

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

known already as "the friend of publicans and sinners." But this is not a slur upon the movement. Rather is it the justification of the Divine Wisdom, in which "these things," the truth of the kingdom, have been hidden from "the wise and understanding," and revealed unto "babes." John's stern preaching of repentance has turned the hearts of publicans and harlots towards Jesus, so that they recognize and respond to the new, saving, Divine order. The Pharisees have virtually ignored John, and utterly failed to discern the meaning of the movement which he inaugurated, regarding its very tokens as a reason for viewing it with scorn and reprobation.

Surely it is a fitting climax to those utterances which assign to John his true position and declare the presence and efficacy of the kingdom in spite of bitter censure and contempt, that Jesus should go on to assert His complete oneness with His Father's purpose, His unique fellowship with the living God, and in virtue of His solitary authority, proclaim that in Himself alone the weary and the burdened shall find rest unto their souls. H. A. A. KENNEDY.

ANALECTA.

II. A LAODICEAN BISHOP.

IN the remarkable epitaph of the Lycaonian fourth-century bishop Engenius, Roman soldier and dignitary of the Christian Church, the phrase, "the life of men," τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον, in lines 17-18, attracts more careful attention. Mr. Calder takes it as "the life of this world," in distinction from the future life; and at first I entertained the same opinion; but hardly had the final proofs of our articles on the subject reached the printer's hands, when I felt that this was not the point which touched the mind of Eugenius. He was not thinking merely of

his approaching death. His intention was to renounce the life of the world and the intercourse of society, and devote himself to the Divine life—that is to say, he had resolved to become a hermit. This idea was in the air at the time. Only a few years later Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus conceived the same intention and carried it into effect for a time. That *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* can be used in the sense of the “world,” i.e., “mankind,” without any idea of contrast with the future world, needs no proof: it is an elementary point: *homines* in Latin is often used in the same way. The use belongs to all periods of the Greek language, and is natural to human thought.¹

The verb *ἀρνεῖσθαι* (which Mr. Calder suggested to me) agrees with the context and the sense required: *ἀρνούμενος τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον* would suit the conditions and the size of the lacuna on the sarcophagus,² and can very well be rendered “renouncing the life of society.” A better suggestion may, however, occur to some other mind. For the present, I have printed this restoration in a description of the “Lycaonian Church in the Fourth Century,” which is contained in a work ready for publication at the time when I am writing, *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion*, pp. 331–410. As it was not consistent with the plan of the book to discuss this question in detail, I take the present opportunity of defending and explaining my view.

While this view seems for its own sake much superior to the other, it has the further recommendation that a satisfactory restoration of the missing participle is difficult to find on the other interpretation, whereas it lies close at hand on this view.

¹ A quaint example may be quoted from Plato, *Lysis*, 211 E, τὸν ἀριστὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὄρνυγα ἢ ἀλεκτρυόνα, “the best quail or cock in the world.”

² It is of almost the same length as the word which he prints, only one letter longer; and it is impossible to specify exactly the number of letters in any space, as the size and distance of the letters vary widely.

The middle voice of *λείπω*, which Mr. Calder adopts, cannot be defended (as he fully recognizes) except on the supposition that it is a piece of bad Phrygian or Lycaonian Greek. He quotes an article of mine from a German Magazine,¹ in which it was shown that in Phrygian epitaphs the middle voice was not unfrequently used instead of the active; and *λείποιτο χηρὸν βίον* was actually one of the examples which I mentioned. But, in the first place, those documents stand on a far lower plane in respect of familiarity with and power of using the Greek language than the epitaph of Eugenius—even although (as Mr. Calder shows beyond dispute or question) its Greek is not that of a person who could handle the language quite freely and correctly. In the second place, while my other examples are right, the examples of *λείπεσθαι* used instead of the active voice must be cut out. My examples all occur in the same formula, a curse invoked on the violator of a grave, *ὀρφανὰ τέκνα λείποιτο, χηρὸν βίον, οἶκον ἔρημον*. Here the verb has the sense of “leave behind him”; and the middle is appropriate in that sense, “may he leave behind him orphan children, a widowed life, a desolate house.” Formerly I thought that the *βίος* which he was to leave was his own life; but the clearly preferable interpretation is that the life of his widow is meant, and the curse is that he die an untimely death, leaving children, widow and desolation behind him. The distinction between the middle and the active of the Greek verb *λείπω* may be illustrated by the story of the dialogue between two American millionaires about a third who had just died. “How much did he leave?” (middle voice), asked one. “My friend, he left everything” (active voice), was the reply.

The invariable expression in Anatolian epigraphy, even

¹ *Philologus*, 1888, p. 754 f.

of the humblest class expressed in the worst Greek, is *λείπειν βίον*, not *λείπεσθαι*; and the example quoted by Mr. Calder from one of the poorest class of epitaphs, *λίψας βίον*, shows the usual practice of north Lycaonia, a district where education was in a very backward condition. The restoration *λειψόμενος*, therefore, must be rejected.

Nor have I been able to find any other more suitable middle participle to take the place of *λειψόμενος* and give a similar sense. The middle voice would be quite right in the case of *ἀπαλλαξόμενος*, but it would require the genitive after it, whereas the accusative is the case used here; and, moreover, the word is too long for the gap. *Τελούμενος* might be justifiable as a middle future,¹ and it is of the right length; but it is out of keeping with the language of Anatolian epitaphs.

But the best defence and the one complete proof of the restoration *ἀρνούμενος* (or some equivalent word)² is that it gives the meaning which is suitable and required in this document.

Besides the many other points of interest in Mr. Calder's discovery, this may be added as not the least, that Eugenius is the earliest Christian leader in Asia Minor about whom we can say that he left the world and became a recluse.

But the question may be asked whether Eugenius's preparation of his grave was an act suitable to this intention. It has several times been pointed out that in Anatolia the making of one's grave in one's lifetime was a pagan custom, and was regarded by pagans as a duty and an act of religion. But Eugenius was not consciously performing an act of pagan religious observance. He was

¹ *τελέσασθαι* is used in a way that has some analogy.

² I have a strong feeling that *ἀρνούμενος* is the most suitable and probable word, simple and not above the standard of Greek as it was known in the Lycaonian and Pisidian country.

merely doing what it lay in his nature and heart to do. The old Anatolian nature and custom was very human. That a hermit should live in the unceasing contemplation of his own death, and should remind himself of it by having his coffin ready—even in some cases keeping the coffin always close beside him and within his view—is quite in accordance with human nature and especially with the character of the hermit.

It will be long before the import of the bishop's epitaph is fully comprehended and the many questions connected with it are solved. I may therefore be permitted to refer to three other points that arise in it.

1. As to the identification of Kouessos and Kousea, I was at first attracted by this suggestion of Mr. Calder's; and the difference of form is probably not insuperable, considering the variations to which non-Greek names were exposed in the process of adapting them to the Greek. But an insuperable difficulty is that Eugenius was born and remained through life a citizen of Laodiceia, whereas Kousea was a village on an imperial estate. The whole point of my treatment of the Tekmoreian inscriptions (in which Kousea is mentioned)¹ lies in the contrast between the Hellenized cities and the population of the imperial estates, dwelling in villages and possessing none of the rights and powers of citizenship in a free, self-governing Hellenic city-state like Laodiceia. The contrast between these two kinds of life and surroundings was strong and deep. It is pointed out in the paper just quoted that a certain number of persons passed from the cities to the villages on the imperial estates: ² "they were going back to the land . . . and reverting to Orientalism . . . abandoning

¹ *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, pp. 305-77.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 357 f.

their cities and settling in Anatolian villages, where the old Anatolian social system prevailed, and where such Hellenic ideas as citizenship and municipal duties and powers had never taken root.”

The opposite process, viz., that the native of a village on an imperial estate should settle in a free city, was illegal and impossible, or at least in the last degree improbable. It was contrary to the whole tendency of the time, and cannot be admitted without definite proof. Every consideration points in the opposite direction. Hellenism and city self-government were growing weaker and dying out. The Eastern spirit was reviving.

It is true that in those inscriptions one or two examples occur of persons acting as Tekmoreioi who were senators of Antiochia² and Apollonia, the two chief Graeco-Roman cities of the neighbourhood; but the cases are exceptional, and we cannot tell in what way it came about that these persons were initiated in the country rites. Perhaps they were there in an official capacity; perhaps they were in the first stage of slipping away from the Hellenic plane of life. We cannot with our scanty information give a biography of each individual mentioned in those long lists. But we can at least say that these senators had not yet settled in any village. They were still citizens; and the burdens of the senatorial order in the cities were so heavy that senators were not likely to be easily permitted to abandon their honourable and onerous position, even if they had desired to do so. The father of Eugenius and Eugenius himself were born in the senatorial order of Laodiceia.

Kousea, however, was one of the villages; and Socrates, a citizen of Synnada, had settled there and become a villager of Kousea,¹ so that its rank is assured.

¹ I am assuming that the restoration on p. 359 is certain, for it seems to impose itself as inevitable.

Otherwise, what Mr. Calder says about Kouessos seems perfectly right. It was doubtless one of the places in the territory of Laodiceia, an estate belonging to the family of Eugenius (as Karbala belonged to the family of Gregory Nazianzenos,¹ and many others were in a similar position), with the family residence (*tetrapyrgion*) and beside it a village of cultivators.² This class of residences was spread widely over central Asia Minor, and they probably existed in the villages of the imperial estates as well as on the land of free cities like Apameia.

2. When the reading *κεντήσεων* was established by Mr. Calder instead of *βεντήσεων* in the Vatican copy, I at first thought that it must mean "embroideries." It may be regarded as beyond doubt that embroidered hangings or curtains were used in churches. But, after some time, Mr. Calder suggested that the word should be connected with *κεντητήριον*, an instrument for piercing wood, and meant carved woodwork; and from the moment that he showed the possibility of this interpretation, it impressed me with a strong conviction that it is necessary and unavoidable. The Tyrian analogy, as he points out, is a strong argument. But far stronger are the facts of church architecture in Anatolia, in their relation to contemporary art and life—facts which were in great part unknown at the time, but which have become clear since his interpretation has placed us at the right point of view and directed our attention to the surrounding facts.

The architectural scheme of decoration on graves in the Isaurian country, and especially in the town of Nova Isaura, has been illustrated and described by Miss Ramsay

¹ *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 285.

² *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 373; *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 376; *Luke the Physician and other Studies in the History of Religion*, p. 187.

in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, pp. 1-60. This scheme takes the form generally of a triple, more rarely of a double or a single entrance way. When it is triple, the central doorway is generally arched and the sides surmounted by pointed pediments ; but occasionally the central part is pointed and the sides rounded ; and sometimes all three are rounded, or all pointed. Ornaments (usually symbolic and Christian in character) are added ; but the essential feature is the entrance (whether triple or double or single). This must be taken as the doorway of the grave ;¹ and, as in older Anatolian religion the grave was a temple, and where the temple was not completely built, the gravestone was regularly and usually carved to represent the door,² so the Christians conceived the grave as a church and represented the tombstone as the door. The triple doorway of the church at Tyre in the fourth century is described by Eusebius x. 4 ; and its central gateway was the largest. In several of the best Isaurian examples that is the case,³ though the central space is never made higher than the others, because the artistic rule was to make the relief equal in height throughout its whole breadth.

In Lycaonia the Christian gravestones of this period often

¹ In a new work, *Luke the Physician, etc.*, p. 380, I have expressed this view in a hesitating and tentative way. In fact I did so only through a correction of the text introduced into the page at the last moment. But, when once the idea had occurred to me, it roused so many analogies in its support and fitted so perfectly into the history of Anatolian religion, that I expressed it positively and definitely in the Preface, Contents, and Index of the same book.

² In some cases the gravestone was the altar, not the door ; but these are the two customary types, and the door is the most frequent. On the altar the word "Door" (*θύρα*) was sometimes engraved (see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, II.). Rarer, but still not uncommon, is the complete temple type ; and the sarcophagus was often carved to the form of a miniature temple.

³ For example, *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, pp. 22, 37 ; *Luke the Physician, etc.*, pp. 371, 383.

have a little door carved under the epitaph. In Isauria some of the examples are evidently doors, especially the single and double and triple arches. The single ones are merely slight modifications of the pagan door-type. The triple are most ornate, and often developed on sculptural lines, losing some of the architectural character, and especially changing the arch to a pointed pediment (which I have seen very rarely above a door in a building); but such development is natural and inevitable. Its progress is traced from sculpture to embroidery (where the pointed form is necessary) in Miss Ramsay's article above quoted, and examples of almost every known type may be found there. The whole subject needs fuller treatment than is here possible. The fondness of the Christians for a triple doorway to a church was the determining motive for the most characteristic Isaurian type, which is triple.

Now on two of these church-gravestones there is represented a reticulated object.¹ This I now understand to be a screen of reticulated woodwork. In one of the two cases this is quite evident; the other is not so obvious because the reticulation is more complicated. The variation in the way of representing the screen shows that already varieties in the way of working the wood occurred and that the custom was familiar and common. Eusebius describes the screens in the church at Tyre as reticulated.²

It is quite evident that, unless our whole view is wrong, some object which was specially characteristic of the church was represented in these cases. This object was the screen that concealed the holiest part of the church from the gaze of the crowd, as described by Eusebius at Tyre.

The screens, then, were important enough to call for special mention by Eugenius, and (as Mr. Calder rightly says) the embroideries could not have been sufficiently important.

¹ *Studies in the History, etc.*, pp. 35, 37; *Luke the Physician, etc.*, pp. 379, 383.

² *δικτυωτός*, made like a fishing-net (*δίκτυον*).

In the later churches at Bin-Bir-Kilisse stone screens are often found, not so high as these wooden screens must have been, but perhaps only half of the total height. Wood was scarce in that region, and stone was substituted; but the importance of the need demanded some kind of screens in the churches.

We observe in Asia Minor the persistence through Christian times of the pre-Christian beliefs and customs regarding the grave. The sanctity attaching to the graves of martyrs was so great as to produce among the pagans of the third century the belief that the Christians worshipped their martyrs as gods;¹ and it is not easy, at least in later times, to distinguish the respect paid to saints and martyrs from the pagan worship of gods. In the same century we have found clear signs of the belief that the tomb should have some decoration to suggest that it is the doorway leading into a holy place, viz., a church. The custom of building churches on the graves of martyrs, which is quite as old, produced or grew out of the further belief that the highest respect to the dead man was shown by building a church over his grave or close to it; just as the old pagans built the temple of the deified dead. In excavating a church at Emir Ghazi,² I found a grave under the apse; and I was told by a Greek inhabitant of Konia that it is still customary among the Greeks in that region to bury a bishop in the apse of a church.

This readily leads to the state of things which we found in the excavating of Barata, that the churches in later Byzantine times were to a large extent regarded as sepul-

¹ See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, viii. 6, 8 (Calder), where this belief is in full force at the beginning of Diocletian's persecution in 303.

² It preserves, in Mohammedanized form, the name of the Byzantine Kases or Kasis and the Khasbia of Ptolemy. Professor Sayce points out that the hieroglyphic inscriptions found here speak of the king of the people Kasimiyu.

chral, and the building of a grave-church was commonly vowed as a religious duty. In this stage we are separated by a very thin line of demarcation from the old pagan belief that a grave was indispensable as the consecration of a holy place ; and we find that ancient belief persisting in Mohammedanized forms to the present day, though it is as thoroughly opposed to the spirit of Mohammedanism as it is to that of Christianity.

3. I hesitate to accept Mr. Calder's view (stated on p. 408 note) that *ὕδρευτον* means a fountain. The word elsewhere means only a water-tank, not a fountain. His reason for believing that the word was used by Eugenius to denote a fountain is that there is and always doubtless was abundance of running water at Laodiceia, and that fountains are mentioned at the church of Tyre. The water is now and has always been brought in artificial channels from the hills which rise close and high above the town of Laodiceia. But a *ὕδρευτον* is not merely a cistern to store rain-water or other stagnant supplies. It corresponds to the Latin *lacus*, and denotes a large basin or tank which was kept constantly full by inflow at one side and fresh by outflow at the other. Agrippa made 700 *lacus* of this kind in the city of Rome, where the water-supply was extraordinarily abundant. These *lacus* were kept full and fresh by the aqueducts.

It is possible that the difference between the fountains beside the church at Tyre and the tanks beside the church at Laodicea may be due to the prevalence of more purely Oriental customs in the former place, and the greater strength of Roman customs in the latter. But on this point I feel no great confidence, and state it merely in the hope of eliciting criticism or corroboration.

In most of the cities of Lycaonia running water was very scanty, and, according to Strabo, there was none at

all in Savatra, where water was procured from very deep wells and actually sold. Savatra lies close under the hills of the Boz-Dagh, which are much lower than those above Laodiceia, and supply little water: I do not remember ever to have seen a fountain in any of the passes which I have crossed. Yet Strabo's description is inaccurate in one respect. The wells at Savatra are not deep; and the Crimean refugees who have recently settled there say that there is abundant water at no great depth, wherever they sink a well. Yet Strabo, clearly, had been at Savatra,¹ and was struck with the novel spectacle of water sold in the streets. The Graeco-Roman cities were, as a rule abundantly supplied with this necessary of life, which in most places ran free and health-giving through the streets. I can only suppose that the Pontic traveller confused the memory of his journey across Asia Minor, and attributes to Savatra a fact which is true of some places along his road through Lycaonia, that the wells are extremely deep.

W. M. RAMSAY.

III. THE TIME OF THE TRANSFIGURATION.

When I reviewed in the *EXPOSITOR*, January 1908, the noteworthy book by Colonel Mackinlay on the Morning Star, I mentioned his very ingenious suggestion that the Transfiguration occurred at the Feast of Tabernacles in A.D. 28, a synchronism which suggested to Peter's mind the idea of making the three tabernacles. The ordinary view as to Peter's reason for making this curious proposal seems to be that which is stated by Dr. Plummer in his Commentary on Luke ix., "if they were to remain there they must have shelter." Why superhuman personages like Moses and Elias should require the shelter of booths in order to remain on a

¹ Soatra is the form which he uses, p. 568: Savatra occurs in the inscriptions and on the coins of the city.