

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

TARSUS.

XIV. TARSUS THE HELLENISTIC CITY.

IN the two centuries which followed the foundation of the new Hellenized Tarsus the surroundings and environment amid which St. Paul was educated were in process of development. But this period of Tarsian history is, if possible, more obscure than the earlier period. It was the fortunate coincidence of literary and numismatic evidence that illuminated the foundation of Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus. Hardly a ray of light illuminates any point in the following period until we come down to the time of the Emperor Augustus and the great Tarsian philosopher and statesman Athenodorus. A very brief section will suffice for the end of the Greek period.

The oblivion into which the Greek name Antioch quickly fell, and the speedy restoration of the native Anatolian name Tarsus, may be taken as indicating that the Greek element had not attained undisturbed predominance in the newly founded city. The continuity of Tarsian history was not interrupted seriously: the city felt itself to be the ancient Tarsus, and not the new Antioch. Tarsus could never be a thoroughly Hellenized city: Antioch-on-the-Cydnus might have been so.

Upon the coins we read the same tale. The few coins struck by Antioch-on-the-Cydnus are thoroughly Hellenic in character: the head of the City (idealized as a divine figure wearing a crown of walls and turrets) and the sitting figure of Zeus have on the surface nothing Oriental about them. The sitting Zeus had long been a Tarsian type; but formerly, even when no Aramaic letters gave him the Oriental name of Baal, there were usually symbols or adjuncts unsuited to the Greek Zeus, which gave an Eastern

and non-Hellenic character to the representation.¹ In the period 171-164 the Tarsian Zeus appears almost purely Greek.

Even the coins of the following period, on which the old name Tarsus reappeared, were distinctly more Hellenic than those of the older time. On some coins the Antiochian types remained, when the name of Antioch disappeared. Another common type showed the Good Fortune of Tarsus seated on a chair, with the river-god Cydnus at her feet: it was imitated from a famous statue by the Greek artist Eutyichides, representing the Good Fortune of Antioch, the Syrian capital. But the Tarsian figure has something about it which stamps it as the Oriental imitation of Greek work. The Greek sculptor had showed the Fortune of Antioch seated on the rocks, at whose feet was the river Orontes: the Tarsian imitator placed his goddess on a chair, with which the Cydnus is out of keeping. The tone and harmony of a Greek ideal is wanting here. Moreover, another very common type which now appears for the first time on Tarsian coins is entirely and strikingly Oriental and Anatolian. This is a young male god, who stands on a winged and horned lion, wearing a tiara and holding in his hands sometimes bow-case and sword, sometimes flower and double-edged battle-axe. This deity is the same as one who appears on the walls of the ancient rock sanctuary at Pteria in the north-west of Cappadocia, in the stately procession of Hittite gods and goddesses who attend the great god and the great goddess as they stand face to face with one another in the Holy Marriage, the most sacred mystic ceremony of the whole ritual. Such an utterly unhellenic figure as this god stands in marked contrast with the Greek head of the City-Goddess, which

¹ Such as grapes and corn-ears, which marked the giver of corn and wine.

appears on the other side of the same coins. It is as if the double character and mixed population of the city, Greek and Oriental, appropriated each one side of the coins.

Tarsus, with the rest of Cilicia, long remained a part of the decaying Seleucid empire. The dynasty grew weaker ; disorder and civil war tormented the state ; but the arrogant ambition of princes who could hardly maintain their position at their capital on the Orontes, still prompted them to seek to enlarge their empire by adding foreign lands to their inheritance, as, for example, when the Egyptian throne was vacant in 123 B.C.

The Hellenic grasp on Asia was relaxing. There was little enough of Hellenism at a court like that of the last Seleucid kings ; but it was all that remained of the Greek sovereignty in the East.

During this period we hear practically nothing about Tarsus ; but it continued to coin its own money as a free city. Between 150 and 100 B.C. silver coins of the Seleucid kings bearing Tarsian types, but not the name of Tarsus, were sometimes struck. In the growing weakness of the sovereignty this can hardly imply that the Seleucid kings were tightening their grasp upon Tarsus ; more probably the choice of Tarsian types was meant by way of compliment to the city as a main support of the Seleucid State.

As the Greek element in Asia grew weaker, the Asiatic spirit revived and attempted to throw off the bonds that European domination had placed upon it. About 83 the Asiatic reaction overwhelmed Tarsus. No authority records whether Tarsus was affected internally by the reaction ; but during the years that followed the armies of Tigranes, king of Armenia, swept over Cilicia and Northern Syria. Tarsus, though not named in the brief record, must have fallen under his power, as did Soloi which lay farther away to the west. Not until the reorganization of the East by

Pompey the Great in 65-4 B.C. was the European hold of Cilicia renewed: the Province of Cilicia now became far more important and well defined.

XV. TARSUS AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN PROVINCE CILICIA.

When the Roman province of Cilicia was first instituted about 104 or 102 B.C. neither Tarsus nor the Cilician plain was made part of Roman territory. They continued, as has been stated above, to belong to the Seleucid kingdom. The Province was instituted chiefly in order to control the pirates of Cilicia Tracheia (the mountainous region west of the level Cilician plain), and to maintain peace on the coasts and the waters of the Levant. Harbours and stations on the land of Tracheia were necessary for this purpose, but the plain and the cities of Cilicia proper were not occupied.¹ The Cilician Province was not as yet a strictly territorial province: the term was used rather in the older sense of "a sphere of duty." The Roman governor of Cilicia was charged with the care of Roman interests generally in the south and east of Asia Minor and on the Levant coasts and waters. He went wherever the pressing needs of the occasion called him. He seems, when it was necessary, to have been in the habit of marching through lands which were not as yet in any real sense Roman; and this implies that some vague right to free movement across those regions had been conceded to, or assumed by, the Romans. The two Provinces of Asia and Cilicia divided between them the execution of Roman policy in Asia Minor; and apparently the only principle of division was that what did not clearly belong to the Province of Asia fell in the Cilician sphere of duty.

The limits of the Cilician Province were vague and never defined: they varied, also, at different times. We find

¹ Appian, *Syr.* 48.

the governor of Cilicia active on the Pamphylian and Lycian coast and in Lycaonia. At one time even great part of Phrygia was detached from Asia and placed in the Cilician Province: such was the case, for example, when Cicero governed Cilicia in 51 B.C. This extension, evidently, originated during the time when the pirates constituted a danger so great that Roman ships were afraid to sail along the Levant coasts. The governor of Cilicia was then obliged to land at Ephesus, and to go by road into Cilicia. As he marched across Phrygia it was convenient for him to hold the assizes in the great cities. After Pompey put down the pirates in 67 and opened the sea once more, the connexion of Phrygia with Cilicia was maintained for a considerable time, and Cilicia was then the most important of the Eastern Provinces in a political view.

The indefiniteness in regard to Roman Cilicia between 103 and the reorganization by Augustus in 27 B.C. was due to the confused condition of Eastern politics. First there was the period of Mithridates and of the Oriental reaction which is associated with his name, and thereafter began the period of the Civil Wars. In the first period the Roman policy was uncertain in its aims and generally ineffective; in the later there was no policy at all till the issue of the struggle was determined.

In the decay of all the Greek dynasties, which marked the later second century and the earlier half of the first century, there was in Asia Minor no possible rule except either Roman or Asiatic; and, not unnaturally, the Roman government shrank from the gigantic task of administering the affairs of the East, while it was also reluctant to withdraw its hand and power from the country altogether. The uncertainty of Roman aims weakened its power; and the necessary result of the slackening of its grasp was that the Asiatic princes, like Mithridates of Pontus and Tigranes of

Armenia, seized the opportunity to assert their freedom against Roman dictation and to enlarge their kingdoms by western conquest. At first they even found allies among the Hellenic states and cities generally. Dread and dislike of Rome united Hellene and Asiatic. Mithridates not merely overran the whole of the Province of Asia, but even sent his armies into Greece and was welcomed for a moment as a deliverer by cities like Athens. He had, however, miscalculated his power, and he only succeeded by over-ambition in compelling the Romans to exert their power, and in making it clear that no compromise, no partition of Asia Minor between Rome and the Asiatic princes, nothing but war to the knife ending in either the subjection of Asia or the ejection of all Europeans, was possible at that time.

The task imposed on the Roman government, however, was too great. It could conquer, but it could not administer. Its general, Pompey, destroyed Mithridates and Tigranes, and regulated after a fashion the East. He set up kings and dethroned kings, founded cities, gave constitutions and laws ; but his work was ineffective, when the central government was paralysed. Some fixed purpose and definite policy was needed, but the Roman Senatorial government had no clear ideas in Eastern policy, and was powerless to maintain order.

To attain a state of permanent peace, it was necessary to conciliate in a single State the warring elements, Oriental and Western. These elements cannot be adjusted and conciliated by any government acting from above and from outside ; but they will work out their own balance and equipoise, if a strong hand enforces order.

Augustus at last, with his clear practical sense, seems to have divined the nature of the situation. Like the Senate, he shrank from undertaking the task of administering the East. He did not at first greatly enlarge the Roman terri-

tory. He continued the traditional Roman policy of entrusting frontier lands to dependent kings. But he insisted that these kings must maintain order and peace, and that they must administer their charge to Roman satisfaction. He regarded them as agents, entrusted with the duty of civilizing and training their subjects up to the level of orderliness suitable for incorporation in the Roman Empire as Provinces.

So he allowed a large kingdom in central Asia Minor to remain under charge of Amyntas, king of Galatia, until 25 B.C. Then, on the sudden and unexpected death of Amyntas in battle, he took the inheritance of this kingdom, and formed it into the Province Galatia, while the private property of the king, including the vast estates of the god round Pisidian Antioch, were added to his own private property.

The importance of the older Province Cilicia now disappeared. For about a century the Province Galatia included the charge of Roman interests and policy in central and eastern Asia Minor, while Cilicia was a mere adjunct to the great Province of Syria.

In this Cilician Province Tarsus necessarily played its part as the capital; but its name is rarely mentioned in the Republican time. It exercised little influence on a policy which was frankly Roman and almost regardless of the rights or interests of the subject people. Such had been the policy of the Republican government. The Imperial policy, on the contrary, was from the beginning thoroughly alive to the duty that Rome owed to the subject races. These non-Roman races were to be treated fairly, governed honestly and for their own benefit, educated up to the level of Roman citizenship, and gradually admitted to the citizenship year by year, now one person, now another, as each individual earned in one way or another this honour

and privilege. Such was the ideal which the Empire set before itself, and which the great Emperors, like Trajan, tried to realize. In the Imperial period, accordingly, there was far greater opportunity than before for the prosperity and development in its own line of a provincial city. Both the individual subjects and the cities of the Provinces had a career opened to them in aiding the wellbeing of the whole Empire. A provincial city henceforth could have a history of action, and not merely a history of suffering.

It would be too little to say that there was general contentment with the new order. The older Provinces in general, and Tarsus in particular, were filled with enthusiastic loyalty to the Empire, which had brought with it peace, order, justice, fair collection of a not too burdensome taxation, and good government generally, in spite of isolated exceptions and failures.

With the Empire Tarsus emerges once more into the light of history. We can hardly even guess what was the state of the city for a long time previously. We cannot say whether the Oriental element in the city was stirred to sympathy with the Mithridatic reaction. But it is certain that nothing could have happened which was more calculated to strengthen the Western spirit in Tarsus than the conquest by a barbarian like Tigranes. There was inevitably a revulsion in the city towards Hellenism, and Roman policy always was directed to encourage and strengthen the hold of Hellenism on the Eastern Provinces. The trained and practical instinct of the Rome did not seek to destroy Greek civilization in Asia in order to put Roman civilization in its place, but treated the two as allied and united in the task of training the Oriental. Hence the reaction from the barbarism of Armenian rule was in favour of Rome as well as of Hellenism.

Such being the character of the Roman administration

in the Provinces, it is not strange that Tarsus (which is practically unknown to us during the Republican period, except as a point on Cicero's journeys through his Province and a place of occasional residence),¹ begins to emerge into light the moment that Julius Caesar, the true founder of the Empire, entered its gate for a brief visit, during his march from Egypt northwards against the Pontic king and his Roman allies of the Senatorial party. Then the feelings and desires of the Tarsians begin to appear, and we find that they were frankly and enthusiastically for the Empire and against the Republic and the Senate. They were so devoted to Julius Caesar that they called their city Juliopolis, and afterwards they were well disposed to his nephew the future Emperor Augustus on his uncle's account. Cassius, acting on behalf of the Senatorial party, compelled the Tarsians and Tarkondimotos, the client-king of the eastern parts of Cilicia, to come over to his side in 43 B.C., when he was preparing for the campaign which ended in the battle of Philippi during the following year. But when Cassius marched on into Syria, and Dolabella approached Cilicia in the interests of the Caesarian party, Tarsus gladly joined him and took an active part in the war against Cassius and against the neighbouring city of Adana, which they considered to be favourable to Cassius. On the approach of troops sent by Cassius, however, Tarsus yielded without fighting. The Tarsians could make war on a rival town, but they dared not resist Roman soldiers. Municipal jealousies and rivalry were thus mixed with the wider politics of the time, and were with many people more powerful, because nearer at hand, than the larger interests

¹ It is only twice named in his writings, *Att.* v. 20, 3, *Fam.* ii. 17, 1; but it is implied as the place where he was residing during certain events; but no light whatsoever is thrown by this Roman governor on the condition of the capital of his Province. He was wholly taken up with Roman matters.

of the great world-struggle. Dion Chrysostom, a century and a half later, speaks of the old feud between Tarsus and Adana.

Cassius soon afterwards entered Tarsus, and requisitioned all the money he could from the state and from private individuals, but did not make any massacre.

When Antonius came to the East to represent the power of the victorious Triumvirs, in accordance with the arrangement which gave him the command of the Eastern Provinces and Augustus the command of Italy and the West, Tarsus hoped to reap the reward of its sufferings. It was complimented for its loyalty ; it was granted the status of a " free city," *libera civitas*—which implied that while continuing to be part of the Empire, i.e. of the Province, it was governed according to its own laws and not on Roman law—along with the right to duty-free export and import trade. Antony resided for some time at Tarsus, and here occurred his famous meeting with Cleopatra, when the Egyptian queen sailed in her splendid galley up the river Cydnus and entered Tarsus in all the pomp of Oriental luxury.

The privileges which Antony had bestowed on Tarsus were renewed or confirmed by Augustus, when he became master of the whole Roman world after the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. Hence it was open to Dion Chrysostom, who naturally ignored Antony and took account only of the recognized line of transmission of the Imperial authority, to speak to the Tarsians about Augustus as the author of all their privileges. Augustus recognized the importance of Tarsus and treated it with great favour.

It is clear from the preceding account that Pompey, Julius Caesar, Antony, and Augustus are all likely to have given the Roman citizenship to a certain number of important Tarsians. Those who received this honour from Antony would certainly have to pay for it. Any Roman

Tarsian born about the time of Christ would probably have as his Roman names either Gnaeus Pompeius, or Gaius Julius, or Marcus Antonius.

XVI. THE ORIENTAL SPIRIT IN TARSUS.

It has been pointed out that the balance in the constitution of Tarsus depended on the presence of both Greeks and Jews in the state. The older native element (into which the original Ionian Greek stock had melted and been lost) was doubtless the larger numerically, but was probably more inert and passive, not guiding but following. The control and guidance lay in the hands of the two enterprising and vigorous races. This view implies that the Greeks and the Jews tended to opposite sides in municipal politics. In the Seleucid time it may be regarded as practically certain that the Greeks insisted on autonomy and laid more stress on the liberty and right of self-government in the city, while the Jews clung to and championed the Seleucid connexion. The Greeks always and everywhere in the world tended to exaggerate the rights of the individual. The Jews were more likely to remember that they had been placed in the city by the kings, and depended on the kings for protection against Greek dislike and enmity. The sense of a common interest made the Jews trusted and trustworthy colonists in the Seleucid foundations.

Now comes the question that is of the most vital importance for Tarsian municipal history. What form did this balance and opposition between Greek and Jew take in the Roman Tarsus? As before, the Greeks inevitably insisted on the rights of the individual, and on the freedom of the citizen from external control; wherever the Greek element is strong, the law is weak, and the government is guided rather by caprice than by principles. That has

been the fact throughout all history ; the Greeks are more prosperous under almost any other government than under their own.

This Greek spirit was diametrically opposed to the Roman law-making and law-abiding spirit. We should expect to find that the Roman administration in Tarsus trusted more to the Jewish element as more conservative and more serious, more consistent and less capricious, than the Greek. As regards the Republican period there is no evidence.

In the beginning of the Imperial time the city as a whole was agreed in support of the party of Caesar, and afterwards of the Triumvirs against the Senate. Partly the rivalry against Adana, still more the hatred against the tyranny of the Senatorial government, made the general body of the citizens unite. The Jews over the Roman world generally seem to have been enthusiastic supporters of Julius Caesar and Suetonius ¹ mentions that in Rome the Jews mourned vehemently throughout successive nights at his tomb ; and naturally they took an active part in the popular movements on his side. Naturally, also, the Jews of Palestine remembered that Pompey had profaned the Holy of Holies, and that Julius Caesar had avenged them of their enemy. There is no reason to think that the Tarsian Jews differed from the rest of their race.

The later history of Tarsus, however, as will be recounted in a following section, shows the Greek element about the time of Christ in strong opposition to the policy of Augustus ; and a suppression of popular liberty was carried through by Athenodorus, the friend of Augustus, armed with authority from the Emperor himself. The change in the constitution was emphatically anti-Hellenic in character, and could not but strengthen the Oriental element in the city.

¹ Suetonius, *Jul.* 85.

That brings up another question, what was the attitude of the large native population, the old Tarsian stock, in the Roman time? We may take Athenodorus as a specimen. He was born in a country village near Tarsus, from which he took his surname Cananites.¹ He was trained in the Greek philosophy, but his school was the Stoic, which had a marked Oriental complexion, and numbered among its leaders many men of Oriental birth. He would naturally carry with him the native population, for it was strongly Oriental in character, and therefore had little eagerness for that freedom of the individual, which was so dear to the Greeks that they were willing to sacrifice for it order, government, and the true freedom of the community as a whole. The opposition which, during the second century B.C., naturally existed between the old native population and the new colonists, both Hebrews and Greeks, must have gradually disappeared, as the generations passed; and new grouping of the Tarsian parties came into being to suit new conditions. The Oriental element, including both Jews and the old Cilician people, stood over against the Greek element. The latter was distinctly weaker, and the Oriental character in Tarsus must therefore have been strongly accentuated.

That this was so is proved by the evidence of Dion Chrysostom in the two orations which he delivered to the Tarsians about A.D. 110. He had come with the approval of the Emperor Trajan on an informal mission to several of the great cities of the East; his petition was, thus, not unlike that of Athenodorus in the time of Augustus. Neither held any regular office or was armed with formal

¹ I have suggested in *Hastings' Dictionary*, art. Tarsus, that he may have been a native of Cana or Kanna in Lycaonia; but this is of course uncertain, Strabo only says that the epithet was derived "from a certain village." The possibility that Athenodorus was a Jew, Kananites, might be suggested, but cannot be proved.

authority, but both carried with them the immense informal influence that the personal friendship and support of the Emperor conferred in the eyes alike of Roman officials and of the provincial population. Dion Chrysostom was a Greek of Bithynia, Greek not by race, but by temperament, by education, and by a really deep and genuine admiration for the ancient Hellenic literature and achievements in all departments of life. His evidence about Tarsus, therefore, is peculiarly valuable.¹

Dion was struck with the non-Hellenic character of Tarsus and of Cilicia in general. He acknowledges that Tarsus was a colony of the Argives ; but its spirit was not Greek. One asked, as one surveyed Tarsus, whether these people were Greeks or the worst of the Phoenicians. In speaking to the Rhodians Dion praised their Hellenism ; even a barbarian who visited Rhodes would be impressed by the old Hellenic spirit, and would recognize at once that he had entered no Syrian or Cilician city, but one that was truly Greek. In speaking to the Tarsians, on the contrary, he recognizes nothing that is Hellenic among them, and little that is good in manners. Only one Tarsian characteristic does he praise unreservedly, and that he praises, though it was, as he says, utterly different from the Hellenic custom. He was much pleased with the extremely modest dress of the Tarsian women, who were always deeply veiled when they went abroad. As Tarsian ladies walked in the street, you could not see any part either of their face or of their whole person, nor could they themselves see anything out of their path. They were separate from the public world, while they walked in it.

Now the difference of spirit between one race and another is nowhere else so strongly marked as in their treatment

¹ It is collected by my friend and old pupil, Professor T. Callender, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 58 ff.

of women and their customs regarding the conduct and dress of women. The complete Oriental veiling of women was practised in Tarsus, and thus even this Graeco-Roman city was marked as an Oriental, not a Greek town. The Greek was swallowed up in the Oriental; and wherever the two elements meet in Asia, either they must hold apart or the Greek is gradually merged in the Oriental.

We may notice in passing how strong an effect was produced on the mind of St. Paul by his Tarsian experience in this respect. It is, as a rule, the impressions of childhood that rule one's prejudices in regard to the conduct of women; and the Apostle prescribes to the Corinthians ¹ a very strict rule about the veiling of women. Whereas men are to have their heads uncovered in church, it is disgraceful for women to be unveiled there. Now it would be quite possible that a Greek or a Roman should reach this opinion as to the conduct of women in church. So far as this command goes, it was quite in accordance with the ideas of the most orderly and thoughtful among those peoples and quite in keeping with the customs of good society. But there is one little touch in St. Paul's sermon about women that reveals the man brought up amid Oriental custom. He says that "the woman ought to have authority upon her head." This seems so strange to the Western mind that the words have been generally reckoned among the most obscure in the whole of the Pauline writings. A vast amount has been written by commentators about them, almost entirely erroneous and misleading, and sometimes false to Greek language and its possibilities. Most of the ancient and modern commentators say that the "authority" which the woman wears on her head is the authority to which she is subject—a preposterous idea which a Greek scholar would laugh at anywhere except in

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 3-16.

the New Testament, where (as they seem to think) Greek words may mean anything that commentators choose. Authority or power that belongs to the wearer, such power as the magistrate possesses in virtue of his office, is meant by the Greek word *ἐξουσία*. So Diodorus i. 47 describes the statue of the mother of the Egyptian king Osymandyas, wearing three royalties upon her head, i.e. she possessed the royal dignity in three different ways, as daughter, wife and mother of a king.¹ The woman who has a veil on her head wears authority on her head: that is what the Greek text says. To the European the words are unintelligible; but that is because he is a European. He must cease for a moment to be a European and pass into the realm of life and thought in which the words apply. Then he will understand them.

To the Oriental the words are simple and clear: they describe the ordinary fact of life. Their meaning has been well described by Rev. W. M. Thomson, in his work *The Land and the Book*, p. 31, in which he has set down the ripe knowledge acquired during thirty years' residence in Syria and Palestine. It was my good fortune not to read this book until I had been visiting Turkey for many years and had learned enough to appreciate the intimate knowledge which guides the thought and expression of the author. The book seems now to be little read; but scholars would find it far more instructive and educative than many of the more learned and more ignorant works produced by Palestinian tourist savants, who see only the surface of the land and people among whom they make hasty excursions, and then judge about custom and character.

¹ *ἔχουσαν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς*. This passage, which is so perfect an example of what Paul did mean, is actually quoted (e.g. in Heinrici-Meyer's *Kommentar*) as a proof that *ἐξουσία* means the authority to which the woman is subject.

I have no prejudice (as many young travellers have) against the tourist who dwells in the tents of Cook. On the tour he learns much in the subject which he has been previously studying, and in which he is able to learn more in a few weeks or months of travelling. But sometimes, conscious how much he has learned in the line of his competence and how much more real, perhaps, the history of Palestine has become to him, he fails to appreciate the limits imposed by the circumstances of his tour.

In Oriental lands the veil is the power and the honour and dignity of the woman. With the veil on her head, she can go anywhere in security and profound respect. She is not seen ; it is the mark of thoroughly bad manners to observe a veiled woman in the street. She is alone. The rest of the people around are non-existent to her, as she is to them. She is supreme in the crowd. She passes at her own free choice, and a space must be left for her. The man who did anything to annoy or molest her would have a bad time in an Oriental town, and might easily lose his life. A man's house is his castle, in so far as a lady is understood to be there ; without her it is free to any stranger to enter as guest and temporary lord.

But without the veil the woman is a thing of nought, whom any one may insult. The true Oriental, if uneducated in Western ways, seems to be inclined naturally to treat with rudeness, to push and ill-treat, a European lady in the street. A woman's authority and dignity vanish along with the large, all-covering veil that she discards. That is the deep-lying idea in the language of the Apostle.

XVII. ROMANS OTHERWISE TARSIANS.

With Pompey's settlement of the East in 64 B.C. began probably the long series of Tarsian-Roman citizens, one of whom is known to us as "Saul otherwise called Paul."

In the Republican time Roman citizenship was not so frequently given as in the Imperial time ; but it is natural and probable that Pompey, when he conquered the Cilician plain in 66, may have found some of the leading Tarsians useful to him in regulating the country for the new system, and rewarded them with the Roman citizenship. It was a matter of pride and also of real advantage in various ways for a Roman noble to have clients and connexions in the great provincial cities ; he aided them and acted for them in Rome, while they added to his dignity as a Roman and furthered his interests in their respective countries.

Such new citizens would naturally take his name, Gnaeus Pompeius, retaining generally as a cognomen or third name their original Hellenic designation. The Roman name Gnaeus Pompeius would thereafter persist in succeeding generations as a family name, and all male descendants of the family would bear it, being distinguished from one another by their various cognomina or additional names. If we had any lists of Tarsian citizens during the first two centuries of the Empire, we should probably find in them more than one family bearing the name Pompeius.

Hence arises a difference between Roman names in Republican usage and these Roman names in the Provinces. In strict Roman usage Gnaeus was the name of the individual, Cornelius or Pompeius or so forth was the name of the *gens* of which he was a member and the cognomen was often the name of his family (e.g. Scipio), though sometimes a personal epithet given to himself (e.g. Magnus to Pompey). But when a large number of families took such names universally as Gnaeus Pompeius, Gaius Julius, Tiberius Claudius, Marcus Antonius, these wholly ceased to be distinctive and the cognomen alone was individual and distinguishing. As the third name was the distinguishing name among such Roman provincial families, it was for ordinary

purposes far the most important. A person was generally known by it, whereas if he were mentioned by the more dignified appellation of Gnaeus Pompeius, this would leave his personality uncertain, for other members of one or more families were so designated. In some inscriptions it may be noticed that the more familiar part of the name, the cognomen (or even in some cases a fourth name, given as a still more familiar and, as it were, pet name) is engraved at the top in a line by itself in larger letters, while the full name is stated in letters of ordinary size in the body of the inscription. This, it may be observed, is one out of many ancient usages, in which large letters were employed to mark superior importance or direct the reader's attention to the words so emphasized (compare Gal. vi. 11).

The result of this superior importance was that the full name was used only in more formal and complimentary designation, and especially was necessary as a legal designation; but, in the ordinary life of Hellenistic cities like Tarsus, the full name sank almost out of use and out of notice. Hence no full Roman names occur in the New Testament, although it stands (according to our view) in such close and intimate, though often hidden, relation with the Roman life and policy in the Provinces; because the New Testament moves on the plane of everyday life, and is expressed in the common speech, sometimes in quite colloquial style. This is most noticeable in the personal names. In many cases the familiar abbreviated or diminutive form of a name was used in place of the correct form, as in Apollos, Silas, Loukas, Epaphras, Priscilla¹: in some of these the correct form of the word never occurs in the New Testament, in others we find both, as in

Epaphras and Epaphroditus,

Apollos and Apollonius (Bezan Text once),

Priscilla and Prisca;

¹ The termination *illa* was often used to form diminutive or pet names.

and, where both occur, it will be observed that either the natural tendency to more formal and elaborate politeness made some speakers use the correct name, whereas other speakers tended to use the more colloquial and familiar name, or the occasion sometimes demanded more formality from a speaker who at other times employed the familiar name; e.g. Paul uses the formal names Silvanus and Prisca, Luke always speaks of Silas and Priscilla; Paul uses the name Epaphras in writing to the Colossians and to Philemon, for they were familiar with the personality of their fellow-townsmen, but to the Philippians who were strangers he speaks of Epaphroditus. In these examples, which might be multiplied, we see the variations of ordinary social usage; some people tend to use diminutives more freely than others, and the same person will designate another according to the occasion, now more formally, now by the diminutive.

But the formal Roman double name was simply not employed at all in the ordinary social usage of Hellenic cities. The Greeks never understood the Roman system of names, and when they tried to write the correct full Roman designation of one of their own fellow-citizens, who had attained to the coveted honour of Roman citizenship, they frequently made errors (as is shown in many inscriptions), just as at the present day Frenchmen frequently misuse English titles, and speak of Sir Peel or Lord Gladstone. The reason why the Greeks failed to understand the Roman system of names was because they never followed the Roman fashion except under compulsion. Greek custom gave one name to a man, and knew nothing of a family name, still less of the Roman gentile name (such as Pompeius); and so all Greeks spoke of their fellow-townsmen who had become Romans by their Greek names, as if they were still mere Hellenes and men of one name.

Thus it comes about that, although Paul, and Silas, and

Theophilus,¹ and probably various others mentioned in the New Testament, were Romans, the full Roman name of none of them is mentioned. This silence about the full legal name is no proof of ignorance or inaccuracy : it is just one of the many little details which show how close and intimate is the relation between the New Testament and the actual facts of life. But just as certain is it that Paul had two Roman names, praenomen and nomen, as it is that he was a Roman citizen. No one could be a Roman citizen without having a Roman name ; and, though he might never bear it in ordinary Hellenic society, yet as soon as he came in contact with the law and wished to claim his legal rights, he must assume his proper and full Roman designation. The peculiar character of the double system and civilization, Greek and Roman at once, comes into play. In Greek surroundings the Tarsian Roman remains a Greek in designation ; but in Roman relations his Roman name would necessarily be employed.

If Luke had completed his story and written the narrative of St. Paul's trial in Rome, we may feel confident of two things, first that he would probably have mentioned the Roman name at the opening of the trial ; and, secondly, that he might perhaps have made an error in setting down the name in Greek. The strict legal designation required the father's name and the tribe to be stated, and these had a fixed order : the Greeks constantly make some error or other in regard to order, when they try to express in Greek the Roman full designation.

Not merely had Paul a Roman praenomen and nomen ; but he was also enrolled in one of the Roman tribes. This was a necessary part of the citizenship, just as enrolment in one of the city Tribes was a necessary part of the citizen-

¹ On the Roman official, ὁ κρᾶτιστος Θεόφιλος, see *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 388.

ship of a Greek city. Now it may seem inconsistent that, after we have in a previous section proved so carefully that it was impossible for a Jew to become a member of an ordinary Greek city Tribe, and that a special Tribe restricted to Jews must be supposed in any Greek city where a single Jewish citizen can be proved to have existed, we should now lay it down as an assured and certain fact that Paul was an enrolled member of an ordinary Roman tribe. There is, however, no inconsistency. No Jew could become a member of a Hellenic city Tribe, because every such Tribe was a local body, meeting at intervals, and bound together by common religious rites, in which every member must participate. But the Roman tribes, though originally similar in character to the Greek Tribes, had long ceased to be anything more than political and legal fictions : they were mere names, from which all reality had long passed away ; their members were scattered all over the Roman world ; they never met, and therefore had no religious bond of union. It is indeed the case that, so long as the Roman people continued to vote, those members of the tribes who wished to vote and lived near enough to Rome must meet to exercise the vote, and some religious formality must have been practised at this meeting. But few of the widely scattered citizens could meet and vote. The Roman citizenship had other value than mere exercise of a vote, and citizens who lived in the provinces could never make any use of the vote. Moreover, after Tiberius became Emperor in 14 A.D., the Roman people ceased to meet in *comitia*, and the popular vote had no longer any existence. In tribes like these there was nothing to forbid a Jew from having himself enrolled ; and all Jews who became Roman citizens were *ipso facto* made members of a tribe, but membership was a mere matter of name.

Inasmuch as the Tarsian Jews were citizens of a Hellenic

city, their language was necessarily Greek, and all who were citizens bore Greek names (or at least names which were outwardly Greek). In some cases they may have taken names which were merely Grecized forms of Hebrew words ; but no example of this is known to me, though some may be suspected.¹ Some Jews in Hellenic cities certainly bore names which were equivalent in meaning to Hebrew names, as Stephanus to Atara, Gelasius to Isaac, Theophilus to Eldad or Jedidiah (among women Eirene to Salome).² But the great majority took ordinary Greek names, and hence arises the difficulty of tracing the history of the many thousands of Jewish families who settled in Lydia, Phrygia, and Cilicia. Only in a few cases can we trace a Jewish family through some accident betraying its nationality, as for example the curious name Tyrronius, found at Iconium, Sebaste and Akmonia (in all of which Jews were numerous), is proved to be Jewish,³ and at Akmonia the wealthy pair, Julia Severa and Servenius Capito, who are so often mentioned on coins, were almost certainly Jews. But, as a whole, the large Jewish population of those regions disappears from the view of history owing to their disuse of Hebrew names, so far as recorded.

In Roman Imperial times, when the Jews were protected and powerful, there was in some degree a revival of purely Jewish names. The name Moses is perhaps found at Termessos in a remarkable inscription of the third century : " I, Aurelius Mo[s]jes, son of Karpus, having been everywhere often and having often investigated the world, now lie in death no longer knowing anything ; but this only (I

¹ Possibly the strange name Tyrronius may be a Grecized Hebrew name : *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. pp. 639, 647-50.

² In some of these cases probably the Greek name was translated from a Jewish name used in Jewish circles (see below).

³ At Akmonia C. Tyrronius Klados was chief of the synagogue in the second half of the first century : *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 650.

say) ‘be of good courage, no man is immortal.’”¹ Another case is Reuben in a long Eumenian epitaph, also of the third century.²

Even in Greek times, however, it is highly probable that most of the Jews of Anatolia had a Hebrew name, which they used in their private life, at home and in the circle of the Synagogue. The Hebrew name was an alternative name, not an additional or second name. The bearer was called by one or by the other, according to the occasion, but not by both: to use one of the few certain examples, the Jew was “Paul otherwise Saul,” “Paul *alias* Saul.” In Greek surroundings he bore the one name, in Hebrew surroundings the other.

Whether there was any principle guiding the selection of the two names is quite uncertain.³ Sometimes the Greek probably translated the Hebrew. This topic is part of a wider question, the evidence on which has never been collected and estimated. In the Greek cities and colonies in alien lands, Thrace, Russia, the Crimea, and Asia generally, numerous examples occur of the alternative name. In many cases these belong evidently to the two languages of a bilingual city, one is Greek, one of the native tongue; but that is not a universal rule; there are plenty of cases, especially of a later time, in which both are Greek. The fact seems to be that as time passed and one language established itself as predominant in the city, the alternative names still persisted in popular custom, but were no longer taken from two different languages. The original rule, however, is the important one for our purpose: viz., that

¹ I propose to restore the text (unintelligible in *Bull. Corresp. Hell.* 1899, p. 189), *Αὐρ. Μω[νο]ῦ Κάρπου, ὁ πάντη πολλακίς γενόμενος καὶ τὸν κόσμον πολλακίς ἱστορήσας, νῦν δὲ κείμει μηκέτι μηδὲν εἰδὼς ταῦτα [δ]ὲ [μ]ό[ν]ο[ν], “εὐψύχει οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος.”*

² *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 386.

³ Sometimes the Greek probably translated the Hebrew.

the two names belong to the two languages in a bilingual society.

It was natural that the Jews should often take the names of those kings who had favoured them so much and opened to them the citizenship of many great cities. Alexander was certainly a common name among them, and perhaps also Seleucus, for both Alexander and Seleucus favoured and protected the Jews¹; but we can well imagine that after the restoration of Jewish power by the Maccabees the name of Antiochus may have become unpopular among the Jews. But, allowing that Alexander and Seleucus were popular names among them, it would be absurd to conjecture that every Alexander in Central Anatolia was a Jew. Even negative inferences are impossible. There is no reason to think that the Jews objected to names connected with idolatry, such as Apollonius, Artemas (or Artemidorus), Asklepiades, etc. Examples can be quoted of Jews bearing names of that kind, such as Apollonius or Apollos.²

Epigraphy, generally speaking, was public, not private; and in a Hellenic city public matters were expressed in Greek. Hence, as it is almost solely the public epigraphic memorials that have been preserved, we rarely know more than the Greek names of the Anatolian Jews, only occasionally the alternative name is stated. In the later Roman period, when a purely Jewish name was sometimes used in a public memorial, this may imply either that the alternative Greek (or Roman) name was disused by the individual, or that he had throughout life borne the Jewish name, without a Greek name. The examples of Moses and Reuben have been quoted above.

When a Jew, who was citizen of a Hellenic city, was

¹ Seleucus, *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 545; Alexander, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18, 7; *Cities and Bish.* ii. p. 672.

² *Cities and Bish.* ii. p. 672.

honoured with the Roman citizenship, the matter of nomenclature was complicated by the Roman triple name. As a Greek and as a Jew, such a citizen had a single name in each case ; as a Roman he had three names ; but the third of these names was, as a rule, identical with the Greek name. Thus we find a Jewish Christian at Hierapolis named " M. Aurelius Diodorus Koriaskos,¹ with extra name Asbolos." We may conjecture that Asbolos was the Christian baptismal name, " he whose sins had been black like soot." Diodoros was the Greek name, M. Aurelius Diodorus the Roman, and the second cognomen is of uncertain character, perhaps a familiar name in private life.

The Jews who became Roman citizens might naturally be expected to have as their *cognomina* in ordinary familiar use Greek names ; and especially the earliest of them must assuredly have had such Greek names. Latin cognomina, however, came into use occasionally ; and are more likely to have been employed in families where the Roman citizenship had been an inheritance for some generations. The one early case which is known with certainty is St. Paul, whose Roman first and second names are unknown ; his cognomen was Latin, not Greek ; and he had an alternative Hebrew name Saul. Yet he was a citizen of a Hellenic city, and therefore legally a Hellene (except in so far as Hellenic citizenship gave way to Roman citizenship), but as a Greek he passed under his Latin cognomen. As his father, and possibly also his grandfather, had possessed the Roman citizenship, the use of Latin speech and names was an inheritance in the family.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ ἐπικλην Ἀσβολος : the reading of the second cognomen Koriaskos or Koréskos is not quite certain, *Cities and Bish.* i. p. 118, No. 28 ; ii. p. 54 ff. ; Judeich, *Alterthümer von Hierapolis*, p. 142. I still believe against Judeich that the inscription is Christian, and specifically Jewish-Christian.