishness, undermining its ethnic meaning and constructing a spiritualized meaning that includes

---

234   Matthew Thiessen helpfully summarizes the consensus view: "Most interpreters believe that in Rom 2:17–29 Paul engages a Jewish interlocutor and, in the process, redefines Jewishness. Standard interpretations run roughly as follows: in vv. 17–20 Paul echoes this Jewish person's lofty, boastful self-description; in vv. 21–27, Paul demonstrates that this Jewish person has no ability to boast in his law observance and circumcision because he does not keep the entirety of the Jewish law, resulting in his being reckoned as uncircumcised; and in vv. 28–29, Paul concludes that true Jewishness and true circumcision are inner realities, unrelated to genital circumcision. In short, then, most scholars believe that in Rom 2:17–29 Paul rejects the common definition of Jewishness in his day, including those marks of identity which were thought to distinguish Jews from others" ("Paul's Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17–29," *NovT* 56 [2014]: 373–391, esp. 373–74).

235   See, for example, Dunn, *Romans*, 125 and N. T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans* (NIBC 10; Nashville: Abingdon, 2001), 448–49.

236   Runar M. Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography* (ConBNTS 40; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003).

237   Thiessen concisely summarizes the conclusions reached by his argument: "the Jew of this passage is only a so-called Jew. He thinks of himself as a Jew, but Paul disagrees. And Paul disagrees, not because he has redefined Jewishness, but because he does not believe that a gentile can actually become a Jew. Paul rejects the belief, held by some of his contemporary Jews, believers in Jesus and otherwise, that gentiles needed to, or at the very least could, become Jews. For Paul, as for a number of other second-temple Jews, most notably the author of *Jubilees*, gentiles profited nothing from the adoption of the law. Paul could allude to the details of the law in Genesis 17, as well as to the prophet Jeremiah, to bolster his claim that getting circumcised did not make gentiles into Jews; it, in fact, reconfirmed their identity as transgressors, since they were breaking the very law they were trying to keep. Paul believed that undergoing circumcision and adopting the Jewish law left gentiles in the same predicament facing non-judaizing gentiles (Rom 1:18–32). In contrast, Paul believed that the God of Israel had dealt with the gentile problem in Christ, a belief he carefully unpacks in Rom 3:21–8:39" ("Gentile Circumcision," 390–91).

Jews and gentiles who believe in Jesus."[238] Thiessen accords with scholars, such as Philip Esler, who problematize a "spiritualized" reading of *Ioudaios*. Esler notes the ethno-religious tension that is created between Rom 2:17–29 and Rom 3:1–8: "Realizing that these comments [i.e., Rom 2:17–29] may appear to have erased the reality of the divine election of Israel, Paul draws back a little to reassert the existence of Judean [i.e., Jewish] privileges (Rom 3:1–8)."[239]

Thiessen, in agreement with Esler's reading of Rom 2:28, brings the ethnic particularity of the term *Ioudaios* to the fore by giving due consideration to the minimalist syntax therein. The Greek of NA[28] requires that one add words, especially verbs such as *eimi*, when translating vv. 28–29 into English.[240] The additions in the RSV appear to allow that "there is a true Jewishness which has nothing to do with genital circumcision and other traditional cultural signifiers of Jewish identity. The true Jew is a spiritual Jew."[241] John M. G. Barclay and Stanley Kent Stowers, on the other hand, argue for maintaining a minimalist

---

238 Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 374. First, Thiessen notes that of Paul's 14 uses of *Ioudaios* outside of Romans, it always refers to a person who is ethnically Jewish. *Ioudaios* is contrasted with *Hellēn* 5× ("Greeks"; Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 1:22, 24; 10:32; 12:13) and with *ethnē* 4× ("gentiles"; Gal 2:13–15 [3×]; 1 Cor 1:23). The other five occurrences of *Ioudaios* "clearly refer to Jews in an ethnic sense" (1 Thess 2:14; 1 Cor 9:20 [3×]; 2 Cor 11:24) (Ibid., 374). Second, Thiessen identifies some concomitant interpretive challenges associated with Paul's use of *Ioudaios* within Romans. The three occurrences of *Ioudaios* prior to Rom 2:28–29 contrast the *Ioudaios* with the *Hellēn* (Rom 1:16; 2:9, 10). Paul's contrast of the *Ioudaios* and the *Hellēn* in Rom 3:9 suggests that the term *Ioudaios* in Rom 3:1 functions as an ethnic signifier. Further afield in Romans, Paul appears to be consistent in his use of *Ioudaios* in reference to an ethnic Jew. Paul contrasts the *Ioudaios* to *ethnē* (Rom 3:29; 9:24) and to *Hellēn* (10:12) (Ibid., 374).

239 Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 153. See Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 374–75.

240 Rom 2:28, 29 (NA[28]) reads, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή· 29 ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.

241 The RSV reads: "For he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal. His praise is not from men but from God." Commentaries which translate Rom 2:28–29 in a similar vein include: Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 123; Peter Stulmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: WJK Press, 1994), 48–49; Simon J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 197–98; Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer* (15th ed.; KEKNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 108; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996), 96–97.

translation of the Greek in Rom 2:28–29.[242] Hans K. Arneson provides one example of such a translation:

> For it is not the outward Jew, nor the outward circumcision in the flesh, but the hidden Jew, and the circumcision of the heart in spirit and not in letter, whose praise [is] not from humans but from God.[243]

Thiessen notes that Arneson's translation avoids three pitfalls. First, it makes superfluous the double addition of *Ioudaios* and *peritomē* ("circumcision") incorporated by scholars such as Cranfield.[244] Second, it does not require the addition of the word *alēthinos* ("true," NRSV; "real," RSV) in reference to what constitutes a Jew or circumcision in Paul's mind.[245] Third, Arneson's less embellished translation makes more explicit the fact that even though praise from God is not dependent on one's ethnic heritage (*Ioudaios*) or on one's religious observances (*peritomē*) (Rom 2:28–29), nonetheless the *Ioudaioi* still are a privileged people by virtue of God having entrusted them with his words (Rom 3:1–9). If Paul had redefined Jewishness in Rom 2:28–29, one would have expected his ensuing discussion on the benefits of Jewishness to have continued in that same vein. Such is not the case. Rather, as Thiessen emphasizes, Paul "reverts back to discussing the benefit of being ethnic Jews and observing the rite of genital circumcision as though Paul had not redefined Jewishness and circumcision."[246]

---

242   Barclay notes that "the Greek here is elliptical, with several missing verbs and nouns, but, given the dangers of interpretative paraphrase, it is well to use as few additions as possible" ("Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2:25–29 in Social and Cultural Context," *NTS* 44 [1998]: 536–556, esp. 545). Stowers affirms the interpretive dangers in translating Rom 2:28–29: "The highly elliptical language of 2:28–29 makes it easy to read and translate, as traditional Christian treatments have, in a manner that spiritualizes circumcision and Judaism to the point that they vanish" (*A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994], 155).

243   Hans K. Arneson, "Revisiting the Sense and Syntax of Romans 2:28–29," (forthcoming; cited in Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 377).

244   C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (6th ed.; 2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 1.175.

245   Thiessen notes that "English interpreters are not alone here" ("Gentile Circumcision," 377, n. 15). German interpeters include Lohse (*Brief an die Römer*, 113–14; "rechter Jude," "wahre Beschneidung") and Ulrich Wilckens (*Der Brief an die Römer* [3 vols.; EKKNT VI; Ostfildern/Einsiedeln/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Patmos/Benziger/Neukirchener, 1982–1997], 1.156); "wer in Wahrheit 'Jude' ist," "wahre Beschneidung"). French interpreters include Simon Légasse (*L'Épître de Paul aux Romains* [LD 10; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002], 211; "le vrai juif").

246   Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 378.

Who then could be Paul's interlocutor in Rom 2:17 ("But if you call yourself a Jew …")? Thorsteinsson takes care to note that "Paul does not actually state that the person addressed in 2:17 *is* a Jew. Rather, this person is depicted as someone who wants to be *called* a Jew."[247] He identifies this person as being a non-Jew who believes himself to have become Jewish not least by virtue of genital circumcision. Thiessen concurs but develops Thorsteinsson's argument further since it "fails to provide a compelling explanation for the way in which vv. 21–27 function to demonstrate that this gentile interlocutor's claim to Jewishness is, to Paul's mind, false."[248] Thiessen asks, "what particular aspect of the law is his interlocutor guilty of preaching but not keeping? The answer, as Rom 2:25–27 makes clear, is the rite of circumcision."[249]

How, though, one might ask, is a circumcised gentile convert to 'Judaism' guilty of being considered uncircumcised by ethnic Jews? Thiessen's answer is that Paul considers circumcision of value for his non-Jewish interlocutor only if he has followed "the entirety of the law of circumcision," not simply "the Jewish law" in general.[250] Specifically, Thiessen points to the injunction in the law of circumcision that requires a Jewish male to be circumcised on the eighth day.[251] Such a requirement could never be fulfilled by a non-Jewish convert; each one would have been circumcised well beyond their eighth day of life. Thiessen suggests that such an understanding, which Paul derives from LXX Jer 9:24–25,[252] "enables the reader to make sense of Paul's seemingly nonsensical claim that one can be circumcised and yet be considered a transgressor of the law through circumcision."[253]

---

247 Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor*, 159 (author's emphasis).

248 Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 379. See pp. 379–90 for Thiessen's argument for a gentile interlocutor in Rom 2:21–27.

249 Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 384.

250 Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 385.

251 Thiessen writes that, "according to the legislation of Gen 17:12 and Lev 12:3, Jewish circumcision is distinct from the circumcision of other nations in that it occurs on the eighth day after birth. Covenantal circumcision is not merely any form of circumcision, but specifically circumcision on the eighth-day" ("Gentile Circumcision," 387).

252 Thiessen contends that "Paul is not the first Jew to claim that physical circumcision of gentiles is to be considered uncircumcision, since this is the way Jeremiah characterized circumcised gentiles in LXX Jer 9:24–25" ("Genile Circumcision," 388). For a detailed analysis of Paul's use of LXX Jer 9:24–25 in Rom 2:25–29, see Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 388–90. LXX Jer 9:24–25 translates as "Behold the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will visit upon all the circumcised their foreskin. On Egypt, and on Idumea, and on Edom, and on the sons of Ammon, and on the sons of Moab, and on every one who shaves his face round about, that is, those dwelling in the wilderness—for all gentiles are uncircumcised in flesh, and all of the house of Israel are uncircumcised in their heart."

253 Thiessen, "Gentile Circumcision," 387.

In sum, Thiessen and Thorsteinsson both contend that Paul is not redefining the term "Jew" in Rom 2. Rather, they suggest that Paul is speaking to a gentile proselyte who self-proclaims as being a Jew by virtue of his circumcision. To paraphrase Thiessen: in Romans 2 Paul is not changing the definition of what it means to be a Jew; he is reconfirming the definition of a Jew as being one who is circumcised *on the eighth day*, a reality that no circumcised gentile could claim. Thus, no gentile, even if circumcised, would ever be considered a Jew by Jews. Nor for that matter, then, would Jews name gentiles as being part of socio-ethnic Israel.

If Thiessen and Thorsteinsson are correct, then Rom 2:28, 29 *cannot* be used as a precedent from which one can then argue, as N. T. Wright for example does, that Paul also theologically redefines the socio-ethnic term "Israel" into a spiritual entity ("the church") which is comprised not only of Jews but also of gentiles who are *en Christos* (e.g., Gal 6:16, "the Israel of God"). Such a claim must be able to stand on its own merit without the benefit of citing Rom 2:28–29 as a precedent.

4.4.1.2   Phil 3:3 ("The [True] Circumcision")

Does the rhetorical "tug of war" found between Rom 2:17–29 and Rom 3:1–8 also underlie Paul's ostensible redefinition of who comprises "the circumcision" in Phil 3? Paul's statement that "we are the circumcision" in Phil 3:3 is immediately followed with Paul's recitation of his ethnic pedigree, one aspect of which is the fact that he was "circumcised on the eighth day" (Phil 3:5).[254] It is tempting to claim that Paul is here asserting, in some sort of supersessionist fashion, that "the ['true'] circumcision" are those "who worship in the Spirit of God and boast in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil 3:3).

Peder Borgen provides a non-supersessionist way of reading Phil 3:3. Borgen claims that Paul views the cross as being a replacement for circumcision, insofar as circumcision confirms one's covenant status in the people of God.[255]

---

254   Phil 3:4b–6 read, "If anyone else has reason to be confident in the flesh, I have more: circumcised on the eighth day, a member of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law, a Pharisee; as to zeal, a persecutor of the *ekklēsia*; as to righteousness under the law, blameless."

255   Peder Borgen, "Observations on the Theme 'Paul and Philo' Paul's Preaching of Circumcision in Galatia (Gal 5:11) and Debates on Circumcision in Philo," in *The Pauline Literature and Theology* (ed. S. Pederson; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 85–102. Borgen notes, for example, that Paul's reasoning for his consistent polemic against circumcision and Torah observance for gentile Christ-followers is directly tied to the fact that these Jewish identity markers diminish the cross (Gal 1:4; 2:21; 3:1, 13; 5:11; 6:12, 14). The (deutero-)Pauline letter to the Colossians corroborates that *topos*. Colossians implies that

Paul's emphatic reliance on the cross event (suffering, death, and resurrection; Phil 3:10, 11) within the immediate context of his list of ethnic qualifications (Phil 3:5, 6) lend purchase to Borgen's point. Framing Paul's comments (Phil 3:3) within this context reinforces the socio-ethnic value of being a Jew, yet without circumventing the fact that "the righteousness from God [is] based on faith" (Phil 3:9b) in the cross event (surrogate circumcision) and not "from the Torah" (e.g., physical circumcision; Phil 3:9a).

4.4.1.3   Gal 6:16 ("The Israel of God")

N. T. Wright,[256] James Dunn,[257] and Terence Donaldson,[258] among other "ecclesiological" interpreters of Gal 6:16,[259] argue in varying ways that Paul uses

---

Jesus' death is portrayed as his circumcision (Col 2:11), which then suggests that circumcision for followers of Jesus the *Christos* is also accomplished in the cross.

256   N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 250; idem, *Letter to the Romans*, 689–90; idem, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2 vols.; Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 4; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 2.1146. Wright notes that "There is of course no precedent in second-temple literature for a meaning of 'Israel' which would correspond to the meaning most commentators believe it must bear in Galatians 6; but then there wouldn't be. Until Paul, nobody had imagined what it might mean for the people of God if the messiah appeared *and was crucified*. Unprecedented situations generate unprecedented results" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1146 [author's emphasis]).

257   J. D. G Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody, MA: Hendriksen, 1993), 345. Dunn suggests that the phrase "Israel of God" refers, in its essence, to the Jewish people as a whole. He provides one important caveat, however: "in light of [Paul's] earlier argument, that would have to mean the Jewish people precisely in their covenant identity, 'Israel' rather than 'the Jews'" (Ibid., 345). Thus, in Dunn's mind, the title also includes gentile *Christos*-followers, since Israel consists "of all of Abraham's offspring, heirs according to the promise" (cf. Gal 3:29). Dunn's approach appears to represent a carefully nuanced distinction from the ecclesiological interpretation; he allows for the fact that Jews who do not believe in Jesus as the *Christos* continue to retain the identity of "the Israel of God." Dunn then qualifies this with his understanding that what is implicit in Gal 6.16 is Paul's hope that such Jewish unbelief ultimately will translate into a belief in his *Christos*.

258   Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 237–38. Donaldson is careful, though, along with Dunn, to note that Paul does not deny to the unbelieving segment of the Jewish nation the identity of "Israel" in the full covenantal sense, despite the fact that they are presently disobedient to God's messianic purposes.

259   Christopher Zoccali affirms his belief that in Gal 6:16 Paul names both Jews and gentiles in Christ as "the Israel of God" yet at the same time is careful to nuance that claim so as to avoid supersessionist implications: "Therefore, based on Rom 2:29 and Gal 6:16 one could conclude that Paul would indeed make the polemical claim that Christ-following Gentiles

the term "Israel of God" in reference to the universal, multi-ethnic "Church of God," which is comprised both of Jews and Gentiles.[260] One interpretative foundation upon which Wright builds that argument is his contention that in Rom 2:17–29 Paul uses the term "Jew" in malleable fashion such that it also includes gentile followers of the Jewish *Christos*.[261] If one accepts Thiessen's analysis of Rom 2:17–29, however, then Wright loses a key precedent for his conclusion on how to interpret Paul's term "Israel of God."

The "ecclesiological" interpretation of Gal 6:16 is not shared by all. John Gager claims that "Paul nowhere addresses his churches as Israel. Nor does he transfer to them Israel's distinctive attributes."[262] Gager agrees with Ernest D. Burton's designation of the "Israel of God" as "the pious Israel, the remnant according to the election of grace (Rom 11:5)."[263] William Campbell notes one problematic implication of incorporating gentiles into the corporate identity "Israel." He suggests that if "gentiles are so designated, even if only in association with Jewish Christ-followers, they may then separate from Jewish

---

are more truly 'Israel' than Jews who fail to believe (cf. Phil 3:13). Yet, *Paul explicitly warns in Romans 11 against any such triumphalism and supersessionism among his gentile converts* (cf. 1 Cor 4) … *they have become part of Israel's story* (cf. 1 Cor 10:1ff; Rom 1:1–4; 9:4–5; 11:16–18; 15:8–12)" (*Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present* [Salem, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010], 116–17 [author's emphasis]). See also Caroline Johnson-Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 131.

260   Zoccali helpfully provides an extensive list of scholars, who, to varying degrees, also hold the ecclesiological position (*Whom God Has Called*, 73, n 37).

261   Wright suggests that, "if Paul were to use 'Israel' in this passage [Gal 6:16] to mean 'the whole seed of Abraham, believing Jews and believing Gentiles together', this would constitute a seriously polemical redefinition. But that is hardly foreign either to his practice in general or to the present passage in particular. In general, we have already had occasion to notice his breathtaking redefinition of 'Jew' itself in Romans 2.29, and of 'circumcision' in Romans 2.26 and Philippians 3.3" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1146).

262   John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 228. Gager suggests that "the blessing [of 'peace and mercy'] falls on two separate groups: those who follow Paul's standard *and* the Israel to whom God will show his mercy, namely, 'all of Israel' (see Rom 11:26)" (Ibid., 228–29). Gager claims further that although "the RSV translation of Philippians 3:3 ('We are the true circumcision …') indicates such a transfer, the RSV translation at this point must be seen as dependent on the rejection-replacement view of Israel, not the other way around" (Ibid., 228).

263   Gager, *Origins*, 228; Ernest DeWitt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921), 358. DeWitt writes that "there is, in fact, no instance of his using *Israel*, except of the Jewish nation or a part thereof" (*Galatians*, 358).

Christ-followers and yet retain the title to Israel and her heritage independently, a possibility Paul warns against in Rom. 11."[264]

There are four primary ways to read the phrase "the Israel of God" in reference to people of Jewish ethnicity: (1) historical Israel as a whole;[265] (2) Jewish Christ followers (cf. Rom 9:6);[266] the total elect from historical Israel;[267] and (4) that segment of Jewish Christ-followers who require circumcision of gentile Christ followers.[268] Wright contends against any of these interpretive approaches:

> if it were the case that Paul, suddenly at this late stage, meant something
> else by 'God's Israel'—meant, for instance, to refer either to all Jews, or
> to all Christian Jews, or to some subset of either of those whether now or

---

264 William S. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 49. Campbell continues to say that "It cannot be, then, that Paul in any way refers in Gal. 6.16 to gentiles, as this would seemingly contradict Paul's concen over historical Israel's theological and sociological integrity" (Ibid., 49).

265 W. D. Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel," NTS 24 (1977): 4–39, esp. 10. In this view, Paul's ascription of mercy upon "the Israel of God," that is, upon all Jews, serves to lessen the harsh polemic he directs against the specific group of Jews in Galatia who seek to convince his gentile converts of their need to be circumcised.

266 For example, John Murray claims that "in Rom 9:6 Paul writes of 'an Israel within ethnic Israel'" (*Epistle to the Romans* [2 vols.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965], 2.9).

267 Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT 9; 3rd ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 417; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 275; DeWitt, *Galatians*, 357; and Peter Richardson *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTMS 10; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 82–83. Richardson comments that Paul asks for mercy for "all those Israelites who are going to come to their senses and receive the good news of Christ" (Ibid., 82). If Paul uses the term "the Israel of God" in reference to the total elect from historical Israel, then he prays for God's mercy both upon a present and a future group of Jews, that is, (1) those who presently believe that Jesus is the *Christos*; and (2) those Jews in the future who will do likewise in accordance with God's election (cf. Rom 11:26). In this respect, this approach is not dissimilar to the first interpretive option ("historic Israel as a whole"), except that it makes explicit Paul's (eschatological) hope of mercy upon historic Israel.

268 See Gottlob Schrenk, "Was bedeutet 'Israel Gottes'?" *Judaica* 6 (1949): 81–94; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Distinction between Jewish and Gentile Believers in Galatians," ABR 13 (1965): 29–44; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Fortress: Philadelphia, 1977), 323. In this view, the polemic in Galatians is directed against 'Jewish Christian' missionary opponents of Paul (the 'influencers'). Unless one reads a two-covenant approach here, the implication then is that "the Israel of God" has reference specifically to the group of Jewish Christ followers who, *contra* the 'influencers', support Paul's mandate for gentile inclusion exclusive of any adherence to Jewish identity markers, particularly ciricumcision.

in the future—then he would, quite simply, have made nonsense of the whole letter.[269]

Exegetical readings of the syntactically awkward phrase εἰρήνη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ figure prominently in deciding which interpretative option one chooses.[270] The *crux interpretum* for this Greek clause revolves around the translation of the second *kai*.

N. T. Wright details three potential ways to read Gal 6:16, depending on how one translates the *kai* which follows *eleos*: "(1) Peace and mercy (a) upon them ('those who walk by this rule') and [copulative *kai*][271] (b) upon the Israel of God (a different group from 'them'); (2) (a) peace upon 'those who walk by this rule'; and (b) mercy even [ascensive/adjunctive *kai*][272] for 'the Israel of God' (a different group from 'those who walk by this rule'); (3) peace and mercy upon 'those who walk by this rule', yes, even [explicative/epexegetical *kai*] upon 'the Israel of God' (i.e. the same group)."[273] This third option undergirds

---

269 Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1151.

270 Gal 6:16 reads, καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν, εἰρήνη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

271 In addition to "copulative," other descriptors which are used for a *kai* that connects an additional element to a discussion are "connective," "continuative," and "coordinate." This *kai*, which differentiates two groups, can be translated "and" or "also" (Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Tesatament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 761).

272 The ascensive use "adds an additional idea to the train of thought … it can also be translated 'also' indicating a key addition. This latter use ('also') is sometimes called adjunctive" (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 671). Richard A. Young translates the ascensive use as "even" and the adjunctive as "also." He defines the ascensive *kai* ("even") as "a focusing addition that futher develops the previous thought … the ascensive idea elaborates on the same thought, bringing it to a climax." He defines the adjunctive use ("also") as "a focusing addition that introduces another thought into the discussion" (*Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach* [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994], 188).

273 Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1148. Wright cites a possible echo by Paul in Gal 6:16 of "a well-known Jewish prayer formula" the so-called 'Eighteen Benedictions' (*Shemoneth Esreh*). The added Nineteenth Benediction is the reverse of Paul's order in Gal 6:16. It reads, "Show mercy and peace upon us, and on your people Israel" (Ibid., 2.1149). If Paul alludes to this Jewish benediction, then Wright suggests that in Gal 6:16 Paul may be thinking "of 'those who walk by this rule' not in the first instance as a general statement about 'all those in the Messiah', but as a specific description of what he wants to see in Galatia, with 'the Israel of God' then following as the larger category of 'all the Messiah's people, whoever and wherever they are'" (Ibid., 2.1149). Gregory Beale sees recourse to the Nineteenth Benediction as being unnecessary: (1) "because of the unlikelihood that the

Wright's identification of "the Israel of God" with the multi-ethnic Church comprised both of Jews and gentiles.[274] Thus, Wright's re-translation of Gal 6:16 reads, "Peace and mercy on everyone who lines up by that standard—yes, on God's Israel."[275]

My position aligns with the second syntactical option—the ascensive/adjunctive *kai*. Translating *kai* as "even" or "also" identifies two related sub-groups: (1) "those who walk by this rule" (i.e., those Galatian Christ-followers who do not require circumcision of gentiles); and (2) "also the Israel of God" (those Galatian Jewish Christ-followers who do require circumcision of gentiles). By identifying the Galatian judaizers as the "Israel of God" one also undermines the contention of some scholars that Paul is negatively contrasting "the Israel of God" (which they view as being the Church) with "Israel after the flesh" (1 Cor 10:18),[276] that is, ethnic Israel.[277] Rather, if only ethnic Jews are included in Paul's use of the term "Israel," then Gal 6:16 can in no way be a triumphalist

---

necessary form existed as early as the first century" ("Peace and Mercy upon the Israel of God: The Old Testament Background of Galatians 6:16b," *Bib* 80 [1999]: 204–23); and (2) because of Paul's use of LXX Isa 54:10 as being the more likely background: "Paul directly quotes Isa 54:1 in Gal 4:27, and allusions to the greater context of Isa 54 pervade much of the letter" (Ibid., 210).

274   In this, Wright follows on from J. B. Lightfoot who states that the phrase "the Israel of God" "stands here not for the faithful converts from the circumcision alone, but for the spiritual Israel generally, the whole body of believers whether Jew or Gentile" (*The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957], 225).Wright claims that the third syntactical option "is the one which, I am suggesting, the whole letter would indicate … [and that there is nothing] in the grammar to suggest that this is ruled out" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1149). Wright cites at least three theological factors that support his syntactical reading: (1) "For Paul, the idea of 'mercy' cannot be separated from the gospel of the Messiah"; (2) "it may well be that 'peace and mercy' is another echo of Isaiah 54 … [which] Paul has already quoted … at 4:27 … [and which] makes a further strong case for seeing 'Israel of God' in 6:16b not as a separate entity but precisely as the believing church" (Ibid., 2.1150); and (3) Paul echoing the so-called 'Eighteen Benedictions': "Show mercy and peace upon us, and on thy people Israel," in which "us" and "Israel" are one and the same referent (Ibid., 2.1149).

275   Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1142.

276   For example, J. B. Lightfoot (*Galatians*, 224–25) and N. T. Wright (*The Faithfulness of Paul*, 2.1147–48). Wright claims that the view that "'the Israel of God' … *must* mean 'the household of faith' … is then strengthened by, the implicit antithesis, 'Israel according to the flesh', in 1 Corinthians 10:18, however much commentators resist such a possibility" (Ibid., 2.1147–48 [author's emphasis]).

277   Concordant with Wright, Zoccali claims that "Paul refers to Israel when they are not exhibiting covenant fidelity in a qualifed way, as *merely* Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Cor 10:18; cf. Rom 9:8)" (*Whom God Has Called*, 121 n. 1).

statement. I would suggest further that "the Israel of God" are not members of Pauline *ekklēsiai*. Rather, following on from Betz who calls this sub-group of the Jesus movement "the Judaizers," I view them as having their apostolic allegiance centred in the apostolic community of *hoi hagioi* in Jerusalem.[278]

Betz's view that the phrase "Israel of God" refers specifically to "the Judaizers" gains additional reinforcement if one takes into account Robert Bryant's reiteratively rhetorical reading of Galatians.[279] Bryant claims that three themes which are introduced in the "salutation-exordium" (1:1–10)[280] are then reiterated in the concluding section.[281] These three themes which Paul develops in the rest of Galatians (1:11–6:10) are the rhetorical cords: (1) of the risen Christ; (2) of the crucified Christ; and (3) of the one who calls in the grace of Christ.[282] Concordant with an *exordium*, Bryant sees these three cords as then being succinctly reiterated in the postscript of the book (6:11–15), yet in reverse order.[283] He identifies Gal 6:16–18 as an epistolary postscript, wherein occurs the phrase

---

278   Betz, *Galatians*, 323.

279   Robert A. Bryant, *The Risen Crucified Christ in Galatians* (SBLDS 185; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001).

280   Bryant, *Risen Crucified Christ*, 140. Bryant suggests that the epistolary prescript (1:1–5) is a "salutation" with the rest of the introduction (1:6–10) being the "exordium." He justifies this *mixtum compositum* with the caveat that, "Though the address is written and sent as a letter, it is written to be presented orally and to be heard" (*Risen Crucified Christ*, 140). A "salutation" is where "speakers [focus on] … getting the audience's attention, and securing their good will—all of which are reflected in epistolary salutations" (Ibid., 133–34). An exordium is "where trained communicators strike the keynote of the discourse … When we view Gal 1:1–10 as a salutation-exordium, the unmistakable keynote is the 'gospel of Christ' (v. 7)" (Ibid., 140).

281   There is general consensus among scholars that Gal 1:6–9(10) serve as introductory material to the body of the letter. Scholars who delimit the opening section of Galatians as being 1:1–10 include: Burton, *Galatians*, lxxii–xxiv; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 79–86; and Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (SP 9; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 12–13.

282   The three themes are said to be: "the apocalyptic activity of God epitomized by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (1:1); the saving work of the Risen Crucified Christ (1:3–5); and the One who is calling forth the new Israel of God in the grace of Christ (1:6–10)" (*Risen Crucified Christ*, 225).

283   Bryant states that, "[The beginning] is the place where trained communicators strike the keynote of the discourse [since it] … is an especially effective location for providing a sample of the key themes to be developed in the body of the communication" (*Risen Crucified Christ*, 140). Bryant asserts that "… rhetorical exordiums [e.g., Gal 1:6–10] were related to the communication's *peroratio* or conclusion [e.g., Gal 6:11–15] where the speech is briefly recapitulated and the speaker's crowning point is made" (Ibid., 133–34).

"Israel of God." I would suggest a further nuance to Bryant's three-fold view. There is a fourth rhetorical cord in the introductory salutation/exordium (1:1–10) of which Bryant fails to take note for which the phrase "Israel of God" (6:16) provides a fitting rhetorical resolution.

The fourth rhetorical cord in the salutation/exordium (1:1–10) is Paul's polemical engagement with those who mandate circumcision for gentile followers of the Jewish *Christos* ("let that one be accursed"; 1:8, 9). I would suggest that Paul's phrase "the Israel of God" (6:16) reiterates that fourth theme. Paul's prayer in Gal 6:16 for mercy upon "the Israel of God" appears to provide a conciliatory nuance to his 'prayer' of imprecation upon a segment of "the Israel of God," that is, the judaizing sub-group of *Christos*-followers originally referenced in 1:1–10.[284] If so, then Bryant's delineation of the postscript would require expansion with the addition of verse sixteen (i.e., 6:11–15+16).

In the final verse (6:16) of the *inclusio* (6:11–15+16), Paul prays the benediction of peace (*shalom*) upon "those who follow this rule" (6:16a). "This rule" is that gentile Christ-followers do need not be circumcised (6:11–15). This prayer of peace, then, explicitly excludes judaizing Jewish Christ-followers since they do not follow "this rule." By excluding the Judaizers from his *shalom*, Paul reinforces his imprecatory 'prayer' at the beginning that they be accursed (1:8, 9). Yet, notwithstanding their misunderstanding of the Gospel, these Judaizers still remain fellow followers of the Jewish *Christos*. Paul's subsequent prayer for mercy (*chesed*; 6:16) upon them implicitly reinforces both that theological fact and Paul's commitment to retain his socio-religious ties with the Judaizers. By asking for mercy, he infers that this sub-group of Jewish Christ-followers have stepped outside of the sociological boundaries of "those who follow this rule," that is, his *ekklēsia* communities.

In this regard, then, Paul's prayer for mercy serves a dual rhetorical function: (1) By not giving the Judaizers a benediction of peace, Paul avoids being viewed as having reversed his initial negative assessment of their relationship to the gospel (i.e., "perverters of the gospel"; 1:7–9); (2) while, at the same time, by praying for God's mercy upon them, Paul "nips in the bud," so to speak, any schismatic impulse that might have arisen on the part of his Galatian *ekklēsiai* in light of his less than conciliatory language towards those self-same Judaizers

---

284   If one sees 6:16 as alluding back to 1:1–10 as a way for Paul to forestall his *ekklēsiai* from using his polemic against judaizing Christ-followers as a justification for creating a schism between themselves and James' Christ-followers, then one needs to extend the concluding segment of the Galatian *inclusio* one verse farther (6:11–16) than the postscript suggested by Bryant and others (6:11–15).

(1:8, 9).[285] Paul makes it clear earlier on (Gal 2:12) that his Galatian *ekklēsiai* knew that it was Jewish Christ-followers associated with James who were the ones promoting the judaizing of gentiles. Paul had first encountered and challenged this sub-group of the early Jesus movement in Syrian Antioch years earlier.

Paul's paradoxical strategy in Galatians of praying both for and against Judaizers is not unique in his acknowledged writings. That strategy also finds a parallel in Rom 11:28, 29. In this paradoxical passage it is not Judaizers who are in view, as in Gal 6:16, but rather Jews who do not follow Jesus as their *Christos*. Paul writes that "as regards the gospel they are enemies of God for your sake, but as regards election they are beloved, for the sake of their ancestors; for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable." In this passage Paul holds in tension the contrasting themes of Jews being both "enemies of God" (Rom 11:28a) and the "beloved of God" (Rom 11:28b). This tension is also evident in Galatians where Paul also holds concurrently both a positive and a negative assessment of his fellow Jews. In that case, however, those Jews are judaizing Christ-followers. If one uses the sentence structure of Rom 11:28–29 as a grid through which to read Paul's rhetoric in Galatians, then his argument in Gal 6:16 might be paraphrased as follows:

> As regards the gospel, these judaizing Jewish Christ-followers are enemies of God insofar as you, my *ekklēsiai*, are concerned, but as regards their election in their ancestor Abraham and in his Seed Jesus the *Christos*, they are beloved. Although I cannot pray *shalom* ("peace") upon them since they do not follow my rule of allowing Christ-following gentiles to remain uncircumcised, I do pray *chesed* ("mercy") upon them, since the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable with respect to socio-ethnic Israel, and, as such, also with respect to the judaizing messianic remnant of Israel, whom I call 'the Israel of God'.

The socio-religious location of all Jews within the early Jesus Movement as "the Israel of God" may have received reinforcement in the minds of Paul's *ekklēsia* members in Galatia if they were conversant with the rhetorical move in the Temple rededication narrative of 1 Maccabees. In 1 Macc 4:59 the followers of Judas Maccabeus are collectively designated as *pasa hē ekklēsia* Israēl ("all the

---

285 Susan G. Eastman argues that "the Israel of God" refers to historic Israel and that Paul prays a benediction of mercy over them because of the implications of his arguments in Galatians ("Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6:16 and Romans 9–11," *NTS* 56.3 [2010]: 367–95).

ekklēsia of Israel"). This serves as an allusion back to the return of God's glory to the Solomonic Temple (cf. LXX 2 Chron 6:3), which serves implicitly to affirm the religio-political legitimacy of the Maccabean movement. Paul uses the terms *ekklēsia* and "Israel of God" in reference to all Jews, which also then includes Jewish *Christos*-followers in his communities. But he only applies one term ("Israel of God") to judaizing *Christos*-followers. He does not also call them an *ekklēsia*. That term is reserved for his multi-ethnic Galatian *ekklēsia* associations. Might the lexical correlation of *ekklēsia* and Israel for his Jewish Christ-followers (Gal 1:2; 6:11, respectively) have hearkened his hearers/readers back to *hē ekklēsia Israēl* of the Maccabean, and thus, of the Solomonic, Temple dedication narratives? If so, these allusional dots would have created a line of socio-religious continuity forward to the "Israel" within the *ekklēsiai* in Galatia. This "Israel" (Jewish *Christos*-followers) then is reminded not only of the fact that they constitute a sacred temple in which God's glory dwells, but also that as a sacred *ekklēsia* they share in that glory with non-Torah observant gentiles qua gentiles. Such an inclusive perspective strikes right at the heart of the judaizers' exclusivist ideology.

4.4.1.4   Rom 11:26 ("All Israel")

There is still one other passage which some point to as evidence that for Paul the covenantal identity "Israel" was no longer the sole possession of ethnic Jews—Rom 11:26. In Rom 9–11 Paul reinforces the union of gentiles with historic Israel.[286] In chap. 11, Paul contends that gentile Christ-followers are grafted into the 'sacred tree,' so to speak, known as ethno-religious Israel (Rom 11:17–27). In verse 26 Paul speaks of "all Israel" being saved. To whom is he referring?

Chris Zoccali concisely overviews five ways in which scholars have interpreted Paul's phrase "all Israel" (Rom 11:26).[287] He identifies these

---

286   William Campbell comments that "the place of chs. 9–11 as an integral part of the letter has been firmly established" ("The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans," 171). See also, Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans* (1996); idem, "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 283–304. Nils Dahl claims that even the epistolary features of Romans affirm the literary centrality of chapters 9–11 ("The Future of Israel," in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977], 137–58, esp. 141).

287   Zoccali, *Whom God Has Called*, 91–117.

views as: (1) "eschatological miracle";[288] (2) ecclesiological;[289] (3) Roman mission;[290] (4) two-covenant;[291] and (5) total national elect.[292] Aside from the

---

288 "Eschatological miracle" scholars hold at least two key foundational assumptions in common on Paul's mystery. First, Israel's hardening against the gospel is a temporary state of affairs. Second, Israel's final salvation is an "eschatological miracle" that takes place only after the full number of gentiles have been saved. There are three sub-sets of this view. Sub-set one is that Paul refers to the whole nation ("all") but not to each member ("everyone"). Sub-set two is that Paul refers to every individual Jew (e.g., Jewett, *Romans*, 702). Sub-set three is that the phrase "all Israel" refers either in diachronic fashion to the faithful Jews of all time or in synchronic fashion to the faithful Jews alive when the *Christos* returns (e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 623). Irrespective of which sub-set one chooses, the one presupposition which all "eschatological miracle" scholars hold in common is that Israel's salvation follows rather than precedes the salvation of the gentiles. Such a view runs counter, however, to the universalism prevalent among Jews in Paul's day. In the Jewish eschatological schema gentiles were to come to salvation only after Israel had already done so. On this, see the works of Ernst Käsemann (*A Commentary on Romans* [trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 313–14), Dunn (*Romans*, 681), Douglas Moo (*The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 719–20); Byrne (*Romans*, 349–50, 354); Jewett (*Romans*, 701) and Terence L. Donaldson (*Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism* (*to 135 CE*) [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007]). See further 4.4.6. Ekklēsia *as Jewish Sacred Space and Paul's Gentile Mission*.

289 Wright, *Climax*, 249–51; idem, *Letter to the Romans*, 687–93; idem, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1239–46 and 2.1251. In a humorous turn-of-phrase, Wright cites "a Pauline remnant" who can be said to support his ecclesiological interpretation of Rom 11:26: "cf. e.g. Whiteley 1964, 97f.; Glombitza 1964–65; Giblin 1970, 303; Jeremias 1977; Martin 1981, 134.f; Ponsot 1982; Aageson 1986, 284.f; Chilton 1988 (cf. too Chilton 2004, 234: Paul was aiming 'to include all the Gentiles ... within Israel now defined by faith alone'); and, a notable back-up for the list, Barth 1936–1969, 2.2.300 (and behind him Irenaeus, Calvin and many others). Others are noted by Moo 1996, 721; Jewett 2007, 701 n. 73. See too the partial agreement from Donaldson, Keck (by implication), Niebuhr, and Wagner, noted below" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1239, n. 672).

290 Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans*, 239–88.

291 Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and Torah* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1987), 49–53; Krister Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 1–5; idem, "In No Other Name," in *Christian Witness and the Jewish People* (ed. A. Sovik; Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1976), 48–53; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 285–316; John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 128–42.

292 Zoccali favours the "total national elect" view since it "does not demonstrate a direct equation of the church with Israel (Wright), nor does it suggest they are wholly distinct, as per the two covenant interpretation of Gaston. Nor does it support Harink's reading that, while accomplished through Christ, Israel's salvation is ultimately guaranteed by

"ecclesiological" view which interprets "Israel" as being the multi-ethnic community of Christ-followers, the other four views each hold in common the assumption that Paul is speaking only of Jews, and thus that the term "Israel" is not malleable; it does not include non-Jews. This fact warrants a more focused analysis of the "ecclesiological" view, particularly the one championed by N. T. Wright.

Wright defines the "mystery" of Rom 11:25–27 as being the process whereby God is saving all peoples, that is, Jews and gentiles. He suggests, therefore, that it is "greatly preferable to take 'all Israel' in v. 26 as a typical Pauline polemical redefinition, as in Gal 6:16 … and in line also with Philippians 3.2ff."[293] Wright's point of departure from other ecclesiological interpreters is his understanding that in the "Jeremianic new covenant" (Jer 31:31–34) God has fully and finally dealt with the sin not only of Israel but also of the entire world. For Paul this "Jeremianic new covenant" was not future. It had already been inaugurated at Christ's resurrection, the singular event that forms the basis upon which both Jews and gentiles receive salvation.[294] As such, Wright contends that the covenant does not make special provision only for Jews whereby "'national righteousness' is suddenly affirmed."[295] Since, in Wright's mind, the new corporate identity of Jews and gentiles "in Christ" is the "church," Wright does not envision a wholesale restoration of "all Jews" in a shortened timeframe at the end of church history. Rather, he sees "a steady flow of Jews into the church, by grace through faith … [to] fulfill all aspects of the promises made to Abraham."[296]

A key intertextual foundation for his interpretation is the fact that in Rom 11:26b–27 Paul cites Isa 27:9 and 59:20. Neither Isaianic reference locates the salvation of Israel in a timeframe that is future (e.g., the *parousia*) to the inauguration of God's new covenant (i.e., the "Jeremianic new covenant"/

---

virtue of their historical election, irrespective of their acceptance of the gospel" (*Whom God Has Called*, 91–92). See also, R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg, 1945), 723–28; Herman N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (trans. John Richard DeWitt; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 354–61; William Hendriksen, *Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 379–82; Ben L. Merkle, "Romans 11 and the Future of Ethnic Israel," *JETS* 43/4 (2000): 709–21.

293 Wright, *Climax*, 250; idem, *Romans*, 689–90.

294 Wright, *Climax*, 251; idem, *Romans*, 691–93. Cf. also Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 625) and Jewett (*Romans*, 705).

295 Wright, *Climax*, 251.

296 Wright, *Climax*, 248–49.

Christ's death and resurrection).[297] Thus, Wright views the salvation of "all Israel" as being progressively fulfilled throughout "church" history (i.e., the history of "the Israel of God"; Gal 6:16), with its culmination taking place at the *parousia*.[298] Wright also cites Rom 9:6 in support of his view that Paul did not use the term "Israel" solely in reference to ethnic Jews. He argues that since Paul appears to distinguish between two "Israels" in Rom 9:6, one can assume that in Rom 11:25–26 Paul also is using "Israel" with two different meanings.[299]

Wright summarizes his version of the ecclesiological view as follows: Given the elect status of Israel (Rom 11:28–29), there "will always be ethnic Jews among the 'true Jews' of [Rom] 2:29; there will always be physically circumcised people among the 'true circumcision' of Phil 3:3; there will always be some from 'Israel according to the flesh' … among 'all Israel'" (Rom 11:26).[300] In all three cases, however, Wright contends that the terms "Jew," "circumcision," and "Israel" now include non-Jews by virtue of their faith in the Jewish *Christos*.

Wright's interpretation of "all Israel" in Rom 9:6 is not without its challenges. First, it is not at all clear that "Israel" is used only in reference to non-Jews in Rom 9:6.[301] As such, it is difficult to see how Rom 9:6 can be used as a precedent for suggesting that the phrase "all Israel" includes non-Jews. It appears, rather, that only ethnic Jews are in view in both uses of the term "Israel" in Rom 9:6. Of these two "Israels," one seems to be a sub-group of historic Israel. This sub-group would be the 'remnant' of Israel (cf. Rom 9:27), that is, those Jews who have placed their faith in Jesus as their *Christos*. The meta-group ("Israel") consists of all ethnic Jews irrespective of their position on whether Jesus is the *Christos*.

Second, Wright's view that the term "all Israel" (Rom 11:26) includes gentiles can be questioned given that 1st century Jews did not conceive of the possibility of gentiles being incorporated into the collective identity "Israel." Righteous

---

297   See esp. Wright's detailed discussion of the complex of verses behind 11:26b–27 (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1246–52).

298   See esp. Wright's discussion of the "hardening" of the Jews as a temporal or partitive description (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2.1235–39).

299   Wright, *Climax*, 250; idem, *Romans*, 690. Wright offers as further evidence Paul's citation of Joel 2:32 (Rom 10:13) in which the functional equivalent of "Israel" is quoted ("those who call upon the name of Yahweh") when he speaks of salvation for both Jews and gentiles (Wright, *Romans*, 665–66).

300   Wright, *Romans*, 693–94.

301   Zoccali notes that, although the definition of the term "Israel" is disputed in Rom 9:6 and 11:26, "throughout [the rest of] Rom 9–11 … 'Israel' unquestionably refers to the historical nation as distinct from the gentiles (9:[4], 27, 31; 10:19, 21; 11: [1], 2, 7, 11, 23, 25; cf. 15:8–12)" (*Whom God Has Called*, 97).

gentiles, that is, Jewish proselytes, were not considered to be part of the Mosaic covenant.[302] Not only were gentiles not seen as being "true Jews" but, on the other side of the ethnicity coin, so to speak, Jews also did not conceive of those self-same gentile proselytes as having maintained their gentile status. As such, one could say that gentile proselytes lived in a sort of "ethnic limbo."

Third, Wright appears to make a logical leap in his interpretation of Gal 3. Wright appropriately claims that Paul incorporated gentiles who were "in *Christos*" into the Abrahamic lineage (Gal 3:1–4:11) by virtue of their faith in the Seed of Abraham, Jesus the *Christos* (Gal 3:29).[303] Such an identification, however, need not warrant the corollary conclusion that gentile Christ-followers could self-designate as "Israel." The socio-ethnic entity "Israel" only began later with Abraham's grandson, Jacob, not with Abraham.

Given my analysis of Rom 11:26 and Gal 6:16, some not insignificant challenges arise when one presumes, in line with the "ecclesiological" view, that gentile Christ-followers are in view when Paul speaks about "Israel." If Paul in fact did reserve the term "Israel" for socio-ethnic Jews, then it is not unlikely that, in non-supersessionist fashion, he also affirmed the Jewish roots inherent in another dyadic identity, the term *ekklēsia*. By adopting *ekklēsia*, with its linguistic roots both in the Jewish LXX and in Greek civic politics, as the collective designation for his Jewish/gentile communities, Paul was able implicitly to affirm the continuation of the social and ethnic identities both of Jews and gentiles (e.g., Scythian, Roman, Ionian).[304] What Paul did not affirm was the

---

302   Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the* Pharisee (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 121.

303   Wright contends that "the central argument of the letter to the Galatians (3.1–4.11) is all about the redefinition of 'election' around Jesus the Messiah … The question of the whole chapter [ch. 3], then, must be understood as follows: who exactly constitutes the children, the 'seed' (*sperma*) of Abraham? The opening of the main argument (3.6–9) declares that the 'family' is the *covenant* family [i.e., the Gen 15 covenant], the *worldwide* family of many nations and the family of faith. The closing declares that the 'family', the *sperma*, consists of those who belong to the Messiah, who constitute the single family ('all one') in him, with no distinctions of ethnic origin, social status or even gender" (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 861 and 862, respectively [author's emphasis]).

304   Scholars of the Paul Beyond Judaism Perspective contend that the social identities of Jews and non-Jews continue to be relevant after they become Christ-followers. For example, William S. Campbell, "Participation in the Covenant or in Christ as Formative of Gentile Identity? The Rationale for Gentile Identity in Paul" (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Atlanta, GA, Nov 22, 2010); and Tucker, "Intercultural Interaction" (Nov 22, 2010); idem, *Remain in Your Calling* (2011). Tucker's work in many ways responds to the social-scientific approaches used in the influential volume edited by David Horrell

continuation of socio-economic stratification and ethnic privilege within the communal gatherings of his *ekklēsiai* (e.g., Gal 3:28).[305]

Perhaps the question of ethnic identity addressed by the author of 1 Peter in his letter to diasporic Christ-followers in Asia Minor (1 Pet 1:1) provides an analogy relative to Paul's strategy with respect to his diasporic *ekklēsiai*. Reidar Hvalvik argues that 1 Peter presents Christ-followers as being "equal with Israel,"[306] not as a replacement for Israel. Given the overlap between 1 Peter and Paul's letters to the Romans and Corinthians in their metaphorical identification of Christ-followers with sacred Israelite institutions (e.g., the Temple and its cult),[307] then Hvalvik's conclusion for 1 Peter may have some application for reading Paul. Specifically, one could view Paul's *ekklēsiai* as non-supersessionist messianic sub-groups of pluriform Second Temple Judaism.

4.4.2 *"The* Ekklēsia *of Israel" (*LXX*): An Identity Co-opted by Paul?*

Having suggested that Paul did not view the words "Jew," "circumcision," and "Israel" as malleable descriptors which could be expropriated by gentiles, it remains to explore the malleability of the LXX phrase "the *ekklēsia* of Israel." The question to be asked is whether Paul evokes a supersessionist agenda at the institutional level in his choice to designate his communities with the same Greek term (*ekklēsia*) that is used in the LXX for the ethno-religious nation of Israel.[308] Trebilco, for one, contends that such an institutional move on Paul's

---

and Todd Still (*After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later* [London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009]).

305   Gal 3:28, 29 read: 28 οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 29 εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

306   Although Reidar Hvalvik uses the term "new Israel" when speaking of 1 Peter's appropriation of Israelite covenantal terminology, he does not mean thereby that Peter is "advocating a 'replacement theology.' It is not said that the believing Gentiles have *taken the place* of the Jews. What is said is that believing Gentiles are *equal with* the Israel of the Old Testament. In Christ they have now become the people of God" ("Jewish Believers and Jewish Influence in the Roman Church until the Early Second Century," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: the Early Centuries* [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 179–216, esp. 205 [author's emphasis]).

307   1 Pet 2:5; Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 12:27; 2 Cor 6:16.

308   In LXX Josh 8:35, God's covenantal people are still called ἐκκλησία (HB: *qāhāl*) after having entered the land: οὐκ ἦν ῥῆμα ἀπὸ πάντων, ὧν ἐνετείλατο Μωυσῆς τῷ Ἰησοῖ, ὃ οὐκ ἀνέγνω Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ ὦτα πάσης ἐκκλησίας υἱῶν Ισραηλ, τοῖς ἀνδράσιν καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶν καὶ τοῖς παιδίοις καὶ τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς προσπορευομένοις τῷ Ισραηλ (8:35 [HB]: "There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua did not read before all the assembly (*qāhāl*) of Israel, and the women, and the little ones, and the sojourners who lived among them").

part need not reflect a supersessionist impulse. Trebilco suggests that since "both ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή were terms from the LXX for the 'assembly' of Yahweh … Jewish Christian Hellenists could use ἐκκλησία to claim theological continuity with the OT people of God, without thereby saying that other Jews [who designated their gatherings/buildings as *synagōgai*] were not the OT people of God."[309] By logical extension, Trebilco's conclusion relative to Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem also applies in the Diaspora given the co-existence there of Pauline *ekklēsiai* and Jewish *synagōgai*.

The (pre-)Covenanters of Qumran, on the other hand, do provide evidence of supersessionist ideology being associated with the semantic domain of the word *ekklēsia*. As a Judean socio-religious sub-group of ethno-religious Israel, they chose, during at least one point in their history, symbolically to self-identify in permanent fashion with (or as) the Israel of the desert tradition (*qhl*). As indicated earlier, there are two words for "assembly" in the Hebrew Bible, *qāhāl* and *'ēdâ*. The LXX uses *ekklēsia* only when translating *qāhāl*, but uses *synagōgē* when translating both *qāhāl* and *'ēdâ*. Unlike in the LXX where *ekklēsia* is used only in conjunction with the supra-local assembly of Israel, within their sectarian literature the (pre)Covenanters use its underlying Hebrew word *qhl* as a sub-group designation. This use of *qhl* is found in 4QMMT,[310] the Damascus Document (CD),[311] 4Q396, and 1QSa,[312] but not in 1QS where *yahad* becomes

---

309   Trebilco, "Early Christians," 458. Trebilco comments further that "If there had been but one LXX term for 'the assembly/gathering', then the Hellenists, in taking over that one 'proper name', could have been making the claim that 'we are the true assembly of God; you (other "Jews") are not'. But given that there were two terms with very similar backgrounds, the use by the Hellenists of the term that was not currently in use in Jerusalem as a name for a Jewish community (as far as we can tell) was a way of distinguishing themselves from ἡ συναγωγή without claiming to replace 'the synagogue' as 'the people of God', either textually or historically. They were simply adopting an alternative term" ("Early Christians," 458–59).

310   Heinz-Josef Fabry notes that "the earlier texts apparently still understood *qāhāl* as a fully valid self-designation for the community itself." As an example, he cites 4QMMT where, early in the community's formation, this letter from the "teacher of righteousness" listed "various factors excluding a person from the 'community' (*qāhāl*), apparently a Qumran-Essene interpretation of Dt. 23 (cf. 4QFlor 1:4). It thus seems that the community in Qumran did not reject the term *qāhāl* as a self-reference until a later period" ("קָהָל," *TDOT* 12.546–61, esp. 559).

311   Within CD, *qĕhal* occurs at 7.17 ("the King is the assembly"), 11:22 ("trumpets of the assembly"), and 12.6 ("he may enter the assembly").

312   The Deuteronomic tradition of associating *qhl* (LXX *ekklēsia*) with a continuing group identity for the community of Israel, as opposed simply with a temporary assembly for the community, is evident in 1QSa 2.4 and 4Q396 1–2i line 40. Fabry sees *qhl* as a fully

the Covenanters' self-designation of choice.[313] Might Paul have been aware
of the (pre)Covenanters' use of *qhl* as a sub-group designation? No defini-
tive answer can be given to that question, but Paul does appear to have some
awareness of at least one theological distinctive found within the Covenanters'
corpus of writings.

Paul uses phraseology ("some of the works of the Law") which is extant else-
where only in one of the (pre-)Covenanters' writings: 4QMMT.[314] If this phrase-
ology indicates an awareness on his part of the (pre-)Covenanters' distinctive
theology (though not necessarily of their writings), then it is not improbable
that he also may have been aware of their adoption of *qhl* as a distinctive sub-
group identity. The (pre)Covenanters' *qhl* identity designates them as a socio-
religious sub-group of the *qhl* of Israel. In not dissimilar fashion, then does the
Pauline Christ-followers' *ekklēsia* identity designate their Jewish and gentile
members as a socio-religious sub-group of the *ekklēsia/qhl* of Israel and thus
as sharers in the salvation history of socio-ethnic Israel?

If so, then Paul has chosen to go one socio-ethnic step further than the (pre)
Covenanters did with his incorporation of gentiles qua gentiles into his Jewish
ekklēsia associations. This type of *corpus mixtum* would have been unthink-
able for the (pre)Covenanters. The (pre)Covenanters' polemic against other
Jewish circles, possibly even against the Temple establishment in Jerusalem
(e.g., 4QMMT),[315] demonstrates not only that gentiles were excluded but also

---

functional self-designation of the authorial community at Qumran (*TDOT* 12:559). Du Toit
also sees the *qhl* in 1QSa 2.4 as "most probably refer[ing] to the *congregation* of Israel"
("*Paulus Oecumenicus*," 135 [author's emphasis]). See my discussion of Philo's use of
Deuteronomy 23 in 3.4.1 *Egyptian Jewish Semi-Public Associations Named* Ekklēsia? (*Philo*).

313   Fabry notes that the root קהל occurs *c.* 50 times, but "strikingly, it does not occur at all in
        1QS …" (*TDOT* 12:559).

314   See n. 272 (Ch. 3) for a survey of scholarly opinions as to the identity of the community
        behind the writing of 4QMMT. Martin Abegg notes three terminological convergences
        between Paul and 4QMMT, all the while taking heed to avoid the interpretive pitfall iden-
        tified by Samuel Sandmel as "parallelomania." Parallelomania, in essence, assumes that
        correlation entails causation (Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 [1962], 1–13). The most
        significant parallel with 4QMMT is Paul's phrase ἔργα νόμου ("works of the law"; Rom 3:20;
        Ga 2:16 [3×]; 3:2, 5, 10) which Abegg claims "is likely a translation of מעשי התורה, found
        in all of ancient Hebrew literature only at 4QMMT C 27 (4Q398 14–17 ii 3)" ("4QMMT C
        27, 31 and 'Works Righteousness,'" *DSD* 6.2 [1999]: 139–47, esp. 139). See also Martin Abegg,
        "Paul, Works of the Law, and the MMT," *BARev* 20/6 (1994): 52–55; J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT
        and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997): 147–53; M. Bachmann, "4QMMT und Galaterbrief, מעשי
        התורה und ΕΡΓΑ ΝΟΜΟΥ," *ZNW* 89 (1998): 91–113.

315   There are at least three general theories as to the literary intent of the sectarian document
        known as 4QMMT: historic extramural polemic, contemporary extramural polemic, or

that a wide swath of the Judean population was. Jewish ethnicity was insufficient grounds by itself for inclusion in the Covenanters' *qhl*.

Paul's use of the term *ekklēsia* as a socio-ethnically inclusive sub-group designation (intra-mural) also has a universal dimension (inter-mural). As with the supra-local *Ekklēsia* of Israel in the LXX, Paul speaks of his regionally disparate, yet trans-locally connected, *ekklēsiai* (e.g., 1 Cor 1:2) as together forming a universal *Ekklēsia* of Hellenistic Jewish and Greco-Roman *Christos*-followers who together share in the salvation history of socio-ethnic Israel (1 Cor 12:28).[316]

How might diasporic Greek-speaking Jews have understood the self-presentation of trans-locally connected Pauline communities as a universal entity named *Ekklēsia* (1 Cor 12:28)? Would they have seen pretension or perhaps even supersession inherent in that usage? Or was it possible that, rather

---

contemporary intramural paraenesis. Maxine Grossman reads 4QMMT as an ideological tradition of extramural polemic within the community at Qumran ("Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," *RevQ* 20 [2001]: 3–22). Albert Hogeterp suggests that 4QMMT is historic extramural polemic. He sees 4QMMT as having "ideological significance within the Qumran community precisely because it goes back to a historical document rather than being a historicising text after the fact" (*Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* [BTS 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006], 82). S. D. Fraade reads 4QMMT as intramural paraenesis intended for communal candidates and neophytes ("To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees," *RevQ* 19 [2000]: 507–26). Hogeterp notes at least one problem with Fraade's perspective (*Paul and God's Temple*, 78). He cites the observation of S. Morag that linguistic and stylistic differences from the Community Rule, among other noted sectarian documents, are sufficiently significant to preclude its consideration as intramural paraenesis ("Language and Style in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah—Did Moreh Ha-Sedeq Write This Document?" *Tarbiz* 65 [1995–1996]: 210–33). For examples of specific correlations between the authorial community of 4QMMT and the Temple establishment, see Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 79–81.

316   Paul's *ekklēsia* reference in 1 Cor 12:28, though, is not unambiguously universal. It is possible to limit the purview of this passage to the Corinthian *ekklēsia*. If one follows along from Dunn, then Paul's list of gifted ministers (e.g., apostles, prophets; 12:28–30) would refer only to Christ-followers located in the Corinthian *ekklēsia*. In other words, Paul would not be commenting upon the types of gifted ministers which should be evident in other *ekklēsiai* outside of Corinth. However, this does not seem to accord with Paul's comment a few verses later that the ministry giftings in Paul's list are in fact not all active within the Corinthian *ekklēsia* (12:31: "earnestly desire the greater gifts"). Such a comment begs the question, then, as to why Paul would create a list of ministry giftings, the full complement of which the Corinthians could never aspire to. It is less problematic to assume, therefore, that when Paul implicitly equates "the body of Christ" (12:27) with the *ekklēsia* (12:28) within which all gifted ministers are found (12:28–30), that Paul is referring there both to a universal body of the Christos and to a universal *ekklēsia*, both of which the Corinthian Christ-followers express locally in their communal gatherings.

than being viewed as replacing the *Ekklēsia* of Israel, Paul's *ekklēsiai* could have been viewed as emplacing the public nature of that Jewish *Ekklēsia* into the associational life of Jewish synagogue communities in the Diaspora?

At least three factors form a historical backdrop against which to evaluate that question. First, the term *ekklēsia* largely was 'free' as a designation for a semi-public association of Jews in the Diaspora (aside from Egypt; *Virt.* 108). As such, Paul's *ekklēsiai* would not have been perceived as competing at the institutional level with other Jewish diasporic associations of the same name. Second, the LXX also uses *ekklēsia* for public gatherings of Israel (e.g., Neh 5:7; 13:1) in which all facets of Jewish life are addressed. Paul's *ekklēsiai* also address all facets of life: social (community *nomoi*, 1 Cor 14); economic (the Jerusalem offering, Rom 15); judicial (disputes among Christ-followers, 1 Cor 6); moral (sexual mores, 1 Cor 7); and political (government relations, Rom 13). Third, Jewish *ekklēsia* assemblies of a public nature are not found in the Diaspora. The combined literary witness of Sirach, Judith, 1 Maccabees and Josephus suggests that only *ekklēsiai* in Judea functioned as formal gatherings for the purpose of addressing all facets of Jewish life not least the ethno-religious, social, political, economic, and judicial dimensions.

The combination of these three factors in the mind of a 1st century diasporic Jew could have led him or her to wonder if Paul's trans-local/universal association of *ekklēsiai* claimed to be extensions of public Judean society within the Diaspora. If one did so, then each Pauline *ekklēsia* could have been viewed as a diasporic 'satellite' in relation to other Judean public *ekklēsiai*, thereby implicitly laying claim to being able to express all facets of Jewish life. Such a perception would have received even greater reinforcement in Paul's allusion to the supra-local *Ekklēsia* of Israel when he claims that his trans-locally connected *ekklēsiai* comprised a supra-local, or universal, entity known as *Ekklēsia* (1 Cor 12:28). In so doing, Paul's *Ekklēsia/ekklēsiai* of *Christos*-followers implicitly lay(s) claim to being the full expression of the ethno-religious, social, political, economic, and judicial dimensions of Jewish life in the Diaspora. Pretension? No doubt. Supersession? Possible, but not probable.

If Paul's *ekklēsiai* were perceived as public institutions, then Paul's claim to have been flogged five times by Jews gains greater clarity (1 Cor 11:23). It provides one more factor by which to explain why Jewish communities would have felt justified in flogging Paul, and, on the flip side, why Paul would have acquiesced to such treatment. If Paul's *ekklēsia* associations were seen as being diasporic 'satellites' of public *ekklēsiai* from Judea, then Paul would have been received by Jews in the Diaspora in some fashion as an ambassadorial *archisynagōgos*. This would have made any disputes which arose between Paul and a synagogue association matters of an *intra-muros* nature, and any religiously oriented

issues disputed therein matters of public concern that also involve the realm of Jewish politics and jurisprudence. A judicial response, such as flogging, would not have been outside the realm of due process possibilities.

Given the lack of convincing evidence in the preceding section by which to indict Paul of supersessionist intent relative to his use of Jewish terminology (Jew, Israel, *Ekklēsia*), one could assume a similar conclusion with respect to Paul's theological portrayals of his *ekklēsiai* as Jewish sacred space (body of the *Christos*, temple, sacred synagogue): each portrayal would seem further to emplace Paul's *ekklēsia* associations within a Jewish heritage, irrespective of their socio-ethnic composition.

4.4.3   Ekklēsia *as Jewish Sacred Space: the Body of the Jewish Messiah*
Paul metaphorically identifies his Corinthian *ekklēsia* and, later, the Roman Christ-followers, with the body of the Jewish *Christos*[317] (1 Cor 12:27; Rom 12:5).[318] From where might Paul have sourced that concept and what ideological end did that metaphor serve?

---

317   John J. Collins notes that one of the earliest usages of the term *Christos* for a coming Davidic king is found in the *Psalms of Solomon*, which can be dated to at least the mid-1st century BCE given historical allusions to the Hasmonean dynasty and the death of Pompey (48 BCE) (*The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 49). Not all Jews in the 1st century CE, whether in Judea or the Diaspora, held messianic expectations. But some did. With respect to Judea, Josephus describes three kingly messianic pretenders (Judas, Simon, Athrongeus) who arrived in the wake of the death of Herod the Great (4 BCE; *B.J.* 2.55f). The sectarians at Qumran expected either one messiah ("the <messiah> of Aaron and Israel"; CD 12.23–13.1; 14.18, 19) or two ("the messiahs of Aaron and Israel"; 1QS 9.11; the priestly messiah and the messiah of Israel; 1QSa 2.11, 20). In *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174 10–11) the sectarian messiah is identified as "the branch of David" (see also 4Q285 5.iii). This identification of a messiah with the Davidic lineage is also evident in *Ps. Sol.* 17:21 ("son of David") and 17:32 (*christos kyrios*). According to Kenneth Atkinson these two titles are only used of messianic kings in post-HB literature ("On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17," in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* [ed. C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000], 106–23, esp. 107).

318   Paul writes to the Corinthians, "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. And God has appointed in the *ekklēsia* first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues" (1 Cor 12:27, 28). Therein, Paul appears to parallel "the body of Christ" with "the *ekklēsia*," and "individual ... members" with "apostles ... prophets ... teachers [etc.]."

Scholars have proposed numerous sources from which Paul may have developed his idea of bodily unity between Christ and his multi-ethnic *ekklēsia*.[319] Some scholars look for Paul's source(s) in pre-existing literary and cultural constructs that include the Jewish concept of corporate representation or solidarity,[320] the Gnostic Redeemer myth,[321] the body of Adam from rabbinic Judaism,[322] and the temple of Asclepius in Corinth.[323] Other scholars have sought for the source of Paul's "body of (the) Christ" imagery in his experiences. These include the celebration of the Eucharist[324] and the Damascus Road theory. The author of Acts lays the groundwork for the latter view. Seyoon Kim argues that Paul's conception of the unity of Christ and his people came from his conversion experience when the risen Christ encountered him ("Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me? … I am Jesus who you persecute"; Acts 9:4, 5).[325] It was only with that encounter that Paul first came to recognize that in his persecution of the followers of Christ he had directly persecuted Christ Himself.

---

319   See Robert Jewett's detailed discussion of possible sources for Paul's "body" metaphor in *Paul's Anthropological Terms: a Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 200–304. See also Michelle V. Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (SNTS 137; Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 8.

320   In this theory, Christ incorporates the church within himself analogous to the way in which a Hebrew Bible figure incorporated ancient Israel within himself as their inclusive representative. See the studies by Albert Schweitzer (*The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* [New York: Holt, 1931]) and Ernest Best (*Interpreting Christ* [New York/London: Continuum, 2000]).

321   Ernst Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1933); Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1951), 1:175–83; Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: an Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (trans. John E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971). The Gnostic *Urmensch* consisted of a gigantic body which came to earth. This body was imprisoned in the physical world. Although the *Urmensch* escaped, pieces of his body remained incarcerated on earth.

322   W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1980), 55–57; Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 239–50. Paul is said to have derived the "body" metaphor from the rabbinic doctrine of the unity of humanity in Adam. In this perspective, Adam's body was symbolic of humanity's oneness. Paul's idea of new humanity "in Christ" enlivened by the Spirit is an analogous concept.

323   Andrew Hill, "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?" *JBL* 99 (1980): 437–39; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 165–67.

324   Lucien Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder/London: Nelson, 1959), 262–82. Bodily union between Christ and the believer is said to occur through the Eucharist when the saint is in communion with the Lord's Body and Blood and participates in Christ's sacrifice.

325   Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1984), 252–56.

There is another cultural backdrop against which the Roman Christ-followers may have viewed Paul's conception. Paul's use of "the body of (the) *Christos*" metaphor (Rom 12:5) would have been particularly relevant in Nero's Rome given Seneca's promotion of Stoic thought. Michelle Lee points towards a number of conceptual intersections in Pauline and Stoic conceptions of the universal body of humanity, particularly in relation to cosmopolitanism.[326] She argues that "Paul's method of linking community identity as a body and corporate ethical exhortation is similar to what is found in Stoic paraenesis."[327] Lee claims that this conjunction of body metaphor with ethical injunction is unheralded outside of Pauline and Stoic conceptions.[328]

There is at least one ideological benefit from these parallels for the predominantly gentile population in the Roman community of Christ-followers. They would have gained increased missional relevance with their Greco-Roman neighbours because of what, on the surface, appears to be the Christ-followers' use of a recognizably Stoic conception—"the (universal) body (politic)."

But there is also an ideological benefit for Jewish Christ-followers. Paul adds a Jewish twist to Stoic body imagery through his addition of the prepositional phrase "of *Christos*." Paul thereby signals that the exemplar of moral lifestyle is not simply a human sage, as in the case of Stoic ideology. Rather, Paul's exemplar is the resurrected Jewish *Christos*—Jesus. This fuller portrayal of all Roman Christ-followers as one unified ('Stoic') body of the Jewish *Christos* implies a

---

326 Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (2006). Daniel Richter's study on the reception history of *cosmopolis* conceptions suggests this definition of cosmopolitanism: "a set of ideas clustered around the principle that the human community is, biologically speaking, an undifferentiated whole" (*Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire* [Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011], 18). Richter (2011) does not include in his bibliography the important studies by Lee (*Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* [2006]) and Buell (*Why This New Race?* [2005]). Buell's study is broader than Lee's, both in the Christian sources she considers (1st and 2nd centuries CE) and in the ideological concerns she explores. Buell examines competing claims for universalism and ethnic identity in early Christianity.

327 Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*, 7. Robert Gundry notes that the "body of Christ" image only appears in paraenetic passages which deal with exhortation related to the relationships between Christ-followers. These passages comprise Romans 12–15 and 1 Corinthians 12–14 (*SOMA in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976], 228).

328 Michelle Lee cites the unpublished dissertation of Leigh Clasby Viner who "argues that exemplars, as especially seen in the Stoic sage, are used in conjunction with principles in Stoic ethics. In particular, 'such exemplars help to bridge the gap between the individual moral choices and actions'" ("Moral Paradigms and the Stoic Sage" [Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University, 2002], 3; cited in Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*, 199).

certain sociological parity between Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-followers in Rome. This perceived socio-religious levelling of the playing field, so to speak, would particularly have benefited those Jewish Christ-followers who returned to Rome after Nero rescinded the Edict of Claudius (54 CE).[329]

Suetonius claims that Claudius expelled Jews from Rome (49 CE) because they "persisted in rioting at the instigation of Chrestus" (*impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes; Claudius* 25.4).[330] Regardless of whether that segment of the Jewish populace which was expelled was large or small, it appeared also to include Jewish Christ-followers, one of whom the book of Acts identifies as being Priscilla, and her non-Jewish husband Aquila (Acts 18:26; cf. Rom 16:3–5). Willi Marxsen is one of the earliest among many who suggest that between 49–54 CE the Roman community of Christ-followers had become predominantly gentile.[331] Only three years later (57 CE), Paul writes to the Roman community, a community which he did not found[332] nor over which he claims apostolic authority.[333] If Romans 16 is authentically Pauline, as Karl Donfried

---

329   Willi Marxsen identifies Paul's purpose in writing to the Romans not so much as being "theology for its own sake" but rather as a treatise that seeks to address how gentiles and Jews can more harmoniously live together as a diverse yet unified community of faith, particularly after the return of Jewish Christ-followers who were expelled from Rome by the Edict of Claudius (*Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to Its Problems* [trans. G. Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968], 95–107). Marxsen is among the first to suggest that Jewish Christ-followers from the synagogue community in Rome, but who still were Torah observant (i.e., who observed Jewish identity markers; cf., Ambrosiaster; 4th cent CE) were also expelled. Thus, according to Marxsen, only a community comprised of gentile Christ-followers remained until Claudius' death in 54 CE. Following his death, Jews and Jewish Christ-followers returned to Rome.

330   For a concise survey of interpretive options relative to the word "Chrestus," see the discussions by Spence (*The Parting of the Ways*, 98–107), A. Andrew Das (*Solving the Romans Debate* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 150–58), and Francis Watson (*Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 167–75).

331   Ben Witherington III cogently argues for the fact that Paul's primary addressees in Romans are gentiles who came to predominate in Rome after the Edict of Claudius. See Ben Witherington III and D. Hyatt (*Paul's Letter to the Romans* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004]) and Ben Witherington III (RBL Review, 03/2009, pp. 3, 4).

332   In Acts 2, Jews from a number of regions throughout the Roman empire are said to have heard Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, some of whom came to faith in Jesus as the *Christos* (2:36–41). This group could be said to include Jews who came from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Acts 2:9; cf. 1 Peter 1:1) and Jews and gentile proselytes from Rome (Acts 2:10; Rom 1:7, *klētois hagiois*).

333   William Campbell suggests that, since Paul is not the founder of the community in Rome, he is careful to avoid any perception that he is overstepping his apostolic authority and

and others claim,[334] then prosopographic evidence affirms the presence of ethnic Jews within the Roman community at the time of Paul's writing.[335]

The predominantly gentile demographic of Christ-followers in Rome would have fueled a clash of expectations upon the return of Jewish Christ-followers, particularly in relation to the re-integration of those returnees into leadership positions. Priscilla and her gentile husband Aquila would have faced one additional hurdle given their prior history of association and partnership in the Gospel with Paul (Acts 18:1–4). Not only would they personally have held an apostolic allegiance (Paul) that differed from that of the Roman *hoi hagioi* (the Jerusalem-based apostles), but they also led a community of Christ-followers with a collective identity that differed from that of the Roman *hoi hagioi*. They led an association named *ekklēsia*, a collective identity that was inextricably tied to Paul (Acts 18:26; cf. Rom 16:3–5).

The importance of distinguishing that Pauline *ekklēsia* association from the rest of the Roman community remains unacknowledged by a number of commentators. For example, Young-Ho Park uses the term "church" to refer both to the *ekklēsiai* who send greetings to the Roman community of Christ-followers (Rom 16) and to the Roman community itself, even though Paul never addresses the Roman community at large as an *ekklēsia*.[336] If Park had been more precise with his terminology he could have added Rome as one more example for his argument that "there was [only] one *ekklēsia* per city."[337] As it is, translational imprecision undermines the central thrust of Park's project to demonstrate that "when addressing a local gathering as an *ekklēsia*, Paul used this

---

thus avoids using overtly assertive tactics for facilitating Jewish–gentile reconciliation (*Paul*, 75–76).

334   Karl Paul Donfried, "A Short Note on Romans 16" in *The Romans Debate* (Rev. ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 44–52.

335   Paul met some of those he greets in Romans 16 in his journeys: Epaphras, Mark, Luke, Aristarchus, Demas (Phlm 23–24; cf. Col 4:7–14); Sosthenes (1 Cor 1:1); Apollos, Stephanas, Fortunatus, Achaicus (1 Cor 16:12, 17); and Jesus Justus (Col 4:7–14). Even though prosopographic evidence indicates that most of the names are not explicitly Jewish, this does not necessarily mean those so named were not Jewish. Jews often took on alternative names whether Greek, Latin or even Egyptian. Donfried cites Harry Leon (*The Jews of Ancient Rome*, 1960) who demonstrated that of the 551 names of Jews found in Roman inscriptions, Latin names occur as frequently as both Greek and Semitic names combined, even though the Jewish community in Rome was predominantly Greek-speaking, and not Latin speaking (Donfried, "A Short Note on Romans 16," 48).

336   Park writes, "the long list [in Romans] itself is Paul's attempt to establish himself as the representative of all the (Gentile) churches to the Roman church" (*Paul's Ekklēsia*, 112).

337   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 100.

term to refer primarily to the plenary meeting representing all Christians in a city."[338] It is quite clear that the *ekklēsia* in the home of Aquila and Priscilla did not represent the entire Roman community of Christ-followers, either when they convened an *ekklēsia* or when they met together as a community called an *ekklēsia*.

Given the foregoing historical backdrop, one could suggest, congruent with Marxsen, that a key reason why Paul writes to the Romans is for the purpose of forging socio-religious unity (not only Jewish-gentile unity) between the two differentiated sub-groups of Christ-followers in Rome.[339] In this respect, then, at its core his epistle to the Romans would be a treatise that addresses identity formation issues. To this end, Paul appears to employ two rhetorical strategies: one political and one theological. The convergence of these two strategies creates a rhetorical sub-text that implicitly mandates the development of socio-religious unity between the Pauline-loyal *ekklēsia* and the Jerusalem-loyal *hoi hagioi* in Rome.

His socio-political strategy with the Roman community mirrors practices related to euergetism. Paul mimics honorific language in his mention that both he and "all the *ekklēsiai tōn ethnōn* ('of the gentiles/nations')" give thanks to two benefactors, Aquila and Priscilla (16:4). Paul describes them as being his "fellow workers [who] ... risked their necks for my life" (16:3). By publicly including the thanksgiving of "all the *ekklēsiai tōn ethnōn*" for Aquila and his Jewish wife Priscilla, Paul raises the rhetorical ante on two fronts. First, with respect to Jewish-gentile relations, Paul increases the honorific standing of the husband/wife team who leads his Roman *ekklēsia* before the gentile *hoi hagioi* who predominate in Rome. If communities of gentile Christ-followers elsewhere publicly honour the ministry of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:4), then, by logical extrapolation, should not gentile Christ-followers in Rome also do the same? Second, with respect to *hoi hagioi/ekklēsia* relations, Paul's honorific language implicitly encourages those self-same *hoi hagioi* to grant to the *ekklēsia* under Aquila and Priscilla's leadership an equal status as partners in the Gospel. On the flip side, by extending greetings to the Roman *hoi hagioi*

---

338   Park, *Paul's Ekklēsia*, 100.

339   See Marxsen's comments in n 868. Some other perspectives on Paul's purpose for writing to the Romans include: anti-Jewish polemic (Baur); a summary of Paul's theology (Bornkamm); a preview of anticipated problems in Jerusalem (Fuchs); a critique of Jewish ethnocentrism which leads to gentile exclusion (J. D. G. Dunn, N. T. Wright); a political critique of Rome (Jewett); a post-Edict of Claudius attempt to bring about Jewish/gentile reconciliation (Marxsen, Wiefel). See the extensive survey of viewpoints by Longenecker (*Introducing Romans*, 93–128). See also Donfried, "A Short Note on Romans 16," 44–52.

from so many different *ekklēsia* associations (16:1, 4, 5a, 16, 23), Paul implicitly reminds them that his trans-local community of *ekklēsiai* have already done towards the Roman *hoi hagioi* what he is asking the *hoi hagioi* to do towards the Roman *ekklēsia*—extend the hand of fellowship as an affirmation of both parties' full partnership in the work of *Christos* ministry.

Paul also incorporates a theological strategy in fostering socio-religious reconciliation. Paul uses at least two depictions of corporate unity that both Roman sub-groups would have held in common (i.e., temple imagery [Rom 12:2]; body of the Jewish *Christos* [12:5]). It is perhaps not insignificant that the only other place in his acknowledged writings wherein Paul portrays all Christ-followers as a temple and as a body occurs within the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor 3:16; 1 Cor 6:19, 20; 2 Cor 6:16 and 1 Cor 12:27, 28). The Corinthians too were a community that was struggling with the effects of socio-religious differentiation ("I belong to Paul ... to Apollos ... to Cephas"; 1 Cor 1:12), perhaps even between *hoi hagioi* and a Pauline *ekklēsia* (1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1).[340]

It seems that Paul is using examples of Jewish sacred space imagery to which both Jerusalem and Pauline loyal Christ-followers can adhere (e.g., temple imagery: Rom 12:1; cf., 1 Pet 2:5 and 1 Cor 3:16, 17) as a theological means to the sociological end of engendering cooperation and harmony between differentiated sub-groups of Christ-followers in Rome and in Corinth ("I belong to Paul ... Cephas"; 1 Cor 1:12). Paul's two-pronged strategy (socio-political, theological) for fostering socio-religious reconciliation among the *hoi hagioi* and

---

340   1 Cor 1:2 reads τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν· There are two options for reading the four dative phrases which are in simple apposition to one another. First, the syntax could imply that Paul refers to all of the Corinthians as a whole as together comprising: (1) the *ekklēsia* of God; (2) which is in Corinth; (3) who have all been sanctified; and (4) who all are "called holy ones/saints." In some sense, the final phrase ("the saints") is redundant, though, if one chooses to translate both *hēgiasmenois* and *hagiois* with theological terminology. Second, Paul could instead be referring first to two broad categories of addressees (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) to which he then gives greater specificity with the second set of dative phrases (τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ and κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, respectively). This second option allows one to infer that Paul is addressing two different sub-groups within the community of Christ-followers in Corinth: (1) *ekklēsia* of God (i.e, the Pauline-loyal Christ-followers) and (2) the *hoi hagioi* (i.e., Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers) who share a common theological unity with the *ekklēsia* of God in that both groups constitute "those who have been sanctified." For a discussion of the dative in simple apposition, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 152.

his *ekklēsia* gives reinforcement to Campbell's emphatic statement that "*identity precedes theology and that in fact theological constructions emerge to solve the problem of identity rather than create it.*"[341] Would the Roman community, though, have had pre-knowledge of Paul's portrayal of his Corinthian *ekklēsia* as the temple of God and as the body of the *Christos*? That is a distinct possibility given the direct ties that Aquila and Priscilla had with both communities.[342] Given this fact, one could suggest that even though Paul wrote the Corinthian correspondence (55 CE) after to their return to Rome (54 CE), Aquila and Priscilla already were acquainted with Paul's use of Jewish sacred space imagery from their prior ministry partnership with Paul (Acts 18:1–3, 18–21, 24–26).

If Aquila and Priscilla had inculcated Paul's Jewish sacred space theology within both their *ekklēsia* association and the broader community of Christ-followers in Rome, then Paul's portrayal of all Roman Christ-followers as the body of the Jewish *Christos* would have been a particularly relevant image for unifying Jewish (universal body of the Jewish *Christos*/messiah) and Greco-Roman (universal body politic of Stoic philosophy) Christ-followers, irrespective of which sub-group identity they had assumed (i.e., *hoi hagioi* or *ekklēsia*).

4.4.4   Ekklēsia *as Jewish Sacred Space: Living Temple of God*
As I have already indicated, another way in which Paul depicts his multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* as Jewish sacred space is as symbolic architecture, specifically as the temple of God (*naos theou*). Paul is not alone among Jewish Second Temple or New Testament writers in his conception of a people as a temple.[343] He is alone, though, in his conception of a people-group as a temple (*naos*), that,

---

341   Campbell, *Paul*, 52 (author's emphasis).

342   Priscilla and Aquila accompanied Paul from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts 18: 18–21), whereupon Paul continued on by himself to Caesarea, Jerusalem, Antioch, and on to Asia Minor (Acts 18: 22–23). When Paul returns to Ephesus (Acts 19:1–41), no mention is made of him finding Priscilla and Aquila there. Might Paul's prior journeys have been the interval during which they returned to Rome?

343   Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 57. See also R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (OTM; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969); Robert A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999); and David Mathewson, "A Note on the Foundation Stones in Revelation 21:14, 19–20," *JSNT* 25/4 (2003): 487–98.

firstly, is named as an *ekklēsia*, and, secondly, among whom not only corporately, but also in whom individually, God dwells.[344]

The Covenanters at Qumran are one Jewish community which self-identified as the Temple. In CD, they refer to themselves as "a holy house."[345] A more explicit identification of the community with the Temple is found in 1QS 8.5–6. Therein the "council of the Community" is called "a holy house for Israel [i.e., Temple] and the foundation of the holy of holies of Aaron."[346] David Aune claims that their self-identification as a temple of God was "an intermediate situation in which they rejected the existing temple cult and lived in expectation of the rebuilding of the true and unpolluted eschatological temple."[347] In line with Aune's view, Lawrence Schiffman[348] and George Brooke[349] argue that the Covenanters expressed ideas of substitution and spiritualization, respectively, with regard to the Second Temple. If these scholars are correct, then the Covenanters' self-portrayal as Jewish sacred space was exclusivist, even supersessionist, in nature. Not all concur with their assessment, however. Rather than substitution, Devorah Dimant argues instead for analogy and complementarity with the Temple.[350]

---

344   Paul claims to be indwelt by the *Christos* in Gal 2:20. Paul depicts individual Christ-followers as being the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:19, 20). Paul portrays the corporate body of Christ-followers as a temple of God (local *ekklēsia*: 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 2 Cor 6: 16; universal *ekklēsia*: Eph 2:19–22).

345   "Holy house": 1QS 5.6; 8.5, 9; 9.6; 22.8; CD 3.19; 20.10, 13. "City of iniquity": 1QpHab 10.10. See Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT II; ed. M. E. Stone; Assen, NL: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483–550, esp. 514.

346   The Hebrew translated "the holy of holies of Aaron" reads קודש קודשים לאהרון.

347   David E. Aune, "Qumran and the Book of Revelation," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2.622–48, esp. 2.641.

348   Lawrence Schiffman, "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 267–284, esp. 272–74.

349   George J. Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 285–301, esp. 297.

350   Devorah Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 1986), 165–89, esp. 187.

Scholars have also interpreted Paul's temple metaphors along similar lines. Bertil Gärtner represents the side that sees spiritualization at work in Paul's identification of the Corinthian community as "the temple of the living God" (2 Cor 6:16). In this, Gärtner sees Paul applying to his Christ-followers the prophetic promise of God's (eschatological) presence in Israel's midst (Ezek 37:27). Bertil Gärtner makes four observations from 2 Cor 6:14–18: (1) the community is identified as the "the temple of God"; (2) this 'living temple' is indwelt by the Spirit of God; (3) the indwelling Holy Spirit makes the 'living temple' holy; (4) this holy state demands holy living from each member of the 'living temple.'[351] He argues that the implication of the Spirit of God 'dwelling' in the Christ-follower *ekklēsia* is that "God's *Shekinah* no longer rests on the Jerusalem temple, but has been removed to the Church."[352]

The key question, however, is whether Paul's metaphorical conflation of Jewish temple and Christ-follower community necessarily reflects supersessionist theology, as Gärtner thinks. Hogeterp notes the inevitability of Gärtner's supersessionist conclusion: it is "the ultimate consequence of the process of 'spiritualization', and is equivalent to the idea of 'substitution'."[353] But there are reasons to challenge Gärtner's reading. First, the context for each of Paul's three *naos* passages makes it clear that his purpose in teaching the Corinthian Christ-followers that they are the *naos* of God is first and foremost to reinforce their need for a lifestyle of holiness that is congruent with the holiness of the God who is associated with the Temple in Jerusalem[354] and who indwells them both corporately and individually.[355] To suggest that Paul's temple metaphor justifies the corollary conclusion that the Corinthian *ekklēsia*, and by logical extension all Christ-followers generally, have replaced the Temple in Jerusalem

---

351   Gärtner, *The Temple*, 57–60.

352   Gärtner, *The Temple*, 58.

353   Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 8.

354   Paul uses two Greek words in reference to temple contexts (*naos* and *hieron*). Gordon Fee notes that in the LXX, which usage Paul seems to mirror, *naos* refers to the building in which God dwells ("sanctuary") while *hieron* refers to the entire area of the Temple, or precincts, which also then includes the sanctuary (*Corinthians*, 146 n. 6). *Naos* as sanctuary occurs 6 times across Pauline and deutero-Pauline writings (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21; 2 Thess 2:4). *Hieron* as temple precincts, specifically as the outer court where the altar for animal sacrifices was located, occurs once (1 Cor 9:13).

355   In 1 Cor 3:16, 17 Paul is addressing divisions in the community that threaten its very existence as a community. In 1 Cor 6:19, 20 Paul explains the danger inherent in a lifestyle of sexual immorality for a follower of Christ. In 2 Cor 6:14–18 Paul challenges the Corinthians' acceptance of relationships in which the partners are unequally yoked with respect to their faith commitments to Christ.

as the fulfillment of Ezekelian (or otherwise) prophecy would seem to stretch that evidence too far.

Second, Paul's metaphorical association of his Corinthian *ekklēsia* with "the temple of God" could just as readily have been a way for Paul to merge his Christ-followers with their Jewish ethno-religious roots, rather than as a way to differentiate them from a Jewish heritage. John Lanci, Albert Hogeterp, Nijay Gupta and Paula Fredriksen each argue that Paul does not replace the Temple in Jerusalem with his *ekklēsia* of Christ-followers in Corinth. They contend, rather, that his figurative depiction of his ethnically diverse *ekklēsia* as sacred Jewish architecture presents Christ-followers as an indelible part of pluriform Second Temple Judaism.[356] For example, Hogeterp argues that it is too myopic to limit a comparative approach only to two elements (Qumranite temple imagery and Paul's communities). Rather, he suggests that the legitimacy of a comparative approach is found in its application "to the larger fabric of contemporary Jewish culture, of which the earliest followers of Jesus Christ were part."[357] Fredriksen incisively critiques attempts at bifurcating Paul's purpose in 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16 along supersessionist lines. She suggests, rather, that Paul emphasizes complementarity in his appropriation of temple imagery for his associations:

> Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he values supremely. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone. This is not an either/or situation: for Paul, God's spirit dwells *both* in Jerusalem's temple *and* in the 'new temple' of the believer and of the community (Rom 9.4; cf. Matt 23.21).[358]

Paul is not the sole New Testament writer to depict Christ-followers as a 'living temple.' Other works such as the Gospel of John and 1 Peter follow suit either

---

356 John R. Lanci points out some significant problems with the interpretation that Paul sought to replace the Jerusalem Temple with the Corinthian community (*A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* [SBL 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1997], 11–18). In a similar vein, see also Hogeterp (*Paul and God's Temple*, 358), Nijay K. Gupta (*Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010], 205–11), and Paula Fredriksen ("Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 [2010]: 232–52).

357 Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 10.

358 Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248 (author's emphasis).

explicitly (1 Pet 2:4–5; 4:17)[359] or implicitly (John 14:2, cf. 2:19–22).[360] John uses temple terminology metaphorically of all Christ-followers (John 14:2; "my Father's house"); the phrase "my Father's house" need not refer to "heaven."[361] Although these two writings depict their Christ-followers as a temple of God, neither employs *ekklēsia* terminology, nor correlates *ekklēsia* with that temple of God.[362]

4.4.5   Ekklēsia *as Jewish Sacred Space: Sacred Jewish Synagogue*

A third way in which a collective *ekklēsia* identity expresses a Jewish heritage extends out from Paul's presentation of the Corinthian *ekklēsia* as a living temple (*naos*). Paul's depiction of the Corinthian community as sacred space places that *ekklēsia* into metaphorical continuity with Greek and Jewish manumission *praxis*. Paul depicts his gathered Corinthian "*ekklēsia* cum *naos*" as a legitimating 'site' for the metaphorical manumission of Christ-followers from their old master called "sin" to a new master, Jesus the Jewish *Christos* (1 Cor 7:17–24).[363] Paul's manumission ideology is analogous to the

---

359   1 Pet 2:5 reads, in part, "like living stones, let yourselves be built into a spiritual house."

360   For a fuller discussion of the Gospel of John's implicit portrayal of Christ-followers as a living Temple, see Robert Gundry, "In my Father's House are many μοναί (John 14:2)," *znw* 57 (1967): 68–72; Mary Coloe, *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007); and Ralph J. Korner, "The Gospel of John's Jesus: the Way into a Place, into a People, or into a Person?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, LA, 22 November, 2009), 1–12.

361   See Korner, "The Gospel of John's Jesus?" 1–12. I argue that the New Testament understanding of people as sacred space problematizes the use of John 14:6 ("I am the way, the truth and the life") as a text from which to argue for an exclusivist soteriology. Specifically, by recasting "the father's house" (John 14:2) as Jewish sacred space ("Temple/New Jerusalem/ people of God") rather than as "heaven," the focus of interpretation moves away from Jesus as "the way" for one to enter a *place* ("heaven") towards Jesus as "the way" for one to enter a *people* ("the living Temple"). Additionally, then, the emphasis of Jesus' statement in John 14:6b ("no one comes to the Father except through me") shifts away from claiming a mediatory role for his disciples' future access to the place where the Father resides ("heaven") towards an assertion of Jesus' unique role in mediating the disciples' direct access to the Father during their earthly lifetime for the purposes of ministry effectiveness (John 14:7–13) and personal intimacy (John 14:20–23).

362   1 Peter uses a pluralistic identity (*christianoi*), not a collective one (e.g., *ekklēsia*), for its addressees in Asia Minor (1 Pet 4: 16).

363   See also Rom 6:17–19. If one assumes that the Roman Christ-followers, in general, do not self-designate as an *ekklēsia*, then Paul is consistent in not using *ekklēsia* terminology in his pericope on metaphorical manumission in Romans 6.

manumission ceremonies of Bosporan Jews (1st to 4th cents. CE)[364] which, in turn, mirror Delphic manumission *praxis*.[365]

Contemporaneous Greek manumission protocol in Delphi involved the manumission of slaves within a sacred structure (e.g., the temple of the Pythian Apollo),[366] with the occasional ratification by decree of a civic *ekklēsia*.[367] Jews of the Bosporus Kingdom, however, do not set a slave's formal release (*aphiēmi*) into freedom (*eleutheria*) within the context of a pagan temple.[368] Rather, the

---

364   The Bosporus Kingdom (1st to 4th cents. CE) was located along the north shore of the Black Sea, above the Asia Minor region of Bithynia and Pontus, both of which formed the south shore of the Black Sea.

365   Gibson demonstrates convincingly that Jews of the 1st century CE did own slaves and that they followed, and adapted, Greco-Roman protocol regarding the management of slaves (*The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House* [TSAJ 75; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999], 66–70).

366   Elizabeth Leigh Gibson notes that over 1300 manumission inscriptions from central Greece have been recovered. These span four centuries and recount release ceremonies at the temple of the Pythian Apollo (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 37). Of these, there are at least 15 inscriptions which include a reference to the civic *ekklēsia* as the legitimating authority.

367   Greek manumission ceremonies, especially those practiced in central Greece (e.g., Delphi; 4th cent. BCE to 1st cent. CE), routinely recount that the official redemption payment (*timas*) (whether figurative or literal) is made in a temple to a god, most often in the temple at Delphi to the Pythian Apollo. Occasionally, this transaction, which involved the change of a slave's status (e.g., *aphēkē eleutheron*, "set free") into a "freedperson" (*apeleutheros*), is formally enacted through a public decree that is authorized within a civic *ekklēsia*. An inscription is then commissioned to officially commemorate the manumission (e.g., *FD* III 2:120; Delphi, uncertain date), upon which official witnesses (*martyres*) are also noted. Sometimes these guarantors are the temple priests themselves (e.g., *FD* III 6:31, Delphi, 1–20 CE). The primary purpose of these *martyres* or "human guarantors ... [is to] act as the god's agent, insuring that potential claimants not harass the former slave" (Runesson, Binder and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 154).

368   The manumission of Jewish slaves by Greek owners, however, was enacted within pagan temples. One example is the only manumission inscription found among the many epigraphic remains of Oropus (3rd cent. BCE), a *polis* that is situated along the Boeotian-Attic border. The Greek text and translation is by David M. Lewis: "... Phrynidas (will release) Moschos to be free [τὸν εἶναι ἐλεύθερον] dependent on no one man. But if anything happens to Phrynidas (i.e., if he dies) before the time elapses [πρότου τὸγ χρόνον διεξελθεῖν], let Moschos go free [ἐλεύθερος ἀπίτω μόσχος] wherever he wishes. To Good Fortune [Τύχηι ἀγαθῆι]. Witnesses [μάρτυρες] ... (Set up) by Moschos son of Moschion the Jew at the command of the god Amphiaraos and the goddess Health [τοῦ θεοῦ Ἀμφιαράου καὶ τῆς Γιειὰς] ... commanded [συνέταξε] to write it [ἀναθεῖναι] on stone and set it up on the altar [πρὸς τῶι Βωμῶι]" ("The First Greek Jew," *JSS* 2.3 [1957]: 264–66, esp. 264).

manumission of slaves by Jewish owners is set within a sacred synagogal structure (*proseuchē*).[369] Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson claim that the sacredness of the *proseuchē*[370] is demonstrated in the manumitted slave being enjoined to show both "deference and devotion" (*thōpeias* and *proskarterēseōs*) to the *proseuchē* under the auspices of the synagogue community, which included both the previous owner's heirs and "the synagogue of the Jews" (*tēs synagōgēs tōn Ioudaiōn*).[371]

Given that the word *ekklēsia* also is a Jewish synagogue term (e.g., Philo, Josephus), and since Paul depicts his Corinthian *ekklēsia* as a sacred (Jewish) structure ("temple of God," 1 Cor 3:16, 17), Pauline Christ-followers and the *proseuchai* of Bosporan Jewish synagogue communities share a common function: as sacred space, they both play host to, and legitimate thereby, the manumission of slaves, whether metaphorical (Corinth) or real (Bosporus Kingdom).

This ideological overlap may not be simply serendipitous happenstance. Paul's missionary travels may have apprised him of Jewish manumission *praxis* in the Bosporan kingdom on the north shore of the Black Sea. According to

---

369 For example, *CIRB* 70/*CIJ* 1.683 (81 CE): ἀφείημι ἐπὶ τῆς π[ρο]σευχῆς θρεπτόν μου Ἡρακλᾶν ἐλεύθερον.

370 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 154. The ascription of a sacred status to a *proseuchē* is not unknown in early Judaism(s). Philo's description of the pogrom in Alexandria (38 CE) includes a comment that the Jews feared that *proseuchai* elsewhere in the Roman empire would be desecrated with the Emperor's images (*Flacco* 45, 47). Commenting on this, Jutta Leonhardt states that "these places must have had a sacred status" (*Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* [TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 76). Epigraphic evidence adds additional evidence of a sacred status: Egyptian kings granted Jewish *proseuchai* the same inviolate status as temples (*asylon*) (e.g., *JIGRE*, no. 125).

371 *CIRB* 70/*CIJ* 1.683 reads, χωρὶς ἰς τ[ὴ]ν προσευχὴν θωπείας τε καὶ προσκα[ρτε][ρ]ήσεω[ς] συνεπινευσάντων δὲ καὶ τῶν κληρ(ο)νόμων μου Ἡρακλείδου καὶ Ἑλικωνιάδος, συνε[πιτ]ροπευούσης δὲ καὶ τῆ[ς] συναγωγῆ[ς] τῶν Ἰουδαίων ("except that he show devotion and diligence toward the prayer hall; both with the consent of my heirs Heraclides and Heliconias and with the joint guardianship of the congregation of the Jews"; translation by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson [*ASSB*, no. 124]). Examples of inscriptions which suggest that synagogues were considered sacred include *JIGRE* 9 (*CIJ* 2.1433; 2nd cent. BCE[?]; "the sacred [precinct] [*hieros peribolos*] and the prayer hall [*proseuchē*]"; *ASSB*, no. 143) and *JIGRE* 24 (*CIJ* 2.1441; [140–116 BCE]; *ASSB*, no. 159). Examples of Jewish literary sources which view synagogues as sacred space include Philo (*Flacc.* 41–53; Alexandrian *proseuchai* are said to possess "sacred precincts" [*hieros peribolos*] [40–41 CE]; *ASSB*, no. 138), Josephus (*A.J.* 16:162–65; a decree of Caesar Augustus which presumes synagogues as being sacred and inviolable; *ASSB*, no. 120), and mishnaic texts (*m. Meg.* 3:1–3, esp. 1 [200 CE]; the sale of a community's synagogue building to an individual is said to "degrade its sanctity"; *ASSB*, no. 82).

Acts 15:36–18:22, during Paul's second missionary journey (49–52 CE), while en route to Troas Paul journeyed not least through the province of Mysia, which is immediately south of the Black Sea (Acts 16:7, 8). It may also be that his inspiration for sacralising his non-civic *ekklēsiai* came from his travels in Mysia, although Paul's familiarity with Ephesos is another potential source.[372] It is only a few years after his Mysian visit that Paul wrote his Corinthian and Roman correspondence, the only two of his undisputed epistles wherein he depicts Christ-followers as Jewish sacred space.[373]

One factor which distinguishes Paul's manumission ideology from Roman-style manumission procedures is Paul's allusion to the ongoing *paramonē* obligations mandated of manumitted slaves (1 Cor 7:24b; *menetō para theou*). *Paramonē* clauses are found in one-fourth of Delphic Greek inscriptions and are replicated in Bosporan Jewish manumission ceremonies.[374] A *paramonē* clause is a legal requirement for the new "freedperson" (*apeleutheros*) to "remain with" (e.g., *parameinatō*)[375] his previous owner until that owner dies.[376] In this regard, Greek manumission is not emancipation.

In analogous fashion to the Greek *paramonē* clause, the manumitted slave of a Jewish owner is also placed under ongoing obligations. Unlike Greek *praxis*, however, those obligations are not to the previous owner. Rather, the Bosporan *apeleutheros* is obligated to a new 'owner'—the *proseuchē* ("prayer

---

372 See n. 126 (Ch. 2) for the Greek text of the seven inscriptions which attribute a sacral dimension to their civic *ekklēsia* through their use of the phrase "*hiera ekklēsia*." Five of the inscriptions are from Asia Minor, with two hailing from Mysia and three from Ephesos.

373 Paul's Corinthian correspondence was completed *c.* 55 CE and his Roman epistle *c.* 57 CE (at the earliest).

374 Of the 1300+ manumission inscriptions from central Greece, 302 of them include a *paramonē* style clause (παραμονῇ; παραμενέτω; παραμεινάτω; παραμ⟨ε⟩ίνασαν). Of these 302 inscriptions from central Greece, 5 include pair the word *ekklēsia* with a *paramonē* style clause. They hail from the region of Phokis, in which Delphi is situated. The five inscriptions are *FD* III 6:31 (Delphi, 1–20 CE), *FD* III 6:27 (Delphi, 1–20 CE), *IG* IX,1 193 (Tithora, beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE), *IG* IX,1 126 (Elateia, 2nd cent. BCE), and *FD* III 2:120 (Delphi, n.d.). See Appendix 3 for full text of the 1 century CE Greek inscriptions.

375 *FD* III 6:31 (*c.* 20 CE) reads, in part, παραμενέτω δὲ Τρυ[φ]έρα Νίκωνι πάντα τὸν τᾶς ζωᾶς αὐτ⟨οῦ⟩ χρόνον ποιοῦσα τὸ ἐπιτασσόμενον ἀνενκ[λ]ήτως.

376 Gibson clarifies that in Greek manumission procedures "service for the life of the former owner was the most common *paramonē* obligation, but a variety of other arrangements were possible. These include providing service for a limited number of years (*SGDI* 1742), maintaining a grave site (*SGDI* 1775, 1796, 1801, 1807), providing replacement slaves (*SGDI* 1717), learning a trade (*SGDI* 1899 and 1904), serving a designated party after the original owner's death (*SGDI* 1742, 1747, and 1884), and agreeing to live in a specific town (*SGDI* 1774 and 1801)" (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 40, 26).

hall").[377] Elizabeth Leigh Gibson contends that this implicit *paramonē* duty involves the provision of labour services,[378] rather than requiring conversion into a god-fearer.[379] If the main purpose of Bosporan Jewish *proseuchai* was the same as that claimed by Jutta Leonhardt for Alexandrian *proseuchai* during Philo's time, then a sacred *proseuchē* provides the opportunity "to show reverence to benefactors" for their euergetism through the reciprocity of "praise and thanksgiving."[380] The provision of labour services is a very practical way of extending ongoing "praise and thanksgiving" to the newly manumitted slave's 'benefactors,' that is, to the entire synagogue community.

It is only in 1 Cor (7:21–24) that we find the juxtaposition of manumission ideology with *ekklēsia* terminology. Paul teaches the Corinthian slaves and masters that, upon becoming members of the *ekklēsia*, their social status, but not necessarily their social stratum, reverses.[381] A slave (*doulos*) whom Christ has redeemed is now called a "freedperson in the Lord" (1 Cor 7:22, *apeleutheros kyriou*), while a "freeperson" (*ho eleutheros*) is now considered "a slave of

---

377 *CIRB* 70/*CIJ* 1.683 (81 CE) reads, in part, ἀφείημι ἐπὶ τῆς π[ρο]σευχῆς θρεπτόν μου Ἡρακλᾶν ἐλεύθερον.

378 The word θωπεία is variously translated as "deference" (Runesson, Binder and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 156, 158) or "diligence" (Binder, http://www.pohick.org/sts/bosporus .html; accessed March 21, 2011). Gibson contends that θωπεία, which is frequently required from the ex-slaves in the inscriptions, is "the attitude with which the servant should perform his service" (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 148). David Noy (RBL review 03/25/2000) applauds her translation over against Liddell and Scott's "flattery, adulation" (p. 373).

379 Gibson contends that the slaves' own religious position was irrelevant, contra Levinskaya who sees manumitted slaves as being an important source of godfearers (Irina Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996]). With respect to the singular phrase *theon sebōn* in *CIRB* 71, Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that even though the emendation suggested by Bellen and Lifshitz (*theo{n}sebōn*) is problematic, it does accord with the fact that "the release requirements prescribed … would be necessary only if the freed slaves were Gentiles" (*Ancient Synagogue*, 160).

380 Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*, 67–69, 71–73.

381 Stegemann and Stegemann differentiate between social stratum and social status (*The Jesus Movement*, 61). Any stratification analysis essentially presupposes social inequality. Social stratum is a measure of one's political and economic assets. Social status is a less concrete measure. Status relates primarily to the esteem in which a person is held by those within his circle of influence. Status also tends to vary depending on one's social circle. Thus, a person's status will fluctuate when talking about his/her family status, or status within a religious group or a guild, and so forth. A stratification system cannot express this multidimensional social situation and it does not have to. Strictly speaking it considers only the social system called *society*.

Christ" (1 Cor 7:22, *doulos Christou*).[382] This leveling of the social playing field, so to speak, releases each Christ-follower from enslavement to socio-economic stratification so that they can practice unrestricted social interaction whenever they gather for displays of "socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*" *en ekklēsia* (e.g., Gal 3:28; "no longer slave nor free").

Paul follows up his comments about status equalization among *ekklēsia* members with a concluding statement. Its ambiguity has long puzzled scholars (1 Cor 7:24b): "In whatever condition you were called, brothers and sisters, there remain with God."[383] If one translates *menetō para theō* (7:24b) with an eye to the *paramonē* formula (e.g., *paramenetō*, *FD* III 6:27), then Paul invites the Corinthians to subject their obligation to human masters (7:23) under a higher obligation to God (7:24b). This *paramonē*-style obligation lasts for as long as God, their master and 'benefactor,' lives.[384] Since God lives forever, each *doulos* of Christ has a *lifelong* obligation to God the Father, and, by familial extension, to their Father's sacred synagogue institution, the "*naos* of God" (1 Cor 3:16, 17), also called the "*ekklēsia* of God" (Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1). Thus, in 1 Cor 7:24b, Paul's implicit message could be that within the Father's surrogate sacred *proseuchē*—the *ekklēsia*—each *doulos* manumitted from sin is to praise and thank God (1 Cor 14:15–17).

The letter to the Philippians contains explicit evidence that the apostle Paul was acquainted with Greek manumission practices, and in particular with the *paramonē* clause. In Phil 1:1 Paul affirms his status as a *doulos* of Christ Jesus. In Phil 1:25 he indicates his familiarity with Greek *paramonē* obligations in that he employs the literal meaning of the simple form of *menō* and the metaphorical meaning of the compound form (*paramenō*), and both within the space

---

382   Dale Martin states that Paul "does not simply redefine the status of Christian slaves; he also redefines the status of free Christians" (*Slavery As Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990], 65).

383   1 Cor 7:24 reads, ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω παρὰ θεῷ.

384   Paul's apparent analogy to a Greek *paramonē* clause is not precise. In Greek *praxis* a manumitted slave is obligated to serve their *old* master for the duration of that master's life. In Paul's fictive schema, the manumitted slave of "sin" is no longer obligated to serve their old master, not because the old master "sin" has died, but, rather, because the *slave* has died to their old master (Rom 6:2, 6, 7). The flip side of that same coin is that each Christ-follower becomes the slave of a new master, "righteousness" (Rom 6:18) and, thus, to God himself (Rom 6:22), through their participation in the resurrected life of Jesus the *Christos* (Rom 6:4, 5, 11). Now that each *doulos* of God is alive in Christ, their *paramonē* obligation is to be directed to him as their new master (and to their new master's community of *Christos*-followers). In this regard, they are to "present [their] members to God as instruments of righteousness" (Rom 6:13).

of a single sentence.[385] In 1:25a Paul says that he will physically remain with the Philippians (*menō*). In 1:25b he states why he chooses physically to remain with them: as a *doulos* of Christ Jesus (1:1), he has a lifelong apostolic obligation (*paramenō*) to Christ's *ekklēsia* in Philippi to help them find fullness of life in Christ ("for your progress and joy in the faith"; 1:25c).[386]

One could summarize Paul's manumission ideology as follows: Paul portrays the *ekklēsia* of Christ-followers as a sacred Jewish synagogal 'place' *within which* individual Christ-followers are metaphorically manumitted from their previous master "sin," *towards which* individual Christ-followers are to remain obligated for life through displays of righteous *praxeis* to *ekklēsia* members, *for whom* their primary allegiance is to a new master, "God," and *to whom* is due their undying praise and thanksgiving for His eternal benefaction of grace.

4.4.6 Ekklēsia *as Jewish Sacred Space and Paul's Gentile Mission*

Paul's portrayals of his *ekklēsiai* as Jewish sacred space (body, temple, synagogue) position his communities as being the fulfillment of prophetic texts which speak of the eschatological return of Jews and the pilgrimage of gentiles.[387] It is in the *eschaton* that all ethnicities are envisioned as streaming to the cosmic mountain upon which sit both Jerusalem, also known as the "centre of the earth" (Isa 24:13; Ezek 38:12),[388] and the temple of God (Isa 2:1–4; 45:14; 66:20). Ezekiel adds a messianic connection. He pictures God making

---

385   Phil 1:25 reads, in part, οἶδα ὅτι μενῶ καὶ παραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως.

386   Friedrich Hauck notes that "in Phil 1:25 Paul characteristically changes the expected avoidance of martyrdom (μένειν, "to remain alive") into the ethical παραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως ... Selfish desires are subordinated to the service and furtherance of the congregation" ("παραμένω," *TDNT* 4:578). The verb παραμένω only occurs twice in Paul's writings (1 Cor 16:6; Phil 1:25), and only two additional times in the rest of the New Testament (Heb 7:23; James 1:25). James' injunction that "a hearer [of the word]" must be a "doer of the work" would have held greater ethical import for his hearing/reading audience if the command (παραμείνας) would have been understood as placing a *paramonē* obligation upon each hearer, both towards their synagogal community (2:2) and to their *ekklēsia* association (5:14). It is understandable that Hauck neglects to observe such allusional connections since he only cites Greek literary sources; he does not investigate epigraphic sources, and, thus, any Greek manumission inscriptions, in his consideration of παραμένω occurrences.

387   Some Second Temple Jews expected that "Israel's full restoration ... [would] set the stage for an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations" (Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles*, 193).

388   Isa 24:13 reads, "in the midst/belly of the earth" (בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ). Ezek 38:12 reads, "the center of the earth" (טַבּוּר הָאָרֶץ).

"the region around [his cosmic] hill a blessing" (Ezek 34:26) by sending his messianic shepherd David to tend the sheep of Israel (Ezek 34:20–31).

Paul could be conflating eschatological pilgrimage imagery in the identification of his *ekklēsiai* as Jewish sacred space. His *ekklēsiai* of "the Jerusalem above" (Gal 1:1; 4:26) are symbolically depicted as eschatological communities, each of which is a temple of God (1 Cor 1:2; 3:16, 17), the body of the Jewish *Christos* (1 Cor 12:27, 28), and a sacred site for freeing gentile and Jewish slaves (1 Cor 7:17–24) from sin. It should be noted, though, that Paul does not personally subscribe to the eschatological pilgrimage theology of some Second Temple Jews.[389] As Terence Donaldson points out, for Paul the "fullness" of the gentiles occurs during the time prior to when Israel is saved (Rom 11), not in the *eschaton* after Israel is saved. Thus, the most one can say is that the "Gentile mission is linked more to the 'not yet' of Paul's eschatological duality than to its 'already'."[390]

Paul's sacred *ekklēsiai*, then, become fitting spatial 'locations,' or 'geographical' centrepoints, if you will, for the influx of gentiles (and Jews) into communities whose risen Messiah has already inaugurated the *eschaton*, but not yet completed it. Thus, if a Corinthian interlocutor had asked Paul, "Where do the Jews and gentiles assemble in the *eschaton*?" Paul may very well have responded with, "it is already happening (1 Cor 10:11) in the *ekklēsia* ("meeting"; 14:28) of the *ekklēsia tou theou* (community of God; 1 Cor 1:2)[391] in Corinth

---

389   Regarding Romans 11, Donaldson notes that: "It is the 'fullness of the Gentiles'—the completion of the Gentile mission—that brings the period of Israel's rejection to an end, and triggers the final salvation of 'all Israel' (vv. 25–26), the resurrection of the dead (v. 15), and so on. Israel's full restoration, far from setting the stage for an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations, actually brings the period of Gentile salvation to an end" (*Paul and the Gentiles*, 193).

390   Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles*, 193.

391   B. J. Oropeza suggests the possibility that Paul's term *ekklēsia tou theou* (e.g., 1 Cor 1:2) may "have been derived from the apocalyptic idea of a holy assembly that would arise in the last days" (LXX Joel 2:16; *hagiasate ekklēsian*) (review of Paul Trebilco, *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament, RBL* 10/2013, 1–5, esp. 4; see also Oropeza's forthcoming commentary on 2 Corinthians for the Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity series [ed. Vernon Robbins and Duane Watson; Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Press]). Oropeza surmises further that since Paul, and Luke, reference Joel 2:28–32 "in relation to Christian conversion by calling on the name of the Lord, and [that] the passage is associated with the last days ... the text of Joel, then, would seem to be influential for early Christian self-identity, and perhaps it influenced the movement's self-perception as an end-time *ekklēsia* anticipated in the prophetic discourse" (*RBL* 10/2013, 4).

among whom the *eschaton* has already been inaugurated by the resurrection of the Messiah" (1 Cor 15:1–58).[392]

4.4.7   *Summary: Pauline* Ekklēsiai *and Jewish Ethno-Religious Identity*

I have identified six ways in which Paul can be said to link his multi-ethnic, diasporic *ekklēsiai* with a Jewish heritage, three are correspondences with Jewish sacred space, and three relate to lexical correlations in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus. Their combined witness, along with the exegetical ambiguities inherent in Paul's use of the terms "Jew," "circumcision," and "Israel," problematizes claims that Paul sees the *Christos*-follower *Ekklēsia* as having superseded the *Ekklēsia* of Israel in God's salvation history.[393] This observation adds an exclamation point to the conclusion reached by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson: "It is thus not possible to argue that when a group of Christ-believers use *ekklēsia* to designate their institution ... they are departing from either 'the Jewish community,' from 'Jewishness,' or from Jewish organizational forms, as has so often been assumed."[394]

One could say that adopting a permanent *ekklēsia* identity would have allowed early Christ-followers to disavow, from an institutional perspective, any perceptions that they were parting ways with "Judaism," but that, in fact, Paul sought institutionally to identify his multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* in some fashion with the ethno-religious 'tree' of Israel (Rom 11:17–24) with full participation in all of the social, political, economic, and judicial dimensions of life that a Jewish identity entailed.

---

392   Paul has been said to evince "inaugurated eschatology," otherwise known as an "already/not yet" theological schema. G. E. Ladd succinctly summarizes this theological position: "For the believer the 'ends of the ages' have arrived (*ta tele ton aionon*, 1 Cor 10:11). It is possible that this unique expression is used precisely to designate the fact that the two ages—this age and the Age to Come—overlap, that the first part of the Age to Come reaches back into the last part of the old age, so that the period between the resurrection and the parousia is a period 'between the times,' or better, a period that belongs to two times" (*A Theology of the New Testament*, 371). For Ladd's full discussion of Paul's "already/not yet" eschatology see pp. 360–73. For a discussion of the related concept "inaugurated eschatology," see Stanley Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 793–796. Paul's *ekklēsia* can be said to be an eschatological community in the sense that Jesus, the risen and enthroned *Christos*, is already present invisibly in the midst of his Christ-followers, who now await his visible revelation at the future *parousia*.

393   See 4.4. Ekklēsia *as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?*

394   Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 11 n. 21.

4.5   Conclusion: Chapter 4

I began Chapter 4 with three key investigative questions regarding the nature of *ekklēsia* usage within the New Testament, with particular focus upon Paul's acknowledged writings. The following picture emerges when one puts together all of the pieces that I have added to the scholarly puzzle that is *ekklēsia* usage among first-generation Christ-followers.

To the question as to which sub-group of the early Jesus movement was first to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity, I have forwarded Paul's communities. Among New Testament writers, he is the most prolific and diverse in his use of *ekklēsia* terminology, and, of those six writers who unequivocally use *ekklēsia* as a permanent sub-group identity, only his writings date prior to 70 CE. It is abundantly clear that he made a creative, and distinctive, contribution to the semantic range of the word *ekklēsia*: Paul created a non-civic, *trans-locally connected* semi-public association comprised of Greeks, Romans, 'barbarians,' and Jews.

To the question as to whether a collective *ekklēsia* identity expresses counter-imperial ideology, I have suggested rather that the widespread use of *ekklēsia* terminology within the Greco-Roman and Jewish worlds gave Paul's associations an increased missional relevance as positive socio-political participants within the Diaspora. There is no counter-imperial rhetoric necessarily inherent in Paul's use of *ekklēsia* as a group identity, not even in his declaration that his regionally separated *ekklēsiai* together formed a supra-local *Ekklēsia*. Rather, Paul equips his *ekklēsiai* to affect the fabric of everyday *polis* life in positive ways through their inculcation, and public expression, of love-based "socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*."

To the question of Jewish perceptions of Christ-follower associations that self-designated as *ekklēsiai*, I have argued that Paul's '*ekklēsia* identity construction project' served further to integrate his multi-ethnic communities into, rather than separating them farther from, religio-ethnic Israel. There are at least six ways in which Paul's use of *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity could have been perceived by Jews as interconnecting his multi-ethnic, diasporic *ekklēsiai* with a Jewish heritage. Paul metaphorically transforms his multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* into three examples of Jewish sacred space: the temple of God, the body of the Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred Jewish synagogue. Additionally, his communities self-designate with the same name used, firstly, of the ethno-religious nation of Israel in the desert (LXX), secondly, by a non-messianic Jewish semi-public association (Alexandria) and, thirdly, by public synagogue assemblies (Judea and Galilee). The multi-faceted integration of Paul's Christ-followers with the Jewish community, Jewishness, and Jewish

organizational forms suggests strongly that Paul does not intend that his designation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* should communicate either separationist or supersessionist ideology.

In sum, my ethno-political findings in Chapter 4 can be encapsulated in a six-point position statement: each Pauline *ekklēsia* reflects civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society, which is not counter-imperial, nor a trans-local parallel political organization, but rather a trans-local Jewish socio-religious semi-public association, whose membership was open to Greco-Romans qua Greco-Romans, and which could have been viewed as a pro-'democratic,' counter-oligarchic participant in the ubiquitous "*ekklēsia* discourse" of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society.

My review of Pauline writings in Chapter 4 now affords the opportunity for some more broadly based conclusions relative to how Paul uses the word *ekklēsia*. First, if the author of Acts uses *ekklēsia* provincially when writing about pre-Pauline Christ-follower communities, then Paul's communities are the only sub-group within the pre-70 CE Jesus movement which self-designated collectively as *ekklēsiai*. Majority opinion ascribes a post-70 CE date to other authors and writings which use the word *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity.[395] Second, not all Christ-follower communities in the Diaspora are explicitly identified as *ekklēsiai*. In 1 Peter the word *ekklēsia* is notable by its absence. This is even more striking since 1 Peter addresses Christ-followers across Asia Minor, which is where Paul established *ekklēsiai* (Galatia, Roman Asia), and where, only a few decades later, the author of Revelation writes to seven *ekklēsiai* (Roman Asia).[396]

Third, not all Christ-followers within the same *polis* self-designate as an *ekklēsia*. Paul's epistle to the Romans appears to be a case in point. Paul requests the addressees of his epistle, whom he does not call *ekklēsia*, to extend greetings to an *ekklēsia* that meets elsewhere within a house owned by Aquila and Priscilla (16:3–5). Paul's other four *ekklēsia* occurrences in Romans all refer to his diasporic communities (16:1, 4, 16, 23).

Fourth, not all Christ-followers within the same worshipping community self-designate as an *ekklēsia*. Paul's Corinthian correspondence is illuminating in this regard. The term *hoi hagioi* may indicate a distinctive group designation

---

395   Matthew, Acts, Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 3 John, Revelation, *1 Clement, 2 Clement, Barnabas, Didache*, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the writings of Ignatius and Justin Martyr.

396   1 Peter 1:1 reads, "To the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia."

assumed by some of the factions within the Christ-following community of Corinth (1 Cor 1:12; 3:4–6; 11:16).

Fifth, in relation to the Corinthian community, Paul may even use *ekklēsia* for ideological purposes. Within the course of only one of the Corinthians epistles (1 Corinthians), Paul employs all four of Schmidt's definitional categories for the word *ekklēsia*[397] in describing four out of the six possible group sizes identified by Meeks.[398] 1 Corinthians, thus, becomes in many respects not only a 'manual' of *ekklēsia* terminology but even a 'manifesto' of *ekklēsia* ideology. From many different angles, Paul, the apostolic overseer of the Corinthian community, not only depicts *ekklēsia* life to the Corinthian Christ-followers, but he prescribes these dictates even to those who do not yet appear to self-identify as a member of a Pauline *ekklēsia* (e.g., the *hoi hagioi* who "belong to Cephas"[?]; 1:12).[399]

---

397   Eleven of the combined total of thirty-one *ekklēsia* occurrences directly refer to the *ekklēsia* ("congregation") in Corinth or to its *ekklēsia* ("meeting") (1 Cor 1:2; 6:4; 11:18, 22; 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28; 2 Cor 1:1). Another sixteen occurrences implicitly assume that the Corinthian *ekklēsia* is trans-locally connected to other Pauline *ekklēsiai* (1 Cor 4:17; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16; 12:28; 15:9; 16:1, 19 [2×]; 2 Cor 8:1; 18, 19, 23, 24; 11:8, 28; 12:13). Some of the different groups of trans-locally connected Pauline *ekklēsiai* include the *ekklēsiai* "of God" (1 Cor 10:32), "of Galatia" (1 Cor 16:1), "of Asia" (1 Cor 16:19), and "of Macedonia" (2 Cor 8:1). Three occurrences (1 Cor 14:33b, 34, 35) may be references to non-Pauline congregations (*hoi hagioi*) which use the word *ekklēsia* in reference only to their "meeting" and not as a collective identity ("congregation").

398   Meeks' third and fourth group types are not represented within 1 (and 2) Corinthians. Paul does not speak either of a trans-local association located across geographical regions but aligned along ethnic or other criteria (e.g., 'the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles'), or of a trans-local assembly (*hē ekklēsia*) which is comprised of a number of local assemblies in any given region ("the *ekklēsia* throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria"; Acts 9:31).

399   By contrast, in 2 Cor 10–13 there are only three *ekklēsia* occurrences and these three do not appear to be used in rhetorically manipulative ways but rather more simply as descriptive terms of associational identity. Paul's non-rhetorical usage of the word *ekklēsia* in 2 Cor 10–13 may imply that these three chapters represent a time of reconciliation among the Jerusalem-loyal *hoi hagioi* and the Pauline *ekklēsia* (*tou theou*). If so, then it seems that the issue of collective identity which is so unsettled in 1 Corinthians has now been resolved to Paul's satisfaction. This suggests a rationale for the sudden appearance of the super-apostles, who claimed to be Christ-followers (2 Cor 11:13) of Jewish ethnicity (2 Cor 3 and 11:22). If the *hoi hagioi* in Corinth had changed their apostolic allegiance from Jerusalem to Paul, one would expect an attack on Paul's apostolic status as a way of undermining the legitimacy of the *hoi hagioi* faction's recent adoption of the *ekklēsia* identity that Paul champions.

Sixth, Paul does not unequivocally use the word *ekklēsia* in a universal sense. The closest he comes is in 1 Cor 12:27, 28 where he equates the *ekklēsia* with the body of Christ, although it is not impossible that the body of Christ he is referencing there may only be the Corinthian community.[400]

My research advances scholarship on Pauline *ekklēsiai*, specifically those in Asia Minor, in at least three respects. First, I problematize counter-imperial interpretations of Paul's *ekklēsiai* by assessing the political implications of their adoption of a civic identity through the lens of the political culture in Asia Minor. Second, I explore analogies between Pauline *ekklēsiai* and the *proseuchai* of Bosporan Jewish *synagōgai*. Third, I contend that Paul's designation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* was ideologically motivated for the purpose not only of linking his Jewish and gentile Christ-followers with a Jewish heritage, but also with their Jerusalem-loyal compatriots in the Jesus movement (e.g., *hoi hagioi*).

----

400   See n. 325 (Ch. 4).

Conclusion

As my study of the word *ekklēsia* has wound its way through the corridors of time, a number of doors of enquiry have opened into its use within Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christ-follower sources. This journey of enquiry has discovered that before its anachronistic translation as "church" or "the Church," *ekklēsia* had a more limited semantic range.

With respect to Greek and Roman sources, *ekklēsia* referred to the civic assemblies of the citizenry (*dēmos*) of a Greek *polis*, to a temporary group designation for the *dēmos* while meeting in their *ekklēsia*, and to some semi-public assemblies of non-civic groups in the Greek East (Delos, Samos, Sinuri). I have suggested that a voluntary association which self-designated as an *ekklēsia* could very well have been seen as a positive, rather than as a counter-imperial, participant within Greek *poleis*. By giving his non-civic groups a political identity, Paul provided them with a type of 'defense mechanism.' It would have been difficult for Roman suspicions to have been aroused over a voluntary association in the Greek East, the socio-religious *praxeis* of which portrays it as a paragon of civic order and *dēmokratia*, and the very name of which situates it in the centre of the "*ekklēsia* discourse" in Asia Minor.

Within Jewish sources, *ekklēsia* was used for various assemblies of, and even as a supra-local identity for, the ethno-religious nation of Israel, for publicly accessible gatherings of Jews during the Hellenistic (Judea) and Imperial periods (Judea and Alexandria), and for the permanent group identity of at least one semi-public association in Philo's Alexandria (*Virt.* 108). When it comes to early Christ-follower sub-groups, Binder has identified the need for a focused study on "the emergence and development of the Christian *ekklēsia*," specifically with respect to its function as a "sectarian synagogue."[1] Given that *ekklēsia* is also a synagogue term, one of the goals of my study has been to begin the process of understanding "the emergence and development" of those early Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* as "sectarian synagogues," or perhaps better, as Jewish associations. The use of *ekklēsia* by *intra muros* groups within pluriform Second Temple Judaism, and subsequently by Pauline Christ-followers, serves as another factor by which to problematize scholarly suggestions, not least at the institutional level, that Paul was "parting ways" with Judaism(s), 'Jewishness,' or Jewish organizational forms or that Paul was supersessionist in his *ekklēsia* ideology.

---

1 Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 24.

It seems feasible to suggest that there did not exist a supra-local "Christian *ekklēsia*" in the 1st century Jesus Movement, if by that term one means a universal designation that was adopted by *all* Christ-followers within the Roman empire. Not every Christ-follower community appears to have self-identified as an *ekklēsia*. The New Testament only explicitly attributes *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective identity to Christ-follower groups which were aligned either with Paul, the "elder" John, the "prophet" John, or Matthew.

If some Christ-follower communities in the early Jesus Movement did not self-identify as *ekklēsiai*, but rather by terms such as *hoi hagioi* and *christianoi*, then Campbell's dictum that identity precedes theology[2] carries particular weight for our understanding of Paul's purpose in writing his epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. Paul's theology, especially his metaphorical portrayal of Christ-followers as the temple of God, the Body of the Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred manumission synagogue, can then be seen as having as its primary ideological goal the construction of a socio-religious bridge. This bridge is not meant specifically for the crossing and mending of a Jewish–gentile ethnic divide, but rather for the crossing and mending of "a denominational divide," so to speak, between Paul's *ekklēsiai* and those Christ-followers (e.g., *hoi hagioi*) who hold different apostolic allegiances, particularly to the apostles in Jerusalem.

At least one area for further study arises out of this "*ekklēsia*-stical" journey through time: the need for a diachronic picture of group identity formation within the early Jesus movement. It would seem that an opportune moment has arrived for a comprehensive reassessment of group identity construction among early Christ-followers and to re-read their writings, which collectively are known canonically as the New Testament, with an ear to the implied conversations between differentiated 'denominational' sub-groups, not only between ethnically differentiated groups (Jews and gentiles). Some pre-70 CE subgroups are in conversation with each other, such as the *hoi hagioi* and *ekklēsiai* in Rome and Corinth. After 70 CE, it seems that the group identity construction project of Christ-followers had become more standardized—non-Pauline *ekklēsiai* begin to abound, whether in Roman Asia (e.g., the *ekklēsiai* of the Johannine epistles and of the book of Revelation) or in Galilee or the Diaspora (the Matthean community).

In summary, one can confidently say that before the Late Antique Christians, there were Christ-followers called "Christians" (*christianoi*; 1 Pet 4:16). However, one cannot confidently say that before the Late Antique "Church" there were "churches"; there were only Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* ("congregations" or "assemblies"), and the earliest *ekklēsiai* in the Jesus Movement were comprised of Pauline Christ-followers, not "Christians" (*christianoi*).

---

2   Campbell, *Paul*, 52.

Bibliography

1   Primary Epigraphic Sources

Alpers, Michael and Helmut Halfmann, with the assistance of John Mansfield and Christoph Schäfer, eds. *Supplementum Ephesium*. Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft. Hamburg 1995.

Ameling, Walter, Wolfgang Blümel, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, and Hasan Malay. *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Bonn: Habelt, 1972–.

Anderson, John George Clark, Franz Cumont, and Henri Grégoire. *Studia Pontica, III. Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines du Pont et de l'Arménie*. Fasc. 1. Brussels 1910.

Avram, Alexandru. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Vol. 3. *Callatis et territorium*. Bucharest 2000.

Barth, Matthias, and Josef Stauber, eds. *Inschriften Mysia und Troas*. Munich: Leopold Wenger-Institut, 1993.

Barth, Matthias, and Josef Stauber, eds. *Inschriften Mysia & Troas*. Leopold Wenger Institut. Universität München. Version of 25.8.1993 (Ibycus). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Troas, « Adramyttenos Kolpos », nos. 700–745.

Barth, Matthias, and Josef Stauber, eds. *Inschriften Mysia & Troas*. Leopold Wenger Institut. Universität München. Version of 25.8.1993 (Ibycus). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Troas, « Nördliche Troas », nos. 1–90.—Includes: Peter Frisch. *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*. « Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien », 6. Bonn 1978.

Barth, Matthias, and Josef Stauber, eds. *Inschriften Mysia & Troas*. Leopold Wenger Institut. Universität München. Version of 25.8.1993 (Ibycus). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Troas, « Südliche Troas », nos. 401–684 (+ 685–698, unbestimmter Fundort). Includes: Reinhold Merkelbach. Die Inschriften von Assos. « Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien », 4. Bonn, 1976.

Baunack, Johannes, ed. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, II. Epirus, Akarnanien, Aetolien*. Edited by Hermann Collitz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1885–1899.

Benndorf, Otto, and George Niemann. *Reisen in Lykien und Karien*. Reisen im Südwestlichen Kleinasien 1. Vienna: Codex, 1884.

Bernand, André. *Pan du désert*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Boeckh, August, Johannes Franz, Ernst Curtius, A. Kirchoff, Hermann Roehl, eds. *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*. 4 vols. Berlin: Reimer, 1828–77. Vol. I., ed. August

Boeckh (1828); vol. II, ed. August Boeckh (1843); vol. III, ed. Johannes Franz (1853); vol. IV, ed. Ernst Curtius and Adolph Kirchhoff (1877).

Bourguet, Émile. *Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie*. Paris: École française d'Athènes, 1929–. Fasc. 1, *Inscriptions de l'entrée du sanctuaire au trésor des Athéniens*, ed. Émile Bourguet. Paris 1929.—Fasc. 2, *Inscriptions du trésor des Athéniens*, ed. Gaston Colin. Paris 1909–1913.—Fasc. 3, *Inscriptions depuis le trésor des Athéniens jusqu'aux bases de Gélon*. 2 vols. Paris 1932–1943. Vol. 1, ed. Georges Daux and Antoine Salać (1932); vol. 2, Georges Daux (1943).—Fasc. 4, *Inscriptions de la terrasse du temple et la région nord du sanctuaire*. 4 vols. Paris 1930–1976. Vol. 1, ed. Gaston Colin (1930); vol. 2, ed. Robert Flacelière (1954); vol. 3, ed. André Plassart (1970); vol. 4, ed. Jean Pouilloux (1976).—Fasc. 5, *Les Comptes du IVᵉ siècle*, ed. Émile Bourguet. Paris 1932. [Replaced by *CID* II (1989).]—Fasc. 6, *Inscriptions du théâtre*, ed. Natan Valmin. Paris 1939.—Chron. Delph., *Chronologie delphique*, by Georges Daux. Paris 1943.

Bosch, Emin. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlarindan, Ser. 7, no. 46. Ankara 1967.

Bradeen, Donald W. *Inscriptions*. *The Funerary Monuments*. « The Athenian Agora », 17. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Buckler, William Hepburn, and David Moore Robinson, eds. *Sardis, VII. Greek and Latin Inscriptions, Part I*. Leiden: Brill, 1932.

Cabanes, Pierre. *L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine (272–167 av. J.C.)*. Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne, 19. Paris: Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Clermont-Ferrand, 1976.

Cabanes, Pierre, and Faïk Drini. *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire 2.2. Inscriptions de Bouthrôtos*. Études épigraphiques, 2. Athens: École française d'Athènes, 2007.

Cagnat, R. L., J. F. Toutain, V. Henry, and G. L. Lafaye, eds. *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*. 4 vols. Paris: E. Leroux, 1911–1927. I: (nos. 1–1518) ed. R. L. Cagnat, J. F. Toutain, and P. Jouguet (1911); II: never published; III: ed. R. L. Cagnat and G. L. Lafaye (1906); IV: *Asia* (nos. 1–1764), ed. G. L. Lafaye (1927).

Calder, William M., Ernst Herzfeld, Samuel Guyer, and C. W. M. Cox, eds. *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*. 10 volumes. Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor 1–8; Journal of Roman Studies Monographs 4, 7. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1928–93.

Chaniotis, A., T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud, and R. Tybout, eds. *SEG* vol. 53, pt. 2. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Corsten, Thomas, ed. *Die Inschriften von Kios*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 29. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1985.

Corsten, Thomas, ed. *Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympum*. IGSK 39–40. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1991–1993.

Corsten, Thomas. *Die Inschriften von Laodikeia am Lykos*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 49. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1997.

Decourt, Jean-Claude. *Inscriptions de Thessalie*. Vol. 1. *Les cités de la vallée de l'Énipeus*. Études épigraphiques, 3. Athens: École françaised'Athènes 1995–.

Dessau, Hermann. *Inscriptiones latinae selectae*. 3 vols. in 5 parts. Berlin: George Reimer, 1892–1916.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis romanae*, Parts 1–11. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1878–1882.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Inscriptiones Megaridis et Boeotiae*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, VII*. *Inscriptiones Megaridis, Oropiae, Boeotiae*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, and Karl Purgold, eds. *Die Inschriften von Olympia*. Olympia, 5. Berlin: George Reimer, 1896.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae IX,1. Inscriptiones Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaniae, insularum maris Ioni*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1897.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1903–1905.—For Egypt, Nubia and Abyssinia: see Étienne Bernand. *Inscriptions grecques d'Égypte et de Nubie: Répertoire bibliographique des OGIS*. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 272. Centre de Recherche d'Histoire Ancienne, 45; Paris 1982.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae: Supplementum sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. 2 volumes. Leipzig/Hildesheim: S. Hirzel/Georg Olms, 1903–5/1960.

Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. Third edition. Edited by Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen, Johannes Kirchner, Hans Rudolf Pomtow and Erich Ziebarth. 4 vols. Leipzig 1915–1924.

Edson, Charles, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae*, 11, *Inscriptiones Macedoniae*, fasc. 1, *Inscriptiones Thessalonicae et viciniae*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1914.

Edson, Charles, ed. *Inscriptiones graecae Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae*. 11: *Inscriptiones Macedoniae*; fasc. 1; *Inscriptiones Thessalonicae et viciniae*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Edson, Charles, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, X: Inscriptiones Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae. Pars II, fasc. 1: Inscriptiones Thessalonicae et viciniae*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Feissel, Denis. *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du IIIe au VIe siècle*. Bulletin de correspondance hellénique. Supplément, 8. Paris 1983.

Frey, Jean Baptiste, ed. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum: Recueil des inscriptions Juives qui vont du IIIe siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VIIe siècle de notre ère*. 2 Volumes. Città del

Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1936–1952. Vol. I, *Europe* (1936), nos. 1–734; Vol. II, *Asie—Afrique* (1952), nos. 735–1539.

Gounaropoulou, Loukretia, and Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos. *Epigraphes Kato Makedonias* (*metaxy tou Vermiou orous kai tou Axiou potamou*). *Teuchos A. Epigraphes Veroias*. Athens 1998.

Heberdey, Rudolf. *Tituli Asiae Minoris, III. Tituli Pisidiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti, 1. Tituli Termessi et agri Termessensis*. Vienna 1941.

Helly, Bruno. *Gonnoi*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. *Les Inscriptions*. Amsterdam 1973.

Herrmann, Peter, ed. *Tituli Asiae Minoris, V. Tituli Lydiae, linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. 2 vols. Vienna 1981 and 1989. Vol. 1, nos. 1–825, *Regio septentrionalis, ad orientem vergens*.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, XII. Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, 1. Inscriptiones Rhodi, Chalces, Carpathi cum Saro, Casi*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1895.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, XII. Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, 3. Inscriptiones Symes, Teutlussae, Teli, Nisyri, Astypalaeae, Anaphes, Therae et Therasiae, Pholegandri, Meli, Cimoli*, Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898.—With: *Inscriptiones Graecae, XII,3. Supplementum*. Edited by Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. Berlin: George Reimer, 1904.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae XII,5. Inscriptiones Cycladum*. 2 vols. Berlin: George Reimer, 1903–1909.—*Ios, Sikinos, Naxos, Paros, Oliaros, Siphnos, Seriphos, Kythnos, Keos, Gyaros, Syros, Andros and Tenos*.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae I: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno (403/2) anteriores*. Second edition. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1924.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Epidauri*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, IV. Inscriptiones Argolidis*. Second edition. Fasc. 1, *Inscriptiones Epidauri*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, XII. Supplementum*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1939. Addenda to *IG* XII,2–3, 5, and 7–9.

Hondius, Jacob E., Arthur G. Woodhead, et al. *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vols. 1–11, ed. Jacob E. Hondius, Leiden 1923–1954. Vols. 12–25, ed. Arthur G. Woodhead. Leiden 1955–1971. Vols. 26–41, eds. Henry W. Pleket and Ronald S. Stroud. Amsterdam 1979–1994. Vols. 42–44, eds. Henry W. Pleket, Ronald S. Stroud and Johan H. M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 1995–1997. Vols. 45–49, eds. Henry W. Pleket, Ronald S. Stroud, Angelos Chaniotis and Johan H. M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 1998–2002. Vols. 50–, eds. Angelos Chaniotis, Ronald S. Stroud and Johan H. M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 2003–.

Horbury, William, and David Noy. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hornblower, Simon. *Mausolus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Jalabert. Louis, and René Mouterde, eds. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie, I. Commagène et Cyrrhestique*. Paris 1929.

Judeich, Walther. "Inschriften." Pages 67–181 in *Altertümer von Hierapolis*. Edited by Carl Humann, Conrad Cichorius, Walther Judeich, and Franz Winter. Jarhbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft 4. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898.

Kaibel, Georg, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, XIV. Inscriptiones Siciliae et Italiae, additis Galliae, Hispaniae, Britanniae, Germaniae inscriptionibus*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1890.

Kalinka, Ernest, Rudolf Heberdey, Frederick Carol Dörner, Josef Keil, and Pter Hermann, eds. *Tituli Asiae Minoris collecti et editi auspiciis Academiae Litterarum Austriacae*. Vindobonae: Academiam Scientiarum Austriacam, 1920–.

Kalinka, Ernest, ed. *Tituli Asiae Minoris, II. Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. 3 fasc. Vienna 1920–1944. Fasc. 1, nos. 1–395, *Pars Lyciae occidentalis cum Xantho oppido* (1920); fasc. 2, nos. 396–717, *Regio quae ad Xanthum flumen pertinet praeter Xanthum oppidum* (1930); fasc. 3, nos. 718–1230, *Regiones montanae a valle Xanthi fluminis ad oram orientalem* (1944).

Kayser, François. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d'Alexandrie impériale*. Bibliotheque d'étude 108. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1994.

Keil, Josef, and Adolf Wilhelm, eds. *Denkmäler aus dem rauhen Kilikien*. Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, 3. Manchester 1931.

Kern, Otto, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae, IX,2. Inscriptiones Thessaliae*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1908.

Kern, Otto, ed. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*. Königliche Museen zu Berlin. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1900.

Kirchner, Johannes, ed. *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. 4 vols. Second edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1913–1940. *Inscriptiones Graecae II et III: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*, 2nd ed., Parts I–III, ed. Johannes Kirchner. Berlin 1913–1940.—Part I, 1–2 (1913–1916) = Decrees and Sacred Laws (Nos. 1–1369); Part II, 1–2 (1927–1931) = Records of Magistrates and Catalogues (Nos. 1370–2788); Part III, 1 (1935) = Dedications and Honorary Inscriptions (Nos. 2789–5219); Part III, 2 (1940) = Funerary Inscriptions (Nos. 5220–13247).—Part V, *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Herulorum incursionem et Imp. Mauricii tempora*, ed. Ericus Sironen. Berlin 2008. (Nos. 13248–13690) [Texts in part V adapted from an electronic copy kindly provided by Prof. Dr. Klaus Hallof, director of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* program.]

Kirchoff, Adolf, Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen, Ulrich Koehler, and Wilhelm Ditttenberger, eds. et al. *Inscriptiones Graecae, Consilio et auctoritate Academiae*

litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae. 14+ volumes. Berlin: Reimer, 1873–; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1924–.

Klaffenback, Gunther, ed. *Inscriptiones graeciae septentrionalis*. Second edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1932–1968. Fasc. 1, *Inscriptiones Aetoliae* (1932); fasc. 2, *Inscriptiones Graecae IX,1*. 2nd ed., ed. Günther Klaffenbach. Berlin 1932–1968.— Fasc. 1, *Inscriptiones Aetoliae* (1932); fasc. 2, *Inscriptiones Acarnaniae* (1957); fasc. 3, *Inscriptiones Locridis occidentalis* (1968).

Koehler, Ulrich, ed. *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora*, Parts I–V. Berlin 1877–1895.

Lalonde, Gerald V. "Horoi." Pages 1–51 in *Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai, Leases of Public Lands. The Athenian Agora* 19. Edited by Gerald V. Lalonde, Merle K. Langdon and Michael B. Walbank. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Lang, Mabel. *Graffiti and Dipinti*. The Athenian Agora, 21. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Langdon, Merle K. "Poletai Records." Pages 53–141 in *Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai, Leases of Public Lands*. The Athenian Agora, 19. Edited by Gerald V. Lalonde, Merle K. Langdon and Michael B. Walbank. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Latyshev, Basilius, ed. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*, 3 vols. St. Petersburg 1885–1901. Vol. 1, Second edition, *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*. St. Petersburg 1916.

Le Bas, Philippe, and William Henry Waddington. *Inscriptiones grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure*. 2 volumes. Paris: Firmin–Didot, 1870; repr., Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972.

Lewis, David and Lilian Jeffery, eds. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Third edition. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1981–. *Inscriptiones Graecae I: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. Third edition. Berlin 1981, 1994. Fasc. 1, ed. David Lewis, *Decreta et tabulae magistratuum* (nos. 1–500); fasc. 2, ed. David Lewis and Lilian Jeffery, Dedicationes. *Catalogi. Termini. Tituli sepulcrales. Varia. Tituli Attici extra Atticam reperti*. Addenda (nos. 501–1517).

Lifschitz, Baruch. *Donnateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1967.

Lüderitz, G. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients, B, 53. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1983.

McCabe, Donald F. *Samos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1986).

McCabe, Donald F. *Amyzon Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1991). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Includes: Jeanne Robert and Louis Robert. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie, I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris 1983.

McCabe, Donald F. *Aphrodisias Inscriptions*. *Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1991). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Includes: J. M. R. Cormack, in: William Moir Calder and James Maxwell Ross Cormack. *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias*. « Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua » [MAMA], 8. Manchester 1962.—Joyce Reynolds. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. Journal of Roman Studies, Monographs, 1. London 1982.—Charlotte Roueché. *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity*. Journal of Roman Studies Monographs, 5. London 1989.

McCabe, Donald F. *Didyma Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1985). Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Albert Rehm. *Didyma, II. Die Inschriften*. Berlin 1958.

McCabe, Donald F. *Ephesos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1991). Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. 8 vols. in 9 parts, with a Supplement. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 11,1–17,4. Bonn 1979–1984.—Vol. Ia, nos. 1–47, ed. Hermann Wankel (1979); vol. II, nos. 101–599, eds. Christoph Börker and Reinhold Merkelbach (1980); vol. III, nos. 600–1000, eds. Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Knibbe and Reinhold Merkelbach (1980); vol. IV, nos. 1001–1445, eds. Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Knibbe and Reinhold Merkelbach (1980); vol. V, nos. 1446–2000, eds. Christoph Börker and Reinhold Merkelbach (1980); vol. VI, nos. 2001–2958, eds. Reinhold Merkelbach and Johannes Nollé (1980); vol. VII,1, nos. 3001–3500, and VII,2, nos. 3501–5115, eds. Recep Meriç, Reinhold Merkelbach, Johannes Nollé and Sencer Şahin (1981), with (VII,1) Reinhold Merkelbach and Johannes Nollé, *Addenda et corrigenda zu den Inschriften von Ephesos I–VII,1 (IK 11,1–17,1)* (1981); vol. VIII,1–2, Indices, eds. Helmut Engelmann and Johannes Nollé (1984).

McCabe, Donald F. *Halikarnassos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Gustav Hirschfeld. In: *The Collection of Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*. London: Clarendon Press, 1874–1916. Part IV, Sect. I, Ch. II, Halikarnassos (1893).

McCabe, Donald F. *Iasos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Wolfgang Blümel. *Die Inschriften von Iasos*. 2 vols. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 28,1–2. Bonn 1985.

McCabe, Donald F. *Magnesia Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Otto Kern. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*. Berlin 1900.

McCabe, Donald F. *Miletos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1984). Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.

McCabe, Donald F. *Mylasa Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Wolfgang Blümel. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*. 2 vols. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 34–35. Bonn 1987–1988. Vol. 1, *Inschriften der Stadt*; vol. 2, *Inschriften aus der Umgebung der Stadt*.

McCabe, Donald F. *Sinuri Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1991). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.—Includes: Louis Robert. *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa, I. Les inscriptions*. Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul, 7. Paris 1945.

McCabe, Donald F. *Smyrna Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1988). Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.—Includes: Georg Petzl. *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*. 2 vols. in 3 parts. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 23 and 24,1–2. Bonn 1982, 1987 & 1990.

McCabe, Donald F. *Teos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1985). Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.

Meritt, Benjamin D., and John Traill. *The Athenian Councillors*. The Athenian Agora, 15. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Mitchell, Stephen. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor, II: The Ankara District. The Inscriptions of North Galatia*. With the assistance of David French and Jean Greenhalgh. British Archaeological Reports, International Series, 135. Oxford 1982.

Mitford, Terence B. *The Inscriptions of Kourion*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 83. Philadelphia 1971.

Moretti, Luigi, ed. *Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae*. Istituto Italiano per la storia antica, studi nos. 17, 22, 28, 47. Rome: Istituto Italiano per la storia antica, 1968–1990.

Nollé, Johannes, and Friedel Schindler, eds. *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*. Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [und der] Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1991.

Peek, Werner. *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Band 60, Heft 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.

Petrakos, Vasileios Ch. *Hoi Epigraphes tou Oropou.* Vivliotheke tes en Athenais Archaiologikes Hetaireias, 170. Athens 1997.

Plassart, André, ed. *Inscriptions de Délos*. 7 vols. Paris 1926–1972. Vol. 6 [1], Nos. 1–88, ed. André Plassart (1950); vol. 7 [2], nos. 89–104[33], ed. Jacques Coupry (1972); vol. 1 [3], nos. 290–371, ed. Félix Durrbach (1926); vol. 2 [4], nos. 372–509, ed. Félix Durrbach (1929); vol. 3 [5], nos. 1400–1496, ed. Félix Durrbach and Pierre Roussel (1935); vol. 4 [6], nos. 1497–2219, ed. Pierre Roussel and Marcel Launey (1937); vol. 5 [7], nos. 2220–2879, eds. Pierre Roussel and Marcel Launey (1937).

Rigsby, Kent J. *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley: University of Southern California Press, 1996.

Roussel, Pierre, ed. *Inscriptiones Deli: Consilio et auctoritate Academiae inscriptionum et humaniorum litterarum francogallicae editae*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1914.

Roussel, Pierre, ed. *Inscriptiones Graecae XI. Inscriptiones Deli, fasc. 4*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1914 (Nos. 510–1349).

Schwenk, Cynthia J. *Athens in the Age of Alexander: The Dated Laws & Decrees of "the Lykourgan era" 338–322 B.C.* Chicago: Ares, 1985.

Segre, Mario. *Iscrizioni di Cosi*. Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente, 6. Rome 1993.

Segre, Mario. "Tituli Calymnii." *ASAtene* 22–23, nos. 6–7 (1944–1945 [1952]): 1–248.

Sokolowski, Fransiczek. *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques: Supplement*. École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers do l'école et de divers savants 11. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1962.

Sokolowski, Fransiczek. *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques*. École Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers do l'école et de divers savants 10. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1969.

Strubbe, Johan H. K. *The Inscriptions of Pessinous*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 66. Bonn 2005.

Struve, Vasili Vasilevich, et al., eds. *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani*. Leningrad: Akademia nauk SSSR, Institut Istorii, 1965.

Tcherikover, V. A., A. Fuks, and M. Stern, eds. *Corpus papyrorum judaicarum*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957–64.

Tod, Marcus, ed. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

Walbank, Michael B. "Leases of Public Lands." Pages 145–198 in *Inscriptions. Horoi, Poletai, Leases of Public Lands*. The Athenian Agora, 19. Edited by Gerald V. Lalonde, Merle K. Langdon and Michael B. Walbank. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Wiegend, Theodor, Georg Kawerau, Albert Rehm, and Peter Hermann. *Milet: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1889–1997.

Woodhead, A. Geoffrey. *Inscriptions. The Decrees*. The Athenian Agora, 16. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

2   Primary Literary Sources

Aristotle in 23 Volumes. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1952.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs, eds. *The New Brown–Driver–Briggs–Genesius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979.

Ellinger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77.

Husselman, E., A. E. Boak, and W. F. Edgerton, eds. *Papyri from Tebtunis, Part II: Michigan Papyri, Vol. V*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1933–1944.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2001.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Nestle, E. B., Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece* 27. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Page, T. E. and W. H. D. Rouse, eds. *The Loeb Classical Library*. London: Heinemann and Co., 1912.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1954.

Plato. *Platonis Opera*. Edited by John Burnet. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914.

Porten, B. *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change*. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and Civilization, 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments, with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose. *Part VII: The Ajax*. Edited by Richard C. Jebb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.

Tov, Emanuel, ed. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. 40 Volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955–2008.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Xenophon. *Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 2. Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921/repr. 1971.

Young, Richard A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum Septuaginta*. 24 Volumes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &Ruprecht, 1931–2006.

3 Secondary Sources

Abegg, Martin. "4QMMT C 27, 31 and "Works Righteousness." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6.2 (1999): 139–47.

Abegg, Martin. "Paul, Works of the Law, and the MMT." *Biblical Archeology Review* 20/6 (1994): 52–55.

Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Adams, Edward. "First-Century Models for Paul's Churches: Selected Scholarly Developments since Meeks." Pages 60–78 in *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-five Years Later*. Edited by Todd D. Still and David G. Horrell. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009.

Agosto, Efrain. "Patronage and Commendation, Imperial and Anti-imperial." Pages 103–23 in *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order*. Edited by Richard Horsley. Harrisburg, London, New York: TPI, 2004.

Alston, Richard and Onno M. van Nijf, eds. *Feeding the Ancient Greek City*. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age, 1. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

Alston Richard, Onno M. van Nijf, and Christina G. Williamson, eds. *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age, 3. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Alter, Robert. *The World of Biblical Literature*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Anderson, Richard H. "Theophilus: A Proposal." *Evangelical Quarterly* 69:3 (1997): 195–215.

Ascough, Richard S. "Translocal Relationships among Voluntary Associations and Early Christianity," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5, no. 2 (1997): 223–41.

Ascough, Richard S. *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1998.

Ascough, Richard S. "Matthew and Community Formation." Pages 97–126 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Studies*. Edited by D. E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Ascough, Richard S. *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians*. WUNT 161. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003.

Ascough, Richard S. "Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Pauline Christian Communities: Overcoming the Objections." Pages 149–181 in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Edited by Andreas Gutsfeld and Dietrich-Alex Koch. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006.

Ascough, Richard S. "'Map-maker, Map-maker, Make me a Map': Re-describing Greco-Roman 'Elective Social Formations'." Pages 68–84 in *Introducing Religion: Festschrift for Jonathan Z. Smith*. Edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon. London: Equinox, 2008.

Ascough, Richard S. "Paul, Synagogues, and Associations: Reframing the Question of Models for Pauline Christ Groups," *Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting from the First to the Seventh Century* 2 (2015): 27–52.

Ascough, Richard S. "What Are They Now Saying About Christ Groups and Associations?" *Currents in Biblical Research* 13/2 (2015): 207–44.

Ascough, Richard, Philip Harland and John Kloppenborg, eds. *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: a Sourcebook*. Berlin/Waco: de Gruyter/Baylor University Press, 2012.

Atkinson, Kenneth. "On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17." Pages 106–23 in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Attridge, Harold. "Historiography." Pages 157–84 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section Two. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984.

Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Aune, David E. "Qumran and the Book of Revelation." Pages 622–48 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, volume 2. Edited by Peter Flint and John C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Bachmann, M. "4QMMT und Galaterbrief, מעשי התורה und ΕΡΓΑ ΝΟΜΟΥ." *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1998): 91–113.

Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978–80.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Barclay, John M. G. "Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2:25–9 in Social and Cultural Context." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 536–556.

Barclay, John M. G. "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant to Paul." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA., Nov. 16–20, 2007.

Barrett, C. K. "Christianity at Corinth." Pages 1–27 in *Essays on Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.

Barrett, C. K. "Cephas and Corinth." Pages 28–39 in *Essays on Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.

Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. International Critical Commentary Series. 2 Volumes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Baumgarten, Albert. "Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Jewish Sects." Pages 93–111 in *Jews in a Greco-Roman World*. Edited by M. Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Beale, Gregory K. "The Background of Ἐκκλησία Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38 (2015): 151–168.

Becker, Adam, and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Second edition. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Becker, Jürgen. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. ed. *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Beeson, Stuart D. "Historiography Ancient and Modern: Fact and Fiction." Pages 3–12 in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne*. Edited by G. Brooke and T. Römer. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007.

Bekker-Nielsen, Tonnes. *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia: The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2008.

Bell, H. I. "Antinoopolis: A Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt." *Journal of Roman Studies* 30.2 (1940): 133–47.

Berger, Klaus "Volksversammlung und Gemeinde Gottes. Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia'." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 73 (1976): 167–207.

Best, Ernest. *Interpreting Christ*. New York/London: Continuum, 2000.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Fortress: Philadelphia, 1977.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *II Corinthians 8–9*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Bigg, Charles. *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. The International Critical Commentary. Second edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.

Binder, Donald. *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogue in the Second Temple Period*. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.

Blumenfeld, Bruno. *The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework*. JSNTSup 210. London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001/ London: T. & T. Clark, 2003/2004.

Boak, Arthur Edward Romilly. "Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt." *TAPA* 68 (1937): 212–20.

Bockmuehl, Markus. "A Commentator's Approach to the 'Effective History' of Philippians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 60 (1995): 57–88.

Borgen, Peder. "Observations on the Theme 'Paul and Philo' Paul's Preaching of Circumcision in Galatia (Gal 5:11) and Debates on Circumcision in Philo." Pages 85–102 in *The Pauline Literature and Theology*. Edited by S. Pederson. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 233–82 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section Two. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984.

Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 86. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979–2012.

Bowman, A. K. *The Town Councils in Roman Egypt*. American Studies in Papyrology. Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, 1971.

Briggs, Robert A. *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999.

Brooke, George. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Brooke, George. "Introduction." Pages xiii–xxxvii in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne*. Edited by G. Brooke and T. Römer. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007.

Brooten, Bernadette. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. Brown Judaic Studies 36. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.

Brooten, Bernadette. "Female Leadership in the Ancient Synagogue." Pages 215–23 in *From Dura to Sepphoris: Studies in Jewish Art and Society in Late Antiquity*. Edited by L. I. Levine and Z. Weiss. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series, 2000.

Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1985.

Brown, Raymond. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.

Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Bryant, Robert A. *The Risen Crucified Christ in Galatians*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 185. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Buell, Denise. *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. New York: Scribner, 1951.

Bunson, Margaret. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Revised edition. New York: Facts on File, 2002.

Burkert, Walter. "Greek *Poleis* and Civic Cults: Some Further Thoughts." Pages 201–210 in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Edited by M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub. Historia Einzelschriften 95. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.

Burtchaell, James Tunstead. *From Synagogue to Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Burton, Ernest DeWitt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921.

Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Camp, Claudia V. "Honor and Shame in Ben Sira: Anthropological and Theological Reflections." Pages 171–188 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Campbell, J. Y. "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word Ekklesia." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 130–42.

Campbell, William S. "'All God's Beloved in Rome!' Jewish Roots and Christian Identity." Pages 67–82 in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*. Edited by Sheila E. McGinn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Campbell, William S. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Campbell, William S. "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?" Pages 171–95 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner, with the assistance of Frank Schleritt. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Campbell, William S. "No Distinction or No Discrimination? The Translation of Διαστολὴ in Romans 3:22 and 10:12." Pages 146–71 in *Erlesenes Jerusalem: Festschrift für Ekkehard W. Stegemann*. Edited by Lukas Kundert and Christina Tuor-Kurth. Basel: Friedrich Reinhart Verlag, 2013.

Carlsson, Susanne. *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*. Historia Einzelschriften 206. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010.

Catto, Stephen K. "Does προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* 14.257–58, Mean 'Build Places of Prayer'?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35 (2004): 159–68.

Catto, Stephen K. *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue: A Critical Analysis of Current Research*. Library of New Testament Series 363. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Cerfaux, Lucien. *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*. New York: Herder and Herder/ London: Nelson, 1959.

Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 75. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Chwe, Michael Suk–Young. *Rational Ritual: Culture, Coordination, and Common Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 18. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Claußen, Carsten. *Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagoge: Das hellenistisch-judischen Umfelt der fruchristlichen Gemeinden*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Clay, Diskin. *Paradosis and Survival: Three Chapters in the History of Epicurean Philosophy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1992.

Coggins, Richard J. *Sirach*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Cole, Susan Guettel. "Civic Cult and Civic Identity." Pages 292–325 in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24–27, 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 2. Edited by M. H. Hansen. Historik–filosofiske Meddelelser 72. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1995.

Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Collins, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Coloe, Mary. *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Cook, B. F. *Reading the Past: Greek Inscriptions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Cosgrove, Charles H. *Elusive Israel: The Puzzle of Election in Romans*. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1997.

Cousin, Georges. "Inscriptions du sanctuaire de Zeus Panamaros." *Bulletin de correspondence hellénique* 28 (1904): 20–53.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. International Critical Commentary. 6th Edition. 2 volumes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975.

Crossan, John Dominic and Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus' Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005.

Dahl, Nils. "The Future of Israel." Pages 137–58 in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.

Das, A. Andrew. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Davies, W. D. "Paul and the People of Israel." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977): 4–39.

Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1980.

Day, John. *Greek History: An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*. New York: Columbia University Press/Arno Press, 1942/repr. 1973.

De Laix, Roger Alain. *Probouleusis at Athens: A Study in Political Decision-Making*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

De Robertis, Francesco M. *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*. Bari: Adriatica, 1938/repr., 1971.

De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

DeConick, April D. "What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?" Pages 1–24 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Symposium 11. Edited by April D. DeConick. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

Del Verme, Marcello. *Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Deschamps, Gaston and Georges Cousin. "Inscription de Magnésie du Méandre." *Bulletin de correspondence hellénique* 12 (1888): 204–223.

Deschamps, Gaston and Georges Cousin. "Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros." *Bulletin de correspondence hellénique* 15 (1891): 169–209.

Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section Two. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen, NL: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Dimant, Devorah. "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple." Pages 165–89 in *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 1986.

Dinsmoor, William Bell. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of Its Historic Development*. New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1950.

Dmitriev, Sviatoslav. *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Donaldson, Terence L. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.

Donaldson, Terence L. "The Imperial Cults of Thessalonica and Political Conflict in 1 Thessalonians." Pages 215–23 in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Edited by R. A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International/ New York & London: Continuum, 1997.

Donaldson, Terence L. *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Donaldson, Terence L. *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism* (*to 135 CE*). Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Donaldson, Terence L. "Supersessionism and Early Christian Self-definition." *Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting* 3 (2016): 1–32.

du Toit, Andries. "*Paulus Oecumenicus*: Interculturality in the Shaping of Paul's Theology." *New Testament Studies* 55 (2009): 121–143.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Romans*. 2 Vols. Word Biblical Commentary 38A, B. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.

Dunn, J. D. G. "4QMMT and Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 147–53.

Dunn, J. D. G. *The Theology of the Apostle Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology? Reflections on Romans 9:4 and 11:27." Pages 3–19 in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*. Edited by Sheila E. McGinn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Reconstructions of Corinthian Christianity and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians." Pages 295–310 in *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Edited by Edward Adams and David G. Horrell. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Beginning from Jerusalem: Christianity in the Making*, Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Dunn, J. D. G., ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Eastman, Susan G. "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6:16 and Romans 9–11." *New Testament Studies* 56.3 (2010): 367–95.

Ebner, Martin. *Die Stadt als Lebensraum der ersten Christen. Das Urchristentum in seiner Umwelt I*. Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament 1,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Ehrensperger, Kathy. *That We May Be Mutually Encouraged: Feminism and the New Perspective in Pauline Studies*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Real Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: HarperOne, 2009.

Eisen, Ute E. *Women Officeholders in Early Christianity: Epigraphical and Literary Studies*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Elbogen, Ishmar. *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*. Translated by Raymond P. Scheindlin. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1993.

Elliott, Neil. "Romans 13:1–7 in the Context of Imperial Propaganda." Pages 184–204 in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Edited by Richard Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997.

Elliott, Neil. *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Elliott, Neil. "The Apostle Paul and Empire." Pages 97–116 in *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*. Edited by R. Horsley. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Elliott, Neil. *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008.

Errington, R. M. "ἐκκλεσίας κυρία γενομένες." *Chiron* 25 (1995): 19–25.

Errington, R. M. "Aspects of Roman acculturation in the East under the Republic." Pages 140–57 in *Alte geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65 Geburtstag*. Edited by Karl Christ, Peter Kneissl, and Volker Losemann. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1988.

Esler, Philip F. *Galatians*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Esler, Philip F. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Falk, Daniel. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Fee, Gordon D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament 50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Feldman, Louis. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.

Feldman, Louis. *Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Translation and Commentary by Louis Feldman. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Feldmeier, Reinhard. *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Translated by Peter H. Davids. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

Filson, Floyd V. "The Significance of the Early House Churches." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 109–12.

Fine, Stephen. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.

Fine, Stephen, ed. *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Graeco-Roman Period*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Fitzer, Gottfried. *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde: Über den unpaulinischen Charakter de mulier-taceat-Verse in 1.Korinther 14*. TEH 10. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1963.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as Test Case." Pages 161–193 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Foucart, Paul. *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs—thiases, éranes, orgéons, avec le texte des inscriptions relative à ces associations*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1873.

Fraade, S. D. "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees." *Revue de Qumran* 19 (2000): 507–26.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 232–52.

Freedman, David Noel, ed. *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. 6 Volumes. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Friesen, Steven J. *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Fuglseth, Kåre. *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran*. Novum Testamentum Supplement Series, vol. 119. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Gager, John G. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

Gathercole, Simon J. *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Gauthier, Philippe. "Les cités héllenistiques: épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des regimes politiques." Pages 82–107 in *Πρακτικά τοῦ Η' διεθνοὺς συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικής καὶ Λατινικής ἐπιγραφικής (Αθινα,3–9 Ὀκτωβρίου 1982) τομος Α.* Athens: 1984.

Gauthier, Philippe. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IVᵉ–Iᵉʳ siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions*. BCH suppléments, 12. Paris: 1985.

Gauthier, Philippe. "Les cités héllenistiques." Pages 211–31 in *The Ancient Greek City-State. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, vol. 1. Edited by M. H. Hansen. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 67. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993.

Gebhard, Elizabeth R. "The Theater and the City." Pages 113–28 in *Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I*. Edited by William Slater. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Georgi, Dieter. *Theocracy in Paul's Praxis and Theology*. Translated by David E. Green. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Gibson, Elizabeth Leigh. *The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House*. Texte und studien zum antiken Judentum 75. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999.

Gillihan, Yonder Moynihan. *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 97. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Girard, Paul Frédéric. "Inscriptions de Samos." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 5 (1881): 477–91.

Glotz, Gustave. *The Greek City and Its Institutions*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1929/1969.

Goldblatt, David M. *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *1 Maccabees*. Anchor Bible Commentary 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *A Commentary on 1 Peter*. EKK. Translated by John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Gordon, Arthur E., and Joyce S. Gordon, eds. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions: vol. 2, part 1, Rome and the Neighborhood A.D. 100–199*. Translated by A. Gordon. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. 2 Vols. London: T&T Clark, 2004/2008.

Green, Bernard. *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Grenz, Stanley. *Theology for the Community of God*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994.

Grieb, Volker. *Hellenistische Demokratie: Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen*. Historia Einzelschriften 199. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2008.

Griffiths, J. Gwyn. "Egypt and the Rise of the Synagogue." Pages 3–16 in *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*, vol. 1. Edited by Dan Urman and P. V. M. Flesher. New York: Brill, 1995.

Grossman, Maxine. "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History." *Revue de Qumran* 20 (2001): 3–22.

Gundry, Robert H. "In my Father's House are many μοναί (John 14:2)." *Zeitschrift für Neuetestamentliche Wissenschaft* 57 (1967): 68–72.

Gundry, Robert H. *SOMA in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Gupta, Nijay K. *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Gupta, Nijay K. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th Edition. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990.

Gutsfeld, A. and D. A. Koch, eds. *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Habicht, Christian. "Ist ein 'Honorationemregime' das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?" Pages 87–92 in *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Edited by M. Wörrle and P. Zanker. München: C. H. Beck 1995.

Hachlili, Rachel. *Ancient Jewish Art and Archaeology in the Diaspora*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, vol. 35. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Hachlili, Rachel. *Ancient Synagogues—Archaeology and Art: New Discoveries and Current Research*. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1, Ancient Near East; volume 105. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Hagedorn, D. *Griechische Papyri (Nr. 45–154): Griechische Urkundenpapyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, Band III. Edited by U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, R. Hübner, and J. C. Shelton. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner GmbH, 1986.

Hainz, J. *EKKLESIA. Strukturen paulinischer Gemeinde-Theologie und Gemeinde-Ordnung*. Biblische Untersuchungen 9. Regensburg: Pustet, 1972.

Hall, Robert G. "The Rhetorical Outline for Galatians: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 277–87.

Hall, Robert G. "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." Pages 308–320 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Hammond, Nicholas Geoffrey Lemprière. *Epirus: The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Hansen, Bruce. *All of You are One*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. "*Kome*. A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements which were not *Poleis*." Pages 45–82 in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Edited by M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub. Historia Einzelschriften 95. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. "City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity." Pages 169–196 in *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Edited by M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub. Historia Einzelschriften 108. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology*. Translated by J. A. Crook. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. "The Hellenic Polis." Pages 141–88 in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation*. Edited by M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s, 2000.

Harink, Douglas. *Paul among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology Beyond Christendom and Modernity*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2003.

Harland, Philip. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Harland, Philip. *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*. New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009.

Harnack, Adolf. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.

Harrington, Daniel J. *Jesus Ben Sira of Jerusalem: A Biblical Guide to Living Wisely*. Interfaces. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005.

Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

Harris, Marvin. *Cultural Materialism*. Updated edition. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2001.

Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hassall, Mark, Michael Crawford, and Joyce Reynolds. "Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century BCE." *Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 195–220.

Hatch, Edwin. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches: Eight Lectures*. Bampton lectures for 1880. London: Rivingtons, 1881.

Heath, Malcolm. "Theon and the History of the *Progymnasmata*." *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 43/2 (2002): 129–160.

Hegedus, Tim. "Naming Christians in Antiquity." *Studies in Religion* 33 (2004): 173–90.

Hellholm, David. "Amplificatio in the Macro-Structure of Romans." Pages 123–39 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter and T. Olbricht. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Hemer, Colin J. *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986/1989.

Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Hengel, Martin. "Proseuche und Synagoge: Jüdische Gemeinde, Gotteshaus und Gottesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina." Pages 27–54 in *The Synagogue: Studies in Origin, Archaeology and Architecture*. The Library of Biblical Studies. Edited by J. Gutmann. New York: KTAV, 1975.

Hengel, Martin and A. M. Schwemer. *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Henry, Alan S. *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees. Mnemosyne* Supplement 49. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Hill, Andrew. "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?" *JBL* 99 (1980): 437–39.

Hogarth, D. G. "The Gerousia of Hierapolis." *The Journal of Philology* 19, no. 37 (1891): 69–101.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Biblical Tools and Studies 2. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

Holmberg, Bengt. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Holmberg, Bengt. "The Methods of Historical Reconstruction in the Scholarly 'Recovery' of Corinthian Christianity." *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Edited by E. Adams and D. Horrell. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Hornblower, Simon and Anthony Spawforth, eds. "Asia, Roman province." Pages 160–90 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Third edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Horsley, Richard A. "Building an Alternative Society: Introduction." Pages 206–14 in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Edited by Richard Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997.

Horsley, Richard A. *First Corinthians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Horsley, Richard A. "Synagogues in Galilee and the Gospels." Pages 46–69 in *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress*. Edited by Howard Clark Kee and Lynn H. Colick. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Horsley, Richard A. "Paul's Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society." Pages 371–95 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Horsley, Richard A. "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly." Pages 227–240 in *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Edited by Edward Adams and David G. Horrell. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Horsley, Richard A., ed. *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International/New York & London: Continuum, 1997.

Horsley, Richard A., ed. *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Horsley, Richard A. *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

Horsley, Richard A. *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Horst, Pieter W. van der. "Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?" Pages 16–37 in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*. Edited by Steven Fine. New York: Routledge: 1999.

Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Huzar, Eleanor G. "Alexandria and Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age." Pages 619–68 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Teil II: Principat, Band 10, 1. Halbband. Edited by Hildegard Temporini. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter 1988.

Hvalvik, Reidar. "Jewish Believers and Jewish Influence in the Roman Church until the Early Second Century." Pages 179–216 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007.

Instone-Brewer, David, and Philip A. Harland. "Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah." *Journal of Graeco-Roman Judaism and Christianity* 5 (2008): 200–21.

Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Jewett, Robert. "Response: Exegetical Support from Romans and Other Letters." Pages 58–71 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 2007.

Johnson-Hodge, Caroline. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Jones, C. P. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, MS/London: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Kahl, Brigitte. *Galatians Re-Imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010.

Kampen, John. *Wisdom Literature*. Eerdmans Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Karpp, Heinrich. "Christennammen." Pages 1115–1138 in volume 2 of *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum; Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*. 29 vols. Edited by Theodor Klauser. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Leib und Leib Christi*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1933.

Käsemann, Ernst. "Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie." Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen. 2 Vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Käsemann, Ernst. *A Commentary on Romans*. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kasher, Aryeh. *The Alexandrian Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 7. Revised edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.

Kee, Howard Clark. "The Transformation of the Synagogue after 70 C.E.: Its Import for Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 1–24.

Kennedy, George Alexander. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric, Writings from the Greco-Roman World, V. 10*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Kim, Ok-pil. "Paul and Politics: *Ekklesia*, Household, and Empire in 1 Corinthians 1–7." PhD diss., Drew University, 2010.

Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1984.

Kim, Seyoon. *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Klauck, Hans-Jürgen. *1. Korintherbrief*. Würzberg: Echter, 1984.

Kloppenborg, John. S. "Edwin Hatch, Churches, and Collegia." Pages 212–38 in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by B. H. Maclean. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Kloppenborg, John. S. "Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership." Pages 16–30 in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Kloppenborg, John. S. "Dating Theodotus (CIJ II 1404)." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 51.2 (2000): 243–80.

Kloppenborg, John. S. "Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups." *Early Christianity* 4, no. 2 (2013): 183–215 (233).

Kloppenborg, John S. and Richard S. Ascough, eds. *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace. Vol. 1 of Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*. BZNW, vol. 181. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

Kokkinia, Christina. "The governor's boot and the city's politicians. Greek communities and Rome's representatives under the empire." Pages 181–90 in *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis: Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich: Akten der Tagung an der Universität Zürich, 18.-20.10.2004*. Edited by Anne Kolb. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006.

Kooten, George H. van. "Philosophical Criticism of Genealogical Claims and Stoic Depoliticization of Politics: Graeco-Roman Strategies in Paul's Allegorical Interpretation of Hagar and Sarah (Gal 4.21–31)." Pages 361–85 in *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham*. Edited by Martin Goodman, George van Kooten, and Jacques van Ruiten. Themes in Biblical Narrative 13. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.

Kooten, George H. van. "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley." *New Testament Studies* 58/4 (Oct. 2012): 522–48.

Korner, Ralph. On-line review of William S. Campbell, *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. Bryn Mawr Classical Review (2009.07.42).

Korner, Ralph. "The Gospel of John's Jesus: the Way into a Place, into a People, or into a Person?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, 22 November, 2009, New Orleans, LA.

Korner, Ralph. "The *Ekklēsia* of Early Christ-Followers in Asia Minor as the Eschatological New Jerusalem: Counter-Imperial Rhetoric?" Pages 455–99 in *Urban Dreams and Realities in Antiquity: Remains and Representations of the Ancient City*. Mnemosyne Supplements: History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity 375. Edited by Adam Kemezis. Leiden: Brill.

Korner, Ralph. "*Ekklēsia* as a Jewish Synagogue Term: Some Implications for Paul's Socio-Religious Location." *The Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting* 2 (2015): 53–78.

Korner, Ralph. "Paul's *Ekklēsia* Associations: Counter-Imperial or Pro-*Dēmokratia* Communities?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November 24, 2015, Atlanta, GA.

Krause, Andrew. *Synagogues in the Works of Flavius Josephus*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 97. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Krauss, Samuel. *Synagogale Altertumer*. Berlin-Wien: Benamin Harz, 1922.

Krauss, W. *Das Volk Gottes. Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus*. WUNT 85. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996.

Kümmel, W. G. *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus*. Second edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Revised edition. Edited by Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Lampe, Peter. "The Roman Christians of Romans 16." Pages 216–30 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Revised and expanded edition. Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991.

Lancellotti, Maria Grazia. *Attis, Between Myth and History: King, Priest, and God*. Religions in the Greco-Roman World 149. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. SBL 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

LaRondelle, Hans K. *The Israel of God in Prophecy, Principles of Prophetic Interpretation*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.

Laughlin, Jack C. and Kornel Zathureczky. "An Anatomy of the Canonization of Asadian Genealogy: A Case Study." *Studies in Religion* 44/2 (June 2015): 233–52.

Lee, Michelle V. *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*. SNTS137. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Légasse, Simon. *L'Épître de Paul aux Romains*. Lectio Divina, vol. 10. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002.

Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Columbus, OH: Wartburg, 1945.

Leonhardt, Jutta. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Levine, Lee I. "The 1st Century C.E. Synagogue: Critical Reassessments and Assessments of the Critical." Pages 70–102 in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine. Old Questions, New Approaches*. Edited by Douglas R. Edwards. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. Second edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005/First edition, 2000.

Levinskya, Irina. *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Lewis, David M. "The First Greek Jew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2 no. 3 (1957): 264–66.

Lifshitz, B. *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives: répertoire de dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues*. Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 7. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1967.

Lightfoot, J. B. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957.

Lindemann, Andreas. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. HNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Llewelyn, S. R. "The Elders and Rulers (Archons) of the Jews." Pages 69–72 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published 1986–87*. Vol. 9 of *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Edited by S. R. Llewelyn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 15th Edition. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, vol. 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Longenecker, Bruce. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Lopez, Davina C. *Apostle to the Conquered: Re-Imagining Paul's Mission*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008.

Lüderitz, Gerd. "What Is Politeuma?" Pages 183–225 in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 21. Edited by J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Ma, John. "Public Speech and Community in the *Euboicus*." Pages 108–24 in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*. Edited by Simon Swain. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

MacDonald, Margaret. Pages 199–220 in "Reading Real Women through the Undisputed Letters of Paul." *Women in Christian Origins*. Edited by Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Mackay, Heather. "Ancient Synagogues: The Continuing Dialectic Between Two Major Views." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* (1998): 103–42.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.

Macro, A. D. "The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Imperium." Pages 658–97 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. 2, Principat. Bd. 7. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Politische Geschichte. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.

Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Manning, J. G. "Ptolemies." Pages 60–62 in vol. 5 of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*. 7 vols. Edited by M. Gagarin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Mantel, Hugo. "The Men of the Great Synagogue." *The Harvard Theological Review* 60/1 (1967): 69–91.

Marguerat, Daniel. *Lukas, der erste christliche Historiker: Eine Studie zur Apostelgeschichte*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 91. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2011.

Marincola, John, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver, eds. *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Marshall, I. Howard. "New Wine in Old Wine-Skins: V. The Biblical Use of the Word 'Ekklēsia'." *Expository Times* 84 (1972–73): 348–62.

Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Martone, Corrado. "Ben Sira Manuscripts from Qumran and Masada." Pages 81–94 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Martone, Corrado. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul.* Revised edition. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Marxsen, Willi. *Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to Its Problems.* Translated by G. Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Mason, Steve. "Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (*Ant.* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus' *Judean Antiquities/Life*." Pages 64–103 in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives.* Edited by Steve Mason. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 457–512.

Matera, Frank J. *Galatians.* Sacra Pagina Series, vol. 9. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.

Mathewson, David. "A Note on the Foundation Stones in Revelation 21:14, 19–20." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25/4 (2003): 487–98.

McCready, Wayne O. "*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations." Pages 59–73 in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World.* Edited by John Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

McKay, Heather A. *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism.* Leiden: Brill, 1994.

McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament.* OTM. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McLean, Bradley H. "The Agrippinilla Inscription: Religious Associations and Early Church Formation." Pages 239–70 in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd.* Edited by Bradley H. McLean. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplementary Series 86. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

McLean, Bradley H. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337).* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul.* London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Merkle, Ben L. "Romans 11 and the Future of Ethnic Israel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43/4 (2000): 709–21.

Merklein, H. 'Die Ekklesia Gottes. Der Kirchenbegriff bei Paulus und in Jerusalem.' *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus.* WUNT 43. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.

Merritt, Benjamin D. "Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia* 36, no. 1 (1967): 57–100.

Meyers, E. M. "Synagogues." Pages 251–60 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Michaels, J. Ramsay. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 49. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.

Middendorp, Theophil. *Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Miller, Anna Crescinda. "*Ekklesia*: 1 Corinthians in the Context of Ancient Democratic Discourse." PhD diss., Harvard University, July 7, 2008.

Milson, David. *Art and Architecture of the Synagogue in Late Antique Palestine: In the Shadow of the Church*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Minear, Paul S. *The Obedience of Faith: The Purpose of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. London: SCM Press, 1971.

Mitchell, Stephen. "Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990): 183–193.

Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. Review of S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charles-Worth, *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. X. The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.–A.D. 70. *Journal of Roman Studies* 34 (1944): 109–16.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Moo, Douglas. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era—The Age of Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1927–1930.

Morag, S. "Language and Style in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah—Did Moreh Ha-Sedeq Write This Document?" *Tarbiz* 65 (1995–1996): 210–33.

Mulder, Otto. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *St. Paul's Corinth*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Murray, John. *Epistle to the Romans*. 2 Vols. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959/1965.

Mussner, Franz. *Der Galaterbrief*. HTKNT 9. Third Edition. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Nanos, Mark. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Nanos, Mark. "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1999): 283–304.

Nanos, Mark. "Challenging the Limits that Continue to Define on Paul's Perspective on Jews and Judaism." Pages 212–24 in *Reading Israel in Romans: Legitimacy and Plausibility of Divergent Interpretations*. Edited by Christina Grenholm and Daniel Patte. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000.

Nanos, Mark. "Paul and Judaism: Why Not Paul's Judaism?" Pages 117–60 in *Paul Unbound: Other Perspectives on the Apostle*. Edited by Mark D. Given. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Nanos, Mark. "Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become Jews, But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus." *Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting* 1 (2014): 26–53.

Nijf, Onno M. van. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East.* Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology, vol. XVII. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997.

Nijf, Onno M. van. "Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age: Introduction and Preview." Pages 1–26 in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno van Nijf and Richard Alstonwith the assistance of C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Nijf, Onno M. van. "Public Space and the Political Culture of Roman Termessos." Pages 215–242 in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno van Nijf and Richard Alston with the assistance of C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Nijf, Onno M. van. "Politics, Culture and Identities: Towards a Political History of the Imperial Greek City." Keynote address at *Urban Dreams and Realities: An Interdisciplinary Conference on the City in Ancient Cultures*, Edmonton, AB, Oct. 21–22, 2011.

Nijf, Onno M. van. "Political Games." Pages 47–95 in *L'organisation des spectacles dans le monde Romain: huit exposés suivis de discussions*. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique LVIII. Edited by K. Kathleen M. Coleman, Jocelyne Nelis-Clemént, and Pierre Ducrey. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2012.

Nijf, Onno M. van. "Staying Roman—Becoming Greek: Associations of *Romaioi* in Greek Cities." Paper presented at *Associations in Context*, Copenhagen Associations Project, Copenhagen, October 11–13, 2012.

Nijf, Onno M. van, and Richard Alston, eds. *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age, 2. Leuven, Peeters, 2011.

Nijf, Onno M. van, Richard Alston, and Christina G. Williamson, "Introduction: The Greek City and Its Religions after the Classical Age." Pages 1–20 in *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age, 3. Edited by R. Alston, O. M. van Nijf, and C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.

Noble, Paul R. "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-biblical Allusions." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 219–52.

Nongbri, Brent. *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.

Oakes, Peter. *Philippians: From People to Letter*. SNTSM 110. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001/2007.

Oakes, Peter. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

O'Brien, Peter. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

O'Brien, Peter. *Colossians, Philemon*. Word Biblical Commentary 44. Waco: Word, 1982.

Ogereau, Julien M. "The Jerusalem Collection as Κοινωνία: Paul's Global Politics of Socio-Economic Equality and Solidarity." *New Testament Studies* 58 (2102): 360–378.

Olsson, Birger and Magnus Zetterholm, eds. *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 39. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.

Oppenheimer, Ahron. *The 'Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic–Roman Period*. Translated by I. H. Levine. ALGHJ VIII. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Oropeza, B. J. Review of Paul Trebilco, *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. *Review of Biblical Literature* 10/2013: 1–5.

Oster, Richard E. "Supposed Anachronism in Luke-Acts' Use of ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ: A Rejoinder to Howard Clark Kee." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 178–208.

Ostwald, Martin. *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Park, Young-Ho. *Paul's Ekklēsia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in their Politico-Social World*. WUNT II 393. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Patterson, Lee E. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.

Penner, Jeremy. *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 104. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Perkins, Judith. *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era*. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Pervo, Richard I. *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

Peterson, E. "Christianus." Pages 64–87 in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen*. Edited by E. Peterson. Freiburg im Breisgau: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.

Pike, Kenneth. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour*. Preliminary edition. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954.

Pike, Kenneth. *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1990.

Pilhofer, Peter. "Ökonomische Attraktivität christlicher Gemeinden der Frühzeit." Pages 194–216 in *Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt: Greifswalder Aufsätze 1996–2001*.

WUNT 145. Edited by P. Pilhofer with assistance from Jens Börstinghaus and Eva Ebel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2002.

Pinette, Shannon Burkes. "The Lady Vanishes: Wisdom in Ben Sira and Daniel." Pages 160–72 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by D. C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Pleket, H. W. "Political Culture and Political Practice in the Cities of Asia Minor in the Roman Empire." Pages 204–216 in *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum*. Edited by W. Schuller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.

Poland, Franz. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909; repr., Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1967.

Portier-Young, Anatheia. "Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book." *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 98–115.

Price, Simon R. F. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Quass, Friedemann. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993.

Rajak, Tessa. "Synagogue and Community in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora." Pages 22–38 in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*. Edited by John R. Bartlett. London/New York: Routledge, 2002.

Ramsay Michaels, J. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 49. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.

Ramsey, William M. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest*, vol 1, Pt. 1. Aberdeen: 1895/repr. 2004.

Regev, Eyal. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Religion and Society. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Reif, Stefan C. "The Discovery of the Cambridge Genizah Fragments of Ben Sira: Scholars and Texts." Pages 1–22 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Reumann, John. *Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 33B. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Rhodes, P. J. "Epigraphical Evidence: Laws and Decrees." Pages 91–112 in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24–27, 1994, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, vol. 2. Edited by M. H. Hansen. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 72. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1995.

Rhodes, P. J. and David M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Richardson, Peter. *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Richardson, Peter. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2004.

Richter, Daniel S. *Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by John Richard DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Robert, Louis. "Inscriptions de Lesbos et de Samos." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 59 (1935): 471–88.

Robert, Louis. *Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*. Memoires de l'institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul VII. Edited by E.de Boccard. Paris: L'institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul, 1945.

Robert, Louis. "Décret d'une syngeneia Carienne au sanctuaire de Sinuri." *Hellenica* VII (1949): 59–68.

Robinson, D. W. B. "The Distinction between Jewish and Gentile Believers in Galatians." *ABR* 13 (1965): 29–44.

Rocca, Samuel. *Herod's Judea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 122. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Rogers, Guy MacLean. "Demosthenes of Oenoanda and Models of Euergetism." *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 91–100.

Rogers, Guy MacLean. "The Assembly of Imperial Ephesos." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 94 (1992): 224–29.

Rogers, Guy MacLean. *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos: Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.

Roloff, J. *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*. GNT 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Rossum, J. A. van. *De Gerousia in de Griekse stedenn van het Romeinse Rijk*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Rost, L. *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament*. BWANT 4. Folge Heft 24. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938.

Rowe, Eric. "Called by the Name of the Lord: Early Uses of the Names and Titles of Jesus in Identifying His Followers." Ph.D. diss., The Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, 2012.

Rowley, H. H. *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.

Rudolph, David. "Messianic Jews and Christian Theology: Restoring an Historical Voice to the Contemporary Discussion." *Pro Ecclesia* XIV/1 (2005): 58–84.

Runesson, Anders. *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study*. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 37. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.

Runesson, Anders. "Persian Imperial Politics, the Beginnings of Public Torah Readings, and the Origins of the Synagogue." Pages 63–88 in *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*. Edited by Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 39. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.

Runesson, Anders. "The Origins of the Synagogue in Past and Present Research: Some Comments on Definitions, Theories, and Sources." *Studia Theologica* 58 (2004): 60–76.

Runesson, Anders. "The Origins and Nature of the 1st Century Synagogue." *Bible and Interpretation* [July 2004]. http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/.

Runesson, Anders. "Women Leadership in the Early Church: Some Examples and Interpretive Frame." *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 82.4 (2006): 173–83.

Runesson, Anders. "Architecture, Conflict, and Identity Formation: Jews and Christians in Capernaum from the 1st to the 6th Century." Pages 231–57 in *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*. Edited by J. Zangenberg, H. Attridge, and D. Martin. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Runesson, Anders. "Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127/1 (2008): 95–132.

Runesson, Anders. "Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and Theodotius I." Pages 59–92 in *Exploring Early Christian Identity*. Edited by Bengt Holmberg. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Runesson, Anders. "Behind the Gospel of Matthew: Radical Pharisees in Post-War Galilee?" *Currents in Theology and Mission* 37:6 (December 2010): 460–471.

Runesson, Anders. "Paul and 'Jewish Christianity': Terminological and Conceptual Issues Or: Paul's Judaism: The Architecture of the Conversation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, Nov. 22, 2010.

Runesson, Anders. "Was there a Christian Mission before the 4th Century? Problematizing Common Ideas about Early Christianity and the Beginnings of Modern Mission." Pages 205–47 in *The Making of Christianity: Conflicts, Contacts, and Constructions: Essays in Honor of Bengt Holmberg*. Edited by Magnus Zetterholm and Samuel B. Byrskog. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series, 47. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012.

Runesson, Anders. "The Question of Terminology: The Architecture of Contemporary Discussions on Paul." Pages 53–78 in *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Runesson, Anders, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson. *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, vol. 72. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Saldarini, Anthony. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Salmeri, Giovanni. "Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor." Pages 53–92 in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Edited by Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Salmeri, Giovanni. "Reconstructing the Political Life and Culture of the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire." Pages 197–214 in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno van Nijf and Richard Alston with the assistance of C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice & Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962), 1–13.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo's Place in Judaism*. New York: Ktav, 1972.

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

San Nicolò, Mariano. *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen sur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*. 2 vols. München: Beck, 1913–15.

San Nicolò, Mariano. "Zur Vereinsgerichtsbarkeit im hellenistischen Ägypten." Pages 255–300 in *ΕΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΟΝ Heinreich Swoboda dargebracht*. Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1927.

Schalit, Abraham. "Domestic Politics and Political Institutions." Pages 255–97 in *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 B.C.E. to 67 B.C.E.*. Edited by A. Schalit. The World History of the Jewish People 6. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972.

Schenk, Wolfgang. "Die ältesten Selbstverständnisse christlicher Gruppen im ersten Jahrhundert." Pages 1357–1467 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. II 2/2. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–.

Schiffman, Lawrence. "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." Pages 267–284 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Schnelle, Udo. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group, 2009.

Schmeller, Thomas. *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*. SBS 162. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995.

Schmeller, Thomas. "Gegenwelten: Zum Vergleich zwischen paulinischen Gemeinden und nichtchristlichen Gruppen." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 47, no. 2 (2003): 167–85.

Schmeller, Thomas. "Zum exegetischen Interesse an antiken Vereinen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert." Pages 1–19 in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kairserzeitlichen Kleinasiens*. Edited by A. Gutsfeld and D. Koch. STAC 25. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2006.

Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth: an Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

Schofield, Malcolm. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 4 volumes. EKKNT 7. Zurich: Benziger, 1994–2001.

Schrenk, Gottlob. "Was bedeutet 'Israel Gottes'?" *Judaica* 6 (1949): 81–94.

Schuler, Christof. *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*. München: C. H. Beck, 1998.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Paul and the Politics of Interpretation." Pages 40–57 in *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl*. Edited by R. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees." Pages 67–80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Schwartz, Daniel R. *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Schweigert, Eugene. "The Athenian Cleruchy on Samos." *American Journal of Philology* 61/2 (1940): 194–98.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. New York: Holt, 1931.

Sealey, Raphael. *Essays in Greek Politics*. New York: Manyland Books, 1967.

Segal, Alan. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Selbie, J. A. "The Great Synagogue." Pages 634–44 in *A Dictionary of the Bible: Volume IV, Part II: Shimrath–Zuzim*. Edited by James Hastings. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1898. Repr., Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 2004.

Selwyn, Ernest G. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. Second edition. London: Macmillan, 1955.

Sergienko, Gennadi Andreyevich. *Our Politeuma is in Heaven!: Paul's Polemical Engagement with the "Enemies of the Cross of Christ" in Philippians 3:18–20*. Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2011.

Shear, T. Leslie, Jr. "Bouleterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens." Pages 157–90 in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Edited by M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub. Historia Einzelschriften 95. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.

Sherk, Robert K. "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV. The Register Part III: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor (continued)." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 93 (1992): 223–272.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Letters of Pliny*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Sinclair, Robert K. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Skarsaune, Oskar and Reider Hvalvik, eds. *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Christians*. Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible Commentary 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Slater, William J. "Pantomime Riots." *Classical Antiquity* 13, no. 1 (Apr. 1994): 120–44.

Small, D. B. "Social Correlations to the Greek Cavea in the Roman Period." Pages 85–93 in *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*. Edited by S. Macready and F. H. Thompson. London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1987.

Smallwood, Mary E. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Snaith, John G. *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Sorek, Susan. *Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine*. The Social World of Biblical Antiquity 2/5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2010.

Spicq, Ceslas. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1994.

Spence, Iain G. *Historical Dictionary of Ancient Greek Warfare*. Historical Dictionaries of War, Revolution and Civil Unrest 16. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002.

Spence, Stephen. *The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study*. Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 5. Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W. and Wolfgang Stegemann. *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Literary Compositions of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran." Pages 123–48 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by G. J. Brooke. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Steinbock, Bernd. Review of John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver, eds., *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2013.10.53.

Stendahl, Krister. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Stendahl, Krister. "In No Other Name." Pages 48–53 in *Christian Witness and the Jewish People*. Edited by A. Sovik. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1976.

Stern, David. *Jewish New Testament Commentary*. JNTP. Clarksville: MD, 1992.

Still, Todd D. and David G. Horrell, eds. *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-five Years Later*. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009.

Storkey, Alan. *Jesus and Politics: Confronting the Powers*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Stowers, Stanley Kent. "The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity." Pages 149–181 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism,* Vol. V. Edited by William Scott Green. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Stowers, Stanley Kent. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Stowers, Stanley Kent. "Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?" Pages 81–102 in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Edited by T. Engberg-Pedersen. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Strack, M. L. *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*. Berlin: 1887.

Strubbe, Johan H. M., ed. *Arai Epitymbioi: Imprecations against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Gmbh, 1997.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus*. FRLANT 87. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Tellbe, Mikael. *Paul Between Synagogue and State: Christians, Jews and Civic Authorities in 1 Thessalonians, Romans, and Philippians*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.

Tellbe, Mikael. "The Prototypical Christ-Believer: Early Christian Identity Formation in Ephesus." Pages 115–38 in *Exploring Early Christian Identity*. Edited by Bengt Holmberg. WUNT 226. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Thiessen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Edited and translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Thiessen, Matthew. "Paul's Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17–29." *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014): 373–391.

Thiselton, Anthony. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Thonemann, Peter (ed.). *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua XI: Monuments from Phrygia and Lykaonia recorded by M. H. Balance, W. M. Calder, A. S. Hall and*

R. D. Barnett. Journal of Roman Studies Monographs 12. London: Roman Society Publications, 2013.

Thorsteinsson, Runar M. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 40. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003.

Tiller, Patrick. "Sociological Settings of the Components of *1 Enoch*." Pages 237–56 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by G. Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Trebilco, Paul R. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor Society*. New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Trebilco, Paul R. "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 440–460.

Trebilco, Paul R. *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Trümper, Monika. "The Oldest Original Synagogue Building in the Diaspora: The Delos Synagogue Reconsidered." *Hesperia* 73 (2004): 513–98.

Trümper, Monika. "Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos. The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos." Pages 49–100 in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno van Nijf and Richard Alston with the assistance of C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Tucker, J. Brian. "Intercultural Interaction and Identity Formation in Pauline Tradition: The Continuation of Gentile Identity in Christ." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Atlanta, GA, Nov. 22, 2010.

Tucker, J. Brian. *Remain in Your Calling: Paul and the Continuation of Social Identities in 1 Corinthians*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.

Twelftree, Graham. "Jesus and the Synagogue." Pages 3105–3134 in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. 4 volumes. Edited by Tom Holmen and Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Urman, Dan and Paul V. M. Flesher, eds. *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*. 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Vaage, Leif E. "Why Christianity Succeeded (in) the Roman Empire." Pages 253–78 in *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Edited by Leif E. Vaage. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 18. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2006.

VanderKam, James C. *An Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Verlinde, Angelo. *The Sanctuary Site at Pessinus. The Genesis, Development and Taphonomy of a Roman Temple in Central Asia Minor in Light of its Phrygian-Hellenistic Predecessors and Byzantine Afterlife*. Monographs on Antiquity 7. Peeters: Leuven/Walpole, MA. 2014.

Verseput, Donald J. "Genre and Story: The Community Setting of the Epistle of James." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 89–101.

Viner, Leigh Clasby. "Moral Paradigms and the Stoic Sage." Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University, 2002.

Vlach, Michael. *Has the Church Replaced Israel?* Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2010.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Kingdom Promises as Spiritual." Pages 263–87 in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by J. S. Feinberg. Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988.

Waltzing, Jean–Pierre, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romaines depuis les origines jusqu'a la chute de l'empire d'Occident*. Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique 50. Brussels: F. Hayez, 1895–1900.

Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Webb, Ruth. "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice." Pages 289–316 in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Yun Lee Too. Boston: Brill, 2001.

Weissenberg, Hanna von. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 82. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Weissenberg, Hanna von. "The Centrality of the Temple in 4QMMT." Pages 293–305 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 90. Leiden, Brill, 2010.

Wellborn, L. L. "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 85–111.

Werline, Rod. *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution*. SBL, Early Judaism and Its Literature 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity." Pages 85–101 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl Paul Donfried. Revised edition. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 volumes. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament VI Studienausgabe. Ostfildern/Einsiedeln/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Patmos/Benziger/Neukirchener, 1982–1997.

Williams, David S. "The Date of Ecclesiasticus." *Vetus Testamentum* 44, no. 4 (1994): 563–66.

Wilson, Walter T. *Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 3. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wiseman, James and Konstantinos Zachos. *Landscape Archaeology in Southern Epirus, Greece. I.* Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003.

Wörrle, M. *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonisticschen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*. Vestigia. Beitrage zur Alte Geschichte Band 39. München: C. H. Beck'sche, 1988.

Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Wright, N. T. *The Letter to the Romans*. New International Bible Commentary 10. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001.

Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 volumes. Christian Origins and the Question of God, volume 4. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.

Writer, Frederick E. *Studies in Hellenistic Architecture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Writers, Jeffrey A. *Oligarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Zahrnt, M. "Antinoopolis in Ägypten: Die hadrianische Gründung und ihre Privilegien in der neueren Forschung." Pages 669–706 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Teil II: Principat, Band 10, 1.Halbband. Edited by Hildegard Temporini. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.

Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1988.

Zetterholm, Magnus. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.

Ziebarth, E. G. L. *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1896/repr. 1969.

Zoccali, Christopher. *Whom God has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan. "The Ambiguity of Munificence." *Historia* 56 (2007): 196–213.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan. "On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 48 (2008): 417–445.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Zuiderhoek, Arjan. "Oligarchs and Benefactors: Elite Demography and Euergetism in the Greek East of the Roman Empire." Pages 185–196 in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno van Nijf and Richard Alston with the assistance of C. G. Williamson. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Appendix 1: *Ekklēsia* in First Century BCE Inscriptions

Sardis 7,1 8, Lydia, Sardis, 5–1 BCE; ἐπὶ τῶι Γαΐωι χαρὰν καὶ περὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εὔνοιαν, παραγενόμενός τε ἐν τῆι συναχθείσῃ δημοτελεῖ ἐκ⟨κ⟩λησίαι τὴν ἀποπρεσβείαν ἐποιεῖτο, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτὸν.

JÖAI 62,1993,114, Nr. 2, Ionia, found in Ephesos, 29 BCE (copy is from the 2nd cent CE): Brief [Octavians] an [bo]ule und demos von [Ephesos]; betr. eine Gesandtschaft der Ephesier bezügl. Eines [ps]ephism[a] der ephesischen Gerusie sowie die Bestätigung von Privilegien (der Gerusie?); πρέσβε[ις] [τῆς ἐκκλη]σίας ⟨ἀπέδοσάν τ'⟩ ἐμοὶ τὸ παρὰ τῆς γερουσ[ίας ψ]ήφισμ[α] [διέλεξ]άν τε ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν αὐτ[ῷ δι]ακε[ιμέ][νοις· διὸ τό] τε σύστημα τῆς γερουσίας [ἀποδέχομαι].

Clinton, Sacred Officials 50,D14/*SEG* 30:93, Attica, Athens, 20/19 BCE: This is the latest extant Athenian decree formalized during an *ekklēsia kyria*; ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν Μηνόφιλος.

Agora 16 335/*IG*² 1051+1058/*SEG* 24.141, Attica, Athens, 30–22/21 BCE; This decree reflects dealings with the klerouchs in Lemnos and recounts the Athenian decision to send four emissaries with the text of a decree to Lemnos, one of whom was a herald (κῆρθξ) of the *boulē* and *dēmos*; [ἐπὶ . . .c.11. . . . ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς . . . . .c.20. . . . . πρυτανήας][ἧ . . . . .c.22. . . . . .ἐγρ]αμμάτε[υεν· . . . . .c.20. . . . .] [. . . . . .c.16. . . . . . τῆς πρυτα]νήας· v ἐκκλησ[ία κυρία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι· τῶν] [προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν . .c.7. . Δ]ωροθέου [. .c.8. . . καὶ συμπρόεδροι]·[ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι·.[1]

IDid 218II, Ionia, found between Didyma and Karakuyu, *c.* 38/24 BCE: *Prophētēs* inscription for [Lysimachos?] Sopolidos, envoy to Egypt and Rome; προφήτης vacat [Λυσίμαχος?]|| Σωπόλιδος, ἀνὴρ εὐσεβὴς καὶ [φιλόδοξος?,]| πρνεσνβεύνσας v δὲ καὶ εἰς Ῥώ[μην καὶ ἀπο]||κανταναστνήσας τήν τε πρό[τερον ἐκκ]|λησίαν τῶι δήμωι καὶ τοὺς νόμους.

SEG 55:608, Thessalia (Pelasgiotis)—Larisa, *c.* 70 BC: Citizenship decree for Zobios and Dionysios of Chalkis; προγραφῆς γενομένης πρὸς τὴν ἐκλησίαν {²⁶ἐκκλησίαν}²⁶ τὴν ἐν τῶι Ἱπποδρομίωι μηνί, στρατηγοῦντος Ἡρακλείδου, περὶ τοῦ δοθῆναι πολιτείαν Ζωβίῳ Ζωβίου, προξένῳ Θεσσαλῶν, καὶ Διονυσίῳ Ζωβίου Χαλκιδεῦσιν τοῦ καὶ ἐπαχθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκλησίαν

---

1 For a detailed analysis of *Agora* 16 335/*IG*² 1051+1058/*SEG* 24.141, see Benjamin D. Merritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 36, no. 1 (1967): 57–100, esp. 66–68.

ὑπὸ τοῦ προεστῶτος ταγοῦ Εὐδίκου τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου καὶ αἰτησαμένου αὐτοῖς τὴν πολιτείαν Φιλοκράτους τοῦ Ἀντιγ[ό]νου.[2]

Reynolds, Aphr.&Rome 2, *Aphrodisias* 28, 88 BCE: An inscription which was found at Aphrodisias is a Decree of the *boulē* and *dēmos* (of Plarasa/Aphrodisias) to give military help to Quintus Oppius, Roman praetor pro consule; εἵλατο δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἄνδρα τὸν ἡγησάμενον v ἀναγκαῖον δέ ἐστιν ἐξαποστεῖλαι καὶ πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς ἐνφανιοῦντας τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ περί τε τῆς αἱρέσεως ἧς ἔχει ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ὄντας σωτῆρας καὶ εὐεργέτας καὶ ἐάν τι ὁ στρ⟨ατ⟩ηγὸς ἐπιτάσσῃ καὶ ἕτερον τῇ πόλει.

> It has been decided by the *ekklēsia*, and it is (appropriate??) to dispatch a man to lead things, and (demarcated) ambassadors to the proconsul in accordance with the proposal which our *dēmos* adopted for the purpose of being deliverers and benefactors of the Romans; and whatever the general may command, and anything else for the *polis* ...

BCH 52 (1928) 174[2], Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 100–50 BCE; μηνὸς Βοαθόιου τετράδι, [ἐ]ν ἐννόμωι ἐκκλησίαι· βουλευόντων Κλεοδάμου, Αἰακίδα, Μέντορος, Δίωνος.

IK 6,7 (*IMT NoerdlTroas* 7), Troas, Äg. Inseln—Thasos, Agora von [Aa: Lampsakos], 100–66 BCE; δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι δήμωι, τὴν βουλὴν προβουλεύσασαν καθ᾽ ὃ τιμηθήσεται προξενίαι Διονυσόδωρος ἐξενεγκεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, συντελεῖσθαι δὲ ὡς ἂν τῶι δήμωι δόξῃι.

> Resolved by the *boulē* and the *dēmos*, since the *boulē* made a *probouleuma* according to which Dionysidorus will be honoured by proxeny before the *ekklēsia*, let it be decided as the *dēmos* sees fit.

IG II² 1028, Attica, Athens, 100/99 BCE; Βοηδρομιῶνος ἐνάτηι ἱσταμένου, ἐνάτῃ τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζεν Ἐπιτέλης Ἀρεταίου Παιανιεὺς καὶ συμπρόεδροι.

IK Knidos I 31,Dlph, Caria, Phokis–Delphoi, 100 BCE: ᾧ] ἡ Ἀσία ἢ Μακεδονία ἐπαρχεία ἐστίν, [ὅδ᾽] ἐν ἡμέραις δέκα ταῖς ἔγγιστα, αἷς ἂν γν[ωρίσῃ τοῦτον τ]ὸν νόμον τ[ῶι δήμωι κεκυρῶσθαι ἐ]ν τῆι ἐκκλησίαι, ὀμνυέτω ὅτι ὅσ᾽ [ἂ]ν ἐν τούτωι τῶι νόμωι κελεύει ποιεῖν, πάντα ποιείτω, οὔτε ὑπεναγ[τίον τι ποιήσει ἄνευ] δόλου πονηροῦ.

---

2   See A. Tziafalias and B. Helly, *BCH* 128/129 (2004/5): 407, II; cf. J.-C. Decourt and B. Helly, *BE* (2008): 316.

The Praetor [or Proconsul who] has either Asia or Macedonia as his province shall, within the ten days immediately after he learns that this law [has been confirmed by the People] in the assembly, take an oath to do everything that he is required to do in this law and shall not do anything contrary [to its provisions] with malice or ill-will.[3]

IG XII,1 3, Rhodes and S. Dodecanese, Rhodes, somewhere between the 1st cents. BCE to CE: A decision to purchase olive oil is transacted by the *dēmos* in the *ekklēsia*; [ἔδοξεν τῶι δ]άμωι ἐν τᾷ ἐκ⟨κ⟩λησίᾳ ἐν τῶι Ἀρταμιτίωι μηνί· τῶ[ν ἀνδρῶν, οἵτ]ινες θησεῦντι καὶ πωλησεῦντι τὸ ἔλαιον ἰς τ[ὸ] [γυμνάσιον(?) ἀ]φθόνως.

IMyl 102/*Mylasa* 25, Caria, found at Mylasa, 1st or 2nd cent. BCE: Honorary decree by *boulē* and *dēmos* for Mos[chio]n Aristeidou; Φιλίππου τε τοῦ Διοφάντου ἐπελθόντος [ἐπὶ] τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, δηλώσαντός τε διότι σῶμα αὐτο[ῦ] ἐψυχαγωγημένον ἧκται εἰς Μύνδον, αἱρεθεὶς πρεσβευτὴς πρὸς Μυνδίους.

After Philip and Diophanus came before the *boulē* and the *ekklēsia*, and made known that his (lifeless??) body had been brought to Myndos, an ambassador was chosen (to go to) Myndos.

Myl 207 (see also *Imyl* 206/*Mylasa* 83, 212/*Mylasa* 87, 1st or 2nd cent. BCE): Decree of phyle of Otorkondeis concerning purchase of land from Thraseas; ἐπελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ Θρασέας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν νης δὲ τῆς ὠνῆς τῶν προγεγραμμένων τοῖς κτηματώναις εἰς -γραμμένα πάντα αὐτὸς Θρασέας παρὰ τῶν ταμιῶν τῆς καὶ ἕξει αὐτὰ εἰς πατρικὰ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἢ οἷς ἂν ἦ -λέσει ἑκάστου ἔτους φόρον τοῖς τῆς φυλῆς ταμίαις ἐμ μη Ῥοδίου λεπτοῦ δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν.

And Thraseas comes before the *ekklēsia* νης them giving advice of the sale to the (owners??) ... the same Thraseas ... everything (was recorded??) according to the treasurers (of ...) and he will ... (maintain) the things within his patrimony and the (will own) what is outside of it, and for those things which (may be [leased??]) a tribute of 100 drachmas per year (will be paid) {something about "what remains outside Rhodes"[??]}

---

3 Translation of *IK Knidos* I 31,Dlph (C.8–10) by Mark Hassall, Michael Crawford, and Joyce Reynolds, "Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century BCE," *JRS* 64 (1974): 195–220, esp. 208.

TAM II 168, Lycia, Hippokome, 1st or 2nd cent. BCE; [ἐπὶ ἱ]ερέ[ως Τ]ο[άλλεως τοῦ]
[Πειγάσεω]ς μηνὸς Ἡρα[ιῶνος? . .] [ἐν? τοῖ]ς ἀρχαιρεσίοις ἐκλησ[ία]ς κυ[ρί][ας γεν]ομένης
ἔδοξεν Ἱπποκωμητῶ[ν][τῇ βο]υλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἀρχόντων [γν]ώμη Σωσιπόλεως τοῦ Ζήνωνος
καὶ Θέωνος τοῦ Μηνοδώρου καὶ γραμματέως Ἡφαιστίωνος τοῦ Παρδαλέοντος·.

IGR 4.292, Mysia [Kaïkos], Pergamon, Mys.—Pergamon, 75–50 BCE (cf. *MDAI(A)*
32 [1907]: 243, 244): ἐπ[ι]θύειν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν λιβανωτὸν ἔν τε ταῖς βουλαῖς καὶ ταῖς
ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐννόμο[ις], [ὅταν] παρατυγχάνηι

Appendix 2: *Ekklēsia* in First Century CE Inscriptions

Meletemata 11 K2, Macedonia, Makedonia (Mygdonia)—Kalindoia (area of Kalamoto), 1 CE; 1 ἔτους · η′ καὶ μ′ · καὶ · ρ′· οἱ πολιτάρχαι προβουλευσαμένων τῶν βουλευτῶν καὶ γενομένης ἐκκλησίας εἶπαν ἐν τῶι δήμωι.

FD III 6:27, Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 1–20 CE: Manumission inscription; ἄ[ρ]χοντος Εὐδώρου τοῦ Ἐπινίκου, μηνὸς Ἀμαλίου ἕκτη ἱσταμέ[νου ἐν] τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, βουλευόντων [Δι] οδώρου τοῦ Φιλονίκου, Διοδόρου τοῦ Ἀ[νδρονί]κου, Κριτολάου τοῦ Δωροθέου, [ἀπ]έδοντο ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ Διόδωρος Φιλονίκου καὶ Καλλικράτεα Λυσιπόνου παιδάριον τὸ ἴδιον θρεπτὸν οἰκογε⟨νέ⟩ς, ὧι ὄνομα Ὕλας, τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ [Πυ]θίῳ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ, τιμᾶς ἀργυρίου μνᾶν τριῶν, καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ἀπέχομε[ν πᾶσ]αν, ἐπὶ τοῖσδε ὥστε ἐλεύθερον εἶναι Ὕλαν καὶ ἀνέφαπτον ὑπὸ πάντων πά[ντα χρ]όνον.

FD III 6:31, Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 1–20 CE: Manumission inscription; ἄρχοντος Πολεμάρχου τοῦ Δάμωνος, μηνὸς Ἀπ[ελλ]αίου ὀγδ[όη ἱσταμένου], ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, βουλευόντων Διοδώρου τοῦ Φιλονίκου, Ἀ[βρο]μάχου τοῦ Ξεναγόρα ἀπέδοτο ἐπ' ἐλευθ[ε]ρίᾳ Νίκων Νικαίου καὶ Δαντὼ Νίκωνος σῶμα γυναικεῖον ἀγοραστὸ[ν] ἐκ Δρυμίων Ζωίλου τοῦ Ζωίλου, ᾇ ὄνομα Τρυφέρα, τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ, τιμᾶς ἀργυρίου μνᾶν δέκα, καὶ τὰν τιμὰν ἀπέχω πᾶσαν, ἐπὶ τοῖσδε ὥστε ἐλευθέραν εἶμεν Τρυφέραν καὶ ἀνέφαπτον ὑπὸ πάντων τὸν πάντα χρόνον πανταχῇ.

SEG 7:2; 21 CE/Parthian year 268, Audnaeus 17). It reads, βασιλευόν[τος Σελευκου, ἔτους] ςλ′ καὶ ρ′, μη[νὸς- - -], ἐν Σελευκ[είαι δὲ τῆι πρὸς τῶι] Εὐλαίωι Λ[ώου- - -, ἐπὶ] Ἀμμωνί[ου. ἔδοξε τῆι ἐκκλησίαι· ("resolved by the *ekklēsia*").

Lindos II 419, Aegean Islands, Rhodes and S. Dodecanese, Rhodes, 22 CE; ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι ἀ[ργ]υρίου ἐν Λίν[δ]ῳ ἐ[ν ταῖς] [ἀ]γο[μ]έναις ἐ(κ)κλησίαις τῷ Ἀγ(ριανίῳ) μ(ηνί)·

Peloponnesos, Peek, Asklepieion 35(2) (see also *IG* IV²,1 84, ll. 24, 41), Epidauria— Epidauros, Asklepieion, 40–42 CE; ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι, τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφιζε Πλάτων Ἡφιστιάδης καὶ συνπρόεδροι.

IScM III 32 (see also *SEG* 16.428), Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis (Mangalia), 50–75 CE; The ἀρχιερατικὰ ἐκλησία is mentioned twice: (1) δ[εδ]όχθαι [οὖν τῷ δά]μῳ ἐπηνῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐν πάσῃ [δὲ] [σ]υνπεριφορᾷ καὶ συνόδῳ καὶ δαμοθοινίᾳ

καὶ Καισαρίοις καὶ πανηγύρει καὶ ἀρχιερατικᾷ ἐκλησ[ί]ᾳ; (2) ἐκυρώθη τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο [ἐν τῇ ἀρχιε]ρατικῇ ἐκλησίᾳ τρίτῃ·.

Bosch, Quellen Ankara 76,72, Galatia, N.—Ankyra (Ankara), 50–100 CE; Τιβ. Κλαύδιο[ν] Φιλόστοργον νεώτερον φυλὴ ⟨θ′⟩ Ἱερὰ Βουλαία, κατὰ ἀναγόρευσιν βουλῆς καὶ δήμου, τειμηθέντα πολλάκις ἐν ἐκκλησίαις, ἀνδρίας ἕν[εκεν].

IScM III 34 (see also Dacia 2 (1925) 126, 8), Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis (Mangalia)—Arsa, 50–100 CE; [ἔ]δοξε τᾷ ἀρχι[ερα]τικᾷ [ἐκ(κ)λησίᾳ].

IScM III 31 (also *SEG* 1.327 [frg. b]—*SEG* 24.1029 [frg. a]), Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis (Mangalia), mid-1st cent. CE: An honorific crowning decree; καθ' ἑκάσταν ἐψάφ[ισθαι εὐεργε][σί]αν στεφανοῦσθε αὐτὸν διὰ βίου καὶ κατ' ἀΐδιον ἔν τε ἀρχιερ[ατικᾷ ἐκ(κ)λησίᾳ] καὶ Κεσαρείοις καὶ παναγύρι καὶ Διομβρίοις καὶ δαμοθοινίες [πάσαις ἀναγο]ρεύοντος τοῦ κάρυκος·.

IG VII 2713, Megaris, Oropia, and Boiotia, Boiotia—Akraiphia, 67 CE; (1) Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ λέγει· ... (11) συνελθόντων τῶν ὄχλων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προσεφώνησεν τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα.

FD III 4:61, Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 75–100 CE; [ἔδοξ]ε τῆι Δελφῶ[ν πόλ]ει, ἐν [προσκλή] τωι ἐ[κ]κλησίαι·.

FD III 3:233, (see also *SGDI* 2731), Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 80–95 CE; μηνὸς Ἀμαλίου γ′, ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εὐφαμηθέντος Ἀρχελάου τοῦ Ὑγίνου τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου.

> The regular occurrence of the ἐκκλησία in 1st cent. CE Delphi is implied by the prepositional phrase ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ

St. Pont. III 141, Pontus and Paphlagonia, Pont.—Amasia, 98/99 CE; Διὶ Στρατίῳ [ὁ δῆμος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ] κυρίᾳ ἐπὶ τῆς συν αρχίας Πομ[πωνίου— — — τοῦ(?)] Κανδίδου, νεωκο- ροῦντος γ′ [— — — — — —ο]υ Ἀγριππιανοῦ, ἐκ τῶν συν⟨λ⟩ε[λεγμένων χρημάτω] ν. ἔτους ρα′.

Iscr. di Cos EV 75bis (see also *Historia* [Milan] 8 [1934]: 433, 434), Cos and Calyma, Kos—Kos, 1st or 2nd cents. CE; [— — ἔδο]ξε τ[ᾶι ἐκκλησίαι(?) — —].

Appendix 3: *Ekklēsia* in Second Century CE Inscriptions

IG IX,1 193, Phokis, Lokris, Aitolia, Akarnania, and Ionian Islands, Phokis—Tithora, beginning of the 2nd cent. CE; δούσας τᾶς πόλιος τὸ ψάφισμα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντι Ἑλλανείκῳ Ἑλλανείκου ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. μάρτυ[ρε]ς· Σώκλαρος Ἀριστίωνος, Εὔφρων Στρατάγου, Τείμων Νεικαινέτου.

IGR 3.192 (see also *Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 120,103), Galatia, N.—Ankyra [Ankara], 100–150 CE; γυνα[ῖ]κ[α] δὲ γε⟨ν⟩ο[μέ]νην Π. Κα]λπουρ⟨ν⟩ίου [Πρόκ]λ[ου(?)] Κορ[ν]ηλιανοῦ [ὑ]⟨π⟩[α]⟨τ⟩ικοῦ [τ]ειμηθεῖσαν ἐν [ἐκ]κλησίᾳ ὑπό τε βουλῆς [κὲ] [δ]ή[μ]ου.

IEph 27A + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 115 (see also Curtius, *Hermes* 4 [1870]: 201–203, no. 12 [part]; *GIBM* 481, 481*; *FiE* II no. 27A; *Laum* 74, 1–7 [part]; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, 1–134; *SEG* 15, 698), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Honorary decree of *boulē* and *dēmos* of Ephesos honoring Gaius Vibius Salutaris for his benefaction paying for statues of Artemis, Trajan, Clotina, Senate, equites, and *dēmos* of Rome, *polis* of Ephesos, *dēmos* of Ephesos, *boulē* of Ephesos, *gerousia* of Ephesos, *ephebeia* of Ephesos, and so on, and accepting benefaction; one of three ἐκκλησία occurrences reads as follows: τῇ τε ν[ουμ]ηνίᾳ ἀρχ[ιερατικοῦ] ἔτους θυσί[ᾳ καὶ ἐν τ]αῖς ι[β′ καθ’ ἕκαστο]ν μῆνα ἀ[θροιζο] μέναις ἱερα[ῖς τε κα]ὶ νομ[ίμοις ἐκκλ]ησίαις κα[ὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν] Σεβ[ασ]τείων [καὶ Σω]τηρίων [καὶ τῶν π]εντ[ετηρικῶν —].

IEph 27B + Add. p. 2/*Ephesos* 212 (see also *GIBM* 481, 481*, 728, 749; *FiE* II no. 27B; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, ll. 134–332; *SEG* 15, 698); found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Letter of Caius [Vibius Salutaris] offering benefaction to [*boulē* and *dēmos*] of Ephesos in form of legal document; ὥ[στε καὶ αὐ]τὰς τίθε[σ]θαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπάνω τῆς σελίδος τῆς βουλ[ῆς μετὰ τῆς] χρυσέας Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκόνων.

IEph 27E/*Ephesos* 153 (see also *GIBM* 481, 481*; *FiE* II no. 27E; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, ll. 414–430), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE; ὅπως ἐξῇ τοῖς χρυσοφ[οροῦσιν τῇ θεῷ φέρειν εἰς τὰς] ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας τὰ ἀπεικ[ον]ίσματα καὶ ⟨τὰς⟩ εἰκόνας τὰ καθιερωμέν[α ὑπὸ Γαΐο]υ Οὐειβίου Σαλουταρίου ἐκ τοῦ προνάου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος.

IEph 35/*Ephesos* 830 (see also *CIL* III 141957n4; *ILS* 7193; *FiE* II no. 28b; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 4; Smallwood, *Doc.'s Nerva* 493a [part]), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Dedication (in Latin and Greek) to Artemis Ephesia and *gerousia* of Ephesos, by

C(aius) Vibius Salutaris; ἅτινα καθιέρωσεν, ἵνα τιθῆται κατὰ ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῶν βάσεων, ὡς ἡ διάταξις αὐτοῦ περιέχει.

FD III 2:104, Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 117–138 CE; μηνὸς Δαδηφορίου δʹ, ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐ(κ)κλησίᾳ, Θησέα Ἡροξένου Ἀθ(η)ναῖον Δελφοὶ Δελφὸν ἐποίησαν καὶ βουλευτή[ν].

Robert, *Hellenica* 6 80,26, Mysia [Upper Kaïkos] / Lydia, Mys./Lyd.—Stratonikeia (Siledik) (see also *BCH* 11.1887.108—*IGR* 4.1156; Oliver 79–81), 127 CE; Κάνδιδος ἀπέδωκα τὴν ἐπισ[το][λ]ὴν Λολλίῳ Ῥουστικῷ ἄρχοντι τῇ πρὸ αʹ ἰδ[ῶ]ν Μαίων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ Παρθ[ι]κοῦ υἱὸς, θεοῦ Νέρουα υἱωνὸς, Τραιανὸς Ἀδριανὸς Σεβαστὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιαʹ, ὕπατος τὸ γʹʹ Ἀδριανοπολιτῶν Στρατονικέων τοῖς ἄρχο[υ]σι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν.

BCH 1885, 127–28, no. B (see also *Clerc, *BCH* 9, 1885, 127–128, no. B; Dietl, *Nysa* 7 no. C; **Kourouniotes, AD 7, 1921–1922, 85 [l. 2] [PH]; *BE* 1924:355; *SEG* 4, 418; **Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 24, 1929, 194 [ll. 10–13]; *BE* 1930:209), Caria, found at Nysa, later at Nazilli, 138–161 CE: Honorary decree for Titus Aelius Alikibiades by *boulē* and *dēmos* of Nysa; ἄλλας ἐπʼ ἄλλαις [χά][ρ]ιτας καὶ δωρεὰς ἰδίᾳ τε ἑκάστο[ις] [κ]αὶ δημοσίᾳ κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ συ[ν]έδρια καὶ συμμορίας διανέμων [ὡ]ς πᾶσαν μὲν ἐκκλησίαν, πᾶ[σ]αν δὲ βουλήν.

IGR 3.704/*Serta Harteliana* 1/7, Lycia, Kyaneai(Yavu), 138–161 CE; χρόνοι ψηφισμάτων τειμητικῶν καὶ ἐπι[στολ]ῶν γραφισῶν ἡγεμόσι καὶ ἀντιγραφῶν περὶ Ἰάσονος … Ἀρτεμεισίου γʹ ἐκλησίας ἀπόλογος.

IG XII,3 326, see also *IG* XII,3 Suppl. p. 283, Doric Sporades, Thera, 149 CE; ἐν ἐγδικί[α]ις ἀκριβής, ἐν πρακτορείαις ὑγιής, ἐ[ν] ἀρχαῖς καὶ στρατηγίαις δίκαιος, ἐν ἐπιδόσεσι πολειτῶν μεγαλόψυχος φανείς, ἐκκλ[η]σίας ἀγομένης ἐννόμου τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, παρελθὼν εἰσή[γ] γειλεν βουλῇ καὶ δήμῳ τὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει Βασιλικὴν στοάν.

Bosch, *Quellen Ankara* 263, 201, Galatia N.—Ankyra [Ankara], 150–200 CE; Ζωτικὸν Βάσσου, ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν, υἱὸν φυλῆς ιαʹ, φυλαρχήσαντα φιλοτείμως καὶ ἀστυνομήσαντα ἀγνῶς κὲ ἔργον ποιήσαντα πολυτείμητο[ν] ἐν κομοκετίῳ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κὲ καθʼ ἡμέραν πολλὰ παρέχοντα τῇ φυλῇ, τειμηθέντα ἔν τε ἐκκλησίαις κὲ βουλῇ, φυλῇ ιαʹ Νέα Ὀλυμπιά[ς].

IMT NoerdlTroas 8, see also *IK* 6,34, Troas, Tr.: nördl. Troas—Lampsakos (Lapseki) [Aa: Eresos od. Methymna?], 2nd cent. CE?: (1) proclamation of a decree regarding a crowning; δεῖξαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβεῖα ἐν τᾷ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὅστις παραγενόμενος πρὸς Λαμψακανοὶς [τό] [τ]ε ψάφισμα ἀποδώσει καὶ ἀξιώσει ποιήσασθαι τ[ὰν ἀν]αγγελίαν τῶν στεφάνωγ καὶ παρʼ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν το[ῖς Δι]ονυσίοις καὶ ἵνα ἀναγραφῇ τὸ ψάφισμα τοῦτο [εἰς] [σ]τάλαν λευκῶ λίθω

καὶ ἀνατεθῇ ἐν τῷ ἐπιφ[ανεστά]τῳ τόπῳ·; (2) voting by show of hands; χειροτονῆσαι δὲ ἐν τᾷ ἐκκλη[σίᾳ ἐφόδι]ον τῷ πρεσβευτᾷ ποσσᾶν [ἀμερᾶν δεήσει — — — —].

FD III 1:261(3), Delphi, Phokis—Delphi, 2nd cent. CE?; πα[ραγενόμενοι καὶ ἐπελ]θόν[τε]ς ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν διελέγησαν ὑπὲρ Πυλ[άδα τοῦ Ἀκ]ε?σαμεν[οῦ Ὑπαταίου.

Strubbe, Cat. Pessinus 13/*IK Pessinous* 13 (see also *CIG* 4085 w/ Add.p. 1111—SbMünchen 1860.194, 197—*OGIS* 537, *IGR* 3.226), Galatia, N.—Pessinous (Ballihisar), 2nd cent. CE or later (PHI dating; U of Hamburg dates *Strubbe*, [2005] 25, Nr. 13 to the second half of the 2nd cent. CE; http://s145739614.online.de/result.php?lang=en&id=10; accessed August 18, 2012); πάσαις τ[ει]μαῖς τειμηθέντα ἐν ἐκκλ[η]σίαις ὑπό τε βουλῆς καὶ δήμου, ἀνδριάντων ἀν[ασ]τάσεσι καὶ εἰκόνων [ἀνα]θέσεσι, ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν ⟨κ(αὶ)⟩ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς [ἑαυτούς].

IG IV 853, Peloponnesos, Saronic Gulf, Corinthia, and the Argolid, Troizenis—Methana, 2nd cent. CE?: Reference is made to the formal title of a member of the ἐκκλησία—οἱ ἐκκλησιασταὶ; αἱ συναρχίαι πᾶσαι κα[ὶ] οἱ ἐκκλησιασταὶ {ἐκκλησιασταὶ} εἶπαν.

SEG 34:766 (see also *IosPE* I² 263—*I.Olbia* 47 + 179 + 53—Sodalitas. Scritti A. Guarino 1 [1984]: 461–465 (J. G. Vinogradov), see also: *I.Olbia* 179 *I.Olbia* 47; *I.Olbia* 53; *IosPE* I² 263), N. Black Sea, Olbia, 200 CE: Honorific decree for Marcianus of Prousias; frg. a.1 ἐπὶ ἀρχόντων τ[ῶν περὶ Σατορνεῖλον Π]εισιστράτου μηνὸς Ληνεῶνος κ[.´, ἐκκλησίας συνηθροι]σμένης πανδήμου, εἰσηγησαμένου [τοῦ δεῖνος — — —ο]υ, οἱ περὶ Σατορνεῖλον ⟨Π⟩εισιστράτου ἄρχ[οντες εἶπαν.

TAM III 4, Asia Minor, Pisidia, Termessos, 2nd cent. CE; μηνὸς Σωτηρίου δεκάτη γ´ ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκλησίᾳ ἔδοξε τῶι δήμωι προβούλων γνώμῃ·

Appendix 4: *Synagō* and *Eis Ekklēsian*: Greek Sources

**1   Greek Writers Pairing *Synagō* with Ekklēsia but not with
*Eis Ekklēsian***

Thucydides (*c.* 460 BC–*c.* 395 BC; Athens; *The Peloponnesian War* 2.60.1) Xenophon
(*c.* 430–354 BC; Athens; *Anabasis* 1.3.2) and Demosthenes (384–322 BCE; Athens;
Letters; 1.5).

**2   Greek Inscriptions Pairing *Synagō* with *Ekklēsia* but not with
*Eis Ekklēsian***

Samos 4 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)
συναχθῆναι μὲν τ[ὴν ἐκκλησίαν? —]

Samos 119 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)
ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῆι γεροντικῆι παλαίστραι, συναχθεῖσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν·

Samos 120 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)
1 ἐπὶ Τίμωνος· Τ[αυρεῶνο]ς ἐμβολίμου νουμηνία· ἐκκλη[σ]ίας συναχθείσης·

Aphrodisias/*BCH* 1972, 443–45 (1st cent BCE[?]; Aphrodisias, Caria, Asia Minor)
Honorary decree of the koinon of Hellenes in Asia for Dionysios Iasonos and Hierokles
Iasonos of Aphrodisias and Tralles; I; found at Aphrodisias
καὶ κληθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου συναχθείσης ἐκλησίας

IvO 52 (138 BCE; Olympia, Elis, Peloponnesos)
ἐκκλησία συνήχθη κυρία ἐν [τῷ θεά]τρωι ἐν τῆι προειρημένηι ἡμέραι,

IMilet I 3, 145/*Miletos* 42 (200/199 BCE; Ephesos, Ionia, Asia Minor)
Honorary decree for Eudemos Thallionos, who established and regulated administra-
tion of school;
τῆι δὲ ὀγδόηι ἀνομένου τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός, ἐπειτὰν ἡ ἐκκλησία συναχθῆι, τίθεσθαι ἐν τῆι
ὀρχήστραι τρίποδα καὶ θυμίατρον, τοὺς δὲ ἱερεῖς τόν τε τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τοῦ Ἐναγωνίου τοῦ ἐν τῆι
παλαίστραι τῶν παίδων καὶ τὸν τῶν Μουσῶν καὶ τὸν ἱεροκήρυκα καὶ τοὺς κεχειροτονη

EKM 1. *Beroia* 1 (200–166 BCE; Makedonia [Bottiaia]—Beroia, Macedonia, northern Greece)
συναχθείσης ἐκκλησίας Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου, ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρᾶ, Κάλλιππος Ἱπποστράτου εἶπαν·

Rigsby, Asylia 52c (242 BCE; Asklepion, Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)
Decree of unknown Ionian city (cf. *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* [1952] p. 27—*Chiron* 31 [2001]: 333, 1 [text]—*SEG* 51.1055)
[καὶ τῶν θεωρῶν συναχθείσης ὑπὸ τ]ῶν στρατηγῶν ἐκκλησ[ία]ς·

SEG 51:1055 (242 BCE; Asklepion, Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)
Decree of an Ionian city concerning the asylia of Kos. No description.
[καὶ τῶν θεωρῶν συναχθείσης ὑπὸ τ]ῶν στρατηγῶν ἐκκλησ[ία]ς·

IosPE I² 33 (3rd cent. BCE[?]; Olbia, north shore of the Black Sea)
τῶν δὲ ἀρχόντων συναγαγόντων ἐκλησίαν

SEG 47:1280 (post-241 BCE; Asklepieion [stoich.], Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)
Decree of Samos?
1 ἐπὶ τοῦ [θεοῦ —] . Μ[— — — — —], Ἀπατουριῶνος τρεισκαιδεκάτηι, ἐκκλησ[ί]ας κατὰ νόμον περὶ τῶν ἀρχαιρεσιῶν συναχθείσης,

IMT Adram Kolpos 732 (319–317 BCE; Aiol.Mys.: Adramyttenos Kolpos—Nasos/Poroselene? [Alibey Ad.]: Nasos [Dulapi], Mysia, Asia Minor)
εἰς μίκρον συνάγαγε ? Implied by μίκρον?

SEG 25:687 (Hellenistic period; Thessalia [Magnesia]—Korope, Thessaly, central Greece). Regulations concerning the cult of Zeus Akraios.
. . . . . . πρῶτον τὸ [ἄγα]λμα τῶι θεῶι, συναχθείση[ς ἐκκλη]σίας τοῦ προειρημένου [μην]ὸ[ς ἀ]ναφέροντος ἀεὶ λόγον τῶι [μηνὶ τῶι] σ . . . τηνιωι[— — — πρὸς τοὺς] ἐξεταστάς·

Iasos 4.33–110/Iasos 4 (195/190 BCE; found at Iasos, Caria, Asia Minor)
Honorary decree of demos (of Iasos) for King Antiochos (III) and Queen Laodike (III)
[πρυτ]άνεων ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγόντων τριακάδι ἔδο[ξε] τῶι δήμωι·

Sardis 7,1 8 (5–1 BCE; Lyd.—Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)
ἐπὶ τῶι Γαΐωι χαρὰν καὶ περὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εὔνοιαν, παραγενόμενός τε ἐν τῆι συναχθείσῃ δημοτελεῖ ἐκ(κ)λησίαι τὴν ἀποπρεσβείαν ἐποιεῖτο, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτὸν

Sardis 7,1 8 (5–1 BCE; Lyd.—Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)
ἐ⟨κ⟩κλησίας, ἀρχαιρετικῆς συναχθείσης καὶ συνελθόντων τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν [πόλεων ἑ]κατὸν κ(αὶ)
ν′ ἀνδρῶν τιμὰν ἐπηνέχθησαν ἄθροοι τὸν καθ’ ἔτος ἔκδικον τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσί[ας Ἑλ]
λήνων Μηνογένην Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Μηνογένους τὸν πολείτην ⟨ὑ⟩μῶν,

IGRR 4.1756 (5–1 BCE; Lyd.—Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)
ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστο[ῦ, Σαρδιανῶν]
ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν· ἐ⟨κ⟩κλησίας, ἀρχαιρετικῆς συναχθείσης καὶ συνελθόντων τῶν
ἀπὸ τῶν [πόλεων ἑ]κατὸν κ(αὶ) ν′ ἀνδρῶν τιμὰν ἐπηνέχθησαν ἄθροοι τὸν καθ’ ἔτος ἔκδικον

IC II xii 20 (227–224[?] BCE; Crete, W.—Eleutherna, Crete, Aegean Islands)
ἐὰν δὲ μὴ σ]υναγάγωσιν τὴν ἐ[κλησίαν ἢ τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς μὴ] προσαγάγωσιν ἢ χρη[ματίσωσιν
ἄλλο τι πρὶν ἢ ἀπόκ]ρισιν δοῦναι τοῖς [πρεσβευταῖς,

IC II xii 20 (227–224[?] BCE; Crete, W.—Eleutherna, Crete, Aegean Islands)
συναγέτωσαν [οἱ κόσμοι τὴν ἐκλησίαν ἐν δέκ]ᾳ ἡμέραις ἀφ’ ἧς ἂν πα[ραγένωνται οἱ
πρεσβευταί,

Meletemata 11 K1 (late 2nd to mid-1st cents BCE; Makedonia [Mygdonia]—Kalindoia
[area of Kalamoto, Macedonia], northern Greece)
οἱ πολιτάρχαι, συνβου[λευσάμενοι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ σ]υναγαγόντες ἐκκλη[σίαν εἶπαν

3   Inscriptions Pairing *Synagō* with Unmodified *Eis Ekklēsian*

Only one inscription: *Samos* 119 ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῆι γεροντικῆι παλαίστραι,
συναχθεῖσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν·

4   Literary Authors Pairing *Synagō* with Unmodified *Eis Ekklēsian*

Polybius (ca. 200–118 BC; Arcadia of Macedonia)
Polybius uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* 13 times
Polybius uses *synagō* plus unmodified *eis ekklēsian* 5 times

Polybius, *Histories*
book 1, chapter 45: [2] βουλόμενος ἀκεραίοις ἀποχρήσασθαι ταῖς ἑκατέρων ὁρμαῖς πρὸς τὴν
διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐπίθεσιν τοῖς ἔργοις, συνῆγε πάντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν:

[2] He wished to take advantage of the excited feelings of both parties, before they cooled, in order to organise an attempt to set fire to the works of the besiegers. He therefore summoned the whole army to a meeting,

Historiae. Polybius. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst after L. Dindorf. Leipzig. Teubner. 1893–. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0233% 3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D45%3Asection%3D2

book 5, chapter 1: [6] ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος, ἐνδεὴς ὢν σίτου καὶ χρημάτων εἰς τὰς δυνάμεις, συνῆγε τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς διὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. [7] ἀθροισθέντος δὲ τοῦ πλήθους εἰς Αἴγιον κατὰ τοὺς νόμους

[6] As for Philip, being in need of corn and money for his army, he summoned the Achaeans to a general assembly by means of their magistrates. [7] When the assembly [not *ekklesia* but *plethos*] had met, according to the federal law,

Historiae. Polybius. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst after L. Dindorf. Leipzig. Teubner. 1893–. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0233% 3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D1%3Asection%3D6

book 22, chapter 10: [10] ὁ δὲ Καικίλιος ὁρῶν τὴν τούτων προαίρεσιν, ἠξίου τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῷ συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. [11] οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἄρχοντες ἐκέλευον αὐτὸν δεῖξαιτὰς ἐντολάς, ἃς εἶχε παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου περὶ τούτων. τοῦ δὲ παρασιωπῶντος, οὐκ ἔφασαν αὐτῷ συνάξειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν:

[10] Seeing what the disposition of the magistrates was, Caecilius demanded that the public assembly should be summoned, to which the Achaean magistrates demanded to see the instructions which he had from the Senate on these points: and when he gave no answer to this demand, they said that they would not summon the assembly for him

Historiae. Polybius. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst after L. Dindorf. Leipzig. Teubner. 1893–. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0233% 3Abook%3D22%3Achapter%3D10%3Asection%3D10

book 22, chapter 12: [5] Ἀπελογήθησαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Καικίλιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχόντων οἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρέσβεις ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ, φάσκοντες οὐθὲν ἀδικεῖν αὐτοὺς οὐδ᾽ ἀξίους ἐγκλήματος ὑπάρχειν ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ συνάγειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν:

[5] But the ambassadors from the Achaeans offered an explanation also to Caecilius in the Senate, on behalf of the magistrates, asserting that "They did not act wrongly or deserve blame for refusing to summon the assembly,"

Historiae. Polybius. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst after L. Dindorf. Leipzig. Teubner. 1893–. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0233% 3Abook%3D22%3Achapter%3D12%3Asection%3D5

book 23, chapter 5: [16] ἐπεὶ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ναύπακτον ἔγραψε τῷ στρατηγῷ καὶ τοῖς δαμιουργοῖς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, κελεύων συνάγειν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν,

[16] Having landed at Naupactus, Flamininus addressed a despatch to the Strategus and Demiurgi bidding them summon the Achaeans to an assembly; to which they wrote back that "they would do so, if he would write them word what the subjects were on which he wished to confer with the Achaeans;"

Historiae. Polybius. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst after L. Dindorf. Leipzig. Teubner. 1893–. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0233% 3Abook%3D23%3Achapter%3D5%3Asection%3D16

Diodorus Siculus (Sicily, wrote between 60 and 30 BCE).
Diodorus uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* 18 times.
Four time he uses *synagō* plus unmodified *eis ekklēsian*
One time he uses *synagō* plus unmodified *eis tēn ekklēsian*

book 14, chapter 38: [4].... ὃς παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἡράκλειαν συνήγαγεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὰ πλήθη, καὶ περιστήσας αὐτοῖς ὁπλίτας συνέλαβε τοὺς αἰτίους καὶ πάντας ἀνεῖλεν, ὄντας περὶ πεντακοσίους.

[4] ... As soon as Herippidas arrived in Heracleia he called an assembly of the people, and surrounding them with his hoplites, he arrested the authors of the discord and put them all to death, some five hundred in number.

Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes with an English Translation by C. H. Oldfather. Vol. 4–8. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1989.
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0083% 3Abook%3D14%3Achapter%3D38%3Asection%3D4

book 15, chapter 74: [5] ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος ὁ νεώτερος διαδεξάμενος τὴν τυραννίδα, πρῶτον τὰ πλήθη συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν παρεκάλεσε τοῖς οἰκείοις λόγοις τηρεῖν τὴν πατροπαράδοτον πρὸς αὐτὸν εὔνοιαν, ἔπειτα τὸν πατέρα

[5] Dionysius the younger on his succession to the tyranny first gathered the populace in an assembly and urged them in appropriate words to maintain toward him the loyalty that passed to him with the heritage that he had received from his father;

Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes with an English Translation by C. H. Oldfather. Vol. 4–8. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1989.
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0083% 3Abook%3D15%3Achapter%3D74%3Asection%3D5

book 16, chapter 10: [3] ... τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν τοῖς παρατυχοῦσιν ὅπλοις συνεσκεύασεν. συναγαγὼν δ᾽ ἅπαντας εἰς κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπεφαίνετο μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἥκειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλευθέρωσιν τῶν Σικελιωτῶν,

[3] ... and equipped the rest as well as he could with weapons that came to hand. Then having brought them all to a general assembly, he disclosed that he had come for the liberation of the Greeks of Sicily,

Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes with an English Translation by C. H. Oldfather. Vol. 4–8. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1989.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0083%3Abook%3D16%3Achapter%3D10%3Asection%3D3

book 17, chapter 94: [5] ὡς δ᾽ ἐπανῆλθον οἱ στρατιῶται πολλῶν πλῆθος ἀγαθῶν ἐκ τῆς προνομῆς εὑρηκότες συνῆγε πάντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. διελθὼν δὲ λόγον πεφροντισμένον περὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς Γανδαρίδας

[5] When the soldiers returned laden with wealth from their expedition, he brought them together to a meeting. He delivered a carefully prepared speech about the expedition against the Gandaridae

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0083%3Abook%3D17%3Achapter%3D94%3Asection%3D5

Plutarch (46–120 CE; born to a prominent family in Chaeronea, Boeotia, a town about twenty miles east of Delphi)
Plutarch uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* 15 times
Plutarch uses *synagō* plus unmodified *eis ekklēsian* 7 times

Plutarch, *Aemilius Paulus*
chapter 11: [1] εἰωθότων δὲ τῶν ὑπατείαν λαβόντων οἷον ἀνθομολογεῖσθαί τινα χάριν καὶ προσαγορεύειν φιλοφρόνως τὸν δῆμον ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος, Αἰμίλιος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγὼν τοὺς πολίτας τὴν μὲν προτέραν ὑπατείαν μετελθεῖν ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀρχῆς δεόμενος

11. [1] It was the custom for those who obtained the consulship to return thanks, as it were, for the great favour in a friendly speech to the people from the rostra; but Aemilius, having gathered an assembly of the citizens, said he had sued for his first consulship because he himself wanted office,

Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives, with an English Translation by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1918. 6.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0080%3Achapter%3D11%3Asection%3D1

Plutarch, *Caesar*

chapter 19: [2] … συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐκέλευσεν ἀπιέναι καὶ μὴ κινδυνεύειν παρὰ γνώμην οὕτως ἀνάνδρως καὶ μαλακῶς ἔχοντας, αὐτὸς δὲ ἔφη τὸ δέκατον τάγμα μόνον παραλαβὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους πορεύσεσθαι,

[2] … he called them together ["into assembly" is implied] and bade them be off, since they were so unmanly and effeminate, and not force themselves to face danger; as for himself, he said he would take the tenth legion alone and march against the Barbarians; *Plutarch*. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1919. 7. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0130% 3Achapter%3D19%3Asection%3D2

Plutarch, *Caius Marius*

chapter 33: [3] … ὡς ἀνεχώρησαν ἀμφότεροι, συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς στρατιώτας, Ἀπορῶ, φησί, πότερον εἴπω τοὺς πολεμίους ἀνανδροτέρους ἢ ὑμᾶς:

[3] … and both sides had withdrawn, he called an assembly of his soldiers and said to them: 'I do not know whether to call the enemy or you the greater cowards; *Plutarch*. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1920. 9. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0132% 3Achapter%3D33%3Asection%3D3

Plutarch, *Fabius Maximus*

chapter 3: [4] … περὶ δὲ ταύτης ὡς πρῶτον ἤκουσεν ὁ στρατηγὸς Πομπώνιος, συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸν δῆμον οὐ περιπλοκὰς οὐδὲ παραγωγὰς ἀλλ᾽ ἄντικρυς ἔφη προσελθὼν ʻΝενικήμεθα, ὦ ἄνδρες Ῥωμαῖοι, μεγάλῃ μάχῃ,

[4] but as soon as Pomponius the praetor heard of this second defeat, he called an assembly of the people, faced it, and without roundabout or deceptive phrases, but in downright fashion, said: "Men of Rome, we have been beaten in a great battle;" *Plutarch*. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1916. 3. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0114% 3Achapter%3D3%3Asection%3D4

Plutarch, *Lycurgus*

chapter 29: [1] … οὕτως ἀγασθεὶς καὶ ἀγαπήσας τὸ τῆς νομοθεσίας κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος ἐν ἔργῳ γενομένης καὶ ὁδῷ βαδιζούσης, ἐπεθύμησεν, ὡς ἀνυστὸν ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνης προνοίας, ἀθάνατον αὐτὴν ἀπολιπεῖν καὶ ἀκίνητον εἰς τὸ μέλλον, συναγαγὼν οὖν ἅπαντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν,

[1] ... He therefore ardently desired, so far as human forethought could accomplish the task, to make it immortal, and let it go down unchanged to future ages. Accordingly, he assembled [nominal not verbal form of *ekklesia*] the whole people,

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1914. 1.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0131%3Achapter%3D29%3Asection%3D1

Plutarch, *Pericles*

chapter 33: [5] τὸν δὲ δῆμον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν οὐ συνῆγε δεδιὼς βιασθῆναι παρὰ γνώμην, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ νεὼς κυβερνήτης ἀνέμου κατιόντος ἐν πελάγει θέμενος εὖ πάντα καὶ κατατείνας τὰ ὅπλα χρῆται τῇ τέχνῃ,

[5] And he would not call the people together into an assembly, fearing that he would be constrained against his better judgement, like the helmsman of a ship, who, when a stormy wind swoops down upon it in the open sea, makes all fast, takes in sail, and exercises his skill,

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1916. 3.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0072%3Achapter%3D33%3Asection%3D5

Plutarch, *Pompey*

chapter 43: [2] εὐθὺς οὖν ἐπιβὰς Ἰταλίας ὁ Πομπήϊος καὶ συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ τὰ πρέποντα διαλεχθεὶς καὶ φιλοφρονησάμενος,

[2] Pompey, accordingly, as soon as he set foot in Italy, held an assembly of his soldiers, and after he had said what fitted the occasion, and had expressed his gratitude and affection for them,

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1917. 5.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0123%3Achapter%3D43%3Asection%3D2

Pausanias (2nd century CE during Hadrian, Antonius Pius, Marcus Aurelius; a native of Lydia; he was certainly familiar with the western coast of Asia Minor, but his travels extended far beyond the limits of Ionia. Before visiting Greece, he had been to Antioch, Joppa and Jerusalem)

Pausanias uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* only once.

Pausanias pairs *synagō* with the unmodified phrase *eis ekklēsian* only once.

Description of Greece

book 4, chapter 5: [6] ... οἱ δὲ τῶν Μεσσηνίων βασιλεῖς τοῖς μὲν πρέσβεσιν ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι βουλευσάμενοι μετὰ τοῦ δήμου τὰ δόξαντα ἐπιστελοῦσιν ἐς Σπάρτην, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκείνων ἀπελθόντων ἐς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς πολίτας συνῆγον.

[6] ... The Messenian kings replied to the ambassadors that after deliberation with the people they would send the findings to Sparta and after their departure they themselves summoned the citizens to a meeting.

Pausanias. Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio, 3 vols. Leipzig, Teubner. 1903.

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0159%3Abook%3D4%3Achapter%3D5%3Asection%3D6

Appendix 5: Verbs with *Eis Ekklēsian*: Josephus

1 Antiquities of the Jews

1.1 Eis Ekklēsian *and No Verb*

(1) book 4, section 22: (rebellion against Moses) ἀνηρέθιστο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ βάλλειν τὸν Μωυσῆν ὡρμήκεσαν, εἴς τε ἐκκλησίαν ἀκόσμως μετὰ θορύβου καὶ ταραχῆς συνελέγοντο, καὶ πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ θεοῦ στάντες ἐβόων ἥκειν τὸν τύραννον καὶ τῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δουλείας ἀπηλλάχθαι τὸ πλῆθος, τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ προφάσει βίαια προστάγματα κελεύοντος

(2) book 19, section 332: (rebellion against King Agrippa) Καὶ δή τις ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀνὴρ ἐπιχώριος ἐξακριβάζειν δοκῶν τὰ νόμιμα, Σίμων ἦν ὄνομα τούτῳ, πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἁλίσας τηνικάδε τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς Καισάρειαν ἐκδεδημηκότος ἐτόλμησεν αὐτοῦ κατειπεῖν, ὡς οὐχ ὅσιος εἴη, δικαίως δ' ἂν εἴργοιτο τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς εἰσόδου προσηκούσης τοῖς ἐγγενέσιν

1.2 Synagō *and* Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 3, section 188: (Moses) καὶ συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸ πλῆθος

(2) book 4, section 63: (Moses) καὶ χαλεπὸν συνήγαγε τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν,

(3) book 4, section 142: (Moses) συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸν λαὸν

(4) book 4, section 309: (Moses) καὶ τέκνοις εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγών,

(5) book 5, section 72: (Joshua) συναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν εἰς τὴν Σιλοῦν ἐκκλησίαν παρήγγειλε

(6) book 5, section 93: (Joshua) Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸν στρατὸν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰόρδανον

(7) book 8, section 368: (Ahab) [συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸ πλῆθος ἔλεγεν,

(8) book 9, section 8: (Jehoshaphat) δείσας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνάγει τὸν δῆμον τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν

(9) book 11, section 228: (Mordecai) Ἰουδαίους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγεῖν

(10) book 13, section 114: (Ptolemy) καὶ συναγαγὼν τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

1.3 *Other Verbs and* Eis Ekklēsian

Athroizō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1) book 3, section 300: (Moses) εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἀθροίζει τὸ πλῆθος

Dialuō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1) book 3, section 306: (Moses) Οἱ δὲ ἄπορον ἐξ ὧν ἠκροάσαντο τὴν κτῆσιν τῆς γῆς ὑπελάμβανον καὶ διαλυθέντες ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶν ὀλοφυρόμενοι διῆγον, ὡς οὐδὲν ἔργῳ τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθοῦντος λόγῳ δὲ μόνον ὑπισχνουμένου

Exreō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 3, section 292: (Jehoshaphat) ἐχρῶντο τοῦ πλήθους εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας·

Heikō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 4, section 24: (Moses) ἧκεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

Parerchomai **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 9, section 10: (Jehoshaphat) τις προφήτης παρελθὼν εἰς μέσην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

Proagō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 16, section 393: (Herod) καὶ προαγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τριακοσίους

(Syn)*Kaleō* **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 3, section 84: (Moses) οὖν συγκαλεῖ τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

(2)   book 7, section 370: (King David) εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συγκαλέσας τοὺς ἄρχοντας

(3)   book 12, section 164: (Joseph, son of Tobias, nephew of Onias the high priest) συγκαλέσας τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

(4)   book 13, section 216: (Simon Maccabeus, high priest and ethnarch) καὶ δὴ τοῦτ' ἔπειθεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καλέσας τὸ πλῆθος

Synerchomai **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 4, section 35: (Moses) τῇ δ' ἐπιούσῃ συνῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρατευξόμενοι

(2)   book 9, section 250: (King Pekah [implied]) ὁ δὲ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν λαὸς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνελθὼν

Syntrexō Eis Ekklēsian

(1)   book 3, section 307: (rebellion against Moses and Aaron) πρωῒ δ' εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συντρέχουσι, δι' ἐννοίας ἔχοντες καταλεύσαντες τόν τε Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἀαρῶνα ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ὑποστρέφειν,

2   Jewish War

2.1   Synagō *and* **Eis Ekklēsian**

(11)   book 1, section 666: (Queen Salome) ἤδη τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ συνῆγον αὐτοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

2.2   *Other Verbs and* Eis Ekklēsian

Proeimi **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(1)   book 1, section 654: (Herod) γενόμενος πρόεισιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

Synerchomai **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(3)   book 4, section 162: (Ananus) Καὶ δὴ συνελθόντος τοῦ πλήθους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

Athroizō **and** *Eis Ekklēsian*

(2)   book 7, section 412: (The principal men of the *gerousia*) ὁρῶντες δ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπόνοιαν οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας οὐκέτ' ἀσφαλὲς αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον περιορᾶν, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀθροίσαντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους

Index of Inscriptional Sources

Index of Literary Sources

6   **Later Christian Writings**

Index of Subjects

Index of Modern Authors