but we may pass on to notice in closing this study that the offence for which Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrin was not really any one of these offences which we have discussed; although the ostensible charge was blasphemy in claiming to be the Christ the Son of God (Matthew xxvi. 63–66), the real reason for His condemnation is given in the cynical confession of Caiaphas, as reported in the Fourth Gospel (xi. 50): "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." On the one hand Jesus had challenged the authority of the worldly priesthood even in the Temple (John ii. 13–19); on the other His movement was likely to attract the attention of the Roman Government, and to lead to further measures of repression (John xi. 48). To save their position and power thus threatened, this worldly priesthood exploited Pharisaic bigotry, popular fanaticism, and the weakness of the Roman Governor to sacrifice Jesus as an offence to their secular ambition.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS OF LYCAONIA.

IN studying the Christian inscriptions of Lycaonia, one is met by the difficulty of specifying the period to which they belong. Whereas the Phrygian Christian inscriptions are frequently dated exactly by year, month and day, and the dated texts form a fixed and certain series alongside of which the undated can be arranged with an approximation to certainty, not a single Lycaonian inscription has been found dated according to an era, such as was used in Phrygia; the custom of dating by an era was rarely, or not at all, practised in Lycaonia. Except where an Emperor or other known person is mentioned, no Lycaonian inscription can be fixed by external and indubitable evidence;

and among the Christian inscriptions that means of determining the period is, of course, not available. The only useful method is to arrange them in classes, according to the formulæ used, then to place these, as far as possible, in chronological succession, and finally to try to determine the period when the earliest class began and when the others were in use.

A first question that arises in this connexion is whether there is any reason to expect that in Lycaonia Christian inscriptions should begin later than in Phrygia. So far as regards the time when the new religion became so general in the country that such a large number of Christian epitaphs could be openly set up, there is no reason to think that Asian Phrygia was more quickly and early Christianized than the Lycaonian country about Iconium and Laodiceia.[1] On the contrary, Christianity seems, so far as the indications afford ground for judgment, to have penetrated much further to the north, and therefore presumably more rapidly, from Iconium than from the first centre in Asian Phrygia (viz., the Lycus valley, where Colossae, Laodiceia and Hierapolis were situated). So far as this consideration goes, we should expect Christian inscriptions to be numerous in Lycaonia at an earlier time than in Phrygia. But it is true that ordinary Pagan epigraphy seems to have spread from the west eastwards, and to have been generally practised in Phrygia earlier than in Lycaonia or Galatia or Cappadocia. Epigraphy spread along with the Greek language and education. From this point of view Christian epigraphy may have been affected by the general principle, and perhaps we should date it later in Lycaonia than in Asian Phrygia. But the difference in time cannot have been very

[1] This part of the Byzantine Province Lycaonia was called in the strict nomenclature of the first century Galatic Phrygia; but as explained above, we speak here of Lycaonia in the Byzantine provincial extent, as it was from A.D. 372 onwards.

great, especially as it seems clear that Christianity was an effective agent in spreading the knowledge of Greek and killing the native languages in Anatolia.[1] It seems safe to suppose that Christian epigraphy was not more than fifty years later in Lycaonia than in Asian Phrygia. Now the earliest Christian epitaphs known in Phrygia are fixed about 192 and about 224 A.D., while about 250 the dated inscriptions become numerous.[2]

On this line of argument we should have to look for the earliest Christian epitaphs in Lycaonia about 240 A.D., and expect that about 300 they should be common; but as 300 lies within the time of the severest persecution, we should rather regard 310–350 as the time when they were frequent. This is exactly the period when the rich Christian epigraphy of Nova Isaura (between Lystra and Derbe) has been placed according to a careful examination and argument.[3]

As a general rule it is certain that formulæ which approximate in form to, or are identical with, Pagan formulæ were earlier in origin than those which are overtly Christian in character. As has been frequently pointed out, Christian society and social customs were only slowly differentiated from the common everyday society and customs of the time. This then must be taken as a principle to start from, that epitaphs expressed according to a form ordinarily used by the Pagans are to be arranged earlier in chronological order than those which are purely Christian in character; and this principle will, at once, simplify our task greatly.

It will, I think, be found that several formulæ, which probably most scholars were formerly disposed to consider as quite late and purely Byzantine in period—as was

[1] See *Zeitschrift f. vgl. Sprachforschung*, N. F. viii. p. 382 f., and *Oesterr. Jahreshefte*, 1905, *Beiblatt*, introd. to art. on "Later Phrygian Inscriptions."

[2] *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. pp. 713, 526.

[3] See Miss Ramsay's paper in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 290 f.

the present writer's view at least—had come into use in Lycaonia at least as early as the fourth century; and there is some probability that a considerable part of the earliest Christian symbolism in art originated in that country.

The overwhelming majority of Pagan epitaphs in the central regions of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire follow the form that such and such a person constructed the tomb for himself, or for some other person or persons, or for both himself and others. The construction of the tomb was a religious duty; and the document began by mentioning the performance of this duty. The Christian epitaphs, which are expressed in this form, may be placed first in our classification. Certain individual epitaphs of this class present various other features, which point to an early date, and thus confirm the general principle. The names and the lettering are, as a whole, of an early type; neither of these criteria are sufficiently definite to date, or even fix the order of, the inscriptions, but occasionally they furnish in isolated cases strong and even complete evidence.

The formula "Here lies the slave of God" (ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ), followed by the name of the deceased, belongs to a more developed stage of Christian expression. An early stage of its development can perhaps be traced in a Laodicean inscription—

> Athenedorus, house-servant of God, and Aelia Eupatra his wife, while in life (prepared the grave) for themselves.

The term "house-servant of God" (οἰκέτης Θεοῦ) in itself might quite fairly be taken as a mere refinement of the commoner "slave of God," and therefore later in origin; but such an opinion is refuted by the character of this inscription, which is expressed in the earlier class of formula, mentioning first the name of the maker of the

tomb. The names, too, are of an early type, especially the name of the wife Aelia Eupatra; and we may feel fairly confident that the inscription must be as early as the fourth century, perhaps even the end of the third. Looking at the style of letters, and the general impression given by the inscription as a whole, I should be inclined to place it in the third century.

The phrase "Slave of Christ" is, evidently, later than "Slave of God," as being more remote than Pagan forms of expression. The latter might quite conceivably be used by a Pagan, though I cannot quote any case in which it was so used. The only inscription known to me, in which "Slave of Christ" occurs, is marked beyond question by other characteristics as of the developed Byzantine period; the title "Comes" occurs, and the detestable spelling (occurring not in rude village work, but on the tomb of a high officer) shows that the epitaph is likely to be of the seventh century or even later.

It may therefore be concluded that the phrase "house-servant of God" belongs to an early stage in the development of Christian forms of expression, and that it was tried before usage had settled on the phrase "slave of God" and stereotyped this latter phrase. Now the rare phrase "house-servant of God" occurs only (so far as I have observed) in the earlier class of epitaphs, while "slave of God" is unknown to me in that class. The formula "Here lies the slave of God" is a purely Christian form, and therefore later; and the second half of the formula is also later in character, so that the first part, "Here lies," is also likely to be later.[1]

In the whole series of the early Lycaonian inscriptions I have observed only one allusion to the New Testament, and that one does not show a very accurate recollection of the words.

[1] Laodiceia No. 16 (*Athen. Mittheil.* 1888, p. 240).

Dikaios, measurer of corn for distribution, raised the stele to his wife Mouna, after a wedded life of 23 years, [ ] months, 20 days, and made (the tomb) for himself in his life-time. And the sarcophagus belongs to Him who knocks where the door stands before Him.

The allusion to Revelation iii. 20, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," seems indubitable; though the Greek shows rather less similarity than the English.[1] It is possible that on the broken ornament of the top a personal name was engraved, and then the first line should be translated "a just measurer of corn." But Dikaiosyne occurs as a woman's name in a neighbouring village, and Dikaios is sometimes found as a man's name and probably so used here.

The Presbyters mentioned are very numerous. With regard to them we note that in many cases they were married. The number of cases where marriage is proved by mention of wife or children or both is so large, that this was evidently the ordinary custom in the Lycaonian congregations. The unmarried Presbyters were indubitably exceptional. Some of the inscriptions in which they are mentioned may perhaps be as early as the end of the third century: e.g.—

I Aur. Nestor erected this titlos to my sweetest father Callimachus in remembrance.

This is marked as early (1) by the formula; it may be doubted if any inscription in which the maker of the tomb is named in the opening words is later than the middle of the fifth century (perhaps even than the end of the fourth).

(2) By the use of Aurelius as mere *praenomen*: this usage began in 212, and was extremely common in the third century, much less common in the fourth (when

[1] κρούω and ἕστηκα ἐπὶ in Rev. iii. 20, κόπτω and ἐπέστηκεν (sic) in the epitaph; but the latter is composed by an uneducated villager, who made κόπτωνος the gen. of κόπτων, and remembered badly the words of the New Testament.

Flavius began to be used to some extent in the same way), and very rare in the fifth.

(3) By the term titlos, frequent in (probably) Pagan inscriptions of the third century or earlier.

"Presbyter of the holy Church of God" (*τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας*) is an expression that belongs probably to the later fourth or early fifth century. It can hardly have originated later, for in one of Hamilton's inscriptions "the very pious Deacon of the holy Church of God of the Novatians, Patricius," has a grave made for him by his brother Aur. Zotikos; this inscription has several marks of comparatively early character; and the name Novatians is not likely to have been kept by the sect in open use very long.[1] The sect and the name were proscribed about A.D. 420, and that determines the latest possible date for the epitaph. I should regard this epitaph as older than 400.

The most interesting picture of the Lycaonian presbyter's duties is contained in the following epitaph:—

> The help of widows, orphans, strangers, and poor, [Nestor?, son of Nestor?], presbyter in charge of the sacred expenditure: in remembrance.
>
> (Garland in relief.)

This remarkable inscription is mutilated, and (besides the personal name) two of the words, viz. "strangers" and "expenditure," are not quite certain. It is possible that "strangers" should be omitted entirely,[2] and it is possible that "things" or "business" should be read in place of "expenditure."[3] But the first point of doubt is

[1] C.I.G. no. 9268.

[2] The choice is between [*κὰὶ ταλαι*]*πώρων* and [*ξένων ταλαι*]*πώρων*: I see no criterion to give certainty; see *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 167, f. The former was suggested by Professor A. Souter, and the latter by Professor F. Cumont, independently. I sent copies of the inscription to each of them as soon as I found it. I think the word "strangers" was used, as the duty of hospitality was strenuously insisted on in the early Church. See below.

[3] The choice is between [*πραγ*]*μάτων* and [*ἀνὰλω*]*μάτων*: it is probable that the latter is correct. The first was suggested by Professor F. Cumont, and the second is my own.

not really important; and the circumstances seem to support the reading "expenditure" in the second, for the title of the presbyter gives the explanation of the opening words. Nestor (or whatever was the name of the deceased) was the helper of widows, orphans, strangers and poor, because he was the presbyter in charge of the Church expenditure.

In favour of reading "strangers" as well as "poor," an unpublished inscription, found near Dorla (Isaura Nova) in 1905, may be quoted. It contains only the words:—

Koulas to Solon, a stranger, in remembrance.

Moreover, we remember the New Town, the great foundation built by Basil near Caesareia, including almshouse, hospital, and place of entertainment for strangers, where travellers and sick persons might find the comfort that they wanted, doctors, means of conveyance, and escort. The reading "strangers and poor" would therefore suit the facts of Christian Church organization during the fourth century excellently.

With regard to the date of this epitaph, we notice in the first place that it is of the later, not the older type: there is no mention of the maker of the tomb. No date can therefore be thought of earlier than the middle of the fourth century.

But, further, it is hardly safe to place the epitaph much later than about 350. There is nothing of a stereotyped and formulated character. It reads like the free expression of an individual mind, and formulæ were likely to grow out of this expression at a later date. In the same district and about the same time we find an example of the tendency to stereotype this expression as a formula descriptive of any Presbyter: it occurs as part of a long metrical epitaph, "Nestor lies (here), a presbyter, helper of poor widows."[1]

[1] The text is badly mutilated: an imperfect copy is given in *Journal of*

I feel in reading this metrical epitaph that the phrase just quoted springs from the same root as the prose epitaph previously quoted. Either they both relate to the same presbyter (in which case the name "Nestor, son of Nestor"[1] would have to be restored), or the expression, "help of widows, etc.," first devised for the prose epitaph, came to be used for subsequent presbyters (just as we shall find below a form of metrical epitaph, employed for any priest, with the name thrust regardless of metre into the verse). The former supposition is perhaps more probable, for the long metrical epitaph seems to have been specially composed for this particular presbyter Nestor, and to be of much higher rank than most of the metrical epitaphs of this region.

Now in publishing that metrical inscription I argued from the name of the province (as restored) that it had been composed before A.D. 372; and the apostrophe to the passer-by and the whole style of expression suit a comparatively early date. It is not stereotyped Byzantine, but direct and original; and while the text is too incomplete for certainty, the erecter of the tomb was probably mentioned. Thus it seems a fair conclusion that both the prose and the metrical epitaph should be dated between A.D. 340 and 372.

These two epitaphs, especially the one in prose, seem to have arisen in the same surroundings of thought and custom, in which the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. ch. 35, grew up; but the latter is distinctly expressed in more formed and almost stereotyped phraseology. "Thus will your righteousness surpass [that of the scribes and Pharisees] if you take greater forethought than they for the priests and the

Hellenic Studies, 1905, p. 169. I recopied it in May, 1905.

[1] Νέστωρ δίς, a very common form of expression. There is hardly room for the full name of the father in genitive (especially if καὶ ταλαι is the correct text in l. 1).

orphans and the widows: as it is written, He hath scattered abroad: he hath given to the poor[1] . . . For thy duty is to give, and the priest's duty to manage, as manager and administrator of the ecclesiastical things."

The term "ecclesiastical" seems to indicate a more advanced state of organization than the word "sacred," which is used in the corresponding part of the epitaph. Moreover the manager (*οἰκονόμος*) is in the next sentence of the *Constitutions* said to be the bishop, while in the epitaph the presbyter is the administrator. The title manager (*οἰκονόμος*) is used several times in the Lycaonian inscriptions to indicate apparently a presbyter, not a bishop —one who was charged specially with the duty of managing the money of the church devoted to charitable purposes. Thus it seems to be implied that in each Lycaonian church there was a certain fund, contributed by the congregation (as the *Constitutions* state) and distributed to widows, orphans, and poor (perhaps also to strangers in the form of entertainment) by the Presbyter, or by one of the Presbyters, who was specially entitled Oikonomos.

The long metrical Lycaonian inscription already quoted speaks of the presbyter in another relation in which the *Apostolic Constitutions* would probably mention a bishop. Immediately after "the Presbyter, help of poor widows," the metrical epitaph mentions "the Deacon, excellent subordinate-worker." In the *Constitutions*, ii. 30, is given an elaborate statement of the relation of the deacon to the bishop, exactly on the lines of the relation stated in this epitaph between the deacon and the presbyter: "Let the Bishop be honoured by you in the place of God, and the Deacon as his prophet, for as Christ without the Father does nothing, so neither does the Deacon without the Bishop; and as Son is not without Father, so neither is

[1] *τοῖς πένησιν*, in the prose epitaph *ταλαιπώρων* is the word.

Deacon without the Bishop; and as Son is subordinate [1] to Father, so also every Deacon to the Bishop; and as the Son is messenger and prophet of the Father, so also the Deacon is messenger and prophet of the Bishop."

In the *Constitutions*, ii. 19, the name Bishop is roughly used in a still wider generic fashion, to include the entire clergy as distinguished from the laity: "Listen, ye bishops; and listen, ye laymen." In this and in the following chapter 20, it is clear that the generic distinction between guide and guided, shepherd and sheep, is in the writer's mind, and that the clergy, higher or lower, are the shepherd, but only the head and representative of the clergy is named on behalf of the whole order. Where the Bishop is, the rest of the clergy does not act except as ministers of his will and policy; but, as doing so, they share in his honourable position and dignity; and where he is not, the next in order acts for him, and is the father and shepherd of the people.

"Let the laymen honour the shepherd, who is good, love him, fear him as father, as lord, as high priest of God, as teacher of piety . . . In like manner let the Bishop love the laity as his children." One feels that the Lycaonian epitaphs might use the same words about the Presbyter.

Here it seems probable that in the *Constitutions* the relation of Deacon and Bishop is generically the relation of Deacon to the higher order of the ministry, and practically includes the relation of Deacon to Presbyter. I do not mean that Bishop and Presbyter were the same thing; but that the term Bishop could still be used, and was sometimes used, as a generic term to include Presbyters and Bishops.

[1] ὑπόχρεος, whereas my second copy of the metrical epitaph has ὑπουργό[ς]; but in this almost obliterated ending of a line, it would be easy to mistake ΥΠΟΧΡΕΟ for ΥΠΟΥΡΓΟ, where every faint trace has to be divined and read by faith rather than by sight. Still, I think my copy is to be accepted.

In the epitaphs, on the other hand, the term Presbyter is used in situations where the *Constitutions* would probably speak of a Bishop. The Lycaonian Presbyter managed the church finances and charitable funds, with the Deacon as his subordinate in administration: in the *Constitutions* the Bishop stands in precisely that same relation to Church and Deacon. Thus the epitaphs stand on the same stage of thought, which made it possible to use the term co-presbyters of several officials, even if one or all of them were Bishops.

The term "Bishop" is also used in some early Lycaonian inscriptions, probably already in the third century; and in one case, probably about the middle of the third century, a deceased bishop is called "the Makarios Papas,"[1] a term known to have been employed elsewhere in that period. Again—

> Makeros and Oas and Anolis the sister did honour to the Bishop Mammas friend to all men.[2]

The final epithet, "friend to all," is simply an epitome of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 20. This is of the older class of epitaphs.

Somewhat later, doubtless of the fourth century, is the following:—

> The very pure and sweet-voiced and with-all-virtue-adorned Sisamoas Bishop.[3]

The epithets here differ from, yet have a distinct analogy to, those used of the Bishop by Basil of Cæsareia about 370: the epithets are there quite conventional and stereotyped, ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἐπίσκοπος, addressed as "your piety," "your perfection," "your God-fearing-ness," "your divine and most perfect consideration," "your compre-

[1] See Expositor, 1905, March, p. 214.
[2] Miss Ramsay in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 269.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

hension": [1] these have all come to be used as polite designations and forms of address.

The two inscriptions describing the duties of the Presbyter present to us the free and unstereotyped stage of expression, out of which grew the forms used in Basil's time; and therefore we can hardly date them later than A.D. 350.

Another example of an early Bishop is:

> Apas son of Kouanzapheês erected to his brother Indakos, Bishop, just, beloved, in his own life-time and for himself, in remembrance.

(Symbol.) (Leaf.) (Garland.) (Leaf.) (Symbol.)[2]

This unpublished inscription, found in 1905 between Nea Isaura, Derbe, and Barata, is of the early class.

The distinction between clergy and laity as two separate orders is clearly marked in the Lycaonian inscriptions, hardly indeed in the earliest class, but certainly in those which may on our view be placed soon after the middle of the fourth century. The use of the term *hiereus* to designate a Bishop or Presbyter probably marks the recognition of this distinction. Those who spoke of a *hiereus* naturally recognized the priest as belonging to a different order from the people; and the correlative term *laos*, to indicate the laity, must have come into use at the same time. The Lycaonian inscriptions in which either term occurs generally seem to be as late as the fifth century, but some are probably of the second half of the fourth. The fact that *hiereus* is so much rarer in these inscriptions than Presbyter forms an argument that we have been right in placing a large number of the epitaphs earlier than A.D. 350.

Two epitaphs at the ancient village beside Zazadin-Khan, twelve miles north-east from Iconium, show the same metrical form applied to two hiereis or priests of the village.

[1] Basil, Epist. 181 (dated 374 A.D.), ἡ εὐλάβεια σου frequent, ἡ σὴ τελειότης 172, ἡ θεοσέβεια σου 167, ἡ ἔνθεος καὶ τελειοτάτη φρόνησις σου 141, ἡ σύνεσις σου 165. A presbyter, on the other hand, is simply "your perfect consideration," ἡ τέλεια φρόνησις σου, or "honoured head," τιμία κεφαλή, 156.

[2] The "symbols" in this line were defaced: they were enclosed within circles, and were probably either crosses or six-leaved rosettes.

> Here lies a man, priest of great God, who on account of gentleness gained heavenly glory, snatched hastily from Church and congregation, having the name Apollinarius [in the other case, Gregory], great glory of the congregation.[1]

The formula, "here lies," is of later type than the epitaphs in which the maker of the tomb is mentioned; it is a mere translation of the Latin *hic jacet,* and marks the spread of Roman custom in the Greek-speaking districts of the East. Probably no example of it can be dated earlier than the latter half of the fourth century.

One of the two epitaphs, that of Gregory, has two additional lines, worse in syntax and expression than the four stereotyped verses, and hardly intelligible: perhaps

> "A man who was a care to God through joyousness; E[. . .]s erected the stele and thus inscribed on the tomb."[2]

Here the older form of epitaph, mentioning the maker of the tomb, makes itself felt at the end, implying that that class was not yet forgotten and wholly out of date. In accordance with the principles on which we are working, it would be impossible to place this inscription later than about 400 A.D. Now the formula of the first four lines was not composed for Gregory, but taken from an already stereotyped epitaph suitable for any priest, and when the composer of Gregory's epitaph tried to add something distinctive in the last two lines he sank to a much lower level and became almost unintelligible. The metrical formula, therefore, was a fourth century composition, perhaps not much later than 350, like the long metrical epitaph quoted above with several others in the same region.[1] That long metrical

[1] Published by my travelling companion, Rev. H. S. Cronin, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 1902, p. 361 f.

[2] Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 1902, p. 362, No. 126; but I should prefer now to restore a proper name at the beginning of the fifth hexameter, E[. . .]s. The form so-and-so ἀνέστησεν the deceased is common in Lycaonia.

[3] For example, the first of the New-Isauran inscriptions published by Miss Ramsay in *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* 1904, p. 262; also No. 69, ibid., 1905, p. 176.

epitaph probably contains the verb ἱερεύεν in l. 2, which would presuppose the use of the noun hiereus. Thus we can push back the popular use of the term *hiereus* in Lycaonia as far at least as about 350 A.D.

There is, of course, no difficulty in supposing that the distinction between priest and laity (ἱερεύς and λαός) was even older than this: the words are taken from the language of the Septuagint. Already in 218 an expression (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 19, 18) is found, where the congregation (λαός) is set over against the bishop: the distinction is here latent though not explicit. At the same time it is certain that priests even late in the fourth century ordinarily lived by practising some trade, as Basil, *Ep.* 198, says, "the majority of them ply sedentary crafts, whereby they get their daily bread."

An inscription, which must cause some hesitation is—

> Papas and Gaius, sons of Titus Lorentius, to their father hiereus and Mania their mother hierissa in remembrance.[1]

I published this at first as an ordinary Pagan inscription; but, since subsequently published epitaphs have shown that *hiereus* and *archiereus* came into ordinary use in Lycaonian epigraphy as technical Christian terms, it seems more probable that here we have a Christian epitaph involving the distinction between clergy and laity. The bare words *hiereus* and *hierissa* seem not to be in keeping with a Pagan epitaph. In Pagan usage a *hiereus* belonged to the worship of one deity, and as a rule either the name of the god to whom the *hiereus* belonged was expressed or the context or situation left no doubt as to what deity and cult the *hiereus* was attached. At one of the great sanctuaries (Hiera) of Anatolia, where a single supreme priest stood at the head of the college of priests as representative of the god, it would be natural and was quite common to state a date "in the time when Noumenios was priest" without men-

[1] Laodiceia, No. 7 (*Athen. Mittheil.*, 1888, p. 237).

tioning in any part of the document the deity or the cult; but the situation and facts in that case left no doubt, for dating was practised only according to the one supreme priest. Similarly, *archiereus* is often used absolutely, because it was a perfectly distinctive term, inasmuch as there was only one *archiereus* in the city or district. But the use of the bare terms *hiereus* and *hierissa* in an ordinary Pagan epitaph in a city where there must have been many priests and hierissa seems so contrary to custom and difficult of understanding that it cannot be admitted with our present knowledge. We conclude that probably Titus Lorentius (popular pronunciation of Laurentius) and Mania were priest and priestess, perhaps a Bishop and his wife, in Laodiceia not later than about 360 A.D.

It would certainly be impossible to take *hierissa* in that epitaph as indicating a special official position in the Church. If the inscription is Christian, *hierissa* can only mean "wife of a priest." This would seem, perhaps, a unique phenomenon in Christian usage; and it could only be explained as belonging to a quite early stage, when terminology was not properly settled and understood, and when the Pagan custom, that man and wife should hold the offices of high-priest and high-priestess,[1] was still not forgotten. We have seen that the epitaph is of the older class. Our interpretation is defended by an inscription of Isaura Nova.[2]

Doxa Oikonomissa the revered (σεμνή).

In this case also it is improbable that oikonomissa indicated a special official position in the Church. It may perhaps be interpreted "wife of an oikonomos."[3]

[1] See *Classical Review*, Nov. 1905, p. 417.

[2] *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 283, No. 24.

[3] Oikonomos is used as feminine (like Diakonos for Diakonissa) in the long metrical epitaph of Nestor the Presbyter and Oikonomos, quoted above. The wife of Nestor is there styled Oikonomos, like her husband. I hope to return to this metrical epitaph (which at present offers many unsolved difficulties) in a subsequent article. The argument mentioned above as to date, from the name of the Province, is affected by

The term oikonomos, used evidently in the sense above defined, as Presbyter in charge of the charitable funds of the Church, occurs in another inscription of Isaura Nova.[1]

> Claudia did honour to Aur. Thal-ain her husband, honourable oikonomos, in remembrance.

This inscription is one of a class which belongs to the period 260–340, as I have argued on various grounds (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 290 f.).

Similarly, Presbyterissa would perhaps have to be taken as the wife of a Presbyter; but its occurrence is uncertain The index of the *Corpus* of Greek inscriptions quotes it from No. 8624; but it depends there on a restoration, which is quite incorrect and unjustified by the copy. The Lexicon of Stephanus quotes it once, but the place does not bear on our purpose. If the inscription, which name many Presbyters and their wives, never use the term Presbyterissa, this would go far to show that a Presbyter's wife did not share his title.

These examples suggest the question whether Diakonissa in the inscriptions of Lycaonia may not mean simply the wife of a Diakonos. The examples are inconclusive. In one case two sons raise the tomb to their mother Nonna, Diakonissa.[2] Another would probably be a test case, but the language is so ungrammatical as to be practically unintelligible. It is the epitaph of two persons, styled the excellent (and) blessed (dead), Flavius Alexander and Amia Diakonissa, belonging probably to the latter part of the ourth century, or the early fifth.[3] Here Alexander and Amia are certainly husband and wife. Alexander has no one uncertainty: the restoration should perhaps be [ἡμετέρ]ης and not [Πεισιδικ]ῆς. But other characteristics point to the same period, 340–372, or even earlier. My chief desire, at present, is to avoid assigning too early a date to the inscriptions; and it may ultimately be proved that they ought to be placed a little earlier than I have ventured to do.

[1] *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 172, No. 46.

[2] Anderson in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1899, p. 130, No. 155.

[3] Anderson, ibid. 1898, p. 126, No. 89.

official title; but the doubt remains whether the omission is due merely to helplessness and inadvertence, the uneducated composer having a vague idea that the title Diakonissa might imply also that the husband had corresponding rank. If that could be assumed, the case would be conclusive that the official title of the husband was communicated to the wife. But it is more probable that Alexander held no office, and Amia was deaconess in her own right.

Less uncertainty attaches to another case, in which a deaconess named Basilissa erected the tomb of her father-in-law Quintos, chief man of the village, her mother-in-law Matrona, her sister-in-law Catilla, and her husband Anicetus; and her single infant son Nemetorius was associated with her in the pious duty.[1] Here the husband has no title, and we cannot suppose that the title of Basilissa implied his official position. We must assume that she was deaconess during the life of her husband, who held no official rank. The tomb was evidently erected immediately after his death. Considering that marriages were ordinarily entered on at an early age, we must regard it as probable that Basilissa was still young when she made the grave.

Another example of the relation of Hiereus and Presbyteros may be quoted—

> Gourdos, good man, sleeps here like a dove. He was among men priest (hiereus) of the Most High God. To him Trokondas; his successor and comrade, made a stele in memory doing him honour on his tomb.
>
> (A Cross in relief on each side of the epitaph.)

Trokondas is called the comrade (*ὀπάων*) of the deceased; but the word, like the Latin *comes*, implies indubitably inferiority in position. Trokondas was a Deacon and

[1] Rev. H. S. Cronin published it in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 359. Basilissa is called *διάκονος*, not *διακόνισσα* (for euphony).

Gourdos was his Bishop or Presbyter. The same Gourdos, perhaps, is mentioned in another inscription—

> Aur(elius) Gourdos, Presbyter, erected (the tomb of) Tyrannos his adopted son (or foundling son) in remembrance.

The latter epitaph has all the marks of the earliest class of Lycaonian epitaphs; and it might very well be twenty or even forty years earlier than the former, which was engraved on the tomb of Gourdos. The omission of the praenomen Aur. in the former is no proof of diversity in the person: both because this praenomen is frequently found omitted and inserted in different references to the same person,[1] and because the epitaph of Gourdos is in hexameter verse, in which proper names were always treated more freely. The unusual name Gourdos (never elsewhere found) is not likely to have occurred twice in the case of a Presbyter and a Hiereus at Iconium during one century. The Presbyter and the Hiereus were assuredly the same person.

The epitaph of Gourdos is interesting in several respects. It unites the old formula with the new; "here sleeps" is a mere poetic variation of "here lies," while the concluding lines name the maker of the tomb. The occurrence of the old formula at the end in addition to the later formula at the beginning has been regarded above as belonging to the transition period, before the old formula had been forgotten; and most of the cases where the old and the new are united are in metrical epitaphs which seem to belong to the period 340–360 A.D.

The comparison to the dove is suggested by the type found (sometimes in relief, sometimes incised) on many tombstones of Lycaonia. One example, much defaced but still recognizable, from Isaura Nova has already been published[2]; in 1905 I found several others close to the town.

[1] See *Lycaonian and Phrygian Notes*, in *Classical Review*, 1905, p. 425.

[2] Miss Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 288. As the symbol was then unique in the district, it was unsafe to say anything about its meaning at that time. Now the other examples show what it was intended to represent.

Another is very important: it is engraved on a large block of fine Dorla limestone, 5 feet 2 inches by 3 feet, very like in character to the tomb of the Makarios Papas[1] at Dorla and probably made in the same workshop. The ornamentation is in the triple schema common at Dorla (Isaura Nova). The centre pediment (round) contains a bird (probably intended for a pigeon or dove) standing on the top of a large garland. Below the garland is a bird (the body of which is mutilated behind by fracture of the stone) with a leaf in its mouth; there can be no doubt that this represents the dove with the leaf in its mouth. The inscription at the top is much obliterated, but it mentions Aur. Domna (distinguished?) by virginity and industry, and her father Aur. Orestianos, son of Cyrus, who made the tomb. We may feel fairly confident that this noble monument is older than 300 A.D. The wife of Orestianos bore the name of Aur. Septimia Domna, which clearly points to the third century: these names must have come into the family about 200 and are not likely to have persisted for a very long time.

The other examples prove that this type of the dove became common in Lycaonia; and finally the epitaph of Gourdos mentions the dove as typical of the deceased Presbyter.

As regards the titles of Church officials, therefore, the usage in those inscriptions, which we have classified as belonging to the fourth century, may be compared with that of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Book II.:—

(1) The inscriptions tend to retain more generally the title Presbyter.

(2) They use the title Bishop more rarely.

(3) They use the title Hiereus, which carries with it the sacerdotal idea, much more rarely.

(4) One inscription has the word "sacred," where the *Constitutions* used "ecclesiastical."

[1] See EXPOSITOR, 1905, p. 214.

These differences are not serious. They point to a slightly more primitive style of expression, which might be explained either because the inscriptions were on the average slightly earlier than the *Constitutions*, or because the inscriptions, though of practically the same period, yet as embodying popular usage were not quite so developed in expression, clung to the simpler terminology, and had not yet adopted the more formal and systematic ecclesiastical or sacerdotal forms of expression. Bearing in mind that the older Lycaonian inscriptions stretch over a considerable period (including both those which have been classified as possibly of the second half of the third century, and those which are probably of the middle of the fourth century), we may fairly regard the comparison as distinctly confirming the chronological scheme which has been adopted.

Setting aside a few which are clearly Byzantine in character, we may hold that the mass of those numerous Lycaonian Christian documents are of the period 260–400. Their abundance during that time, and their rarity later, confirm the general impression that is given by Anatolian epigraphy. Inscriptions on stone become much rarer all over the western parts of the country after 300 A.D. In Lycaonia we have supposed that the inscriptions, becoming numerous at a later date than further west, continued to be common for nearly a century later. This point of view suggests that if our chronology in Lycaonian inscriptions needs modification, the change that is required would be to place them earlier, and not later.

Why did epigraphy die out during the fourth century? Several causes may have contributed to this result, viz. :—

1. It is possible that writing on perishable materials, such as paper, was more practised in the fourth century and later, and writing on stone became less frequent.

2. Fashion may have changed. There can be no doubt that the Christian custom seems to have recoiled from the

exaggerated respect paid among Anatolian pagans to the construction of a tomb as almost the most important and binding of religious duties, and that the form and character of the epitaphs changed towards greater brevity and simplicity. There may probably have been also a change in the way of discarding altogether epitaphs and tombstones.

3. Education probably deteriorated: a bishop of Hadrianopolis in Phrygia, present at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., had to get a helper to sign for him because he did not know how to write.[1]

In publishing these notes on a very difficult subject, my chief aim is to elicit correction or confirmation from other scholars.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE TEXT AND EXEGESIS OF MARK XIV. 41, AND THE PAPYRI.

THE text of this passage according to the viiith edition of Tischendorf runs as follows:

καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοῦ κ.τ.λ.

The great stumbling block in this verse has always been the apparently meaningless *ἀπέχει*. Yet modern critics[2] felt themselves not free to omit it altogether (as perhaps St. Matthew did: xxvi. 45), because it is impossible then to

[1] *Histor. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 92.

[2] In the Novum Testamentum Graece . . in usum studiosorum, by Prof. J. M. S. Baljon, Groningae, 1898, however, the words *ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα* have been printed in brackets. A note is added which runs as follows: *απεχει· ηλθεν η ωρα absurda lectio est.* D *απεχει το τελος και η ωρα.* Michelsen (*Het evangelie van Markus*, pag. 25–27) *conjecit απεχει τελος η ωρα Mihi videtur* (*Theol. Studien*, 1887, pp. 195–6) *απεχει —ωρα glossema esse.*

To this opinion the whole of our present inquiry is an objection and perhaps a decisive one. Moreover it is rather difficult to see how De Baljon can consider such a vexed passage as a gloss. Glosses commonly add explanatory matter and are usually distinguished by their plain senselessness.