

translation as well as that of Salkinson's, with two striking exceptions, in Luke iii. 5, Philippians iv. 22, renders this *Kaiōap* by הַקִּיָּסָר. But as in the New Testament Greek this word *Kaiōap* is always found without the article, and is therefore treated as a self-determining proper name, so it would seem that the Hebrew קִיָּסָר in the Talmud and Midrasch is also always employed without the article. In every case then the article should be removed. But how will this principle affect such a phrase as מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם? In the case of these two words we find that in the oldest synagogal literature שָׁמַיִם has not the article, whereas in my translation, as well as in Salkinson's, the phrase is throughout written מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם. Is the article also in this instance to be dispensed with? We shall seek to answer this question in our next paper.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS IN PHRYGIA.

A STUDY IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

III.

THE inscriptions which constitute the foundation of this study belong to what is, as a general rule, the least interesting and the least important class of ancient epigraphic remains—the commonplace epitaph. In the epitaphs of Asia Minor especially a dreary monotony is the rule. A number of formulas are stereotyped, and long series of inscriptions repeat one or other of them with very little variety beyond that of names and dates. During my first journeys in Asia Minor these wearisome epitaphs were a severe trial to my patience, and it seemed almost useless to take the trouble of copying them. Time was precious, and work was pressing, and it was hard to waste minutes or hours in getting access to and copying such uninteresting and valueless

epitaphs. Frequently when an inscription was reported, I got its appearance described, and if the description showed that it was an epitaph declined to waste time in hunting it up, a process which sometimes involves the expenditure of considerable diplomacy, time, and money. In many of the Christian epitaphs, the fact that they are Christian constitutes the sole interest. Otherwise they hardly differ except in the personal names from dozens of their neighbours. But I trust to have shown by the examples already quoted that even from this most despised class of documents intelligent study may derive some important historical conclusions. Varieties of style and formula have been shown to spring from difference in religious training and in social circumstances, and two distinct tides of Christianizing influence, differing in character, have been traced. When Christianity became supreme these provincial differences were proscribed and rapidly disappeared, but it is a distinct gain to know that they ever existed. The Church of north-western Phrygia has been traced, by a hypothesis which has in its favour antecedent probability and a certain amount of positive indications, to a Bithynian origin, and it has been shown that the Bithynian¹ tradition assigned the beginning of Christianity in that country to the visit paid by Paul and Silas to the Troad.² The origin of the other stream of Christianizing

¹ I have assumed the genuineness of the famous disputed letter of Trajan about the Bithynian Christians: it appears to me that the criticism directed upon it has only proved more conclusively that it must be genuine. It forms no part of my task to discuss such points, and the same remark which has been made about Trajan's letter may be applied to some other documents, which I have already quoted or may quote below.

² Without contending that the tradition, mentioned already (*THE EXPOSITOR*, October, 1888, p. 264), of the visit paid by Paul and Silas to the country between Cyzicus and the Rhyndacus is really very ancient in origin, I may mention that the natural way for them to go from Phrygia and Galatia to the Troad (Acts xvi. 6-8) would be through this district, and that the tradition also agrees with the recorded history in not making them appear east of the Rhyndacus in the Roman province of Bithynia.

influence in central and southern Phrygia cannot be doubtful. Antecedent probability is that this influence proceeds from the valley where Laodiceia, Colossæ, and Hierapolis lie; and the documentary evidence is most abundant and characteristic in the districts which lie immediately east and north-east of that valley, and grows less distinctive and approximates more and more to the general type of Christian documents, as we go farther away. Thus the second and chief stream of Christianizing influence also is traced back to St. Paul, from whom the Churches of Laodiceia and Colossæ derived their origin.

It will be best to devote one of these articles to a description of the local limits and of the characteristics of the Church of central and southern Phrygia. But before essaying this task, it is necessary to discuss one preliminary point, which is both of the first importance and of the greatest difficulty—I mean the influence and authority exercised by powerful individuals in founding and consolidating the Church in Phrygia. This subject leads us on to difficult and dangerous ground, a battlefield where controversy has raged without having yet reached a conclusion. I must therefore repeat my warning as to the scope of these Studies. I do not and cannot speak from the point of view of the Church historian. My purpose is only to show that a great amount of neglected evidence bearing on this important period of history is in existence, and is perishing year by year. But the duty of the archæologist is not completed by the mere collection and cataloguing of raw material, or by the publication of the bare text of new documents, however important and in many cases difficult this too thankless task is. The due interpretation of the natural sense of the documents equally belongs to his province. He is bound to study them from his own point of view, and his point of view is totally different from that of the historian, to whom these documents come as mere

small parts of a great mass of evidence, which he looks at with eyes already habituated to a certain view of the subject. The archæologist, on the other hand, is penetrated with the belief that each new document is an end in itself. He has the conviction that all of them are redolent of the soil and atmosphere where they were produced. He familiarizes himself with the tone and colour and spirit of the country, brings himself as much as possible under the influence of its scenery and atmosphere, and tries to realize in full vividness the surroundings in which and the feelings with which the documents that he has to interpret were composed and engraved. I believe that one can hardly insist too strongly on the influence of nature over the human spirit in Phrygia. There is no country where the character of the land has more thoroughly impressed itself on the people, producing a remarkable uniformity of type in the many races which have contributed to form its population. A tone of melancholy, often of monotony, in the landscape, combined with the conditions of agriculture, whose success or failure seems to depend very much on the heavens and very little on human labour, produced a subdued and resigned tone in its inhabitants, a sense of the overpowering might of nature, and a strong belief in and receptivity of the Divine influence. The archæologist who would understand or interpret the unused historical material in Asia Minor must saturate himself with the spirit and atmosphere of the country; and though I feel how far short I fall of the ideal, yet this is the spirit in which I should wish to write. It must be remembered that, in thus studying a single group of documents apart from the general evidence bearing on the subject, there is always a danger of straining their interpretation, and I cannot hope to have wholly escaped this danger.

The obscure and ill-composed epitaph which was pub-

lished above as No. 12,¹ appears to me, with all its miserable Greek, to be one of the most instructive of the Phrygian documents in regard to the tone of the early Christians to their leaders, and I have therefore added the Greek text in a footnote, inasmuch as no translation can ever fairly represent an ancient document. The writer of this epitaph was full of the same feeling which led the Phrygians of the Pentapolis to style their hero of the second century "the equal of the apostles." The leaders and preachers of Phrygia were felt by their converts and disciples to be really the successors of the apostles, and their people entertained for them all the respect and veneration (and we may be sure paid them the unhesitating obedience) which breathes through the title and the epitaph which have just been quoted. Under what actual name these great leaders exercised their authority, I cannot presume to decide: this is a point which must be determined by the Church historians; but, as I said above, the scanty evidence seems to me to point to the conclusion that the title "bishop" was not in ordinary use in the early Phrygian Church. So far as I can presume to hold an opinion the leader and "equal of the apostles" exercised his supreme and implicitly accepted authority under the humble title of presbyter: he was one among a number, and the wide authority which he exercised depended on personal ascendancy, and was not accompanied by any distinguishing official name and express rank. The two typical cases in the second century are Avircius and Montanus. The former is in later history called Bishop of Hierapolis, and it is quite clear

¹ Ἀκύλαν καθορῆς [κα]τέχ[ει], ξέν[ε], οὗτος ὁ τύμβος

. ον θεοῦ ἀγγέλοις τε ποθητόν,

λαοῦ προστάμενον, νόμῳ τ[ᾶ] δίκαια φρονῶν.

* Ἦρθε [i.e. ἦλθε] δὲ δῶμα θεοῦ μέ[γ]ας ταυμαῖς [τ'] ἀνάπαντιν.

In line 3 φρονῶν has been substituted for φρονοῦντα, which would give better syntax and better metre, and perhaps ξυθ' was intended instead of ξένε. ταυμαῖς apparently for ταμαῖς: μέτας engraved for μέγας. The rest of the epitaph does not bear on our subject.

that he exercised a personal ascendancy which perhaps surpassed that of the later bishops; but the natural conclusion from the only reference to him in literature, *viz.* the dedication of the tractate against Montanism by his fellow presbyter,¹ is that he was usually styled presbyter. More is known about Montanus, but the evidence is distorted by the prejudice and hatred cherished against a leader, who was held to have betrayed the cause and to have become an apostle of evil. But there can be no doubt that Montanus considered himself to be the apostle of light, and that his character, position, and influence were analogous to those of the other leaders who made the Church of Phrygia, and whose memory has not been kept alive by the brand of heresy. There is not the slightest evidence or even probability that Montanus was ever styled bishop. The opinion is now general that Montanus represented the old school of Phrygian Christianity, as opposed to the organized and regulated hierarchical Church which was making Christianity a power in the world, and that "the chief opponents of the Montanists were the bishops."² The very name Kataphryges, which was given to his followers, shows that he was considered to be a representative of the old Phrygian spirit and custom.

The bishops however won the day; Phrygian custom and the individuality of the Phrygian Church were sacrificed to the uniformity of the Church Catholic. Everything known about the later organization of the Phrygian Church

¹ The anonymous author speaks of "our fellow presbyter, Zoticus of Otrous." Otrous was a town about three miles west of Hierapolis, where Avircius lived. It seems to me that only prepossession can make such a writer as Bonwetsch, after quoting this passage, use it as an argument that Avircius was actually called bishop. The author also addresses him by the respectful phrase *ὁ μακάριε*. The interpretation advocated above, that Avircius had the authority and personal influence of an "equal of the apostles," but only the title of presbyter, seems to explain the evidence of this tractate, and to show why a man who exercised even greater authority than the later bishops received in later documents the title bishop.

² Compare Bonwetsch, *Geschichte des Montanismus*, pp. 11, 12, and *passim*.

shows that it was framed according to the civil organization : every city had its bishop, and the bishop of each provincial metropolis exercised a certain authority over the bishops of the cities in his province. No other crisis in the Phrygian Church is known when this organization is likely to have been substituted for the old, looser system of personal authority and influence. One who approaches the subject of Church organization after studying the civil organization of the Anatolian provinces, and who sees the two coinciding with each other as far back as the records reach, is forced to the conclusion that it originated when the Phrygian Church was brought into conformity and closer union with the Church in general, *i.e.* at the Montanist controversy following after A.D. 160.

The bishops indeed won the day, but they did not succeed in making Phrygia thoroughly orthodox, or in putting their system into the hearts of the whole people. We should be glad to find some traces of the true character and tone of Montanism, as described by those who came under its influence. If something was gained in power and uniformity, something also was lost in fervour, by the proscribing of Montanism as a heresy; and the Church in Phrygia certainly ceased to be the Church of Phrygia. Complaints of the heterodoxy and abominable heresies of Phrygia are common in later times. In the scanty records of its history frequently some slight detail suggests that underneath the orthodox hierarchy of bishops another religious system, which lies deeper, gives an occasional sign of its existence. But it eludes our search; the sign, too unsubstantial a ground for argument, melts away as it is examined.¹

“I will go forward, sayest thou,
I shall not fail to find her now.
Look up, the fold is on her brow.”

¹ Montanism is a subject which has long had a special interest for me, and on which I have been most eager to discover some evidence.

Montanus was no bishop, but he exercised a practically boundless influence over his followers, and he preserves to us the earlier character of the Phrygian Church. The name however under which authority is exercised is immaterial; the important fact is that widespreading authority and influence of individual teachers is the character of the early Phrygian Church. The Phrygian Church gradually organized itself on the model of the civil organization; but on the whole the change is in the direction of breaking up the more wide-reaching ascendancy of the old leaders. The tendency of the early Byzantine policy in central Asia Minor was to break up the wide territories of the great cities by raising villages or small subject towns to the dignity of independent cities, and the principle was expressly laid down that every city should have its own bishop, an exception being made by Justinian in the case of Isaurapolis, which, probably on account of its proximity, was to remain under the authority of the Bishop of Leontopolis.¹ In some cases the Church resisted the principle that civil division should cause ecclesiastical division also, but as a general rule the former was followed as a matter of course by the latter. After much examination and many various attempts, I have at last been driven to the conclusion that the only way of explaining various discrepancies between the civil boundaries of certain provinces in Asia Minor and the ecclesiastical lists is due to old religious connexions or to the personal ascendancy of great religious leaders. To discuss this as fully as the material extends would require an article to itself, but one or two examples which bear specially on our immediate purpose may be here quoted.

¹ I regret to have lost the precise reference, and my memory perhaps deceives me as to the exact details, especially as to the name Leontopolis. I read the sentence in an old collection of extracts from Greek ecclesiastical law in the Bodleian Library, and thought I had also seen it in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, but have recently been unable to find it.

I have frequently mentioned the north-western Phrygian Church as being originally distinct in character from and unconnected with the rest of Phrygia. No one who reads over the first of these articles, and notes the connexion there described between Kotiaion and the country of the Prepenisseis, can fail to be struck when the fact comes before him that in many ecclesiastical lists Kotiaion and the country of the Prepenisseis are separated from the rest of the province, and the bishops of the district placed under the authority of a separate archbishop.¹ I have also argued elsewhere that the omission of Kotiaion from the list of Hierocles is to be explained because he was greatly under the influence of the ecclesiastical lists, which did not class Kotiaion under Phrygia, but reckoned it as autocephalous and subordinate only to the Patriarch of Constantinople and not to the metropolitan of the province. The only addition which I have now to make to the reasoning given in the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*,² is to connect this independence of the Bishop of Kotiaion with the old religious separation between this part of Phrygia and the rest of the province. A parallel case may be found in Pontus. Euchaita does not occur in Hierocles,

¹ In *Notitiæ Episcopatum* iii., x., xiii., the Metropolitan of Kotiaion has subject to him the bishops of Spore, Kone, and Gaiou Kome. In my *Cities and Bishoprics*, § xc. to xcv., I have shown (long before the point which I am now explaining occurred to me) that these three bishoprics lie on the roads south-east of Kotiaion, the first and third being in the territory of the tribe Prepenisseis, the third being on its border and perhaps partly in it also.

² A writer in the *Church Quarterly* for July, 1888 (p. 309), whose generous praise of my work has been a full reward to me for much toil, of a kind which I should not have voluntarily chosen, presses further than I intended my words, "the list of Hierocles is the list of the bishops of his time," when he understands them (and dissents rightly from them) as meaning "the *synecdemus* itself is ecclesiastical." My rather carelessly expressed sentence was not intended to imply more than that a list of cities is *ipso facto* a list of bishoprics, and *vice versa*; I did not mean that Hierocles arranges his list as a list of bishoprics would be arranged. Further study however has shown me that the case is more complicated, and that while in most provinces his lists are identical with the ecclesiastical lists, in some (*e.g.* Hellespontus) he has used a different authority. He arranges the cities of Asia Minor always in a geographical order.

though it is an important town often mentioned in history. The probable reason is that it was autokephalous, and therefore not mentioned in ecclesiastical lists in the province of Pontus. This honorary position was probably due, at least in part, to the respect paid to St. Theodore of Euchaita.

Of the apostles and martyrs of the Phrygian Church very little is recorded, and that little is transmitted to us in such suspicious authorities and with such impossible surroundings, that it is very doubtful how far the personages described can be accepted as historical characters. I propose here to examine the evidence about two of these personages, to endeavour to separate the legendary from the historical element in their personality, and to trace how the latter has been preserved in memory and how the former has grown around it. The first case is that of St. Artemon, whose story, connected partly with Laodiceia and partly with Diocæsareia (a town on the southern frontier of Phrygia), abounds in such absurd and puerile miraculous details that the Bollandists themselves entitle it "elogium fabulosum." Unfortunately no complete biography of him is known to have been preserved, but several brief accounts of his martyrdom may be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*, October 8th, p. 41 ff. He was a presbyter of Laodiceia in the time of Diocletian. In company with Sisinnius, bishop of Laodiceia, he destroyed the images in a temple, which in one of the accounts is called the temple of Artemis, while in another the deity to whom it was dedicated is Æsculapius. It is to be noted that such vagueness is always a bad sign of the character of these documents. Moreover such conduct is contrary to all that we know about the Christians of Asia Minor, who were advised not to voluntarily give themselves up, much less to wantonly attack the shrines and the holy things of their neighbours. Such an account arose during the period when pagan temples were really being

destroyed by the victorious Christians, and when deeds similar to those of the present were attributed to the heroes of the past. He was arrested on the road from Laodiceia to Diocæsareia,¹ and a hind brought news of his arrest to the Bishop Sisinnius. The javelins which the governor ordered to be hurled at Artemon slew one of his own assessors. A pool, probably the actual lake of Diocæsareia, was produced at the prayers of the saint. Other details are really too grotesque and puerile for repetition.

As the Bollandists have already labelled it, this account obviously belongs to the sphere of legend, not of history. At one time this admission would have been considered a sufficient reason for relegating the document to the limbo of oblivion. In recent time however the study of legend and mythology has become a science. The mere rationalization of legend by omitting the marvellous and leaving a residue of physical possibility is of course an utterly unjustifiable and unscientific process; the residue which is thus obtained is not one whit more historical than the whole legend to which it belongs. Some definite objective evidence, outside of the legend, unconnected with it, and of independent certainty, must be obtained; and the legend tested thereby sometimes yields real information of a very different kind from that which it professes to give. It is now an accepted principle that even the genesis of legend is an historical process, which may throw light at least on the character of the age when the legend grew, if not on the age to which it professes to belong.

The problem now is to find some external evidence which shall furnish a criterion in this particular case. The preceding statement has exhibited the relation of the details

¹ The authorities all say Cæsareia; but Diocæsareia was not very far from Laodiceia, and was in the Roman *conventus* whose administrative centre was at Laodiceia, whereas no city Cæsareia existed in Phrygia. On this point I shall have more to say below.

to actual localities in a way which was impossible until the general survey of Phrygia was organized by the Asia Minor Exploration Committee. We may now say confidently, that the local surroundings are not fictitious, but real. The legend of the origin of the lake of Diocæsareia must have arisen at a time when there was a tendency to connect natural phenomena with the history of Christian saints, and when therefore the veneration of saints possessed a strong hold on the popular mind. In the old pagan time the reason for such phenomena of nature was found in the action of the deities, action of a capricious kind, and not in accordance with general principle. The Christians of Phrygia supplied the place of the old anthropomorphic deities by the saints, who had been the champions of their faith. This same process is a familiar one in the history of religion. Among the Teutonic races we find stories, whose details are among the earliest heirlooms of the Indo-European races, and which were once told about pagan deities, related with only the changed personality of Christ and the apostles. But it must be observed that this explanation presupposes the existence of a widespread respect for the saint; he must have been already venerated before the legend could arise. If we can fix a date for the growth of the legend, we can then say that St. Artemon was then and for some time before that date an object of general veneration in southern Phrygia and the heir to the legendary heritage of the pagan deities.

Fidelity of local detail is one of the most important characteristics of the class of tales which is here described. This class of tales has grown up among the people of a district, and has the character of popular legend; it is to be distinguished from another class which seems to be purely invented and to have no roots in popular belief and no clear local indications. I have here assumed the truth of the discussion of the localities which is given in full else-

where ;¹ the precise amount of evidence in every detail need not be repeated here, but should be carefully scrutinised by those who wish to reach the truth.

In the details of the legend of Artemon no sufficient clue is furnished as to the date of its composition. The transmitted form of one of the versions is later than A.D. 536, for it mentions the governor stationed at Laodiceia under the title *comes*, and Justinian in that year made a new arrangement of the provincial governments, and for the first time placed at Laodiceia a *comes* as governor of Phrygia Pacatiana.² But briefer accounts quoted by the Bollandists from Greek Menæa preserve different forms of the tale ; and one which speaks of the temple of Æsculapius, and of the two serpents which lived in it, seems to be of better character, and to show some real knowledge of the time when paganism was still existent, though the length of the serpents is exaggerated to eighty cubits.

Some importance is to be attached to the name Cæsareia. The native name of Diocæsareia was Keretapa. Under the influence of the Græco-Roman civilization, which was diffused in a very superficial way over the central provinces of Asia Minor, the Roman name Diocæsareia was substituted for the vulgar Phrygian name. But this official term never became thoroughly popular, and after a time, probably as early as the fourth century, it passed out of use, and the native name came once more into general employment. The tale of Artemon preserves the recollection of the time when Diocæsareia was the name of the city. But in the later versions of the tale, which alone are

¹ See my papers on "Antiquities of Southern Phrygia and the Border Lands" in *American Journal of Archæology*, 1887-88, section on Diocæsareia Keretapa.

² The same feature also proves that this version is not later than the century immediately following Justinian. The government of Phrygia was entirely remodelled in the following century, when the Themes were instituted, and probably Laodiceia ceased then to be a seat of government, while the impregnable fortress of Chonai took its place.

preserved, the writer, having no knowledge of the localities, does not understand the now disused name, and substitutes for it the commoner form *Cæsareia*. This slight detail furnishes a valuable proof of the antiquity of the story. It takes us back to a fourth century version, possibly only an oral version, in which St. Artemon was connected both with the small country town of *Diocæsareia* and with the seat of the Roman officials at *Laodiceia*, and in which fidelity of local details was a characteristic. The trial of a townsman of *Diocæsareia* for an offence against Roman law would necessarily be held at the government centre *Laodiceia*, the seat of the *conventus*. In all probability this is the only historical part now recoverable from the legend. The rest consists of floating popular tales, which gathered round the person of the popular Christian hero as a fixed point.

The tale of Artemon is one of many which grew in the popular mind during the fourth century, and many of which assumed literary form during the fifth century. The form in which many of them are written down exhibits to us the historical circumstances which obtained about 400-450 A.D.¹ The Roman officials mentioned bear the titles and perform the functions which belonged to officials of the early Byzantine empire, and which were unknown under the Roman empire. The tales may be taken as evidence of the state of society and belief during the period when they were written. The leading incidents were not invented by the person who gave literary form to the tales. They have the character of popular spontaneous legend, arising among a people not highly educated, about personages whose memory was preserved by religious veneration and by actual Church ceremonial. This point is the key-stone of the view which is here

¹ Perhaps some other version of the Artemon-legend may yet be found in MS., earlier and more detailed than those which are published.

expressed. The permanence and unalterableness of religious ritual, as distinguished from the fluctuation of mere oral tradition and popular legend, make it the one sure guide in the study of mythology. If memorial ceremonies kept alive the recollection of the more distinguished martyrs, the popular imagination was kept right in some main details, while the importance thus given to their personality made them fixed centres round which floating details and vague beliefs gathered. It is, I believe, a fact that such memorial services were performed in honour of the great saints of the early Church, and that at these services such discourses as that of Gregory Nyssenius on the Forty Martyrs were delivered; though on such a point I speak with all diffidence. Such was the way in which the memory of St. Artemon was kept fresh by thoroughly trustworthy evidence as to some of the main facts, and yet his personality became a centre of mere popular tales.

I do not of course maintain that all tales of Asian saints rank in the class. Each one must be examined separately, and vividness of local detail is one of the chief criteria for admitting any tale into this class. My purpose is only to show that some tales do belong to this class; but several examples might be given of tales, which have not the slightest trace of local colouring or reality about them.

While the general facts were given by popular legend, the literary form is due to the genius, or want of genius, of the writer. How much should be attributed to the former cause, and how much to the latter, it is not possible to determine absolutely, though an approximation may be made in each case, and something may be learned about the ability and character of the writer in the cases where a longer biography is preserved. It is not certain whether the hand of a single writer is to be traced throughout, or whether there was a general wave of hagiography over Asia Minor. Probably such a general tendency did charac-

terize the fifth century, but at the same time it may be possible to trace the work of the same writer in several biographies. The whole subject however requires patient investigation, and I cannot hope to have hit the truth entirely, much less to have exhausted what might be learned, in these remarks, which are founded only on a hasty perusal of part of the material, undertaken at first for purposes of topography, and made in the intervals of a busy life devoted chiefly to other pursuits. I shall be entirely satisfied if I succeed in drawing more attention to the Christian antiquities of Asia Minor, and in arousing others to correct me and to do better what I here do imperfectly.

It is possible that the foregoing remarks may be held extravagant, but I think it best to draw with rigorous logic the conclusions that seem to follow from the principles enunciated; and those who consider that the conclusions involve too great a strain on their credulity will scrutinize with proper severity the premises from which they are deduced.

It has fortunately happened that in the explorations carried out in connexion with the Asia Minor Exploration Fund indubitable evidence was discovered of the historical character of another Phrygian saint, in whom the legendary and fantastic and marvellous element is almost as strongly marked as in the tale of Artemon. Here we have a case where it is possible to compare the legend with the historical facts, to trace the origin of the legendary details, and to show the real facts out of which some of them grew. The whole circumstances furnish a striking example of the way in which archæological evidence may be used to estimate and establish the authority of semi-historical documents. Assuming all that has been said by the Bishop of Durham in this magazine, January, 1885, p. 3 ff., on the special legend which I have to discuss, I shall, in the first place, enumerate the main points in the tale, so as to bring out both the purely fictitious character and the probable

origin of many of them, and also to show something of the character of the writer who first put the tale in literary form. My view is that he wrote about 390-410 A.D., that he was a man of fair education and knowledge, and that many details are not of such a character as he would be likely to invent, but bear all the marks of free creative popular mythology.

It is possible that the tale has passed through subsequent editions; but on this point I express no opinion. In the main, I hold that it may be considered as a document of 400 A.D. It may be mentioned that this date was proposed by me in 1883. M. l'Abbé Duchesne argued against my reasons and advocated a sixth century date. I have replied to his arguments in a later paper, and I am glad to find my opinion corroborated by such an authority as the Bishop of Durham.¹

When Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Verus were emperors, there went forth a decree that all should sacrifice to the gods. Publius, who was governor of Lesser Phrygia, carried out the command in his own province, and in particular the senate and people of Hierapolis, clad in white apparel, offered solemn sacrifice. Aberkios,² who was Bishop of Hierapolis, seeing what was being done, prayed in anguish of spirit for great part of a day, and then falling asleep, beheld in a dream a young man of noble aspect, who put a staff in his hand and bade him destroy therewith the

¹ "The Tale of St. Abercius" in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1882, p. 339 ff.; L. Duchesne in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, July, 1883, p. 1 ff.; *Cities and Bishoprics*, part ii., § xxviii., 1887; Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. i., p. 483. A difficulty which I found in my own view (*Cit. and Bish.*, vol. i., p. 425), and which is cleared away by Bishop Lightfoot, is now disposed of by other reasons on a more careful examination of the stone.

² I use here the spelling of the biography (see *Acta Sanctorum*, October 22nd). A few pages previously I used the second century spelling Avircius, which occurs in the anonymous treatise against Montanism. During the third century it became customary to use β where older documents use ou to express the sound of our v or w . I call Aberkios the hero of the legend, Avircius the historical character.

false gods. Awakened full of zeal, Aberkios took a large piece of wood, and going about the ninth hour to the temple of Apollo, which was the chief sanctuary of the city, he forced open the doors, and rushing in overthrew and broke in pieces the statue of the god. Thereafter he broke in succession the statues of all the other gods which were in the temple. Neither did the gods themselves interfere to save themselves, proving thus by their inaction the folly of men in worshipping and calling gods mere stocks and stones, nor did the ministers of the temple, who were struck with astonishment, raise a hand against him in defence of their deities: and Aberkios, after pointing the moral to be drawn from the helplessness of the deities whose sacred images he had broken, retired to his own home like a victor from battle. Towards evening the ministers of the temple recovered from their astonishment, and formally accused Aberkios before the municipal senate. In the morning a meeting of the people was held in the temple to deliberate. The mob were eager to burn the house of Aberkios over his head; but the senate, fearing that the conflagration might spread, and that they might be involved in trouble with the governor of the province, resolved to arrest Aberkios and any associates whom he might have, and send all for trial before the governor.¹ During the delay caused by the difference of opinion in the public meeting certain of the Christians came to warn Aberkios of the design against him, and found him engaged in instructing the crowds who resorted to him. His friends advised him to retire for a short time from the city; but he declined to do so, and going forth into the marketplace he began to teach in public.

¹ In that case they would have been sent to Synnada, the seat of the *conventus* (assuming for the moment the historical character of the incident), just as it was shown above that Artemon must have been sent from Diocæsareia to Laodiceia for trial.

The multitude were now roused to greater fury when news was brought into the temple of this open defiance. The senators could no longer restrain them, and they rushed to the marketplace to kill the saint. As they approached him, three young men possessed by demons, hurried forth in front of them, with foaming mouths and squinting eyes, biting their own hands, and calling out, "We adjure thee by the true and only God, whom thou preachest, not to torment us before our time." All stood still, and gazed on the saint, who, after praying aloud, touched the young men with the staff which he carried, and ordered the evil spirits to come out of them. They were healed forthwith, and from henceforth would never leave the side of Aberkios. The multitude, to a man, renounced idolatry and were converted on the spot. As it was too late to baptize them that day, the ceremony was postponed till the morrow, and many of the new converts spent the whole night in the open marketplace. On the next day five hundred persons were baptized.

Such is the scene with which the biography of Aberkios opens. Its utterly fabulous character is plain. Examining it a little more closely, we can see that it could not arise until long after the events which it relates. I have in the preceding paper described the true character of the struggle which took place in the second and third centuries. It was not a struggle between the religion of Christ and the religion of Apollo or Jupiter; it was a struggle between the supreme State religion, the worship of the emperors, and the religion which claimed to be sole and universal. In this tale there is not a word about such an aspect of the religious question; and it cannot therefore have arisen so long as such a question was placed alone before the world. But in the attempted revival of paganism by the Emperor Julian, in 361-363 A.D., the question was different. The attempt was then actually made to restore the worship of the old gods, Apollo and

Jupiter and the rest; and the tale, which could not have arisen before this time, might very naturally come into existence after it.

It is probable that the name Apollo is true to nature. I need not here enter on the point, but it can be shown that the god of Hierapolis was identified with the Greek Apollo, and was frequently called by that name by Greek speakers. In reality he was a purely Phrygian deity, a sun-god, who in some respects, and especially as a god of prophecy and as a solar deity, approximated to the character of the Greek Apollo. Remains, which I take to be those of the temple of Hierapolis, can still be traced just appearing above the soil at a wretched village called Kotch Hissar; they are of great extent, and are built of unusually large blocks of stone, in a style which seems to be older than the Roman domination. The tale arose before recollection had ceased of the time when a temple of Apollo at Hierapolis had been the chief sanctuary of the whole Pentapolis.¹ The picture of the senate and people clad in white is true to Roman custom: the touch is due to the writer, and implies that either he had actually seen such a ceremony in the time of Julian, or that he had learned it by reading Roman authors. Most of the opening scene probably is due to the writer's free invention. It has not the character of popular legend, but appears to be written in free imitation and exaggeration of passages in the New Testament by a person who had actually seen or heard from eye-witnesses about ceremonies held in the temple of Apollo at Hierapolis.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(*To be continued.*)

¹ I have treated this point in a paper "Trois Villes Phrygiennes," in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique*, 1882.