

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

### ICONIUM AND ANTIOCH.

FOR a good many years I have, so far as possible, avoided making any reference to the controversy about the "Churches of Galatia." In writing on "The Cities of St. Paul," it was of course inevitable that an account of the great Galatian cities must take up an attitude on this matter. In fact, the mere omission of all North Galatian cities in such a book presupposes the opinion that the Apostle did not visit that country. It was, however, my purpose to state only what appeared to be most important for the right understanding of the history and character of each city, Iconium, Antioch, Lystra and Derbe, and tacitly to omit contrary opinions except on two or three matters where wrong views had been advocated not long previously by distinguished scholars, as for example that Iconium was a Roman colony in the time of St. Paul, and that it was detached from the Province Galatia and incorporated in the new Province of Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia by the Emperor Hadrian about the end of his reign, A.D. 130 to 137.<sup>1</sup>

I was perfectly content to wait the progress of discovery. There is abundant evidence in the country which will gradually be found by exploration. Had I been able to spend the needed money and time purely on a systematic exploration of the Pauline country, the amount of evidence bearing on this subject would have long ago been largely increased in amount. Its character would not have changed. The new evidence will not contradict, but confirm, the old; and the old evidence was sufficient to settle all the subsidiary questions relating to the Galatian churches for any

<sup>1</sup> As it chanced, the most eminent champion of the former opinion held the South Galatian view, and the principal advocate of the latter was a distinguished numismatist who probably has no opinion about and no interest in Pauline questions,

one who is willing to study it sufficiently, and not merely to glance over it for the purpose of finding weapons to destroy his opponent's position. The evidence, however, had only an indirect bearing on Pauline questions. It settled the main questions regarding the history of the South Galatian cities. It showed them as important cities of the Province, proud of their Roman character, some as colonies, some as Hellenic states of the Empire, of which they formed a part in virtue of their position in the Province. They were only indirectly and not directly Roman states: they were units in the fabric of the Province, and the Province was part of the Empire. But there existed no evidence bearing directly on Pauline questions; and no such evidence is to be expected. It is in the last degree improbable that any proof will ever be found in the soil of South Galatia that Paul traversed that country on his third missionary journey (Acts xviii. 23). Still less can proof be expected that he did not go through North Galatia on that journey or on his second journey; and nothing less than such a negative proof is likely ever to convince the old North Galatian theorists. They can always find some new way of evading the indirect evidence; and, though they are proved wrong in every objection they make to the South Galatian view so far as external history, antiquities and geography are concerned, yet ingenious manipulation of the difficult Lucan and Pauline references easily provides a stronghold where they can feel themselves safe.

But though no direct proof of the route followed by St. Paul in his second and third journeys is to be expected, the indirect proof will be greatly increased both in amount and in clearness. It has been made an argument against me that several of my positions depended on one single piece of evidence. One single inscription is really as strong as a score on matters of administration and bounds and political

arrangement ; but the argument will be more convincing to the world, when a score of inscriptions attest the same fact. The Province Galatia was so little known that many details regarding it depended on one witness, and much was unattested and unknown, a matter of conjecture and analogy.

Moreover, the increase in the amount of evidence will also make the attestation more clear and simple. When facts of organisation in a Province like Galatia, of which very little is known, depend on a single witness, the testimony needs commentary and elucidation ; and the complexity of the explanation makes those who have not carefully studied the subject feel some doubt about the force of reasoning which has to be so elaborate. When there are twenty attestations, these elucidate one another, and produce a simpler, more complete and more convincing picture.

These reflexions were roused in my mind by reading the few paragraphs in which Dr. Moffatt, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 95 ff., dismisses the Galatian question. A more extraordinary caricature of a historical theory it would be difficult to find than his account of the arguments for the South Galatian theory. I do not mean that Dr. Moffatt intentionally caricatured the South Galatian arguments. His strong desire to be strictly fair and accurate in stating views from which he dissents is conspicuous throughout his book ; but he has evidently only dipped lightly into the subject, and has never studied the history of Anatolian society and the geography of the country sufficiently to understand the arguments on the opposite side, or to reproduce them accurately.

I need not, however, go further into wearisome detail ; but will simply mention some fresh evidence, most of which was found in 1911, when we were able to spend several days continuously at Pisidian Antioch.

## I. THE PHRYGIAN REGION OF GALATIA PROVINCIA.

It is a cardinal point in the South Galatian view that there was a region of the Province called Phrygia, and that this region included the cities of Iconium, Antioch of Pisidia, and Apollonia. One inscription<sup>1</sup> mentions Phrygia as forming part of the Province Galatia. Now the greater part of Phrygia was in the Province Asia. This Galatic Phrygia must therefore have been a small region outside the Asian frontier; and Ptolemy v. 4, 9, mentions in the Province Galatia a region Phrygia containing the cities Apollonia, Antioch, and others. Strabo also describes both those cities as being in the country Phrygia; and numerous witnesses prove that they were included in the Province Galatia. Still there was naturally a craving for an inscription which stated simply and directly that Antioch was reckoned by the Romans to be part of a region called Phrygia.

The nearest approach to such proof lay in two inscriptions, which seemed to mention Phrygian Antioch; but both were expressed in poetic phraseology; and one of these was interpreted by Kaibel as alluding not to Antioch, but to Magnesia,<sup>2</sup> while in the other the name Antioch was restored. The former therefore is unconvincing.

The latter inscription is engraved on a large basis intended to bear a statue. Professor Sterrett copied it in 1884: it mentions on one side of the stone a "regionary centurion," who was honoured by the city of Antioch; and Professor Sterrett altered his own copy to "legionary centurion." My protest against this change was approved by Professor O. Hirschfeld of Berlin, who in discussing the police system of the Roman Empire regarded this "regionary

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.L.*, iii. 6818.

<sup>2</sup> *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 260, 445; *Histor. Comment. on Galatians*, p. 201, Kaibel, *Inscr. Græc. Ital.* etc., no. 933.

centurion" as an officer charged with the maintenance of peace in the region of which Antioch was capital. This diversity of reading, however, encouraged others to doubt the force of the inscription, especially as the name of the region seemed not to be expressly stated. On the adjoining side of the stone Professor Sterrett copied a mutilated inscription relating to the same centurion, whose statue once stood on the basis. In slightly differing ways he and I partly restored this mutilated inscription; he read "the Mygdonian city of the Antiochians"; I proposed: "Mygdonian Antioch," which made a hexameter line. Still the inscription was incomplete; and there can never be any finality about an incomplete restoration. There could be no doubt that "Mygdonian" was a mere poetic epithet equivalent to "Phrygian"; but it was not absolutely certain that the epithet was applied to Antioch;<sup>1</sup> and, if it were so applied, it might only indicate that the city had been originally Phrygian.

In 1911 we found the basis, half buried in a Turkish cemetery and turned upside down. I got a man to dig it up, but the difficult side was in deep shadow, and could not be read until the sun reached it. I could only see that the important word was neither *Ἀντιόχεια* as I proposed, nor *Ἀντιοχέων πόλις* as Sterrett restored, but something quite different.<sup>2</sup> This was disquieting, and threatened to give a different and less illuminative turn to the inscription.

During the next two days we were wholly taken up with another more important discovery, of which more will be said in the sequel. At last on the morning of our departure from Antioch, we prepared to clear up the difficulty, while the morning light shone on the undeciphered side. Our

<sup>1</sup> Of the word "Antioch" *αντι* was read on the stone by Professor Sterrett, but all the rest was conjectural.

<sup>2</sup> I could see that *αντι* was the beginning, but the rest was not *δχεια*.

travelling companions<sup>1</sup> went off to the stone, while Lady Ramsay and I waited to see the camp packed, and then followed them. We met them half way on their return. They had the complete text, which was far better than I had ever imagined: *τόνδε σε Μυγδονίη Διονύσιον ἀντὶ βίου πολλῶν καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης στέμμα.*

Mygdonia, therefore, is used not as an adjective, but as a noun. The country Mygdonia at Antioch can of course be nothing but Phrygia, expressed by a poetic synonym. Mygdon was an ancient Phrygian king, and Mygdonia was either a district of Phrygia,<sup>2</sup> or Phrygia as a whole. Pliny indeed distinguishes Mygdonia from Phrygia, placing it on the southern frontier of Asian Phrygia (i.e., Phrygia in so far as it belonged to the Province Asia), adjoining Pisidia and Lycaonia. This is an excellent description of Galatic Phrygia, and agrees exactly with the evidence of the inscription now before us. Hence I cannot see any loophole for escaping the conclusion that a certain region of the Province Galatia, having Antioch as its metropolis and centre, was called Phrygia (*C.I.L.*, iii. 6818) or Mygdonia.

The translation of the text as now constituted presents some difficulty. The general import is evident: on one side of the stone the metropolis Antioch honours Dionysius the regionary centurion: on the other side the whole *Regio* over which he was placed in authority does honour to him as protector of the life of many and as guardian of peace.<sup>3</sup> The opening word *τόνδε* implies that a statue was placed on the basis. The construction would then be perfectly simple, were it not for the concluding word *στέμμα*, which Professor Sterrett eliminated conjecturally by altering his

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. M. Calder, B.N.C., Oxford, and Miss M. M. Hardie, Newnham College, Cambridge, both former pupils of my own in Aberdeen.

<sup>2</sup> De Vit. *Onomasticon* (added to Forcellini *Lexicon*), *M. Regio Phrygiæ memorata* Plin. v. 41, 1, Solin. 40, 9, Capell. 6 § 686.

<sup>3</sup> The exact title at an earlier period would have been Eirenarch.

own copy to read *ἐνεκα*. There is however as little doubt about the reading in this case as there is in regard to *ῥεγεωνάριον*.

The text is probably to be explained as an example of double accusative, similar to but even more glaringly ungrammatical than the series of cases explained in *Studies in the History of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, p. 278.<sup>1</sup> The meaning would then be "Thy statue here, a Dionysius (in marble), Mygdonia (erected, and honoured thee with) a crown, in return for (guarding) the life of many and (preserving) the peace."

The inscription belongs to the middle of the third century after Christ or later. There was therefore alike in the first century and in the third a region (*χώρα, regio*) of the Province Galatia called by the names Phrygia and Mygdonia, practically synonymous. To any one that has experience of Greek geographical terminology, there can be no more precise, definite and clear way of defining this region than the words of Luke in Acts xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, "The region which is from one point of view (i.e. racially) Phrygian and from another point of view (i.e. administratively) Galatic."

Mr. W. M. Calder will, I hope, soon publish an argument, in which he attempts to mark out the bounds of Galatic Phrygia or Mygdonia according to the extension of the Phrygian language. A negative argument can also be derived from the use of other languages than Phrygian. Thus Lystra is proved to be beyond the bounds of Phrygia, not merely by the express statement of Acts xiv. 6, but also by the use of the Lycaonian language in the city; and wherever the use of the Pisidian tongue can be proved or

<sup>1</sup> Several of these cases had caused trouble to interpreters; but when the class of examples is recognised and placed in order side by side, all difficulty disappears.



made probable, the presumption is correspondingly strong that we are outside of Galatic Phrygia and in Galatic Pisidia. Antioch was, strictly speaking, a Phrygian city towards Pisidia : so Strabo defines it.

## II. THE PHRYGIAN LANGUAGE AT ICONIUM.

By geographical conformation Iconium is, indubitably, a city of the great Lycaonia plain. It was assigned to Lycaonia by Cicero (who visited it several times), and by Strabo ; it was the capital of a Province Lycaonia after A.D. 372. This might seem on a superficial view conclusive. Yet the evidence that it was a Phrygian city, and so called by its inhabitants, is overwhelming ; see *Hastings' Dict. Bib. s.v.*, and other authorities.

When I first began to perceive that the people of Iconium persisted throughout the Roman period in reckoning their city as Phrygian, not Lycaonian, I felt that some strong racial feeling must have been confirmed by language : " in all probability difference of language originally emphasised their diversity from their Lycaonian neighbours." <sup>1</sup> In the same paragraph it was pointed out that in Asia Minor through all periods of history, down even to the present day, racial distinctions have been persistently and tenaciously maintained, and that prejudice and even antipathy have been felt by each tribe or race amid that motley population against its neighbours who differed in blood and language. At the present day even the unifying influence of Mohammedan religion and Turkish speech has not been strong enough to extirpate racial hatred between different peoples of Moslem faith living side by side in separate villages on the plateau.

In the *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 329, 334, it was argued that

<sup>1</sup> *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 38.

this Phrygian people became strongly affected by Hellenic civilisation and language, so that the city became in outward appearance Hellenic; however, "it was not a body of Greek settlers, but rather the conquering and transforming power of Hellenic manners and education, that gave a Hellenised character to this Phrygian city, . . . but the Oriental [i.e., the Phrygian] spirit revived, and the native religion and the native goddess returned." Again on p. 366, with regard to the period 250-300 A.D., "Iconium was still a Greek-speaking city (except perhaps among the humbler classes, where the Phrygian language may still have lingered)."

This opinion that the use of the language kept the racial feeling strong was confirmed last year by the discovery of two Phrygian inscriptions in the hill which covers the remains of the Seljuk Sultans' palace in the centre of Iconium. We had the fortunate opportunity in 1910 of making some excavations in the hill and disclosing part of a considerable number of inscriptions, which were built into the basement of the palace. They belong to the period about 150 to 250 A.D.; the only one which is dated bears the names of the consuls of 169 A.D., but many are certainly of the third century, and one of the two which are inscribed in the Phrygian language can hardly be earlier than A.D. 240 and may be even later.<sup>1</sup>

There is therefore no doubt that the Phrygian was still in use among a section of the Iconian population during the third century, and *a fortiori* it must have been even more widely known in the middle of the first century. How then is this to be reconciled with two facts which are patent in the narrative of the Acts? (1) St. Paul addressed the

<sup>1</sup> They will soon be published by my companion in exploration, Mr. W. M. Calder, in the forthcoming number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

Iconian audiences in Greek ; (2) the people of Iconium who listened to Paul are called Hellenes.

These two questions are answered together. There was, as has been frequently pointed out and as has just been stated in the preceding page, a very considerable amount of Hellenisation in Iconium when St. Paul first saw it. It was already a Hellenic city in organisation and management. The language of public business and municipal documents was evidently Greek, and not Phrygian. The education was Hellenic. The civilization of Greece had laid its grip on the people. The educated part of the community spoke Greek, although the uneducated certainly used the Phrygian tongue. To what extent individual Iconians spoke both languages remains uncertain ; but evidence bearing on this interesting question may yet be discovered.

As regards name, wherever Hellenic education had laid hold of a city of the Aegean lands or Western Asia, the Greek-speaking population counted themselves Hellenes, for Hellenism in that age was not a fact of blood, but of manners, ideals and language.

Hence Paul found in Iconium the Phrygian city, just as he found in Antioch the Roman colonia, a considerable Greek-speaking population ; and it was among this section of the inhabitants that he chiefly found his converts. Many of the Jews and the Hellenes believed ; others of the Jews disbelieved and opposed him, and these enemies sought allies, not among the Hellenes, but among "the nations." Luke carefully draws this distinction ; and it corresponds apparently in large degree to the distinction between the uneducated and therefore Phrygian-speaking part of the population and the educated and therefore Greek-speaking. The popularly elected magistrates sided with the majority, as democratic magistrates in a city must always do.

It is not, of course, for a moment to be thought that

all Hellenes in Iconium were with Paul, and the whole Phrygian populace against him; but clearly Luke's words convey the impression—and they must have been intended to convey the impression—that the Hellenes supplied, as a rule, the converts, and the non-Hellenes the opponents of Paul and Barnabas. Here and everywhere Luke's words, when closely scrutinised, point to the conclusion that the educated middle class, not the aristocracy on the one hand,<sup>1</sup> nor the superstitious lower classes on the other, formed the bulk of the Pauline Churches.

In the end of Hadrian's reign, about A.D. 130–138, Iconium became a Roman *colonia*; but there is no reason to think that this title implied an access of Roman or Italian settlers (as it did at Antioch, when Augustus made that city a *colonia*). It meant only an advance in dignity and rights.

While the Iconians clung to their Phrygian character as opposed to the Lycaonian, there is no proof and no likelihood that the citizens styled themselves "Phryges." They would, probably, have called themselves "Hellenes," as Luke implies. The name "Phrygian" was almost equivalent to "slave." Phryx occurs often as a slave-name.

The association of Hermes with Zeus in Anatolian popular religion is proved specially for the district of Phrygia adjoining Iconium towards Tyriaion,<sup>2</sup> and for the district of Lycaonia adjoining Lystra (or perhaps belonging to Lystra), as Mr. Calder has shown in the *EXPOSITOR*, 1910, July, p. 1 ff.

### III. ANTIOCH A GALATIAN CITY.

In *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 53, I argued from an inscription

<sup>1</sup> In a Greek city there was hardly anything that could be called an aristocracy distinguishable by any generic name or characteristic; there was only an educated and an uneducated section of the people. In the Roman *colonia* there was an aristocracy, viz., the Roman citizens, and Luke states clearly that in Antioch they were opposed to Paul, Acts xiii. 50.

<sup>2</sup> *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 58 note.

of Apollonia that it was not merely a Galatian city, but was classed in the tribe of the Trocmi. In the inscription there quoted a person who gains distinction in Apollonia is said to gain distinction "among the sacred Trocmi" (*ἐνὶ Τρόκμοις ζαθέοισι*). It afterwards occurred to me that in this passage the Trocmi were perhaps meant figuratively to represent the Galatians as a whole,<sup>1</sup> so that the words implied no more than "among the sacred Galatians." If that were so, the inscription would merely say in emphatic terms that Apollonia was a Galatian city, and its people were Galatians and called themselves Galatians. Even this was a striking fact, for Apollonia was far more remote from North Galatia than Iconium or Antioch; and if its inhabitants could be spoken of simply as Galatians, then all the more could the inhabitants of those other cities be addressed as Galatians.

The city of Apollonia prided itself on its origin as a colony of Lycians and Thracians settled in this remote corner of Phrygia; and they boasted of this racial character in municipal inscriptions and on coins. They were not, and had no reason to be, ashamed of their blood and race, as Phrygians might well be—since "Phrygian" meant "slave." Yet even Apollonian citizens in certain relations spoke of themselves as Galatae, i.e., people of the Province Galatia.

A fact which has recently been discovered by Mr. Calder suggests that my first interpretation may be correct, and that this region was ranked as part of the Trocmian territory. He has found, and will in due course publish, an inscription of Pisidian Antioch, in which Tavia capital of the Trocmi pays a compliment to its sister the colonia of Antioch. The term "sister" implies the thought of some peculiarly close con-

<sup>1</sup> Metrical considerations made it impossible to write *ἐνὶ Γαλάταις* or *ἐν Γαλάταις*. Moreover, the name Galatians occurs in the preceding line (where the writer speaks of his fatherland, *πατρίς*, i.e. the city to which he belonged, as being "in the land of the Galatians," i.e. part of the Province Galatia); and some variation was desirable.

nexion between Tavia and Antioch : they regard themselves as of the same family, sprung, so to say, from the same parents. The North Galatian tribe, proud as the Gaulish tribes always were of their origin, treats Antioch as a sister. It is difficult to imagine any stronger proof that this city of South Galatia ranked in the fullest sense as a city of Galatia, and that the tribal character was extended to include the South Galatian cities.

Lystra also addressed Antioch as a sister.<sup>1</sup> Both were Roman *coloniae*, founded by Augustus and peopled by his veterans ; they were therefore of the same family, sprung from the same stock and parentage, Roman citizens and soldiers. This analogy shows how much emphasis must be laid on the salutation of Tavia to its sister Antioch.

#### IV. THE FINAL ANTI-CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT AT PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

One of the most interesting and most obscure parts of history is the last struggle between Christianity and the moribund paganism of the Roman Empire between 304 and 315. The ancient authorities are not merely scanty, but also one-sided and strongly prejudiced ; and the current of opinion in modern times ran rather strongly against them, until the recent discovery of evidence confirmed the main facts that they record. I remember well the change that was produced about the trustworthiness of Eusebius, the chief authority on the subject, in the mind of a great historian, when an inscription was found in Lycia giving the exact contemporary registration of facts about which in conversation he had professed doubts so strong as to amount almost to a condemnation of the Church historian as untrustworthy.

<sup>1</sup> See the inscription translated in *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 50. It was discovered by Professor Starrett, and published in his *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 218, and recopied by me in 1886.

The story of the burning of an entire city in Phrygia during Diocletian's persecution because its whole population from the highest to the lowest were Christians, though once derided as a pure invention or at least a gross exaggeration, would now be doubted by few who study that period of history; and I have given reasons for thinking that we can guess the name of the city which was destroyed.<sup>1</sup> In a recent book I collected a few of the other newly-found documents bearing on this subject,<sup>2</sup> especially those which showed the nature both of the popular movement and the governmentally engineered revival of paganism, and the tendency to clothe it in Christian forms. I mentioned there briefly the view which is stated and supported at considerable length in an earlier book,<sup>3</sup> that about 250 to 315 A.D. there existed on the estates which had once belonged to the god of Pisidian Antioch and which had been the property of the Roman Emperors from 25 B.C. onwards, an association or brotherhood called Tekmoreian, bound together in the worship of the Emperor and the old native religion for the purpose, among other things, of resisting the new religion.

The most striking detail on which my argument rested was a strange participle of an otherwise unknown Greek verb, viz., *τεκμορεύσας*. I argued that this word *τεκμορεύειν* must have been an invention of the period and place where it was found, because it was non-Greek in character, and that in view of the circumstances then reigning on imperial estates in Galatic Phrygia this newly coined word must have been connected with the anti-Christian revival, and denoted an enforced compliance with the ceremonies of the association. The term and the custom connected with it were, in that case, comparable to the certificates of compli

<sup>1</sup> *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, II. p. 505 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Pauline and other Studies*, paper III.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies in the Eastern Roman Provinces*, see the last paper on "An Anti-Christian Society in the Roman Empire."

ance with pagan religious regulations, which were given to recanting Christians in Egypt, as the discovery of some certificates has now conclusively proved.

The weak point of this theory lay in the isolated character of the word *τεκμορεύσας*. It occurred only once in an inscription in letters so faint that other copyists had not deciphered the word. There was room for justifiable suspicion that an error had been made by the copyist or by the engraver: the latter made several other mistakes in the same inscription.

Another criticism to which the theory which I proposed was open, and which was stated in letters and conversation by friends, was that the verb *τεκμορεύειν*, admitting its real existence, ought to mean "serve as an official in the Tekmorian association."

To those criticisms no answer was possible. They had a certain strength and foundation. There was nothing to do but wait for the discovery of further evidence. The soil of Asia Minor is inexhaustible for the archaeologist: the evidence is there to clear up every difficulty and answer every question: all that is wanted is patient work with time and money, and properly trained and experienced scholars.

In 1911 we had the opportunity of spending eight days in or near Antioch, with many advantages for exploration; and we obtained results quite beyond my hopes. So far as concerns the religion of Antioch the report of our discoveries will soon be published by Miss M. M. Hardie, Newnham College, Cambridge.

Many doubts have now been dissipated by the discoveries of 1911. The participle *τεκμορεύσας* is now known in more than a dozen votive inscriptions. We were so fortunate as to find the ancient holy place of Men, the god of Antioch, a great altar on the top of a mountain, open to the sky (as suits the situation), and surrounded by a wall



enclosing the "holy place." The inscriptions belong to the late Roman period, towards A.D. 300; and it must now be taken as a fact from which discussion must start that this verb, hitherto unknown in Greek, came into common use in and near Pisidian Antioch at the time of the pagan revival.

It must also be remembered that in Antioch the anti-Christian movement was specially strong, under the governor Valerius Diogenes, as we gather from the epitaph of Bishop Eugenius of Laodiceia (recently discussed at some length in this journal by Mr. Calder and myself, and by several German and French writers).<sup>1</sup> The date of Valerius Diogenes's rule is now fixed by several authorities: his tenure of office lasted after the victory of Constantine (as is proved by a dedication to that emperor which we copied at Antioch this year, and which could not be erected until peace was concluded between Licinius and Constantine in 314, perhaps not until 324). His government had begun before the banishment of the Empress Valeria in 311.<sup>2</sup> He was the agent of Maximin's persecution.

The wall of the precinct was covered, on at least one side, with votive inscriptions, of which we excavated and copied about seventy: among these about thirteen contain the participle in question. The following examples may be quoted here, as throwing light on the meaning of the term.

(1) L., son of Antonius, and Antonius brother and Maxima sister with children and foster-children (i.e., foundlings?)<sup>3</sup> having all gone through the ceremony (or performed the act) of *tekmoreuein*, (paid) to Men Askaênos<sup>4</sup> a vow.

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, 1909 and 1910, Monsignor Batiffol in Paris, Professor A. Wilhelm, Cavalieri, and others.

<sup>2</sup> *Luke the Physician and other Studies*, pp. 344-5.

<sup>3</sup> On *θερτροί* (*θερτρά*, *θερμματα*) and foundlings in the early Church, see the long discussion in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, and authors there quoted.

<sup>4</sup> Δ. Ἀστανίου καὶ Ἀστανίου ἀδελφῶν καὶ Μάξιμα ἀδελφῆ μετὰ τέκνων καὶ θερτροῦ

(2) Fl(avius) Ki. Eiliras having performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* with wife and child (paid) to Men Askaênos a vow.<sup>1</sup>

(3) Gaius Vettius Umbricianus Maximus with Gaius his cousin having performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* (paid) to Men Askaênos a vow.<sup>2</sup>

(4) [Hy]acinthos, son of [Mn]esithe[os], having both performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein*, [to Men Askaênos a vow].<sup>3</sup>

(5) Quintius to Men a vow, living in error, performing the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* with wife and children.<sup>4</sup>

Three or four of these inscriptions show that the word *tekmoreuein* does not refer to the holding of any office, whether in a society or in the city. Here groups of persons, and even a large family of brothers, sister, children, and freedmen or foster-children, perform the act called *tekmoreuein* together.

The last dedication brings the act within the range of confessional and expiatory inscriptions, which were a remarkable feature of Anatolian religion. The popular name of these inscriptions was *exemplaria*<sup>5</sup>: "the authors are presented

*τεκμορεύσαντες Μηνι εύχην*. It is not easy to explain why the oldest brother should be indicated only by an initial. It is perhaps an ignorant way of expressing in Greek the Latin form L. Antonius L. F. The other brother Antonius must have had a different praenomen. This inscription, which is on a marble tablet, let into a niche cut in the wall of the holy precinct, is not earlier than A.D. 300 to judge from the lettering.

<sup>1</sup> Φ. Κι. Ειλίρας (or Ειαίρας or Σιλίρας) τεκμο[ρ]εύσας μετά γυναϊκός και τέκνου Μηνι Ασκαηνῶ εύχην. Many of the inscriptions are hard to read.

<sup>2</sup> Γ. Ουδέττιος Ουμβρικιανός Μάξιμος μετά Γαίου άνεψιου τεκμορεύσαντες Μηνι Ασκαηνῶ εύχην. This inscription can hardly be later than the persecution of Decius, A.D. 250.

<sup>3</sup> Τακινθος Μνησιθέου τεκμορεύσας [Μηνι εύχην]: names imperfect, as indicated above.

<sup>4</sup> Κύντις Μηνι εύχην, άμαρτάνων, τεκμορεύσας μετά γυναϊκός και τέκνων.

<sup>5</sup> The word *exemplarion* in Greek in the letters of Ignatius used to be quoted as a proof that the letters were a later forgery; but some *exemplaria* show the word in familiar use among every uneducated people in

to the readers as having approached the hieron or engaged in the service of the deity" (or neglected the proper service), "while polluted with some physical or moral impurity . . . they confess and acknowledge their fault: they appease the god by sacrifice and expiation."<sup>1</sup> In the dedication now before us the act of *tekmoreusis* (to coin another word) is stated to arise not from a single act of sin—for in that case the aorist would have been used—but from a course or life of sin—as indicated by the present participle.

In the fourth inscription the name Mnesitheos probably belongs to a Christian. In another [Ire]naeus, a favourite Christian name, probably occurs.

The documents now discovered do not prove the truth of my theory that *tekmoreuein* indicated recantation of Christianity under persecution; but they raise it from the rank of an hypothesis, based on a single occurrence in a badly engraved inscription of a verb otherwise unknown, to an explanation of a verb commonly used at a centre of anti-Christian feeling in the time when that feeling was strongest; and they set aside as impossible certain other explanations which had been suggested. The third inscription is the least favourable to my view, as it might possibly belong to an earlier period than the pagan revival; but on the other hand, it is quite suitable to the persecution of Decius, when the pagan revival had certainly begun. The other inscriptions are all indubitably of the Decian or post-Decian period, and some are certainly as late as A.D. 300–315.

A subject so interesting as this deserves further investigation; the little sanctuary ought to be wholly cleared.

W. M. RAMSAY.

south-western Phrygia during the second century. The word does not occur in the Antiochian inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Cities and Bishopricks of Phrygia*, i. p. 134 f. Examples of the inscriptions, *ibid.* p. 149 ff.