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In this study I situate socio-historically the adoption of the term ekklēsia as a permanent identity by some groups of early Christ-followers. Given pre-existing usages of the word ekklēsia in Greco-Roman and Jewish circles, I focus on three investigative priorities: What source(s) lie(s) behind the permanent self-designation of some Christ-followers as an ekklēsia? What theological need(s) did that collective identity meet? What political and ethno-religious ideological end(s) did the appropriation of ekklēsia as a sub-group identity serve?

In addressing these questions, particularly in relation to Paul’s use of the word ekklēsia, I contribute to at least three areas of ekklēsia research. First, I build upon and develop the preliminary observation by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson (2008) that ekklēsia can refer either to a gathering of Jews or to the self-designation of a Jewish community, i.e., that ekklēsia should be understood as one among several terms referring to what is translated into English as “synagogue.” This problematizes, from an institutional perspective, suggestions common in scholarship that Paul was “parting ways” with Judaism(s), ‘Jewishness,’ or Jewish organizational forms. Second, given both that non-Jewish Christ-followers could not be designated using the ethno-religious term “Israel” and that ekklēsia is a Jewish synagogue term, Paul’s designation of his multi-ethnic communities as ekklēsiai allowed gentiles qua gentiles to share with Torah observant Jews qua Jews in God’s salvation history with Israel. Ekklēsia, thus, does not
indicate an inherently supersessionist identity for communities designated by this term. Third, Paul’s adoption of a political identity (civic ekklēsia) for his communities need not imply his promotion of counter-imperial civic ideology. Greek literary (e.g., Plutarch) and inscriptional evidence suggests that if an Imperial period non-civic group (e.g., voluntary association) self-designated as an ekklēsia, it could have been perceived as a positive, rather than as an anti-Roman, participant in society.
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Introduction

1. Ekklesia as Christ-follower Sub-Group Identity

Before “church,” there was *ekklesia*. Before the *ekklesia* of first-generation Christ-followers, there was the *ekklesia* of Israel in the Septuagint (LXX). Before all Jewish uses of the word *ekklesia*, there was the civic *ekklesia* of classical Athens.

The use of *ekklesia* terminology by some early Christ-followers was distinctive in at least one respect from Jewish and Greek sources. Some sub-groups of Christ-followers, which were trans-locally connected, adopted *ekklesia* as a permanent collective identity. Greek sources do not use *ekklesia* as a permanent group designation. *Ekklesia* occurrences in Greek literary and epigraphic sources refer either to the public gathering of the citizenry (*dēmos*) of a *polis* or to a temporary collective identity assumed by the *dēmos* during the course of that public gathering. The semantic range of *ekklesia* in

---

1 The Greek word often translated “church” in modern versions is *ekklesia*. Its meaning in the ancient world was simply “assembly.” As such, I will generally avoid using the anachronistic term “church” throughout this study and either transliterate the Greek word (*ekklesia*) or translate “ekklesia” as “assembly” or “meeting.”


3 Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that scholarly consensus defines a Greek *polis* as “a community of citizens rather than a territory ruled by a government” (“City-Ethnics as Evidence for Polis Identity,”” in *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 108; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996], 169–196, esp. 169 and 192). P. J. Rhodes and David M. Lewis note the challenges inherent in trying to identify whether the enacting community of a decree (i.e., ἔδοξεν τῷ…) is a *polis*. He says that a community could be a *polis*, or “a smaller unit within a *polis* or a larger unit containing poleis, or some other kind of body. A *dēmos* may be the body of citizens of a *polis*, or of a federation of *poleis*, or it may be smaller unit within a *polis*…A dependent community may call itself a *kome* or a *chorion*; it may
Jewish sources, while including the concept of a public gathering, also refers to a permanent group identity. In the LXX that permanent group identity is a supra-local one: the ethno-religious nation of Israel. Only in three of Philo’s works does the possibility surface that the term *ekklēsia* might refer to a regional group identity, that is, to a local group of Jews in Egypt. Philo gives no indication, however, that this local *ekklēsia* was trans-locally connected with other Jewish *ekklēsiai* outside of Egypt. Given Greek and Jewish usages of the word *ekklēsia*, three questions naturally arise. Together, these three questions encapsulate my investigative priorities in this study: What source(s) lie(s) behind the permanent self-designation of some Christ-followers as an *ekklēsia*? What theological need(s) did that collective identity meet? What political and ethno-religious ideological end(s) did the appropriation of *ekklēsia* as a sub-group identity serve?

The term *ekklēsia* is not the only group designation adopted by first-generation Christ-followers. Acts and 1 Peter speak of *Christianoi* (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16), Acts and the Pauline epistles mention *hoi hagioi* (e.g., Acts 9:13; Romans 15:25, 26, 31), the author of 3 John writes of *hoi philoi* (vv. 6 and 10), and Acts alone records that some were called followers of “the Way” (Acts 9:2; 24:14). The one identity-signifying term call itself a *dēmos* or a *koinon* or it may even call itself a *polis*” (*The Decrees of the Greek States* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], 102).

Commenting on Acts 9:13, Richard I. Pervo implies that the group designation by which (Hebrew) Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem self-identify is the term *hoi hagioi* (*Acts: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009], 248). Richard Bauckham makes that implication explicit: “there is good reason to suppose that it [*hoi hagioi*] goes back to the early Jerusalem church” (“James and the Jerusalem Community,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 55–95, esp. 57). Trebilco gives greater specificity to Bauckham’s claim: “the use of οἱ ἅγιοι as a self-designation originated with Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians in Jerusalem at a very early point” (*Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012], 134). Trebilco explains his rationale: “In any case it is clear he [the author of Acts] does not seem to introduce οἱ ἅγιοι as a self-designation for purposes of variety; that he only uses it four times [Acts 9:13, 32, 41; 26:10] and then only in connection with
which came to dominate by the end of the first century CE, however, was the designation *ekklēsia*. The question remains as to why this terminological development took place and what hermeneutical developments were at play in the process.

My investigation of *ekklēsia* usage among early Christ-followers in Part III will focus extensively upon *ekklēsia* occurrences within the Pauline tradition. The reason for this approach is simple. Out of the 114 references to the word *ekklēsia* within the New Testament writings,⁵ Paul’s undisputed writings predominate with 44.⁶ The book of Acts is second at 23 occurrences, while the deuto-Pauline letters account for another 18.⁷ Thus, Paul, together with later writers who claim some affiliation with him, account for 85 of the *ekklēsia* references in the New Testament.

There are at least four areas of *ekklēsia* research which still bear further investigation, particularly as they apply to Paul’s usage of the term. The first is a methodological lacuna. Most studies which interpret *ekklēsia* usage among early Christ-followers privilege literary sources, such as Greek writers, Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, and early Christ-follower sources. Some studies include Greek epigraphic

---

⁵ The word *ekklēsia* occurs 114 times in the writings of the New Testament (*BDAG*). Occurrences are found in Matthew (3x), Acts (23x), Romans (5x), 1 Corinthians (22x), 2 Corinthians (9x), Galatians (3x), Ephesians (9x), Philippians (2x), Colossians (4x), 1 Thessalonians (2x), 2 Thessalonians (2x), 1 Timothy (3x), Philemon (1x), Hebrews (2x), James (1x), 3 John (3x), and Revelation (20x).

⁶ The seven undisputed letters of Paul, listed in canonical (not compositional) order are: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon. The 44 Pauline usages of *ekklēsia* are found in: Romans (5x; 16:1, 4, 5, 16, 23); 1 Corinthians (22x; 1:2, 4:17; 6:4; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16, 18, 22, 12:28; 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, (vv. 33b, 34, 35; disputed authorship); 15:9; 16:1, 19 (2x)); 2 Corinthians (9x; 8:1, 18, 19, 23, 24; 11:8, 28, 12:13); Galatians (3x; 1:2, 13, 22); Philippians (2x; 3:6, 4:15); 1 Thessalonians (2x; 1:1; 2:14); Philemon (1x; Phlm 2).

⁷ *Ekklesia* occurs in Ephesians (9x; 1:22, 3:10, 21; 5:23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32), Colossians (4x; 1:18, 24, 4:15, 16), 2 Thessalonians (2x; 1:1, 4), and 1 Timothy (3x; 3:5, 15; 5:16).
sources, but none exhaustively so. This is problematic not least since approximately 2100 mentions of the word *ekklēsia* are extant in the Greek inscriptive record. It is only with the rise of electronic resources that it has become possible fully to mine this treasure-trove of information relative to *ekklēsia* usage in extant epigraphical sources.

A second area of research involves a desideratum identified already in 1999 by Donald Binder. Binder includes Christ-follower *ekklēsiai* within his discussion of “what we might imprecisely label ‘sectarian synagogues,’ those synagogues belonging to the Essenes, the Theraputae, and the Samaritans.” He writes that “the emergence and development of the Christian *ekklēsia*, [however], deserves an examination beyond what can be given in this study.” Anders Runesson, Donald Binder and Birger Olsson take an important step in this direction within their synagogue sourcebook. They include the word *ekklēsia* as one among many synagogue terms used within Jewish sources, but can do little more than provide a cursory analysis of each occurrence. In Part II (*Ekklēsia* in Jewish Sources) I build extensively upon their observations. I provide analysis of Jewish sources within which the word *ekklēsia* is used for a gathering of Jews and for the self-designation of a Jewish community. I will examine seven Jewish sources which use the

---

8 Epigraphy means “a writing upon” and has reference to any process (e.g., etching, inscribing, writing with ink) by which words are ‘permanently’ placed upon a material (e.g., stone, wood, papyrus, pottery). Inscriptions are a sub-set of epigraphy. When it comes to sourcing epigraphic examples electronically, unless otherwise noted, I have accessed them from the website of the Packard Humanities Institute (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main; accessed beginning May 22, 2010). The same decree is not infrequently found replicated in multiple inscriptions with different titles. As such, when I state that the word *ekklēsia* occurs “x” amount of times, I do not mean to say that there are “x” amount of extant *ekklēsia* references within the inscriptive record, but only that the word *ekklēsia* is listed at least “x” amount of times in the database of inscriptions of the Packard Humanities Institute (as of 2013).


word ἐκκλησία (the LXX, Ben Sira, Judith, 1 Maccabees, Josephus, Philo, and the apostle Paul). Of these seven, the combined witness of four (Ben Sira, Josephus, Philo, and Paul) suggests that ἐκκλῆσια was actual group terminology adopted by some Jews in Judea and in Egypt. Within these Jewish sources, the word ἐκκλῆσια can be said to denote both semi-public voluntary associations⁷¹ and public assemblies within which are addressed a broad range of issues relevant to all members of a regional community.⁷² Its appropriation by intra muros groups within pluriform Second Temple Judaism,⁷³ and its subsequent

---


⁷² In his survey of 1st century CE sources, Lee Levine notes that the public συναγωγῆ building was used for “the entire gamut of [public] activities connected with any Jewish community…[such] as a courtroom, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions [such as public Torah reading, rituals, festival observance]” (The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years [2d ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005], 29). See also Richard A. Horsley (“Synagogues in Galilee and the Gospels,” in Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress [ed. H. C. Kee and L. H. Colick; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999], 46–69) and Runesson (“Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 463).

⁷³ When I speak of “Judaism,” I follow the definition of “common Judaism” offered by E. P. Sanders. Sanders defines “common Judaism [as being] that of the ordinary priest and the ordinary people…Common is defined as what is agreed among the parties, and agreed among the populace as a whole” (Judaism: Practice and Belief—Early Roman Period (63 BCE to 66 CE) [Philadelphia: TPI, 1992], 11–12). More specifically, “common Judaism” is the convergence of four beliefs among 1st century CE Jews: “belief that their God was the only true God, that he had chosen them and had given them his law, and that they were required to obey it” and that “the temple was the visible, functioning symbol of God’s presence with his people and it was also the basic rallying point of Jewish loyalties” (Judaism, 241).
adoption by Pauline Christ-followers, becomes another factor by which to problematize scholarly suggestions that Paul was “parting ways” with the \textit{Ioudaioi} (Jews),\footnote{Throughout this study, I will use the term “Jewish” rather than “Judean,” in contradistinction to Steve Mason’s approach. Mason asserts that \textit{Ιουδαϊκός} is better translated as “Judean” rather than the traditional “Jewish” (“Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism,” 457–512). For a judicious critique of Mason’s position, particularly as it relates to (1) Mason’s “terminological distinction between ancient contexts…and the late antique and modern situation,” and (2) “the name of the place associated with Jew,” see Runesson “Inventing Christian Identity,” 64–70.} that is, with Judaism(s), ‘Jewishness,’ or Jewish organizational forms.\footnote{For suggestions that the ways parted by the end of the 1st century CE, see the essays in \textit{Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135} (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). For opinions that Christ-followers and Jews continued to exhibit social interaction in their dealings with one another even into the Late Antique period, see the collection of essays in \textit{The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages} (ed. A. Becker and A. Yoshiko Reed; Tübingen/Minneapolis: Mohr Siebeck/Fortress, 2003/2007). See also, Stephen Spence (\textit{The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study} [ISACR 5; Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004]).}

A third lacuna within \textit{ekklēsia} research is an investigation into how Paul’s designation of his communities as \textit{ekklēsiai} solved a key ethno-religious conundrum. Since non-Jewish Christ-followers could not be called “Israel,” Paul’s communities required another inherently Jewish group identity which could integrate gentiles qua gentiles into theological continuity with God’s salvation history for covenantal Israel.\footnote{By “gentiles qua gentiles” I mean that gentiles could become fully constituted followers of the Jewish \textit{Christos} without being required to become Jewish proselytes and/or or take up any one, or all, of the Jewish covenantal identity markers such as circumcision, dietary restrictions, and festival observances.} I will assess five ways in which Paul’s incorporation of gentiles into the new dyadic identity \textit{ekklēsia} reinforces their theological continuity with ethno-religious Israel. The first two are by lexical association (the \textit{ekklēsia} of Israel as well as Jewish synagogue associations and public assemblies named \textit{ekklēsia}). The other three are by literary depiction. Paul theologically transforms his \textit{ekklēsiai} into three examples of Jewish sacred space: the temple of God, the body of the Jewish \textit{Christos}, and a sacred Jewish synagogue wherein occurs metaphorical manumission from sin. To my knowledge, there
has not yet been a study which integrates all five of these ethno-religious and theological depictions of Paul’s *ekklēsiai* when assessing questions relative to the “the parting of the ways” between ‘Christians’ and Jews. I will suggest that the combined witness of Paul’s five portrayals links his *ekklēsiai* with, rather than separates them from, pluriform Second Temple Judaism. This possibility favours viewing Paul as being non-supersessionist rather than supersessionist relative to other forms of Judaism.\(^{18}\) In its essence, the term “supersessionism,” otherwise known as “replacement theology”\(^ {19}\) or “fulfillment theology,” holds that the “promises and covenants that were made with the nation of Israel…now allegedly belong to another group that is not national Israel.”\(^ {20}\) Such a theological claim has socio-cultural ramifications, specifically with respect to the continuation of Jewish ethnic identity within the *ekklēsiai* of Pauline Christ-followers.\(^ {21}\)

\(^{18}\) Leonhard Rost is an early 20th century proponent of supersessionism. He claims that early Christ-followers were supersessionist in their adoption of *ekklēsia* because it expressed their conviction that they were the new Israel, the true people of God (*Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament* [BWANT 4, Folge Heft 24; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938], 154). Some supersessionist scholars differ from Rost in that they still see continuity in salvation history between the ‘Church’ and historic Israel, such that Torah observance and faith in Christ are compatible (J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 508; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], 237; Terrance L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convincional World* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 306).


\(^{21}\) While lauding Paul’s challenge to Jews on how they could “ethically construct a particular identity…without falling into ethnocentrism or racism of one kind or another,” Daniel Boyarin identifies what he considers to be some negative implications of Paul’s apparent alternative: “Paul’s universalism seems to conduce to coercive politico-cultural systems that engage in more or less violent projects of the absorption of cultural specificities into the dominant one” (*A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* [Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994], 228–29). More specifically, Boyarin asserts that “the negative evaluation of genealogy as a ground for identity can be traced to Paul, the fountainhead, as I am claiming, of western universalism. In his authentic passion to find a place for the gentiles in the Torah’s scheme of things…Paul had (almost against his will) sown the seeds for a Christian discourse that would
A fourth window of opportunity in ekklēśia research relates to the third player in the identity construction game—Roman Imperial ideology.²² The matrix of Jewish and ‘Christian’ contexts is incomplete by itself as a paradigm for understanding group identity formation among sub-groups of Christ-followers. As William Campbell emphasizes, and Mikael Tellbe clearly demonstrates, there are three, rather than two, micro-identities which Paul, in particular, needed to nest under one macro-identity for his diasporic, multi-ethnic communities.²³ This leads some scholars to presume, however, that Paul’s adoption both of a political identity (ekklēśia)²⁴ and of political terminology (e.g., kyrios, sōtēr) reflects counter-imperial ideology.²⁵ Such a political assumption bears reassessment in light of an emerging consensus among ancient historians on politics in


²³ The three micro-identities with which Paul had to deal are: (1) a Jewish Christ-follower who, through his ethnically Judean heritage is a part of historic Israel and its covenantal status with God, but who through faith in the Jewish Christ, has become a part of the new covenant available to historic Israel; (2) a gentile Christ-follower who, given his ethnically gentile heritage is excluded from historical Israel and its covenantal status with God, but who through faith in the Jewish Christ, has become part of the new covenant that is available to historic Israel; and (3) both the Jewish and the gentile Christ-follower who together live within Greco-Roman society, one which is permeated with Roman imperial ideology.

²⁴ Richard A. Horsley comments that “it is clear that the [Pauline Christ-follower] movement thought of itself in political terms as an ekklēśia…an ‘assembly’ alternative to the established city-assembly” (First Corinthians [ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998], 14).

the Greek East during the Imperial period (27 BCE–284 CE).\textsuperscript{26} The exponential rise in euergetism, otherwise known as benefaction,\textsuperscript{27} during the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE is testimony to the development of a political culture,\textsuperscript{28} which informally enfranchised the political influence of a middle stratum (e.g., voluntary associations) in Imperial Greek cities.\textsuperscript{29} The existence of such a political culture in the Greek East, particularly in Asia Minor, forms the basis from which I suggest that an Imperial period non-civic group (e.g., voluntary association),\textsuperscript{30} which self-designates as an ekklēsia could have been perceived as a

\textsuperscript{26} See, for example, Onno van Nijf’s summary (“Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age: Introduction and Preview,” in Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 1–26).

\textsuperscript{27} For an extensive list of epigraphic references to Imperial period benefactions, see Arjan Zuiderhoek, The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor (GCRW; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 160–66. Examples of euergetism include fund distributions, festival sponsorships, and the construction of public buildings (e.g., agoras, theatres, odeia, baths/gymnasia, stoas, temples).


\textsuperscript{29} I follow Onno van Nijf’s definition of “Imperial Greek city” as a city (polis) in the Greek East during the first three centuries CE, that is, between the reigns of Augustus and Diocletian (“Politics, Culture and Identities: Towards a Political History of the Imperial Greek City,” keynote address presented Oct. 22 at Urban Dreams and Realities: An Interdisciplinary Conference on the City in Ancient Cultures [Oct. 21-22, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB], 1).

\textsuperscript{30} I use the word “non-civic” as an umbrella term both for unofficial groups, such as voluntary associations, and for official groups such as ‘boards’ in charge of administering temples or other similar institutions, and age-based ‘organizations’ connected with the gymasia (e.g., epheboi, gerousia). Philip defines “associations” as “social groupings in antiquity that shared certain characteristics in common and that were often recognized as analogous groups by people and by governmental institutions. Associations were small, unofficial (“private”) groups, usually consisting of about ten to fifty members (but sometimes with larger memberships into the hundreds), that met together on a regular basis to socialize with one another and to honour both earthly and divine benefactors, which entailed a variety of internal and external activities” (Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities [New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009], 26). See a more extensive yet concise definition of “associations” in David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland, “Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah,” JGRJCh 5 (2008): 200–21, esp. 202, 203. John S. Kloppenborg provides a select list of 50 voluntary associations with details given for each as to the type of association (e.g., oregoμενες, theiaσoτaι) and the size of its membership (“Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups,” EC 4, no. 2 [2013], 183–215, esp. 209–214).
positive, rather than as a counter-imperial, participant in society. The widespread
“ekklēsia discourse” evident among Second Sophistic writers such as Plutarch, Dio
Chrysostom, and Theon increases this possibility. In Part I, I will explore this political
culture with a view to applying my findings within Part III, where I explore the political
implications of early Christ-followers self-designating collectively as *ekklēsia*.

---

31 For example, Giovanni Salmeri, “Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor,” in *Dio
92; idem, “Reconstructing the Political Life and Culture of the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire,” in
*Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the
assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 197–214; Anna Criscinda Miller, “Ekklesia: 1
Corinthians in the Context of Ancient Democratic Discourse,” (PhD diss., Harvard University, July 7,
Ideology?).
2. Christ-follower Ekklēsiai: Three Investigative Questions

The four lacunae within ekklēsia research, which I have identified, give rise to three investigative questions that will direct the balance of this study. First, which non-civic group in antiquity was the first to self-designate as an ekklēsia? Second, did Greco-Roman outsiders perceive the adoption of a permanent ekklēsia identity by early Christ-followers as being reflective of counter-imperial or of pro-dēmokratia, ideology? Third, was the self-designation of early Christ-followers as ekklēsiai a supersessionist move or did it, conversely, identify those self-same Christ-followers with a Jewish heritage, and perhaps even, as intra muros communities of pluriform Second Temple Judaism? Each of these three questions has been answered in many different ways by previous scholarship. A review of the status quaestionis for each follows below.

2.1. Ekklēsia as Group Identity: Who Was First?

The combined witness of John Kloppenborg, Richard Ascough, and Philip Harland initially painted a picture of four Greco-Roman voluntary associations which adopted ekklēsia as a permanent group identity (IGLAM 1381–82; IDelos 1519; Samos 119; OGIS 488). In due course, Kloppenborg and Harland reversed some of their initial findings. They now acknowledge that only two of those five inscriptions were inscribed by voluntary associations (Tyrian merchants, IDelos 1519; a gymnastic association, Samos 119), and that none use ekklēsia as a collective identity, only as a name for the

---

assembly of each inscription’s sponsoring community. My research will add one more such insessional example of a non-civic group naming their assembly an *ekklēsia*: the *syngeneia* (“family clan”) of Pelekōs (*Sinuri* 73/8; 4th cent. BCE).

At least one Jewish source, though, does appear to use *ekklēsia* as a collective identity for a semi-public association—Philo. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson identify three *ekklēsia* references in Philo, which, if contemporaneous with his time, suggest that up to two Jewish non-civic associations in Egypt may have self-designated collectively as an *ekklēsia* (*Virt.* 108, *Deus* 111), and one Jewish voluntary association, with a different group identity (*hieros syllogos*), called their publicly accessible assembly an *ekklēsia* (*Spec.* 1.324-325). My research will provide further substantiation of their initial assessments. In so doing, I will argue that Jewish groups in Philo’s Alexandria are the first extant examples of communities using *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity.

If Jews in Alexandria were the first, then a corollary question arises: which sub-group in the Jesus movement was the first to self-designate collectively as an *ekklēsia*? The recent arguments of Paul Trebilco and George H. van Kooten encapsulate the interpretive options. Trebilco makes two claims. First, he forwards pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Judea as being the first sub-group in the Jesus movement to self-designate collectively as *ekklēsiai*. Second, he postulates that their

---

inspiration for doing so derived from how the LXX used the word *ekklēsia*. Van Kooten differs with Trebilco on two fronts. First, he forwards Paul as being the initial Christ-follower to appropriate *ekklēsia* as a group designation. Second, he states that Paul’s primary inspiration for doing so was the prevalence, and continued political relevance, of civic *ekklēsiai* throughout the Greek East of the Roman empire. With this assertion van Kooten locates himself within the trajectory of other political interpreters of Paul’s *ekklēsiai* like Dieter Georgi, Karl Donfried, and Richard Horsley, to name a few.

There is substantive evidence for each of the above viewpoints, making any claims of a definitive answer problematic. I will suggest, though, that there is room for another interpretive approach. I too will forward Paul as being the first Christ-follower to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent group designation. I will argue, however, that neither the ancient *ekklēsia* of the LXX nor the contemporary *ekklēsiai* of Greco-Roman *poleis* were

---


35 “Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 536.

36 Van Kooten states that the ‘Graeco-Roman political meaning [of *ekklēsia*] in the sense of ‘civic assembly’ was decisive in its adoption by Paul, and that Paul wishes to portray his community as an alternative organization existing alongside the civic assemblies” (“Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 522; cf. also 532–35). Other scholars who assert the preeminence of Greek backgrounds by which to explain New Testament appropriations of *ekklēsia* as a group designation include Erik Peterson (*Die Kirche* [München: Beck, 1929], 14–15, and nn. 18–19), Jürgen Becker (*Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 427). See also Wayne O. McCready, who assesses the socio-religious value for Paul’s gentile mission of the Graeco-Roman backgrounds to the word *ekklēsia* (“Εκκλησία and Voluntary Associations,” in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 59–73).

sufficient precedents for solving Paul’s key ethno-religious conundrum for his multi-ethnic group identity construction project. His ideological agenda would have been particularly reinforced if examples existed of contemporary *ekklēsia* referents with Jewish roots.

2.2. *Ekklēsia* as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?

Numerous political interpreters of Paul explore how his political terminology, including the term *ekklēsia*, intersects with Roman Imperial ideology. Opinions diverge, though, when it comes to determining if Paul’s use of terms and concepts from a Greco-Roman political milieu reflect a pro-imperial, a neutral-imperial, or a counter-imperial message. Horsley is a leading voice in the polyphonic chorus of scholars who explore how Paul negotiated the demands of imperial ideology upon his theocratic communities. Four aspects of Paul’s ostensibly counter-imperial ideology are generally forwarded: the Gospel of Imperial salvation, patronage and power, an alternative Gospel, and the assemblies (*ekklēsiai*) of an alternative international society.

---

38 Bruno Blumenfeld claims that “Paul upholds political sovereignty and reaffirms the authority of the state while making it fully compatible with faith” (*The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* [JSNTSup 210; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001/London: T. & T. Clark, 2003/2004], 283–84, see also 391).

39 Seyoon Kim asserts that Paul uses political language simply as a *lingua franca* through which more effectively to communicate the message about Jesus the Christos (*Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008]).

40 Counter-imperial interpreters of Paul’s acknowledged writings include: Robert Jewett (Romans); Richard Horsley (1 Corinthians); Davina Lopez, Brigitte Kahl (Galatians); Peter Oakes (Philippians); and Karl Donfried (1 Thessalonians).


42 The Gospel of imperial salvation was disseminated through the emperor cult which came into existence during the reign of Augustus (27 BCE–14 CE). The imperial cult was more prevalent in the Greek East, dominated public space through dedicated buildings and statues, and, through its integration of traditional Greek religion, created a pervasive presence of imperial munificence and salvation.
Horsley sees the rhetorical target of Paul’s *ekklēsiai* as being the Roman *imperium* in all of its political and religious expressions. He claims that Paul’s rhetoric in the Corinthian correspondence de-constructs the three-legs of imperial ideology: the patronage system, the imperial cult, and the rhetoric of peace and concord (*pax romana*). Paul is said to achieve this deconstruction by constructing his Corinthian Christ-followers into an alternative socio-political community. The Corinthian *ekklēsia* is said to be organized by egalitarian principles, rather than along the lines of the Roman patronage system.\(^{46}\) Horsley identifies at least five social functions within Pauline *ekklēsiai* which he claims challenge Imperial authority: (1) a trans-local network of missionally-united, household-based *ekklēsiai*; (2) communal affairs that are adjudicated autonomously of local authorities (e.g., lawsuits); (3) isolation from “fundamental forms of social relations in the dominant society” (e.g., abstinence from eating food offered to idols); (4) the embodiment of radically different economic relations (avoidance of patronage); and (5) the initiation of an economic practice that was “unprecedented and probably unique in antiquity” (the collection for poor Christ-followers in Jerusalem).\(^{47}\)

---

\(^{43}\) Patronage and power were both a means of social control and social cohesion. Patronage involved reciprocal exchanges of goods and services, with mutual-aid societies known as *collegia* (or *thiasoi*) being the focus of such reciprocity.

\(^{44}\) If one assumes that Paul’s terminological and definitional parallels with Roman imperial ideology are intentional (e.g., *euangelion*, *sōêria*), then the possibility arises that Paul’s gospel includes counter-imperial elements. Some elements include Paul’s apparent disdain for Roman imperial “peace and security” (1 Thessalonians), his proclamation of impending doom for “every rural ruler and every authority in power” (1 Corinthians) such that “this [republican imperial] world is passing away.”

\(^{45}\) Paul’s *ekklēsiai* in Asia Minor and Greece, which self-presented in many ways as Greco-Roman voluntary associations, incorporated alternative social patterns than those associated with the hierarchical social stratification that was intrinsic to Imperial period Roman society.


Donfried reinforces Horsley’s counter-imperial claims with evidence from 1 and 2 Thessalonians.\textsuperscript{48} One of his arguments is of particular note. Donfried contends that an anomalous phrase in Paul’s \textit{adscriptio} displays counter-imperial rhetoric: “to the \textit{ekklēsia thessalonikeōn} in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”\textsuperscript{49} Paul’s use of the “city-ethnic” (\textit{nomen gentilicum}) \textit{theSSalonikeōn} is atypical in his undisputed writings. Donfried tries to explain Paul’s intent in this by pointing to numismatic evidence from Thessalonica. The word \textit{thessalonikeōn}, but not \textit{ekklēsia}, occurs with some regularity as a legend on late Hellenistic and early Roman period Thessalonican coins. The obverse side displays the heads of Julius Caesar, Augustus, and Gaius along with the legends \textit{Theos, Kaisar SeBastos, and Gaios SeBastos Huios}, respectively.\textsuperscript{50}

From this numismatic evidence Donfried draws the conclusion that “the apostle is clearly distinguishing and separating two types of assemblies in Thessalonica, each comprising different groups of people with substantially different allegiances and loyalties.”\textsuperscript{51} He identifies Paul’s phrase “\textit{tei ekklēsia(i) thessalonikeōn}” (1 Thess 1:1) as being “primary among these…language and thought-patterns that these former pagans were familiar with and which still surround them and encircle them.”\textsuperscript{52} Donfried claims that Paul’s mimicry of the Thessalonican “city-ethnic” implies that he views his Christ-followers as the true \textit{ekklēsia} of Thessalonica, a patently counter-imperial statement.

\textsuperscript{48} Donfried, \textit{Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity} (2002).
\textsuperscript{49} The Greek text of 1 Thess 1:1 (cf. 2 Thess 1:1) reads, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.
\textsuperscript{50} Donfried, \textit{Paul, Thessalonica}, 140–41.
\textsuperscript{51} Donfried, \textit{Paul, Thessalonica}, 143.
\textsuperscript{52} Donfried, \textit{Paul, Thessalonica}, 143.
Leif Vaage takes a different tack. He focuses not upon counter-imperial intentionality but upon the inevitability of a clash between the Roman *imperium* and the empire-wide association of Christ-follower *ekklēsiai*.\(^{53}\) This socio-political clash develops, in his mind, not because Christ-followers intentionally sought to usurp Roman political structures and authority. Rather, it develops because Christ-followers used political terms and concepts, like *ekklēsia*, which germinated into political aspirations that eventually grew to fruition in Constantine’s ‘Christian’ empire. Vaage believes that “Christianity’s cultural destiny was, in fact, decisively shaped by the fact that so much of its core religious vocabulary is expressly political and so frankly imperial.”\(^{54}\)

Georgi focuses his rhetorical analysis of Paul’s “*ekklēsia* ideology” upon its intersection with municipal politics rather than with the *imperium*. He views Paul’s assemblies as being “in competition with the local political assembly of the [city’s] citizenry”\(^{55}\) in that they form an “alternative social utopia” which reflects three “central ideals of Hellenistic society”: “its libertarian and democratic universalism, its socially egalitarian pluralism, and its urban basis.”\(^{56}\) In this, Georgi views the Pauline *ekklēsiai* as reflecting a civic ideology which is directed against oligarchic rule and hierarchical society rather than against the Roman empire itself.

---


\(^{54}\) Vaage, “Why Christianity Succeeded,” 255.


Van Kooten follows the lead of Georgi in also labeling the Christ-follower ekklēsia as an alternative society. His distinctive contribution lies in his claim that the alternative society of Christ-follower ekklēsiai paralleled three levels of political organization: municipal/regional, provincial, and empire-wide. Van Kooten does not follow Horsley, however, in claiming that counter-imperial ideology lies behind any attempts by Pauline ekklēsiai to become politically organized.

My focus in this study is not upon Paul’s political ideology in general. Rather, it is upon Paul’s adoption of one particular political identity for his communities—the Greek democratic institution par excellence, the ekklēsia. My interpretive assessment of Paul’s “ekklēsia ideology” mirrors Georgi’s more neutral-imperial, counter-polis approach, but adds a more positive political spin (pro-dēmokratia) and a distinctively Jewish element (ekklēsia as Jewish sacred space). My postulate is that Paul presents his ekklēsiai as sacred, multi-ethnic Jewish synagogue communities, which inculcate Greek socio-democratic ideals, and whose alternative civic ideology implicitly critiques the oligarchic privilege and socio-economic stratification within Imperial Greek cities.

---

57 In each city wherein Christ-followers reside, van Kooten claims that Paul creates an antithesis between his ekklēsia and the civic ekklēsia (1 Cor 1:2; 11:6; 2 Cor 1:1; Rom 16:1; 1 Thess 1:1; 2:1).

58 Van Kooten, “Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 536. Van Kooten sees a provincial level of organization in the phrases “the ekklēsiai of Galatia” (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2), “the ekklēsiai of Asia” (1 Cor 16:19), “the ekklēsiai of Macedonia” (2 Cor 8:1), and “the ekklēsiai of Judea” (Gal 1:22; cf. 1 Thess 2:14).

59 Van Kooten states that there appears to be a “universal, even global notion of έκκλησίαι, [which] was unparalleled in the Greek world and the Roman empire” (“Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 537). He specifically cites Rom 16:4 in this regard and claims that it indicates “an alternative, non-ethnic, global community, which takes the form of a collective of assemblies from the nations…the political overtones [of which] cannot be missed” (Ibid, 537).
My postulate intersects with previous scholarship in the following fashion: Paul’s *ekklēsia* ideology reflects civic ideology (Gillihan) for the creation of an alternative society (Georgi), that is not counter-imperial (contra Horsley), nor a trans-local parallel political organization (contra van Kooten), but rather a trans-local Jewish voluntary association (Runesson) that is socially accessible to Greco-Romans (McCready), and which could have been viewed as a pro-‘democratic,’ counter-oligarchic participant in the ubiquitous “*ekklēsia* discourse” (Salmeri, Miller) of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor (Wörrle, Mitchell, Sherk, van Nijf, Zuiderhoek). In sum, self-designating as *ekklēsiai* gave Paul’s multi-ethnic communities the potential to present both as *intra muros* Jewish synagogue communities and as Greco-Roman voluntary associations, with a civic ideology that is both pro-đēmokratia and counter-oligarchic.

2.3. *Ekklēsia* as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?

Paul’s Jewish heritage brings to the fore the need to consider ethno-religious optics when assessing Paul’s rationale for adopting a permanent *ekklēsia* identity for his multi-ethnic, diasporic communities. My analysis of *ekklēsia* occurrences in Jewish sources (Part II) provides answers to my third investigative question, which, when

---


61 See Part III, §2.2.2. *Paul’s Ekklēsia: Counter-Imperial Ideology?*

62 See Part III, §2.2.3. *Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Parallel Political Organization?*

63 See Part III, §2.2.4. *Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Jewish Voluntary Association?*

64 See Part III, §2.2.5. *Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Greco-Roman Voluntary Association?*

restated, reads: “Did Jews and gentiles within Pauline ekklēsiai self-perceive as having superseded ethno-religious Israel in God’s salvation history?”

Christopher Zoccali cogently summarizes the various positions taken by scholarship relative to the relationship between the ‘Church’ and Israel. The first position is supersessionist: the ‘Church’ has superseded Israel in God’s salvation history. There are two interpretive options. First, is the view championed by Ernst Käsemann which sees discontinuity between the ‘Church’ and historic Israel. Thus, Torah observance and faith in Jesus as Messiah are incompatible. Second, J. D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright spearhead the view that there is continuity in salvation history between the ‘Church’ and historic Israel. Thus, Torah observance and faith in Christ are compatible for Jews who have become Christ-followers.

There is also a post-supersessionist position: the ‘Church’ does not displace or replace historic Israel, but rather is emplaced within Israel. This position is taken by scholars of the so-called “Radical Perspective on Paul,” also known as “Beyond the New Perspective on Paul” (BNP). They argue that Israel and the ‘Church,’ that is, the

---

67 Christopher Zoccali, Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present (Salem, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010).
68 Rost, Die Vorstufen, 154.
69 Zoccali, Whom God Has Called, 23ff. See, for example, Käsemann’s work Leib und Leib Christi (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1933).
70 Dunn, Theology, 508; Wright, Climax, 237; Donaldson, Paul, 306.
72 For a discussion of the similarities and differences between scholars in the New Perspective and Beyond the New Perspective (BNP) ‘camps,’ along with a carefully nuanced comparative analysis of different views within the BNP ‘camp,’ see J. Brian Tucker, Remain in Your Calling: Paul and the Continuation of Social Identities in 1 Corinthians (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 7–10. BNP scholars include, but are not limited to, William S. Campbell, Kathy Ehrensperger, Anders Runesson, Magnus Zetterholm, Mark Nanos, David Rudolph, Pamela Eisenbaum, John Gager, Stanley Kent Stowers,
universal, multi-ethnic community of Christ-followers, are distinct yet covenantally related socio-religious entities.\textsuperscript{73} As such, so the argument goes, by faith in the Jewish Christ, gentiles qua gentiles share with Torah observant Jews qua Jews in God’s salvation history with historic Israel.\textsuperscript{74} As William Campbell succinctly states, “The church and Israel [are] related but separate entities which should not be dissolved or merged in such a way that the sub-group identity of the one is lost or unrecognized.”\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{73} David Rudolph argues for the inclusion of a Messianic Jewish perspective in Christian theology (“Messianic Jews and Christian Theology: Restoring an Historical Voice to the Contemporary Discussion,” Pro Ecclesia XIV/1 [2005]: 58–84). Rudolph envisions a five-fold post-supersessionist perspective which Messianic Jews would bring to Christian theology: “(1) God’s covenant fidelity to the Jewish people, (2) that Jesus was Israel’s Messiah and participated in the unique identity of the God of Israel, (3) that the \textit{besorah} (gospel) was for Jews and Gentiles, (4) that Jesus-believing Gentiles were full members of God’s people without becoming Jews, and (5) that Jesus-believing Jews should continue to live as Jews in keeping with Israel’s calling to be a distinct and enduring nation” (http://mjstudies.squarespace.com/about-post-supersessionist/; accessed 1.29.2012).

\textsuperscript{74} Zoccali states that Nanos and Campbell appear to presume that “while the church existed for Paul under the umbrella of Israel, in as much as it consists of Jewish and gentile Christ followers it can equally be seen as a larger entity encompassing both Israel and the nations” (\textit{Whom God Has Called}, 135). See Mark Nanos (“Challenging the Limits that Continue to Define on Paul’s Perspective on Jews and Judaism,” in \textit{Reading Israel in Romans: Legitimacy and Plausibility of Divergent Interpretations} [ed. C. Grenholm and D. Patte; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000], 212–24, esp. 221) and Campbell (\textit{Paul}, 138). For a volume which extensively explores the inter-relationship between 1st century CE Jewish Christ-followers and a Jewish heritage, see \textit{Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries} (ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007), esp. 3–418.

\textsuperscript{75} Campbell, \textit{Paul}, 101. Campbell notes that one cannot merely distinguish Israel from the Church in the conviction that God’s purposes for historical Israel are not yet fully realized (\textit{Paul}, 99). One must rather establish to what degree Israel and the (predominantly gentile) Church are mutually distinct entities in Paul’s theology. The question is whether Paul envisions one inclusive or two parallel covenants. Campbell, Nanos, Dunn, Wright, and Donaldson all agree that there is only one covenant for both Jews and gentiles and that trust in God’s act in Christ is the ultimate basis for covenant membership. Gaston and Harink see trust in God’s act in Christ as being a necessary prerequisite only for gentiles. Lloyd Gaston proposes a two covenant view, one through Sinai for Jews, one through Christ for gentiles (\textit{Paul and Torah} [Vancouver: UBC Press, 1987], 33–34, 143–44). Douglas Harink, while agreeing with Gaston’s claim of discontinuity relative to the Christ event, focuses upon Paul’s apocalyptic theology wherein there exists a sharp antithesis between the old world and the new creation that was inaugurated by the Christ event (\textit{Paul Among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology Beyond Christendom and Modernity} [Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2003], 68–72, 80–81, 168ff). Zoccali identifies five primary interpretive approaches to the key exegetical battleground of Romans 9–11, particularly in relation to the phrase “And so all Israel will be saved” (Rom 11:26): (1) “eschatological miracle”; (2) ecclesiological; (3) Roman mission; (4) two-covenant; (5) total national elect (\textit{Whom God has Called}, 91–102).
Campbell argues that Pauline Christ-followers would not have seen themselves as some sort of new, a-cultural, universal association which is disconnected from its Jewish roots, but rather as Jews and other ethnicities who, while ethnically diverse, are united under the transforming influence of Christ, and who express that diverse unity within their individual cultures.\(^{76}\) Campbell contends, therefore, that Paul is a non-sectarian, Jewish reformist who sought to establish groups that were theologically united with, yet socially distinct from, the greater synagogue community, but who still accepted Jewish ethno-religious identity markers in their worship of the Jewish Christos.\(^{77}\)

In a parallel vein, Denise Buell claims that Paul’s views do not contain the supersessionist seeds of some 2\(^{nd}\) century CE Christ-followers who conceived of themselves as a “third race.” These later Christ-followers downplayed the importance of ethnic and racial identity, and in some cases even erased it. Buell bases her argument upon a conversionist paradigm which rests “on Christian collective self-definition in ethical/racial terms.”\(^{78}\) While Buell moves in the right direction, her conclusions would have been strengthened, specifically in relation to the Roman and Corinthian communities, had she assessed early Christ-followers’ collective self-definition along socio-religious (i.e., sub-group identities), rather than only along ethnic/racial, lines.

---


\(^{77}\) Campbell, *Paul*, 66. Campbell makes this point very clear in his analysis of Paul’s discussion on the weak and the strong in Romans 14:1–15:13. Campbell states that Paul “feels obliged to make it clear that accommodation to those living a Jewish way of life, far from being in conflict with his gospel, is demanded by it, if the conviction of fellow Christ-followers so requires” (“The Addressees of Paul’s Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?” in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11* [ed. F. Wilk and J. R. Wagner, with the assistance of F. Schleritt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 171–95, esp. 188).

3. Methodological Considerations: Identity, Social History, Epigraphy

3.1. Identity Precedes Theology

Although personal identity can be described from social, religious, ethnic, political, and economic perspectives,\(^79\) it is not complete without an assessment of the group identities which impinge upon an individual. This is true not least since “ancient Mediterranean cultures focused on the collective rather than on individuals.”\(^80\) Bruce Malina even goes so far as to categorize the Mediterranean personality type as “dyadic” or “collectivistic.”\(^81\) Thus, in no small measure, group identity is constitutive of, though not solely determinative for, personal identity formation.\(^82\)

A focus on group identity construction is, therefore, particularly important for understanding the ideology behind a variety of theological constructs in the New Testament. Campbell emphatically reinforces that fact when he states that “identity precedes theology and that in fact theological constructions emerge to solve the problem of identity rather than create it.”\(^83\)

When applied practically to Paul’s letters, for example, this truism suggests that Paul’s metaphorical appropriation of Jewish sacred space imagery for the communities of Christ-followers he addresses in Rome and Corinth

\(^79\) For example, ethno-religious terminology used in scholarship for individual Christ-followers begins with base descriptors such as “Jews,” “Christians,” “Judeans,” “Christ-believers,” and “Christ-followers,” to which are added ethnicity modifiers (“Jewish,” “non-Jewish”/”Gentile”) and/or theological modifiers (“non-messianic Jews,” “messianic Jewish”). Social identities include slave, freedperson, \textit{paterfamilias}, and wife. Socio-political identities include Greek, Roman, “barbarian,” Jew.


\(^82\) Tellbe claims that “Social identity” is thus the outcome of a process whereby an individual models his or her thoughts, feelings and actions on the thoughts, feelings and actions attributed to significant group members and then incorporates these into a mental image” (“The Prototypical Christ-Believer,” 120).

\(^83\) Campbell, \textit{Paul}, 52 (author’s emphasis).
(temple of God, body of the Jewish Christos) is not theology for its own sake, but rather is a theological means to the end of resolving socio-religious divisions. In other words, Paul uses a theology of sacred space, to which both Jerusalem and Pauline loyal Christ-followers can adhere (e.g., fictive temple imagery: 1 Pet 2:5 and 1 Cor 3:16, 17), as a basis from which rhetorically to engender cooperation and harmony between differentiated sub-groups of Christ-followers in Rome and in Corinth (“I belong to Paul…Cephas”; 1 Cor 1:12). These apostolically differentiated sub-groups may even hold to different sub-group identities (hoi hagioi and ekklēsia, respectively).  

3.2. Social History and Epigraphy

A comprehensive analysis of ekklēsia occurrences within New Testament texts requires at least three sociological approaches:  

- social description (“what does the artefact mean?”),  
- social history (“how does the text inform us of the socio-cultural

84 For example, in the book of Romans Paul addresses his comments to the klētoi hagioi (1:7). Robert Jewett claims that “when the term ‘saints’ is used as a description of specific Christian groups in contrast to all Christians, it refers to Jewish Christians, loyal to or associated with Jerusalem” (Romans: A Commentary [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 2007], 114). Jewett cites other examples in Romans 15:25, 26, 31; 1 Cor 16:1 (Ibid, 114; see also Horst Balz, “ἀγίοις κτλ.,” EDNT 1.17). Some scholars come close to Jewett’s suggestion when they say that the phrase κλητο/uni1FD6ς /uni1F01γίοις is “almost titular” (C. E. B. Cranfield, Romans [2 vols.; ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 1979/2006 reprint], 1.69). See also, Ulrich Wilckens (Der Brief an die Römer [3 vols.; EKKNT VI; Ostfildern/Einsiedeln/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Patmos/Benziger/ Neukirchener, 1982–1997], 1.68 n. 39). For a detailed discussion of the term hoi hagioi and its use as a group identity by early Christ-followers loyal to, or associated with, Jerusalem, see Trebilco, Self-designations, 104–37. Paul does not speak of an ekklēsia in his Roman epistle until the final chapter wherein he requests that greetings be sent by the addressees of his Roman epistle to the ekklēsia which meets in the home of Aquila and Priscilla (16:3-5).  


86 “Social description” incorporates all the information we have from antiquity such as literature, archeology, art, numismatic evidence, and inscriptions. Scholars organize this data for the purpose of describing every aspect of the social environment (e.g., occupations, economics, villages and cities, laws, social classes, patron-client relations, gender roles). Once organized, social description enhances our
context of the narrative’s timeframe?"), and sociology of knowledge ("how does the text inform us of the community behind its writing?"). My socio-historical methodology affirms the principle of variegated ‘Christianities,’ which together exhibit apostolic (Matthean, Johannine, Pauline, Petrine), regional (Asia Minor, Greece, Judea, Rome, Syria), and epochal (pre-70 CE, post-70 CE) variations, and whose attestation is found in textual, archaeological, and/or inscriptive artefacts. The importance of supplementing literary artifacts with material evidence is emphasized by Harland. He makes the point

understanding of the daily cultures and customs in specific geographical locations in the ancient world (see Rhoades, “Social Criticism,” 145–180).

87 Philip Harland uses the phrase “social history” to mean at least three things: (1) “the actual social and religious life of persons and groups (from various levels of society) living within a particular region”; (2) being “concerned with social relations and, more specifically, with issues regarding the relationship between groups and surrounding sociocultural institutions and values…[which includes] issues concerning interactions between groups (associations, synagogues, or assemblies) and others within the structures of society, including the elites”; and (3) using “methods and insights from the social sciences [such as] sociological studies of social networks…anthropological insights [regarding] the meaning of rituals…social-scientific studies of acculturation and assimilation among minority cultural groups” (Associations, 14–15).

88 For usage of “sociology of knowledge” as a way of understanding the community behind a piece of literature, see the work of Anthony Saldarini on the Matthean community (Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994]), and Raymond Brown’s diachronic analysis of the Johannine community (An Introduction to the Gospel of John [ed. F. J. Moloney; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007], esp. 62–84). Rhoades succinctly summarizes the interrelationship between “social description” and “sociology of knowledge.” He notes that while social description focuses on the material realities of a society, sociology of knowledge deals with how that society organizes and interprets those realities. Sociology of knowledge makes us aware of the relativity of cultures and challenges the idea that cultures are fixed. Each society interprets, organizes, and experiences life in its own way and has a set of common values and customary ways in which people interact. Together these social factors make up a given culture’s “common knowledge.” Since people are born into their cultural paradigm, they seldom question the “common knowledge” (“Social Criticism,” 145–180).

89 I use the term “Johannine” here for the sake of expediency in referring to the authors of the Johannine epistles and to the book of Revelation, not necessarily implying thereby that both sets of literary works are written by the same “John.”

90 For example, Bengt Holmberg emphasizes the need for integrating social historical backdrops when reading the Pauline corpus. He calls for a recognition of the fact that Paul’s ethical and theological pronouncements need to be situated within the context of “social factors like stratum-specific behaviour patterns operative in the everyday life of these Christians” (“The Methods of Historical Reconstruction in the Scholarly ‘Recovery’ of Corinthian Christianity,” in Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church [ed. E. Adams and D. Horrell; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 161).

91 Unless otherwise noted, text copied from Greek literary works is taken from the Perseus website (http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/; accessed beginning November 2010).
that only archaeological evidence allows for the emergence of a “grass roots level” perspective on non-elite life within Greco-Roman society, a perspective which is too easily masked by literary texts that are the product of social elites. This literary *tendenz* towards ideological representation is evident both in Greek and Roman authors. Epigraphic evidence, when available, is less susceptible, although not immune, to ideological self-presentations. This fact undergirds my choice to focus upon epigraphic occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* to a degree much greater than has previous scholarship.

In so doing, however, I affirm four limitations noted by Robert Sinclair relative to conclusions one can draw from inscriptional evidence. First, public inscriptions only

---

92 Harland emphasizes the need to add local archeological and epigraphic materials as evidence for associations in the world of early Christ groups and Judean gatherings (*Dynamics of Identity*, 2).

93 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 2, 3.

94 One Greek literary example is Aristotle’s corpus, wherein, while writing about the *boulē* and *ekklēsia* of 4th century Athens, he substitutes original 5th century terminology. Susanne Carlsson cogently compares the historical value of literary sources and epigraphic sources (*Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States* [HE 206; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010], 17–18): “In contrast to ancient literary sources which are often written many years after the course of events they describe and which are known only from medieval manuscripts, inscriptions are original texts and thus constitute not only sources, but also archaeological artefacts.”


represent the “tip of the epigraphic iceberg,” so to speak. Second, a statistical analysis of only extant stone or bronze inscriptions neglects a much larger body of epigraphic evidence, which is either lost to posterity, given the happenstance nature of archaeological discoveries, or permanently lost through decay and destruction. Third, since stone stelae are not infrequently of a fragmentary or eroded nature, a historian cannot prima facie assume that the epigraphist has correctly reconstructed the text. Fourth, variations in terminology and decree formulae may still reflect a similar provenance and compositional date.

---

97 Public display was reserved for more important decisions such as alliances with foreign states. An exponentially greater number of inscriptions were archived, and, thus, ultimately lost to posterity. As such, any socio-historical conclusions reached relative to public inscriptions will of necessity reflect only a limited cross-section of that polis’ actual socio-political reality. Aeschines (3.187) mentions that all Athenian psēphismata tou dēmou are filed in the Metroon by an overseer known simply as the “public servant” (δηµόσιος) (see also, Dem. 19.130; Paus. 1.3.5). In ancient Athens, the Old Metroon initially functioned as “the record office and repository of the laws” (Photias, Souda, Agora III no. 487). However, between the years 410/9 and 405/4, following the completion of the new Bouleterion, the records of the boulē were moved and organized into a centralized public archive within the old Bouleterion, which now became known as the new Metroon. See the discussion by T. Leslie Shear, Jr. (“Bouleterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens,” Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis [HE 95; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995], 157–90, esp. 173–89).

98 Civic decrees were engraved and written not only on stone and bronze, but also on less durable materials, such as wooden tablets and papyrus. Their increased susceptibility to decay over time means a treasure trove of insights into ancient socio-political life has been forever lost. The clearest statement that copies of decrees were written on wooden tablets is found in IG I1, 165 ADD, lines 6–11 (430–420 BCE?).

99 Carlsson notes that there are two divergent approaches taken by schools of thought involved in editing inscriptions. The one school does “small restorations of occasional letters without any need of defence” and the other follows the “Principle of Extreme Freedom” where attention is focused not on the exact wording but on what one thought was the original substance (Hellenistic Democracies, 19). Carlsson stresses that there is a need for the historical interpreter to distinguish between what has been restored by an epigraphist and what can actually be read on the original stone. This confirmatory process, though, is time-consuming and is the purview of only highly qualified linguists.

100 I offer two sets of examples not noted by Sinclair. The first set involves the use of two different morphemes within the same inscription for the same case of definite article (e.g., τά and ταί) and its accompanying noun (e.g., ἐκκλησία and ἐκκλησίατα, respectively): (1) IG XII.Suppl 139 (167? BCE; Aegean Islands, Lesbos, Nisos, and Tenedos, Ionia — Miletos); ἐν τά ἐκκλησίαια and ἐν ταί ἐκκλησίαια; (2) IMT NoerdlTroas 4 (2nd cent. BCE; Asia Minor, Troas, Lampsakos [Lapseki]); ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ and ἐν τῇ δήσομεν τdiğini ἐκκλησίαι;
(3) IMilet I 3, 146A (209/208 BCE; Asia Minor, Ionia, Ephesus, Notion, Klaros); εἰς τήν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπί τῇ βουλήν καὶ τήν ἐκκλησίαν. The second set involves different morphemes of the same definite article occurring in different inscriptions linked by similar timeframes and regions: (1) 2nd half of the 1st cent. BCE: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησίαν (FD III 1:463; central Greece,
The import of epigraphic evidence on the meaning of the word *ekklēsia* in New Testament writings remains, to a large extent, untapped. In order more effectively to address this lacuna in *ekklēsia* research, I have created a searchable database of the extant inscriptional occurrences of the word *ekklēsia*, along with the concomitant political and religious terminology that accompanies each *ekklēsia* reference. Whenever I use the transliterated lexeme *ekklēsia* in reference to epigraphic evidence, the resultant data reflects the collated evidence from five Greek lexemes (ἐκκλησία, ἐκλησία, ἐκκλησίη, ἐκκλεσία, and ἐγκλησία), and their morphological variations. There are approximately 2100 inscriptive mentions of the word *ekklēsia* dating from the 5th century BCE to the 11th century CE, which can be reorganized by region, city, date, syntactical locutions (e.g., adjectives, verbs), and a number of other investigative categories, within my epigraphic database. In Part I, which deals with *ekklēsia* usage in Greek and Roman sources, I identify a number of correlations between *ekklēsia* occurrences in the epigraphic record not yet noted by scholarship.
Part I: *Ekklēsia* in Greek and Roman Sources

1. Introduction

My primary focus here in Part I is upon examining the way in which the word *ekklēsia* is used in Greek and Roman sources dated from the 5th century BCE up to, and including, the 2nd century CE. My purpose in this is three-fold. First, I will assess whether a non-civic group, which self-designated collectively as an *ekklēsia*, could have been perceived by Roman authorities as being politically seditious. Such an assumption gains purchase if civic *ekklēsiai* in the Greek East still retained sufficient democratic power (*dēmokratia*) to have been perceived as a political threat by Rome.

A second political assumption requiring attention is the view of some scholars that Greek civic *ekklēsiai* were ‘secular’ institutions; they did not mix politics with religion. This leads some to conclude that, since Jewish synagogues mixed religion and politics, any Jewish writer (e.g., Josephus) who calls a Jewish assembly an *ekklēsia* is not using authentic Jewish terminology but rather is viewing it through Greek eyes.

Third, I will reinforce the research of John Kloppenborg and Philip Harland that no example exists of a Greco-Roman non-civic group (e.g., a voluntary association) using *ekklēsia* as a permanent group designation. I accomplish this through an investigation of all extant references to the word *ekklēsia* within the Greek inscriptions record (5th century BCE to 35 CE).  

---

105 There are at least 1858 *ekklēsia* mentions in the inscriptions record which are dated from the 5th cent. BCE up to and including the 2nd cent. CE.  
106 There are at least 1780 *ekklēsia* mentions in the inscriptions record which are dated from the 5th cent. BCE up to 35 CE.
2. Ekklēsiai in the Imperial Period: The Politics of Oligarchy, Hierarchy, and Democracy

My first investigative focus in Part I can be restated as a question: How might a non-civic group, which adopted civic terminology, specifically the word ekklēsia, have been perceived, socially, by Greco-Roman outsiders and, politically, by Roman authorities? Two taxonomical issues require clarification before one can answer this question. First, three civic institutions require definition and, second, the three key political players in Imperial period poleis require identification.

2.1. Civic Terminology

An Imperial period polis in the Greek East had three primary institutional bodies for political decision-making: the council (boulē),¹⁰⁷ the people (dēmos),¹⁰⁸ and the

¹⁰⁷ Imperial period boulai were not infrequently of similar size to their classical Athenian ancestor—500 councilors (bouleutai)—and often mimicked the Athenian political year. In classical Athens, 50 bouleutai were drawn from each of the ten phylai (“tribes”) of Attica. Each phylē presided over the affairs of the Athenian city-state for a 35 (or 39 day) period called a prytaneia. During each prytaneia, the presiding tribe designated 50 bouleutai to act as prytaneis. These 50 prytaneis gave oversight to the other 450 members of the boulē, and thus over each ekklēsia held during their prytaneia. Although the Athenian dēmos was sovereign, its boulē was the chief power broker among the official political institutions of the state, including the magistrates (archontes) (cf. Arist. Pol. 1322b12–18). See further in Robert K. Sinclair (Democracy and Participation in Athens [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 105, 229) and in Mogens Hermann Hansen (The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987], 220). Aristotle lists some of the officials who were subordinate to the boulē in the age of Demosthenes (Ath. Pol. 54:3–5): “They also appoint by lot the officer called Clerk for the Presidency (γρα/uni03BC/uni03BCατέα τ/uni1F78ν κατ/uni1F70 πρυτανείαν), who is responsible for documents, is keeper of the decrees that are passed and supervises the transcription of all other documents, and who attends the sittings of the Council. Formerly this officer was elected by show of hands… but now it has been made an office elected by lot. [4] They also elect by lot another officer to superintend the laws (ἐπ/uni1F7Aς νό/uni03BCους), who attends the sittings of the Council, and he also has copies made of all the laws. [5] The People also elect by show of hands a clerk (γρα/uni03BC/uni03BCατέα) to read documents to the Assembly and to the Council; he has no duties except as reader.”

¹⁰⁸ The word dēmos refers generally to “the whole mass of clans assembled under one rule, whether it was conceived in terms of the country or its inhabitants” (Gustave Glotz, The Greek City and Its Institutions [New York: Barnes and Noble, 1929/1969], 9). The dēmos constituted an ekklēsia when it assembled together as the body of the full citizenry in Athens for the purpose of conducting civic business. The full citizenry, or dēmos, was comprised only of males (Sinclair, Democracy, 15). Rhodes nuances Glotz’s definition in his note that δῆμος could also refer to the “deme,” of which there were 139 following Cleisthenes’ political reforms. However, whenever the term δῆμος occurs within an enactment formula (e.g., ἔδοξε δῆμωι) that was motioned and approved before an ἐκκλησία (ekklēsia), δῆμος never has
assembly (ekklēsia). Beginning with the Classical period, members of the boulē (bouleutai) had administrative oversight of civic, foreign and regional affairs. They reported their recommendations during an ekklēsia by bringing forward resolutions (probouleumata) for ratification or revision by the dēmos. Each probouleuma was placed on the agenda (programma or prographē) of the ekklēsia.

The ekklēsia represents a different political category than either the boulē or the dēmos. An ekklēsia is a juridically defined event during which members of the dēmos assemble in a particular time and location to carry out specific governmental functions. Usually the two terms are clearly differentiated. Not infrequently, though, the referent for the term ekklēsia is left ambiguous, such that it can refer either to the public assembly reference to a geographically regional deme, but always to the “whole mass of clans,” that is, to the body of the full citizenry in Athens (P. J. Rhodes, “Epigraphical Evidence: Laws and Decrees,” in Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24–27, 1994, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, vol. 2 [HFM 72; ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1995], 91–112, esp. 93).

Although not a political institution, per se, there was one more important governing institution in classical Athens, and in other democratic poleis. It was the dikastēria or popular courts. In classical Athens, each dikastēria consisted of several hundred jurors (dikastai) each of whom was chosen by lot from a pool of 6000 jurors. Private actions had a jury of 201 or 401 dikastai, while most public actions were heard by 501 dikastai. The popular courts of ancient Athens heard civil and criminal cases and “examined the magistrates, passed judgement in political trials and sometimes reviewed the decrees of the people and the laws (nomoi) of the nomothetai to see if they were unconstitutional. The people’s court met between 150 and 200 times a year” (Hansen, Athenian Assembly, 211).

P. J. Rhodes and David M. Lewis note that “proposers of probouleumatic decrees had to be members of the council” (The Decrees of the Greek States [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997], 28). A comment by Aeschines (389–314 BCE) problematizes that view with respect to Athenian democracy in the mid-4th century. Although no inscriptive corroboration survives, Aeschines (III. Ctes. 125–27) suggests that a citizen who was not a member of the boulē could influence the enactment of a decree. In order to do so, a citizen who was not a councilor (bouletēs) would need first to find a sponsoring bouletēs. The amenable bouletēs would put forward that citizen’s motion as a probouleuma to the boulē. The other option would be for the sponsoring bouletēs to present the non-member and his proposal before the gathered ekklēsia in an open probouleuma.

Three inscriptive examples of a differentiation in meaning between boulē as “council,” dēmos as “people,” and ekklēsia as “meeting” are: (1) IG XII,1 3 (Rhodes, 1st cent. BCE or CE): [ἐξοδεύει τοῖς δήμοις ἐν τῷ ἐκκλήσιον ἐν τῷ Ἀρταμιτίῳ μηθ᾽]; (2) Bosch, Quellen Ankara 184, 144 (Ankýra/Ankara, N. Galatia, n.d.): [...] φυλή ἑνάτῃ ἑβάλε Βουλαία ἀνέπτύσσεν ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτῆς εὐνοίας ἐνέκεν ἀναγορευθέντα ἐν ἐκλήσια ὑπὸ τὸν δήμον τὸν δημοτού ἀρχάγγελον Νείκερον ἅλοντος Βασιλείαν ἄρσι; and (3) Bosch, Quellen Ankara 265, 202 (Ankýra/Ankara, N. Galatia, n.d.): τειμῆθεν ἐν ἐκλήσια ὑπὸ [δήμου] βουλής καὶ δημοῦ ἀνδρόν ἐν ἐκκλήσιας τειμαῖς.
or to the *dēmos* for the duration of its gathering in that public assembly. The terms *boulē* and *dēmos*, on the other hand, only refer to continuously existing groups of human beings. Interaction between *boulai* and *dēmoi* within *ekklēsiai* is described in both literary and epigraphic sources dated from the 5th century BCE into the Imperial period. Literary sources include, but are not limited to, Plato (429–347 BCE), Xenophon (c. 430–355 BC), and Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE). Epigraphic sources span the centuries (5th cent. BCE to the early 3rd cent. CE), and hail from geographically diverse regions.

112 Of the over 1896 inscriptional *ekklēsia* references (5th cent. BCE to 3rd cent. CE), at least 507 are ambiguous enough to be read as identifying either a public assembly (*ekklēsia*) or the *dēmos* while they are gathered together in assembly. Their occurrence by region is as follows: Aegean Islands (25x; late 5th cent. BCE–100 BCE); Asia Minor (177x; 332 BCE–160 CE); Attica (159x; 403 BCE–40 BCE); central Greece (83x; 341 BCE–117 CE); North Shore of the Black Sea (15x; 275 BCE–210 CE); Northern Greece (23x; 400 BCE–1CE); Peloponnesos (13x; 303 BCE–130 BCE); Scythia Minor (7x; 230 BCE–100 CE); and Thrace (5x; 300 BCE–200 BCE).

113 In many locales in Peloponnesos and in the northwest of Greece, the body of citizens fictively called themselves “the *polis*” (“city”). For example, an enactment decree made by the *politai* of Orchomenus in Arcadia reads, “resolved by the *polis*” (*ISE* 53, *SEG* 33:317) and “resolved by the *boulē* and the *polis*” (*SEG* 33:391) (Rhodes, “Epigraphical Evidence,” 95).

114 Greek writers who reference an *ekklēsia* are: Aeschines, Andocides, Appian, Apollodorus, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Athenaeus, Demades, Demosthenes, Diodorus, Dinarchus, Diogenes Laertius, Euripides, Herodotus, Hyperides, Isaues, Isocrates, Lucian, Lycurgus, Lysias, Pausanias, Plato, Plutarch, Polybius, Pseudo-Xenophon, Strabo, Theophrastus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. The number of their combined references to a civic *ekklēsia* totals at least 1063 (See Appendix #6).

115 Plato writes about a civic *ekklēsia* 13 times. For example, *Laws* book 8, section 850b: κα/uni1F76πιστεύ/uni1FC3πείσειν βουλ/uni1F74ν κα/uni1F76/uni1F10κκλησίαν, τινα/uni1F00ναβολ/uni1F74ν τ/uni1FC6ς/uni1F10ξοικήσεως (“and if he believes that he can persuade the Council and Assembly to grant his request”) (*Plato. Platonis Opera* [ed. John Burnet; Oxford University Press, 1903]).

116 Xenophon mentions a civic *ekklēsia* 20 times. For example, *Hellenica* book 6, chapter 5: [33] άκούοντες δε τα/uni1F72τα ο/uni1F31/uni1F08θηνα/uni1FD6οι…/uni1F10κκλησίαν/uni1F10ποίησαν κατ/uni1F70δόγ/uni03BCα βουλ/uni1FC6ς. (“When the Athenians heard of all these things…by resolution of the Senate they called a meeting of the Assembly”) (*Xenophon. Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 2 [2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921/repr. 1971]).

117 Plutarch speaks of a civic *ekklēsia* 142 times. One wonders, though, whether his descriptions of the classical *ekklēsia* more reflect *praxis* within *ekklēsiai* of his day. For example, Plutarch claims to be authoritative even in his description of Solon’s reforms (*Solon* 16.3: ...και τον Σόλωνα της πολιτείας διορθωτην και νομοθετην ἀπεδειξαν, ου τα μεν, τα δ' ουχι, παντα δ' ὀμαλως ἐπιτρέψαντες, αρχας, ἐκκλησιας, δικαιστηριας, βουλας. [33] “They also appointed Solon to reform the constitution and make new laws, laying no restrictions whatever upon him, but putting everything into his hands, magistracies, assemblies, courts-of-law, and councils”) (*Plutarch. Plutarch’s Lives*. [trans. Bernadotte Perrin; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/ London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914]).

118 For inscriptional references to the civic *ekklēsia* during, and surrounding, the 1st century CE, see Appendices #1–3.
such as the Aegean Islands (e.g., Delos), central Greece (e.g., Delphi), and Asia Minor (e.g., Pisidia and Caria). Since the words ekklēsia and dēmos are often used interchangeably, enactment decrees which mention either term, but not the boulē, imply an autonomous exercise of political authority by the people. This type of decree is called a non-probouleutic, or ecclesiastical decree (e.g., edoxen tōi dēmoi). There are three potential non-probouleutic decrees from the 1st or 2nd centuries CE which use the word ekklēsia.

119 For example, IDelos 1502 (Delos, 148/7 BCE) reads, δεδοχθας τε [bouleτι τους λαχον] τας προεδρους εις [την επισουσαν έκκλησιαν] χρηματισα περι [τοιτων].
120 For example, FD III 4:47 (Delphi, 98 CE) reads, θεος, τουχ άγαθη, ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφος Τ. Φλαουίου Σωκλάρου, μηνος ἑνδυσποιτροπιου ζ, ἐν προσκλήτων έκκλησια, δόμη βουλής καὶ δήμου.
121 For example, Mon. Ant. 23.1914.259,172 (Pisidia, Sagalassos, 4th/3rd cent. BCE) reads, ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος Τ(ίτων) Ἀλιον Ἀδριανὸν Τυδέα τὸν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, ἄρχιερεα τῶν Σεβαστῶν, υἱον βουλῆς, υἱον έκκλησιας, υἱον πόλεως, φιλόπατριν.
122 For example, BCH 1972, 435–36 (Caria, found at Aphrodisias, 2nd/1st cent. BCE) reads, δεδοχθας τῇ βουλής καὶ τοῦ δήμο[uß], κυρωθόντος τοῦ βουλη[ματας] . . . στεφάνας δὲ αυτὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ βαλλοῦσα [στεφάνας] .
123 For detailed definitions of bouleutic, probouleutic, and non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decrees see Roger Alain De Laix, Proboulēsis at Athens: A Study in Political Decision-Making (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 195–98 and Sinclair, Democracy, 94, 229. A non-probouleutic decree implies that the decision reached in the ekklēsia did not derive from a proboulēsis of the boulē. Examples from the Greek East wherein the people (dēmos) on their own are stated to have made a decision include: IPrusaOlym 1006–1011 (all 1st or 2nd cent. CE); ISmyrna 676 (117–138? CE); TAM V.2 1264 (Hierocasesarea, 25?CE); ISetge 31 (late 1st/early 2nd cent. CE), 32 (Imperial); IKourion 87 (113/4 CE); and IGLSyrV I 167 (Nicopolis, Imperial; cf. Arjan Zuiderhoek, “On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City,” GRBS 48 [2008]: 417–445, esp. 419 n. 3).
124 There are no 1st cent. BCE inscriptions within which the word ekklēsia occurs either in an enactment formula (έδοξεν τῇ έκκλησίᾳ) or in a motion formula (δεδοχθας τῇ έκκλησίᾳ; “Let it be resolved by the ekklēsia”). There are three occurrences within 1st and 2nd cent. CE inscriptions, but their fragmentary nature precludes any definitive readings. Only one hails from Asia Minor proper: SEG VII 2 (Parthia, Susiana, Seleucia on the Eulaeus [Susa]; 21 CE/Parthian year 268, Audnaeus 17). It is a letter from Artaban III, king of Parthia, to Seleucia approving the election of a city treasurer. It reads, Βασιλευ[ν] το[ς Σελευκου, έτοιοι] [ς] [α] καὶ [ρ], μη [ν] [νος - - -] , ἐν Σελευ[κειαι δ] ε[ν τῆ προς τῷ] Εὐλαίω [Α[έους]] - - , έπι Άμωνιουυ, έδοξε τῇ έκκλησίαι. See its discussion by Robert K. Sherk (“The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV. The Register Part III: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor (continued),” ZPE 93 [1992]: 223–272). The other two are from Kos and Arsa (Scythia Minor): Iscr. di Cos EV 75bis (Cos and Calyma, Kos — Kos, 1st or 2nd cents. CE; [— — έδοξεν τῇ έκκλησίᾳ(?)] — — ); IScM III 34, (Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis [Mangalia] — Arsa; 50–100 CE; [Έ]δοξε τῇ άρχιεραστικά [έκκλησία]).
There are more, though, which use the word dēmos. This implies that more than three examples of popular assemblies exercising political autonomy existed in the early Imperial period. A full analysis of the data, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis: early Christ-followers self-designated as ekklēsia; they did not self-identify as dēmos.

The confluence of the three civic terms (boulē, dēmos, ekklēsia) within one inscription indicates a population centre called a polis (“city-state”). Onno van Nijf uses the term “Imperial Greek city” to indicate a polis in the Greek East during the first three centuries CE, that is, from the reign of Augustus up to, and including, Diocletian (27 BCE–284 CE). The governance model of Imperial Greek poleis continued to use all three Classical-era political institutions (boulē, dēmos, ekklēsia), yet, as a rule, without the concomitant dēmokratia that empowered their Classical ancestors.

---

125 An example of a non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decree from Asia Minor in which only the dēmos is mentioned comes from Cyzicus (Syll. 798 = IGR IV 145; Mysia, 37 CE). Therein, the dēmos commissioned the archontes to draft and propose a decree, which was then discussed and passed at a later meeting (Rhodes and Lewis, Decrees of the Greek States, 416). An example from the 2nd century CE has the dēmos electing the city’s treasurers (tamiai) (Ismyna 771; c. 117–138 CE). Of note is one non-probouleutic/ecclesiastical decree which uses both terms ekklēsia and dēmos but not synonymously (IG XII,1 3, Rhodes, 1st century BCE or CE; [ἐδοξέσεν τῷ δῆμῳ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῷ Ἀρχαμβάτῳ μηνί].

126 Rhodes notes that only inscriptions of a polis mention both a boulē and a dēmos in the enactment formula (e.g., ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ). This is because only a (larger) polis has a boulē and, along with it, a legislative procedure called probouleusis. By contrast, some smaller cities (e.g., in Arcadia) do not appear to have had a boulē (“Epigraphical Evidence,” 94). The enactment formula is but one of five standardized elements within enactment decrees: the enactment formula (ἐδοξέσεν τῇ…; “resolved by…”), the proposer of the motion (“X” εἶπεν; “X” proposed”), the motivation clause (ἐπείδη…; “since…”), the motion formula (δεδόχθαι…; “Let it be resolved…”), and the substance (the action to be taken) (Rhodes and Lewis, Decrees of the Greek States, 551–52). See also the detailed discussion of decrees by B. H. McLean, An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337) (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002), 215–27.

127 The start of Octavian/Augustus’ reign can be placed either in 31 BCE, after his defeat of Mark Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium, or in 27 BCE when Octavian officially became Augustus by award of the Senate. Diocletian reigned from 284 BCE until 305 BCE.

128 Onno van Nijf also notes at least five distinctive architectural features of an Imperial Greek city: (1) a theatre; (2) an odeion; (3) a gymnasium; (4) monumental stoas on the agora; and (5) a large colonnaded street, which van Nijf calls, somewhat tongue in cheek, “the ultimate fashion statement of the era” (“Public Space and the Political Culture of Roman Termessos,” in Political Culture in the Greek City...
2.2. Political Players in Imperial Greek Cities

Arjan Zuiderhoek identifies three public, and often competing, dimensions to civic politics in Imperial Greek cities: “The sources point to a strong element of oligarchy as well as to a continuing tradition of popular politics, against a background of a growing social and political hierarchisation.”

Van Nijf adds a fourth: “political culture.”

Political culture is the social expression of the underlying mentality and practices that inform political practice. It is particularly evident in inscriptions of Asia Minor poleis.

The first dimension of Imperial period political life in the Greek East was civic governance by oligarchs. Oligarchs represent the top of the social hierarchy. They also came to predominate in the boulē where council membership was restricted to property holders who passed the census qualification. Aelius Aristides (mid-2nd cent. CE) calls

---

129 Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 418.
130 Onno van Nijf defines “political culture” as “a ‘menu of approaches’ developed in political science, but adopted also by historians involving both the ideals and the operating norms of a political system. Political culture includes subjective attitudes and sentiments as well as objective symbols and creeds that together govern political behaviour and give structure and order to the political process” (“Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age” in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* [ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 1–26, esp. 5). See also Stephen Mitchell (“Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor,” *JRS* 80 [1990]: 183–193) and H. W. Pleket (“Political Culture and Political Practice in the Cities of Asia Minor in the Roman Empire,” in *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* [ed. W. Schuller; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998], 204–216). They argue that politics permeated cultural forms and religious life.

131 For example, van Nijf, “Public Space,” 215–242.
oligarchs “the most important and powerful” people (*megistoi kai dynatótatoi*) from across the Empire.\textsuperscript{133} New councilors technically could no longer come from the *zeugitai* or *thetēs* census classes, as in Athens of old,\textsuperscript{134} but only from respectable elite families.\textsuperscript{135} In reality, the fact that urban elites were “heavily stratified internally” brings Zuiderhoek to state that there were “lower echelons of the *bouleutic order*...[consisting of] a group of well-to-do non-elite citizens from whom these new councilors could be recruited.”\textsuperscript{136}

Where popular elections still existed, such as for magisteries, it was the *bouleutic ordo* which drew up the list of potential candidates.\textsuperscript{137} Zuiderhoek states that oligarchization developed to such a degree that councilors sat for life and they and their families “increasingly came to have a corporate identity as a ruling class, and began to refer to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Aelius Aristides emphasizes the high status of these provincials associated with Rome: “Many in each city are citizens of yours no less than of their fellow natives...There is no need of garrisons holding acropolises, but the most important and powerful in each place guard their countries for you” (*Or. 26.64*).
\item Solon founded democratic rule in Athens (late 590’s BCE). He divided the citizenry into four census classes: *pentakosiomedimnoi* (producers of at least 500 ‘bushels’ or *medimnoi*, of grain per year), *hippeis* (knights or cavalrymen—300 and more *medimnoi* per year), *zeugitai* (hoplites—200 and more *medimnoi* per year), and *thetēs* (labourers—under 200 *medimnoi* per year) (Sinclair, *Democracy*, 2). For a nuanced analysis of the socio-economic dynamics associated with each census class in classical Athenian society, see Jeffrey A. Writers, *Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 78–85. Writers sub-divides “hoplites” into two categories (“lower hoplites,” “upper hoplites”), and names the top 1,200 richest Athenians “Trierarch-Oligarchs.” He sub-divides this category into the “Lower 900 Trierarch-Oligarchs,” the “290 of the ‘Three Hundred’” and the “Top 10 Trierarch-Oligarchs” (*Oligarchy*, 79–83).
\item Pliny *Ep. 10.79* (Bithynia and Pontus). For council membership in other *poleis* in the Greek East, see Quass (*Die Honoratiorenschicht*, 384–94) and Stephen Mitchell (*Anatolia I* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 88–89 [Galatia]).
\item Arjan Zuiderhoek, “Oligarchs and Benefactors: Elite Demography and Euergetism in the Greek East of the Roman Empire,” in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 185–196, esp. 190–91. Zuiderhoek argues that it was “conditions of high mortality” which gave rise to this strategy for keeping “the *ordo* at a fixed numerical strength” (Ibid, 191). He names some of the urban non-elites who were candidates for the lower echelons of the *bouleutic* order: “rich craftsmen, traders, manufacturers, owners of medium sized estates, perhaps even professional men such as doctors, teachers, and rhetoricians” (e.g., a gymnastic trainer [*paidotribes*] in Smyrna [*ISmyrna 246*]; a shipowner [*naukleros*] councilor in Nikomedia [*TAM IV.1.304*]) (Ibid, 191).
\item Pleket, “Political Culture,” 206. With respect to the *boulē* in Prusa (early 2nd cent. CE), Bekker-Nielsen notes that “the social standing of its members and the fact that the council united almost all the powerful and wealthy men of the city meant that in addition to its probouleutic function, it was often the real locus of decision-making” (*Urban Life*, 67).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
themselves collectively as the βουλευτικόν τάγμα, the bouleutic order (or ordo decurionum)."¹³⁸ In Bithynia, at the very least, these socio-political elites even received constitutional recognition under Roman leges provinciae.¹³⁹

Rome ‘deputized’ the oligarchic elites as rulers of each polis on its behalf. This indirect approach is evident in an inscription from Oinoanda (Oenoanda) in Lycia (Asia Minor). It describes the organization of a festival processional during Hadrian’s reign (SEG 38:1462; 124–125/126 CE).¹⁴⁰ The involvement of Roman elites amounted only to the granting of official approval and to being given assurances that neither civic nor state revenues would be required for the successful implementation of the new quadrennial sacred crown festival. The local dēmos took full control of festival planning and of enacting all arrangements. Mitchell notes that “few imperial documents more clearly indicate the division of responsibility between a city and the central authorities.”¹⁴¹

The Romans not only indirectly supported these Greek models of civic governance within existing poleis, they also built new Imperial Greek cities. This does not necessarily mean, though, that the Romans encouraged dēmokratia itself. Rather, the boulai, ekklēsiai, and magistrates of new poleis were heavily weighted towards oligarchy.

¹³⁸ E.g., CIG 4411a, b, 4412b; RECAM II 195; SEG 33:1123; See Quass (Die Honoratiorenschicht, 388 n. 170) and Pleket (“Political Culture,” 205–206).
¹³⁹ Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 429. For example, see especially Pliny the Younger’s summary of the lex Pompeia of 65 BCE for Bithynia and Pontus (Ep. 10.79).
¹⁴¹ Mitchell, “Festivals,” 188.
This type of scenario unfolded in Egypt during Hadrian’s rule with his construction of a Greek *polis* known as Antinoopolis or Antinoë (130 CE).\(^{142}\) Robert Sherk notes that, although privilege was extended to citizens, there is no indication that non-elite citizens enjoyed a greater degree of political influence than elsewhere in Egypt.\(^{143}\)

As a rule, oligarchs slowly increased their stranglehold on the formal, and even more importantly, on the informal reins of power as the Imperial period progressed. One strategy was particularly effective in broadening their regional standing and deepening their Imperial influence. Judith Perkins notes that oligarchs from across the Greek East created informal trans-local alliances between their *poleis* based upon educational, cultural, and political commonalities.\(^{144}\) She observes that “the elite proclaimed their

---

\(^{142}\) For a full bibliography and discussion of items such as the city’s foundation, excavations, citizenship, and institutions, see M. Zahrnt, “Antinoopolis in Ägypten: Die hadrianische Gründung und ihre Privilegien in der neueren Forschung,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.10.1 (ed. H. Temporini; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 669–706.

\(^{143}\) Sherk writes that Hadrian “organized [Antinoopolis] as a typical Greek city and granted its citizens special privileges, freeing them from the obligation to perform the liturgies in the other cities. It had magistrates, boule and demos. The eponymous official was almost certainly a prytanis” (“Eponymous Officials,” 267). Bell identifies other privileges allotted to the citizens of Antinoopolis, each of whom considered themself a “New Greek.” Examples include the granting of citizenship to children from the marriage of an Antinoite male and an Egyptian woman, exemption from tax on sales of real property and slaves, and exemption from the poll tax (and thus eligibility for service in the legions), allotments of land, and, not least by 151 CE, the right of Imperial support for children of Antinoite citizens, if registered within the first 30 days of birth (H. I. Bell, “Antinoopolis: A Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt,” *JRS* 30.2 [1940], 133–47, esp. 142–43). Sherk (“Eponymous Officials,” 267 n. 124, 266 n. 129) cites the work of A. K. Bowman that the prytany system of classical Athens is replicated in Antinoopolis, but with a twist. Rather than having ten tribally based *prytaneiai*, which each year assumed leadership only for a 36 (or 39) day period, the *boulē* of Antinoopolis used a ten-year cycle of ten *phyliai*. One of the names of the *phyai* is preserved for posterity. It is Ἀθηναϊκής (Orelli, No. 4705). During the year of a particular *phylē*’s leadership its *prytaneia* provided a board or college of *prytanikoi* (A. K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* [ASP; Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, 1971], 1–19).

\(^{144}\) Judith Perkins states that “across the territories of the Greek east, the Greek elite shared educational and cultural interests that allowed them to cement their solidarity and to constitute a group identity of *pepaideumenoi*, the educated, of persons from divergent locales and different ethnicities. These educated persons also acquired, it seems, a system of allegiances and attitudes that constituted them not only as the educated, but also as an empire-wide power elite, a ruling ‘class,’ positioned to administer empire” (*Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* [RMCS; New York: Routledge, 2009], 23–24).
superiority through their *paideia* and their civic benefactions, [a strategy which]…naturalizes and legitimates political and economic dominance.” On the flip side, the wide use of benefaction by elites implicitly affirms the high degree of political influence still held by the main beneficiary of that oligarchic munificence—the *dēmos*.

Formal alliances also developed. A. D. Macro identifies the most prestigious in Asia Minor as being “the *koinon* of Asia.” He anachronistically describes it as an exclusively religious organization which oversaw the provincial imperial cult situated in Pergamon. An imperial cult, however, was more than a religious institution; it was inherently political.

Oligarchs were not the only ones who formed trans-local alliances. Two non-civic associations appear also to have done so. Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, following on from Diskin Clay, claims that Epicurean associations tended toward this strategy. Gillihan

---


147 Macro, “The Cities of Asia Minor,” 674–75. See also, Harland, *Associations*, 121–25. Simon Price notes that prior to Domitian’s time, only three provincial imperial cults had ever existed in Roman Asia (Pergamon, 29 BCE; Smyrna, 23 CE; Miletos, c. 40 CE), with one of those being discontinued after the death of Gaius (Miletos). Ephesos dedicated a cult to the Sebastoi (i.e., Titus, Vespasian, and Domitian) in the late first century CE (*Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984], 249–74 [“Catalogue of Imperial Temples and Shrines in Asia Minor”]). See also Steven J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 27–28. Pergamon was one of the seven *poleis* where Revelation’s addressees lived (Rev 2:12-17). Three other *poleis* in the *koinon* of Asia also contained a community to which the book of Revelation is addressed (Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea; Rev 3:1-22).

148 Even if the regular functions of the *koinon* dealt only with the imperial cult, there was a significant political dimension inherent in its cultic responsibilities. A key political element involved making representations to the emperor. This included determining which *poleis* were included, whose officials were authorized, and what sorts of honours were given.

149 Epicureans enacted their fictive commonwealth of world citizens through the establishment of trans-local networks of local groups, which Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, not unproblematically, claims “formed alternative commonwealths whose territory and towns mirrored, even rivaled, those of empires” (*Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters’ Sect*).
suggests that the “Epicureans’ sense of membership in an alternative commonwealth was surely reinforced by the existence of oikoi spread throughout the Mediterranean world, counterparts to the poleis and territories of state order.” Gillihan does have a point, but needs more evidence by which to make that point. It is true that the writings of Diogenes of Oenoanda confirm that a network of Epicurean communities, as originally envisioned by Epicurus, did exist into the mid-2nd century CE. Clay states that Diogenes “provides us with all the information we possess concerning the lost Epicurean community of Oenoanda,” as well as of a number of “Epicureans active in Rhodes and in mainland Greece.” Clay claims, however, that trans-local connections between these individual Epicureans implies trans-locally connected Epicurean communities which interacted through personal visits and epistolary correspondence. For Gillihan to base a

[150] Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 101. Gillihan claims that “schools in different cities attempted to implement the same teachings and practices” and that such a trans-local praxis “seems to have been Epicurus’ own design” (Ibid, 100). He cites examples of Epicurus founding three schools during his lifetime (c. 341–270 BCE), one each in Mytilene, Lampsacus, and Athens. By the 2nd century BCE, schools were established in Laodicea, Cos, and Rhodes. In the 1st century BCE, Cicero complained that Epicureans had “occupied” Italy (Tusc. 4.6-7) (Ibid, 101).

[151] Clay, Paradosis, 245. Before Diogenes’ inscription came to light in Oenoanda, he “was completely unknown” (Ibid, 245). Only one Epicurean listed by Diogenes of Oenoanda was previously known (L. Hediofus Lollianus Avitus, 144 CE). The others listed are Antipater (of Athens), Theodoras of Lindos (Rhodes) and Menneas, Carus, Dionysius, and Niceratus of the polis of Rhodes. Clay postulates that formal trans-local connections stand behind these names particularly since “in addressing Antipater, Diogenes calls Theodoras ‘our companion’…and in addressing Menneas, he speaks of ‘our’ Dionysius” (Ibid, 245).

[152] Gillihan notes that “in his letter to Antipater, Diogenes writes of travels to Rhodes, Athens, Chalcis, and Thebes, and about Epicurean friends (philoi) in those places” (Civic Ideology, 101). Clay notes that at least two letters survive from Diogenes’ epistolary corpus: “a letter to Dionysius of Rhodes (NF 58) who was already known (fr. 51 Chilton), and a long letter Diogenes addressed to his associates in Rhodes concerning an Epicurean by the name of Niceratus” (Paradosis, 241). Diogenes speaks of the decision of the Epicureans in Rhodes to send Niceratus “to us” (pros hēmas). Clay, while acknowledging that “we” might be a euphemism for “me,” suggests that “it is likely that his use of the first person plural reflects
conclusion upon Clay’s inference places into question Gillihan’s view that Epicurean communities formed “counterparts to the poleis and territories of state order.” If a trans-local network of communities did exist, though, then the Epicureans mirror another non-civic association which clearly employed a trans-local strategy: Christ-followers in Roman Asia, who were aligned with the apostle Paul (e.g. the ekklēsiai of Asia)\textsuperscript{154} and with the prophet John mentioned in Revelation (the seven ekklēsiai of Asia).\textsuperscript{155}

A second political ‘player’ in Imperial Greek cities grew out of the ideological shift away from isonomia (“equality of political rights”) towards hierarchical politics. Van Nijf calls this socio-political phenomenon “ordo-making”: “Public ceremonies in the Greek East reinforced a hierarchical conception of society within which identity was derived from membership of a status group constructed along the lines of a Roman ordo.”\textsuperscript{156} This resulted in the honestiores being “decidedly less ordinary than others.”\textsuperscript{157}

This hierarchic restructuring, far from muting the voice and diminishing the influence of

\textsuperscript{154} 1 Cor 16:19. See George van Kooten for his view that Paul “seems to hint at a conscious paralleling of the Roman provinces which points to an alternative structure of the Roman empire” (“Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The ‘Church of God’ and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley,” NTS 58/4 [Oct. 2012]: 522–48, esp. 542). He sees this provincial level of organization as being implicit in Paul’s phrases “the ekklēsiai of Galatia” (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2), “the ekklēsiai of Asia” (1 Cor 16:19), “the ekklēsiai of Macedonia” (2 Cor 8:1), and “the ekklēsiai of Judea” (Gal 1:22; cf. 1 Thess 2:14) (Ibid, 536).

\textsuperscript{155} Rev 1:4.

\textsuperscript{156} Van Nijf, Civic World, 245. Van Nijf states that beginning with the late Hellenistic period a number of wealthy and powerful elite families in the Greek East “re-invented themselves as a separate status group, as an (ideally) hereditary ordo of honoratiorei claiming to be the repositories in the community of genos, arête and chremata (pedigree, virtue, and money)” (Civic World, 134; see also 163, 187, 217).

\textsuperscript{157} Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 429. The honestiores consisted of Roman senators, knights, and municipal decurions from the provinces, as well as military veterans.
the dēmos, actually served to contribute to the political vitality of the popular assembly by enfranchising what Scheidel calls a “substantial ‘middle.’”

One type of non-elite, non-civic group with a “middle” status appears to have thrived particularly well within the hierarchization of polis life: professional associations or collegia. Collegia developed intrinsic ties with the bouleutic elite through their networks of euergetism and patronage, their participation in hierarchically arranged festival processions, their privileged seating in theatres, and their receipt of cash handouts in public distributions that were proportionally larger per capita than those

---

158 Perkins, citing Scheidel, notes that, since only 1 per cent of the population of the Roman empire could be considered homestores, “it is perfectly possible to reconcile the dominance of a disproportionately affluent elite with the presence of a substantial ‘middle’” (Perkins, Roman Imperial Identities, 5).


160 The replication of polis hierarchy in festivals and processions is most clearly seen in the festival foundation established by C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oenoanda (Oinoanda) in Lycia in 124/5 CE (SEG 38:1462, see further in n. 140). The replication of polis hierarchy is also evident in Ephesos (104 CE). Gaius Vibius Salutaris donated over 30 silver figures which were carried in a bi-weekly procession by almost 300 persons for display, not honorific worship, to the theater (103/104 CE; IEph 27 A–G). Elizabeth Gebhard notes that the figurines, each about a meter tall, included nine of the goddess Artemis, and others of Trajan along with personifications of the Roman senate, the Roman people, the Ephesian boulē, gerousia, epheses, dēmos, and of the six civic tribes (“The Theater and the City,” in Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I [ed. W. Slater; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996], 113–28, esp. 121–23). See also Guy MacLean Rogers, “The Assembly of Imperial Ephesos,” ZPE 94 (1992): 224–29. For an analysis of the continuing importance of debate in the 2nd cent. CE ekkōlia, see Rogers, “Demosthenes of Oenoanda,” 91–100.

161 Seat inscriptions reinscribe the Imperial practice of hierarchical organization by marking places for citizens according to rank and position. Gebhard lists theaters from across the Greek East in which seat inscriptions are found: “at the Theater of Dionysus at Athens, Delphi, Megalopolis, Heraclea, Lyncestis, Miletus, Termessus, and Aphrodisias” (“The Theater and the City,” 113). These date primarily to the Imperial period. While seats nearest the front were given to the bouleutai (councilors), non-elite civic associations of various types, particularly the urban professional collegia, also had reserved seating. See also D. B. Small, “Social Correlations to the Greek Cavea in the Roman Period,” in Roman Architecture in the Greek World (ed. S. Macready and F. H. Thompson; London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1987), 85–93; and Onno van Nijf, Civic World, 216–40.
received by the *politai* or *plebei*. The elitist connections of some associations in Roman Asia extended beyond the equestrian class and into the senatorial order itself.

The third public player in Imperial period politics was the popular assembly, or in other words, the *dēmos* when gathered together *en ekklēsia*. During the Imperial period most of the inscriptive decrees enacted by the *dēmos* through the *ekklēsia* relate primarily to euergetism. This predominance of honorific decrees does not, though, necessitate the corollary conclusion that the *ekklēsia* only filled a ceremonial role. On the contrary, Zuiderhoek argues that,

> the organisation of benefactions usually meant that decisions had to be made which touched on many and widely different areas of civic life—for instance, public construction, festive and religious life, public finance, civic administration, relations with Roman governors and/or emperors, and so on.

### 2.3. Political Authority of the Popular Assembly in the Imperial Period

Aside from the political influence which the *dēmos* exerted in the process of honouring benefactors, there are other indicators of the political vibrancy and influence of Imperial period *ekklēsiai*. Merely citing the fact of their existence is not one of those

---

162 *IGR* III 800–802.
163 Harland, *Associations*, 151. Examples of associational connections within the equestrian class include the purple-dyers at Hierapolis honouring a procurator (*epitropos*) who is an assistant to the proconsul of provincial Asia (*HierapJ* 42 = *IGR* IV 816) and the physicians at Ephesos (*IEph* 719, early 2nd cent. CE). Senatorial connections surface in the joint honouring of Augustus’ grandson Gaius by the people of Assos (northwest Pergamon) and the association of Roman businessmen (*IAssos* 13; 1 BCE–4 CE).
164 See Appendices #2 (*Ekklēsia in First Century CE Inscriptions*) and #3 (*Ekklēsia in Second Century CE Inscriptions*).
165 Zuiderhoek notes that “provincial elites in the Greek East were certainly not powerful enough to force assemblies into submission and have them merely applaud and rubber-stamp pre-arranged decisions” (“Political Sociology,” 422).
166 Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 422.
Rather, one must establish the degree to which those ekklēsiai were democratically relevant. When assessing their formal power, one must broaden the search criteria, at the very least, to include inscriptive references to democratic ‘code-words’ (dēmokratia, autonomia, eleutheria), democratic functions (e.g., voting by lot, accountability of public officials), and democratic forms (boulē, ekklēsia, dēmos).

Sviatoslav Dmitriev (2005), Volker Grieb (2008) and Susan Carlsson (2010) all studied epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. They each contend that, even though generally the dēmos continued to be consulted by ruling authorities, dēmokratia ceased to be a viable political system in Asia

---

167 Of the approximately 2100 inscriptive mentions of the lexemes ἐκκλησία, ἐκλήσια, ἐκκλησί, ἐκκλεσία and ἐγκήσια (5th cent. BCE–11th cent. CE), 52 are datable with certainty to the Imperial period (27 BCE–284 CE). Imperial period inscriptions, however, only use the lexemes ἐκκλησία and ἐκλήσια. Organized by century, the number of ekkēsia occurrences are: 1st cent. BCE (3 [4]x); 1st cent. CE (22 [21]x); 2nd cent. CE (15x); 3rd cent. CE (12x).

168 For example, although the classical Athenian practice of holding the “ordinary assembly” (ἐκκλησία κυρία) is still evident in at least two 1st century CE poleis (Epidauria, Peloponnesos [Peek, Asklepieion 35(2) = IG IV²,1 84]; Pontus, Paphlagonia [St.Pont. III 141]), one cannot assume thereby that the ἐκκλησία κυρία of the Imperial period exercised similar functions to its namesake in classical Athens.

169 Herodotus (Histories; 431–425 BCE) lists three essential features that distinguish classical Athenian dēmokratia from monarchical rule. Herodotus focused on: (1) the use of the lot to select officials; (2) the accountability of officials to the dēmos; (3) the decision-making power (kratos) of the popular assembly (ekkēsia) (Hist. 3.80.6, cf. 82.4, cf. 6.43.3; Arist. Pol. 1279b21–2). See Raphael Sealey (Essays in Greek Politics [New York: Manyland Books, 1967], 272–77) and Martin Ostwald (Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy [Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969], 107–13, 178–79).

170 Sviatoslav Dmitriev states that “even though the political activity of the people’s assemblies became extinct, the people retained, albeit formally, the final say in administrative and political matters...At the same time, the people remained an important social force whose attitudes had to be taken into consideration by the members of the local élite, and Roman authorities still treated Asian cities as communities by addressing letters to their ‘council and the people’” (City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor [Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005], 330).

171 Susanne Carlsson focuses on epigraphic occurrences of the words dēmokratia, eleutheria, and autonomia (Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States [HE 206; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010]). Volker Grieb, on the other hand, looks for the survival of those three elements in historical events that demonstrate the active participation of the dēmos (“demokratischen Praxis”) and the pursuit of independent foreign policy initiatives (“aussenpolitischen”) (Hellenistische Demokratie: Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen [HE 199; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008]). Unfortunately, although Carlsson’s work was published after that of Grieb, she does not interact with his work, much of which would have provided her with supportive evidence.
Minor, especially in the coastal cities, sometime between c. 150 BCE and the time of direct Roman rule in 129 BCE. With respect to Athens, Philippe Gauthier argues that Athenian citizens continued to be involved politically, even in democratic ways, up to the dawn of the *basse époque hellénistique* which he situates c. 150 BCE. Christiaan Habicht concurs but extends the time of active political life in Athens to the late Hellenistic period (c. 150–30 BCE). Thus, in relation to *formal* indicators, *dēmokratia* seems to have deteriorated to a large degree in Imperial Greek cities.

There are at least four other factors, however, which appear to problematize any assumptions of extensive democratic malaise. Three derive from epigraphic evidence and the fourth from literary sources. First, the Athenian *ekklēsia* continued to inscribe decrees beyond 30 BCE, even well into the 3rd century CE. Second, inscriptive evidence attests to the democratic *praxis* of the four jurisdictional responsibilities of the classical

---


174 The latest extant Athenian decree formalized during an *ekklēsia kyria* dates to 20/19 BCE (*Clinton*, Sacred Officials 50,D14/SEG 30:93; ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τῶν προέδρων ἐπερημητὴν Μηνόφιλος). See also *Agora* 16 335/IG² 1051+1058 (30–22/21 BCE). For a detailed analysis of *Agora* 16 335/IG² 1051+1058, see Benjamin D. Merritt, “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 36, no. 1 (1967): 57–100, esp. 66–68. Merritt notes that the content of *IG*² 1051 reflects “dealings with the klerouchs in Lemnos” and recounts the Athenian decision to send four emissaries with the text of a decree to Lemnos, one of whom was a herald (κήρυξ) of the *boulē* and *dēmos* (Ibid, 68, 67, respectively). Decrees of Athenian *ekklēsiai*, though not of *ekklēsiai kyriai*, are extant into the late Imperial period (up to 230 CE). Examples include: *SEG* 15:108 (124 CE; ἕλατε τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τῆς μνήσεως, ἐπάναγκης ὁ στρατηγὸς τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς ἀθροίας), *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 165, 10 (179–180 CE; an honorific decree for the Roman emperor; ὅρθως δὲ ἐποίησατε καὶ ἐπίτετε[—c.6—] ἐς ὅσπερ δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰς ἐκκ[ησίας — ]), and *SEG* 30:82*/SEG* 21:506*/SEG* 33:137*/IG* II² 1064 (c. 230 CE; [εἰσακελέσα]θα δὲ αὐτόν καὶ εἰς τὸ θέατρον διὰ τῶν προτάσεων ἀεὶ ἐπὶ προεδρία καὶ κοινωνία θυσίων καὶ [σπον])δῶν τῶν ἐν τε ποι[μ]ατίς πᾶσαις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις γεινομένων αὐτ[όν].
Athenian δῆμος within civic ekklēsiai. This fact is most prevalent in inscriptions from Asia Minor. Van Nijf forwards 2nd century CE Termessos as one particularly illustrative example. He claims Termessos “was technically still a democracy.” In terms of formal democratic institutions, van Nijf notes that Termessos had a regular assembly (ennomos ekklēsia) in which probouleutic recommendations of the boulē were considered by upwards of 4500 citizens. Van Nijf could have strengthened his case for the democratic vitality of Termessos even further by noting, firstly, that, in comparison to other Imperial Greek poleis in Asia Minor, Termessos is the only one which convened an ennomos ekklēsia, and, secondly, that its declaration of an ecclesiastical/non-probouleutic decree implies a high degree of political autonomy for the δῆμος of this ennomos ekklēsia.

The democratic kratos of the δῆμος of Termessos is further reinforced in its exercise of formal jurisdictional responsibilities. The assembly debated issues included in the traditional agenda of the classical Athenian ekklēsia kyria. Van Nijf cites examples

---

175 Glotz lists the four jurisdictional responsibilities of the classical Athenian δῆμος as being legislation, oversight both of executive power and foreign policy, and political control of judicial power (Greek City, 162). Three of the four jurisdictional realms enacted within the context of civic ekklēsiai during the 1st century CE include: (1) legislative functions such as the pronouncement of imperial favours to political regions (IG VII 2713, Akraiphia) and of honorific decrees (Bosch, Quellen Ankara 76,72, Ankyra [Ankara]; IsCm III 31, Kallatis [Mangalia]); (2) executive functions such as the decision to purchase olive oil (IG XII,1 3, Rhodes); and (3) judicial functions such as the manumission of slaves (FD III 6:31, FD III 6:27, BCH 108 [1984] 366,4 [all from Delphi]). See Appendix #2 for all 1st century CE inscriptional attestations of the word ekklēsia.

176 Van Nijf, “Public Space,” 234.

177 Van Nijf bases his estimate on the fact that the theatre in which the δῆμος met in assembly contained seating for c. 4500 people (“Public Space,” 234).

178 There is only one other extant mention of an ennomos ekklēsia in Asia Minor (and the only plural reference anywhere in the inscriptional record). It comes from Mysia but it pre-dates the Imperial period (IGR 4.292, 75–50 BCE; cf. MDAI(A) 32 [1907]: 243, 244). It reads, in part, ἐν τῇ ἔννοιᾳ τοῦ δῆμου προβολεύων γνώμην.

179 See n. 123 for an explanation of the term “ecclesiastical/non-probouleutic decree.” TAM III 4 reads, in part, μηνὸς Σωτηρίου δεκατή χρόνοις ἐν τῇ ἐννομῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξελέξε τῶι δήμῃ προβολεύων γνώμην.

180 The principal ekklēsia (i.e., ἐκκλησία κυρία) of classical Athens had an all-embracing program which included: votes of confidence (ἐπιχειροτονία; epicheirotonia) with respect to the magistrates.
such as “the appointment of magistrates, financial affairs, civic subdivisions (including the introduction of new phylai), construction works (roads and cisterns), food-supply, and the organization of games and festivals.” Termessos even involved itself in foreign policy initiatives by providing auxiliary troops and sending embassies to Rome.

A third indicator of widespread kratos for the dēmos during the Imperial period is the burgeoning political culture in Asia Minor. Van Nijf states that the post- Classical polis “lost little of its political and cultural significance in worlds dominated by Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors.” Van Nijf identifies three non-institutional aspects of vibrant political culture: festivals, monuments of leadership, and emotive communities. The unspoken underlying goal of political culture appears to have been the avoidance of intra-polis conflict through preservation of the status quo.

(archontes); discussion of military preparedness and of issues related to food security, consideration of accusations of high treason (εἰσαγγελίαι; eisangeliai), reports of confiscated property and of determinations made with respect to disputed inheritance claims (Glotz, Greek City, 85; Cf. Ath. Pol. 43.4–6).

181 Van Nijf, “Public Space,” 234.

182 Onno van Nijf, Richard Alston, and Christina Williamson, “Introduction: The Greek City and Its Religions after the Classical Age,” in Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age (GRHSGCCA 3; ed. R. Alston, O. M. van Nijf, and C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming), 1–20, esp. 3. They claim further that “the essays in van Nijf and Alston (2011) repeatedly stress… and Alston and van Nijf (2008) showed, the post-Classical period retained vibrant and complex political cultures, the institution of the polis spread over a far greater region than in the Classical period, and the economic complexity and the abilities and strategies of the poleis to manage and provide for their resident communities were, if anything, enhanced…It is evident that the polis did much more than just persist—it flourished” (Ibid, 3). The two cited works are: Onno M. van Nijf and Richard Alston, eds., Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age (GRHSGCCA 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2011); and Richard Alston and Onno M. van Nijf, eds., Feeding the Ancient Greek City (GRHSGCCA 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2008).

183 For van Nijf’s discussion of festivals and monuments of leadership in political culture see: (1) Civic World, 131–148 (festivals) and Civic World, 73–130 (honorific inscriptions); (2) “Political Culture,” 11–14; and (3) “Public Space,” 217–23 (monumental politics).

184 Van Nijf observes that “when a writer of the Second Sophistic wanted to get to the essence of a community he would naturally focus on the emotional climate in which social and political transactions took place” (“Politics, Culture and Identities,” 11 [author’s emphasis]).
Euergetism, or benefaction, was a key strategy in maintaining *status quo* and undergirds two of van Nijf’s three elements of political culture (monumentalism and festivals). Acts of munificence served both internal and external political functions during the Imperial period.\(^{185}\) Internally, euergetism allowed the lines of political influence between the oligarchic elite and the *dēmos* to flow in both directions.\(^{186}\) Zuiderhoek terms euergetism “the politics of redistribution.”\(^{187}\) The *dēmos* distributed power and prestige to the oligarchs in exchange for the distribution of material and social ‘wealth’ from the oligarchs. Zuiderhoek notes that public rituals associated with euergetism,

\[
\text{did much to ease possible tensions arising from this political configuration by creating a dynamic exchange of gifts for honours which allowed the elite to present itself as a virtuous, benevolent upper class, while simultaneously allowing the *dēmos* [*sic*] to affirm (and thereby legitimate) or reject this image through the public allocation of honours.}^{188}
\]

Externally, “the politics of redistribution,” as enacted by the oligarchic elite, served to prevent outside interference in civic affairs. The prospect of Roman intervention was a real one,\(^{189}\) especially given the fact that, as Zuiderhoek notes, power sharing between the oligarchic elites and the popular assembly “seems often to have been

---

\(^{185}\) See Zuiderhoek for his study of how high mortality rates and short lifespans affected the demography of social elites. He hypothesizes that public euergetism served an important private function for elites in memorializing their family lineage (“Oligarchs and Benefactors,” 185–196).

\(^{186}\) Van Nijf argues that the public use of honorific language implicitly pressures the honorand to live up to the public impression created of him or her. In this way, the *dēmos*, through individuals and/or collectives such as voluntary associations, plays an active role in the process of political identity construction even without having been formally granted any official political office or even role. The practice of monumentalism exponentially increased in the Greek East during the Imperial period (van Nijf, *Civic World*, 73–130; “Public Space,” 217–23).

\(^{187}\) Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 435.

\(^{188}\) Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 444. See Zuiderhoek for charts on the frequency with which different types of benefaction were given (e.g., types of buildings, categories of benefaction-types) (*The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* [GCRW; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 76–80).

\(^{189}\) Plutarch, *Mor.* 814F–815A. Fear of Roman intervention is explicitly cited as the reason for dismissing an ‘illegal’ *ekklēsia* that was hastily assembled in Ephesos (Acts 19:23–41, esp. vv. 39–41).
an uneasy one.”\textsuperscript{190} This ongoing need for the negotiation of power resulted in civic disturbances that are widely attested throughout the Greek East during the first two centuries CE.\textsuperscript{191} Giovanni Salmeri provides details of many of the conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated \textit{boulē} and the \textit{dēmos}.\textsuperscript{192} Somehow conflict had to be mediated in order to avoid direct Roman intervention in the local affairs of \textit{poleis}. The rise in the frequency and generosity of public and semi-public benefaction, or euergetism, appears to have mitigated the development of undue conflict.

Zuiderhoek states that this three-way tug of war involving imperial authorities, civic elites, and popular assemblies “helps to explain the remarkable proliferation of euergetism we see in the eastern provinces during the first two centuries.”\textsuperscript{193} By appeasing the expressed and perceived demands of the popular assembly, euergetism facilitated civic harmony. Zuiderhoek even goes so far as to claim that, to a large measure, the well-being and stable functioning of the Empire depended on the vitality of its cities...[hence] euergetism’s contribution to civic socio-political stability may well have been one of the keys to the survival and flourishing of the Roman imperial system as a whole during the first two centuries AD.\textsuperscript{194}

\textsuperscript{190} Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 442. He sees the genesis of this uneasy relationship in the fact that there was “the cohabitation of oligarchisation, hierarchisation, and a continuing measure of active popular politics (fuelled quite possibly by a politically vocal middling stratum within the \textit{demos})” (Ibid, 442).

\textsuperscript{191} Zuiderhoek cites examples of civic unrest, though not of revolt, throughout the Greek East during the Imperial period: (Sardis) Philostr. \textit{Letters of Apollonius} 56; (Aspendos) Philostr. \textit{V.Apoll.} 1.15; (Smyrna) Philostr. \textit{V.Soph.} 1.25; (Rhodes) Aelius Aristides, \textit{Oration to the Rhodians: Concerning Concord} (\textit{Or.} 24); (Tarsus) Dio Chrys. \textit{Or.} 34.16–20; (Nicaea) \textit{Or.} 39; (Prusa) \textit{Or.} 46, 47.19, 48.9 (“Political Sociology,” 442 n. 61). See also Giovanni Salmeri who provides an extensive summary of the many conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated \textit{boulē} and the \textit{dēmos} (“Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor,” in \textit{Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy} [ed. S. Swain; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 53–92, esp. 73–86).

\textsuperscript{192} Salmeri provides an extensive summary of the many conflicts in Roman Asia Minor between the elite dominated \textit{boulē} and the \textit{dēmos} (“Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life,” 73–86).

\textsuperscript{193} Zuiderhoek, “Political Sociology,” 435.

\textsuperscript{194} Zuiderhoek, \textit{Politics of Munificence}, 5.
Literary sources provide a fourth countervailing factor for claims of democratic malaise in Imperial Greek cities. A vibrant “ekklēsia discourse” surfaces in the 1st century CE literary works of Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, and Theon.\(^{195}\) Within the writings of Plutarch and Dio, Anna Crescinda Miller defines their “ekklēsia discourse” as including topoi familiar from classical literature, such as idealization of an empowered citizen body and the speech of the assembly...were applied not only to historical assemblies of the past, or theoretical assemblies of the imagination, but also to the assemblies that were meeting in Greek cities of the first century.\(^{196}\)

Ruth Webb defines the purpose of Theon’s progymnasmata as being the preparation of the student for rhetorical repartee within the real world as a citizen in the ekklēsia.\(^{197}\)

Participation within an ekklēsia, however, required more than simply political acumen.

---


Salmeri notes four key differences and five substantive similarities between Imperial period and classical Athenian ekklēsai (“Reconstructing,” 206). See Christina Kokkinia on “ekklēsia discourse” in Aelius Aristides (early 2nd cent. CE) (“The Governor’s Boot and the City’s Politicians. Greek Communities and Rome’s Representatives under the Empire,” in Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis: Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich. Akten der Tagung an der Universität Zürich, 18.-20.10.2004 [ed. A. Kolb; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006], 181–90). Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE) was born in Chaeronea (Boeotia) in central Greece. Dio Chrysostom (c. 40–c. 115) is also known as Dion of Prusa or Dio Cocceianus. He was born in Prusa, a town in Bithynia. Aelius Theon was from Alexandria and probably lived during the mid to late 1st century CE. Miller contends that he wrote the progymnasmata before 95 CE, that is, the point at which Quintilian cites Theon on statis theory (“Ekklesia,” 30 n. 35). She cites the argument of George Alexander Kennedy (Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric, Writings from the Greco-Roman World; V. 10 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 1). Miller does not, however, consider the perspective of Malcolm Heath who claims that arguments for an early date for Theon’s Progymnasmata are inherently weak, especially given the fact not only of its popularity in late antiquity, but also that it was translated into Armenian (“Theon and the History of the Progymnasmata,” GRBS 43/2 [2002]: 129–160).


\(^{197}\) Webb, “Progymnasmata,” 289–92. Topoi raised in the classical Athenian ekklēsia are also given priority as progymnasmata students spoke in their imagined ekklēsia (e.g., the danger of tyrants, tyrannicide as a heroic act, provision of justice and equality for the poor over against the oppression of the rich; cf. Dem. 21.124-127; also Thuc. 2.37).
Religious ritual was also germane to *polis* politics in the Greek East during the Imperial period.

### 2.4. Religion and Imperial Period Ekklēsiai

Onno Van Nijf, Richard Alston, and Christina Williamson note that “it is quite clear that religion [e.g., patron *polis* gods] continued to play an important role in the way that cities represented their identity both to their own inhabitants and to the outside world.”

This religious representation is prevalent throughout the inscriptive record. Religious terminology within enactment decrees abounds from the time of classical Athens until the end of the Imperial period. Inscriptional examples of religious terminology include the offering of sacrifices (*thysias*), addresses to the gods (*theoi*), lists of religious professionals (*hiereis*), and the public display of enactment decrees set up within Greek temples (e.g., Zeus, Pythian Apollo, Artemis, and Serapis/Asklepios).

---


199 Of the more than 2100 inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* (5th cent. BCE to 11th cent. CE), at least 675 contain religious terminology. Of those 675, 600 are dated from the 5th cent. BCE to the 2nd cent. CE.

200 Examples of religious phraseology which occurs within late Hellenistic and Imperial period inscriptions that mention an ἐκκλησία (and related lexemes such as ἐκλησία) include: (1) 1st cent BCE, Athens (*IG IP 1030*): τοῖς θεοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶν; (2) 1st cent. CE, Epidauros in Peloponnesos (*IG IV², 1 84*): τε τῇ Ἀθήνῃς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ πρώτων ἀνδρῶν,
While religious rituals were part and parcel of the political activity of *ekklēsiai* in the Imperial period, the flip side was also true, both of political officers and of institutions. In Philadelphia, following the great earthquake of 17 CE, one of its magistrates is designated a priest of emperor Germanicus in honour of Rome’s five year remittal of tribute. Some institutional *ekklēsiai* in central Greece became part and parcel of socio-religious ceremonies, specifically those through which slaves were manumitted. The formal ratification of a slave’s manumission normally was tied to a sacred institution such as a temple, with occasional ratification in a civic *ekklēsia*.

Colin Hemer cites numismatic evidence in this regard (Nos. 51, 52, of Caligula) (*The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986/1989], 157). The religious commitment of a Philadelphian magistrate to the emperor is politically reinforced in their self-styled designation as *φιλ/καισαρ* (*BMC Lydia*, lxxxv; coin no. 54) and *φιλ/πατρις* (*BMC Lydia*, lxxxv; cf. also the much later *CIG* 3422.4) (Ibid, 157 n. 18).

There are fifteen mentions of an *ekklēsia* within Greek manumission inscriptions. These date between the 2nd century BCE and the 1st century CE. The breakdown of these inscriptions by region is as follows: Phokis (Delphi, 6x; Elateia, 6x; Titthora, 1x), Boeotia (Phaestin, 1x), and W. Locris (Phaestinus, 1x). Eleven inscriptions date to the 2nd century BCE, three to the 1st century CE, with one being undatable. The three 1st century CE inscriptions all hail from Delphi, as does the one that is undatable. Of the ten 2nd century BCE inscriptions, two are from Delphi (See Appendix #5: Ekklēsia Occurrences in Manumission Inscriptions of Central Greece). The use of an *ekklēsia* to legitimate a slave’s manumitted status finds metaphorical parallel in Paul’s depiction of *ekklēsia* members as manumitted slaves (Romans, 1 Corinthians). In Part III, I expound further upon Paul’s manumission theology, particularly as it intersects with Jewish manumission protocol among synagogue communities on the north shore of the Black Sea during the time of the Bosporan Kingdom (1st – 4th centuries CE).

Elizabeth Leigh Gibson notes that over 1300 manumission inscriptions from central Greece have been recovered. These span four centuries and recount release ceremonies at the temple of the Pythian Apollo (*The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House* [TSAJ 75; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999], 37). Under priestly oversight, a slave’s (doulos) status was changed (e.g., ἀφεθέκε ελευθέρων; “set free”) into that of a “freedperson” (*apeleutheros*). The official redemption payment (τίμας) (whether figurative or literal) is not infrequently made to a god in a temple, most often to the Pythian Apollo in the temple at Delphi (e.g., *FD III* 6:31 [Delphi, 1–20 CE]; see Appendix #5 for the Greek text). Greek manumission is not emancipation, though, since not infrequently the “freedperson” (*apeleutheros*) was still enjoined through a *paramonē* clause to “remain with” his/her previous owner until that owner died (e.g., paramainatō, *FD III* 6:31, ca. 20CE; παραμενέτω δὲ Τρυ[φ]έρα...
public setting allows the dēmos to become a witness, thereby ensuring that common knowledge of the new status of the recently manumitted slaves was disseminated.\(^{204}\)

The interpenetration of religion into politics also flowed in the other direction. In some Hellenistic-era inscriptions from Asia Minor, religious figures became polis officers.\(^{205}\) In one instance the chief priest is given the political office of eponymous archōn, that is, the chief magistrate of the polis. Sherk cites one example from the 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE polis of Laodicea-by-the-Lycus (Phrygia) in which “it [is] probable that a

---

\(204\) For the concept of “common knowledge” within Imperial Greek cities and the role of public spectacles for the spread of religio-political knowledge, see Onno van Nijf’s discussion of the “game theory” of Michael Suk–Young Chwe (Rational Ritual: Culture, Coordination, and Common Knowledge [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001]) (“Political Games,” 61–70, 73–75). Public manumission ceremonies, which include the witness of the dēmos en ekklesia, are particularly fitting contexts within which to spread common knowledge for the ultimate benefit of the newly manumitted slaves. Van Nijf notes that “for collective action, it is important that people know that other people agree with them, for only then are they inclined to take a common course of action. Accordingly, in this view, political legitimacy depends on general agreement between the rulers and the ruled, on common knowledge that everyone will take the written and unwritten rules of the political game seriously…A public ritual is first and foremost an occasion where all the members of a community are required to be present in one place and jointly to learn the cultural information contained in the spectacle” (“Political Games,” 63).

\(205\) For example, Diodorus Siculus describes Pessinous in Asia Minor as being, in essence, a “priest-state” for Cybele (Maria Grazia Lancellotti, Attis, Between Myth and History: King, Priest, and God [RGRW 149; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 71–72). See also Angelo Verlinde, The Sanctuary Site at Pessinus. The Genesis, Development and Taphonomy of a Roman Temple in Central Asia Minor in Light of its Phrygian-Hellenistic Predecessors and Byzantine Afterlife (MOA 7; Leuven/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014). For inscriptive evidence see, Johan Strubbe, The Inscriptions of Pessinous (IGSK 66; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 2005).
priest was eponymous” (MAMA VI 10). This ideology even continued into the early decades of the 1st century BCE (MAMA VI 18).

These two inscriptions take the concept of priest as archôn one exponential step further, however: they equate the priest/archôn with the very polis itself. Sherk comments that “the eponymous priesthood is that of a ἱερεύς τῆς Πόλεως, i.e. a personification of the city itself.” Thus, not only is a priest in that region of Phrygia considered the chief polis official but he is even regarded as the embodiment of the polis itself. This sacralization of a polis is also mirrored elsewhere, to a lesser degree, in at least seven inscriptive occurrences of the phrase ekklêsiai (hiera ekklêsia) .

206 Sherk, “Eponymous Officials,” 224. Laodicea consisted of a large population of Jews, whose descendants had been transplanted there from Babylon by Antiochus III, the Great (2nd cent. BCE). The enduring significance of the Laodicean Jewish community even into the 1st century CE is seen in Cicero’s comment that, as part of their annual contribution, they had tried to send nine kilograms of gold to the Temple in Jerusalem, all of which was confiscated by the Romans (Pro Flacco 28–68).


209 There are at least seven extant inscriptions within which a polis attributes a sacral dimension to its civic ekklêsiai (“hiera ekklêsia”). Four are dated to the Hellenistic era and three to the Imperial period. The Hellenistic-era examples are: (1) IMT Adram Kolpos 715 (Andros, Lamyra, Mysia, Asia Minor, 106 BCE): δέδοχθαι τῇ ιερᾶς ἐκκλησίας; and (2) IMT Adram Kolpos 716 (Tayili, Mysia, 168–160/59 BCE): δέδοχθαι τῇ ιερᾶς ἐκκλησίας; (3) IG XII,5 722+[1] (Andros, Cyclades, Aegean Islands, 2nd/1st cent. BCE): δέδοχθαι τῇ ιερᾶς ἐκκλησίας. The sentence δέδοχθαι τῇ ιερᾶς ἐκκλησίας can be translated as, “let it be resolved by the sacred assembly”; (4) I Eph 1570 (2nd cent. BCE): [—] [ι]ερα ἐκκλησία [—] ἐν τῷ ἑπὶ πρυτάνευ[ως]. There are two decrees from Imperial-period Ephesos which attribute a sacral dimension to a civic ekklêsia: (1) I Eph 2902 (found at Ephesos, Imperial period; honorary inscription for kosmêteira [no name]): [—]ερα κοσμη[τείμως] ὁ τει[μὸς καθ/ ὑπάτας τηimer[—] — ἐν τῇ ιερα ἐκκλησία [—] ἔφησιοντο [—] προφόν[ον] λειτουργο[ν], τοῦ μὲν πάππου — τοῦ δὲ πατρός [—] —; and (2) I Eph 959 (found at Ephesos, Imperial period; thanksgiving to Artemis [no name], husband of Pomp[ei]a) Aphroesias): χρυσοφόρος ἄν[τος ἐτή ἔξηκον[τα], νεοποιοῖας ο[ὐ] βαίρετος κατὰ σήν ἄρετὴν, καθὼς περιεχ[εῖ] τά ὑπομνήματα[α] τῆς ιερᾶς ἐκκλησίας[ας,] σύν καὶ τῇ συνβίω μου Πομπ[ηία,] Ἀφροδείται[ίδι] καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις[ε] μου Ρομφείνη καὶ Ῥομφείνῳ καὶ τῷ συγγενεῖ. The seventh inscriptive example of a hiera ekklêsia is also dated to late Imperial period Asia Minor, but no city is identifiable: IDid 305 (a prophêthês inscription for [no name], agonôthêtês of Megala Didymeia Kommodeia and [Pythia] Panonia): τὰ ὑπὸ πατρὸς τα[ —] — [ι]ερ[α] ἐκκλησία[ι —] — τῇ πατρι[ίδι] ἐκ τῶν διδών;?. The sacralization of polis and ekklêsia is in Imperial period poleis is metaphorically paralleled by seven 1st century CE Christ-follower communities in Roman Asia, one community of which was paralleled in Ephesos. The seven ekklêsiai of Christ-followers, to whom the book of Revelation is addressed, are symbolically depicted as together forming one sacred polis, the Jewish temple-polis called the New Jerusalem (Rev 1:4; 21:9, 10). I will explore Revelation’s
2.5. Summary: Ekklēsiai in the 1st Century CE

Given the foregoing, to what degree, then, did civic ekklēsiai possess kratos in the 1st century CE, particularly in Asia Minor? Generally, the enactment of intra-polis politics within civic ekklēsiai was not overshadowed by direct interference from Rome. In many respects, Rome co-opted the existing oligarchs in service of Roman rule. Euergetism became the primary strategy that oligarchs employed to avoid popular discontent, and, thus, Roman intervention. These socio-political elites, though, are but one of four key dimensions in the civic politics of the Greek East during the Imperial period. The other three are a socio-political hierarchy, a political culture, and the popular assembly (ekklēsia).

The hierarchal restructuring of the Greek East did not mute the voice of the popular assembly. Rather, somewhat counter-intuitively, it contributed to the political vitality of the popular assembly by enfranchising professional associations or collegia. Honorific monumentalism became the professional associations’ contribution to the “politics of redistribution,” and, thus, to their ability to influence the bouleutic elite.

The popular assembly also frequently used honorific decrees to influence oligarchs. Their laudatory content served rhetorically to pressure the oligarchic honorand to live up to those expectations. At least one popular assembly in the Greek East wielded direct political influence: the ennomos ekklēsia of Termessos exercised jurisdictional responsibilities continuous with those assumed by the classical Athenian ekklēsia.

sacralization of people and polis in detail in my examination of ekklēsia uses within early Christ-follower literature (see Part III, §3.4. Ekklēsia in Apocalyptic Literature: Revelation). On Paul and the sacralization of his ekklēsiai, see Part III, §2.3. Ekklēsia as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?
Given the apparently laissez-faire attitude of Roman authorities with respect to
democratic governance at the level of the local *polis*, the primary ideological target of the
popular assembly can not have been Rome but rather its ‘deputies,’ the oligarchic elites.
The existence of a political culture in Asia Minor meant that a vibrant “*ekklēsia*
discourse” only served to further the *pax Romana*, rather than to threaten it. As long as
order was maintained, Rome was not overly particular about how a *polis* self-governed.

Rome’s promotion, and even construction of, Imperial Greek cities, along with
their concomitant democratic apparatii, coupled with its lack of interference in vibrant
displays of democratic life in Imperial Greek cities, brings at least one conclusion to the
fore. As a rule, it would seem that Roman authorities would not have viewed the adoption
of civic terminology (e.g., *ekklēsia*) by non-civic groups as being reflective of
oppositional rhetoric, much less of a seditious ideology. Roman intervention was directed
more towards disorderly behaviour. This hypothesis will be tested when, in my next
section, I examine inscriptive decrees of Greco-Roman non-civic groups, at least one of
which pre-dates early Christ-followers in calling its semi-public assembly an *ekklēsia*. 
3. Ekklēsia and Non-Civic Groups

Voluntary associations are non-civic groups that, while particularly ubiquitous in the Imperial period, already existed in the fourth century BCE.\textsuperscript{210} The range of association types meant that they were known by a variety of designations.\textsuperscript{211} My focus here is to explore which Greco-Roman voluntary associations appropriated ekklēsia terminology, whether ekklēsia was used simply as a name for an association’s “members-only” assembly or also as its group designation, and if the adoption of ekklēsia terminology could have been viewed suspiciously by Roman authorities.

3.1. The Non-Civic Ekklēsia: A Meeting or a Permanent Collective Designation?

Use of the term ekklēsia by Greco-Roman voluntary associations is only evident in epigraphic sources, not in papyrological or literary sources. At least thirteen of the papyri that have been preserved were written by voluntary associations.\textsuperscript{212} Only one

\textsuperscript{210} Harland identifies at least five types of non-civic associations based upon their principal social networks: (1) household connections; (2) ethnic or geographic connections; (3) neighbourhood connections; (4) occupational connections; and (5) cult or temple connections. Harland adds one caveat. He emphasizes that these five categories cannot be applied rigidly to a taxonomy of associations since “these webs of connections certainly overlap, and several can play a role in the membership of a particular association” (\textit{Associations}, 29; see also David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland, “Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah,” \textit{JGRJCh} 5 [2008]: 200–21, esp. 202, 203).

\textsuperscript{211} Greco-Roman voluntary associations were called collegia in Latin, and in Greek by terms such as orgeōnes, thiasoi, melanephoroi, eranistai, synergasia, synergion, syngeneia, taxis, phylē, hairesis, kollegion, syllogos, synteleia, synedrion, systema, synodos, koina and koinon (van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 8–10). Some voluntary associations appropriated multiple identities depending on their socio-cultural needs. For example, Saittai’s association of linen weavers “appears to have been known both as a synergasia (the name used in six surviving funerary inscriptions) and as a homotechnon, both names referring to occupational identity. This association is also, however, described as a plateia (emphasising its territorial basis), and perhaps as a phyle, referring to the political status of its members” (van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 10). See Albert Baumgarten for a comparison of the organizational structures and functions (e.g., commensality, literacy) of Greco-Roman associations and Jewish sects (e.g., Essenes, Pharisees) (“Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Jewish Sects,” in \textit{Jews in a Greco-Roman World} [ed. M. Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], 93–111).

\textsuperscript{212} The thirteen papyri are: Hib. 99 (?BCE; a receipt), P.Duk.inv. 624 V (199–100 BCE), P.Mich. 5:246 (c. 43–49 CE; contributions to a guild of Harpokrates), P.Mich. 5:243 (14–37 CE; a guild ordinance during the reign of Tiberius), P.Mich. 2:121 (42 CE; a collection of abstracts of contracts \textit{eiromenon}), after August 28, 42 CE), P.Mich. 5:244 (43 CE; a guild ordinance of the \textit{Apolysimoi} of Tebtynis, Egypt),
refers to an assembly convened by an association, but in this case the word translated “assembly” is *syllogos* (P. Mich. 5:243).

Relative to epigraphic sources, previous scholarship has identified five decrees in which the word *ekklēsia* purportedly is used by a voluntary association: *IGLAM* 1381–1382, *OGIS* 488, McCabe 1986, no. 119/ *Samos* 119 (hereafter *Samos* 119), and Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271/*IDelos* 1519 (hereafter *IDelos* 1519).

All five, at some point, have even been cited as evidence of a voluntary association self-designating as an *ekklēsia*.

---


*P.Mich.* 5:243 (14–37 CE) mentions a *syllogos*:

> ἐὰν δὲ τις ζ σύλλογος παραγγελεῖ καὶ μὴ παραγείνηται, ζημιοῦσθαι ἐπὶ μὲν τὴς κώμης δραχμῆς μίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς πόλεως δραχμῆς τέσσαρας ("If anyone receives notice of a meeting [syllogos] and does not attend, let him be fined one drachmē in the village, but in the city four drachmai.")


See Appendix #7 for the complete Greek text and for a full English translation of each of the five inscriptions.

---

1. John Kloppenborg has, at one time, claimed that three epigraphic occurrences of *ekklēsia* designate the collective identity of a voluntary association: *IGLAM* 1381–1382 and *IDelos* 1519. He wrote that “some associations were [author’s emphasis] called ἐκκλησία, as is clear from [IGLAM 1381–1382 and Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271]” (“Edwin Hatch, Churches, and Collegia,” in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity* [ed. B. H. Maclean; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 212–38, esp. 231); (2) Richard Ascough argues that, “Despite McCready’s claim that ‘there is little evidence that voluntary associations or clubs used the word *ekklesia* as a community designation,’ there are a few examples: one from Samos (E.G.L. Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen* [Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1896/repr. 1969], 116 n. 3); *OGIS* 488 (Kastollos near Philadelphia, 2nd century CE); *IGLAM* 1381 (Aspendus [Pamphylia]); *IGLAM* 1382 (Aspendus); *IDelos* 1519 (196 BCE)” (“Matthew and Community Formation,” in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Studies* [ed. D. E. Aune; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 97–126, esp. 113). Ascough is here engaging with Wayne O. McCready (“*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations,” in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 59–73); (3) Philip Harland also initially mirrored the claims of Kloppenborg and Ascough in his statement that “the self-designations of some groups also reflect the vocabulary of the *polis*, such as the associations that called themselves an assembly (ekklēsia) at Aspendos in Cilicia [IGLAM 1381–82] and on the island of Delos [Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271]” (*Associations*, 106 and 182). Harland has since changed his stance with respect to *IDelos* 1519/Foucart 43/*CIG* 2271 (* Dynamics*, 44–45); (4) A wrestling school (Ἀλεξομένων) in Samos is the fourth example of an
Regarding *IGLAM* 1381\(^{216}\) and *IGLAM* 1382,\(^{217}\) Le Bas originally wondered (“peut-être”), but did not conclude, whether each records an instance of *ekklēsia* being used as a collective designation for a non-civic association.\(^{218}\) Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland each originally made conclusive what Philippe Le Bas merely suggested.\(^{219}\) Kloppenborg has since reversed his initial conclusion, although not yet in print.\(^{220}\)

The *crux interpretum* for *IGLAM* 1381–82 revolves around the translation of the phrase *euphēmon ekklēsian*. Liddell and Scott offer three definitional categories for *euphēmon*. The third (“laudatory, panegyrics”) emphasizes the civic nature of the *ekklēsia* in *IGLAM* 1381–82. Translating *euphēmon* as “laudatory” brings to mind a civic association that purportedly self-identifies collectively as an *ekklēsia* *(Samos 119)* (Ascough, “Matthew,” 113).

\(^{216}\) *IGLAM* 1381–82 is from Aspendos in Pamphylia (Asia Minor), which is located just inland from the Gulf of Antalya, approximately halfway between Tlos and Lamos. Both *IGLAM* 1381 and 1382 use the phrase *euphēmon ekklēsian* (εὐφήμων ἐκκλησίαν), which is otherwise unattested in epigraphic sources. *IGLAM* 1381 reads, Ζήνων[θεοδόρου ἀρχιτέκτων τοῦ θεάτρου ἀνέθηκεν. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγώνων] γενέσθαι, [καὶ εἰς εὐφήμων ἐκκλησίαν ἔχαρισα κῆπος πρὸς τῷ ἱπποδρόμῳ...].

\(^{217}\) *IGLAM* 1382 reads, ἢ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτέθησαν Ζήνων[ῷ] θεοδόρου ἀρχιτέκτονα τοῦ θεάτρου [καὶ] τῶν τῆς πόλεως ἑργῶν... καὶ εἰς εὐφήμων ἐκκλησίαν ἔχαρισαμενον κῆπους πρὸς τῷ ἱπποδρόμῳ...


\(^{219}\) See n. 215 (Kloppenborg, “Edwin Hatch,” 212–38, esp. 215–16; Ascough, “Matthew and Community Formation,” 113; Harland, *Associations*, 106). In a subsequent book, Harland makes that comment less conclusive, but he does not rescind it: *IGLAM* 1381–1382 “may involve an association that was called an ‘assembly’” (Dynamics of Identity, 44).

\(^{220}\) In an email to Ralph Korner (August 11, 2011), John Kloppenborg indicated how his initial stance regarding *ekklēsia* usage in *IGLAM* 1381–82 (and *IDelos* 1519) has changed: “There are certainly other associations that use either *ekklesia* or, more commonly, *agora*, meaning assembly or meeting, but in none of these cases is it the ‘name’ of the association.” His expertise in inscriptional matters related to Greco-Roman voluntary associations is undeniable. See his recent edited publications on associational inscriptions in the Greek East from 4th century BCE to the 4th century CE: (1) John S. Kloppenborg and Richard Ascough, eds., *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Vol. 1 of *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (BZNW 181; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011); and (2) Richard Ascough, Philip Harland, and John Kloppenborg, *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: a Sourcebook* (Berlin/Waco: de Gruyter/Baylor University Press, 2012).
ekklēsia within which polis officials publicly honour a civic benefactor. Such an honorary civic backdrop comes to the fore in *IGLAM* 1381–82. The boulē and dēmos of Aspendus are said to honour (eteimēsen) Zenon, son of Theodorus who, as chief craftsman (architektōn) of the theatre and of the public works, donated (apedōken) three thousand (trischeilia?) denarii. Thus, *IGLAM* 1381 clearly identifies the euphēmon ekklēsian as being the formal assembly of a polis (Aspendos), not as being the regular assembly of a non-civic group. The same conclusion holds for *IGLAM* 1382.

A not dissimilar conclusion seems possible for *OGIS* 488 (2nd century CE).

This inscription speaks of an ekklēsia of local citizens from the village (kōmē) of Kastollos. Kastollos is located in Roman Asia near the polis of Philadelphia.

---

221 Polybius’ *Historiae* is cited as an example of euphēmos being used with the meaning of “laudatory” or “panegyric” (31.3.4). It reads, in part, ἐπανελθόντας ἐφθούς λόγους ποιήσασθαι περὶ τῇ πατρί καὶ καθόλου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν.

222 It would seem that πρισχελία is an unknown hapax or else a misspelling for τρισχέλια (3000). χέλια (1000) is spelled χελία in Ionic inscriptions. Ionia is also a region in Asia Minor.

223 See the discussion of *OGIS* 488/TAM V.1 222 by Richard Ascough in “Matthew,” 113; idem, *Paul’s Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Filippian and 1 Thessalonians* (WUNT 161; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003), 74 n. 12.

224 Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that “kome [sic] is traditionally rendered by village but, like polis, it has a whole range of meanings and is commonly used to denote a village in the socio-economic sense without any constitutional or political functions” (“Kome. A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements hich were not Poleis,” in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* [HE 95; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995], 45–82, esp. 50). He comments further that “a kome may or may not have had a political organization of its own, and it may or may not have been a unit in the political organization of the polis or region to which it belonged” (Ibid, 61). Examples of towns called both poleis and kōmai include Helisson (Arkadia; early 4th cent. BCE), Megaris (4th cent. BCE, polis; 200 BCE, kōmē), and Smyrna, Mantinea and Phokis which, through dioikismos, were broken up into kōmai (Ibid, 73–78). Komai “are completely absent from the non-Dorian Peloponnesse, Attica, the north-eastern part of Hellas, the islands of the Aegean, and all the colonies” (Ibid, 81). They “abound in Western Greece, in the Peloponnesse, in Macedon, and along the coast of Asia Minor” (Ibid, 69).

225 Independent attestation of Kastollos’ existence ranges from 330 BCE to 300 CE. Chaniotis, Corsten, Stroud, and Tybout note that “Kastollos was a village on Philadelphia’s territory” and was “located in the mountainous area northeast of Philadelphia, between Bebekli and Başibüyük” (A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, R. S. Stroud, and R. Tybout, *SEG* vol. 53, pt. 2 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 345). Strubbe claims that “Karakuyu Mevkii…ca. 25 km. north-east of Alasehir…has been identified with Kastollos on epigraphical basis (G. Petzl, EA 26, 1996, 11–12)” (Johan H. M. Strubbe, ed., *Arai Epitymbioi: Imprecations Against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor* [Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Gmbh, 1997]).
Ascough claims that ekklēsia is used as a collective designation for a non-civic group.\(^\text{226}\)

It seems more likely, though, that ekklēsia is the name of an assembly. \(\text{OGIS} \) 488 reads:

In the village of Kastollos of the Philadelphians, after an assembly (ekklēsia) was held by the gerousia and by the rest of the villagers, and after the councilors resolved to divide up a field that lay within the boundaries of their village, in the place called Agathon’s, a field that was bounded by hills, since all the villagers...

The word ekklēsia appears simply to indicate the name of a meeting. Additionally, the context of \(\text{OGIS} \) 488 places into question whether the gerousia and the villagers of Kastollos are a non-civic group.\(^\text{228}\) Kastollos is a kōmē, which, as a rule, does not possess

\(^{226}\) Ascough, "Matthew," 113; idem, \textit{Paul’s Macedonian Associations}, 74 n. 12.

\(^{227}\) Translation by Patrick Hogan. \(\text{OGIS} \) 488 in its entirety reads: ἐν Καστωλλῷ χώμῇ Φιλαδελφίων, γενοµένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν χωµητῶν πάντων, καὶ βουλευσαµένων αὐτῶν διελέσθαι τὸν ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοίς ἄγρον ἐν τοῖς ἱδίοις ὅροις τόπῳ τῷ λεγοµένῳ Ἁγάθωνος μάνδραις δύνται ὑπερνέναι, ἐφ’ ψάντες ὅι χωµῆται. See further Ziebarth, \textit{Das griechische Vereinswesen}, 116 n. 3. See also Appendix #7.

\(^{228}\) Macro, among others, suggests that “the Gerousia was a social organization which usually had its own gymnasium...[but] one must doubt any formal administrative capacity for these organizations in Roman times, however. Certainly they enjoyed official recognition by the city...and in imperial times the Gerousia frequently joined the boule and dēmos in moving decrees for conferring honours” (“The Cities of Asia Minor,” 681). Based on a study of Imperial period inscriptions from Anatolia, D. H. Hogarth adduces that (1) “the Gerousia had a recognized ‘political’ position in the civic organisation, and was not merely a social club” and (2) “we can say with fair assurance that the Gerousia under the Empire was a close, privileged body of limited numbers, probably 100 or thereabouts on an average, and originally elected by the civic assemblies, the boule and ἐκκλησία, with which it afterwards ranked...we infer that no class, except foreigners or slaves, was ineligible; for both freedmen and persons of doubtful parentage might be included (cf. “Εὐτύχης πατρός ἀδηλω” at Sidyma) as well as women in exceptional cases” [see \textit{TAM} II.1, 176; 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. CE] (D. G. Hogarth, “The Gerousia of Hierapolis,” \textit{JPhil} 19, no. 37 [1891]: 69–101, esp. 70 and 72, respectively). Dmitriev notes that the term gerousiarchia in \textit{IP}rusias ad Hypium 25.3 (2\textsuperscript{nd}–3\textsuperscript{rd} cents. CE) is regarded as a \textit{hapax} by the editor, Walter Ameling, “for women as members of the gerousia” (\textit{City Government}, 181 n. 220). Van Nijf notes that the gerousia “catered both for members of long established families as well as ‘new men’ [i.e., newly ‘minted’ social elites]” (“Public Space,” 218). He cites the unpublished dissertation of J. A. van Rossum (\textit{De Gerousia in de Griekse stedenn van het Romeinse Rijk} [U of Leiden, 1988]) for evidence that the gerousia “might have been a cross-section of the population” (“Public Space,” 218 n. 11; cf. also \textit{TAM} II.1, 176 above). A gerousia was generally comprised of older men over the age of fifty. Guy MacLean Rogers notes that “epigraphical evidence from Asia Minor and the Greek mainland from the late Macedonian and early Imperial periods reveals that young men...could remain neoi until the age of fifty, when they entered the Gerousia” (\textit{The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos: Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World} [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012], 106).
a boulē or an ekklēsia.\textsuperscript{229} By convening an ekklēsia, however, the kōmē of Kastollos does self-present as a polis with a surrogate boulē (i.e., gerousia, bouleusamenoi).\textsuperscript{230}

Three other factors support a civic context for \textit{OGIS} 488. First, Kastollos is “of the Philadelphians” (\textit{philadelpheōn}). In other words, it is a dependency of the polis of Philadelphia. \textit{Philadelpheōn} is a “city ethnic” (\textit{nomen gentilicium}).\textsuperscript{231} This coheres with the view of Mogens Hermann Hansen that “the term \textit{kome [sic]} could be used about a political community which was in some respects a dependency ruled by a major polis but in other respects had a substantial amount of self-government, and thus could be called a polis as well.”\textsuperscript{232}

Second, Christoph Schuler, following Wilhelm Dittenberger, suggests that the gerousia of Kastollos, while not a boulē proper, does designate village elders with civic responsibilities.\textsuperscript{233} He cites \textit{OGIS} 488 as being but one example of an official corporate

\textsuperscript{229} See Hansen, “\textit{Kome},” 45–82. See n. 126 where P. J. Rhodes notes that only a (larger) polis has a boulē.

\textsuperscript{230} Note that the term \textit{bouleutai} (councilors) is not used, simply a participle (\textit{bouleusamenōn}, “those who gave counsel/those who were councilors”).

\textsuperscript{231} Regarding a \textit{nomen gentilicium}, Mogens Hermann Hansen notes that one “way of viewing the polis was the habit to call it by the city-ethnic in the plural [e.g., (\textit{ο/uni1F31/uni03BCπρακι/uni1FF6ται})] rather than using the toponym itself [e.g., (\textit{αυραχωται})]” (“City-Ethnics as Evidence for Polis Identity,” in \textit{More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis} [HE 108; ed. M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996], 169–196, 169 and 192).

\textsuperscript{232} Hansen, “\textit{Kome},” 73–74.

\textsuperscript{233} Christof Schuler writes, “Bemerkenswert ist die Rolle der Gerusie, die in Kastollos und Orkistos mit der Einberufung der Gemeindeversammlung bzw. deren Vorsitz sehr ähnliche Funktionen wahrmahm… Dazu merkte bereits Dittenberger an, daß diese dörfliche Gremium, das für ihnnoch <<unum exemplum gerousias pagi>> war, seiner Funktion nach der boulē einer Polis entsprach” (\textit{Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasiien} [München: C. H. Beck, 1998], 227; Cf. Wilhelm Dittenberger, ed., \textit{Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae. Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum}, vol. 2 [Leipzig: Hildesheim, 1903–5/repr. 1960], 121–22 or http://www.archive.org/stream/orientisgraeci02dittuoft#page/n55/mode/2up). William M. Ramsey makes four key observations regarding the Gerousia in Imperial period Phrygia, a region to the east of Lydia (\textit{The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest}, vol 1, Pt. 1 [Aberdeen: 1895, repr. 2004]). First, “the Senate [boulē], the Demos and the Gerousia often united in the preamble to honorary decrees” but that this fact does not mean “all were political in character; for we find occasionally the Senate, Demos, Gerousia and Neoi [who met as an
body of *geraioi* (sometimes, but not always, designated as a *gerousia*) which was constituted within many Imperial period Anatolian village communities and whose function resembles that of the *boulē* of a *polis*. Third, the clause *genomenēs ekklēsias* can be said to allude to the fuller expression *ekklēsias kyria genomenēs*, which R. M. Errington contends is technical terminology that indicates the existence of a quorum within a civic assembly, particularly in Asia Minor (4th to 2nd cents. BCE). Evidence

Second, “the inscriptions show what importance was attached in Asia Minor to the care of tombs, and the Gerousia, as the body most trusted in these cases, became very wealthy corporations” (Ibid, 109). Third, “a resolution of the *Gerousia* had some analogy to a *senatus auctovitas*, a decree vetoed by a tribune and therefore devoid of legal force, yet having the weight naturally attaching to the mere opinion of a body so influential and respected” (Ibid, 112). Fourth, the *gerousiai* in Asia Minor had “as a rule, some building as their centre, a clubhouse and meeting-house combined.” Examples in Asia Minor include a basilica (Thyatira), a “Gerousia” (Nikomedea; Plin. *ad Traj*. 33), a stoa (Teos), a “Gerontikon” (Nysa), and most commonly a gymnasion (e.g., Sidyma) (Ibid, 112).

234 Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen*, 227. Michael Ballance notes that there appear to be only two inscriptive examples wherein “the γέραιοι are distinguished from the other οἰκίτορες (‘inhabitants’) of a village.” Both hail from Imperial period Roman Asia (*OGIS* 488 and *MAMA XI* 294) (http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/ MAMA-XI-294.html [University of Oxford and the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents]; accessed April 2, 2013). *MAMA XI* 294 is an honorific inscription of the ‘elders and all the inhabitants’ of a village on the territory of Ikonion. It reads, ΚΑΝΑΙΩ[ - - -] εων γεραιοι και [i. pαν]τες οι οικ[ι]τορες Μανιον Πασικρατους 5 τον ηαυτων ει[εργε]ιην τω τε ει[. . . 4-5 . .] τηρω και τω [ . .4-5 . .] έτειμου[ν] [ vac. (?)]. It is translated as, “...the elders and all the inhabitants honoured Manius son of Pasik[rates], their benefactor, with the [...] and the[...].” The book-form publication of *MAMA XI* is still forthcoming (Michael Balance, ed., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua XI: Monuments from Phrygia and Lykaonia* [JRS Monograph series; 2014]). Peter Thonemann (Wadham College, Oxford) comments that *MAMA XI* is “a corpus of 387 inscriptions and other ancient monuments, 292 of which are unpublished, from Phrygia and Lykaonia recorded by Sir William Calder (1881–1960) and Dr. Michael Ballance (+27 July 2006) in the course of annual expeditions to Asia Minor in 1954–1957” (http://www.currentepigraphy.org/2012/09/24/mama-xi/; accessed April 3, 2013).

235 The complete sentence in *OGIS* 488 reads, γενομένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν ἱεραρχῶν ἱερών παντῶν.

236 R. M. Errington notes 54 inscriptions from Asia Minor which contain the clause ἐκκλησίας κυρία γενομένες (or οὕσης) (“ἐκκλησίας κυρία γενομένες,” *Chiron* 25 [1995]: 19–25). These decrees date from 367/66 BCE to c.140 BCE. At least two are undatable (Samos 14 and 61; ἐκκλησίας νομαίς οὕσης). An additional 4 inscriptions outside of Asia Minor date to the 2nd century CE. I would add three observations that are not included in Errington’s conclusions. First, not only civic bodies, but at least one non-civic group, the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs (*Sinuri* 73/8, Caria; 350/44 BCE), uses the formulaic ἐκκλησίας κυρία γενομένες ([ἐδοξέ]ν) Πελεκόδως συγγενεύει [συνελθούσην πασίν] vacat [ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης] (see my fuller discussion of *Sinuri* 73/8 in n. 262). Second, at least one more Asia Minor inscription dates after 140 BCE (*TAM II* 168; Lycia, Hippokome; 2/1 cent. BCE: [ἐπί] [ἐρέμως] το] [Αλέως του] [Πειγάσεως] μην[ος Ἡραίωνός?] [. .] [ἐν] τούς ἄρχαρεσίοις ἐκκλησίας κυρίας [κα]ρ[i]ας γε[ν]σιμένης ἐδοξέ]ν

63
that the simpler collocation genomenēs ekklesias can carry the same legal connotation as does ekklesias kyria genomenēs is found in four other Asia Minor inscriptions, the latest of which dates to the terminus ad quem of Errington’s examples of the clause ekklesias kyria genomenēs.\(^{237}\) If the fact that the ekklesia kyria is no longer extant in Asia Minor inscriptions after 99 CE indicates its dispute as a political designation,\(^{238}\) then it is not surprising if the simpler ekklesias genomenēs replaced the full quorum clause ekklesias kyria genomenēs during that same timeframe.\(^{239}\) Irrespective of historical questions, the
gerousia in Kastollos did not leave the status of a quorum open to question. All doubt is removed in the explicit mention that both the gerousia and “all the rest of the villagers” (tōn loipōn chōmētōn pantōn) attended the now legislatively authoritative ekklēsia.

This enfranchisement of a kōmē with local jurisdictional responsibilities also is not unexpected in Kastollos’ “post-edict of Domitian” world. In 92 CE Domitian decreed that at least half of the vineyards in the Greek East were to be cut down and replaced with corn. Philadelphia and its surrounding kōmai, with their rich volcanic soil, would have been among some of the hardest hit regions. Viticulture was the agricultural foundation of the Philadelphians.²⁴⁰ Hemer notes that, given the two factors of ongoing earthquake repairs and a depressed viticulture, “for most of the [2nd] century the state had probably reverted largely to the older Lydian pattern of agricultural villages ‘outside’ the city.”²⁴¹ This being the case, 2nd century CE Lydian villages, including Kastollos, would have gained more political autonomy, thereby necessitating greater jurisdictional authority for governance over matters of local concern (e.g., field boundaries).²⁴² This falls into line with the observation of Hansen that a relative degree of political autonomy was enjoyed by some Asia Minor kōmai.²⁴³ If Kastollos enjoyed such autonomy then it helps explain

---

²⁴⁰ Hemer, *Letters*, 155–56. This fact is numismatically attested in images of cornucopiae (e.g., *BMC Lydia*, no. 54 of Caligula), of ears of corn (no. 56 of Claudius), of Demeter (no. 71 of Marcus Aurelius), of Dionysos (e.g., no. 66 of Trajan), and of bunches of grapes (no. 64 of Domitia).
²⁴² Schuler notes the lack of a polis council in villages within Roman Asia, and the governing authority accorded the popular assembly: “in den meisten Dörfern gab es dagegen kein Äquivalent für den stadtischen Rat, und die ersammelten Mitglieder verkörperten deshalb allein die chōmē oder die katoixia. Wenn die chōmē einen Beschluß faßte, so standen dahinter eben die Gemeindemitglieder und keine andere Instanz außer ihnen. Sie brauchten deshalb nicht also démos identifiziert werden” (*Ländliche Siedlungen*, 226).
²⁴³ See Hansen’s comments on kōmai in n. 224.
why it is one of only two inscriptions (OGIS 488, Lydia; MAMA XI 294, Phrygia) in which a gerousia and the villagers of a kōmē are inscriptionally differentiated within the context of a formal enactment decree.\textsuperscript{244} By naming their village assembly an ekklēsia, the formal nature of their village decree is enhanced, which, when coupled with differentiation of the gerousia from the villagers, presents Kastollos as a polis that contains the political equivalents of a boulē (gerousia) and a dēmos (villagers). The ekklēsia convened by this kōmē is, thus, implicitly affirming the legal right of the kōmē of Kastollos autonomously to divide the field called Agathōn.

The fact that the gerousia of Kastollos was involved in a land transaction is not out of character either: a roughly contemporaneous gerousia in Ionia used land transactions as a source of income.\textsuperscript{245} The close association of Asia Minor gerousiai with gymnasias\textsuperscript{246} opens up the possibility that OGIS 488 may even recount the division of land for the purpose of constructing a gymnasium\textsuperscript{247} and/or a palaistra.\textsuperscript{248} While these last two

\textsuperscript{244} OGIS 488 and MAMA XI 294 both date into the Roman Imperial period. See n. 234 for Ballance’s comments.

\textsuperscript{245} Gaston Deschamps and Georges Cousin analyse an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander during the time of Hadrian. It describes, among other things, how the gerousia (to systēma tôn presbyterōn; lines 3–4) used land possession and exploitation as a source of income (IMagn 316) (“Inscription de Magnésie du Méandre,” BCH 12 [1888]: 204–223). Deschamps and Cousin state that “le σ/uni1F7Bστη/uni03BCα τ/uni1FF6ν πρεσβυτ/uni1F73ρων est le meme corps que la γερουσ/uni1F77α” (Ibid, 211) and that this gerousia gains income for local philanthrōpa from “le rendement des terres et des industries dépendant de la gérousia” (Ibid, 214). The second part of the inscription (lines 30 to 67) provides a list of philanthropic acts.

\textsuperscript{246} See n. 233 for examples of the type of clubhouses/meeting-house used by gerousiai in Asia Minor. The gymnasium was their most common meeting place (e.g., Sidyma) (Ramsey, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 112).

\textsuperscript{247} Dinsmoor describes the interrelationship between the Hellenistic and Roman period palaistra and gymnasium: “the gymnasium proper was the open [or enclosed] athletic ground for running, jumping, and throwing, while the name palaestra was given to the enclosed structures wherein wrestling and the like were practised” (William Bell Dinsmoor, The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of Its Historic Development [New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1950], 320). The gymnasium is well attested beginning already in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE (M. L. Strack, Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer [Berlin: 1887], 234 n. 46; cf. Arch. Pap. Xiii 1938, 29 n. 3).
points represent inference rather than evidence, I would suggest that the combined weight of all the evidence tips the scale in favour of seeing a municipal-style, village-wide decision-making process at work in OGIS 488. It does not appear that a non-civic group living within the kōmē of Kastollos effected this transaction in a semi-public ekklēsia.

The decree in Samos 119 also incorporates a gerousia and the word ekklēsia, but does so within the decree of a non-civic group, the association of aleiphomenoi (“gymnasts”).

The decree in Samos 119 also incorporates a gerousia and the word ekklēsia, but does so within the decree of a non-civic group, the association of aleiphomenoi (“gymnasts”).

Wrestling schools (aleiphomenoi) met within palaistrai. A palaistra was not necessarily part of a gymnasion, since a palaistra could function independently of a gymnasion. No gymnasion, though, could function without a palaistra. Beginning with the Hellenistic era, the architecture of a typical palaistra entailed a rectangular court demarcated by colonnades outside of which were adjoining rooms for dressing-rooms, baths, lectures, and the like (Dinsmoor, Architecture of Ancient Greece, 320–21). Dinsmoor notes that the size of the inner court varied but typically ranged from 104 sq. ft. (Delos) to 135 sq. ft. (Olympia) (Ibid, 320). Pompeii’s palaistra was “no larger than the corresponding complex at Olympia” (Frederick E. Writer, Studies in Hellenistic Architecture [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006], 130). Writer suggests that although “Pompeii was only a small provincial town...there is no reason to believe that ‘urban’ gymnasia in larger cities...were much larger in scale; doubtless when additional facilities were needed, civic authorities...[prioritized] building additional smaller gymnasia rather than a single very large complex” (Studies in Hellenistic Architecture, 130).

248 Wrestling schools (aleiphomenoi) met within palaistrai. A palaistra was not necessarily part of a gymnasion, since a palaistra could function independently of a gymnasion. No gymnasion, though, could function without a palaistra. Beginning with the Hellenistic era, the architecture of a typical palaistra entailed a rectangular court demarcated by colonnades outside of which were adjoining rooms for dressing-rooms, baths, lectures, and the like (Dinsmoor, Architecture of Ancient Greece, 320–21). Dinsmoor notes that the size of the inner court varied but typically ranged from 104 sq. ft. (Delos) to 135 sq. ft. (Olympia) (Ibid, 320). Pompeii’s palaistra was “no larger than the corresponding complex at Olympia” (Frederick E. Writer, Studies in Hellenistic Architecture [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006], 130). Writer suggests that although “Pompeii was only a small provincial town...there is no reason to believe that ‘urban’ gymnasia in larger cities...were much larger in scale; doubtless when additional facilities were needed, civic authorities...[prioritized] building additional smaller gymnasia rather than a single very large complex” (Studies in Hellenistic Architecture, 130).

249 The decree in Samos 119 also incorporates a gerousia and the word ekklēsia, but does so within the decree of a non-civic group, the association of aleiphomenoi (“gymnasts”).

250 Harland notes that the phrase eis ekklēsia refers to an assembly of the
As such, the opening line of *Samos* 119 can be translated as follows: “With Leukippos presiding; on the seventh day of the month of Lenaion it was resolved by the athletes in the *palaistra* of the elders, who were gathered (*synagō*) in an assembly (*ekklēsia*).” Richard Ascough goes one step further and claims that *ekklēsia* is the collective self-designation of the *aleiphomenoi*. Harland’s evaluation appears preferable, though. The other 19 inscriptive pairings of *synagō* with *ekklēsia*, including the two more from *Samos* (Samos 4, 120), use *ekklēsia* only in reference to a civic assembly (“gathered together in an *ekklēsia*”), not to a group designation (“gathered as an *ekklēsia*”).

*IDelos* 1519 also mentions an *ekklēsia* that was held by a non-civic group, in this case, the Tyrian Herakleistai (153/2 BCE). The Herakleistai are an association (*koinon*, Spence notes numerous instances in *Samos*’ history which demonstrate its enduring commitment to Greek democratic rule (*Historical Dictionary of Ancient Greek Warfare* [HDWRCU 16; Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002], xxix, xxxv, 188).

---

251 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 45 n. 75.
253 There are 20 collocations of *synagō* with the word *ekklēsia* across 14 inscriptions. Seven of those fourteen inscriptions come from Asia Minor (195 BCE–1 BCE), all of which are honorary decrees, with fully three hailing from *Samos* (Samos 14, 119, 120). Of the fourteen inscriptions, only *Samos* 119 employs the preposition *eis*. There are four other Samian inscriptions which use the word *ekklēsia*, but not with the verb *synagō* (*Samos* 12, 21, 61, 122/SIG 976). Only one of those four employs the preposition *eis* (*Samos* 21), but it pairs *eis tēn ekklesiān* with the verb *parerchomai*, not with *synagō* (παρελθ/uni1F7Cν ε/uni1F30ς τ/uni1F74ν/uni1F10κκλησ/uni1F77αν).

synodos) of merchants, shippers, and warehousemen in Delos. At the time IDelos 1519 was inscribed, Delos was a free port having been restored by Rome to its former status as a cleruchy of Athens (167/6 BCE). John Day notes that the association of Tyrian Herakleistai was one of the two most important non-Roman associations at Delos during the time of the Athenian cleruchy. The Poseidoniasts of Berytus were the other.

In IDelos 1519, the Tyrians enact an honorific decree for a benefactor, ostensibly during an ekklēsia. Kloppenborg and Harland have both reversed their initial stance that the word ekklēsia is used as a collective designation for the Tyrian association. They now translate ekklēsia as “assembly/meeting.” In this regard, then, IDelos 1519 recounts the successful outcome of a decision reached in the Tyrians’ ekklēsia ("assembly") to send an embassy to Athens for permission to construct a sanctuary for Herakles. This view is reinforced in the Tyrians’ mimesis of stock civic terminology from Athenian inscriptions, specifically the standard opening lines of an enactment decree.

---

255 Scholars date IDelos 1519 either to 153/2 BCE or to 149/148 BCE. See Monika Trümper’s discussion in “Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos. The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos,” in Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 49–100, esp. 55 nn. 21 and 22.


257 Day notes that by 110 BCE, the Poseidoniasts built an extensive complex northwest of the Sacred Lake (Greek History, 67). Their complex of buildings includes shops/storerooms, a club-house, and various rooms dedicated to religious observances. For precise archeological descriptions of the Poseidoniasts’ complex, see Trümper, “Non–Delians,” 53–58.

258 Initially, both Kloppenborg and Harland interpreted the word ekklēsia in IDelos 1519 as referring to a group designation (Kloppenborg, “Edwin Hatch,” 231; Harland, Associations, 106 and 182). Kloppenborg has rescinded that initial estimation by email (see n. 215). Harland reverses his 2003 opinion in a later book (2009): IDelos 1519 “recounts the outcome of a particular assembly (ἐκκλησία) of the members of the association, who are also called ‘society members’ (θιασται)” (Dynamics of Identity, 111).

259 The opening line of Epigr. tou Oropou 297 serves as an example of the standard opening line(s) of an Athenian-style enactment decree (McLean, Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, 219–220). Epigr.
Three of the five standard Athenian terms are evident along with one other common term—\\textit{ekk\'lesia}.\textsuperscript{261} This political mimicry of civic terminology by a Delian voluntary association is not surprising given that, during that time, Delos was a cleruchy of Athens.

There is one other potential inscriptional example, not previously noted by scholars, of a non-civic group using \textit{ekk\'lesia} terminology: \textit{Sinuri 8/73} (4\textsuperscript{th} cent BCE; Asia Minor, Caria).\textsuperscript{262} The group behind \textit{Sinuri 73} is a \textit{syngeneia}, not a \textit{polis} or a \textit{koinon}.

---

\textit{tok Oropou} 297 (332/1 BCE; Oropos in Boiotia, central Greece) is an honorific decree of Athens for Phanodemos, son of Dyillos. Its opening line reads, \textit{θεοί. ἐπὶ Νικήτου ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθείδος ἐνάτης πρυτανείας, ἔξω Ἀριστόνος Ἀριστόνου Ἄναγυρᾶς ἐγραμμένευ, θαρητλήνος ἐνδεκάτης, τρίτη καὶ εἰκοστή τῆς πρυτανείας}. McLean notes that, aside from the occasional invocation (e.g., \textit{θεοί; “to the gods”), the standard opening for an Athenian-style decree contains at least five elements. Any combination of these five provide dating details for the enactment formula (\textit{ἐδοξέν τῇ...}) which follows. First, the name of the eponymous magistrate is given followed by his title in the genitive (e.g., \textit{ἐπὶ Νικήτου ἄρχοντος; “during the archonship of Nikētōs”). Second, in Athens, the name of the prytanizing tribe is given (e.g., \textit{ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθείδος; “during the [prytany] of [the tribe] Erechtheídos”). Third, the ordinal sequence of the \textit{prytaneia} is stated (e.g., \textit{ἐνάτης πρυτανείας; “of the ninth prytaneia”}). Fourth, the day of the month is given (\textit{τρίτη καὶ εἰκοστή τῆς πρυτανείας; “on the thirty-third day of the prytaneia”}). Fifth, other officers are cited, such as the secretary of the prytany or of the \textit{boule} (\textit{ἡ Ἀριστὸνος Ἀριστόνου Ἀναγυρᾶς ἐγραμμένευ; “when Ariston, son of Aristonos, of [the deme] Anagyrasios was secretary”). McLean observes that “the name of the secretary gave official sanction to public documents and became a means of identifying and dating decrees, in the same way we might assign a document an identification number for easy reference” (Ibid, 219). McLean does not add a sixth element, which also often occurs in the standard opening lines of an inscription. At least 1064 Athenian inscriptions mention, in their opening lines, that a formal \textit{ekk\'lesia} had been convened.

\textit{Delos} 1519 follows two of the five recurring elements in the standard opening line of an Athenian-styled inscription, with a third evident later in the inscription: (1) the eponymous magistrate (\textit{ἐπὶ Φαιδρίου ἄρχοντος}; (2) there is no name of the prytanizing tribe since Delos does not have a prytany system; (3) there is no ordinal sequence of the tribe since Delos does not have a prytany system; (4) day of the month (\textit{Ἐλαχηδηλῶν ὁγδόεις}; and (5) other political officers are not cited, contrary to normal civic \textit{praxis}. Rather, political officers are cited well after the opening lines in lines 45–47 (\textit{ἐπιμελεῖς δὲ ἑστὶ τοῖς καθήσκεσθαι ἐρημίδοις καὶ ταμίαις καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῖς}). A sixth political element in a standard opening line is also evident in the Tyrian honorific decree: enactment within an \textit{ekk\'lesia}. The Tyrians met \textit{en ekk\'lesia} within the temple of Apollo: \textit{ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος}. Citing a location for the \textit{ekk\'lesia} (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) also mimics Athenian inscriptionsal \textit{praxis}. Examples of locations for Athenian \textit{ekk\'lesia} in the mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE include: \textit{ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ} (e.g., \textit{IG II² 905, 175/4 BCE}; 135 occurrences in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. BCE); \textit{ἐν Πειρατείᾳ} (e.g., \textit{Agora 16 290[1], 170/69 BCE}; 46 occurrences in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. BCE); \textit{ἐν Διονύσου} (e.g., \textit{IG II² 896, 186/6 BCE}; 4 occurrences in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. BCE).

A *syngeneia* is a kinship-based group, whether biological or mythical. Louis Robert claims that the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs is a non-civic group. He postulates that this 4th century *syngeneia* of Pelekōs is a family clan generationally in charge of the temple of a Carian deity named Sinuri. His conclusion is based upon the common occurrence of the family toponym “Pelekōs” in the list of eponymous priests in Caria (*Sinuri 5, 73*).

The *syngeneia* of Pelekōs did not use *ekklēsia* as a group designation. The family clan identifies only its semi-public meeting as an *ekklēsia kyriē*. If Errington is correct, then the legally binding nature of decisions reached during their *ekklēsia kyriē* is implicitly

---


For an extensive analysis of *syngeneiai* in both literary and epigraphical sources, see Lee E. Patterson (*Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* [Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010], esp. 109–123 for epigraphic evidence of kinship diplomacy). Patterson examines the role that kinship myth plays in the construction of political and cultural identity. Mythic kinship in the realm of politics is evident when a Greek *polis* claims *syngeneia* with other Greek *poleis* in order to create deeper socio-political ties. For example, the decree of Allaria (200 BCE) confirms friendship (*syngeneis*) with, and *asylia* of, Teos (*LW 73, Teos 3, I Cret II Allaria* no. 1 [ll. 4, 12]). It reads, "[πείρατε] τα πλούσια και συγγενεῖς του τιμίου κυρίου της Εν... η Νεσαιών καλόν γαθόν" (ΦΗ 2009: 168).

263 For an extensive analysis of *syngeneiai* in both literary and epigraphical sources, see Lee E. Patterson (*Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* [Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010], esp. 109–123 for epigraphic evidence of kinship diplomacy). Patterson examines the role that kinship myth plays in the construction of political and cultural identity. Mythic kinship in the realm of politics is evident when a Greek *polis* claims *syngeneia* with other Greek *poleis* in order to create deeper socio-political ties. For example, the decree of Allaria (200 BCE) confirms friendship (*syngeneis*) with, and *asylia* of, Teos (*LW 73, Teos 3, I Cret II Allaria* no. 1 [ll. 4, 12]). It reads, "[πείρατε] τα πλούσια και συγγενεῖς του τιμίου κυρίου της Εν... η Νεσαιών καλόν γαθόν" (ΦΗ 2009: 168).

reinforced in their use of the inscriptive formula *ekklēsiās kyriēs genomenēs.* The term *ekklēsiā kyriē* alludes back to the *ekklēsia kyria* held once every 36 (or 39) days in classical Athens (4th century BCE to 322 BCE), the derivative assemblies of which continued in Athens, and beyond some even into the Imperial period.

By the Hellenistic period, however, only a civic entity known as *syngeneia* is inscriptionally extant in Sinuri (*Sinuri 24a/Sinuri 22*). This Hellenistic-era civic

---

268 See n. 236 for Errington’s contention that inscriptive occurrences of the clause ἐκκλησίας κυρία γενομένες (or οὖν) indicate an official quorum for *ekklēsiai* across the Greek East from 367/66 BCE until at least c.140 BCE (“ἐκκλησίας κυρία γενομένες,” 19–25).

269 By at least 355 BCE, classical Athens convened four types of *ekklēsia* (*kyria, nomimos, synklētōs*, and *archairesia*) (Hansen, Athenian Assembly, 41–44). Compare, however, Rhodes and Lewis who state that “by the end of the fifth century there were four regular assemblies, one of the four retaining the designation *kyria*” (*Decrees of the Greek States*, 13, 503). The principal *ekklēsia*, whose roots extend into the 5th century BCE, was called *ekklēsia kyria* (*Ath. Pol.* 43. iii–vi). It was convened ten times in the year, that is, once each *prytaneia* (Hansen, Athenian Assembly, 25–28). See n. 180 for a description of the all-embracing program of an Athenian *ekklēsia kyria*. Literary sources (e.g., *Ath. Pol.* 43.4–6) suggest that the three supplementary *ekklēsiai* in each *prytaneia* were generally designated “lawful” *ekklēsiai* (*nomimoi ekklesiai*) (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 43:3; Aeschin., *Emb.* 72). Athenian inscriptions, however, make no mention either of a *nomimos ekklesia*, or of the semantically related *ennomos ekklesia*. Inscriptions with *ennomos* are predominantly found in central Greece between the 2nd cent. BCE and the 2nd cent. CE (Phokis and Thessaly; 36x). Other inscriptions with *ennomos* come from the Aegean Islands (7x), and Asia Minor (Pergamon in Mysia, 1x; Termessos, 1x). Acts’ use of the phrase τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Acts 19:39) for the regular assembly of Ephesos is unattested in the inscriptive record. There is only one inscriptive extant from Asia Minor which uses the phrase τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. It dates to the 2nd century CE and comes from Termessos (*TAM* III 4). The adjective *nomimos* occurs once each in central Greece (Delphi, 185–175 BCE) and Asia Minor (Ephesos, 104 CE). The term *ekklēsia kyria* first appears epigraphically in *IG* I² 42, 22 (446/45 BCE). It is more regularly attested beginning in 336/35 as part of the *prytaneia* system described in the *Athēnaion Politeia* (cf. *IG* II, 2 330). There are at least 1064 extant inscriptive mentions of ἐκκλησία in Athenian epigraphy. These are dated from the 4th cent. BCE until the 2nd cent. CE. Extant adjectival modifiers for the *ekklēsia* in Athens include κυρία (253), πρώτη (123x), ἐποίοδαν (102x), ἀρχαιεσία (3x; *IG* IP 892, 188–87 BCE; *IG* IP 954, pre-159 BCE; *IG* IP 955, 159 BCE), καθήκουσαν (2x; *IG* IP 971, 140–39 BCE), συγκλητος (2x; *IG* IP 945, 168–67 BCE; *IG* IP 911, 169–68 BCE).

270 See n. 174.

271 Examples of non-Athenian poleis which adopt the title *ekklēsia kyria* for their civic assemblies include Kios (*IK Kios* 1; Bithynia, Asia Minor; 4th cent. BCE), Telmessos (*Clara Rhodos* 9:183; Lycia, Asia Minor; 258–256 BCE), Delos (*Delos* 1502; Aegean Sea; 148/7 BCE), and Olympia (*IVO* 52; Peloponnesos, 138 BCE).

272 There are three inscriptive occurrences of the term *ekklēsia kyria* from the Imperial period: *Clinton, Sacred Officials* 50, D14/SEG 30:93 (20/19 BCE); *Peek, Asklepieion* 35(2) (Peloponnesos, Epidaurus; 40–42 CE); *St.Pont.* III 141 (Asia Minor, Pontus and Paphlagonia, Amasia, 98/99 CE; for text see n. 238).
syngeneia appears to be some sort of political subdivision of Mylasa.\(^{273}\) This means that its ekklēsia (“kyrias ekklēsias”) had been transformed into a public institution for the entire community.\(^{274}\) This development leaves only IDelos 1519 (and potentially Samos 119) as a Hellenistic-era, or later, inscription wherein a non-civic association names its semi-public meeting ekklēsia.

### 3.2. The Non-Civic Ekklēsia: Politicization of Association Life?

The foregoing analysis indicates that there does not appear to be inscriptive attestation of a community of people using the word ekklēsia as a collective designation prior to the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century CE. At most, the word ekklēsia identifies the semi-public assemblies of three non-civic groups: the Samian wrestlers (Samos 119), the Tyrian Herakleistai (IDelos 1519), and the Sinurian cultists (Sinuri 73/8). Only the latter unequivocally predates Roman hegemony in the east. The honorary decree of the association of Samian wrestlers is not datable with certainty, while the Tyrian Herakleistai can be dated to the mid-2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century BCE. Thus, at the very least, one of the three non-civic groups lived under Roman hegemony, though not under direct Roman rule. This still leaves open, though, the question as to how Romans in the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century CE might have perceived a non-civic group which enacted decrees within an ekklēsia.

\(^{273}\) Other Mylasan tribal clans around the same timeframe also self-describe as civic organizations called syngeneiai. Robert Sherk identifies two 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century BCE inscriptions which use the word syngeneia as a collective civic designation for the entire tribal clan, not simply for a family clan. The enactment formulae use phylē and syngeneia: IMylasa 108 (2\(^{\text{nd}}\) cent. BCE; ἐδοξε τῶν ὀτωροκονδέων φυλῆ); and IMylasa 123 (3\(^{\text{rd}}/2^{\text{nd}}\) cent. BCE; ἐδοξε τῇ ὄγονδέων συγγενείαι) (“Eponymous Officials,” 232).

\(^{274}\) Sinuri 24a (Sinuri 22 in the PHI website) is dated by Louis Robert into the Hellenistic period. In its entirety it reads: [-] Λέοντος Κυρίας [ἐκκλησίας] [-] ΔΗ [-] ΟΠΠΑ [-] ΣΑΝ (Appendix #7).
3.2.1. Roman Perceptions of Voluntary Associations

In general, voluntary associations were perceived by the Romans with particular unease. Suetonius notes that Julius Caesar dissolved “all collegia except those of ancient foundation” during 47–46 BCE when he was seeking to solidify his power base.  

Roman prejudice towards voluntary associations continued even into the Imperial period. Suetonius discusses the draconian measures of Octavian (later known as Augustus) in the late 30’s BCE to redress the “anti-social practices that endangered public order” in Italy following the resolution of the civil wars. At the other end of the Roman empire, and over a hundred years later, Pliny, the governor of Bithynia-Pontus in northern Asia Minor (111–113 CE), wrote to the emperor Trajan requesting that he be allowed to agree to the formation of an association of firefighters at Nikomedia. Trajan denied the request and reminded Pliny that,

we must remember that it is societies like these which have been responsible for the political disturbances in your province, particularly its towns. If people assemble for a common purpose, whatever name we give them and for whatever reason, they soon turn into a political club (hetaerae).

There is one type of association—Greek gymnastic associations—which gained particular disapproval from Roman elites, especially from the senatorial class. If the Samian alephomenoi lived during the early Imperial period, then Roman distaste may have been directed at them also. Plutarch, perhaps tongue in cheek, describes Roman

---

276 See Harland’s regionally nuanced discussion on tensions and conflicts between civic authorities and associations (Associations, 161–73).
277 Translated by Rolfe (1913 [LCL]), with adaptations by Harland (Associations, 165). Brigandry had been on the rise, with some bands mimicking association terminology (titulo collegi novi, “the title of a new association”). As a result, Octavian, soon to be Augustus, “disbanded all associations [collegia], except such as were of long standing and formed for legitimate purposes” (Divine Augustus, 32:1–2).
278 Pliny, Epistles 10.34, translated by Rolfe (LCL). See also Harland, Associations, 137; Macro, “Cities of Asia Minor,” 658–97; and Dmitriev, City Government, 308, 309.
prejudice towards Greek preoccupation with public nudity, specifically within 
gymnasia.279 The displeasure of Cato and Cicero, however, is unrestrained in their 
“ferocious denunciations of Greek gymnastic nakedness.”280 Elitist denunciations need to 
be taken with a grain of salt, however, since private praxis among Roman elites 
sometimes differed.281

This Roman prejudice against gymnasia and their aleiphomenoi would have 
received particular reinforcement during and after the Pantomime Riots in Rome (14–15 
CE), which followed upon the death of Caesar Augustus.282 Pantomimes specialized in a 
form of calisthenics that was taught in the gymnasion, known as cheironomia. 
Cheironomia was “designed to create graceful and rhythmic movements…which were 
the same as those for which the pantomimes were famous or notorious.”283 The fact that 
cheironomia was also practiced by aleiphomenoi may have positioned them, in the public 
eye, with the pantomimes through guilt by association.

---

279 Plut. QR 40. W. J. Slater notes that “the attack on athletics is as old as Euripides and Plato” 
280 Cicero, Resp. 4.4.4. Additional critique can be found in Pliny, Ep. 4.22.7; Hor. Od. 3.24.51, 
Sat. 2.2.10; Tac. Ann. 14.14–15, 20–21; Pliny, NH 15.19, 29.26; Paneg. 13.6; Mart. 7.32; Luc. 7.270; Suet. 
Dom. 4. See Slater, “Pantomime Riots,” 134 n. 84.
281 Slater observes that one of the most distinguished men of Caesarean Rome, L. Munatius 
Plancus, acted out a Greek mythological theme in a pantomime at a private occasion in Egypt, and 
apparently with his elite audience’s approval (Vell. Pat. 2.83.2) (“Pantomime Riots,” 136).
282 Slater notes that this riot was significant enough that six historians mention it: Tac. Ann. 1.77; 
Dio 57.14.10; Vell. Pat. 2.126.2; Suet. Tib. 34.1; Zos. 1.6.1; possibly also, Valerius Maximus (2.4.1) 
(“Pantomime Riots,” 125 n. 32).
283 Slater, “Pantomime Riots,” 133–34. Cheironomia involves silent, expressive gesticulation also 
used in pantomime performances. For cheironomia in the palaistra see, for example, Plato, Leg. 814–15; 
Plut. Mor. 747A; Dio Prus. 32.20; Galen, De Sanit. Tuend. 6.325.1; Diod. Sic. 1.16.1; Athen. 14.629b–c; 
Polyb. 9.20.6; Synes, De Insomniis 20.
3.2.2. The Aleiphomenoi of Samos (Samos 119)

If the Samian aleiphomenoi existed around the time of the Pantomime Riots, or, for that matter, anytime after Samos became part of the province of Roman Asia (129 BCE), and if Roman authorities would have viewed with suspicion the adoption of ekklēsia terminology by a non-civic group, then one would not expect political terminology in Samos 119. Yet the word ekklēsia does occur, and it does so within the collocation synagō eis ekklēsian, which suggests a terminus post quem for Samos 119 of the mid-2nd century BCE, that is, the period of Roman ascendancy in the Greek East.

Samos 119 is in select company, within the inscriptional record, when it comes to using the anarthrous prepositional phrase eis ekklēsian, and alone in its pairing of eis ekklēsian with synagō. If one broadens the syntactical search criteria to an investigation of instances in which synagō is paired only with the noun (ekklēsia), then a two hundred year compositional window for Samos 119 opens. There are fourteen

284 In each of the 302 inscriptions where the phrase eis ekklēsian, with or without the article tēn, occurs, that prepositional phrase refers to public, not semi-public, assemblies which are open to citizens of a polis. The latest extant example of the phrase eis (tēn) ekklēsian is in an honorary decree by the boulē of Ephesos in 104 CE (IEph 27E/Ephesos 153). Of the 302 juxtapositions of eis and ekklēsian, 233 are articular (eis tēn ekklēsian). The article tēn is reconstructed in 86 cases and eis in 131 instances.

285 See Appendix #8 (Synagō and Eis Ekklēsian: Greek Sources). The verbal pairings associated with the six inscriptional occurrences of eis ekklēsian are as follows: Samos 119 (Samos, Aegean Islands, undatable; ἐδοξὲν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῇ γεροντικῇ παλαιώτερας, συναχθεῖς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν; “resolved by the wrestlers/gymnasts … to gather together in [an] assembly”); IEph 1383 (Ephesos; συνέλθεντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν); IMT NoerdlTroas 7/IK 6,7 (Troas, Asia Minor, 100–66 CE; καθ’ ὑπὸ θεοπρὸσελεγκεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίαν); SEG 13:458 (Thasos, Aegean Islands, 2nd/1st BCE; καθ’ ὑπὸ τιμηθεῖσα γενεαλογίας, ἐξενεγκεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν); IMYL 135/Mylasa 11 (Mylasa, 5th BCE–2nd CE; ἀπεγράφαντο ἔρθον εἰς βουλήν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ποιοῦμενοι); Milet 12/Miletos 9 (Miletos; οἱ μὲν θεοπρόσελεγκεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν).

286 There are seventeen inscriptions in which the verb synagō is paired with the noun ekklēsia. None of these seventeen come from Attica, with only four hailing from Hellas proper (Macedonia, Thessaly, and Peloponneseos). The seventeen inscriptions are: Aphrodisias 2 (BCH [1972]: 443-45); EKM 1. Beroia 1; IMT Adram Kolpos 732; IC II xii 20; Ilassos 4.33-110; IosPE I² 33; IvO 52; Milet I 3, 145; Meletemata 11 K1; Rigsby, Asylia 52c; Samos 4; Samos 119; Samos 120; Sardis VII,1 8 (IGRR 4.1756);
inscriptions which together pair *synagō* with the word *ekklēsia* twenty times. Of the seven inscriptions which hail from Asia Minor, four date between 195 BCE and 1 BCE, and the other three inscriptions, which are from Samos, are undated (*Samos* 14, 119, 120). If this syntactical correlation between the three Samian and four Asia Minor inscriptions also reflects a correlation in compositional timeframe, then, at the earliest, *Samos* 119 dates to the 2nd or 1st centuries BCE.

A 2nd century BCE terminus post quem also accords with Greek literary evidence. The collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* is found with some frequency in Greek literary sources, specifically in the writings of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Plutarch, and Pausanias. These writings date somewhere from the time of Roman ascendancy (mid-Hellenistic) into the Imperial period. Of these five writers, Josephus most frequently collocates *synagō* with *ekklēsia* (13 of his 48 *ekklēsia* references) and

---

SEG 25:687; SEG 47:1280; SEG 51:1055. Only *Samos* 119 pairs *synagō* and *ekklēsia* (unmodified, anarthrous) within a prepositional phrase (*eis ekklēsian*).

Polybius (c. 203–c. 118 BCE; Arcadia of Macedonia) uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* at least 13 times. He pairs *synagō* five times with the unmodified phrase *eis ekklēsian* (*Hist*. 1.45.2; 5.1.6; 22.10.10; 22.12.5; and 23.5.16). Polybius began to write his “universal history” around 167 BCE and recounted events only up to the destruction of the cities of Corinth and Carthage in 146 BCE.

Diodorus Siculus (Sicily) wrote between 60 and 30 BCE. He juxtaposes *synagō* with *ekklēsia* at least eighteen times. He pairs *synagō* four times with *eis ekklēsian* (*14.38.4; 15.74.5; 16.10.3; 17.94.5*).

Josephus (37–100 CE, Jerusalem), originally known as Joseph ben Matityahu, but after the Jewish Revolt as Titus Flavius Josephus, uses *ekklēsia* a total of 48 times. He pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia* fourteen times. Of these fourteen pairings, he uses the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* eleven times.

Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE; Chaeronea, Boeotia) uses *synagō* with *ekklēsia* at least fifteen times. Of these, seven times he pairs *synagō* with the prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* (*Aemilius Paulus* 11.1; *Cæsar* 19.2; *Catius Marius* 33.3; *Fabius Maximus* 3.4; *Lycurgus* 29.1; *Pericles* 33.5; 43.2).

Pausanias (2nd cent. CE; Lydia) pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia* only once. This sole occurrence is the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* (*Description of Greece* 4.5.6).

Greek writers who pair *synagō* with the noun *ekklēsia*, but not with the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian*, are: Thucydides (c. 460 BCE–c. 395 BCE; *Pelop. War* 2.60.1), Xenophon (c. 430–354 BCE; *Anabasis* 1.3.2), and Demosthenes (384–322 BCE; *Letters* 1.5).

Josephus uses the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* twenty-five times, eleven of which occur with the verb *synagō*. The other prepositional phrases used by Josephus to indicate an assembly of people are εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (4x), εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας (1x), ἐν ἐκκλησία (1x), ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1x), and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (1x).
he appears to do so in technical fashion. Eleven of those thirteen pairings use the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian*. In each of those eleven passages Josephus mentions a public *ekklēsia* being convened by the overseeing official of a Jewish community.

The other four non-Athenian writers also appear to use the collocation *synagō eis ekklēsian* in technical fashion. In each of the seventeen combined usages by Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch and Pausanias, the official functionary who calls a group of people together (*synagō*) into a formal assembly (*eis ekklēsian*) is the presumed head of that group (e.g., general, king, ambassador). Polybius describes two instances in which Greek *polis* officials rebuffed Roman officials who illegally tried to call an *ekklēsia*. His use of the clause *synagō eis ekklēsian* in his description of those two historical situations would have given particular emphasis to the irony inherent in that Roman move.

In books 22 and 23 of his *Histories*, Polybius mentions four elites who summon (*synagō*), or attempt to summon, a people into an assembly (*eis ekklēsian*). Two are

---

294 Josephus does pair verbs other than *synagō* with the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekklēsian* (i.e., *epeimi*, *synkaleō*, *synerchomai*, *atrhoizō*, *proagō*, *proeimi*). Josephus’ collocation of the verb *epeimi* and *ekklēsia* (4x; A.J. 6:86; 8:222, 358; Vita 268), for example, is consistent with Greek inscriptive *praxis* for denoting the formation of an assembly of people. Inscriptive evidence comes from Athens and its cleruchies (162x [e.g., Athens, 135x; Delos, 160–145 BCE, 18x]) and literary evidence of this *praxis* is found among Athenian and non-Athenian writers (e.g., Thuc. *Pelop. War* 1.139.3; 4.118.14; 6.8.2; Lysias, *Against Erat*. 12.72; Plutarch, *Cleomenes* 10.1). The verbs, other than *synagō*, which Josephus uses (*epeimi*, *synkaleō*, *synerchomai*, *proagō*, *proeimi*) are also found in Greek literary and inscriptive sources for indicating the assembly of people into an *ekklēsia*.

295 There are two instances in which Josephus pairs *synagō* with *ekklēsia*, but not with *eis ekklēsian*. They are found in A.J. 4:176 and A.J. 16:62. In A.J. 4:176 Josephus uses *ekklēsia* as a collective designation for Israel itself (“Moses gathered the congregation [*ekklēsia*] together near Jordan”). In A.J. 16:62, Josephus writes: “[Herod] gathered all the people (*pandēmon*) together in an assembly [*ekklēsia*].” Josephus also uses the articular phrase *eis tīn ἐκκλησίαν*, and its plural form *eis tās ἐκκλησίας*, a total of five times. These five articular prepositional phrases, though, are not paired with the verb *synagō*.


297 Diodorus Siculus mentions four officials: Herippidas, Dionysius, Dion, and Alexander the Great. Plutarch describes six: Julius Caesar, Caius Marius, Fabius Maximus, Lycurgus, Pericles, and Pompey. Instead of an individual, Pausanias mentions a ruling group, the Messenian kings.
juridically entitled to do so (the general Himilco, King Philip of Macedon). The other two are not (Caecilius and Flamininus). These latter two are Roman emissaries of the Senate. They each presume the juridical power of an archôn in their desire to adjudicate between the Achaean league and the Spartans. The first emissary, Quintus Caecilius, attempts to summon (synagō) the Achaean to a formal assembly (eis ekklēsian). The Achaean do not obey. Polybius reports that they stand on ceremony and claim that Caecilius’ request is unlawful according to their laws. Only an Achaean archôn has that authority and only if “a resolution has to be passed regarding war or peace.”

---

298 *Hist.* 1.45.2 and 5.1.6, respectively.

299 *Hist.* 22.10.10, 11: [10] ὁ δὲ Καεκίλιος ὀρῶν τὴν τούτων προσάρεσαι, ὡςίου τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῶν συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. [11] οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἄρχοντες ἐκέλευσαν αὐτὸν δεξιάτας ἐντολάς, ἃς εἶχε πρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου περὶ τούτων. τοῦ δὲ παρασιωπῶντος, οὐκ ἐρερασαν αὐτῶν συνάξειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ([10] “Caecilius, seeing how this meeting was disposed, demanded that the popular assembly should be summoned to meet him; [11] but the magistrates asked him to show them the instructions he had from senate on the subject; and, when he made no reply, refused to summon the assembly; [12] for their laws did not allow it unless a written request was presented from the senate stating what matters it desired to submit to the assembly”). English text from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Polybius/22*.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

300 In his final use of the collocation synagō eis ekklēsian, Polybius recounts the visit of another Roman emissary to the Achaean, subsequent to Caecilius’ visit. Flamininus also requests that they formally summon an assembly (synagō eis ekklēsian). He too is rebuffed for the same procedural reason used by the Achaeans in stonewalling his predecessor Caecilius. Polybius writes (*Hist.* 23.5.16): [16] ἐπεὶ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ναύπακτον ἔγραψε τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ τὸν δαμιουργὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, κελεύων συνάγειν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ([13] “However, he appeared now in Greece with Flamininus, [14] convinced that he had only to show his face when the affairs of Messene would be arranged as he wished. [15] But Philopoemen, well knowing that Flamininus had no instructions from the senate regarding the affairs of Greece, kept quiet awaiting his arrival, and when, [16] on disembarking at Naupactus, he wrote to the strategus and damiurges of the Achaean, ordering them to call the general assembly of the Achaean, they replied that they would do so upon his informing them on what subjects he wished to address the Achaean; [17] for that was the course imposed on the magistrates by their laws”). English text from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Polybius/23*.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

301 *Hist.* 22.12.5: [5] Ἀπελογήθησαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Καεκίλιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄρχοντων οἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρέσβεις ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ, φάσκοντες οὐθὲν ἀδικεῖν αὐτούς οὐδ' ἀξίους ἐγκλήματος ὑπάρχειν ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ συνάξειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ([5] “The envoys from Achaean also spoke in the Senate defending their magistrates against Caecilius. They maintained that the magistrates had done nothing wrong and were deserving of no censure in not having summoned the assembly to meet, [6] the Achaean law being that the popular assembly is not to be summoned unless a resolution has to be passed regarding war or peace, or unless anyone brings a letter from the Senate. [7] Their magistrates had therefore been right on that occasion; for while they had desired to summon the Achaean to a general assembly they were prevented from doing so by the laws, as Caecilius was neither the bearer of letters from the Senate nor would he show
Polybius can be said rhetorically to reinforce the presumptuous nature of Caecilius’ demand by attributing to him an illegal attempt to synagō Achaians eis ekklēsian.

A terminus ad quem of Samos 119 in the early Imperial period can be postulated given that the juxtaposition of synagō with ekklēsia is inscriptitionally extant between 5 and 1 BCE (Sardis 7,1 8; IGRR 4.1756). The latest occurrence of the collocation synagō eis ekklēsian is found in a 2nd century CE literary work, Pausanias’ Descriptions of Greece.302 If the clause synagō eis ekklēsian in Samos 119 allows for a compositional range from the rise of Roman hegemony in the Greek East to Imperial rule in Asia Minor, then one could conclude that the aleiphomenoi were not fearful of negative political repercussions in their adoption of ekklēsia terminology.

3.2.3. The Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos (IDelos 1519)

The Tyrian Herakleistai also do not appear to fear repercussions from Romans, even though, in three ways, they mimic Athenian political terminology and processes. The first two have already been discussed: they enacted an honorific decree within an ekklēsia and they mimic four of the six elements of an Athenian-style enactment decree.303 The third is the Tyrians’ use of embassy selection protocol employed only a few years earlier by the dēmos of Delos (IDelos 1498). IDelos 1498 describes how the dēmos held a civic ekklēsia (ekklēsia kyria) in their ekklēsiastērion within which they voted upon delegates (presbeis) for an embassy they wished to send to the Athenian...
The Tyrian Herakleistai also adopt civic protocols for the non-civic mission of their association’s embassy to Athens (IDelos 1519). This correlation between IDelos 1498 and IDelos 1519 appears not yet to have been noted by previous scholarship.

Wisely, though, the Tyrians avoid perceptions of pretentiousness by not replicating the full name of the civic assembly for Delos and Athens—ekklēsia kyria. Instead, they choose the simpler term ekklēsia. Given their intent to gain approval for the construction of a temple to Herakles, the fact that the Tyrians’ mimicked both Athenian-style enactment decree formulae (e.g., ekklēsia) and Delian embassy selection protocol suggests that such political terminology was perceived by the Tyrians as aiding rather than as hindering their cause before the Athenian boulē and ekklēsia.

It would not be unexpected for the Tyrians to have publicly displayed their honorific decree. The Roman governing authorities would have expected Delians to demonstrate allegiance to Athens; non-Delians may have been another matter. The fact, however, that the non-Delian Tyrians still felt free publicly to display allegiance to Athens by using expressly political terminology suggests that they did not fear

---

304 IDelos 1498 (160–150 BCE) reads, ἐπὶ Αρισταίχμου ἀρχοντος, Γαμηλιώνος δεκάτει ἰσταμένου ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησιαστήρωι: Μενανδρος Μενανδρου Μελιτέως εἵπεν... χειροτονήσαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις ἣδε τρεῖς στίνες ἐπελθόντες ἐπί τὴν ἀθήνην βουλήν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν παρακαλέσουσι τὸν δήμον.

305 The civic assembly of Delos, which existed concurrently with the Tyrian Herakleistai, is called an ekklēsia kyria in IDelos 1498 (160–150 BCE) and in IDelos 1502 (148/7 BCE).

306 Of the over 250 occurrences of the phrase ekklēsia kyria in Athenian inscriptions (4th cent. BCE to 1st cent. BCE) at least 22 are dated to the 2nd century BCE. Examples include: Agora 15 170 (190/89 BCE); IG II² 897 (185/4 BCE); Agora 15 183 (182/1 BCE); IG II² 989 (140/3 BCE); IG II² 989 (mid-2nd cent. BCE); IG II² 1008 (118/7 BCE); IG II² 1011 (106/5 BCE).

307 The practice of publicly displaying, rather than archiving, civic honorific decrees is prevalent already in the Classical period but predominant by the Imperial period. Association decrees were also posted publicly, not least honorific decrees. One Imperial period example is the Theodotus inscription on the pre-70 CE synagogue in Jerusalem (John S. Kloppenborg, “Dating Theodotus (CIJ II 1404),” JJS 51.2 [2000]: 243–80). Membership lists also were made public: “in the case of Attic, Macedonian and Asian associations, their names could be found on a stele” (John S. Kloppenborg, “Membership Practices in Pauline Christ Groups,” EC 4, no. 2 [2013]: 183–215, esp. 208).
recrimination on the part of the Romans. Their Berytian counterparts even demonstrate that it was possible for non-Delians to cultivate positive relations with the Romans both for political and economic reasons. These facts speak to Roman perceptions of non-civic groups in Delos using civic terminology; suspicion does not appear to have been one of their responses.

3.3. Political Terminology: Voluntary Associations as “Cities Writ Small”

Even though extant evidence of ekklēsia usage by non-civic groups is rare, their use of other political terminology is more common. Kloppenborg highlights Paul Foucart as being one of the first to observe that “associations imitated the structure of the polis.” As such, Kloppenborg suggests that a Greco-Roman voluntary association could be called a “city writ small.” Even Roman associations (the Romaioi) in Greek poleis adopted a type of mini-city terminology. Harland notes one example of civic

---

308 Trümper notes that the Berytians allowed Romans to hold membership, and even received substantial benefaction from a Roman banker Marcus Minatius Sexti filius (IDelos 1520; post-153/52 BCE). He was accorded many honours such as “two portraits in the clubhouse, a seat or couch of honor at banquets, a feast with blood sacrifice, a banquet in his honor, and the privilege to invite guests to various festivals” (“Non-Delians,” 56–57; see also AGRW, no. 224). In later years the Berytians even dedicated a statue and an altar to the goddess Roma for her “benefaction” (IDelos 1778, 1779; 130–69 BCE; see AGRW, nos. 226 and 227, respectively), and an honorary decree for the Roman Praetor Gnaeus Octavius for his benefaction (IDelos 1782; pre-128 BCE or pre-87 BCE; see AGRW, no. 228).


310 See Onno van Nijf, “Staying Roman – Becoming Greek: Associations of Romaioi in Greek Cities” (paper presented at Associations in Context, Copenhagen Associations Project, Copenhagen, October 11–13, 2012). In Latin texts they are called cives romani qui…negotiantur (the Romans who are doing business) or the Romani consistentes (the Romans who are resident). In Greek inscriptions their names include hoi Romaioi, hoi Romaioi pragmateuomenoi and hoi Romaioi katoikountes (for a complete
mimesis as being “crossovers in [civic] titles such as ‘overseer’ or ‘bishop’ (episkopos), ‘elders’ (presbyteroi), ‘servant’/‘deacon’ (diakonos), and ‘patroness’ (prostatis).”

What rationale drove this political impetus in non-civic groups? From the perspective of positive benefits, Kloppenborg contends that civic mimesis allowed many non-elite politai, particularly in the Imperial period, whose socio-economic status excluded them from participation in the boulê and other official political offices, to gain socio-religious status within the confines of “a polis writ small.” With respect to negative rhetoric, mimicry of civic structures facilitated critique of the Roman ordo with its hierarchical politics and policy of restrictive access to political office.

There are at least two reasons why political self-depictions by socio-religious associations (thiasoi) do not necessarily express anti-Roman ideology. First, Ascough notes that even though voluntary associations “often took their nomenclature from the civic institutions [it was] more often not in direct competition but in the sense of

list of Greek inscriptional names, see Ibid, 1). Van Nijf argues that Roman associations played a key role in the spread of the Imperial cult(s) and in the representation of Roman Imperial power in Greek poleis. They “began to play the role as a kind of symbolic or ideological intermediaries” (Ibid, 20). The associations of Romans disappear from the record after 212 CE when the Constitutio Antoniniana granted Roman citizenship to all free citizens in the empire. Clubs for Romans then became redundant “as every Greek was now a Roman” (Ibid, 21). See also R. M. Errington, “Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic,” in Alte geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. K. Christ, P. Kneissl, and V. Losemann; Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1988), 140–57.

312 Harland, Associations, 182 (see 299 n. 4 for the actual epigraphic references). Harland notes further: “the internal organization of many associations and guilds mirrors civic organization, with positions of leadership including secretary (grammateus), treasurer (tamias), president (epistatēs), and superintendent (epimelētēs; cf. Poland, Geschichte, 376–87)” (Associations, 106). Kloppenborg agrees with Edwin Hatch’s suggestion that “ἐπισκόπος…along with ἐπιμελητής was a key title for a financial administrator in associations and in the polis. The terms ‘elders’ (πρεσβυτέροι) and ‘bishops’ (ἐπισκόποι) referred to the same persons, but to different roles: as members of the council they would be called πρεσβυτέροι, but as administrators they were ἐπισκόποι” (“Edwin Hatch,” 214).

313 Kloppenborg explains the socio-political value which collegial/thiasoi would have held for non-elites: “As a polis writ small, the collegium provided a social setting in which persons who normally could never aspire to participation in the cursus honorum of the city and state could give and receive honors, enjoy the ascribed status that came with being a quinquennalis or mater, have a feeling of control over at least the destiny of the collegium, and enjoy regular banquets” (“Collegia and Thiasoi,” 26–27).
‘imitation as flattery.’”\(^\text{314}\) In this respect, political mimicry could simply reflect an impulse fictively to replicate Athenian-style δημοκρατία within a non-civic context. Second, many inscriptional examples of voluntary associations self-presenting as fictive poleis pre-date the rise of Roman hegemony in the Greek East. Thus, since the original rationale for the adoption of civic terminology by voluntary associations was not anti-Roman, the continuation of that practice into the Imperial period need not necessarily reflect anti-Roman sentiments either. If there is any inherent rhetoric of resistance in the mimesis of political institutions by non-civic associations, it would have been directed first and foremost against municipal expressions of oligarchic privilege and social-political hierarchy, rather than against the Roman imperium.

3.4. Summary: Ekklēsia and Non-Civic Groups

There are three extant inscriptions whose non-civic groups designate their semi-public assembly as an ekklēsia (Samos 119, IDelos 1519, Sinuri 73). At least one can be dated with confidence to the period of Roman ascendance (IDelos 1519; 153/2 BCE). The use in Samos 119 of the collocation synagogē eis ekklēsian implies a terminus post quem for the Samian aleipomenoi of the mid-2\(^{nd}\) century BCE and a terminus ad quem of the Imperial period. Both of these non-civic groups replicate Athenian-style political terminology (i.e., enactment decree formulae, ekklēsia) in garnering socio-political benefits (temple construction, benefaction). Their self-presentation as “cities writ small”

does not appear to reflect anti-Roman sentiments or concern over stirring up Roman suspicion.
4. Conclusion: Part I

My primary focus in Part I was upon examining the way in which the word *ekklēsia* was used in the Greco-Roman world from the 5th century BCE up to, and including, the 2nd century CE. This provides a socio-historical backdrop against which better to understand the socio-political implications that attended those early Christ-followers who designated both their communities and their semi-public assemblies as *ekklēsiai*. I had two primary goals: first, to investigate whether any non-civic group prior to the 1st century CE adopted the word *ekklēsia* as their permanent group identity and, second, to ascertain whether Roman authorities would have viewed the appropriation of *ekklēsia* terminology by a non-civic group as a political threat.

My examination of Greek literary, papyrological, and inscriptions sources did not find evidence of a non-civic group self-designating as an *ekklēsia*. Inscriptional decrees do indicate, though, that some non-civic groups named their semi-public meeting an *ekklēsia*. The unprecedented extent to which I examined *ekklēsia* occurrences in the inscriptive record gives warrant for limiting that number to three non-civic groups: the Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos, the *aleipomenoi* of Samos, and the *syngeneia* of Pelekōs.

My research is the first to integrate recent scholarship on the political culture of Imperial period Asia Minor for the purpose of understanding the political implications of a non-civic group self-designating as a civic entity, specifically as an *ekklēsia*. It has become clear that, generally, *dēmoi* of Imperial Greek cities had, to a large extent, lost the *kratos* necessary for the formal exercise of classical Athenian *dēmokratia* through their civic *ekklēsiai*. Nevertheless, the civic *ekklēsia* continued to play an important role
in the construction of a political culture, especially in Asia Minor, wherein the influence of the δῆμος became a positive factor in the spread of oligarchic munificence. This political culture included not only widespread festivals and monumentalism but also a ubiquitous “ἐκκλησία discourse,” each of which continued into the 3rd century CE.

Voluntary associations, as a “substantial ‘middle,’” became a mediating influence between the δῆμος and the bouleutic elite through, for example, the establishment of networks of euergetism and patronage and their participation in hierarchically arranged festival processions. Given that voluntary associations frequently adopted political terminology for their organizational structure, without undue negative reaction from the Romans, it seems improbable that, by also self-designating as an ἐκκλησία, such a voluntary association would have raised Roman suspicions, even if in so doing they self-presented as a “city doubly writ small,” so to speak. It seems more probable, rather, that an ἐκκλησία association would have been perceived as making a positive attempt, albeit an ostentatious one, at integrating themselves into the grass roots “ἐκκλησία discourse” which had sprung up throughout Imperial period Asia Minor.

As far as the extant evidence is concerned, this identity construction step was taken in the 1st century CE by upwards of five groups who self-identified as ἐκκλησίαι. I have already identified four groups which could be called a “city doubly writ small”: the Christ-follower sub-groups named ἐκκλησία, which were associated with Paul, John the Elder (Johannine epistles), John the prophet (Revelation), and Matthew. A fifth group is spoken of in Jewish sources. It is to an investigation of these sources that I now turn.
Part II: \textit{Ekklēsia} in Jewish Sources

\textbf{1. Introduction}

Aside from Greco-Roman \textit{ekklēsiai}, Jewish sources are another ‘competitor’ in the \textit{ekklēsia} identity construction game. There is a long history of \textit{ekklēsia} usage within Jewish Second Temple literature such as the Septuagint (LXX), Philo and Josephus. If the word \textit{ekklēsia} is a Jewish synagogue term, as Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson suggest,\textsuperscript{315} then synagogue research intersects with three of the questions I ask in this study: (1) Which non-civic group was first in antiquity to adopt \textit{ekklēsia} as a collective identity?; (2) Is an \textit{ekklēsia} group identity expressive of counter-imperial rhetoric?; and (3) Is the adoption of \textit{ekklēsia} as a collective self-designation by an association with Jewish roots (early Christ-followers) reflective of supersessionist ideology?

\textbf{2. Ekklēsia and Synagogue Terminology in the 1\textsuperscript{st} Century CE}

Synagogue research has come of age to such a degree in the last twenty-five years that Lee Levine characterizes the results of that research as a “deluge of synagogue-related material.”\textsuperscript{316} The breadth and depth of this “synagogue-related material” brought Levine to revise and update his seminal study a scant five years later.\textsuperscript{317}

\textsuperscript{315} Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson, \textit{The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book} (AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 159–63, 328.


\textsuperscript{317} Lee Levine’s first edition of \textit{The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years} was published in 2000 (New Haven: Yale University Press). Examples of the “deluge of synagogue-related material” include: (1) three edited volumes of essays: Dan Urman and Paul V. M. Flesher, eds., \textit{Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery} (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Stephen Fine, ed., \textit{Jews,
2.1. History of Synagogue Scholarship

This plethora of publications has come to challenge many long-held assumptions about the ancient “synagogue.” Years prior to Levine’s book, Dan Urman and Paul Flesher already noted that synagogue studies were undergoing more than one paradigm shift; they claimed that “many paradigms are shifting.” Cross-disciplinary paradigm shifts are taking place through the emergence of new evidence for synagogue...
buildings, the revisiting of old archeological ‘facts,’ the re-reading of textual material in light of archaeological discoveries, and the development of debate around issues such as the origin of the ‘synagogue,’ the function of the ‘synagogue,’ and whether ‘synagogues’ are to be understood as buildings or gatherings, or both.

Runesson, Binder and Olsson identify four heuristic categories, or “four broad aspects,” for the organization of previous synagogue research, and with which all future research must engage: spatial, liturgical, non-liturgical, and institutional. Spatial aspects involve the integration of architectural, artistic and iconographic evidence. Comparative analyses figure prominently in this respect and include the relationships between Jewish synagogues and Greco-Roman temples, the temple in Jerusalem, Runesson, Binder and Olsson identify four heuristic categories, or “four broad aspects,” for the organization of previous synagogue research, and with which all future research must engage: spatial, liturgical, non-liturgical, and institutional.

———

320 In 1998 Ehud Netzer discovered a building in Jericho which he considers to be a synagogue. Anders Runesson agrees, as long as the building is understood as the edifice of an association, not a public, synagogue (“The Origins and Nature of the 1st Century Synagogue,” Bible and Interpretation [July 2004]; http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Runesson—1st-Century_Synagogue_1.htm). Lee Levine, who defines synagogues as public institutions, disagrees. Levine argues that it is a Hellenistic-Roman villa (“The 1st Century C.E. Synagogue,” 70–102).


323 Synagogal functions include: (1) religious activity (e.g., public Torah reading, rituals, festival observance); (2) social aspects such as council meetings, law courts, schools, treasuries (see Horsley, “Synagogues,” 46–69; Levine, Ancient Synagogue [2005]; Anders Runesson, “Behind the Gospel of Matthew: Radical Pharisees in Post-War Galilee?” CurTM 37:6 [December 2010]: 460–71, esp. 463).

324 Stephen Catto’s synagogue study is an example of research in which architectural and communal aspects are integrated (Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue [2007]).

325 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 7–10. See also Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 34–35.


Liturgical aspects are religious activities which took place within early synagogue contexts. Although public reading of Torah is a well-established fact, prayer during early synagogue worship is still a topic of debate. Other questions relative to liturgical practices in the synagogue include whether public fasts and festivals were observed and even how magic and mysticism were integrated. Non-liturgical aspects, also known as social aspects, are communal activities previously considered to be the domain of public municipal institutions such as council halls, treasuries, law courts, public archives, and schools. Levine is the major proponent of understanding ancient synagogues as public institutions. Institutional aspects involve synagogue leadership and operations and

---


332 For example, on festivals see Daniel Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

answer two primary questions: is any party in charge of the synagogue (e.g., Pharisees)\textsuperscript{334} and what is the role of women in synagogue leadership and benefaction?\textsuperscript{335}

Runesson, Binder, and Olsson also identify “two problems related to the ancient synagogues that need to take into account all four areas: the origin and nature of ancient synagogues.”\textsuperscript{336} Synagogue origins have been sought in every time period from the age of the Patriarchs to the Late Imperial period,\textsuperscript{337} and in every region of the Mediterranean, with an eye to identifying which confluence of historical, social, political, economic, and religious factors led to the emergence of “the synagogue.” Runesson, Binder, and Olsson succinctly summarize the scholarly perspectives on the 1st century CE “synagogue.”

They ask if “the synagogue,” not simply the term \textit{synagogue}, is best viewed as an informal gathering of people (Kee 1990)? As a public formal gathering, but not in specific purpose built edifices (Horsley 1999)? As a public assembly in a purpose-built edifice (Oster 1993)? Was the Jewish home the primary model giving the synagogue its unique character (Claußen 2002)? Or are we dealing with a semi-public, voluntary association, similar to, or indeed within the same category as the Graeco-Roman\textit{ collegia} (Hengel 1971, Richardson 2004, Harland 2003)? Did the synagogue parallel Graeco-Roman temples—but without animal sacrifices (Flesher 2001)? Or was the Jerusalem temple the blueprint for the institution, the latter functioning as a (non-sacrificial) extension of and supplement to the former (Binder 1999)? Did the Egyptian Per Ankh, an institution closely related to both temples and associations, stand as a model for the synagogue (Griffiths 1995)? Or should we rather focus on local administration, viewing the first century synagogue as a communal institution with a religious dimension (Levine 2004)? Or again, does the evidence lead us to the conclusion that synagogue terms could


\textsuperscript{336} Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, \textit{Ancient Synagogue}, 10.

\textsuperscript{337} See Levine’s review of synagogue origins scholarship (\textit{Ancient Synagogue}, 21–44).
refer to two types of institutions—both public communal assemblies and Jewish voluntary associations—and that, consequently, the meaning of ‘synagogue’ was still fluid at this time (Runesson 2001)?

In this study I will follow Anders Runesson who integrates two trajectories in his synagogue research: first, that a number of different synagogue terms were used for a gathered community and for the building within which that community gathered, and, second, that this breadth of synagogue terminology was used for two types of institution—the public synagogue and the association synagogue.

2.2. Ekklēsia in the History of Synagogue Scholarship

One lacuna in synagogue studies still exists: an analysis of the word ekklēsia as a Jewish synagogue term. This possibility was first clearly acknowledged by Donald Binder (1999) and Anders Runesson (2001). It was reiterated in the synagogue sourcebook of Runesson, Binder, and Olsson (2008). In order for this acknowledgment to move to accepted fact, however, a comprehensive analysis is still required of how ekklēsia is used within Jewish contexts in reference to a gathered community. My ensuing discussion provides a start in that direction.

When it comes to “synagogue” terminology by which buildings and/or gatherings of Jewish communities are identified, a number of terms, including ekklēsia, apply.

Anders Runesson notes that “what in English is translated ‘synagogue’ went under

---

338 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 11–12. See the Bibliography for the publication information of each scholar cited (Ibid, 295–311).
339 Levine does not investigate ekklēsia as a synagogue term either in the original or revised versions of his book The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years. In her most recent tome, Rachel Hachlili also does not appear to treat the word ekklēsia as a synagogue term, at least insofar as the absence of ekklēsia references in her subject index would seem to indicate (Ancient Synagogues—Archaeology and Art: New Discoveries and Current Research [Leiden: Brill, 2013]).
341 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, esp. 159–63, 328.
several different names in antiquity,” that is, 17 Greek terms, 5 Hebrew terms and 3 Latin terms, some of which overlap.\(^{342}\) Architectural space within which Jewish communities meet is described with terms such as *proseuchē* (“house of prayer”), \(^{343}\) *didaskaleion* (“school”), \(^{344}\) *hieron* (“temple” or “sacred place”), \(^{345}\) *topos* (“place”), \(^{346}\) *sabbateion*, \(^{347}\)

---


\(^{343}\) Evidence from Josephus and Philo suggests that *proseuchē* is used synonymously for some sort of physical structure in which Jews assemble for prayer (Philo) and/or public decision making (Josephus). Philo’s comments on the anti-Jewish riots in Alexandria serve as a clear example: “Assembling enormous hordes together, they attacked the prayer halls [proseuchai]… Some they smashed, some they razed to the ground, and others they set on fire and burned…” (Legat. 132). Josephus mentions *proseuchai* both in Alexandria (C. Ap. 2.10; ASSB, no. 22) and in Judea (Vita 276–81, 294-295; ASSB no. 43). In *Vita*, Josephus’ *proseuchai* are purpose-built structures for public communal gatherings, not primarily for association-specific gatherings. This is clear from his comment that the *proseuchē* in Tiberias was spacious enough to contain approx. 600 persons into which a large part of the populace as well as the entire *boulē* (“council”) of Tiberias (Vita 284) gathered (B.J. 2.641). Levine comments on the three-fold significance of Josephus’ description: (1) this is the only instance of a Judean synagogue being referred to as a *proseuchē*; (2) to date, synagogues of such monumental size are known only from the Diaspora; and (3) it was used socio-politically in a “pivotal communal role” (*Ancient Synagogue*, 53–54). With respect to diasporic synagogues, the first attestation of Egyptian synagogues under the name *proseuchē* comes from the third quarter of the third century BCE (Hengel, “Proseuchē und Synagoge,” 27–54). In Delos (Aegean Sea), building GD 80 has been identified as a synagogue building used first by Samaritans (3rd and early 2nd cents. BCE) and then by Jews (late 2nd to mid–1st cents. BCE). Two Samaritan honorific inscriptions appear to refer to it as a *proseuchē* (e.g., *IDelos* 2329). The original building consists of a large hall 240 m\(^2\) with a marble colonnade running the length of its front. By the fourth phase of construction (post-88 BCE) it had been expanded to a size of c. 870 m\(^2\). See Monika Trümper, “Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos. The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos,” in *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age* (ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston, with the assistance of C. G. Williamson; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 49–100, esp. 61–63. Although Trümper’s essay is published in 2011, her research is current only to 2004. See also Trümper, “The Oldest Original Synagogue Building in the Diaspora: The Delos Synagogue Reconsidered,” *Hesperia* 73 (2004): 513–98.

\(^{344}\) Philo indicates that the term *didaskaleion* can be used synonymously with *proseuchē* (*Mos. 2.214-16*). See also, *Spec. 2.62* (“in every city thousands of schools”) and *Dec. 40* (“the schools of the holy laws”) (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 209).

\(^{345}\) For example, Philo mentions *ta hiera* (“the temples”; *Deus* 8), which Binder interprets as referring to synagogue buildings (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 202). *CIJ* 1433 (*JIGRE* 9; 2nd cent. BCE) makes mention of a sacred enclosure, *hieros peribolos*, that was attributed to a synagogue in Ptolemaic Egypt (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 186). Josephus uses the
bet ha-midrash (“house of study”), oikos (“house” or “room”) and synagōgē (“synagogue”). Communal gatherings are referenced by terms such as syllogos (“meeting”), ekklēsia (“assembly”), laos (“people”), politeuma (“community”), plural morpheme hierois to describe “sanctuaries set on fire” by the Romans in Jerusalem (70 CE) (B.J. 7.144). The plural form militates against an identification of the hierois with the Temple. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson conclude that “a) Josephus used hieron to refer to synagogue buildings, and b) that the Romans destroyed many of these assembly places—or ‘sanctuaries’ as Josephus describes them—during the First Jewish Revolt” (ASSB, no. 62).

Josephus (A.J.14.259-61) mentions a Roman decree (2nd cent. BCE) in which Jews in Sardis were granted their own area (topos) to conduct business and even religious gatherings (e.g., euchai kai physisai). See also A.J. 14.235 where a decree of Lucius Antonius (49 BCE) states that Jews “from earliest times…have had a private association [synodos] and a place [topos] of their own” (ASSB, no. 114). Tessa Rajak notes, though, that architectural details for the topos are ambiguous and could be either “a synagogue, a plain civic building or even just an outdoor area” (“Synagogue and Community in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora,” in Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities [ed. J. R. Bartlett; London/New York: Routledge, 2002], 22–38, esp. 29).

In A.J.16.162-65, Josephus implies that a sabbateion is a structure of some sort. In his report of Augustus’ decree of 2–3 CE, Josephus writes “If anyone is caught stealing their holy books or holy monies from a synagogue [sabbateion]…he shall be regarded as sacrilegious and his property shall be confiscated to the public treasury of the Romans” (ASSB, no. 120). See also David Aune, Revelation 1–5 (WBC 52A; Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 165.

Runesson notes that “the rabbis and their predecessors, among which surely the Pharisees was one group, was a voluntary association whose institution was the bet hamidrash” (Origins of the Synagogue, 486). In m. Ter. 11:10 the bet hamidrash is a building: “They may kindle oil of priest’s due, that must be burnt, in the synagogues (bate knesiot)…he shall be regarded as sacrilegious and his property shall be confiscated to the public treasury of the Romans” (ASSB, no. 120). See also David Aune, Revelation 1–5 (WBC 52A; Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 165.

Levine notes that it was not until the 2nd century CE that “‘synagogue’ had become a universal term for the building in which communal activities were held” (Ancient Synagogue, 1). Prior to that time, Levine states that “it is entirely possible that some communities initially met on premises other than a ‘synagogue’ building or called their central institution by another name” (Ibid, 1). Josephus uses synagōgē in reference to a physical structure in Jewish Wars (B.J. 2.285, 289 [Caesarea]; B.J. 7.44 [Antioch]). The only occurrence of the word synagōgē in Antiquities is in A.J. 19.304-305. Therein, Josephus records the response of the Roman governor of Syria to King Agrippa’s lobbying attempt on the behalf of the Jews of Dora. In his subsequent decree against the citizenry of Dora, Petronius accuses them of forbidding Jews from assembling in the synagōgē (ASSB, no. 193). Although the word synagōgē is not used by Josephus in his report of Julius Gaius’ decree to the people of Parium about the Jews of Delos (A.J. 14:213-15), Runesson, Binder, and Olsson claim that Julius Gaius’ comments imply the existence of synagōgē buildings in Rome during the 1st century BCE (ASSB, no. 180). For Josephus’ references to synagogue structures or assemblies, see the Sources index in Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 322.
and synagogē (“a gathering”). Of all synagogue terms, proseuchē and synagogē occur most frequently within Jewish sources. Given the well established usage of proseuchē and synagogē, what would bring a Jewish community to adopt ekklēsia terminology instead? An analysis of their respective semantic domains offers at least one clue.

---

Synagogue, 201). Regarding the Therapeutae, Philo mentions that they met for a syllogos (“general assembly”) every seventh day (Contemp. 30–33; 30–45 CE).

352 Runesson, Binder and Olsson claim that Philo uses ekklēsia three times in reference to a contemporaneous synagogue entity (Spec. 1.324–25, Deus. 111, and Virt. 108) (ASSB, nos. 201, 202, 203, respectively). Ben Sira and Josephus use ekklēsia for public gatherings in the land of Israel. The use of ekklēsia by all three Jewish authors will be explored later in this chapter.

353 Runesson comments that, in CJI 776, laos “refers to the local community, and not, as the common usage, to the people as a whole” (“Persian Imperial Politics,” 66 n. 14).

354 Josephus speaks of Jews in Alexandria constituting a politeuma which in some fashion mirrors Greek governance models (e.g., monarchies, oligarchies; C. Ap. 2.164-165; cf. A.J. 1.13) and Greek community organizations (A.J. 1.5). At least two inscriptions mention a group of Judeans in Egypt who self-identify as politeuma. Both are from Berenike in Cyrenaica. IBERENIKE 18 dates to the 1st cent BCE (March 30; = SEG 16 (1976), no. 931 = CJI 70). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg translate IBERENIKE 18 as, “The leaders of the corporate body (politeuma) of the Judeans in Berenike resolved to engrave his name in the … and to be free from services (leitourgia) of every kind. Likewise they resolved to crown him with an olive crown and wool ribbon at each synodos and new moon” (AGR, no. 305). The second inscription from Berenike most likely dates to 24 CE (IBERENIKE 17 = CJI 71 = IGR 1 1024). It recounts honours ascribed to a Roman provincial official: “Furthermore in performing his governorship in a useful way for the Judeans of our politeuma, both individually and as a group, he never fails to live up to his own noble rank. For these reasons, the leaders and the politeuma of Judeans in Berenike decided to praise him, to crown him by name at each gathering and new moon with a crown of olive branches and ribbon, and to have the leaders engrave the decree on a monument of Parian stone which is to be set up in the most prominent place in the amphitheater” (Ibid, 192, no. 306). A distinctive feature of this dedicatory politeuma of Judeans is that “it seems that the same group also referred to itself as a ‘synagogue’ in later decades” (IBERENIKE 16) (Ibid, 192). IBERENIKE 16 (55 CE; = CJI 72 = SEG 17 [1977] no 823) reads: “It seemed good to the synagogue of the Judeans in Berenike that they should inscribe on a monument of Parian stone the names of those who contributed toward the restoration of the synagogue (synagogē)” (Ibid, 192).

Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg note that “most of the donors are designated by their role as leader (archon), with one designated as a priest. Two of the donors of five drachma are women” (Ibid, 192).

355 A clear example is found in CPJ I.138 (ASSB, no. 170), which reads, in part: “at the assembly [synagogē] that took place in the prayer hall [proseuchē].” Richardson notes that “proseuchē refers to the building and synagogē refers simply to the ‘gathering’” (Building Jewish in the Roman East, 116).

356 Levine notes that “Neither of these terms [proseuchē and synagogē] was uniquely Jewish, as both were borrowed from pagan culture…[but] certainly by the first century C.E., they had become largely associated with the Jewish community” (Ancient Synagogue, 2). Evidence for Greek usage of synagogē is found as early as the 5th cent. BCE in the writings of Thucydides of Athens (c. 460–396 BCE). Its basic sense is of a “gathering” or “union” (Thuc. II, 18, 3 [Attic εὑραγούη]) (Schrage, TDNT 7.797–852, esp. 798).
Evidence from Josephus and Philo suggests that *proseuchē* is a physical structure within which Jews publicly assemble for prayer, Torah reading (Philo, Josephus)\(^{357}\) and/or for public decision making (Josephus).\(^{358}\) Jutta Leonhardt highlights an even more specific role for Alexandrian *proseuchai* in Philo’s day. She states that they primarily functioned as locations within which Jews could “show reverence to their benefactors” for their euergetism through the reciprocity of communal “praise and thanksgiving.”\(^{359}\)

Aside from describing “prayer halls,” Runesson notes that the word *proseuchē* was also used of structures such as “the temple in Jerusalem,”\(^{360}\) earlier Jewish shrines,\(^{361}\) and ‘synagogues,’\(^{362}\) in the latter case most frequently in the Diaspora,\(^{363}\) particularly in

\(^{357}\) See n. 343 within Philo’s comments on the Jewish pogrom in Alexandria (Legat. 132).

\(^{358}\) See n. 343 where Josephus attests to the use of the term *proseuchē* in Alexandria (C. Ap. 2.10), in Judea (Vita 276-81, 294-295), and in Halicarnassus (A.J. 14.257-58). Josephus affirms that a Judean *proseuchē* can be used both for political (Vita 276-81) and religious activity (Vita 294-295). Stephen Catto claims that Josephus’ use of the word *proseuchē* in A.J. 14.258 does not refer to a building (“Does προσευχ/uni1F70ς ποιε/uni1FD6σθαι, in Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews 14.257-58, Mean ‘Build Places of Prayer?’” JSJ 35 [2004]: 159–68). For a discussion on the use of *proseuchē* in Acts regarding a structure in Philippi (Acts 16:13, 16), see Catto, Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue, 186–89.

\(^{359}\) Jutta Leonhardt, Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria (TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 76, 77. See also Heather A. McKay, Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 67–69, 71–73. Rather than viewing Jewish displays of “praise and thanksgiving” for euergetism as evidence of reverence for living patrons, Susan Sorek argues that the common epigraphic formula “remembered for good” signals a memorial to a deceased donor, particularly in the late antique era (Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine [SWBA 2/5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2010]).

\(^{360}\) 1 Macc 7:37; Mark 11:17/Matt 21:13/Luke 19:46.

\(^{361}\) 1 Macc 3:46. Aryeh Kasher notes that early Hellenistic *synagogai* in Egypt could be viewed as sacred structures: Arsinōe “already had an organized Jewish community in the early days of the Ptolemaic settlement program as definitely proven by a dedicatory inscription in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes I and his family from a local synagogue (CPJ 3.1532A =SB, 8939). . . . the fact that the synagogue land was marked ‘sacred land’ is itself illuminating, as the first editor of the papyrus notes. The synagogue was certainly recognized as a holy place [the synagogue land was listed as ἱερόν in the Ptolemaic registry] by the authorities along with other sacred sites allotted suitable land and designated as sacred” (The Alexandrian Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights [TSAJ 7; rev. ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985], 138).

\(^{362}\) Philo, Flacc. 122; Legat. 156. See also n. 343 for two Samaritan honorific inscriptions from Delos (250–175 BCE and 150–50 BCE) which mention the construction and dedication of a *proseuchē* (*IDelos* 2329), which later was used by Jews for their synagogue (1\(^{st}\) cent BCE).

\(^{363}\) Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 429.
Egypt. Philo’s proseuchē is a regional synonym in Egypt for synagogē. With respect to Egyptian inscriptions, Levine notes that the word synagogē occurs only once, while proseuchē does so ten times. The word proseuchē is also found four times within papyri. In every Egyptian source the word proseuchē refers to a physical structure. It is never used as a collective designation for a Jewish community.

The semantic range of synagogē (“assembly”), by contrast, is broader. Synagogē is used for: (1) a public village or town assembly in the land of Israel; (2) a

---

364 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 188. Philo uses proseuchē 18 times in his writings (see further in Hachlili, Ancient Jewish Art, 18). An inscription found in the Gabbary section of Alexandria (JIGRE 13=CJ 2.1432; 37 BCE[?]) “is one of three existing examples of Egyptian synagogue benefactions made solely by individuals (cf. JIGRE 28, 126; Nos. 152, 172)” (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 186). It reads, in part, “Alypus built the prayer hall [proseuchē].” The first attestation of Egyptian synagogue buildings under the name proseuchē comes from the third quarter of the third century BCE (Hengel, “Proseuche und Synagoge,” 27–54).


366 The ten proseuchē inscriptions from Egypt are: CJ 2.1440 (= JIGRE 22; Schedia, 246–221 BCE; ASSB, no. 158); CJ 2.1449 (= JIGRE 125; lower Egypt, 246–221 BCE; ASSB, no. 171); CJ 2.1443 (=JIGRE 27; Athribis, 180–145[?] BCE; ASSB, no. 151); CJ 1444 (=JIGRE 28; Athribis, 180–145[?] BCE; ASSB, no. 152); CJ 2.1442 (=JIGRE 25 [1422 in Schürer]; Nitriai, 144–116 BCE; ASSB, no. 156); CJ 2.1444 (=JIGRE 24; Xenephryris, 144–116 BCE; ASSB, no.159); CJ 2.1433 (=JIGRE 9; Alexandria, 2nd cent. BCE; ASSB, no. 143); CJ 2.1432 (=JIGRE 13; Alexandria, 36[?] BCE; ASSB, no. 144); and JIGRE 126 (Alexandria, 36[?]-BCE; ASSB, no. 172). In Arsinoē–Crocodilopolis in the Fayum, one inscription and two papyri from the same period also use the word proseuchē; CJ III.1532A (=JIGRE 117; 246–221 BCE; ASSB, no. 150); CPJ I.129 (May 11, 218 BCE; ASSB, no. 147), and CPJ I.134 (late 2nd cent. BCE; ASSB, no. 148). A 2nd century CE papyrus from Arsinoē–Crocodilopolis affirms the continued existence of proseuchai in that region (CPJ 2.432=P.Lond. III 1177; 113 CE). See also the concise discussion by Richardson of all the inscriptions and the two Hellenistic-era papyri (Building Jewish in the Roman East, 115–16). For a discussion of CPJ 2.432 see Kasher, Alexandrian Jews, 138.

367 CPJ I.129, CPJ I.134, CPJ I.138, CPJ II.432. See Levine, Ancient Synagogue, 83 n. 10; ASSB nos. 147, 148, 170, 149, respectively.

368 A clear example is found in CPJ I.138 (ASSB, no. 170). It reads, in part, “at the assembly [synagogē] that took place in the prayer hall [proseuchē].” Levine states that the most common type of proseuchē inscription is the dedicatory type (Ancient Synagogue, 83). For example, “On behalf of king Ptolemy and queen Berenice his sister and wife and their children, the Jews [dedicated] the proseuchē” (CJ 2.1440=JIGRE 22; Schedia, 246–221 BCE; ASSB, no. 158).


370 Public synagogues existed only where Jews were in charge of town and city administration (cf. m. Ned. 5:5). Some of the functions of public synagogues are those “that contemporary western culture would regard as more properly belonging to municipal institutions. These included council halls, law
of voluntary association, that is, a semi-public assembly of Jews, both in Israel and in the diaspora; and (3) a building in which an assembly of Jews meets. The term *synagōgē*, then, can refer both to a physical structure and to the temporary group designation of Jews while gathered within that physical structure. The term *synagōgē* is not used: (1) as a permanent group identity after the meeting of the *synagōgē* disbands; or (2) as a name for the meeting convened by the *synagōgē*. It took until the Roman period for *synagōgē* “to be largely associated with Jews and with the practice of Judaism.”

Understanding the semantic domain of *synagōgē* in Jewish usage does little to explain the types of activity which took place within the *synagōgē* during the gathering of the *synagōgē*. Runesson states that the institutional origins of the Jewish *synagōgē* appear to be the “supra-local and official institution [that began]…when public torah readings

courts, schools, treasuries, and public archives” (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 8; see primary sources cited on p. 8 n. 17). But Runesson notes that public synagogues also included religious elements: “since religion was not thought of as separate from other spheres of society, including politics, Torah was read publicly and discussed on Sabbaths” (Runesson, “Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 463). Leadership of a public synagoge was not dominated by one specific group such as Pharisees or ‘early rabbis,’ not even after Temple destruction in 70 CE. Runesson states that ‘individuals and groups could use public meetings to promote their own understanding of religious traditions and Jewish law, and how they should be implemented in contemporary society” (“Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 112).

---

372 For examples of semi-public association synagogues, see n. 12.
373 Archaeological finds at Gamla, Herodium, Masada, Modi‘in, Qumran, and, perhaps, Capernaum have been suggested as possible synagogue buildings in pre-70 CE Israel (Twelftree, “Jesus and the Synagogue,” 3110; on the Capernaum synagogue, see esp. Runesson, “Architecture, Conflict, and Identity Formation,” 231–57). The use of *synagōgē* as an unequivocal reference to a building is also found in inscriptions that predate the Temple’s destruction in 70 CE. The most notable of these are: (1) the Theodotus *synagōgē* dedication in Jerusalem (*CIJ* II 1404; See John Kloppenborg’s refutation of Kee’s argument for a post-70 date [“Dating Theodotus (CIJ II 1404),” *JJS* (51.2): 243–80]); and (2) the three public inscriptions from Berenike (Cyrenaica) (*CJZC* 70–72; cf. B. Lifshitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives: répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues* [CRB 7; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1967], 100). Tessa Rajak notes that the latter of the three inscriptions from Berenike (i.e., *CJZC* 72) “is interesting in featuring the two senses of *synagogue* in close proximity in its opening phrase, first as the community responsible for the resolution which is being recorded and then in connection with the furnishing donated by the honorands (*episkeue tēs synagōgēs*)” (“Synagogue and Community,” 32).
were first initiated” during the Persian period (e.g., Artaxerxes I). This Persian period public institution appears to presage the public synagogues in the Land during the 1st century CE. These synagogues are depicted as being open to all Jews of a particular region and among whom civic, administrative, social and religious activities occurred.  

Semi-public synagogue associations did not develop until the Late Hellenistic period with the rise of “non-official institutions [voluntary associations] dedicated to communal reading and study of Torah.” These synagogue associations, with their restricted memberships, were modeled after the “general pattern of the thiasoi or collegia [voluntary associations] of the Graeco-Roman world.”

2.3. Summary: Ekklēsia and Synagogue Scholarship

Of the numerous synagogue terms used by Second Temple Jews, two predominate: proseuchē and synagogē. Proseuchē only refers to a structure within which a Jewish community meets. Synagogē is used both of a structure and of the community which meets within that structure. Ekklēsia does not ever refer to a physical structure. This would have made ekklēsia an attractive term for any community which wished to avoid having their collective membership either identified with, or terminologically tied to, a specific structural location. The question still to be investigated is whether, in Jewish

---

375 Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 479.
376 In his survey of 1st century CE sources, Levine notes that the synagogē building was used for “the entire gamut of [public] activities connected with any Jewish community…[such] as a courtroom, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions” (Ancient Synagogue, 29).
378 Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 480. For an extensive investigation of Greco-Roman voluntary associations, see Onno van Nijf (The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East [DMAHA XVII; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997]). For a list of scholarly resources relative to understanding the ekklēsai of early Christ-followers as a Greco-Roman voluntary association see Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 480 n. 57. See also the list by Kloppenborg cited in n. 786.
circles, *ekklēsia* functioned as a designation for a public institution, for a semi-public meeting, and/or for the group self-designation of a Jewish voluntary association.
3. Ekklēsia and Public Jewish Assemblies

Runesson’s argument for the existence of two types of synagogue communities (public and semi-public) forms a helpful interpretive grid through which to examine ekklēsia usage in Jewish sources. In this section I explore public Jewish assemblies called ekklēsiai. In the following section I will examine if any semi-public Jewish synagogue associations self-identified as ekklēsiai.

3.1. The Septuagint (LXX) (Hellenistic Era)

The earliest reference within Jewish literature to an ekklēsia is found in the LXX. Therein, it refers both to the ancient supra-local community known as Israel and to gatherings of its people. There are two words for “assembly” in the Hebrew Bible, qāhāl and ‘ēdā, with the LXX translating only qāhāl as ekklēsia. Qāhāl is used predominantly for assemblies of various kinds, including of the people of Israel. It can refer either to a meeting or collectively to those who are meeting (“congregation”).

379 BDB states that the noun הַנָּחָה occurs 123 times (“חֶנָּה,” 874b/6951). Heinz-Josef Fabry gives the number as 122 times (“חֶנָּה,” TDOT 12.546–61, esp. 549).

380 There are 149 occurrences of הַנָּחָה in the HB (BDB 417a; “חֶנָּה,” HALOT 2.789–90).

381 Andries du Toit provides a helpful summary of the conclusions that can be reached from the lexical data on these two Hebrew words (“Paulus Oecumenicus: Interculturality in the Shaping of Paul’s Theology,” NTS 55 [2009]: 121–143).

382 Fabry claims הַנָּחָה is never used of groups of animals or things (TDOT 12:546–61, esp. 550). Examples of where הַנָּחָה is used for assemblies include: assemblies of the people of God (Deut 23:2ff; 1 Chron 28:8; Neh 13:1; Micah 2:5), of prophets (1 Kgs 19:20) and of a mob (Sir. 26:5). Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner cite three primary categories: a contingent or assembly, including the congregation assembled for worship, the post-exilic cultic community, and miscellaneous meanings such as “crowd” and “angelic assembly” (“חֶנָּה,” HALOT 3.1078–80). BDB divides the semantic domain of הַנָּחָה in two (“חֶנָּה,” 874b/6951, noun masc.): “assembly specially convened” and “congregation, as organized body.” The meaning of הַנָּחָה as assembly is subdivided into four categories: (a) for evil counsel: Gen 49:6; Ps 26:5; Prov 5:14; 26:26; Job 30:28; (b) for war or invasion: Num 22:4; Judg 20:2; 21:5, 8; 1 Sam 17:47; Ezek 16:40; 17:17; 23:24; 32:3; 38:4, 7, 15(+8x); Jer 50:9; (c) company of returning exiles: Jer 31:8; Ezra 2:64 (=Neh 7:66); (d) for religious purposes, to hear words of the LORD at Horeb: Deut 5:19; 9:10; 10:4;
primary referent for 'ēdā appears more consistently to be the people who are assembled.\textsuperscript{383} The word 'ēdā is regularly used of the people of Israel in the wilderness,\textsuperscript{384} but qāḥāl and 'ēdā “can in fact be used with no real difference in meaning.”\textsuperscript{385}

---

\textsuperscript{383} Koehler and Baumgärtner note that the majority of occurrences refer to the “national, legal and cultic communities” with some referring to a throng or gang or to a family or friendship circle (HALOT 3.1079). \textit{BDB} (“ערד,” 417a/5712, noun fem.) defines ערד as meaning “congregation.” Three basic categories of “congregation” are noted: “congregation [of people, other than Israel],” “of animals,” and “elsewhere of Israel.” The meaning of ערד as congregation of people includes: (a) congregation of El, of company of angels: Ps 82:1; (b) congregation of peoples: Ps 7:8; (c) congregation of the righteous: Job 16:7; Ps 111:1; Prov 5:14 (both ערד and ידים occur); (c) in a negative sense, company of evil doers: Job 15:34; Ps 22:17; 86:14; (d) company of Korah: Num 16: 5, 6, 11, 16; 17:5; 26:9, 10; 27:3; Ps 106:17. The meaning of ערד as congregation of animals is found in Ps 68:31 (fig. of nobles) and Judg 14:8 (bees). The meaning of ערד as congregation of Israel includes: (a) the congregation of Israel generally: Hos 7:12; 1 Kgs 8:5 (=2 Chron 5:6); 12:20; Jer 6:18; 30:20; Ps 74:2 and (b) in a technical sense for the congregation of Israel of the Exodus (115x). Phrases include: עבד המשלאק: Exod 12:3, 6, 19, 47; Lev 4:13; Num 16:9; 32:4; Josh 22:18, 20; (=Exod 16:1, 2, 9, 10; 17:1; 35:1, 4, 20; Lev 16:5; 19:2; Num 1:2, 53; 8:9, 20; 13:26; 14:5, 7; 15:25, 26; 17:6; 19:9; 25:6; 26:2; 27:20; 31:12; Josh 18:1; 22:12; (=Exod 8:4(+29x); (=Lev 8:3(+33x)); (=Lev 4:15); (=Exod 16:22; Num 4:34; 16:2; 31:13; 32:2; Josh 9:15, 18; 22:30; (=Joshua 21:14); (=Exod 34:31; (=Joshua 3:5; (=Exod 16:1; 17:1; Num 1:2, 18.

\textsuperscript{384} For example, Exod 16:1; 17:1; Num 1:2, 18.

Notwithstanding overlap in the semantic domains of qāhāl and ‘ēdā, the LXX uses ekklēsia to translate only qāhāl,\(^{386}\) while synagogē translates both qāhāl\(^{387}\) and ‘ēdā.\(^{388}\) In total, ekklēsia occurs 103 times in the LXX\(^{389}\) and synagogē, 221 times.\(^{390}\)

The LXX does not use the word synagogē for a place of meeting (i.e., synagogue building), unlike some later Jewish sources (e.g., CIJ II 1404; the Theodotus synagogē).\(^{391}\) While synagogē predominantly means the whole congregation of Israel, it has at least four other referents: (1) a local congregation; (2) a formal assembly/meeting;

---

\(^{386}\) The noun ἱερός is translated as ἐκκλησία 68 times. The noun ἡ ἱππα is never translated as ἐκκλησία (Fabry, *TDOT* 12:546–61, esp. 561). In the four cases where ekklēsia translates lexemes other than qāhāl, K. L. Schmidt notes that the morphemes are Hebrew equivalents from the stem qhl: 1 Kgs 19:20/1 Sam 19:20 (הַקָּל), Neh 5:7 (קָל), Ps 25:12/26:12 (כֶּל), and Ps 67:27/68:27 (חַקִּיק). (“ἐκκλησία,” *TDNT*, 3.501–34, esp. 520). Regarding the morpheme ἱερός, Schmidt states that “the same radicals are found in a different sequence. Either we are to assume that this is also a derivative of ἱερός or it may be that we have dittography in relation to ἱερός, which comes shortly before” (*TDNT* 3.520).

\(^{387}\) The noun ἱερός is translated as συναγωγή 36 times. Of the 23 occurrences of ἱερός in Genesis–Numbers it is never translated by ἐκκλησία, but rather always by συναγωγή. (Fabry, *TDOT* 12:561). One example of ἱερός being translated both as ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή is found in LXX Ps 39:9, 10, respectively (HB Ps 40:10, 11). Therein, the two occurrences of the Hebrew phrase בְּהַיַּר are rendered as ἐκκλησία μεγάλη (39:10) and συναγωγή πολλή (39:11). See Schrage, *TDNT* 7.797–852, esp. 802.

\(^{388}\) Fabry notes that “with few exceptions ‘ἐδά is indeed generally rendered as συναγωγή 132 times.” Two exceptions are ἐπιστροφή (11x) and πληθυσμός (4x) (*TDOT* 12:561). Schrage lists other Greek words which translate ἱερός. Some examples are ἱερά (Num 4:34), ἱερά ἱερά (Num 3:7), συστροφή (Judg 14:8a) and παρεμβολή (Num 17:11) (*TDNT* 7.803).

\(^{389}\) The number of occurrences of ἐκκλησία per book in the LXX are: Deuteronomy (9); Joshua (2); Judges (6); 1 Samuel (2); 1 Kings (4); 1 Chronicles (8); 2 Chronicles (24); Ezra (5); Nehemiah (6); Judith (4); 1 Maccabees (5); Psalms (10); Proverbs (1); Job (1); Sirach (13); Micah (1); Joel (1); Lamentations (1). The Psalms of Solomon (10:6) adds the only other occurrence of ἐκκλησία within the corpus of Jewish writings prior to the turn of the Common Era. Out of this total of 104 ἐκκλησία occurrences, only 2 are in the plural (LXX Ps 25:12, 67:27).

\(^{390}\) Schrage, *TDNT* 7.798–852, esp. 803. A little more than half of the total occurrences of συναγωγή (221) translate συνή (132). Altogether, 20 of the 221 occurrences of synagogē in the LXX translate 16 different Hebrew words other than qāhāl and ‘ēdā (Schrage, *TDNT* 7.802).

\(^{391}\) See n. 373 on archaeological evidence for buildings called synagogē used by Jews.
(3) a gathering of many sorts; and (4) Jacob and his progeny who, as *synagōgai ethnōn* (“gatherings of nations”), are assured of spreading throughout the earth. This last usage by the diasporic translator(s) may be ideological in nature. If the readers of the LXX saw in the phrase *synagōgai ethnōn* a veiled reference to their own *synagōgai* which had spread throughout the diasporic world of the *ethnōn*, then these diasporic Jews could have viewed themselves as being the fulfillment of God’s original promise to their patriarchal namesake ("Israel"). There is also at least one instance in the LXX in which it seems that *ekklēsia* is used ideologically as a group designation. The translator of 2 Chronicles appears syntactically to infer that only Judah, and not Israel, is *hē ekklēsia*.  

---

392 Some examples cited by Schrage include the “collecting” of revenues (Sir. 31:3), a “bringing in” of the harvest (Exod 34:22, cf. 23:16), a “gathering” of young men (Jer 6:11), and the “gathering” of a diverse array of items such as a pile of stones (Job 8:17) and water (Lev 11:36) (*TDNT* 7.802–805).

393 LXX Genesis translationally differentiates the three occurrences of *qāhāl* within the divine promise to make Jacob/Israel into a *qāhāl* of *‘amim/goyim* (Gen 28:3; 35:11; 48:4) from the fourth occurrence, which refers only to an assembly for counsel (Gen 49:6). Within Genesis, the translator(s) only uses *synagōgē* to translate the *qāhāl* of *‘amim/goyim*. He/they substitute *boulē* for the *qāhāl* of counsel in Gen 49:6. Interestingly, in Gen 28:3, 35:11, and 48:4, the translator revises the singular *qāhāl* to read the plural *synagōgai*, and uses only *ethnōn* to translate the two Hebrew words *‘amim* and *goyim*.

394 Viewing diasporic synagogue communities as being part of God’s original plan for Israel’s progeny would be particularly comforting theology to those diasporic Jews for whom life in the Diaspora was perceived as evidence of divine punishment, even abandonment. Donald Verseput claims that there was a prevalent notion within Second Temple Judaism that “the very existence of the Jewish Diaspora was . . . evidence of divine displeasure from which only national repentance and divine mercy could bring relief” (“Genre and Story: The Community Setting of the Epistle of James,” *CBQ* 62/1 [2000]: 96–110, esp. 100). He identifies a sub-genre of Jewish epistolary literature that developed in order to comfort and call diasporic Jews to holy living. He calls it a “Covenant Letter to the Diaspora.” He suggests five exemplars: Jer 29:1-23; The Epistle of Jeremiah; 2 Macc 1:1-9; 1:10–22:18; 2 Baruch 78–86, and the epistle of James (Ibid, 101). I will suggest a sixth, Rev 1:9–22:21, in Part III on usages of the word *ekklēsia* in early Christ-follower sources.

395 The implicit identification only of Judah, and not of Israel, as *hē ekklēsia* is evident in the appositional construction in LXX 2 Chron 30:24. It reads, ἵνα ἐξεκύριες ἀνήρξατο τῷ Ιουδα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (“For Hezekiah set apart for Judah, even the congregation”). In the next verse (30:25), the Chronicler applies the term *ekklēsia* to Judah in contradistinction to other Israelites: καὶ ἡ προσέλθει τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ λευτάται καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰουδα καὶ οἱ εὐρεθήντες εξ Ἰσραήλ καὶ οἱ προσήλυτοι οἱ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ γῆς Ἰραήλ καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ιουδα (“And all the congregation, the priests, and the Levites rejoiced, and all the congregation of Judah, and they that were present of Jerusalem, and the strangers that came from the land of Israel, and those dwelling in Judah”).
There are at least four ways in which the word \textit{ekklēsia} is differentiated from \textit{synagogē} in the LXX. While \textit{synagogē} translates \textit{qāhāl} throughout Genesis–Numbers, \textit{ekklēsia} does not do so until LXX Deut 4:10.\footnote{Deut 4:10 includes the phrase “the day of the assembly” (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας) when referring to the day when Israel gathered to hear God speak at Mount Horeb. See also Deut 9:10 and 18:16. There are textual variations in Deut 9:10. For example, the Göttingen edition omits τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας at the end of the verse.} Second, while both words can be used of a collective identity, \textit{ekklēsia} far outnumbers \textit{synagogē} when referring to gatherings of people. Third, when referring to a “gathering,” \textit{ekklēsia} does so only of people, not of animals or items. Fourth, \textit{ekklēsia} occurs with a greater number of locutions tied to God or to God’s people.\footnote{When referencing God, examples of \textit{ekklēsia} phraseology in the LXX include: “the assembly of God” (Neh 13:1; MSS S and L read κυρίου instead of ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ); “the assembly of the Lord” (Deut 23:1, 2, 3[2x], 8; 1 Chron 28:8; Mic 2:5), and “the assembly of the Most High” (Sir 24:2). The phrase “in the assembly of holy ones” (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων) is found in Ps 88:6, wherein ἁγίοι means angels. \textit{Ekklēsia} is used of an assembly for worship in Ps 21:23, 26. When referencing God’s people, examples of \textit{ekklēsia} phraseology include: “all the assembly of Israel” (Deut 31:30; 3 Kgs 8:14, 22, 55, 65; 1 Chron 13:2, 4; 2 Chron 6:3[2x], 12, 13; 7:8; 10:3; 1 Macc 4:59; Sir 50:13); “all the assembly of the sons of Israel” (Josh 8:35; Sir 50:20); “all the assembly of the people of God” (Judg 20:2); “all the assembly of Judah” (2 Chron 23:3; 30:24, 25); “the assembly in Jerusalem” (2 Chron 30:2; 1 Macc 14:19); “the assembly of faithful [soldiers]” (1 Macc 3:13); and “the assembly of the people” (Jdt 14:6).} This semantic flexibility in the word \textit{ekklēsia} suggests its functionality as a group designation and/or as a meeting name for God’s people, the Jews.

3.2. Public Assemblies in Hellenistic-Era Judea (Judith, 1 Maccabees, Ben Sira)

3.2.1. Ekklēsia in Judith

The book of Judith, which ostensibly recounts 8th century BCE events, makes mention of an \textit{ekklēsia}. This \textit{ekklēsia} is presented as a specially constituted assembly of Jews during a time of national emergency (6:16, 21; 7:29; 14:6).\footnote{The four passages in Judith read: (6:16) καὶ συνεκάλεσαν πάντας τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς πόλεως, καὶ συνέδρασαν πάντας ταῖς νεανίσκοις καὶ ταῖς γυναῖκις τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντων (They called together all the elders of the town, and all their young men and women ran to the assembly’); (6:21) καὶ παρέλαβεν αὐτῶν ὸζιας ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Uzziah took him [Achior] from the assembly to his own home’); (7:29) ἑγένετο κλαυθμός μέγας ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντων ὁμοθυμάδων (‘Then great and general lamentation arose throughout the assembly’); (14:6) ὥς δὲ ἦλθεν καὶ εἶδεν τὴν κεφαλὴν}
included “all their young men and women” (6:21). The author’s identification of this assembly as an *ekklēsia* is anachronistic, not least since the original Athenian *ekklēsia* did not come into existence until two centuries later. Given that Judith was composed sometime during the Hasmonean period, the ostensible *ekklēsia* of the 8th century BCE Israelites has two potential models: either Greek *ekklēsiai* of the Hellenistic period or a Hasmonean-era public synagogue assembly in Judea named *ekklēsia*. The latter option seems preferable; unlike Greek *ekklēsiai*, Judith’s *ekklēsia* allows women to participate (6:16). This egalitarian motif is also the case in the public Jewish *ekklēsiai* described in two other Hasmonean-era literary works: 1 Maccabees and Sirach.

3.2.2. *Ekklēsia in 1 Maccabees*

The occasional nature of Judith’s *ekklēsia* is consistent with the *ad hoc* nature of the *ekklēsiai* mentioned in the Hasmonean-era literary work known as 1 Maccabees. Two of the five *ekklēsia* usages in 1 Maccabees (1 Macc 5:16; 14:19) refer to an occasional, public, religio-political assembly convened by the Maccabees.

---

399 Majority opinion places the compositional date of Judith “in the Maccabean era (in a broad sense)” (Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002], 132). Both the terminus a quo and ad quem of Judith is said to be the time during which the *gerousia* existed in Judea. It is first mentioned in the charter of Antiochus III (c. 200 BCE) and later disbanded by the Romans in favour of a *boulē* (Ibid, 133). See Otzen for a list of scholars who date Judith either to the pre-Maccabean (post-300, c. 200, or c. 180 BCE), the Maccabean or early Hasmonean (167–c. 110 BCE; majority opinion), or to mid-to late Hasmonean or early Roman, periods (minority view) (Ibid, 132).

400 The compositional date of 1 Maccabees lies somewhere between the rule of John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE) and the desecration of the Temple by Pompeii (63 BCE) (Harold Attridge, “Historiography,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* [CRINT II; ed. M. E. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984], 157–84, esp. 157).

401 1 Macc 5:16 and 14:19, respectively, read as follows: ἐπισυνήχθη ἐκκλησία μεγάλη (“a great assembly was called”) and καὶ ἁγιάσθησαν ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ (“And these were read before the assembly in Jerusalem”). The other three *ekklēsia* occurrences in 1 Maccabees are found in
The first such assembly is called an *ekklēsia megalē* (1 Macc 5:16). Jonathan Goldstein questions the authenticity of the phrase. He states that since “Judas and his band were outlaws and were probably regarded as such by the high priest and the national Council of Elders…it is best not to render the Greek by words which imply the meeting of a fully constituted body.” Goldstein does not explain, however, why the phrase *ekklēsia megalē* need necessarily suggest a “fully constituted body.” Its absence in the Greek inscriptional record until the Late Antique period, where it is used only of purpose-built structures for Christ-follower meetings, suggests that the author of 1 Maccabees does not intend, thereby, a reference to a pre-existing Greco-Roman political institution. He may, however, intend an allusion to a Jewish *ekklēsia megalē*, one which did comprise a “fully constituted body.” That Greek phrase occurs five other times in the LXX. In two of the historical books, *ekklēsia megalē* simply refers to the large (*megalē*) gathering of people at the dedication of the Solomonic Temple (LXX 3 Kgs 8:65; LXX 2 Chron 7:8).

1 Macc 5:16 reads in full: “When Judas and the people heard these messages, a great assembly was called (πισυνήχθη κκλησία) to determine what they should do for their kindred [in Galilee and Gilead] who were in distress and were being attacked by enemies.”

There are six extant examples of *ekklēsia megalē* within the inscriptional record. All are Late Antique Christian references: *Inscr. Aeg. Thrace* 390 (Thrace, Paisoulai-Maximianopolis; 6th cent. CE?); *SEG* 38:1856 (Egypt or Nubia; post-474/491 CE); *Asdracha, Inscr. Byz.* (AD 49/50A) 281,112 (Thrace, Hadrianopolis [Edirne]; 575–577 CE); *SEG* 44:588 (Thrace, Hadrianopolis [Edirne]; 576–577 CE); *I Eph* 1373 (Ionia, found at Ephesos; fragments of a Christian text referring to the Church of John; n/d); *Miletos* 629 (Ionia, Miletos; a building inscription for the church of the archangel Michael; 602/606 CE).

LXX 3 Kgs 8:65 reads, καὶ ἐποίησεν Σαλωμῶν τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραηλιτός μετὰ αὐτοῦ, ἐκκλησία μεγάλη (“So Solomon held the festival at that time, and all Israel with him—a great assembly”). The parallel passage (LXX 2 Chron 7:8) confirms that *ekklēsia megalē* only has reference to the size of the group, and not to an official political institution. 2 Chron 7:8 reads, καὶ ἐποίησεν Σαλωμῶν
assembly.” The two references to an ekklēsia megalē in Psalms read the same both in Hebrew (Ps 22:26; 40:10) and in Greek (LXX Ps 21:25; 39:9). Unlike 1 Macc 5:16, however, the two Psalms presume a religious setting, such as the Temple.

There is a political context, though, for at least one of the ekklēsia megalē occurrences in the LXX. The reference in LXX Neh 5:7 implies “a fully constituted body” not least with judiciary powers, but at most of an ad hoc nature. If the implied reader of 1 Macc 5:16 presumed an allusion to LXX Neh 5:7, then Judas Maccabeus implicitly gains political continuity with Nehemiah. Nehemiah’s ekklēsia megalē also occurred at a seminal point in the history of the Jewish nation. During that ekklēsia, he decisively gained lasting political authority through the acquiescence of the Judean elite to his demands that their use of indentured slavery and property confiscation be discontinued and that property and family members be restored to their fellow Jews. The exalted political status of Nehemiah implicitly accords political legitimacy for Judas, who through his ekklēsia megalē self-presents as a head of state, not as a brigand.

The second mention of a public ekklēsia in 1 Maccabees occurs at another decisive point in the history of the Jewish nation. In 1 Macc 14:20-23, the Spartans send a

---

406 In both LXX Ps 21:25 and LXX Ps 39:9, the Hebrew prepositional phrase bēqāhāl rāḇ (Ps 22:26; 40:10) is translated as en ekklēsia megalē (LXX Ps 21:25, παρὰ σοῦ ὃ ἐπαινός μου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ; LXX Ps 39:9, εὐθυγελοσάμην δικαιώσων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ). Both the Hebrew and Greek can be translated either as “in the great assembly” or as a temporary collective designation, “in the great congregation” (NRSV).

407 Neh 5:7 reads, καὶ ἔβουλοσάτο καρδία μου ἐπ’ ἐμέ, καὶ ἐμαυξασάμην πρὸς τοὺς ἐντίμους καὶ τοὺς ἐρυθερμός καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς Ἀπαίτησε ἀνὴρ τόν ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ ὑμεῖς ἀπαίτετε. καὶ ἔδωκα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησιάν μεγάλην (“After thinking it over, I brought charges against the nobles and the officials; I said to them, ‘You are all taking interest from your own people.’ And I called a great assembly to deal with them”).

message of condolence on bronze tablets to Simon Maccabeus on the occasion of the passing of his brother Jonathan (143/142 BCE).\footnote{This account in 1 Macc 14:19 accords with Greek praxis whereby decrees are cast in bronze stelai, engraved on wooden tablets, or written on papyrus, and then archived out of public view (Robert K. Sinclair, Democracy and Participation in Athens [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 93; also Alan S. Henry, The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees [Mnemosyne Sup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1977], 31 n. 40).}

Therein, the Lacedaemonians renew their alliance and ostensibly present themselves as Abrahamic descendants\footnote{Louis Feldman finds a Jewish precedent for the Spartans’ genealogical presupposition. Feldman states that Josephus “proudly quotes the non-Jewish writer Alexander Polyhistor, who reports that, according to Cleodemus the prophet, also called Malchus, two of Abraham’s sons by Keturah joined the great hero Heracles in his campaign against Libya and Antaeus, the giant son of Earth, and that Heracles actually married the daughter of one of them, who became the ancestor of the barbarians called Sophakes (A. J. 1.165) (Josephus’ Interpretation of the Bible [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998], 237). He notes further that “perhaps there is some connection between this and the statement in 1 Macc. 12:10, 20 and 14:20 and 2 Macc. 5:9 and Ant. 12.226 (the letter of Areios, the Spartan king to Onias), that the Spartans were regarded as descended from Abraham” (Ibid, 237 n. 36).} (“our brothers”; 1 Macc 14:20).\footnote{The practice of reinforcing kinship ties, even mythical ones, reflects the praxis of syngeneia between Greek poleis and phylai. For epigraphic evidence of kinship diplomacy, see Patterson, Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece, 109–123.}

These tablets were read out “before the ekklēsia in Jerusalem” (1 Macc 14:19).\footnote{The Greek reads, ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ.}

The LXX uses ekklēsia here as a temporary collective designation, which is consistent with Greek literary and inscriptive praxis.

Samuel Rocca makes mention of another ekklēsia in Jerusalem: “during the early Hasmonean period the gerousia lost much of its power to the great assembly, ekklēsia megalē.”\footnote{Samuel Rocca, Herod’s Judea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World (TSAJ 122; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 262.} He suggests that ekklēsia megalē is a term “coined by Simon in 141 BCE, [which] clearly reflects the democratization of society.”\footnote{Rocca, Herod’s Judea, 262.} His conclusions appear open to question, not least on two fronts. First, the term ekklēsia megalē does not occur in 1 Maccabees 14 and is not associated with Simon Maccabeus in any other Jewish literary
Second, although there is a “great assembly” associated with Simon Maccabeus, the author of 1 Maccabees calls it a *synagōgē megalē* instead (1 Macc 14:28). The context speaks of a leadership vacuum after Jonathan’s death, which resulted in a *synagōgē megalē* being convened by “the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country.” Simon was elected high priest, military commander, and ruler (1 Macc 14:25-49). As early as the 19th century, scholarship has questioned the technical nature of this term, preferring simply to translate it as “a great gathering.” The term *synagōgē megalē* does not recur in Philo, Josephus, or the Apocrypha.

---


416 1 Macc 14:28 reads, ἐπὶ συναγωγῆς μεγάλης ἱερέων καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντων ἐθνοῦς καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῆς χώρας ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν (“in the great assembly of the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country, the following was proclaimed to us”).


418 There is a rabbinic tradition which associates the term “great synagogue,” or more precisely “the Men of the Great Synagogue” (*Gen. R.* 35:2), with events related to Ezra’s leadership, as they are described in Nehemiah 8–10. *Avot* 1:1 chronologically locates the Men of the Great Synagogue between the Prophets and the Zugot (the Pharisaic leaders after the Maccabean victory). Simon II, the Just (High Priest, 219–199 BCE), is considered one of their “remnants” (see Hugo Mantel, “The Men of the Great Synagogue,” *HTR* 60/1 [1967]: 69–91, esp. 69). Mantel notes four positions scholars take on the reliability of this Tanaitic tradition: (1) those who reject an early date for the Great Synagogue (H. E. Ryle), or who doubt its institutional status (H. Englander, E. Bickermann, Y. Gutman); (2) those who “identify the Great Synagogue as the official government in Jerusalem, under the presidency of the high priest” (N. Krochmal, S. Levy, L. Herzfeld, S. Sachs, D. Hoffman, S. Krauss); (3) those who claim that “Great Synagogue” was a title given to assemblies of key leaders, “which met in times of high national crises in order to decide on crucial issues” (e.g., Ezra, Simon II, and the assembly which authorized rebellion against Rome [66 CE]); and (4) Finkelstein who suggests that the Great Synagogue “was associated with a non-official religious movement...called Keneset Ha-Hasidim...a synonym for Pharisees (M. Yoma VII, 1; M. Zabim III, 2; M. Bek. V, 5, etc.)...[who established the] Keneset ha-Gedolah, meaning Great Court (usually translated as Great Synagogue)” (Ibid, 69–70). Mantel sides with Finkelstein but offers two caveats: he dates the origin of the term Keneset at least a century and a half after Ezra’s time and he redefines Keneset as “association” instead of as “an official, public court.” He notes that “what remains to be pointed out is that the Jewish sects in Palestine itself, such as the Keneset, which was equivalent to the Pharisees, and its supreme council, the Keneset ha-Gedolah, were modeled in their organization on the Hellenistic religious and social associations” (Ibid, 75). Mantel identifies twelve similarities between the Keneset and Greco-Roman voluntary associations (Ibid, 75–91).
The other three *ekklēsia* occurrences in 1 Maccabees refer only to a group, rather than to the meeting of a group: “a body of faithful [soldiers]” (1 Macc 3:13); the historical *ekklēsia* of Israel in the desert (1 Macc 2:56); and a Maccabean-era group designation which alludes back to the *ekklēsia* of Israel during David and Solomon’s day (4:59; *pasa hē ekklēsia Israēl*).\(^{419}\)

The phrase *pasa hē ekklēsia* Israēl in 1 Macc 4:59 appears to allude to LXX 2 Chron 6:3. In 2 Chronicles 6–7, the Chronicler relates Solomon’s dedication of the Temple before *pasa hē ekklēsia* Israēl, along with the concomitant descent of God’s glory (LXX 2 Chron 7:1-3).\(^{420}\) The motif of Temple (re-)dedication is common both to 1 Maccabees and 2 Chronicles. Thus, an informed reader of 1 Maccabees could have seen a rhetorical agenda in the lexical and thematic commonalities. This reading strategy would situate the description of the Maccabean rededication ceremony as a “type-scene,” or “type-narrative,” of the Solomonic Temple dedication.\(^{421}\)

---

\(^{419}\) In 1 Macc 4:59 Judas Maccabeus, his brothers, and his victorious followers (*pasa hē ekklēsia* Israel), after having purified and re-dedicated the Temple, “determined that every year at that season the days of dedication of the altar should be observed with joy and gladness for eight days, beginning with the twenty-fifth day of the month of Chislev.”

\(^{420}\) The same prepositional phrase is found both in LXX 2 Chron 6:12 and 13 within the account of Solomon’s prayer of dedication for the Temple (ἐναντι πάσης ἔκκλησίας Ἰσραηλ; “in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel”). Accusative and nominative forms of only the nominal phrase each occur in 2 Chron 6:3 (εὐλόγησεν τὴν πάσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ἰσραηλ, καὶ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραηλ παρεἰστήκει; “he [King Solomon] blessed all the assembly of Israel while all the assembly of Israel stood”).

\(^{421}\) Robert Alter uses the term “type-scene” for a conventional way in which a significant episode in a hero’s life is literally presented (*The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York: Basic Books, 1981], 51–52). One common “type-scene” is a hero’s betrothal. Conventional elements include the hero journeying to a distant land, meeting an eligible girl at a well, the girl rushing home to announce the hero’s arrival, the hero being honoured with a meal, and a betrothal being subsequently concluded. Instances of this “type-scene” are said to occur in Gen 24:10-31 (Abraham), Gen 29:1-20 (Jacob), Exod 2:15b-21 (Moses), Ruth 2 (Ruth), and 1 Sam 9:11-12 (Saul). Robert Alter also explores the “type-scene” conventions evident in the stories of Esau and Jacob, Tamar and Judah, and Joseph and his brothers (*The World of Biblical Literature* [New York: Basic Books, 1992], 114–17). Paul R. Noble expands upon Alter’s insights but uses the term “type-narrative” in relation to these three stories “which each manipulates a set of shared motifs in such a way as to provide meaningful variations on essentially the same underlying plot. Thus, although each story
implies that God’s glory did in fact descend at the Temple rededication led by the
Maccabean brothers and that it did so in a fashion not dissimilar to that which occurred at
the Temple dedication led by Solomon. Such a “type-narrative” reading implicitly
confers religious legitimacy onto the Maccabees, which also, thereby, elevates their
political status in the newly independent nation of Israel.

The semantic domain of the word *ekklēsia* in 1 Maccabees has implications for
one’s interpretation of the roughly contemporaneous book of Judith. The use of *ekklēsia*
in 1 Macc 14:19 for an occasional, public, religio-political assembly in Jerusalem, not
least by the time of Simon Maccabeus, makes it possible that Judith’s regional, public
*ekklēsia* is also modeled after a Hellenistic-era synagogue assembly, rather than only
after a Greco-Roman *ekklēsia*. If so, then Judith’s mention of women and young men
taking part in the 8th century BCE *ekklēsia* may actually mirror *praxis* in synagogue
assemblies contemporaneous with the author of Judith. 1 Maccabees also affects one’s
interpretation of *ekklēsia* usage in Sirach, another Hasmonean-era Jewish writing. One
case in point is that, in their use of the word *ekklēsia*, they both appear to allude back to
the Solomonic Temple dedication (1 Macc 5:16; Sir 50:13, 20).

---

has a narrative integrity of its own, its full significance can only be grasped when it is read intertextually
with the other two, since only then can the relevant motifs be identified and the individuality of their
handling in each story be appreciated” (“Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-biblical
3.2.3. Ekklēsia in Sirach

Evidence for a public Jewish synagogue assembly known as *ekklēsia* within Judea surfaces in Ben Sira (c. 200 BCE), specifically in Sirach (c. 132 BCE),\(^{422}\) which is the Greek translation of the original Hebrew text.\(^{423}\) Therein, the grandson of Ben Sira ascribes the designation *ekklēsia* to the Judean assembly known in Ben Sira’s Hebrew text as *qhl*. In Sirach there are thirteen occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* and seven of the word *synagōgē*.\(^{424}\) Three *ekklēsia* occurrences mirror LXX usage in referring to the


\(^{424}\) Sirach uses the word *ekklēsia* in 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 24:2; 26:5 (“the gathering of a mob”); 34[31]:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; and 50:13, 20. Ben Sira speaks of a *synagōgē* as a place for legal judgments (41:18, ἀπὸ συναγωγῆς καὶ λαοῦ περί ἀνομίας) and as a community before which to show deference (4:7, “Endear yourself to the congregation” ἀνθεφρότητι συναγωγῆς σεαυτὸν ποιεί). As in the LXX, Sirach uses *synagōgē* to refer to ancient Israel (24:23; 46:14) and to smaller groupings, specifically to godless groups (16:6, ἐν συναγωγῇ ἄμαρτωλῶν; 21:9, συναγωγὴ ἄνόμων; 45:18, συναγωγὴ Κωφῆ).
supra-local ekklēsia of Israel (46:7; 50:13, 20).\textsuperscript{425} The other ten occurrences are not used as a group designation. One refers to “the gathering of a mob” (26:5). The other nine speak of a publicly accessible meeting located in a particular region, within which religio-political matters are addressed.\textsuperscript{426} Runesson sees in each of these nine ekklēsia occurrences a reference to some sort of institution contemporaneous with the author.\textsuperscript{427}

These nine references raise a three-fold question. Does Ben Sira’s grandson accurately report the name of an early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century Judean synagogue assembly or does he anachronistically retroject the name of a late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century Egyptian or Judean synagogue assembly? In other words, was Ben Sira’s qhl known as ekklēsia by early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE Hellenistic Judeans, or is his grandson ascribing to the earlier Judean qhl the name of one of three contemporaneous institutions in his own day (c. 132 BCE): a civic ekklēsia in the Greek East, a Jewish ekklēsia in Egypt, or a Jewish ekklēsia in Judea?

Sirach’s nine regional assemblies named ekklēsia share a number of similarities with Greek ekklēsiai in their exercise of juridical, political, and religious functions. One juridical issue with which Sirach’s ekklēsia is tasked is that of judging adultery

\textsuperscript{425} The NRSV translation of Sir 46:7 lacks precision. It implies that the rebellious people were known as an “assembly.” Rather, the Greek text differentiates between the rebellious people and the assembly before whom Moses and Caleb opposed the rebels (“when they stood before the assembly to oppose the rebellious people”; ἀντιστήναι ἑναντὶ ἐκκλησίας κωλύσαι λαὸν ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας).

\textsuperscript{426} Theophilo Middendorp concludes that the two terms used for assembly in Sirach (qhl and ‘dh) refer to public assemblies in Jerusalem which are focused primarily on political matters after the supposed fashion of Hellenistic-era ekklēsiai (Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus [Leiden: Brill, 1973], 155–62). Sirach carefully maintains the distinction created in the LXX by only translating qhl with ekklēsia and using synagōgē for ‘dh (Ibid, 155–56, 159). Burton Mack claims that this translational distinction does not necessarily indicate an institutional distinction. Sirach is not necessarily implying that either 2\textsuperscript{nd} century Judea or Egypt knew of a complimentary, or competitive, public institution to the ekklēsia which was known as synagōgē (Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985], 79).

\textsuperscript{427} Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 312–13.
Adultery also was an item of jurisprudence for the Athenian ekklēsia, at least until 355 BCE. Politically, Sirach’s ekklēsiai parallel Greek ekklēsiai as public forums, within which respected community members voice their opinions, and where honour and praise is bestowed upon the blameless. Theophilo Middendorp claims that it is encomiastic speech which is evident in Sirach’s assemblies, not simply rhetoric appropriate to deliberation and jurisprudence. Since encomium is a distinctively Greek praxis, Middendorp asserts that the Greek ekklēsia is Sirach’s primary model.

Burton Mack demurs. He advises caution when viewing Ben Sira’s public assemblies through Greek eyes. He gives two reasons for seeing a Jewish heritage behind Ben Sira’s use of ekklēsia for a public assembly. First, Ben Sira’s most panegyric
passage, the hymn about Simon II (ch. 50), within which are found two ekklēsia references, “does not correspond fully to the form of the Hellenistic encomiastic speech.”

Second, Mack states that, notwithstanding Ben Sira’s appreciation for “Hellenistic models of social governance, education, cultural forms, and thought, [he] has not destroyed essentially Jewish concerns for theocracy, Torah, tradition, and wisdom.” For Mack, the model for Sirach’s ekklēsia has decidedly Jewish roots. If so, is Ben Sira’s grandson thinking of Jewish ekklēsiai in Judea or in Egypt?

Patrick Tiller states that Sirach’s ekklēsiai are differentiated from Greek civic ekklēsiai in that they “were not regular, legislative bodies.” In his mind, this fact suggests that Sirach is describing a Judean institution, not one located within a Greek polis. Sirach’s ostensibly Judean ekklēsiai are not simply forums for political and juridical activity, however. In three ekklēsia references they also reflect religious praxeis (Sir 24:2; 50:13, 20). In Sirach 24 items of a religious nature are central, while in Sir

433 Mack, Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic, 81.
434 Mack, Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic, 79.
435 Patrick Tiller cites four examples of “various assemblies where one could speak…but [which] were not regular legislative bodies.” These are in Sir 15:5, 34[31]:11, 44:15 and 50: 13, 20 (“Sociological Settings of the Components of 1 Enoch,” in The Early Enoch Literature [ed. G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 237–56, esp. 247). Tiller does cite one potential example of a regularly constituted assembly (7:14). This example is problematic, however, since this verse does not use the word ekklēsia or its Hebrew equivalent qhel. Sir 7:14 reads, μη ἀδολέσχει ἐν πλήθει πρεσβυτέρων [בַּיָּהוּד תַּלְתָּא] καὶ μη δευτερώσῃς λόγον ἐν προσευχῇ σου (“Do not babble in the assembly of the elders, and do not repeat yourself when you pray”) (Ibid, 247). Although Goldblatt argues that Josephus uses plēthos to refer to an ekklēsia, Tiller does not cite Goldblatt as analogous support for his reading of Ben Sira’s plēthos as an ekklēsia (David M. Goldblatt, The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-government in Antiquity [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994], 115).
436 Tiller maintains this to be the case even in Sir 38:32 where the words ekklēsia and boulē are juxtaposed (eis boulēn laou) (“Sociological Settings,” 247). Ben Sira speaks of Judean artisans: “Yet they are not sought out for the council of the peoples nor do they attain eminence in the public assembly” (ἀλλ’ εἰς βουλὴν λαοῦ οὗ ξινε resultSetαι καὶ ἐν ἑκκλησίᾳ οὐχ ὑπεραλάτωνται) (38:32, 33). Skehan and Di Lella note that artisans, are not “prominent in the assembly (vv. 32c-33a) [for the simple reason that]…they are not trained for civic or religious leadership in general…[and] not trained in wisdom” (The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 451).
50:13 and 20 *ekklēsia* is used as a collective identity that alludes back to Solomon’s dedication of the Temple. Each of these religious contexts warrants further investigation.

### 3.2.3.1. Ekklēsia in Sirach 24

In Sir 24:2, Lady Wisdom is said metaphorically to speak within “the assembly of the Most High (*en ekklēsia hypsistou*)…in the presence of His hosts.”\(^3\)

This *ekklēsia* appears to be a heavenly one given that the term “His hosts” (*dunameōs autou*) can refer to heavenly hosts such as angels.\(^4\) Middendorp suggests an alternative explanation. He sees Sirach’s use of *hypsistos* (“Most High”) as being a euphemism for the tetragrammaton (YHWH). This prevents offense with Hellenistic Jewish readers who avoid direct equivalents like *kyrios*.\(^5\) Middendorp suggests, therefore, that the *ekklēsia hypsistou* in Sir 24:2 is simply symbolic language for a formal gathering of 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE Jews. If so, then to what type of assembly does Sirach’s *ekklēsia hypsistou* refer?

Andries du Toit sees it as being both local and religious in nature. He notes, first, that Sir 24:2 shifts the Deuteronomic definition of *ekklēsia kyriou*: “the term which traditionally had an inclusive, supra-local connotation, now refers to a local assembly.”\(^6\)

Second, he states that “the fact that it is called an ἐκκλησία υψίστου rather points towards

---

\(^3\) Sir 24:2 reads, “Wisdom praises herself, and tells of her glory in the midst of her people. In the assembly of the Most High [*ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ υψίστου*] she opens her mouth, and in the presence of his hosts she tells of her glory.”

\(^4\) Precedent for such an interpretation is found in LXX Ps 88:6 where the “holy ones” most naturally refers to angels (“Let the heavens declare your wonders, O Lord, and your truth in the assembly of the holy ones”; ἔξωμολογήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ τὰ διαμασία σου, κόρε, καὶ τὴν ἀληθείαν σου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἄγιων). Skehan and Di Lella contend that the personages identified by the phrases “the assembly of the Most High” and “his host” are indeed the angelic attendants at God’s throne, where Wisdom personified is also said to reside” (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 331). Lester L. Grabbe states that 24:2 is evidence of Ben Sira’s acceptance of the existence of angels. He cites other potential examples of this belief in 17:32, 42:17, and 45:2 (*Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* [London and New York: Routledge, 2000], 222).

\(^5\) Middendorp, *Stellung*, 158.

a primarily religious occasion.”441 If so, then 24:2 differentiates itself from Hellenistic-era Greek inscriptions in using ekklēsia for a local meeting of a religious character.442

Richard Horsley views Sirach’s ekklēsia hypsistou as political rhetoric not as religious euphemism. He asserts that “the hymn in Sirach 24 articulates something…more political, or rather more political-religious.”443 His rationale comes from Sir 24:8-12 where Wisdom’s universal distribution (Sir 1:9-10, “poured…upon all the living”) is geo-politically particularized “in (the Temple in) Zion, [with her having] assumed authority/power in Jerusalem.”444 Thus, he claims that “this declaration grounds the Jerusalem temple-state as a way of legitimating the established political order."445

If, as per du Toit and Horsley, Sir 24:2 reflects a symbolic description of an earthly ekklēsia, then it aligns with Mack’s contention that the model for Sirach’s ekklēsia has decidedly Jewish roots.446 Wisdom’s identification with the Torah (24:23)447

---

441 Du Toit, “Paulus Oecumenicus,” 136. Du Toit does acknowledge that since local governance is by a priestly aristocracy, “we should not differentiate too strictly between political and religious meetings” (Ibid, 136).

442 Although religious ceremony was part and parcel of each Athenian ekklēsia from its inception, the Hellenistic-era ekklēsia in Athens, or elsewhere in the Greek East, did not point towards a primarily religious occasion. For example, Agora 15 199 (Athens, 175/4 BCE): ὑπὲρ [Ἀγαθῆ Ἁλκιδίδης] οἱ πρυτάνεις τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ὑπὲρ τῶν θυσιῶν ὡς ἔδοξεν τὸ πρὸ τῶν ἐκκλησίων τῶν θυσίας τῶν ἱερωμάτων καὶ τεύ θυεῖα τῇ θυείᾳ καί τεύ τοῦς θεοὺς τῆς θυείας τῶν ἱερωμάτων ἀνακαλοῦσαν ἐν συνελεύσει ἑαυτῆς ἐν τῇ ἱερείᾳ καὶ τοῦς θεοὺς τῆς θυείας τῶν ἱερωμάτων. Additionally, the seven ekklēsiai within the inscriptional record which were called “sacred” (hiera) appear to have dealt predominantly with civic issues, not with religious ones (see n. 209).


444 Horsley, Scribes, Visionaries, 147.

445 Horsley, Scribes, Visionaries, 147.

446 See Mack’s comments relative to nn. 433 and 434.

allows one to postulate that in 24:2 (and 15:5) Sirach speaks of a public synagogue. Therein, Sirach describes a publicly accessible assembly in which Jews gather to hear the exposition of (religio-political) Torah by Lady Wisdom through the mouth of her human representative for the purpose of making decisions on matters of community interest.

3.2.3.2. Ekklēsia in Sirach 50

In contradistinction to Sir 24:2, the word ekklēsia in Sir 50:13 and 20 does not refer to a meeting of people but rather to a collective designation—pasa ekklēsia (huiōn) Israēl. The preposition enanti (“before”) in Sir 50:13 reinforces the fact that the ekklēsia therein refers to a gathered community. In Sir 50:13, the high priest Simon II (219–196 BCE) presides at the altar “before the whole assembly of Israel” (enanti pasēs ekklēsias Israēl). Simon is inextricably connected with God’s glory in grandiose
fashion (50:5; “how glorious he was!”).\textsuperscript{452} In this, he provides a fitting climax to Ben Sira’s “catalogue of biblical heroes…[who are] generally manifestations of the glory of God” (chs. 44–49).\textsuperscript{453} The “glory” motif associates each biblical hero with “the theme of the covenant and the cultic complex of the Israelite priesthood, temple worship, and sacrifice.”\textsuperscript{454} Simon’s status as the climactic biblical hero (50:1-21) is further reinforced in his allusional connection to the Solomonic Temple cult through his altar ministry “before all the assembly of Israel” (\textit{enanti pasēs ekklesiās Israēl}, 50:13; cf. LXX 2 Chron 6:12, 13). The rhetorical benefits of such an allusion appear also to have been appropriated by the author of 1 Maccabees (4:59).

In Sir 50:20 the grandson of Ben Sira is not as faithful to his base text (LXX 2 Chron 6:12, 13) as he is in Sir 50:13; he adds the word “sons” to the phrase \textit{pasēs ekklesiās Israēl}.\textsuperscript{455} The word “sons” also does not appear in the Hebrew, at least insofar as the Cairo genizah text of Ben Sira is concerned (11\textsuperscript{th} or 12\textsuperscript{th} century CE).\textsuperscript{456} Otto Mulder claims that the addition of “sons” in 50:20 provides a more specific sense of “institutionalized cultic community.” This brings Sir 50:20 more into continuity with

Both Sir 50:13c and 50:20b read the same: בְּנֵי קַהֲלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. For facsimiles of Sirach 50 in Hebrew, see Mulder (Ibid, 69).

\textsuperscript{452} For example, Sir 50:5-11 reads, “How glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of the house of the curtain. Like the morning star among the clouds, like the full moon at the festal season; like the sun shining on the temple of the Most High, like the rainbow gleaming in splendid clouds; like roses in the days of first fruits, like lilies by a spring of water, like a green shoot on Lebanon on a summer day; like fire and incense in the censer, like a vessel of hammered gold studded with all kinds of precious stones; like an olive tree laden with fruit, and like a cypress towering in the clouds. When he put on his glorious robe and clothed himself in perfect splendor, when he went up to the holy altar, he made the court of the sanctuary glorious.”

\textsuperscript{453} Harrington, \textit{Jesus ben Sira}, 128.

\textsuperscript{454} Harrington, \textit{Jesus ben Sira}, 128.

\textsuperscript{455} Sir 50:20 reads, in part, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.

\textsuperscript{456} The word בְּנֵי (“sons”) does not occur in the Hebrew text of B XIX verso (50:11a-22b [T-S 16.314 verso]) (Mulder, \textit{Simon the High Priest}, 69).
post-exilic descriptions of an exclusively male cultic community (e.g., 1 Chron 29:10; cf. 28:1). One example Mulder cites is the Chronicler’s description of the Solomonic Temple dedication wherein only elders, heads of tribes, and leaders of the ancestral houses apparently are in attendance (2 Chron 5:2). By contrast, in pre-exilic texts Mulder says “women, children and foreigners were commonly included” in ekklēsiai. There is another way to explain Sirach’s addition of the word “sons.” Outside of Sir 50:20, there is only other occurrence in the LXX of the collocation “all the ekklēsia of the sons of Israel” (LXX Josh 8:35). The end of Deuteronomy forms the historical backdrop for the context of Joshua 8. As Moses’ life concludes, he and Joshua recite to “all the assembly of Israel” (LXX Deut 31:30) the words of a song which warns against apostasy (LXX Deut 32:1-43). Not long thereafter, apostasy does occur resulting in the initial defeat of the Israelites at Ai (Josh 7:1-6). After their second attack is victorious (Josh 8:10-17), Joshua leads the people in a time of recommitment (Josh 8:30-35). He renews the Mosaic Law upon stone and then reads “all the words of the law,
blessings and curses...in the hearing of all the assembly of Israel [kol-\(q'\)hal yi\(\text{\`a}\)r\(\text{\`a}\)\(\text{\`e}\)l], and the women, and the little ones, and the aliens who resided among them” (Josh 8:34, 35).\(^{462}\) As in Sirach, LXX Josh 8:35 adds the word “sons” (hui\(\text{o}\)n) to the same Hebrew phrase (kol-\(q'\)hal yi\(\text{\`a}\)r\(\text{\`a}\)\(\text{\`e}\)l) and translates it as pas\(\varepsilon\)s ekkl\(\varepsilon\)sias hui\(\text{o}\)n Isra\(\text{\`e}\)l.

If Sirach’s addition of hui\(\text{o}\)n (50:20) intends an allusion back to Joshua’s time when Israel recommitted to Torah faithfulness (LXX Josh 8:34, 35), and if Simon’s blessing of “all the ekkl\(\varepsilon\)sia of the sons of Israel” with “the blessing of the Most High” (50:21) is meant to allude back to Joshua’s blessing (and cursing) of pas\(\varepsilon\)s ekkl\(\varepsilon\)sias hui\(\text{o}\)n Isra\(\text{\`e}\)l (LXX Josh 8:34, 35),\(^{463}\) then Sirach reinscribes his grandfather’s attempt to promote Torah faithfulness among the original Judean readership with his own attempt to call his contemporary Alexandrian readership to Torah observance. If Sirach’s Greek speaking readership connected those allusional dots, then they may even have viewed the aristocratic high priest Simon II as a counterpart to Moses (Sir 45:2) and Joshua (Sir 46:1), thus, enhancing Simon’s status as a religious Torah teacher and political nation

\(^{462}\) The unpointed Hebrew text of Josh 8:35 reads the same as in Sir 50:20 (הַל יִשְׂרָאֵל).

\(^{463}\) The epithet “the Most High” (50:21) is clearly identified as the Jewish “God Most High” four verses earlier (50:17; theos hypsistos). The phrase theos hypsistos occurs in numerous Jewish sources. In the LXX the phrase theos (kyrios) hypsistos (articular or anarthrous) is found 20 times (e.g., Gen 14:18-22; Job 31:28; Ps 7:18; 56:3; and Dan 5:1). Some Jewish inscriptions (2nd to 4th cents. CE) from the Bosporus Kingdom also refer to a theos hypsistos. See Gibson’s discussion of the full invocation θε/ο
\(\text{\`e}\)ι ψιστωι παντοκρατορι ἑλογητῷ, which is found in three inscriptions CIRB 1123, 1125, 1126 (Jewish Manumission Inscriptions, 106–23). CIRB 1123 begins with, “To Theos Hypsistos, all powerful, blessed” and ends with, “under Zeus, Ge [“Earth”], and Helios [“Sun”].” One cannot extrapolate from these facts, however, the corollary conclusion that all instances of the phrase theos hypsistos refer to the Jewish God. Its use is not distinctive of Jews. Non-Jews denoted Zeus or other transcendent gods as theos hypsistos (Gibson, Jewish Manumission Inscriptions, 109–11). Bosporan examples from Tanais include CIRB 1277 (173–211 CE) and CIRB 1283 (228 CE). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg note that “there is no evidence pointing to the presence of Judeans at Tanais” (AGRW, nos. 91 and 92). Paul Trebilco, in his study of Jews in Asia Minor, contends that, since Greco-Romans also denoted Zeus or other transcendent gods as θε/ο
\(\text{\`e}\)ς ψιστος, Jews decreased their use of that epithet in public settings (Jewish Communities in Asia Minor Society [NTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 142–44).
If Sirach alludes to LXX Josh 8:35, then, contrary to Mulder, Sir 50:20 does not implicitly promote a post-exilic, patriarchal, public ekklēsia within which women, children and foreigners were excluded. This being the case, Sirach places his ekklēsia at odds with the “male citizen only” demographics of a Greek civic ekklēsia. This would make Sirach’s ekklēsia an inclusive precedent for any early Christ-followers who required a historical model of an ekklēsia within which unrestricted social interaction between men and women, at the very least, was prioritized (e.g., Gal 3:28).

This still leaves open the question, though, as to why Ben Sira and his grandson would need rhetorically to ‘construct’ a grandiose aristocratic high priest who walks in the shoes of Moses and Joshua. Ben Sira’s grandson writes in tumultuous times, both from the perspective of religious and political change. He writes from Alexandria in the 38th year of the reign of Ptolemy VIII Physkon (c. 132 BCE), during a time when his grandfather’s homeland, Judea, continued to be under Seleucid control (Demetrius II Nicator; 147–125 BCE), and in the same year that civil war broke out in Egypt. The people of Alexandria, who were loyal to Cleopatra II, the estranged wife of Ptolemy VIII,

---

464 Tiller notes that “it is clear from the characterization of Simon that the high priesthood has taken over the functions of kingship (fortifications and water supply; cf. 48:17 and 50:2-4), while remaining focused on the temple-cult” (“Sociological Settings,” 247). The consolidation of political and religious power into the hands of the high priest is not out of character for Hellenistic-era Judea. During the Ptolemaic reign (301 BCE–198 BCE), the high priest in Jerusalem functioned as a religio-political regent responsible for the oversight of the Temple-state of Judea.

465 Ptolemy VIII Physkon Euergetes II reigned from 170–163 (co-regent with his brother Ptolemy VI Philometor) and from 145–116 BCE (sole regent).

466 Demetrius II Nicator successfully fought together with his father-in-law Ptolemy Philometor against Alexander Balas, usurper to the Seleucid throne, for control of Coele-Syria in the decisive battle at Antiochia on the Ainoparus (146 BCE).
revolted against the rest of Egypt, which was loyal to Ptolemy VIII and his new wife (and daughter), Cleopatra III.\textsuperscript{467} This civil war lasted sixteen years (132–116 BCE).

The literary enhancement of the role of the Judean high priest by Ben Sira’s grandson may reflect counter-Ptolemaic rhetoric. Aside from the internecine conflict and incestuous marriage associated with Ptolemy VIII’s reign, Ben Sira’s grandson may also have reacted negatively to a specific religious development associated with Onias IV, the grandson of Simon II. Sometime after arriving in Egypt,\textsuperscript{468} Onias IV gained approval from Ptolemy VI Philometor (169–145 BCE) to build a temple-fort at Leontopolis near Memphis (c. 154 BCE).\textsuperscript{469} Its height purportedly paralleled that of the Temple in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{470} Josephus contends that Onias planned thereby to cause a schism with the Temple in Jerusalem. John J. Collins calls this view “highly implausible.”\textsuperscript{471} In fact, Collins contends that “there is no record that [Onias’] temple was ever a bone of


\textsuperscript{468} For a survey of scholarly opinions on whether it was Onias III (167 BCE; \textit{B.J.} 1.31-33; 7.420-36) or Onias IV (162 BCE; \textit{A.J.} 12.9.387-88) who fled to Egypt, see John J. Collins, \textit{Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora} (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 69. He notes that “Josephus’ account is riddled with contradictions and implausibilities” (Ibid, 69).

\textsuperscript{469} \textit{B.J.} 7.426. Josephus states that Memphis was 180 furlongs (36 km) away. This places the temple in the nome of Heliopolis. Collins states that “Onias the general was identical with Onias the priest, and that his settlement in the land of Onias was a military colony…[and] he was allowed to build his temple as a reward for his service [to Philometor]” (Collins, \textit{Between Athens and Jerusalem}, 69).

\textsuperscript{470} \textit{B.J.} 7.426-432, esp. 427: “Onias built a fortress and a temple...a tower...to the height of sixty cubits.” The Temple in Jerusalem was also said to be 60 cubits in height. See a survey of archaeological findings in Kasher, \textit{Alexandrian Jews}, 121–32.

\textsuperscript{471} Collins, \textit{Between Athens and Jerusalem}, 71. Josephus writes that “by building this temple he [Onias] should draw away a great number [of Jews from Jerusalem] to himself” (\textit{B.J.} 7.431). Arnaldo Momigliano agrees (\textit{Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization} [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975], 118). Collins disagrees, especially since “if Onias wanted to set up a temple that would be a center for Egyptian Jewry and rival Jerusalem, he would have set it up in Alexandria” (\textit{Between Athens and Jerusalem}, 71).
contention." Any ill will between the Alexandrian Oniads and the Hasmoneans had dissipated by the time of Ananias, the son of Onias IV, who Josephus states intervened on behalf of Alexander Jannaeus before Queen Cleopatra III (142–101 BCE).

Historical realities notwithstanding, Ben Sira’s grandson may have viewed things quite differently. Since he lived in Alexandria, his political loyalties may have been so firmly planted in Cleopatra II, and his Torah-based ideological worldview so inextricably linked with his grandfather’s, that he could not countenance an incestuous Ptolemaic king whose brother had granted permission to construct a ‘rival’ Jewish temple in Leontopolis. His Greek translation of Ben Sira allusonally connects the Jews in Simon II’s day with the Hebrews who witnessed the dedication of the Solomonic temple (pasa ekklesia Israël). This adds rhetorical force to Ben Sira’s laudatory depiction of the Judean Temple’s high priest, a high priest whose political sympathies did not lie with the Ptolemies. Tiller adds one more observation that raises the political profile of the Judean high priest in Sirach even further. He notes that Sirach “never, or almost never, mentions the gerousia” as playing a role during ekklēsiai.

In sum, Sirach appears to describe a public synagogue institution in Judea, not least in nine of his thirteen references to an ekklēsia. Therein, he depicts a publicly

---

472 Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 71. Collins states that “it is noteworthy that, despite the flagrant violation of Deuteronomic law posed by a temple outside of Jerusalem, later Rabbinic Judaism stopped short of condemning the Oniad temple outright…(*Menachot* 13:10). The Talmud confirms this view and adds explicitly that the temple of Onias was not idolatrous” (Ibid, 72).

473 Josephus claims that Ananias said to Cleopatra III, “For I would have you know that an injustice done to this man [Alexander Jannaeus] will make all of us [Alexandrian and Judean] Jews your enemies” (*A.J.* 13.354).

474 One other example of an earlier Jewish literary work from Egypt that reflects pro-Temple rhetoric is *Sib. Or*. 3. Collins writes that “the hypothesis that *Sib. Or*. 3 was composed in circles close to the younger Onias [IV] accounts satisfactorily for all aspects of the work [such as]…enthusiasm for the Ptolemaic house…and the strange silence…on the Maccabean revolt” (*Apocalyptic Imagination*, 124).

accessible meeting, one that is contemporaneous with, or earlier than, himself, and within which juridical, political, and religious matters are addressed.

3.2.3.3. *Four Interpretations of Ekklēsia in Sirach*

Sirach’s translation of Ben Sira’s *qhl* with *ekklēsia* may reflect rhetoric more than reality. Four interpretive options arise. Is Ben Sira’s grandson viewing the Judean *qhl* through the lens of a Greco-Roman *ekklēsia*, an Alexandrian Jewish *ekklēsia*, or a Judean *ekklēsia*, or is he simply translating *qhl* as *ekklēsia* due to translational constraints?

*Greco-Roman* Ekklēsia?

Du Toit, following Middendorp, claims that Sirach’s Judean *ekklēsiai* are anachronistically presented along the lines of Greek civic *ekklēsiai*.\(^{476}\) If that is true, then the word *ekklēsia* in Sirach is not the actual name used by Judean Jews for their publicly accessible assemblies. This makes *ekklēsia* surrogate terminology by which an Alexandrian Jewish readership, one familiar with Greek *ekklēsiai*, is able more readily to understand how public assemblies in faraway Judea function. This implies that Greek and Judean public institutions (i.e., synagogues) were functionally equivalent.

*Alexandrian Jewish* Ekklēsia?

It is also possible that, concurrent with the reign of Ptolemy VIII, Jewish semi-public assemblies named *ekklēsia* were actually convened in Alexandria. If so, then Ben Sira’s grandson is viewing the Judean *qhl* through the lens of a Jewish synagogue association in Alexandria called *ekklēsia*. While there is no extant evidence for the

\(^{476}\) Du Toit notes that “Sirach basically has the meeting of a Greek δήμος in mind. Nevertheless, the Jewish theocratic idea is not yet abandoned. This is clear from 24.2, where he changes the traditional ἐκκλησία κυρίου to ἐκκλησία ὑψίστου in order not to offend Greek-oriented readers” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 135–36). See also, Middendorp, *Stellung*, 172.
existence of Jewish *ekklēsiai* in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy VIII, such an institution does appear to surface almost two centuries later. Runesson, Binder and Olsson suggest that three *ekklēsia* references in Philo describe Jewish synagogue communities in Alexandria.\(^{477}\)

*Judean Ekklēsia?*

A third possibility is that Sirach’s use of the word *ekklēsia* reflects actual Greek terminology used by Jews in Judea contemporaneous with Sirach’s time (c. 132 BCE), or with Ben Sira’s time (c. 200 BCE). The latter option is somewhat counter-intuitive. It requires Ben Sira’s use of the Hebrew word *qhl* to be secondary rather than original. If Yeshua ben El-azar ben Sira, however, is constructing a Torah-based symbolic universe to counter a Hellenistic worldview, then one can understand why, in the politically tumultuous times of his day, he might choose to describe a public assembly in Judea, which the Jewish authorities of his day call *ekklēsia*, with a Hebrew term instead (*qhl*). In so doing Ben Sira implicitly re-casts that contemporary Judean assembly into continuity with the ancient Israelite *qhl*, a Hebrew community that was faithful to the Mosaic Law.

*Ekklēsia as Translational Conundrum?*

A fourth interpretive option may simply be that Ben Sira’s grandson felt constrained by lexical considerations to translate *qhl* with *ekklēsia* rather than with *synagōgē*. In other words, since the LXX uses *synagōgē* to translate two Hebrew terms (*qhl*, *‘dh*), but uses *ekklēsia* only for one (*qhl*), Sirach ensures that his readership in Alexandria, where the translation of the LXX first began, has no possibility of

misunderstanding his grandfather’s original wording; Sirach translates $qh$ with $ekklēsia$.

There is a semantic consequence, though, to this terminological choice. In the LXX, $synagōgē$ translates more precisely the type of assembly to which Sirach regularly refers—a meeting in the generic sense—while $ekklēsia$ refers more consistently to one particular assembly—the supra-local $ekklēsia$ of Israel and its meetings.\(^{478}\) Sirach appears to take pains to avoid that confusion. He does not use $ekklēsia$ in a supra-local sense. Rather, he applies the term $ekklēsia$ to a local public assembly, one that is only occasionally convened, and then only within certain regions of Israel’s geo-political boundaries (e.g., Jerusalem). In this, Ben Sira’s $qh$, which was translated as $ekklēsia$ by his grandson, is presented as a public synagogue institution, complete with religious (e.g., Torah reading) and administrative (e.g., judicial, political) elements.

While all four options are possible, one seems preferable—$ekklēsia$ as a public synagogue institution in Judea around 132 BCE. One factor in particular tips the scales in favour of such a view. If the $ekklēsia$ in 1 Macc 14:19 is a public institution which existed in Jerusalem during Simon Maccabeus’ day (c. 141 BCE), then it is not unreasonable to assume that only nine years later when Ben Sira’s grandson emigrates from Judea to Alexandria and there translates $qh$ with $ekklēsia$ that he is doing so because actual $ekklēsiai$ in Judea, especially in Jerusalem, still existed.

\(^{478}\) The LXX translates $בּוֹן$ as $ekklēsia$ in Deuteronomy (except 5:22), Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. In the rest of the LXX $בּוֹן$ is translated by $synagōgē$. 
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3.3. Public Assemblies in 1st Century CE Judea (Josephus)

Josephus uses ekklēsia 48 times. He mirrors its use in the LXX for “a summoned assembly.” This summoned assembly can consist of all Hebrews/Jews in a particular region, or of a sub-group of a larger community. In both cases, Josephus implies that once an ekklēsia is dismissed, it ceases to exist as a communal identity. In order to indicate a legally sanctioned assembly, Josephus pairs ekklēsia with verbs also used by Greek sources. Josephus most clearly indicates a formally constituted assembly by conjoining eis ekklēsian with synagō (11x). His eleven references are

479 Josephus uses the word ekklēsia forty times in Antiquitates judaicae (Jewish Antiquities), seven times in Bellum judaicum (Jewish War), and once in Vita (Life). The 48 ekklēsia references are: Antiquitates judaicae 3.84, 188, 292, 300, 306, 307; 4.22, 24, 35, 36, 63, 142, 176, 309: 5.72, 93, 105, 110, 111; 6.86, 222; 7.370; 8.122, 222, 358, 368; 9.8, 10, 250; 11.172, 228; 12.164; 13.114, 216; 14.150, 252; 16.62, 135, 393; 19.332; Bellum judaicum 1.550, 654, 666; 4.159, 162, 255; 7.412; and Vita 268. Josephus lived from c. 37–97 CE.

480 Josephus most commonly uses the prepositional phrase eis ἐκκλησίαν, and its variations (eis τὴν ἐκκλησίαν [4x], eis τὰς ἐκκλησίας [1x]) to indicate an assembly of people (30x). Of this total, the anarthrous prepositional phrase is used 25 times. Other prepositional phrases used by Josephus to indicate an assembly of people are ἐν ἡ ἐκκλησία (1x), ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1x), and ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (1x).

481 Two examples are A.J. 3.84 (“He called the multitude into an assembly [ekklēsia] to hear what God would say to it [the assembly of people]”) and B.J. 7.412 (“after gathering all the Jews into an assembly [ekklēsia].”)

482 Three examples are A.J. 6.222 (“and after coming to Samuel and finding an assembly [ekklēsia] of prophets of God”), A.J. 8.222 (“Then Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, made an assembly [ekklēsia] of the two tribes”), and A.J. 16.393 (“after bringing into an assembly [ekklēsia] three hundred officers who were under an accusation”).

483 Three examples are A.J. 3.306 (“and when the assembly [ekklēsia] was dispersed, they [the men], their wives, and children continued the lamentation”), A.J. 8.122 (“After the king had spoken these things to the multitude, he dispersed the assembly [ekklēsia]”) and A.J. 14.150.

484 Josephus collocates synagō with ekklēsia (not only eis ekklēsian) for formal assemblies of Jews called by: Moses (A.J. 3.188; 4:35, 63, 142, 309), Joshua (A.J. 5.72, 93), Ahab (A.J. 8.368), Jehoshaphat (A.J. 9.8), Mordecai (A.J. 11.228), Ptolemy (A.J. 13.114), Herod (A.J. 16.62), and Queen Salome (B.J. 1.666). Josephus’ use of collocation of the verb ποιέω and ἐκκλησία to denote the formation of an assembly of people (A.J. 6.86; 8.222, 358; Vita 268) also mirrors Greek inscriptional and literary praxis (e.g., Thuc. Pelop. War 1.139.3; 4.118.14; 6.8.2; Lysias, Against Erat. 12.72; Plut., Cleomenes 10.1; IMT NoerdTroas 4 [Troas, 2nd cent. BCE (?)]; Syll. 622 [Delphi, 185–175 BCE]).

485 For full text of the prepositional phrase eis ekklēsian in its eleven pairings with synagō plus its eleven pairings with verbs which speak only of convening or entry, see Appendix #9 (Verbs with Eis Ekkleišes: Josephus). Feldman notes that Josephus’ collocation of ekklēsia and synagō for indicating the convening of a regular assembly (e.g., A.J. 3.188 and 4.176) accords with the practice of other Greek writers (Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities I–IV [trans. and commentary Louis Feldman; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 341 n. 87; 393 n. 527). He does not, though, compare occurrences of ekklēsia and synagō with or
consistent with Greek literary praxis in that they always depict the person who gathers (synagō) the laos into an ekklesia as being a high-ranking (religio-) political dignitary of that laos.\textsuperscript{486} The other verbs paired with eis ekklesian can also indicate a legitimate assembly into which people are called by an official community leader.\textsuperscript{487} Only twice does eis ekklesian occur without a verb. In both instances an unauthorized ekklesia is convened for the purpose of inciting rebellion, first, against Moses (A.J. 4.22), and, second, against King Agrippa (A.J. 19.332).\textsuperscript{488} Josephus implicitly reinforces the illegal nature of each ekklesia by avoiding any mention of a verb of summoning/convening/entry. In A.J. 19.332, for example, Josephus speaks of a man named Simon, a renegade without the preposition eis, nor does he provide corroborative evidence for his case from Plutarch who numerous times uses the same formulation (ἐκκλησίαν ... συναγαγόν) in reference to the convening of civic ekklesiаia (e.g., Dion 33.2; 48.2; Timoleon 10.2; Caesar 19.2; Lycurgus, 6.2; 29.1; Caius Marius, 33.3; Amilius Paulus, 11.1; 30.4; 36.2; Agis 9.1; Camillus 42.4; Cato the Younger, 18.1; Lives, Caius Marius Coriolanus 26.3). See further in Appendix #8. The eleven occurrences of verbs of convening or entry that does not have the preposition eis, occurs without a verb. In both instances an unauthorized ekklesia is convened for the purpose of inciting rebellion, first, against Moses (A.J. 4.22), and, second, against King Agrippa (A.J. 19.332).\textsuperscript{488} The other verbs paired with the prepositional phrase eis ἐκκλησίαν are synkaleó (3x), kaleó (1x), proagó (1x), synerchomai (2x), athroižō (2x), proeimi (1x), and ἑκό (1x). See Appendix #8. Synagō is paired with eis ekklesian in Polybius (5x), Diodorus Siculus (4x), Plutarch (7x), Pausanias (1x), and in only one inscription (Samos 119). Synagō is paired with the simple noun ekklesia 47 times in Greek literary works, and 18 times in Greek inscriptions. None of these eighteen inscripational examples come from Attica, with only four hailing from Hellas proper (Macedonia, Thessaly, and Peloponnesos). Ben Sîra’s sole mention of the anthroursous eis ekklesian is juxtaposed with the lexically related compound verb exagō and is set within the context of a formal synagogue meeting in which juridical matters, specifically adultery, are addressed (Sir 23:24).

\textsuperscript{487} Of Josephus’ 25 eis ekklesian occurrences, 4 are found in Jewish War, and 21 in Antiquities, with 16 of those referring to biblical timeframes (e.g., Moses, Joshua, David, Mordecai; see Appendix #9). The public nature of these assemblies is made even more explicit by Josephus in A.J. 4.309 where Moses is said to gather (synagagōn) eis ekklesian not just men, but also women and children, and even slaves. The intermingling of persons of different gender, legal status, and citizenry status was rare, at best, within Greek civic ekklesiаia. Each of Josephus’ 6 remaining references to community leaders gathering people eis ekklesian refer to a public meeting of Jews convened within Judea or Galilee for the enactment of business related to local matters. The six places where Josephus uses the phrase eis ekklesian in relation to a purportedly official gathering of Jews are found in B.J. 1.654 (Herod, Judea; πρόεισιν), B.J. 1.666 (Queen Salome, Judea; συνήγονον), B.J. 4.162 (Ananus, Judea; συνελθόντος), B.J. 7.412 (Alexandria; hoi prōteutones tēs gerousia; ἄδροσάντες), A.J. 16.393 (Herod, Judea; προαγαγόν) and A.J. 19.332 (Simon, Judea; no verb). Aside from Josephus’ 25 usages of the anthropous prepositional phrase eis ekklesian, four times he also uses the articular phrase eis tēn ekklesian, whether in the plural (A.J. 3.292: ἔχρωντο) or in the singular (A.J. 3.307, συνήγονοι; 4.24, ἤκεν; 4.35, συνήλθον). Each describes a formal assembly of the people of Israel during biblical timeframes.

\textsuperscript{488} See Appendix #9 for the Greek text of A.J. 4.22 and 19.332.
leader in Jerusalem, who illegally calls together an ekklēsia during the king’s absence. He convenes that ekklēsia so as to enact a decree excluding Agrippa from the Temple.  

Josephus’ use of ekklēsia terminology raises the question as to whether it is etic or emic terminology relative to his Judean referents. Du Toit argues that Josephus’ view of ekklēsia is “thoroughly Hellenized,” meaning that his interpretive template for Jewish assemblies is the Greek civic assembly. “Exhibit A,” so to speak, in du Toit’s case is Josephus’ practice of not following the LXX in modifying ekklēsia with the two genitival constructs “of the LORD” (kyriou) or “of God” (theou) when speaking of the ekklēsia of Israel. Louis Feldman mirrors du Toit’s view. He sees a solely political dimension in Josephus’ use of the word ekklēsia. He cites as evidence the fact that Josephus incorporates political procedures from Greek civic ekklēsia into his descriptions of the communal praxeis of the ekklēsia of Israel in the desert. Steve Mason indirectly

---

489 Josephus does not pair a verb with the phrase πληθος εις έκκλησιαν (“multitude into an assembly”; A.J.19.332).
490 Kenneth Pike first used the neologisms “emic” and “etic” from analogy with the linguistic terms “phonemic” and “phonetic.” He states that “descriptions or analyses from the etic standpoint are ‘alien’ in view, with criteria external to the system. Emic descriptions provide an internal view with criteria chosen from within the system. They represent to us the view of one familiar with the system and who knows how to function within it himself” (Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour [Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954], 153; see also, idem, Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate [Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1990]). Marvin Harris provides a further nuance relative to Pike’s original definition of the terms emic and etic when applied to the study of cultural systems (Cultural Materialism [updated ed.; Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2001], esp. 37–40). Within the context of ancient societies, April D. DeConick helpfully describes an emic term as “a word actually used by ancient people to describe their experiences” (“What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?” in Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism [Symposium 11; ed. A. D. DeConick; Atlanta: SBL, 2006], 1–24, esp. 2). DeConick defines an etic term as one that reflects “a modern typology, [it is] contemporary analytic vocabulary that we are imposing on the ancients in order to investigate their religiosity” (Ibid, 2). She notes the functionality of an etic term: “it serves the modern scholar heuristically as a taxonomy aiding our engagement in historical investigation and research. It is a comparative analytic tool created and employed by outsiders to the culture and imposed on insiders” (Ibid, 2).
491 Du Toit, “Paulus Oecumenicus,” 134 n. 68.
492 Regarding Josephus’ recounting of Moses’ orders to Korah and his followers (A.J. 4:35; Num 16:6-7), Louis Feldman observes that “Moses makes a proposal to the multitude, and they give their free
corroborates the “Hellenized” readings of these two scholars. Mason claims that Josephus’ emphasis on the politeia of Israel in Antiquities brings him regularly to use Greek political language for Israel and her constitution. Josephus’ main impulse in this regard is said to be his desire to use terminology that was familiar to his target audience: Greek speakers in Rome.

Even if one grants Josephus’ definition of ekklēsia as being “thoroughly Hellenized,” it would not be solely political for at least three reasons. First, Greek civic ekklēsiai were not solely political; they integrated religious and political issues. Second, one of the public ekklēsiai in the Land described by Josephus expressly concerned itself with religious matters: the ekklēsia convened by Simon against King Agrippa (A.J. 19.332). The incorporation of religious issues in that ekklēsia accords with Levine’s definition of a public synagogue.

consent [which shows that] Josephus continues to use Greek political vocabulary when he describes this meeting as an assembly (ἐκκλησία) (Flavius Josephus, 341 n. 87).

Stephen Mason, “Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (Ant. 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus’ Judean Antiquities/Life,” in Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives (JSPSup 32; ed. S. Mason; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 64–103, esp. 80–87. For example, in A.J. 3.84, Josephus cites Moses as saying that God “has suggested…an order of political government (politeia) [for you].”

The Greek civic ekklēsia was well known to Josephus’ Hellenistic Jewish and/or gentile audience. Given that the word synagōgē was already in use in a more specialized sense for Jewish gatherings or buildings, it is not surprising that Josephus only uses the word synagōgē eight times. Six times Josephus uses synagōgē in reference to a building (A.J. 19.300, 305[2x]; B.J. 2.285, 289; 7.44). The other two times are to a collection of water (A.J. 15.346) and of books (A.J. 1.10). Elsewhere Josephus replaces the word synagōgē with ekklēsia whenever the LXX context for the occurrence of synagōgē does not speak of a building within which Jews gathered.

Du Toit states that Josephus’ “ἐκκλησία is thoroughly Hellenized” because the modifying phrase κυρίου/θεοῦ “is completely lacking” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 134 n. 68).

See the discussion in §2.4 of Part I on the integration of religious ritual within the agendas of Greco-Roman civic ekklēsiāi.

For further details regarding the communal nature of public synagogal entities, especially among rural areas in Israel, see Levine, Ancient Synagogue, 1–6. He states that “Because of its centrality and importance in the community, the synagogue played an integrative role in ancient Jewish society. The inclusiveness of its activities, ranging from social to religious and from political to educational, underscores this fact” (Ibid, 5).
Third, a fusion of religion and politics is clearly implied in the only time that Josephus uses *ekklēsia* as a collective designation. In *A.J.* 4.176, Josephus calls the theocratic community of Israel, as it is about to enter the Promised Land, simply an *ekklēsia*. In so doing, he avoids attaching either of the religious modifiers usually added by the LXX (“of the LORD/κυριου” or “of God/θεου”). Did Josephus assume that his Hellenized readers would understand the religio-political nature of that community simply through the word *ekklēsia* itself? Even if that was not his understanding, it is still difficult to maintain that Josephus reflects “Hellenized” usage here: there is no Hellenistic precedent for a religio-political *community* permanently being designated as an *ekklēsia*. As will be seen, the only possible precedents are Jewish, whether the LXX, association synagogues located in Egypt (Philo) and Judea (Paul), or the *ekklēsiai* of early Christ-followers.

The *ekklēsiai* mentioned by Josephus range in location from Judea to the Diaspora, excluding Galilee. Within Judea, Josephus mentions the existence of a public *ekklēsia* in Jerusalem during Herod’s reign. Rocca calls it “the General Assembly,” although there is no adjectival qualifier in Josephus’ Greek text to warrant such a

---


499 In 47 out of Josephus’ 48 usages of the word *ekklēsia*, he refers to an assembly of all Israelites or Jews gathered in a certain place, or to a gathering of a local assembly either of a sub-group of Israelites (e.g., prophets; *A.J.* 6.222) or of Jews (100 prominent men; *Vita* 268).

He contends that its value to Herod lay in its function as a sounding board for his policies and for assessing his level of popularity among the Judean populace (e.g., A.J. 16.62). This political strategy is not atypical of earlier Hellenistic rulers who “liked to demonstrate that their rule derived from the people.” E. P. Sanders argues that Herod convened this assembly only when he desired to legitimate instances of capital punishment. Rocca differs. He presumes, without documentation, that “Herod convened this assembly on more trivial occasions not mentioned by Josephus.”

Josephus also uses ekklēsia to designate a Jewish assembly in Alexandria. He mentions that “principal men of the gerousia” (hoi prōteuontes) convened an ekklēsia (B.J. 7:412). The prōteuontes called the ekklēsia to debate the fate of Sicarii who had fled to Alexandria after the fall of Masada. Eleanor G. Huzar notes that a Greek civic assembly convened at Alexandria.

---

501 Rocca cites three instances in Josephus of what he calls Herod’s “General Assembly” (A.J. 15.381, A.J. 16.393-94, and B.J. 1.150) (Herod’s Judea, 266). A Greek equivalent for the word “General” does not occur in Josephus’ text; ekklēsia is unmodified. In A.J. 16.393-94 and in B.J. 1.150, Herod brings into an ekklēsia (eis ekklēsia and en ekklēsia, respectively) his son Tero, the barber Tryphon, who along with Alexander, were accused of plotting an insurrection. The laos carried out the execution. In A.J. 15.381 Herod identifies “the multitude” (plēthos) as another instance of Herod’s “General Assembly.” In A.J. 15.381 Herod calls the plēthos together (synkaleō) before initiating work on the Temple Mount. Goldblatt presumes that this plēthos constituted an ekklēsia since the multitude was invited and it played a public role (Monarchic Principle, 115). There is a second, and final, mention of plēthos in Josephus, but Rocca does not mention it (B.J. 1.648-650). According to Goldblatt, Josephus speaks of Herod convening an assembly to judge those accused of being responsible for pulling down the eagle from the entrance to the Temple precincts.

502 Rocca, Herod’s Judea, 266. He surmises that “the Herodian ekklēsia was probably convened ad hoc and consisted entirely of free men of military age, perhaps divided between priests and laymen as in the ekklēsia megalē called by Simon” (Ibid, 266–67).

503 Rocca, Herod’s Judea, 266. Rocca notes that diasporic precedence is provided by the “Ptolemies in Alexandria, who abolished the boulē but conserved the ekklēsia” (Ibid, 266 n. 69). Rocca directs the reader to the study by “Will, Histoire politique du monde hellénistique, II, 440–45, 522–27, 537–39” (Ibid, 266 n. 69).


505 Rocca, Herod’s Judea, 266 n. 71.

506 B.J. 7.412 reads, “but when the principal men (oî πρωτεύοντες) of the [Jewish] senate [in Alexandria] saw what madness they were come to, they thought it no longer safe for themselves to overlook them. So they got all the Jews together to an assembly (ἀθροίσαντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους), and accused the madness of the Sicarii.”
ekklēsia had not existed in Alexandria since before the Julio-Claudian period (29 BCE–68 CE).  

Thus, either Josephus is using Greek ekklēsiai outside of Egypt as his literary template for the Jewish assembly in Alexandria, or he is referring to an actual Jewish assembly that was named ekklēsia. Philo lends credence to the authentic nature of Josephus’ Alexandrian ekklēsia when he speaks of a publicly accessible ekklēsia for Alexandrian Jews that was convened decades earlier (Spec. 1.324–25; pre-45 CE).

Aside from Philo’s works, there is a second reason why Josephus may be historically accurate in his use of ekklēsia for Alexandrian synagogue assemblies. Josephus demonstrates insider knowledge in his description of another Jewish political institution: the gerousia (“senate” or “council”; B.J. 7:412). Both Greeks and Jews in Alexandria had a gerousia as their chief leadership council. The Jewish gerousia was

507 Eleanor G. Huzar, “Alexandria and Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age,” in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, 2.10.1 (ed. H. Temporini; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 619–68, esp. 656–63. Huzar also notes that Augustus disbanded the boulē. Huzar cites PSI 1160 (20/19 BCE) as evidence that a boulē existed prior to Augustus’ conquest of Alexandria (Ibid, 667 n. 202). The Alexandrians sent delegates to Augustus early in his reign (c. 20/19 BCE, perhaps again in 13 CE) to request the reestablishment of the boulē (Ibid, 667). The koina tôn archontôn was the Roman replacement for, but with lesser authority than, the defunct boulē. This council was presided over by a board of the prytaneis, the executive board of the city. Huzar notes that the prytaneis was wholly subservient to the Roman Prefect, with the major officials being directly appointed and the lesser officials closely supervised (Ibid, 661).

508 Spec. 1.324–25 reads, “Thus, knowing that in the assemblies (en tais ekklēsiais) there are not a few worthless persons who steal their way in and remain unobserved in the large numbers which surround them…. ” See further in Part II, §4.1 on Philo’s use of the word ekklesia.

509 Kasher, Alexandrian Jews, 172. Kasher gives a summary of the scholarly status quaestiones on the Alexandrian gerousia. The Greek gerousia was either “a public institution operating mainly in matters of religion which sometimes took part in the administration of the city…[or] a body representing a social organization, such as ‘older citizens’ or ‘younger citizens,’ which at most had some political influence in the life of the city” (Ibid, 172). Huzar concurs and adds that the Greek gerousia had 173 members (“Alexandria and Aegyptum,” 662). Kasher notes that “the important point here is that the Greek community organization in Alexandria had a gerousia, just as the Jewish politeuma had, and in that respect had no advantage. This fact is evidence of isopoliteia that the Jews enjoyed according to Josephus” (Alexandrian Jews, 172). The Jewish gerousia had replaced the office of the ethnarchēs, which was disbanded by Augustus. The Jewish gerousia was comprised of a council of 71 elders (genarchai) who were connected in some fashion with the gymnasia (Phil, In Flacc., 73ff) (Huzar, “Alexandria and Aegyptum,” 661; see also Arnaldo Momigliano, review of S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charles-Worth,
established for the politeuma (“community”) in Alexandria well before Josephus’ account of the sicarii. The Jewish gerousia was formally instituted after the death of their ethnarch (10/11 CE) by decree of Caesar Augustus (12 CE).

By way of overview, Josephus uses all three of the most common synagogue terms: synagōgē, proseuchē, and ekklēsia. Of these, only ekklēsia is never used by Josephus in reference to a physical structure. He uses ekklēsia in reference to public meetings, but not as the self-designation of a semi-public Jewish voluntary association.

3.4. Summary: Ekklēsia and Public Jewish Assemblies

A number of conclusions can be reached with respect to ekklēsia occurrences in Judith, 1 Maccabees, Ben Sira, and the writings of Josephus. With respect to the Hellenistic-era writings (Judith, 1 Maccabees, Ben Sira), three conclusions seem
warranted. First, each mentions a public gathering in Judea which was called *ekklēsia*. These *ekklēsiai* appear to have addressed the political, juridical, and possibly religious concerns of regionally defined communities.  

Second, 1 Maccabees (4:59; 14:19) and Sirach (50:13, 20) are alone in their use of *ekklēsia* as a temporary collective designation for Jews during the time in which they are gathered in assembly. Third, *ekklēsia* is used in *etic* fashion in Judith wherein a Judean *ekklēsia*, which is contemporaneous with the author, appears to be retrojected into the narrative timeframe of 8th century BCE events. Sirach uses *ekklēsia* when ostensibly describing some early 2nd century BCE public Judean synagogue institutions. In reality, however, this practice may reflect a Seleucid-era Judean institution named *ekklēsia*, one that is contemporaneous, at the very least, with the translation of the Hebrew text of Ben Sira into Greek (132 BCE).

A public Jewish synagogue institution appears to have continued within Judea well into the 1st century CE, at least insofar as the witness of Josephus is concerned, although it is possible that he is using *ekklēsia* in *etic* fashion for the benefit of his Greco-Roman reading audience. The interrelationship between each of the three synagogue terms found within Josephus’ writings (*synagōgē, proseuchē, ekklēsia*) can be encapsulated as follows: Josephus’ *ekklēsiai* may have been constituted within a *proseuchē* or a *synagōgē* after being convened by the leadership of a local *synagōgē*. As is the case with Judith, 1 Maccabees, and Ben Sira, in Josephus’ writings the word *ekklēsia* does not refer to a physical structure,  while *synagōgē* can. In the Jewish

---

516 The practice in the LXX of using *ekklēsia* only to indicate assemblies of people, and not the physical structures within which those people meet, is consistent with Greek *praxis* in the Classical, Hellenistic and Imperial periods. In Part I (*Ekklēsia* in Greek and Roman Sources), I note that the word
writings studied thus far, a consistent pattern repeats itself: the gathered community of Jews, known as *synagōgē*, make decisions relative to local administrative, judicial, social, and religious matters during the course of a public *ekklēsia* gathering.

*ekklēsia* did not identify physical structures within which the *ekklēsia* met. The *ekklēsia* met in locations such as the agora (Athens), the Pnyx (Athens), or the *ekklēsiasterion* (Priene).
4. Ekklēsia and Non-Civic Jewish Institutions

In the Jewish sources examined thus far, a public ekklēsia has primarily been in view. In this section, usages of the word ekklēsia for semi-public Jewish synagogue communities will be examined. Both Ben Sira and Philo mention cultically-focused synagogue associations, but as will be seen, only Philo designates one as an ekklēsia.

4.1. Egyptian Jewish Non-Civic Groups Named Ekklēsia? (Philo)

Philo uses the word ekklēsia twenty-three times. Nineteen ekklēsia occurrences are set within the context of Israel’s desert wanderings, with fifteen of those referring directly or indirectly to the giving of the law in Deuteronomy 23. Du Toit views these fifteen ekklēsia references as “self-evident designations… [with] a cultic connotation.”

---

517 As one who dedicated himself to the life of a “scribe” (Prologue, 39:1-11), Ben Sira invites his less educated readers to “draw near to me, you who are uneducated, and lodge in the house of instruction” (51:23; ἐγγίσατε πρὸς με, ἀπαίδευτοι, καὶ ἀσπίζετε ἐν οίκῳ παιδείας) for the purpose of Torah education (51:24-28). The Greek phrase translated “house of instruction” (οἰκὸς παιδείας) derives from the Hebrew phrase beit midrash. Ben Sira’s description of what appears to be a dedicated structure for religious education presages later rabbinic usage of the same phrase (“house of study/learning”) to identify the structures within which they facilitated Torah education. In m. Ter. 11:10 the bet hamidrash may very well be a building, which brings Runesson to claim that “the rabbis and their predecessors…[were] a voluntary association whose institution was the bet hamidrash” (Origins of the Synagogue, 486; see also 223–34; cf. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 105). Runesson claims that the community which meets in Sirach’s “house of instruction” reflects “the earliest evidence for this type of institution [Jewish voluntary association] in the land” of Israel (Origins of the Synagogue, 314, 318).

518 Philo speaks of Essenes (Judea) and Theraputae (Egypt) “because they are models of Judaism according to his ideals” (see Hypothetica 11, 18 and Prob. 88–91) (Peder Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus [CRINT II; ed. M. E. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984], 233–82, esp. 248). For Philo, the Essenes are ideal examples of the practical life, and the Theraputae of the contemplative life (Borgen, “Philo,” 248). For a fuller discussion of areas of agreement between Essenes and Theraputae, see Samuel Sandmel, Philo’s Place in Judaism (New York: Ktav, 1972), 194–96. One essential contrast is that, unlike the Essenes, the Theraputae allowed women a role in cultic activities, at least insofar as their presence in Sabbath meetings would seem to indicate (De Vita Contempl. 32 f). The Theraputae read “twice every day, at morning and at evening…and the interval between…they take up the sacred scriptures and philosophize concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy” (De Vita Contempl. 27–28).

with only one being used of a local congregation (Virt. 108). In this Philo maintains the emphasis of LXX Deuteronomy 23 in which “the focus shifted to the group who attended these meetings.” Du Toit disavows the possibility that Philo’s nineteen ekklēsia references to the Israel of the desert tradition, including the ekklēsia in Virt. 108, indicate a contemporary Jewish synagogue community or meeting. The final four of Philo’s twenty-three ekklēsia mentions refer to other incidents during the Exodus. These four do not refer to ethno-religious Israel. Du Toit rightly identifies three as only speaking of “public meetings in the Greek sense,” not of ancient or contemporary Jewish

520 Du Toit states, though, that irrespective of the localized use of ekklēsia in Virt. 108, “there seems to be a correlation between the local Jewish community and the Jewish people as a whole. To join a local ἐκκλησία means becoming a part of the Jewish people” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 137). Another one of Philo’s nineteen cultic references (Her. 251) may indicate a synagogue assembly within which the words of the Exodus account are being read: “And, again, in Exodus, in the ekklēsia, [we read]” (καὶ ἐν Ἑξαγωγῇ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν).

521 Du Toit, “Paulus Oecumenicus,” 137 [author’s emphasis]. Du Toit claims that in LXX Deut 23 the ekklēsia kyriou is “understood as a closed group with boundary markers and entrance requirements… the ἐκκλησία κυρίου is no longer a one-off assembly; it has acquired a permanent existence of its own and the meeting aspect has become supplementary” (Ibid, 135). He also cites a similar semantic development in LXX Neh 13:1-3 where “separating those of foreign descent from the ἐκκλησία actually means excommunication from the people of Israel” (Ibid, 135).

522 Du Toit, “Paulus Oecumenicus,” 136. Direct or indirect references to Deuteronomy 23 are found in Conf. 144(2x); Deus 111; Ebr. 213(2x); Leg. 3.8, 81(2x); Migr. 69; Mut. 204; Post 177; Somn. 2.184, 187; Spec. 1.325; Virt. 108. Of these, five contain direct quotations from Deut 23 (Conf. 144; Ebr. 213; Leg. 3.81; Post. 177; Somn. 2.184; cf. Virt. 106). Exodus references occur in: Dec. 32, 45; Her. 251; and Post. 143. The fact that the LXX translates qāhāl with ekklēsia only beginning in Deuteronomy and there only for the assembly of the nation of Israel as they hear God speak at Mount Horeb (e.g., Deut 4:10; “the day of the ekklēsia”) serves implicitly to reinforce one of Philo’s ideological goals—to establish Moses, the author of Torah, as the philosopher par excellence in whose footsteps later Greek philosophers follow (Philo states, for example, that Moses “had reached the very summit of philosophy” and “had learnt from the oracles of God the most numerous and important of the principles of nature” [Op. 8]). By ascribing an ekklēsia identity to the nation under Moses’ leadership, the LXX serendipitously locates Moses’ Israel, at least insofar as Philo’s ideological agenda is concerned, as a precursor for later Greek poleis which adopt ekklēsia as the title for their civic assemblies. Given that Torah is Philo’s perfect examplar upon which all true philosophy is built, including that of the later Greek philosophers, and that 19 of Philo’s 23 ekklēsia references are to the Israel in the desert which receives that Torah, then Philo’s Moses can be said doubly to presage later Greek culture. If, as I will argue, Philo’s ekklēsia in Virt. 108 is a contemporary non-civic group in Alexandria which prioritizes Torah instruction for Egyptian proselytes, then Philo’s Hellenized depiction of Moses derives not simply from an ideological agenda, but ostensibly also from a socio-historical reality.
assemblies. The fourth (Aet. 13) refers to the Platonic conception of a “divine assembly” of the gods.

Philo’s awareness of ekklēsia terminology not only stems from his familiarity with the LXX, nor only from his awareness of ekklēsiai in Greek poleis other than Alexandria. Philo seems to have had first-hand experience of an ekklēsia and of at least two other Jewish governance models in Alexandria: the gerousia and the purported “great synagogue.” Runesson, Binder and Olsson posit that three of Philo’s ekklēsia mentions refer to a contemporary, local Jewish group in Egypt which designates either its meeting or the community itself as an ekklēsia (Virt. 108, Spec. 1.324-25, Deus 111).

Scholarly opinion is divided, though, as to whether the three ekklēsia references are

---

523 Du Toit, “Paulus Oecumenicus,” 136. In Abr. 20, Prob. 138, and Spec. 2.44, Philo recounts political institutions among Greco-Roman poleis of his day, excluding Alexandria: (Abr. 20) “the bad man runs about through the market-place, and theatres, and courts of justice [dikastēria] and council halls [bouleutēria], and assemblies [ekklēsias], and every meeting [syllogon] and collection of men [thiason anthropōn]”; (Spec. 2.44) “in all the cities which they inhabit, avoid all courts of justice [dikastēria], and council halls [bouleutēria], and market-places [agoras], and places of assembly [ekklēsias]”; (Prob. 138) “for what other object are councils [boulai] and assemblies [ekklēsiai] convened nearly every day.”

524 Aet. 13 reads, “some say that the world has been proved by Plato in the Timaeus to be both uncreated and indestructible, in the account of that divine assembly [dia tēs theoprepous ekklēsias] in which the younger gods are addressed by the eldest and the governor of them all.”

525 Within the context of asking “what other object have Greece and the nations of the barbarians ever had in all the continual seditions and wars,” Philo answers “for what other object are councils (boulai) and assemblies (ekklēsiai) convened nearly every day, rather than about freedom” (Prob. 138).

526 Josephus also makes mention of an Alexandrian gerousia (B.J. 7.412; hoi prōteuontes tēs gerousia).

527 See Levine’s discussion of Philo’s mention of “the largest and most magnificent [synagogue] in the city” of Alexandria (Embassy, 134) (Ancient Synagogue, esp. 90–96). Philo (Embassy, 133) mentions that the synagogue was “lavishly decorated with, inter alia, insignia, shields, golden crowns, stelae, and inscriptions honoring emperors” (Levine, Ancient Synagogue, 90). The specific phrase “great synagogue” is used of the Alexandrian synagogue only in late antique writings such as Tosefta Sukkah 4.6 and Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah 5.1, 55 A-B. The Tosefta describes the main hall with the basilica-style term dyplastoon (a stoa within a stoa, or double stoa) (see Levine, Ancient Synagogue, 92–93). For rabbinic evidence on the great synagogue in Alexandria, see George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era–The Age of Tannaim (Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1930), 3.91f.

528 The full citations, respectively, are On Virtue (De virtutibus) 108, The Special Laws (De specialibus legibus) book 1, sections 324–25, and That God is Immutable (Deus ist immutabilis) 111. See ASSB, nos. 201–203 (esp. see each of the “Comments” sections).
simply part of Philo’s historical narrative on the Israel of the desert wanderings (e.g., LXX Deut 23) or whether they refer to actual institutions contemporaneous with Philo. I begin my analysis with Virt. 108, a passage most consistently identified by scholars as designating a Jewish non-civic institution in Alexandria during Philo’s day.

4.1.1. De virtutibus 108

In Virt. 108 Philo refers back to Deut 23:8, 9 on how sojourners are to be treated, specifically new converts.

If any of them should wish to pass over into the Jewish community [τὴν Ἰουδαίων πολιτείαν], they must not be spurned with an unconditional refusal as children of enemies, but be so favoured that the third generation is invited to the congregation [εἰς ἐκκλησίαν] and made partakers in the divine revelations [λόγων θείων] to which also the native born, whose lineage is beyond reproach, are rightfully admitted.\footnote{\textit{ASSB}, no. 203; translation by Runesson, Binder and Olsson.}

Two questions arise. First, is Philo’s rewritten citation of LXX Deut 23:8, 9 meant as instruction for his contemporary audience?\footnote{LXX Deut 23:8, 9 reads, οὐ βδελύξῃ ἴδιοματι, ὅτι ἰδιερός σοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ βδελύξῃ ἀγνότου, ὅτι πάροικος ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ, οὐι ἐὰν γεννηθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, γενεὰ τρίτη εἰςελεύσονται εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου. A translation of MT Deut 23:7, 8 (NRSV) reads, “You shall not abhor any of the Edomites, for they are your kin. You shall not abhor any of the Egyptians, because you were an alien residing in their land. The children of the third generation that are born to them may be admitted to the assembly of the Lord.”} If so, then, second, is Philo’s \textit{ekklēsia} in Virt. 108 a public meeting of all Jews within a specific section of, say, the Delta quarter, or does it refer to the collective designation of a Jewish voluntary association? In order to address these two questions, the immediate literary context of Virt. 108 and its relationship to Philo’s political theory bear investigation. Philo’s \textit{De Virtutibus} has four component parts: On Courage (1–50), On Philanthropy (51–174), On Repentance (175–186), and On Nobility (187–227). \textit{Virt.} 108 is found within the section of On Nobility.
entitled On Philanthropy (also called “On Humanity”). Therein, Philo argues that “humanity is the virtue closest to piety and is its sister, and even its twin (Virt. 51).”

Virt. 108 concludes a topic begun at Virt. 80—philanthropia (“love of people,” “charity”). Three types of people are considered worthy of Jewish philanthropia: members of the same nation (hoi homoethneis), incomers (hoi epēlutai), and settlers (hoi metoikoi). Philo appears to use the term hoi epēlutai (incomers) in reference to proselytes: “abandoning their kinsfolk by blood, their country, their customs and the temple and images of their gods…they have taken the journey to a better home…to the worship of the one and truly existing God” (Virt. 102). This Philonic concern for the acceptance of proselytes is also mirrored by Josephus (Ag. Ap. 2:261). Philo enjoins love for the third group called metoikoi as well. As foreigners (metoikoi) living in a land that is not their own, they live in an alien state (Virt. 105), just as Israel also once did in Egypt.

In Virt. 102–108 Philo narrows his focus to one specific ethnic group—the Egyptians. He quotes LXX Deut 23:8 as a rationale for showing philanthropia to Egyptians (Virt. 106): “you shall not abhor an Egyptian because you were a sojourner in Egypt.” In Virt. 108 he again refers to Deut 23:8 but this time on how to treat one very

532 For a fuller discussion on Philo’s use of oἱ ἔπηλόται for proselytes see Peter Borgen, Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time (NovTSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 256–259. See also, Sandmel who mentions, without any apparent need for argumentation, that Virt. 102–104 “speaks of proselytes” (Philo of Alexandria, 71). Walter T. Wilson situates Virt. 108 in the context of Borgen’s comments on Philo’s three-fold conversionist paradigm (Borgen, Philo of Alexandria, 208–216). Wilson states that Philo’s use of the phrase “passing over” and his concept of repentance entails conversion and includes “three basic components: the acceptance of monotheism, moral reform, and a new identity predicted on one’s relationship to God” (Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues [PACS 3; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011], 362–63).
specific subset of Egyptians. He entreats his Jewish readership to focus their 
philanthropia upon the ostensibly new converts to their community.

How much warrant, in fact, is there for postulating a contemporary referent for 
Philo’s ekklēsia in Virt. 108? Some scholars, while conceding that Virt. 108 refers to a 
localized group, identify that group only as a local congregation of Israel during the 
desert wanderings. By contrast, Walter T. Wilson, in his seminal study of De 
Virtutibus, presumes a contemporary readership when translating Virt. 108. His 
primary rationale for such a translation derives from what Klaus Berger has already 
oberved. Given that the word ekklēsia occurs in obvious parallelism both with 
Egyptian converts and with the phrase pros tēn Ioudaiōn politeian, and since the word 
politeia is not used in LXX Deuteronomy for the Israelites in the desert, it is probable 
that Philo is writing about the politeia of his Jewish contemporaries in Alexandria.

This, then, also makes Philo’s references to an ekklēsia and to Egyptian converts 
contemporary commentary. Peder Borgen too is of this opinion. He categorically states 
that “it is evident that Philo does not only refer to the Laws of Moses as such, but that he 
also applies Deut 23:8 to the concrete Jewish community in his own time, since he writes 
‘into the community of Jews (πρὸς τὴν ἱούδαϊ̣̣ν πολιτείαν).’” Samuel Sandmel also

---

and Paul Trebilco, “Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?” NTS 57 (2011): 440–460, 
estp. 448.

534 Wilson translates Virt. 108 as: “And if any of them should want to cross over to the Jewish 
polity, they are not to be scorned unyieldingly like the children of enemies, but are to be treated in such a 
manner that the third generation is invited into the congregation and granted that share of the divine oracles 
into which the native- and noble-born are also rightfully initiated” (Philo of Alexandria, 65).


536 Borgen, Philo of Alexandria, 249. Kåre Fuglseth concurs. He writes that “when it comes to the 
admitting of new participants of the Jewish community in Alexandria, Philo argues that Egyptians who
agrees, but for different reasons. He notes “two curious factors of omission” in Philo’s political discussions: (1) the political affairs in Judea (e.g., Maccabeans, Herod the Great); and (2) David as king. Given Philo’s silence on both points, Sandmel infers that “Philo is concerned more with the situation of the Jewish community in Alexandria as part of a unique politeuma than with the Judean situation and experience.”

Aside from Philo’s reference to Egyptian converts and to “the Jewish polity” (tên Ioudaiôn politeian), four other factors suggest contemporary commentary in Virt. 108. First, Philo makes a syntactical change from his base text of LXX Deut 23. He removes the adjectival qualifier kyriou from the phrase eis ekklēsian. The ambiguity of this simpler phrase would have allowed Philo’s readership to assume that a contemporary institution (ekklēsia), not necessarily only the assembly of Israel in the desert (ekklēsian kyriou), was in view. This reading strategy is probable given that there is no inherent contradiction between ancient peoples’ understanding of ekklēsia as an historic or as a
contemporary institution; they did not possess a historical-critical perspective.\textsuperscript{540} Thus, Philo’s readers would have thought of their own contemporary ekklēsia when they read of the ekklēsia in the desert. For them, the former was in continuity with the latter.

Second, in contrast to LXX Deut 23, Philo emphasizes the local, rather than the supra-local nature, of the ekklēsia in Virt. 108.\textsuperscript{541} Third, Philo makes contemporary commentary in at least one other place within the literary context for Virt. 108, that is, within On Philanthropy (Virt. 80–108). Oppenheimer views Philo’s mention of Temple tithes needing to be paid to the priest (Virt. 95) as being an implicit commentary on Jewish practice current in Philo’s day. In Spec. 1.156, however, Philo makes clear that he is aware that ancient Hebrews did not tithe to priests. Therein, he correctly states that their tithe was directed to the Levites.\textsuperscript{542} Fourth, Runesson, Binder and Olsson claim that the “instruction” mentioned in Virt. 108 implies contemporary Alexandrian praxis:

The natives of the land, who were descendants of God’s people, had the right to be instructed in divine words. The verb hierophanteisthai means ‘to be initiated in, to be instructed in.’ The sojourners received the same right. The formulation is reminiscent of Philo’s descriptions of the activities in the prayer halls.\textsuperscript{543}

\textsuperscript{540} With respect to Greek “history,” in the Introduction to their recent edited volume, John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver state that classicists are now less interested in “what actually happened and more in what the Greeks believed to have happened” and how such beliefs affected contemporary social identity construction and socio-political developments (Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians [ELS 6; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012], 12). In his review of this volume, Bernd Steinbock concurs. He claims that “the last three decades have seen a sharp rise in studies which seek to situate the accounts of the Greek historians within their contemporary ideological and communicative framework” (review of John Marincola, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, and Calum Alasdair Maciver, eds., Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians, BMCR 2013.10.53).

\textsuperscript{541} Du Toit notes that there seems to be “a correlation between the local Jewish community and the Jewish people as a whole [such that] to join a local ἐκκλησία means becoming part of the Jewish people” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 136–37).


\textsuperscript{543} Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 263.
If one allows that Philo is speaking of a contemporary institution in *Virt.* 108, then a second question arises: Is the *ekklēsia* therein a meeting of Alexandrian Jews which is publicly accessible, a semi-public meeting of a voluntary association, or a collective designation for a voluntary association? The text by itself is ambiguous. What is clear, though, is that Philo’s *ekklēsia* in *Virt.* 108 has one essential characteristic. It is a forum for ethno-religious activity and its practice of “initiating” sojourners within an *ekklēsia* is congruent with religious activities in prayer halls that Philo describes elsewhere.

The binding nature of this new religious identity for Egyptian converts finds reinforcement in another syntactical change made by Philo to his base text. He changes the verb of entry/initiation from *eiserchomai* (LXX Deut 23:8) to *kalēo* (*Virt.* 108). The compound form *eiserchomai* (LXX Deut 23:8) is not paired with the word *ekklēsia* in Greek inscriptions, only the related compound forms *eperchomai* and *synerchomai* are. Philo follows the more common practice found in Greek literary sources, and in at least one extant inscription, wherein *kalēo* is juxtaposed with *ekklēsia*. Semantically, *kalēo* carries with it the sense of a legal summons to an official judicial or legislative body.

---

544 As is to be expected, when the compound verb *eperchomai* occurs with a preposition, it is *epi* not *eis*. Only one extant inscription pairs the anarthrous prepositional phrase *eis ekkλεισια* with an *erchomai* compound verb. In this case, however, it is *synerchomai*, not the *eiserchomai* of Philo’s base text (LXX Deut 23:8, 9). *IEph 1383/Ephesos* 149 (Ionia, found at Ephesos) is a decree of the *boulē* and *dēmos* of Ephesos concerning the celebration of holidays. It reads, καὶ ταχύν συνελθόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ θυσίας (καὶ μηνιόν ἐπικαλουμένας ἡμέρας ἀγαθᾶς στεφανοφοροῦντων κα[―]) [― συνφέροντος. See Josef Keil’s discussion in *JOAI* 30.1-2 (1937):197–200.

545 The simple verb *καλέω* is collocated with *ekklēsia* in: Diod. Sic. 15.75.1; Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.14.2; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.6; and Thucydides, *Pelop.* War, 8, 97. The compound verb *syγκαλέω* is used by Polybius when describing the convening of an ἐκκλησία of the army by one of its generals (*Hist.* 11.27.5).

546 LSJ, “καλέω,” A.4, “as a law-term, summon…before court”: Dem. 19.211 (καλεῖν ἓν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον); A.1, “call, summon”: Homer, *Od.* 1.90 (εἰς ἄφρην καλέσαντα); II.10.195 (δοει κεκλήτο βουλήν). LSJ cites Richard C. Jebb who notes that, “the Homeric βουλή consists, not of all the chiefs, but of a select number, specially summoned” (*Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments, with critical notes,*
especially when paired with the word *ekklēsia*. The sole inscriptionsal example of this formula also speaks of a summons before a legislative body. Josephus replicates this syntactical formula in his use of both the simple and compound forms of *kalēo* in contexts where an *ekklēsia* is legally convened by a community representative.

If Philo intentionally juxtaposes *kalēo* with *ekklēsia* due to the resultant forensic connotation, then his clause *kalein te eis ekklēsian* carries with it a legislative force that reinforces the permanent nature of Egyptian proselytes’ membership in the *ekklēsia*.

This *ekklēsia* is not simply a semi-public voluntary association. The legal force of *kalēo* implies that the *ekklēsia* in Virt. 108 is an official collective, whether a meeting or a non-civic group, that represents the *politeia* of Alexandrian Jews for the purpose of providing


547 Compound verbs forms of *kalēo* (παρακαλέω and ἐπικαλέω), when paired with the word ἐκκλησία, also signify official civic occasions. Only παρακαλέω, however, functions as a verb of entrance/initiation, and then only once (IG XII.3 1270; παρακαληθεὶς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν κοινεῖν συνετέλεσαι [δ]ιὰ τὰ ἐργα ἐπαγγέλατο καὶ συνετέλεσε). Of the other eight inscriptions which juxtapose παρακαλέω with an *ekklēsia* reference, five use παρακαλέω in the more restrictive sense of exhorting or encouraging a person who has already entered the *ekklēsia* (ἐπέρχομαι) to enact a specific course of action (e.g., IMT SuedlTroas 579; ἐπελθὼν ἐπ’ ἐκκλησίαν παρακαλέσαι φίλους ὄντας). Of these five inscriptions, four pair παρακαλέω with ἐπέρχομαι (Miletos 26, Teos 40, Tit. Calymnii Test. XIII, IMT SuedlTroas 579) and one with συνέρχομαι (IEph 1383). The verb ἐπικαλέω is juxtaposed with *ekklēsia* in I Eph 1383/Epheosos 149 (καὶ τανὸν συνελθόντος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ θυσίας —) [— μὴν ἡς ἐπικαλομένας ημέρας ἄγαθὰς στεφανηφόρουν καὶ[—] — συνφέροντος).

548 *IDid* 314/Didyma 472 (Ionia, no city mentioned, 2nd cent. BCE(?)); ἐπιτελέσασα δὲ καὶ τοὺς κόσμους ταῖς τε γυναιξί καὶ παρθένοις εὐαρέστως, καλέσασα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ [τὰς γυναῖκας].

Regarding potential definitions of *kalēo*, LSJ notes that it can be used “as law-term, summon, of the judge, καλεῖν τινας ἐς τὸ δικαστήριον, cite or summon before the court, D.19.211, etc.; simply καλεῖν ib.212, Ar.V.851, etc.” (I. 4.).

549 *A.J.* 7.370 (συνκαλέω; David calls the ruler of the Hebrews together into assembly); 13.216 (καλέω; Joseph, the nephew of Onias the high priest, convened an *ekklēsia* at the Temple, in which “the multitude” [πλῆθος] confirmed him as their ambassador to the Ptolemaic king).

550 While Philo pairs καλεῖν with ἐκκλησία, at least two Greek literary works pair καλεῖν/κάλεον with two other Greek civic institutions: the *boulē* (Homer *Od*. 10.197; αὐτοὶ γὰρ κάλεσαν συμμετάσχατι [see βουλή in 10.195]) and the *dikastērion* (Dem. 19.211, 212; for the functions of *dikastērion* see n. 109).
ethno-religious instruction.\footnote{Virt. 108ab reads, “a share of the divine words…being instructed in the will of God.”} This being the case, then Philo acknowledges the possibility not only that individual Egyptians converted to the politeia of the Alexandrian Jews, but that, coincidental with their new dyadic identity, they became part of a local socio-religious sub-group, one which either self-designates as ekklēsia or, at the very least, designates its public or semi-public meeting as an ekklēsia.

4.1.2. De specialibus legibus (The Special Laws) 1.324–25

Spec. 1.324–25 is the second place in Philo’s works where Runesson, Binder and Olsson suggest that contemporaneous reference is made to a Jewish ekklēsia:

Thus, knowing that in assemblies (ekklēsiai) there are not a few worthless persons who steal their way in and remain unobserved in the large numbers which surround them, it [the law] guards against this danger by precluding all the unworthy from entering the holy congregation (hieros syllogos).\footnote{Translated by Runesson, Binder and Olsson (ASSB, no. 210).}

The first question to ask is whether Philo is referring here to ancient practice or to a contemporary situation? Philo’s differentiation of ekklēsia from the hieros syllogos (“holy congregation”) parallels the Hebrew Bible’s differentiation of the assembly of ancient Israelites (qhl) from the holy congregation (qhl or ‘dh) known as “Israel.” This could imply that ancient practice is here being replicated.

There is other evidence, though, which favours a contemporary referent for the ekklēsiai of Spec. 1.324–25. Borgen notes that Spec. 1.324 begins Philo’s discussion of who is to be left out of communal life. Among others, Philo lists sexual deviants (Deut 23:1–2) and polytheists.\footnote{Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that Philo creates five classes of men who, based on his allegorical interpretation of LXX Deut 23, are to be excluded from the hieros syllogos: “(1) deniers of the Platonic Forms or Ideas, (2) atheists, (3) polytheists, (4) those who rely on the human mind, or (5) those
contemporary situation in mind” in the fact that Philo concludes section one of *Special Laws* with the phrase “we, the pupils and disciples of Moses” (*Spec. 1.345*). If Philo’s “we” includes his contemporary readership, then to what Alexandrian institution might the word *ekklēsiai* refer? Since a civic *ekklēsia* did not appear to exist in Alexandria during the Julio-Claudian era, it is problematic to identify Philo’s reference to *ekklēsiai* with Greco-Roman public assemblies. It seems more probable that Philo uses *ekklēsia* terminology in *Spec. 1.324* either to explain to a Greco-Roman audience how a Jewish synagogue meeting works or to speak of an actual Jewish institution in Alexandria.

Du Toit suggests that Philo’s *ekklēsiai* are publicly accessible Jewish political assemblies. George H. van Kooten follows suit, but adds a disclaimer: “Philo refers to the political *ekklēsia* as a counter-example to the synagogue.” In other words, van Kooten bifurcates the two terms and seems to imply thereby that they represent two mutually exclusive institutions, one for political purposes (*ekklēsia*) and one for religious concerns (*hieros syllogos*). He sees the public nature of the “political *ekklēsia*” implied who rely only on the human senses, making gods of them and forgetting the truly living God” (see also *Spec. 3.344*) (*Ancient Synagogue*, 260).

---


555 See n. 507.

556 Du Toit states that, “*Abr. 20; Prob. 138* and *Spec. 1.325; 2.44* refer to public meetings in the Greek sense” (“*Paulus Oecumenicus*,” 136). For example, *Abr. 20* reads, in part, δικαστήρια βουλευτήρια τε καὶ ἐκκλησίας καὶ πάντα συλλογον καὶ θίασον ἀνθρώπων.

557 George H. van Kooten allows that only the *ekklēsia* in *Spec. 1.324–25* is a contemporaneous institution. He claims that *Deus* 111 and *Virt. 108* only “adopt the *ekklēsia* terminology from the LXX but do not prove that their authors technically described the Jewish synagogue meeting as an ἐκκλησία” (“*Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*: The ‘Church of God’ and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire. A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley,” *NTS* 58/4 [Oct. 2012]: 522–48, esp. 535).

558 By “counter-example,” van Kooten means that “whereas the political ἐκκλησίας are in practice open to all since access cannot be controlled, the holy congregation [i.e., synagogue community] should take precautions so that all of the unworthy are precluded from entering” (“*Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*,” 535).

559 Van Kooten, “*Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*,” 535.
in the fact that the unworthy can enter it. By contrast the semi-public nature of the
‘religious’ *hieros syllogos* is evident in the fact that this communal gathering has
membership restrictions (‘all the unworthy [are precluded] from entering’; *Spec.* 1.325).\(^{560}\)

If I have read van Kooten correctly, then his dichotomy suffers on four fronts.
First, a purely political *ekklēsia* did not exist in antiquity. One cannot bifurcate “politics”
and “religion” in respect of ancient governance institutions. Second, a “political” (i.e.,
civic) *ekklēsia* did not exist in Philo’s Alexandria. Third, if Philo’s *ekklēsia* is a Jewish
institution, then, *de facto*, it cannot be a “counter-example” to the synagogue. In fact, if
this Egyptian *ekklēsia* is analogous to Josephus’ Judean *ekklēsiai* then, at the very least, it
is a publicly accessible synagogue assembly wherein communal needs relative to local
politics, religion, jurisprudence, administration, social life, and economics can be
addressed. Josephus seems to imply the existence of such an Alexandrian synagogue
assembly when he mentions that the *gerousia* convened an *ekklēsia* there after the fall of
Masada. It addressed at least one communal socio-political need: safety and security (*B.J.*
7:412). Fourth, Runesson, Binder, and Olsson suggest that Philo may be using *ekklēsia*
and *hieros syllogos* as two descriptors for one Jewish religio-political assembly. Given

\(^{560}\) Another basis upon which van Kooten could have differentiated the *ekklēsia* from a semi-
public group is by virtue of the large numbers of people who are said to have gathered *en tais ekklēsiais*.
The large numbers of this group runs counter to the average size of a Greco-Roman voluntary association,
which Philip Harland says usually numbered from 10 to 50 (*Dynamics of Identity*, 26). A notable exception
to the small size of most voluntary associations is the 2nd cent. CE association headed by Pompeia
Agrippinilla. She is a priestess of Dionysus from Toree Nova in the Roman West. Her group consists of
400 Dionysian “initiates” (*mystai*) (*IGUR* 160; c. 160 CE). They are almost entirely ‘household’ members,
whether familial or servile (*Dynamics of Identity*, 26 and 32; see also, idem, *Associations*, 30). For a
detailed discussion of *IGUR* 160, see Bradley H. McLean, “The Agrippinilla Inscription: Religious
Associations and Early Church Formation,” in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of
Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd* (JSNTSup 86; ed. B. H. McLean; Sheffield:
Sheffield Academic, 1993), 239–70.
Philo’s ascription of a sacred nature (*hieros*) to the “congregation” (*syllogos*), they conclude, in line with Berger, that “ekklēsia and the synonymous *syllogos*…[probably] refer to some form of synagogue fellowship,” that is, Sabbath assembly.561

The translation of *hieros syllogos* as “holy congregation” by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson perhaps allows one more conclusion: Philo’s *hieros syllogos* is not simply a communal gathering (“Sabbath assembly”) but a communal designation. If so, then *Spec.* 1.324–25 may imply that a voluntary association known as *hieros syllogos* sponsored meetings (*en tais ekklēsiais*) which were publicly accessible to local Jews. This scenario accounts for two paradoxical facts: there are participants in the meetings (*ekklēsiai*) who are in an unworthy state (e.g., atheists, polytheists),562 yet participation in the synagogue association is only available to the worthy.563

---


562 See n. 553 for the identities of the five classes of men who Philo claims should be excluded from the “holy congregation” of Deut 23.

563 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that “The Greek words *hieros syllogos* (without definite article) could also be translated as ‘a holy congregation.’ Philo often returns to this allegorical interpretation of Deut 23 frequently using the word *ekklēsia* and sometimes also *syllogos*” (*Ancient Synagogue*, 260). By translating *hieros syllogos* as “a holy congregation,” Runesson, Binder, and Olsson remove the impression that *hieros syllogos* is a sub-category of *ekklēsia*.
My analysis of *Virt.* 108 and *Spec.* 1.324–25 suggests the conclusion that *ekklēsiai* functioned complementarily with three other Jewish religio-political governance institutions in Alexandria: *gerousia, proseuchē,* and *synagōgē.* What jurisdictional niche might Philo’s *ekklēsiai* have fulfilled? By the time of the pogrom (38 CE), Alexandria, not least the Delta quarter, had a sizeable concentration of Jews. Given their numbers, one would expect that a multi-layered administrative system was in place. S. R. Llewelyn follows the majority view that the Jewish *politeuma* (“community”) was given oversight by a *gerousia,* which functioned as an oversight council for several synagogues:

its power [is] notorial (supervision of contracts), judicial (settlement of disputes) and administrative (application of government legislation to Jewish courts). However, the powers of the *gerousia* were not limited to these spheres; it might also police dissent within the community, send envoys to a ruler to represent its interests and vote honours to a benefactor.

A governance system in which a body of community leaders (e.g., *gerousia*) oversees multiple synagogue communities in some sort of “federal” system finds later attestation in an Egyptian *polis* well south of Memphis (*CPJ* 2.432; 113 CE). It is called Arsinoë, and also known as Crocodilopolis. Aryeh Kasher notes that a Jewish synagogue existed there since “the early days of the Ptolemaic settlement program.” In an official report to Arsinoë’s auditor on municipal water usage, two Jewish institutions are

---

564 *Flacc.* 55; B.J. 2.495. Josephus states that the Delta quarter was near the palace and bordered on the sea (*C. Ap.* 2.33-36).  
566 Kasher states that the existence of a synagogue in Arsinoë is “definitely proven by a dedicatory inscription in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes I and his family from a local synagogue (*CPJ* 3.1532A=SB, 8939)” (*Alexandrian Jews,* 138). See n. 366 for further details on one inscription and two papyrii from Crocodilopolis within which occur two synagogue terms, *proseuchē* and *synagōgē* (*CIJ* III.1532A=JIGRE 117; *CPJ* I.129; *CPJ* I.134). A 2nd century CE papyrus from Arsinoë–Crocodilopolis affirms the continued existence of *proseuchai* in that region (*CPJ* 2.432=P.Lond. III 1177; 113 CE).
mentioned as owing twice the monthly amount that was charged to a nearby bath house. 567 The one institution is called “synagogue of the Thebans.”568 The other is simply called eucheion.569 Kasher claims that “the distinction made suggests that the local Jews at the time were organized into two landsmannschaft-type bodies, one of people from Thebes (Diospolic Magna) and the other probably of local people.”570

The interrelationship between these two synagogue organizations varies depending on how one translates archontōn Ioudaiōn proseuchēs (line 57). Kasher favours the translation: “from the Jewish archontes for the synagogue of the Thebans…and similarly for the prayer house.”571 This identifies the Jewish community of Arsinoē as being, what Kasher calls, a “federative organisation.”572 Llewelyn nuances Kasher’s position. He presumes that “each synagogue or local Jewish community had its own council of elders, and that a federation of councils had a common executive board or committee, the archons.”573 He forwards papyrological (P. Monac. III 49) and literary sources as evidence for an administrative division of roles.574 Llewelyn states that “the

567 Runesson, Binder, and Olson, Ancient Synagogue, 192. They conclude that “the high fees imply elevated water usage—and thus present possible evidence for the observance of ritual ablutions in or near these structures” (Ibid, 192).
568 Προσεθχ θηβαίων (CIJ 2.432, line 57; see ASSB, no. 149).
569 CPJ 2.432, line 60. The word εὐχείον implies a place of prayer, not unlike the term proseuchē.
Runesson, Binder, and Olson observe that this is the only extant use of this term for a Jewish community (Ancient Synagogue, 328).
570 Kasher, Alexandrian Jews, 140.
571 Kasher, Alexandrian Jews, 140. If one translates it, as Fuks does, “from the archontes of the synagogue of the Theben Jews,” then this suggests that the local synagogue (the eucheion) did not have archontes in leadership (Ibid, 140).
572 Kasher, Alexandrian Jews, 140.
574 Llewelyn notes that in P.Monac. III 49 two titles are used for the leadership of a Jewish community in the Ptolemaic chora called Heracleopolis: πρεσβύτεροι and ἀρχοντες (“The Elders and Rulers,” 69; for full text of the papyrus see, D. Hagedorn, Griechische Papyri (Nr. 45–154): Griechische Urkundenpapyri der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München, Band III [ed. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, R. Hübner and J. C. Shelton; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1986], 8–10). The question is whether these represent
advantage of such a system would be to give each community a larger collective voice and more effective representation at the centres of regional administration.” If a small Jewish populace in Arsinoë was a “federative organisation,” then it seems natural to presume that the more populous Jewish community in Alexandria self-organized under the oversight of a federation of councils led by a common executive board (gerousia), under which regionally-centred groups of Jews convened publicly accessible synagogue gatherings (synagōgai), some of which may even have been named ekklēsia.

4.1.3. Quod Deus ist immutabilis 111

The third example in Philo of a contemporaneous local assembly named ekklēsia, to which Runesson, Binder, and Olsson point, is found in Deus 111:

But there is a different mind which loves the body…Pleasure. Eunuch-like it has been deprived of all the male and productive organs of the soul…debarred from the holy congregation [ekklēsias tēs hieras] in which the talk and study [syllogoi kai logoi] is always of virtue.576

Philo’s phrase ekklēsia tēs hieras is not LXX terminology; it neither occurs in the base text of Deus 111 (LXX Deut 23), nor anywhere else in the LXX. To what, then,
might this phrase refer? There are three candidates: the congregation of ancient Israelites, assemblies of contemporary Jews in Alexandria, or an allegorical referent.

Philo’s related phrase (ekklēsias hieras) comes into play when reaching a decision on the best interpretation of ekklēsia tēs hieras. Ekklēsias hieras is found three times (Som. 2.184, 187; Migr. 69), with only one instance possibly referring to an Alexandrian synagogue community or its assembly (Migr. 69). In Som. 2.183–188, Philo recounts the contrasting life stations of two people: the butler of Pharaoh and the Jewish high priest. In his speech, the butler of Pharaoh, while alluding to Deut 23, states that, given his status as a eunuch, he has been “excluded from the assembly (syllogos) and sacred meeting (ekklēsias hieras) of the people” (Som. 2.184). It seems clear that Philo intends here a reference to an Egyptian socio-political institution, but one that is contemporaneous only with the eunuch’s day. Philo’s second use of ekklēsias hieras, which speaks about the high priest, is only allegorical in nature (Som. 2.187).

The third occurrence of ekklēsias hieras (Migr. 69) holds greater promise. It is found in the Migration of Abraham, a literary work which interprets Abraham’s life allegorically as a journey of the soul from sensuality to reason (e.g., Migr. 17–21). Therein, Philo writes regarding atheists and polytheists that “the law banishes them both from the sacred assembly (ekklēsias hieras)” (Migr. 69). Although he mentions “law,” Philo does not justify their banishment by citing a specific commandment of “the law,”

---

578 Aside from the phrase ἐκκλησία ἱερά, Philo uses four other phrases to interconnect the ἐκκλησία with deity: ἐκκλησία θεοῦ (Leg. 3.8; Ebr. 213), ἐκκλησία θεία (Conf. 144), ἐκκλησία τοῦ πανηγείου (Mut. 204; cf. Leg. 3.81), and ἐκκλησία κυρίου. Philo only uses ἐκκλησία κυρίου in direct quotations from Deut 23 (Leg. 3.81; Post. 177; Ebr. 213; Conf. 144).

579 Philo states that the high priest is one who as “guide and father…is no insignificant part of the sacred assembly (hieras ekklēsias)...of the parts of the soul” (Som. 2.187).
that is, the Mosaic Law. Rather, he pleads his case only by dint of reason. The two types of ungodly people (atheists and polytheists) are compared to two types of animals (two unclean reptiles) and are described as two types of human beings (eunuchs and children of a harlot, respectively). How does this line of argumentation help in clarifying what Philo means by *ekklēsia hiera*? Simply put, one can argue that the timeframe within which “law” exists is the same timeframe within which the *ekklēsia hiera* exists. There are three potential timeframes for Philo’s “law.”

First, one could suggest that Philo is simply being chronologically consistent in his storyline by not citing Mosaic Law during an Abrahamic timeframe. If this is the case, though, then Philo is being inconsistent on another level. The word *ekklēsia* is not used within LXX Genesis; it only first occurs within LXX Deuteronomy when Moses recounts the law he was initially given at Mount Horeb. Thus, if one uses the first occurrence of *ekklēsia* terminology to delimit the timeframe of “law” then the *terminus a quo* of the “law” becomes the time of Moses and the *terminus ad quem* in Philo’s day.

Second, if one presumes that the first occurrence of the word *ekklēsia* is the *terminus ad quem* of Philo’s “law,” then that “law” is in fact “the Law” (i.e., the Mosaic Law). This makes Philo’s *ekklēsia hiera* the assembly of Israel at Horeb (Deut 23:2). Such a conclusion is paradoxical, though, given that Philo does not cite a specific Mosaic commandment. Had he done so he would immeasurably have solidified, and even settled, his case for the banishment of atheists and polytheists from the “sacred

---

580 The LXX only first uses the word *ekklēsia* in Deuteronomy 4:10 when speaking of the “day of the assembly” (“when you stood before the Lord your God in Horeb for the day of the assembly”; ἐστητε ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἐν Χωριῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας).
assembly.” In fact, Philo’s silence here is quite uncharacteristic of his voiferous proclamation elsewhere. In book 1 of On the Special Laws Philo uses the first and second commandments of the Decalogue to rail against polytheism and idols.\(^{581}\)

A third, and perhaps least problematic interpretation, is that Philo avoids pairing “law” with any Mosaic commandments because he intends a more generic reference to legal judgments enacted among Alexandrian Jews in his day. If so, then the \textit{ekklēsia hiera} in Migr. 69 is an Alexandrian synagogue community, or its assembly, although the lack of extant evidence in Jewish sources for an \textit{ekklēsia hiera} places such a conclusion into question. The Greek inscriptiveal record, however, does make mention of a \textit{hiera ekklēsia}. Inscriptiveal examples of this type of civic institution date from the Hellenistic to the late Imperial periods, and are found in Asia Minor and in the Aegean Islands.\(^{582}\) Although no conclusion can be reached as to whether Philo had personal knowledge of such an institution, given the random nature of archaeological and inscriptiveal discoveries, one cannot discount outright the possibility that \textit{hierai ekklēsiai} existed closer to, or even in, Egypt.

In sum, it seems that of the three places where Philo uses the phrase \textit{ekklēsia hiera} (Som. 2.184, 187; Migr. 69), only Migr. 69 has any prospect of referring to a contemporaneous Jewish synagogue assembly in Alexandria. This implicitly reinforces the possibility that Philo’s analogous phrase \textit{ekklēsias tēs hieras} also refers to a

\(^{581}\) See, for example, Borgen’s brief content survey of Philo’s work, On the Special Laws, books 1–4 (Philo of Alexandria, 71–73).
\(^{582}\) See n. 209 for details on the seven inscriptions which mention a \textit{hiera ekklēsia}. 
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contemporary Jewish institution, perhaps even one which barred eunuchs from communal participation. Contextual considerations within Deus 86–121 further that possibility.

Borgen notes that, within the broader literary context of Deus 111 (Deus 86–121), Philo uses a simple question and answer process by which to unravel the meaning of Gen 6:8 (“Noah found grace before the Lord God”). Within the immediate context of Deus 111 (Deus 104–116), Philo focuses upon Noah. He states that Noah (Gen 6:8) represents a lower worthiness, and thus was in need of grace, while Moses (Exod 33:17) was found worthy of grace. Philo adds Potiphar as another example of lower worthiness (Deus 111–116). Potiphar becomes an allegorical representation of the “mind,” which is also then identified with a lower status (Gen 39:1; Deut 23:2). This mind, which Philo calls Pleasure, is characterized as loving the body and its passions.

People who live on the level of the mind are analogously viewed as eunuch-like slaves of pleasure and passion. These ‘slaves’ are incapable of receiving the divine message. Because of their lack of virtue, they cannot join “the holy congregation” (ekklēsias tēs hieras) whose meetings (syllogoi) revolve around the expression and discussion of virtue. Given the allegorical context of Deus 111, the ekklēsias tēs hieras could simply be symbolic terminology for a community which lives above the Noachic level of the mind. On the other hand, it could reflect a contemporary synagogue community. Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that Philo’s description of the activity which takes place within the ekklēsias tēs hieras (“talk and study…of virtue”) reflects the

---

kind of socio-religious praxis that is consistent with the “definition of the prayer halls as Philo describes them elsewhere.”

The possibility that a Jewish association synagogue would exclude eunuchs is not unknown during the Second Temple period. One case in point is a Hasmonean-era Jewish voluntary association, one of whose writings was found at Qumran. In 4QMMT (4Q394–399) the author(s)/redactor(s) describes “some of the works of the Torah” (4Q398 14 ii 3), specifically as they relate to communal praxis. One of those works of Torah is to forbid eunuchs (“one with crushed testicles and one whose penis has been cut off”); 4Q394 8 iii 10; 4Q396 i 5; 4Q397 v 1) from entering the qhl (the Hebrew term translated ekklēsia in the LXX).

In sum, the fact that the ekklēsiastēs hieras in Deus 111 involves itself in issues of religious jurisprudence (e.g., eunuchs, “talk and study”) is consistent with Philo’s non-

---

584 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 262.
585 Since the completed publication of the Scrolls, a fuller picture of the residents of Qumran has emerged. As such, I do not speak of “the community at Qumran,” not least because of John Collins’ view that “the sectarian movement known from the Scrolls cannot be identified simply as ‘the Qumran community.’ Qumran was at most one of many settlements of the sect” (John J. Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 10). Collins also challenges the common perception in scholarship that identifies “the yachad with the (celibate) community that lived at Qumran” (Ibid, 65). Collins notes that the Serek (1QS) “assumes that the yachad has multiple places of residence” (Ibid, 69). The small group of the yachad who lived at Qumran is a more religiously strict “elite group [for whom] the intensification of holiness is reflected in the retreat to the desert” (Ibid, 73).
586 The identity of the authorial community of 4QMMT is debated. See the helpful overviews by Hanna von Weissenberg (4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue [STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 17–21; idem, “The Centrality of the Temple in 4QMMT,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context [STDJ 90; ed. C. Hempel; Leiden, Brill, 2010], 293–305, esp. 293–94) and John Collins (Beyond the Qumran Community, 9, 19–21). The majority of scholars view the authorial community of 4QMMT as being the members of the Qumran group or its predecessors (e.g., Strugnell, Eshel, D. Schwartz, and Regev). Other options include: (1) the Teacher of Righteousness (Qimron and Strugnell); (2) a group with similarities in halakhic practices to the later rabbinic descriptions of earlier Sadducees (Schiffman); (3) a group in Jerusalem cherishing a hope of return to the Temple (S. Hultgren).
587 Fabry (TDOT 12:559) notes that 4QMMT applies various injunctions from Deut 23 (cf. 4QFlor 1:4) to communal praxis. At that period of the sectarians’ development, their community was known as qhl (the Hebrew word which the LXX only translates as ekklēsia).
civic ekklēsia in *Virt.* 108, within which the instruction and/or initiation of Egyptian epēlūtai (“incomers”/proselytes) takes place. The combined witness of these two passages suggests that Philo conceived of a contemporaneous, semi-public synagogue association named ekklēsia located within Alexandria whose membership focused upon Torah instruction both for Jews and proselytes. Unlike Hellenistic-era Jewish ekklēsiai (Judith, 1 Maccabees, Sirach), Philo’s ekklēsia is not described as being a public assembly within which juridical and political issues are also addressed.

4.2. Judean Jewish Voluntary Associations Named Ekklēsia? (Paul)

Paul’s undisputed writings also can be said to use the word ekklēsia in reference to a Jewish synagogue community or assembly. When speaking of ekklēsiai in Judea, Paul adds a potentially redundant phrase—“in Christ Jesus” (Gal 1:22, “the ekklēsiai of Judea in Christ Jesus”; 1 Thess 2:14, “the ekklēsiai of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea”). Trebilco represents the majority view in his claim that these two passages refer to groups of Greek-speaking Jewish Christ-followers in Judea. The pairing of “Judea” with “in Christ Jesus” seems superfluous, though, if in Judea only Christ-follower communities self-designate as ekklēsiai. Paul’s apparent redundancy reflects either an explanatory emphasis added for the sake of his Galatian and Thessalonian readers, or an indirect reference to non-messianic Jewish ekklēsiai which existed in Judea.

---

588 Gal 1:22 reads, ἡμιν δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. 1 Thess 2:14 reads, ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμήται ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησίων τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὑσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

589 Trebilco, “Early Christians,” 440–460. Regarding Gal 1:22, and with respect to Paul describing the Christ-follower communities in Jerusalem and Judea as ekklēsiai, Trebilco writes that “Paul is referring here to a time three years after his Damascus Road experience (Gal 1.18), and so to a very early period. As Dunn notes, this passage implies that ‘Paul’s usage was not original to him or to his mission’” (Ibid, 442–43; see J. D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem: Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 2.600).
contemporaneously with messianic Jewish *ekklēsiai*. If the latter option is correct, then Paul is referring either to public Judean assemblies called *ekklēsiai*, which Josephus was later to write about, or to non-civic Jewish synagogue associations.

If Paul is speaking of public Jewish assemblies as they are defined by Levine, that is, of Judean synagogue assemblies which functioned as “courthouse, school, hostel, a place for political meetings, social gatherings, housing charity funds, a setting for manumissions, meals (sacred or otherwise), and, of course, a number of religious-liturgical functions,” then a corollary assumption follows. If Paul’s reference to *ekklēsiai* in Judea implies, then, that entire synagogue communities have come to be “in Christ Jesus.” In other words, whole villages in rural Judea have embraced messianic belief in Jesus. The book of Acts does not preclude such a possibility.

The author of Acts records that soon after the day of Pentecost upwards of eight thousand Jews in Jerusalem came to faith in Jesus as the Jewish *Christos* (messiah). Most of these new Christ-followers are said to have dwelt in Jerusalem or in the Diaspora. Irrespective of whether this account reflects historical accuracy or ideological rhetoric, the narrative could be said to imply that rural Judeans were also among that number, and that upon returning to their villages, a wholesale joining of messianic communities took place. Such an interpretation, however, is tenuous at best,

---

591 Acts records that three thousand Jews came to faith “in Christ Jesus” on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:42) and five thousand soon thereafter (Acts 4:4).
592 The five thousand new Christ-followers ostensibly came from the ranks of those who heard Peter speak in the portico of Solomon (Acts 3:11). Of the three thousand new Christ-followers on the day of Pentecost, many are said to have hailed from the Diaspora (“how is it that we hear, each of us, in our own native language? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs”; Acts 2:8–11).
not least given Acts’ silence on this point. Silence directly counters the expressed purpose of Acts which is to recount the spread and success of the early Jesus movement “in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end [sic!] of the earth” (Acts 1:8). This lacuna in Acts’ narrative makes it highly unlikely that Paul’s mention of ekklēsiai in Judea (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14) refers to public synagogue communities or assemblies. If Paul is not speaking of Judean Christ-follower ekklēsiai, then the only option remaining is that he is referring to semi-public, non-messianic Jewish voluntary associations. If this assumption underlies Paul’s terminology, then, aside from Egypt, Judea was one more region wherein the word ekklēsia came to be used as a permanent group designation by Jewish voluntary associations during the early 1st century CE.

4.3. Summary: Ekklēsia and Non-Civic Jewish Institutions

The word ekklēsia appears to be used by non-civic Jewish groups within Egypt (Philo) and possibly even in Judea (Paul). Of the 23 ekklēsia occurrences in Philo, scholars most commonly forward the one in Virt. 108 as referring to a non-civic institution of Alexandria Jews during Philo’s day. This ekklēsia is a forum for ethno-religious activity, specifically for the initiation of Egyptian proselytes. It is more than simply an association synagogue since it holds some sort of official status on behalf of the politeia of Alexandrian Jews. This sub-group either self-designates as an ekklēsia or

---

593 David Instone-Brewer and Philip A. Harland suggest that the Mishnah confirms the existence of Jewish associations in Roman Palestine before 200 CE. The Mishnah does not, though, use the word ekklēsia for a Judean ‘association’. Instead, Instone-Brewer and Harland claim that “the feminine noun chavurah refers to an ‘association’ of people who meet together for a ceremonial meal” (e.g., Passover meal [m. Pes. 7.3, 13; 8:7] and Sabbath meals [m. ‘Erub. 6.6]) (“Jewish Associations in Roman Palestine: Evidence from the Mishnah,” JGRJCh 5 [2008]: 200–21, esp. 208). They state that at least one chavurah reference “contains evidence that it originated before 70 CE” (m. ‘Erub. 6.6; a Sabbath meal ‘association’) (Ibid, 212).
designates its meeting as an *ekklēsia*, a meeting that is either publicly accessible or for “members only.”

Jewish association synagogues, contemporaneous with Philo and Paul, also appear to use *ekklēsia* terminology. In *Spec.* 1.324-325, Philo mentions a voluntary association, known as *hieros syllogos*, that held meetings (*en tais ekklēsiais*) which were publicly accessible to Jews, irrespective of their state of socio-religious worthiness. Philo seems to indicate that an Alexandrian association synagogue even went so far as to self-identify collectively as an *ekklēsia hiera*. This sacred *ekklēsia* involved itself in issues of religious jurisprudence (e.g., “talk and study” of Torah). Judean synagogue associations, which self-designated as *ekklēsiai*, may also have existed, although the ambiguity inherent in Paul’s reference to *ekklēsiai* in Judea prevents any firm conclusion in that regard (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14).
5. Conclusion: Part II

It has been my primary intent in this chapter to investigate the use of the word *ekklēsia* within Jewish sources. Seven key literary witnesses have been brought to the stand—the LXX, Judith, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, Josephus, Philo and the apostle Paul.

Regarding Jewish *ekklēsiai* in the land of Israel, Judith, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, and Josephus describe *ekklēsiai* that are public synagogue institutions. The public nature of Josephus’ *ekklēsiai* is evident in their functioning as venues for decision-making on issues related to administrative, judicial, and religious matters. Since an *ekklēsia* is not a physical structure, Josephus’ *ekklēsiai* may have been convened within the *proseuchai* or the *synagōgai* that he mentions elsewhere. The apostle Paul, at best, can be said only to imply either that Jewish voluntary associations, or public assemblies, called *ekklēsiai* existed in the Judea of his day.

With respect to the possibility that Jewish *ekklēsiai* existed in Egypt during the 1st century CE, three of Philo’s *ekklēsia* references appear to denote non-civic Jewish institutions. In *Spec.* 1.324–25, Philo may be describing a publicly accessible assembly (*ekklēsia*) which is convened by a Jewish voluntary association (*hieros ylllogos*). In two others cases, Philo seems to speak of non-civic *ekklēsiai*, whether assemblies or communities, that are responsible for the initiation and religious instruction of Egyptian converts (*Virt.* 108) and/or for religious “talk and study” (*Deus* 111).

---

594 See n. 30 where I clarify that my use of “non-civic” is as an umbrella term both for small, unofficial ("private") groups (e.g., voluntary associations), and for official groups such as age-based ‘organizations’ connected with the gymnasia (e.g., *epheboi*, *gerousia*).
Although others have suggested that *ekklēsia* is a synagogue term (Runesson, Binder, and Olsson), my research has attempted to establish that fact. If I have succeeded, then it would seem that if a 1st century CE voluntary association with a *corpus mixtum* of Jews and gentiles, or even one with an exclusively gentile composition, adopted an *ekklēsia* identity, its members could have been viewed as being in continuity with a Jewish, and not simply with a Greco-Roman, heritage. This fact has implications for early Christ-followers who self-designated collectively as *ekklēsiai*. Their sub-group identity, then, not only facilitated their permanent identification with a Jewish heritage, but, as was argued in Part I, also gave their communities socio-cultural relevance within the political culture of the Greek East during the Imperial period. Keeping in mind the preceding analyses of Greek and Jewish backgrounds, I now turn to a re-reading of the “*ekklēsia* discourse” that is found within the New Testament writings.
Part III: Ekklēsia in Early Christ-follower Sources

1. Introduction

At the outset of this study, I identified three key issues scholars debate with respect to ekklēsia usage among first-generation Christ-followers: (1) which sub-group of the early Jesus movement was first to adopt ekklēsia as a permanent group identity; (2) does a collective ekklēsia identity entail counter-imperial ideology, either by insider intent or by outsider perception; and (3) given that the LXX identifies historic Israel as an ekklēsia, does Paul’s identification of his multi-ethnic communities as an ekklēsia serve further to integrate them with, or farther to separate them from, historic Israel?

Before assessing these three issues, it is necessary first to map out the various ways in which the word ekklēsia is employed within the New Testament. A survey of the 114 occurrences indicates that ten writings do not employ ekklēsia terminology: three Gospels (Mark, Luke, and John) and seven epistles (2 Timothy, Titus, 1, 2 Peter, 1, 2 John, and Jude). In the remaining seventeen writings, fifteen use ekklēsia unequivocally as a permanent group designation, while James and Hebrews use ekklēsia ambiguously in reference either to an assembly, an assembled congregation, or to a permanent group identity for that congregation after its dispersal.

There are at least two ways to categorize ekklēsia usage within the New Testament. Wayne Meeks represents the first approach and K. L. Schmidt the second.

Meeks looks only at how Pauline communities use *ekklēsia* as a group designation.\(^{598}\) He identifies six differentially sized Pauline sub-groups.\(^{599}\) Meeks does not analyze Pauline uses of the word *ekklēsia* in reference to a semi-public meeting, though.\(^{600}\) Schmidt takes a more comprehensive approach, one which I follow in this study. He looks at *ekklēsia* occurrences throughout the New Testament and divides their semantic range into four categories:  

1. as a title for the semi-public, ritual assembly (“meeting”) of early Christ-followers;  
2. as a designation for the collective sum of all Christ-followers while gathered together in assembly (e.g., “congregation”);  
3. as a permanent collective designation for Christ-followers even outside of their assembly times (e.g., “a church”); and  
4. as a reference to the supra-local, or universal *ekklēsia* (e.g., “the Church”), of which regional *ekklēsiai* (e.g., “churches”) are local manifestations.

---

\(^{599}\) Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 75. Meeks sees the smallest grouping of Christ-followers as being reflected in Paul’s expression ἡ κατ’ οἶκον εκκλēsia (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Phlm 2). The word οἶκος could refer either to private houses or tenement houses. Meeks distinguishes the “house assembly” from five larger assemblies. These five larger assemblies are: (1) “the whole assembly” at any given location (Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 14:23; Phil 4:15); (2) the *ekklēsia* as a trans-local entity (plural) within one geographical region (1 Cor 16:19, “the *ekklēsiai* of Asia”); (3) the *ekklēsia* as a trans-local entity located across geographical regions but aligned along ethnic or other criteria (Rom 16:4, “the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles”; Rom 16:16, “the *ekklēsiai* of Christ”); (4) the trans-local assembly (singular and articular, ἡ εκκλēsia) comprised of a number of local assemblies in any given region (e.g., Act 9:31, “the *ekklēsia* throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria”; Phil 3:6, “a persecutor of the *ekklēsia*”); and (5) the trans-local assembly (singular and articular, ἡ εκκλēsia) comprised of the sum total of all assemblies across the Roman Empire (1 Cor 12:28[?]).  
\(^{600}\) Pauline usages of *ekklēsia* for “meeting” include occurrences of the anarthrous phrase *en ekklēsia* (1 Cor 11:18; 14:19, 28, 35) and its plural articular variation *en tais ekklēsiais* (1 Cor 14:33b, 34; Pauline authorship is disputed for 1 Cor 14:33b-35).  
2. The Origin and Nature of the Ekklēsia Designation in the First-Generation Jesus Movement

As I assess the origin and nature of ekklēsia usage in the early Jesus movement, the witness of Paul’s undisputed writings will predominate. Three factors favour such an emphasis. First, Paul uses ekklēsia a disproportionately greater number of times and in more definitionally diverse ways than do other New Testament writers. Only Paul’s use of the word ekklēsia incorporates all six differentially sized groups mentioned by Meeks and crosses all four definitional categories identified by Schmidt. Second, even though Paul is not alone in ascribing a permanent ekklēsia identity to his communities, he is alone in overseeing a trans-local network of ekklēsia communities, one that spans both sides of the Aegean Sea. Third, and most importantly, Paul’s writings, as the earliest Christ-follower documents, are the earliest witnesses of communities in the Jesus movement being designated as ekklēsiai.

Aside from Paul, there are only five other New Testament writers who unambiguously attribute a permanent ekklēsia identity to a community of Christ-followers. Even in these instances, though, that designation may be more rhetorical.

---

602 As I already indicated, Paul’s seven undisputed writings contain 44 of the 114 New Testament occurrences of the word ekklēsia. Paul is the sixth most prolific user of ekklēsia terminology in antiquity. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is first with 225 occurrences, followed by Plutarch (142), Diodorus Siculus (101), Demosthenes (76), and Aeschines (57) (see Appendix #6, Ekklēsia in Greek Literary Works). The Greek writers, however, only reflect two of Schmidt’s definitional categories: a meeting of people and a temporary group identity assumed during the course of that assembly, while Paul employs all four.

603 Paul’s ekklēsiai are located in Asia Minor and in Hellas (Thrace, Macedonia, and Achaia). The “John” of Revelation claims prophetic authority over seven ekklēsiai in Roman Asia. They are located in the cities of Ephesos, Smyrma, Pergamon, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea (Rev 2:1–3:22). The “John” of 2 and 3 John is elder of at least two ekklēsiai in Ephesos and/or in its immediate vicinity.

604 Three of the five directly and unequivocally designate their own community/ies as an ekklēsia (deutero-Paul, the “elder” John, the “John” of Revelation). Matthew implies that same identity for his Galilean or Antiochean community when he places the word ekklēsia onto the lips of Jesus (Matt 16:18;
than historical. Each of those six writers may simply be prescribing his preferred group designation upon his community, as opposed to using the group designation by which the community members themselves self-describe. One case in point may be Paul’s extensive use of the word *ekklēsia* within his Corinthian correspondence. This may reflect an implicit strategy by which rhetorically to prescribe an *ekklēsia* identity upon all of Paul’s addressees given that his apostolic authority was not recognized by every sub-group within Corinth (e.g., “I belong to Paul…Apollos… Cephas”; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:4).

There is no straightforward interpretation of *ekklēsia* usage in the Gospel of Matthew either: did the author place the word *ekklēsia* onto the lips of Jesus (16:18; 18:17) by way of allusion to the historic Israel of the LXX, or because *ekklēsia* was the group designation of Matthew’s post-70 CE community? Use of *ekklēsia* terminology within the book of Acts also cannot simply be taken at face value (e.g., Acts 5:11). Ancient historiographers are known to substitute contemporary and/or provincial terminology when writing of earlier events or locations unfamiliar to their reading audiences (e.g., Josephus). The book of Acts may be following suit in its designation of first-generation Christ-followers in Jerusalem as an *ekklēsia*.

---

18:17). As a historiographer, the author of Acts may be using regional terminology familiar to his reading audience, rather than the actual terminology by which pre-Pauline Jewish Christ-followers self-described.

605 Paul uses the word *ekklēsia* 22 times in 1 Corinthians. This represents half of the 44 occurrences of the word *ekklēsia* in his undisputed writings. 2 Corinthians contains 9 occurrences.

606 W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison seek to demonstrate that the author of Matthew is associating his community with the *ekklēsia* at Sinai (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* [ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997], 2.629). Warren Carter emphasizes that the ‘non-use of of ‘synagogue’ distinguishes Jesus’ group from those hostile and rejecting groups (‘their synagogues’ in 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34)” (*Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-political and Religious Reading* [London/New York: T&T Clark, 2000], 335). Anthony Saldarini states that the *ekklēsia* in Matthew is “an identifiable, formal group…[that is,] the Matthean group” but he is careful not to presume that *ekklēsia* is the actual group designation of the Mattheans (*Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994], 118, 119).
The various challenges inherent in interpreting writings of different genres highlight the need for a carefully nuanced approach when assessing *ekklēsia* usage among New Testament writers, including the apostle Paul.

### 2.1. Who Were the First Christ-followers to Self-identify as *Ekklēsia*?

Notwithstanding Paul’s use of the word *ekklēsia* in greater number and with greater diversity than other New Testament authors, this does not *ipso facto* qualify him as the first Christ-follower to assign his communities such a group identity. Paul Trebilco forwards a different group of Christ-followers as the first *ekklēsiai* in the Jesus movement.

#### 2.1.1. Pre-Pauline Jewish Christ-followers and the *Ekklēsia* of Israel

Following on from du Toit, Trebilco prioritizes two literary witnesses for substantiating his claim that pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Judea were the first groups in the Jesus movement to self-designate collectively as *ekklēsiai*. He cites the ‘historiography’ known as the book of Acts (e.g., 5:11; 9:31), and Paul’s historiographical statement in Gal 1:13. His two witnesses bear further investigation.

---

607 While the book of Acts can be classified as historiography, Richard I. Pervo cautions against assuming, therefore, that Acts is historically reliable. He states that “although some still associate the author of Acts with Thucydides and Polybius and claim a high level of accuracy for the book, NT scholarship in general has taken at least a step or two back from that position” (*Acts: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009], 14). Pervo notes that Acts has been identified with two sub-categories of the genre of historiography: monograph (Conzelmann) and apologetic historiography (Sterling) (*Acts*, 15–16). Pervo, though, disputes these genre designations by noting ten variances in Acts from the genre of ancient historiography (*Acts*, 17–18). Daniel Marguerat surveys a number of other genre possibilities such as Roman history, Gospel summary, and exaltation of Christian faith (*Lukas, der erste christliche Historiker: Eine Studie zur Apostelgeschichte* [ATANT 91; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2011], 57–67).

608 Acts 5:11 reads, “great fear seized the whole *ekklēsia* [in Jerusalem].” Acts 9:31 reads, “the *ekklēsia* throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace.” Gal 1:13 reads, “I was violently persecuting the *ekklēsia tou theou*.” Paul Trebilco particularly points to Paul’s ascription of an *ekklēsia* identity to the community in Jerusalem (Gal 1:13) as substantive evidence that the later historiography of Acts also uses
With respect to Acts, Trebilco assumes, along with a number of other scholars, that *ekklēsia* is the *emic* self-designation of first-generation Christ-followers in Jerusalem and Judea. By contrast, other scholars (e.g., Richard Pervo, C. K. Barrett, Joseph Fitzmyer) contend that Acts is using the term *ekklēsia* anachronistically. These scholars presume that the author of Acts is writing after the time of first-generation Christ-followers in Jerusalem and is attributing to that original community a group designation which the implied readers of Acts, but not the original community, adopted. In this they assume that *ekklēsia* in Acts is an *etic* group designation for first-generation Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem. This debate highlights the need for differentiating between *emic* (“insider” language) and *etic* (“outsider” language) terminology when reading historiography. George Brooke cautions against reading historiography simply in *emic* fashion for that same community of Christ-followers (“Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?”, *NTS* 57 [2011]: 440–460, esp. 442–43).

---


610 Trebilco, “Early Christians,” 443. Trebilico appears to dismiss almost out of hand Pervo’s claim that the use of *ekklēsia* in Acts is anachronistic (Ibid, 443 n. 12).


612 Historiography (“a writing about history”) is an authorial construct. As such, historiography may or may not say anything valid with respect to actual communal socio-historical realities (George Brooke, “Introduction,” in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography* L’historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne [ed. G. Brooke and T. Römer; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007], 10).
as ‘history,’ that is, as accurate historical details. He argues that one must interpret
historiography in recognition of the fact that the text is simply “the history of the
ideological perspectives of the ancient author.”\textsuperscript{613} Stuart Beeson concurs. He writes that
“texts tell us most about their time of authorship, rather than of the time they
describe….”\textsuperscript{614} Anomalously, Trebilco concedes these points elsewhere, but not for his
interpretation of \textit{ekklēsia} use in Acts.\textsuperscript{615}

Even if Acts is dated pre-70 CE, thereby removing the possibility of \textit{ekklēsia}
being used anachronistically, at least two factors favour viewing Acts’ attribution of a
permanent \textit{ekklēsia} identity to the pre-70 community in Jerusalem as being \textit{etic}
terminology. One is the fact that Acts uses at least one \textit{ekklēsia}-related term in \textit{etic}
fashion: the collocation \textit{ennomos ekklēsia} (Acts 19:39).\textsuperscript{616} The second factor involves
precedents from other historiographers. Josephus, for example, can be accused of
provincialism in his use of some Greek political terms.\textsuperscript{617} Provincialism entails the use of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{613} Brooke, “Introduction,” xiii-xxxvii, esp. xiv. See further in n. 540 on how classicists read
Greek “history.”
\item \textsuperscript{614} Stuart Beeson, “Historiography Ancient and Modern: Fact and Fiction,” in \textit{Ancient and Modern
Scriptural Historiography L’historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne} (ed. G. Brooke and T. Römer;
\item \textsuperscript{615} Paul Trebilco highlights the need for critically evaluating group self-designations from at least
three perspectives: “insider language,” “outward-facing,” and “outsider-used.” He defines these three
categories as follows: (1) “insider language” is terminology by which the group itself self-designates;
(2) “outward-facing self-designations” are those used by insiders when communicating with outsiders; and
(3) “outsider-used designations” reflect terminology used by outsiders by which to describe the in-group
(Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2012], 10).
\item \textsuperscript{616} Acts 19:39 reads, \textit{εἰ δὲ τι περαιτέρω ἐπιζητεῖτε, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται} (“If
there is anything further you want to know, it must be settled in the regular/traditional assembly”).
\item \textsuperscript{617} See the discussion of Josephus’ use of \textit{ekklēsia} in Part II (§3.3. \textit{Public Assemblies in 1\textsuperscript{st}
Century CE Judea}).
\end{itemize}
emic terminology from one geographical region to describe a similar institution found in another geographical region, but which is designated by other terminology.518

2.1.1.1. Ennomos Ekklēsia in Acts

Acts’ use of the phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* for the regular assembly of Ephesos (Acts 19:39) is unattested in inscriptions from Ephesos. Within extant epigraphic sources, there are only three adjectival modifiers used for the Ephesian *ekklēsia: nomimon, prōtēn,* and *hierā.*619 The phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* only occurs twice in other inscriptions from Asia Minor (Mysia and Pisidia), but 43 times in inscriptions from two regions of Hellas (Phokis and Thessaly).621 Pauline *ekklēsiai* do not appear to have been established

618 Donald Binder helpfully differentiates between anachronism, provincialism, and bias (Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period [Atlanta: SBL, 1999], 89). “Anachronism” is the practice of interpreting earlier architectural and literary artefacts from the perspective of later evidence. “Provincialism” involves the attribution to other geographical regions, or social groupings, the socio-cultural realities of one’s own geo-political region. “Bias” entails the interpretation or revision of source material for the purpose either of supporting one’s pre-existing suppositions or of creating new ideologically motivated conclusions.


620 The collocation ἐννόμος ἐκκλησία occurs in two Asia Minor inscriptions: MDAIK(A) 32 (1907) 243.4 (Mysia, Pergamon; 75–50 BCE) and FAM III 4 (Pisidia, Termessos; 2nd cent. CE?).

621 The collocation ἐννόμος ἐκκλησία predominantly occurs in inscriptions from central Greece (Phokis [32X; e.g., Delphi, Elateia] and Thessaly [11X]). These inscriptions are dated between the 2nd cent. BCE and the 2nd cent. CE.
there, only in other regions of Hellas, such as Attica (e.g., Athens), the Peloponnesos (e.g., Corinth), and Macedonia (e.g., Thessalonica, Philippi).

If one assumes that the author of Acts uses the phrase *ennomos ekklēsia* as a literary strategy by which more clearly to communicate with his ostensible dedicatee, Theophilus (Acts 1:1), then Theophilus may very well have Hellenic roots, perhaps even in or near Phokis or Thessaly. There is one more regionally specific political term used in Acts (*politarch*) which potentially narrows Theophilus’ region of origin still further, specifically to Macedonia, which lies immediately north of Thessaly.

2.1.1.2. Politarch in Acts
The author of Acts displays precise knowledge of a group of Macedonian officials who are called *politarchs* (Acts 17: 6). B. F. Cook notes that “the title ‘politarchs’ (literally, ‘rulers of the citizens’) was used in several Greek cities,” one of which is Thessalonica. Brad McLean brings greater specificity to Cook’s observation: “in Macedonia, a single supreme board called πολιτάρχαι dealt with civic and military

---

622 Surviving inscriptions from Athens do not make mention of an ἐννόμος ἐκκλησία. See n. 269 for adjectival modifiers used for the Athenian ἐκκλησία. The adjective νομίζω (“traditional, regular”) only occurs once each in central Greece (Delphi, 185–175 BCE) and in Asia Minor (Ephesos, 104 CE).
623 The 18 ekklēsia mentions in inscriptions found in Peloponnesos are not modified by any adjectives.
624 Of the 41 ekklēsia occurrences in inscriptions found in Macedonia, 29 are by Christ-followers of the Late Antique period. The 12 inscriptions from early antiquity only modify ekklēsiai twice, once with νομίζω (200–160 BCE; *EKM* 1.Beroia 1) and the other time with οἰκείοτητα (243 BCE; *SEG* 12.373, ll. 18-34).
625 This presumes, of course, that Theophilus is a real person rather than only a symbolic term broadly applicable to all Christ-followers (i.e., “lover of God”). Pervo notes that both Bede (*Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, 6) and Origen (e.g., *Hom. In Lucam* 1.10–11) interpret the word “Theophilus” (“lover of God”) symbolically (*Acts*, 35). Possible historical referents for “Theophilus” include T. Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Emperor Domitian (Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: a Study of Origins* [London: MacMillan, 1936], 534–55), Theophilus, a son of Annas the High Priest, who was High Priest from 37–41 CE (Richard H. Anderson, “Theophilus: A Proposal,” *EvQ* 69:3 [1997]: 195–215), and a Jewish elite holding Roman equestrian status (Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 195).
A woodcut on the Roman arch at Thessalonica confirms the continued use of *politarch* as a title for city officials well into the second century CE (*BMGR* 1877.5–11.1). McLean notes that Beroia (Beroea/Berea) is another Macedonian *polis* which designates its primary magisterial board as *politarchai*. Berea is a *polis* near Thessalonica. The perception of Acts’ having insider knowledge of Berean and Thessalonican political terminology is further reinforced in the fact that the title *politarch* rarely occurs outside of Macedonian inscriptions. It is extant in 36 inscriptions, 34 of which are from Macedonia.

Acts’ familiarity with local political terminology from the regions of Thessaly (*ennomos ekklēsia*) and Macedonia (*politarch*) could imply that Acts’ intended reader has socio-ethnic ties to both regions. If Theophilus has such trans-local roots, then he most likely was a social elite, or notable. Three factors suggest this possibility.

First, as the dedicatee for Luke/Acts (Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1), Theophilus may have been the writer’s benefactor. Second, Fitzmyer suggests that the phrase “most excellent Theophilus” (Luke 1:3) infers that Theophilus holds elite status as a Roman knight (*ordo*...)

---


629 Imperial period Macedonian cities which designate their primary magisterial board as *politarchai* include Thessalonica (up to 2nd cent. CE), Styberra (95 CE), Heraklei (100–150 CE), and Beroia (41–44 CE) (McLean, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 311). There are two non-Macedonian references to a *politarch*: one from Leontopolis in Egypt (*CIJ* 2.1530a/Bernard, *Inscr. Métr*. 16; early Imperial period), and one from Delphi in central Greece (*FD* III 3.207; 252/1 BCE).

630 McLean provides an extensive list of other terms associated with the principal magisterial board of different *poleis* across the Greek East: *archontes* (Athens, Aphrodisias); *demiourgoi* (Aigina, Salamis, much of Peloponnesos); *ephoboi* (Lakonia); *kosmoi* (Crete); *politarchai* (Thessalonika, Beroia); *prostatai* (Cos); *prytaneis* (e.g., Knidos, Rhodes, Samos, Pamphylia, Cilicia, *poleis* of Peloponnesos); *stratēgoi* (e.g., Kalymnos, Iasos, Miletos, Sardis, Smyrna, most of the Greek cities of Caria, Lydia, Phrygia and Thessaly); *tagoi* (Thessaly); and *timouchoi* (Sinope) (*Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 311).

631 Pervo notes, though, that “the relation between dedication and patronage is too complicated to allow firm conclusions” (*Acts*, 35).
Third, Louis Feldman suggests that Theophilus may be of Jewish descent, which could even place him among those Jews in Berea who converted to Christ, some of whom are described as being “men of high standing” (Acts 17:12). Acts mentions that the Jews in Berea “examined the scriptures every day to see whether these things were so” (Acts 17:11). If the author of Acts also wrote the Gospel of Luke (Acts 1:1; cf. Luke 1:1-4), then his description of Berean attention to scriptural detail may explain why the author is so concerned with narratival accuracy in his account for Theophilus.

How probable is it, though, that, as a Jew, Theophilus could also have been a Roman notable, perhaps even with equestrian status? At least two historical precedents exist for such a scenario, with each person playing an important military role for the Romans during the Jewish revolt: Philo’s nephew Tiberius Julius Alexander and Flavius Josephus. If Theophilus was a notable of the *ordo equester*, with a primary residence in Berea or Thessalonica, he would have been familiar with the *politarchai*. As noted, this civic governing body had responsibility not just for political matters but also for military affairs. The possibility of Theophilus’ trans-local status as both a Berean Jew and as a Berean/Thessalonican Roman notable provides a fuller basis for understanding Acts’

---

632 Fitzmyer notes that the adjective *kratistos* used in Acts 1:1 (*kratistē Theophile; “most excellent Theophilus”) “was the Greek equivalent of Latin *egregius*, a title often used for the *ordo equester*, the ‘knights’ of Roman society. It is used of the governor Felix in 23:26” (Acts, 195).

633 The Gospel of Luke explains that, “since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided, after investigating everything carefully from the very first, to write down an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed” (Luke 1:1-4).

634 Tiberius Julius Alexander abandoned the Jewish religion, became the Roman procurator in Judea in 46–48 CE, and was a not insignificant factor in helping the Romans quell the Jewish revolt of 66–70 CE (James C. VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 138). After his capture by the Romans, Josephus assisted them in convincing the Jews in Jerusalem to surrender.
addition of a predominantly Thessalian adjective (*ennomos*) when speaking of an Ephesian *ekklēsia*.

2.1.1.3. Josephus

The literary strategy of inserting provincial terminology into historiography for the sake of a contemporary readership is mirrored by Flavius Josephus. In his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus describes the religio-political *praxis* of ancient Israelites in terms reminiscent of democratic processes enacted by the *dēmoi* of 1st century CE Greek *poleis*. There are two ways to interpret Josephus’ use of Greco-Roman politics. He either could be using provincial terminology that was familiar to his Greek speaking readership in Rome, or he is retrojecting the actual political *praxis* of Jews in the 1st century CE upon their ancient ancestors, the Israelites of the desert tradition. Either way, Josephus’ description of ancient Israelite political *praxis* is an *etic* one in which he uses terminology familiar to his contemporary reading audience as a substitute for the original terminology used by his historical referents.

In sum, the inscriptional record and historiographical works, such as Acts and Josephus’ *Antiquities*, highlight the importance of interpreting ancient historical evidence with genre considerations in mind. Such considerations make it possible that the author of

---

635 For example, in Josephus’ recounting of Moses’ orders to Korah and his followers (A.J. 4:35; Num 16:6-7), Louis Feldman observes that “Moses makes a proposal to the multitude, and they give their free consent [*cheirotonia*, which shows that] Josephus continues to use Greek political vocabulary when he describes this meeting as an assembly (*ἐκκλησία*)” (*Flavius Josephus*, 341 n. 87). The word *cheirotonia*, which indicates a free vote by show of hands, occurs at least 47 times in association with an *ekklēsia* in Greek inscriptions. The regions represented include Attica, the Aegean Islands (Delos, Cos), central Greece, northern Greece, Asia Minor (Caria, Ionia, Troas, and Mysia). There are three 1st cent. CE examples (Kalindoia, Macedonia, *Meletemata* 11 K2, 1 CE; and two from Phokis in central Greece [*FD* III 6:27, 1–20 CE; *BCH* 108 [1984], 366, 20–46 CE]). Feldman also notes a syntactical correlation between Josephus and other Greek writers—Josephus’ practice of indicating the meeting of a regular assembly with the clause ἑκκλησίαν... συναγαγόν (cf. *A.J.* 3:188 and 4:176; Ibid, 393 n. 527).
Acts uses *etic* terminology more familiar to his implied reader rather than using *emic* terms originally employed by Acts’ historical referents. One example of provincialism in Acts could be its use of the term *ennomos ekklēsia*. This being the case, then it is not improbable that Acts’ attribution of the term *ekklēsia* to the pre-70 community in Jerusalem as their collective designation is another example of provincialism, particularly if the implied reader’s socio-economic roots are in Macedonia.

2.1.1.4. Ekklēsia, the LXX, and Early Christ-followers in Jerusalem

A second factor Trebilco forwards, not unproblematically, as evidence that first-generation Jewish Christ-followers used *ekklēsia* as a collective self-designation, is that Hellenistic and Hebrew Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem required different group identities. He states, firstly, that the Hellenists needed “to worship separately and to develop significantly different emphases in their theology and practice” than the Hebrew sub-group.\(^{636}\) From this he concludes, secondly, that the Hellenists also required a group identity which was distinct from their Hebrew compatriots, who purportedly self-designated as *hoi hagioi* (e.g., Acts 9:13).\(^{637}\) According to Trebilco, “the Hellenists’ theological conviction that their group was in continuity with that assembly of Yahweh” known in the LXX as the *ekklēsia* of Israel, led them to adopt *ekklēsia* as their new identity.\(^{638}\) Trebilco suggests that, among Jewish communities, “ἐκκλησία was ‘free,‘”\(^{639}\)

---


\(^{637}\) Pervo, in his comments on Acts 9:13, implies that the *emic* group identity for (Hebrew) Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem is the articular, pluralistic term *hoi hagioi* (Acts, 248). Paul Trebilco is more explicit. He claims that “the use of ὀἱ ἄγιοι as a self-designation originated with Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians in Jerusalem at a very early point” (Self-designations, 134).

\(^{638}\) Trebilco, “Early Christians,” 444. Trebilco claims that “it is more likely that the use of ἐκκλησία in the LXX [rather than the Greek civic *ekklēsia*] was the most crucial factor” for the selection of *ekklēsia* as a collective designation for early Christ-followers (Ibid, 446). This allowed the Hellenists to
since the term *synagogē*, which the LXX also uses to describe Israel, had already been widely adopted by non-messianic Jewish communities.

There are at least three reasons for reading the evidence differently. First, it is evident from the writings of Philo and Paul that a case can be made for claiming that *ekklēsia* was not free, not least in Egypt and perhaps also in Judea. Trebilco does acknowledge that *Virt.* 108 is the one “place [in Philo where] ἐκκλησία refers to a local congregation.” Contrary to majority opinion, however, he does not consider that congregation as contemporaries of Philo. Furthermore, if Paul presupposes that Jewish communities named *ekklēsiai* already existed in Judea (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14), then, within Judea, *ekklēsia* also was not “free” for pre-Pauline Jewish Christ-followers.

Second, why would Greek speaking Jewish Christ-followers require an *intra muros* group identity to counter outsider perceptions of apostasy when such an identity was readily available to them through their Hebrew speaking compatriots in Jerusalem? Trebilco claims that Hebrew speaking Christ-followers self-designated as *hoi hagioi* for

“express their continuity with the OT people of God” (Ibid, 446). Klaus Berger contends, though, that the evidence is limited by which to connect the NT use of *ekklēsia* with the Israel of the desert period (“Volkversammlung,” 185, 186, 204, 206). Berger claims that Hellenistic Judaism (and thus the LXX translators) derived its understanding of *ekklēsia* from civic *ekklēsiai* of the Greek East in the Hellenistic period (321–27 BCE). Du Toit critiques Berger’s work since it “still reveals a predisposition towards minimizing the effect of Israelite-Jewish traditions” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 133).

Trebilco states that “other (non-Christian) Jews could have used ἐκκλησία for their gatherings, as well as συναγωγή; it simply seems that, as far as we know, none of them were using ἐκκλησία with reference to a contemporary ‘assembly’ in the same way they were using συναγωγή and thus ἐκκλησία was ‘free’” (“Early Christians,” 456).

640 For my discussion of *Virt.* 108 see Part II, §4.1.1.
the purpose of claiming theological continuity with eschatological Israel—the “people of the holy ones” in Aramaic Daniel 7.642

Third, even if the question of ‘otherness’ was instead an intra-mural issue between different sub-groups of Jewish Christ-followers, it still does not necessarily follow that the Hellenists felt the need for a sub-group identity that was different from their Hebrew speaking compatriots. The Christ-follower community in Rome is a case in point. Robert Jewett suggests that the collective self-designation of that corpus mixtum of Jews and gentiles also was hoi hagioi (Rom 1:7).643 If this was the case, then the Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Rome, in their self-designation as hoi hagioi, did not adopt a sub-group identity that was different from the Hebrew speaking sub-group in their ‘mother community’ in Jerusalem, notwithstanding Trebilco’s claim that they differed in theology and worship praxis.

---

642 Trebilco suggests that “after the resurrection, and in the light of the inaugurated eschatology which belief in the resurrection engendered, the earliest Jerusalem Christians used of ἅγιοι as a self-designation as they reflected on Dan 7 in the light of Jesus’ use of ‘the son of man’” (Group Designations, 123). Trebilco acknowledges that a connection to Daniel 7 is problematized by John Collins’ observation that the substantival use of qedoshim (“holy ones”) in Daniel 7, and elsewhere in the HB and DSS, has primary reference to celestial beings (Daniel [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 313 n. 322; idem, The Apocalyptic Imagination [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 123–55). Trebilco comments, though, that “it is not very far from speaking of ‘the people of the holy ones of the most High’ (Dan 7:27), where ‘holy ones’ are angels, to assimilating the character (of being ‘the holy ones’) of the people’s angelic patrons and representatives to the people themselves and actually calling the people ‘the holy ones,’ although we note that Daniel himself does not do this. But it is no surprise that 1 Enoch, which is much influenced by Daniel, does do this” (Self-designations, 104–37, esp. 105). Trebilco’s argument that the term of ἅγιοι could have referred to human beings would have gained greater purchase, though, had he cited the claim by Crispin Fletcher-Louis that the substantival adjective “the holy ones” in Dan 7:13 is used in reference to pious Jews such as priests (“The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as Test Case,” in Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 161–193, esp. 186–92; idem, All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls [STDJ XLII; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 142 n. 16; 83 n. 82).

643 Robert Jewett sees the phrase klētois hagiois (Rom 1:7) as referring to Jewish Christ-followers in Rome within Jerusalem’s circle of influence (Romans: A Commentary [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 2007], 114).
Given the foregoing, it seems simplest to assume that first-generation Greek speaking, Jewish Christ-followers adopted *hoi hagioi* as their group identity. In so doing, the Hellenists’ would have addressed their intra-mural, and inter-mural, religio-ethnic identity needs. If this was not the case, and, instead, the Greek speaking Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem self-identified collectively as *ekklēsiai*, then one could conclude that Paul’s collection for *hoi hagioi* in Jerusalem (1 Cor 16:1; Rom 15:25) did not include the Hellenists. If Trebilco wishes to avoid such a conclusion, it would seem he needs either to change his view that Paul uses *hoi hagioi* as a group designation when speaking of the Jerusalem collection or that Jerusalem was the first place where Christ-followers self-identified as *ekklēsia*.

### 2.1.2. Paul and Greco-Roman Political Institutions

Contrary to Trebilco, George H. van Kooten does not look to Judea for the original community of Christ-followers who adopted a permanent *ekklēsia* identity. He finds his answer in Paul’s diasporic communities. While I concur with van Kooten’s conclusion, it appears that five of his rationales for arriving at that conclusion are open to question.

First, as already noted, Greco-Roman literary, epigraphic and papyrological sources do not use the word *ekklēsia* in the sense of a permanent group identity, whether in civic (political) or non-civic (e.g., voluntary association) contexts. As such, the

---

645 “Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 527–36.
646 At most, Greek sources use the word *ekklēsia* in reference to a temporary group identity, but only for as long as the *ekklēsia* (‘gathering/meeting’) is in session. This continues to be true even into the 1st century CE. In a letter from Artaban III, king of Parthia, to Seleucia approving the election of a city
Greek *ekklēsia* cannot form the primary basis for Paul’s inspiration in adopting the word *ekklēsia* as a permanent group identity for his non-civic groups.

Second, it does not seem to me that a political term with a Greek background satisfies the primary criterion of Paul’s group identity construction project. Paul needed a term, first and foremost, which could indelibly situate his Greco-Roman Christ-followers within the covenantal promises made to Abraham. Additionally, if, Paul was concerned with maintaining Jewish and gentile social and ethnic identities, then his communal designation also needed to be inclusive enough for that socio-ethnic purpose. *Ekklēsia*

treasurer, the word *ekklēsia* is used in lieu of the word *dēmos* (SEG 7:2; 21 CE/Parthian year 268, Audnaeus 17). It reads, βασιλευον[τος Σελευκου, έτοου] χλ' κα' ρ', μη[νός - - ], έν Σελευκ[εια δὲ τή πρός τῶι] Εύλαιοι [νόουν - - , ἐπί] Α'μωνι[ον. έδοξε τή ἐκκλησίαν (“resolved by the *ekklēsia*”).

647 J. D. G. Dunn suggests that “‘covenant’ was not a major theological category for Paul’s own theologizing” (“Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology? Reflections on Romans 9:4 and 11:27,” in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology* [ed. S. E. McGinn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 3–19). While this may be true generally, William S. Campbell opts for viewing Abraham as the covenantal father of gentiles in answer to his question whether Paul uses the Abrahamic tradition as a way of “simply providing his converts with a fictive-family connection to an individual significant only as a ‘punctiliar’, exemplary believer? Or is he actually relating them to a particular people of God of whom Abraham was the father? Is Paul, in fact, rooting the Gentiles in the ancient stem of Abraham, or is he creating a new people of God?” (“‘All God’s Beloved in Rome!’ Jewish Roots and Christian Identity,” in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology* [ed. S. E. McGinn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 67–82, esp. 68). There are at least five intersections between the Genesis 15 covenant and Paul’s theology which, when taken together, imply that, in Paul’s mind, gentile inclusion is intrinsic to God’s unconditional promises to Abraham: (1) Abraham’s faith is the model for gentile faith (Gen 15:6; cf. Rom 4:1-5); (2) Abraham’s uncircumcised state (Genesis 15) removes the necessity of gentile observance of Torah/Jewish identity marker observance (Rom 4:9ff); (3) God’s unconditional promise of innumerable biological descendants (Gen 15:5), is extrapolated by Paul also to include uncircumcised gentiles (Rom 4:10-25); (4) While faith in the LORD’s promise is the basis for Abraham’s covenantal arrangement, for gentiles it is faith not only in the LORD but also in His promised One, the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom 4:24-25); (5) The peace with God, which ensues (Rom 5:1), is not simply existential (inner experience), nor fraternal (social relationships), but is forensic (a state): a state of permanently peaceful relations with the God of Abraham. For a discussion of Romans 4 and Abraham’s faith, see Stephen Westerholm (*Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], esp. 278–84, 307–21) and Benjamin Schliesser (*Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* [WUNT2.224; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], esp. 152–220 [Gen 15:6 in Jewish theology], and 221–39). For a concise analysis of Paul’s use of the Abrahamic covenant in Galatians 3, see J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (rev. ed.; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 161–75.

suited both of Paul’s ostensible needs admirably. Notwithstanding its political roots in the Greek *polis*, the ethno-religious roots of the word *ekklēsia* in Jewish literature (e.g., LXX, Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees), and potentially in contemporary Alexandrian (Philo) and Judean synagogue communities, also could have been factors in Paul’s choice.

Therefore, third, while van Kooten argues that Paul chose *ekklēsia* primarily for its ability to designate trans-local political organizations which paralleled municipal and imperial political structures, I would suggest that Paul’s interest in its Greek background lay elsewhere. His group identity construction project required a term with Greco-Roman roots deep enough ideologically to facilitate, what Dieter Georgi calls, “libertarian and democratic universalism [and]…socially egalitarian pluralism” among the Jews and gentiles in his communities (e.g., 1 Cor 7:17-24; Gal 3:28). The word *ekklēsia* fit the breadth of Paul’s ideological needs well.

---


Fourth, it appears that van Kooten may be leaving himself open to the charge of anachronistically reading Paul in light of Origen. He seems to presume that since Origen views Christ-follower ekklēsiai as alternative societies which paralleled the socio-political structures of Greek poleis and the Roman imperium,⁶⁵⁰ that he has faithfully enacted Paul’s original intent.⁶⁵¹

Fifth, even though van Kooten convincingly argues that a collective ekklēsia identity need not entail counter-imperial ideology,⁶⁵² and that Paul’s trans-local associations implicitly criticize “the morality of civic assemblies,”⁶⁵³ his overall argument would have gained strength had he also explored how Paul’s ekklēsiai constituted an implicit critique of those polis politics which validated socio-economic stratification and oligarchic privilege.

2.1.3. Paul and Jewish Sources

The five mitigating factors in van Kooten’s argument suggest the need for an alternative approach for forwarding Paul as the first Christ-follower to appropriate ekklēsia as a collective identity. In order to demonstrate this, there are three Pauline

---

⁶⁵⁰ Van Kooten, “Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 4. Van Kooten claims that a double meaning of ekklēsia as political assembly and as the “church” is explicitly alluded to in Origen’s Contra Celsum 3.29-30 (c. 249 CE): “He will be amazed at the one who both planned and had the power to carry into effect the establishment of the assemblies of God in all places, living beside the assemblies of the people in each city.” Van Kooten comments further: “After Origen construes this antithesis between the Christian and the civic assemblies, and even characterizes the relationship of the former to the latter as one of political opposition, he opens up the possibility that both assemblies are not necessarily mutually exclusive (Contra Celsum 3.30: ‘And so also, if you compare the council of the assembly of God with the council in each city, you may, in future, find that some council members of the assemblies are worthy, if there exists a city of God in the universe, to hold public office in it’)” (Ibid, 5).

⁶⁵¹ Van Kooten states that “Origen draws the full consequences of the view that Christianity is an assembly of God which parallels the political assembly of the Greek cities of the ancient world (see further 8.5 and 8.74-75). In this I will argue that Origen is not original but follows Paul. The political meaning of ekklēsia must have been the first to spring to people’s minds” (“Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 5).


statements which first require reframing. In each, Paul appears to describe those whom he formerly persecuted as having already adopted an *ekklēsia* identity. He ostensibly identifies the Hebrew and Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem either as *hē ekklēsia tou theou* (Gal 1:13, 1 Cor 15:9) or as *hē ekklēsia* (Phil 3:6).\(^{654}\)

There are at least three ways to read those historiographical comments of Paul. First, one could follow J. D. G. Dunn and Trebilco who claim that Paul’s use of the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* reflects the *emic* terminology of pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem and surrounding regions.\(^{655}\) Second, one could see anachronism at play. Van Kooten states that there is “no reason why the three references…[should not contain] a term of different origins that was also retrospectively applied by Paul to the Christian communities which he had persecuted.”\(^{656}\) A third way is to read Paul’s statements as reflecting provincial terminology. In other words, in order more clearly to communicate with his addressees, Paul attributes to the Jewish Christ-followers whom he formerly persecuted the *emic* self-designation of his readers in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi.\(^{657}\)

---

\(^{654}\) Gal 1:13 reads, Ἃκούσατε γὰρ τήν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ ἱουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν (“I was violently persecuting the *ekklēsia* of God and was trying to destroy it”); 1 Cor 15:9 reads, ἕγγο γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς σὺν εἰμὶ ἰκανός καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“because I persecuted the *ekklēsia* of God”); Phil 3:6 reads, κατὰ ζήλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (“as to zeal, a persecutor of the *ekklēsia*”).

\(^{655}\) Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, 2.600. Trebilco concurs with Dunn’s assessment. He argues that since in Gal 1:22 Paul is referring to “a very early period…[it] reinforces the likelihood that ἐκκλησία was first used as a self-designation in Jerusalem and Judea” (“Early Christians,” 442–43).

\(^{656}\) Van Kooten, “Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 526.

\(^{657}\) Paul explicitly calls each community an *ekklēsia* in 1 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:2, and Phil 4:15.
Paul’s Philippian epistle is an illustrative case in point.\(^{658}\) In Phil 3:6, Paul anomalously uses the unmodified noun \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) in lieu of the complete phrase \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) (Gal 1:13; 1 Cor 15:9).\(^{659}\) Why only in his later Philippian epistle does Paul simplify his terminology? At least two reasons surface. First, the Christ-follower \(ekklēsia\) in the Roman colony of Philippi\(^{660}\) appears to have been predominantly, if not even exclusively, gentile in makeup.\(^{661}\) Thus, if, when writing to a largely gentile

---

\(^{658}\) Paul first came to Philippi on his second missionary journey which is generally dated between 49–52 CE (Peter O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 5).

\(^{659}\) The articular phrase \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) (and its variations) occurs once in the book of Acts (20:28) and eight times in Paul’s authentic letters, twice in the plural: 1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:16 (pl), 22; 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13; 1 Thess 2:14 (pl). Within the deuetero-Pauline letters the articular phrase \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) only occurs once (2 Thess 1:4) and that in plural form (“Therefore, we ourselves boast of you \(en\) \(tais\) \(ekklēsiais\) \(tou\) \(theou\)” for your steadfastness and faith”) (The anarthrous phrase \(ekklēsia\)\(s\) \(tou\) \(theou\) occurs twice in the deuetero-Paulines [1 Tim 3:5, 15]). Contra Schmidt, Ladd, and Harris, none of the nine New Testament occurrences of the articular phrase \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) necessarily refer to a universal, or trans-local, fictive entity which encompasses all Christ-followers, both Jew and gentile, across the Roman Empire (Schmidt, *TDNT* 3.506; George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* [rev. ed.; ed. D. A. Hagner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 582; Murray Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 132–33). Two occurrences of \(hē\) \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) refer to the community of Jewish Christ-followers whom Paul persecuted in Judea (Gal 1:13; 1 Cor 15:9). The other seven occurrences could simply reflect the fact that local groups of Pauline Christ-followers self-identified collectively as an \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) (1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:16; 22; 2 Cor 1:2; 1 Thess 2:14; [2 Thess 1:4]). This fact becomes clear in three of the seven references which locate the \(ekklēsia\) \(tou\) \(theou\) within a specific geographical region (\(tē\) \(ousē\) \(en\) …; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1; 1 Thess 2:14), and one which speaks of multiple \(ekklēsiai\) \(tou\) \(theou\) (1 Cor 11:16).

\(^{660}\) Following the battle of Actium (31 BCE), some of Octavian’s disbanded troops and supporters were relocated to Philippi, which then became known as Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis. All citizens of Philippi were also considered to be citizens of Rome. Even Philippi’s constitution, physical layout, and architectural style were modeled on those of Rome (O’Brien, *Philippians*, 4). John Reumann succinctly encapsulates the ethno-cultural mix in Philippi with his comment that “Philippi reflected Thracian underpinnings, Hellenistic culture, but dominant *Romanitas*” (*Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AYB 33B; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008], 3). Latin was extensively used and the citizens wore Roman dress. Philippi was governed by Roman law and was given the highest privilege available to a provincial municipality—the *ius Italicum*. This status entitled the Philippians to full property rights (purchase, ownership, transference) and to the right of initiating civil lawsuits. Philippi was headed by two collegiate magistrates, whom the author of Acts identifies as *stratēgoi* (Acts 16:22, 35, 36, 38).

\(^{661}\) Reumann notes that indications of a predominantly gentile population in Philippi include the fact that no archeological evidence exists for a synagogue, that Paul “may echo but never overtly quotes (OT) Scriptures,” and that the existence only of a *proseuchē* in Philippi (Acts 16:16) implies that there was an insufficient number of male Jews available formally to constitute a *synagōgē* (*Philippians*, 4).
ekklēsia, Paul had used emic terms by which the original Jewish Christ-followers in Judea self-designated (e.g., hoi hagioi, Acts 9:13), that terminology may have been largely nonsensical. Even the modifier tou theou may not have communicated well given a gentile audience’s limited familiarity with the LXX and its ekklēsia tou kyriou. Second, the inscriptive record is silent as to the existence of a civic ekklēsia in Philippi. Paul’s ekklēsia may have been “the only ekklēsia in town.” If so, then his use of ekklēsia, without a modifier such as tou theou, could not have been mistakenly identified with a civic ekklēsia; his readers would have known that it referred to a Christ-follower ekklēsia.

In the final analysis, Paul’s use of the unmodified word ekklēsia would have been sufficient in and of itself even when speaking in etic terms of the Judean Christ-followers whom Paul formerly persecuted. It should be noted, however, that not all of Paul’s references to an ekklēsia tou theou point towards persecuted first-generation Jewish Christ-followers. In 1 Corinthians Paul uses ekklēsia tou theou to designate a contemporaneous sub-group of the Christ-following community in Corinth and beyond.

This fact comes explicitly to the fore in 1 Cor 11:16. Therein, Paul not only refers to

---

Markus Bockmuehl (“A Commentator’s Approach to the ‘Effective History’ of Philippians,” JSNT 60 [1995]: 57–8) and O’Brien (Philippians, 5).

662 In Rom 15:25 Paul does appear to use hoi hagioi as a group identity for the original Jewish Christ-followers in Judea and surrounding regions. Unlike the Philippians, however, Paul’s Roman readership, with its close ties to the apostolic community in Jerusalem, would have been quite familiar with socio-religious terminology adopted by the community in Jerusalem.

663 Paul’s choice to use tēn ekklēsian tou theou when writing about his former persecution of Judean Christ-followers to his gentile addressees in Galatia (Gal 1:13) seems inconsistent with his use only of ekklēsia when writing to his gentile addressees in Philippi. If Paul’s syntactical variation is intentional, then perhaps it is due to his expressed awareness of the Galatians’ familiarity with Jewish ethno-religious tradition, which could imply their concomitant familiarity with the LXX term hē ekklēsia tou kyriou.

664 Only two inscriptions commissioned by Late Antique Christ-followers in Philippi mention an ekklēsia, and then only with respect to the institutional “Church” (RIChrM 233, 379 CE: τῆς θαυματουργῆς ἐκκλησίας; RIChrM 238, 4th–5th cents. CE[?]·πρεσβοιτέρου τῆς Φιλιππισίων ἀγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας).
multiple *ekklēsiai tou theou*, but he may even be differentiating those Christ-follower sub-groups from himself and his communities.665

Ephesos appears to be another locale within which a local group of Christ-followers self-identifies as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*. In Acts 20:28, Paul is said to enjoin the Ephesian elders to “watch the flock.” This “flock,” which the Ephesian elders are “to shepherd,” is ostensibly designated by Paul as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*.666 In this account the author of Acts implies that Paul refers only to the local association of Christ-followers in Ephesos as *ekklēsia tou theou*, not to the trans-local community of Christ-followers. This being the case, then there appears to be two independent witnesses of the possibility that, not least in Ephesos and Corinth, there existed a sub-group of Christ-followers who self-identified collectively as *hē ekklēsia tou theou*. If Acts’ recounting of Apollos’ ministry reflects historical reality, then it may be that the primary apostolic allegiance of the *ekklēsia tou theou* in Ephesos and Corinth did not lie with Paul. Given Apollos’ deep Jewish roots (Acts 18:24, 28) and his extended stays in Ephesos (Acts 18:24-26) and in Corinth (Acts 18:27–19:1), it does not seem beyond the realm of possibility that the *ekklēsia tou theou* in Ephesos is related to the sub-group of Christ-followers in Corinth who claim to “belong to Apollos” (1 Cor 1:12; 3:4-6).

---

665 1 Cor 11:16 speaks of multiple *ekklēsiai tou theou* (οὐκ ἔχομεν σῶδὲ αἱ ἑκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ; “we have no such custom, nor do the *ekklēsiai* of God”). The other occurrences of the articular phrase *hē ekklēsia tou theou* in 1 Corinthians also could refer to a specific sub-group in Corinth. They are found in 10:32 (“Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the *ekklēsia* of God”) and 11:22 (“Or do you show contempt for the *ekklēsia* of God and humiliate those who have nothing?”).  
666 Acts 20:28 reads, “Keep watch…over all the flock [in Ephesos], of which the Holy Spirit has made you elders to shepherd the *ekklēsia tou theou* that he obtained with the blood of his own Son” (ποιμάνειν τὴν ἑκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἥν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου).
In sum, two overarching comments can be made in relation to New Testament occurrences of the phrase ἡ ἐκκλησία του θεου. Both Paul (1 Corinthians) and the author of Acts refer to a contemporary diasporic, and not only to a historic Judean, community of Christ-followers. Second, Paul’s three references to the ἐκκλησία (του θεου) whom he persecuted need not necessarily reflect the emic terminology of Paul’s victims. It could simply be that Paul speaks of his historical referents in terms that reflect the group identity of his epistolary addressees in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi.

When it comes to discerning ancient sources which inspired Paul’s adoption of a permanent ἐκκλησία identity, it is not helpful to bifurcate those sources into either “Jewish” or “Greco-Roman” categories. Acculturation, accommodation and assimilation to Greco-Roman culture were evident among Jews in the Mediterranean during the first century CE.667 These processes of Hellenization ensured an intermingling of “Jewish” and “Greco-Roman” influences.668 In a not dissimilar vein, to privilege a “Jewish” over a

---

667 John Barclay creates three heuristic categories by which more precisely to measure the degree to which Jews in the Mediterranean region adapted and adopted Hellenism: assimilation, acculturation, and accommodation (Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora (323 BCE–117 CE) [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996], 88–124). Acculturation relates to the adoption of “non-material aspects of a cultural matrix, in particular its language, values, and intellectual traditions” (Ibid, 95). Accommodation “concerns the use to which acculturation is put, in particular the degree to which Jewish and Hellenistic cultural traditions are merged, or alternatively, polarized” (Ibid, 96 [author’s emphasis]). Assimilation assesses “the degree to which Diaspora Jews were integrated into, or socially aloof from, their social environments” (Ibid, 93).

668 Barclay attempts a definition of “Hellenism” and “Hellenization”: “[it] is not easy to define what is meant by the cultural complex we call ‘Hellenization.’ Never static or fixed, the Hellenistic tradition developed over time. It was boosted as well as modified by the emergence of the Roman empire. It was an urban culture which rarely penetrated into the countryside and was neither missionary in intent nor intolerant of indigenous cultures. By ‘Hellenism’ then we mean the common urban culture in the eastern Mediterranean, founded on the Greek language typically expressed in certain political and educational institutions and largely maintained by the social elite” (Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 88). He identifies seven principal components of Hellenization, the interplay of which point to the degree of assimilation, acculturation, and/or accommodation evident among diasporic Jews: (1) political engagement, (2) social interaction, (3) linguistic choices (language), (4) educational processes (e.g., paideia), (5) ideological appropriations (e.g., cultural norms and values), (6) religious syncretism, and (7) material imitation (e.g., dress) (Ibid, 89–90).
“Greek” source as Paul’s inspiration for a collective *ekklēsia* identity is also problematic. A more nuanced approach is preferable.

At the risk of privileging one socio-cultural background over against another, it is important nonetheless to acknowledge Paul’s inherent need for a group designation which, at its irreducible minimum, was deeply rooted within the history of Jewish ethno-religious identity construction. While the LXX provides a lexical association, the real-world use of *ekklēsia* for public synagogue meetings in Judea (Josephus) and the adoption of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity by a Jewish voluntary association (Philo) would have given Paul a serendipitous ideological milieu for situating his multi-ethnic communities into pluriform Second Temple Judaism. In a later section I discuss another participant in that ideological milieu: the (pre)Covenanters at Qumran who self-designate as *qhl* (*4QMMT*, *CD*), the sole Hebrew word which is translated by the LXX as *ekklēsia*.

669 See n. 586 and my fuller discussion of *4QMMT* and *CD* in Part III, §2.3.5 (*The Ekklēsia of Israel [LXX]*).

2.1.4. Summary: First Christ-follower Ekklēsia?

If one grants the possibility that Paul’s historiographical comments employ provincial terminology for the purpose of clearer communication with his reading audience, then it is not impossible that Paul was the first Christ-follower to adopt *ekklēsia* as a permanent collective designation. When one compares Paul’s usage of the word *ekklēsia* with that found in Jewish and Greek sources, he makes at least one distinctive contribution to its semantic domain. He conflates the Greco-Roman civic *ekklēsia* with a Jewish ethno-religious *ekklēsia* to form a semi-public, non-civic, *multi-ethnic* voluntary
association with the potential of incorporating, and maintaining, the social and ethnic identities of Greeks, Romans, ‘barbarians’ and Jews.\footnote{Davina Lopez highlights the fact that to Greeks all non-Greeks were considered ‘barbarians’ (p. 5), and that to the Romans all nations (ethnē), aside from Greeks and Romans, were ‘barbarians’, that is, “outside of civilization” (p. 101) (Apostle to the Conquered: Re-imagining Paul’s Mission [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008]).}

2.2. Ekklēsia as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?

Paul’s ascription of a permanent ekklēsia identity to his communities would have held socio-political implications for their engagements with Greco-Roman society. The puzzle that is Paul’s political ideology has been extensively explored by numerous scholars. As already indicated, it is not my intent to explore Paul’s general use of, and allusion to, political terms and concepts. My concern, rather, is to understand more fully how the permanent ekklēsia identity of Paul’s communities would have been perceived in the Greco-Roman world. The following thesis statement, which I have already highlighted but not yet explicated, summarizes my answers.

socio-religious voluntary association (Runesson) that is socially accessible to Greco-Romans (McCready), and which could have been viewed as a pro-‘democratic,’ counter-oligarchic participant in the ubiquitous “ekklēsia discourse” (Salmeri, Miller) of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor (Wörrle, Mitchell, Sherk, van Nijf, Zuiderhoek). In sum, Paul’s designation of his communities as ekklēsiai makes them perceivable as intra muros Jewish synagogue communities as well as Greco-Roman voluntary associations, whose civic ideology is pro-đemokratia and counter-oligarchic.

2.2.1. Paul’s Ekklēsia: Alternative Civic Ideology?

The first point in my thesis statement is that Paul’s ekklēsiai “reflect civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society.” By “alternative society” I intend Georgi’s paradigm with its three definitional characteristics: “libertarian and democratic

---

675 Runesson, Origins of the Synagogue, 483. See Part III, §2.2.5. Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Jewish Voluntary Association?


universalism, socially egalitarian pluralism, and an urban basis." By “civic ideology” I intend the definition offered by Yonder Moynihan Gillihan: “[civic ideology] designates a comprehensive system of claims about the nature of a state and its relationship to its subjects, as articulated by both the state and its subjects.” Gillihan defines “ideology” congruent with that of modern political philosophy: “a system of thought that legitimates the authority of one social group over others...[and] facilitates domination.”

Gillihan identifies six essential components of civic ideology. He takes these from the prologue of the Institutes of Justinian written in late antiquity (6th cent. CE), but claims that each of the six components is also extant in early antiquity: “(1) piety, or proper understanding of theology; (2) proper understanding of natural order; (3) the comparative superiority of one state over others; (4) the historical evolution of a state to mature status; (5) the promotion of justice, and (6) the promotion of human thriving.”

Civic ideology is implicitly promulgated through literature, visual imagery (public monuments, inscriptional decrees, coins), and dramatic performances (festivals,

---

680 Georgi, Theocracy, 51.
681 Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 75.
682 Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 75.
683 Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 77–78. Justinian’s Institutes, a codification of Roman law, are based in large measure upon the Institutes of Gaius, a 2nd century CE work by a Roman jurist.
684 Examples of literary approaches for promoting state civic ideology include imperially commissioned poetry recited at Greek agonistic festivals, that is, artistic and/or athletic competitions (e.g., Horace’s Carmen Saeculare), Vergil’s Aeneid (mythological aetiology for Rome’s historical and theological legitimation), and Ovid’s Metamorphoses (extolling the virtues of Numa and Pythagoras, Italy’s most celebrated philosopher [Metam. XIII–XV]).
685 Paul Zanker has demonstrated that in the early Principate imperial ideology was disseminated amongst its populace in a plethora of visual images, whether static ones like monuments or mobile ones like coins (The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus [trans. A. Shapiro; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1988]). See more recently the study by Davina Lopez on how imperial visual imagery promoted a state ideology that promulgated the status inequity of conquered and vanquished peoples (Apostle to the Conquered, esp. 26–55).
While Gillihan focuses primarily upon how the Covenanters of Qumran adopted and adapted civic ideology to their own ends, my focus here is upon how Christ-follower *ekklēsiai*, particularly Paul’s, adopted and adapted civic ideology.

### 2.2.1.1. Assimilative Civic Ideology

Gillihan helpfully distinguishes between two main types of civic ideology: assimilative and alternative, both of which were prevalent among voluntary associations. An assimilative response by an association is said to be evident if they accepted “the state’s authority and legitimating arguments, and defined their identity and role in terms established by the state.”

Some ways in which associations expressed assimilative civic ideology was through acceptance of patronage (e.g., honorific inscriptions), regular participation in festivals, collection of taxes from their members, internal policing of participants’ behavior, and incorporation of prayers during assemblies.

John Kloppenborg notes that many non-civic associations, both Greek and Roman, even went so far as to assimilate the organizational and regulatory elements of a *polis*. Bruno Blumenfeld claims this was particularly true of associations for whom the

---

686 See also van Nijf’s discussion of hierarchically arranged seating within Imperial period theatres (*Civic World*, 209–40 and 257–60 [diagrams of theatre seating]).

687 Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

688 Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

689 John S. Kloppenborg, “Edwin Hatch, Churches, and Collegia,” in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity* (ed. B. H. Maclean; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 212–38. Ramsay MacMullen observes that “at least the larger craft associations constituted in every detail miniature cities” (*Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974], 76). The membership of a *collegium*, like the *plebs* of a town, were subject to the rules and regulations of a codified *lex*. As such they were typically called the *plebs collegii*. State titles were appropriated for *collegium* offices (e.g., *quinquennalis*, *quaestor*, *magister*). A veritable moratorium on social stratification was not infrequently in place to the degree that, in some associations, women, freedmen, and slaves were able to join, and even take up leadership positions (Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 90).
oikos was the locus of association life. Civic-style regulations are reflected in the nomoi by which associations conducted their affairs. Gillihan argues that expressions of allegiance to a polis within associational nomoi took at least three forms: use of imperial chronology for dating the text, prayer for a ruler’s welfare, and citation of

690 Blumenfeld contends that, “as public political life shrinks and sheds it relevance, the oikos expands its sphere and increases in significance; it itself becomes a polis” (The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework [JSNTSup 210; London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001/London: T. & T. Clark, 2003/2004], 113). Blumenfeld’s assessment that political life was shrinking in the Greek East during the Imperial period unfortunately only takes into account the state of démokratía among formal civic institutions such as the boulê and the ekklesiá. Blumenfeld does not consider van Nijf’s contention that informal political culture permeated the life of Imperial period polis in the Greek East.

691 In order to facilitate his seminal study of association ordinances in Roman Egypt, A. Boak heuristically delimits the meaning of nomoi to associational bylaws. See Boak’s edition of P.Mich. 5.243, 244 in Papyri from Tebtunis (1944) and in his “Organization of Guilds in Greco-Roman Egypt,” TAPA 68 (1937): 212–20. In ancient praxis, however, the term nomoi refers both to state and association laws, or even simply to laws in a general. Hugo Mantel provides a seven point summation of Boak’s research on the functions of association nomoi. The nomoi regulated: (i) the election of the president; (ii) dues; (iii) dates of meetings; (iv) conduct at meetings; (v) mutual assistance; (vi) funerals; and (vii) fines (“The Men of the Great Synagogue,” HTR 60/1 [1967]: 69–91, esp. 88 n. 124).

692 Gillihan lists the best preserved nomoi in chronological order (Civic Ideology, 6–7): P.Dem. Lille 29 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 223 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 31178 (cultic association [Osiris, Isis and Serapis?] at Arsinoe; 179 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30606 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 157 BCE); P.Dem. Hamburg I (cultic association of Sebek at Tebtynis; 151 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 31179 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 147 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30605 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 145 BCE); P.Dem. Cairo 30619 (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 137 BCE); P.Dem. Prague (cultic association of Sebek at Arsinoe; 137 BCE); P.Dem. Berlin 3115 (cultic association of Amon-Ophet at Djeme; c. 110 BCE); P.Lond. 2710 (cultic association of Zeus Hypsistos at Philadelphia; c. 68–59 BCE); P.Mich. 5.244 (association of the Apolysimoi of Tebtynis; 43 CE); P.Mich. 5.243 (unnamed association at Tebtynis during the reign of Tiberius [14–37 CE]); ILS 7212 = CIL XIV 2112 (cultic association of Diana and Antinóus at Lanuvium; c. 136 CE); SIG7 1109 (cultic association of the Iobacchoi at Athens, 178 CE).

693 Effusive praise of the reigning Ptolemaic king is evident in the Demotic nomoi. For example, “Year 24, month of Mesore of the king Ptolemy and Cleopatra... divine Epiphanies, the priest of Alexander of the divine savior...” (P.Dem. Cairo 30306 I-4; c. 157 BCE). In the Roman era sparser dating elements are found in nomoi texts. For example, in ILS 7212 1 (c. 136 BCE), the top reads: “In the consulships of L. Ceionius Commodus and of Sextus Vettulenus Civicus Pompeianus, on the day before the 5th day of the Ides of June.” Gillihan claims that the use of imperial chronology by nomoi texts “signifies associational acceptance of the imperial order” (Civic Ideology, 93). Obversely, Gillihan cite examples of social groups who express resistance to state ideology by using an alternative calendar. This is evident in the Damascus Rule wherein the establishment of its “new covenant” is dated in conjunction with the years of Israelite history (CD 1:5-10) (for other examples, see Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 93 n. 57). However, Gillihan does not consider the possibility that use of imperial chronology may simply reflect the use of formulaic literary terminology that is requisite for gaining the hearing of one’s intended reading audience. This pragmatic concern need not necessarily imply “associational acceptance of the imperial order.”

694 Gillihan (Civic Ideology, 93) notes that “theological affirmation of state authority” is evident, for example, in the inscription of the association of Diana and Antinóus at Lanuvium: “May this be
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state laws to legitimate association activity. Associations with trans-local connections do not display assimilative civic ideology. In this respect, but not in this respect alone, Paul’s trans-local association of *ekklēсiai* diverges from assimilative civic ideology.

2.2.1.2. Alternative Civic Ideology

According to Gillihan, an alternative civic ideology consists of three elements. First, the six major themes of state ideology are critically filtered through that association’s own paradigmatic ideological grid. For example, the filters of the Covenanter include “the themes of adherence to Torah, participation in the covenant with God, and human thriving as inheritance of covenantal blessings.”

Second, the status quo of civic ideology is challenged through the differentiated organizational and regulatory choices an association makes. Thus, even though voluntary associations in general adopted civic structures and leadership titles, it is their modifications to, or specific rejections of, institutional norms that provided an implicit critique of civic ideology. One way in which some associations rejected the state’s right of interference was to deny their members access to the public justice system and, instead, internally to provide imperially sanctioned judicial services.


The best example is from the Lanuvium inscription wherein associational statutes are prefaced with a direct quote from *senatus consultum*: “Clause from the *senatus consultum* of the Roman people: These are permitted to assemble, convene, and maintain a society: those who desire to make monthly contributions for funerals may assemble in such a society, but they may not assemble in the name of such society except once a month for the sake of making contributions to provide burial for the dead” (*ILS* 7212 1.11–13, trans. A. Gordon, with modification by Gillihan [*Civic Ideology*, 94]).

Gillihan, *Civic Ideology*, 79.

Gillihan cites the seminal work of Mariano San Nicolò which first argued that “from the Hellenistic times onward the imperial authorities granted associations limited but significant juridical
Third, Gillihan makes the blanket statement that all associations with an alternative civic ideology assisted their members in developing strategies for negotiating the boundaries between association and state. In so doing, they did not reject outright all claims which poleis, provincial governors, or imperial authorities had upon their subjects. Some associations even encouraged the direct engagement of their members with state bureaucracy. This impulse towards integrative association with, yet associational differentiation from, the state is a key feature which distinguishes alternative civic ideologues from revolutionary political movements, such as the Jewish sicarii.

2.2.1.3. Pauline Ekklēsiai as Alternative Societies

In addition to the Covenanters, Gillihan names two other types of associations which he claims promulgated an alternative civic ideology: Pauline ekklēsiai and three Greek philosophical schools: Stoics, Epicureans, and Cynics. These four are said

authority over members” (Civic Ideology, 87–88; see Mariano San Nicolò, Ägyptisches Vereinswesen sur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer [2 vols.; München: Beck, 1913–15]; idem, “Zur Vereinsgerichtsbarkeit im hellenistischen Ägypten,” in ENITYMBION Heinrich Swoboda dargebracht [Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1927], 255–300). Two rules in particular were common within the nomoi, or regulations, of voluntary associations: (1) fellow members were prohibited from suing one another in public courts. Lawsuits were arbitrated by a special juridical committee within the association; and (2) brawling among members was subject to internal sanctions. The president was most often the person given the authority to mete out fines or other penalties.

698 For example, the nomos of the Athenian Iobacchoi mandated celebratory festivities whenever a member was elected to public office (Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 89).

699 Gillihan notes that “of course revolutionary movements sometimes have alternative civic ideologies, but they may also have assimilative civic ideologies but disagree about who should hold power” (Civic Ideology, 80 n. 14).

700 Although Gillihan does not paint John’s seven ekklēsiai in Roman Asia with this same ideological brush, they too embraced an alternative civic ideology. Their alternative civic ideology, however, was directed more towards the counter-imperial end of the ideological spectrum. See my discussion of Revelation in Part III, §3.4. Ekklēsia in Apocalyptic Literature: Revelation. See also Korner, “The Ekklēsia of Early Christ-Followers in Asia Minor,” forthcoming.

701 Stoic civic ideology takes its cue from a preconception of the kosmos as the true commonwealth. It is incumbent, therefore, upon all human poleis to fall into conformity with this true commonwealth whose citizens are the gods and humans and whose underlying nomos is the nous, or rather the rationality presupposed in a mind that is in harmony with the law of “right reason” (δρθος λόγος)
to have “rejected the arguments of state civic ideology and the state’s claims to ultimate legitimacy.” The Stoics, Epicureans, and Cynics each created a symbolic universe thought to represent a commonwealth superior to any in existence. The philosophical foundation of each commonwealth derived from the six major themes of civic ideology.

Like the Covenanters, Paul’s ideology reflects a not dissimilar concern for faithful participation in a covenantal relationship with God. For him, though, humanity establishes that relationship through faith in the Jewish Christos. There are at least two more ways in which Paul modified, and even rejected, state civic ideology. While civic ekklēsiai only accorded political equality to male citizens, irrespective of their socio-economic status and ethno-religious background, Paul mirrored some Greco-Roman voluntary associations and Jewish public synagogues in choosing to grant

through which all human life can be brought into conformity to nature (κατὰ φύσιν) (e.g., Arius Didymus, ap. Eusebius, PE 15.15.3-5). This law of right reason is neither a social nor a divine construct, but rather a transcendent principle to which both gods and humans are subject (Chrysippus, Marcian 1 [SVF 3.314]). This law of right reason should inform the actions of all humans, since all humans are citizens in the kosmopolis. Thus, Stoics prioritized direct political engagement in poleis which either rejected or neglected δρός λόγος. See further in Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 114.

Epicureans paid special attention to two of the six themes that together constitute civic ideology: nature and justice. Nature endows human nature with a distinct aversion to pain and a concomitant desire for pleasure. The ultimate goal, then, for Epicureans is “a life of tranquility, free from pain” (Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 96). In a societal context, this type of life is possible both individually and collectively only when what Epicurus calls “nature’s justice” is enacted on behalf of all (Epicurus, Key Doctrines, 31–35).

Cynic society is “one comprising humans who choose, through constant discipline (ἀσκησίς), what is in accordance with nature (κατὰ φύσιν)...[and] since they live in formity to divinely established natural laws, Cynics claim a uniquely intimate relationship with the founders of the kosmopolis itself, i.e., the gods” (D.L. 6.37, 72) (Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 108). Cynic civic ideology views every person as a “citizen of the kosmos,” or as Diogenes defined himself, as a κοσμοπολίτης. As such, a trans-local identity is presumed for citizens of the kosmopolis, at least for those who live κατὰ φύσιν, that is, in accordance with natural law, an immutable law that transcends all geo-political boundaries.

Women and slaves were given entrance into some Greco-Roman household-based associations. Harland recounts a 1st cent. BCE example from Philadelphia (ILydiaKP III 18) (Associations, 30). Therein, Dionysios, the head of a household, established regulations for the membership of “men and women, free people and slaves” in his oikos (“household”).
unrestricted social interaction also to women and to slaves (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 7:17-24). Paul also paralleled association nomoi in his encouragement of his ekklēsia members in Corinth to access juridical services internally, rather than airing internal disputes publicly in the civic justice system (1 Cor 6:1–8).

2.2.2. Paul’s Ekklēsia: Counter-Imperial Ideology?

A question worth asking at this point is whether Paul’s ideological differentiation of his ekklēsiai from state political structures entails counter-imperial ideology. As already discussed, some political interpreters of Paul believe so. Such a position, though, must overcome at least four socio-historical challenges.

First, by way of analogy from the Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos and the wrestling association of Samos, one could suggest that some of those early Christ-followers who named their membership assemblies ekklēsiai, may have done so as a way of currying political and economic favour with civic authorities and/or Greek notables (e.g., benefactors). This possibility becomes even more plausible for Christ-follower ekklēsiai located in Asia Minor with its ubiquitous “ekklēsia discourse” and its burgeoning culture of benefaction towards voluntary associations.

---

706 One example of an inscription which recounts the participation of women in synagogues is IJO 1/CIJ 1.728 (Delos, 1st cent. BCE). Therein, Laodice offers a votive inside the edifice (ASSB no. 96). Josephus cites a decree of the people of Halicarnassos (A.J. 14.256-58), which also dates to the 1st cent. BCE, in which Jewish “men and women alike…may keep the Sabbaths…and sacred rituals…and may build proseuchai (“prayer halls”).” If the author of Judith models his 8th century BCE Judean assembly after a public synagogue assembly contemporaneous with his day, then Hellenistic-era Judean public assemblies allowed women to participate. See further, Runesson, “Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 108–110; idem, “Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 463.

707 Gal 3:28 reads, “There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.”


709 See further in Part III, §2.2.6. Paul’s Ekklēsia: Socio-Ethnic Dēmokratia and Counter-Oligarchic Civic Ideology?
Second, Richard Horsley’s identification of five social functions in Paul’s Corinthian ekklēsia, which purportedly communicate counter-imperial polemic, appears open to question.\(^{710}\) To begin, other “trans-local networks of missionally united” associations were not perceived as a political threat by Roman authorities. Oligarchic families, for one, developed formal and informal trans-local networks whose mission was the retention of power and wealth through the solidification of educational, cultural, and political commonalities.\(^{711}\) Although that mission was intrinsically self-serving, these trans-local networks were still pro-imperial in their socio-political functioning.\(^{712}\) Horsley’s point is further weakened by the fact that pluralistic phrases like “the ekklēsiai of Asia” (Rom 16:1; cf. Rev 1:4) may simply describe a multiplicity of loosely connected ekklēsiai in a particular region, rather than a formal, regional association of ekklēsiai.

Horsley also leaves himself open to question in his claim that the autonomous adjudication of communal affairs by Paul’s ekklēsiai represents counter-imperial ideology. As already noted, this juridical praxis was legally granted by Roman authorities to voluntary associations since Hellenistic times. There is little possibility that Romans perceived the enactment of a legal right as an expression of anti-Roman ideology.\(^{713}\)

---

\(^{710}\) See Part I, §2.2 (Ekklēsia as Political Identity: Counter-Imperial Ideology?). Richard Horsley does suggest a sixth factor by which Paul presents a counter-imperial agenda, but it is a literary strategy, not a social function: the use of deliberative rhetoric in the Corinthian correspondence (“1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul’s Assembly,” in Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church [ed. E. Adams and D. G. Horrell; Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004], 227–240, esp. 237).

\(^{711}\) See Part I, §2.2, Political Players in Imperial Greek Cities.

\(^{712}\) Van Kooten also states that Paul organizes Christ-followers into trans-local communities “as an alternative political structure existing alongside the Greek civic assemblies and the Roman State” (“Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 535). He does not follow Horsley’s later trajectory of viewing Paul’s trans-local ekklēsiai as counter-imperial associations.

\(^{713}\) See n. 697 on San Nicolò’s claim that associations were granted “limited but significant juridical authority over members” (cited in Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 87–88).
Finally, Horsley’s ostensible claim that Paul rejected benefaction in Corinth is problematic on three fronts. Paul accepted patronage from Phoebe in Cenchrae (Rom 16:2) and seems to have enjoyed the same from Gaius as well as Erastus while writing his Roman epistle in Corinth (Rom 16:23). This “Erastus” may be the same aedile (“treasurer”) whose name is found inscribed on a paving stone in Corinth. If so, then this confirms his elite status as a city notable with sufficient personal funds at his disposal to be a source of benefaction for Paul and the Corinthian Christ-follower community.

A third key issue which limits any claim that ekklēsia was an inherently counter-imperial identity relates to the democratic authority of civic ekklēsiai in Imperial Greek cities. Imperial period inscriptional evidence demonstrates that the dēmos, when assembled en ekklēsia, did not possess sufficient kratos to have been perceived as a direct political threat to Roman hegemony. In fact, the rise of euergetism and of a widespread “ekklēsia discourse” in Asia Minor suggests an opposite reality. A non-civic group self-designating as ekklēsia would have been perceived as an active and supportive participant in the political culture of that day, with the cross-hairs of its pro-dēmokratia rhetoric not aimed any higher than the level of municipal (polis) or regional (oligarchic trans-national associations) political institutions. One can assume, therefore, that any non-civic group self-identifying as an ekklēsia was in little danger of being perceived as a counter-

---

714 Rom 16:2 reads, in part, Phoebe “has been a benefactor [prostatis] of many and of myself as well.” Rom 16:23 reads, “Gaius, who is host to me and to the whole church, greets you. Erastus, the city treasurer, and our brother Quartus, greet you.”

715 Anthony Thiselton reviews the scholarly debate with respect to connecting the Erastus who is honoured on an inscription for paving a street in Corinth with the Erastus who appears to be a member of the Corinthian ekklēsia, which met in the home of Gaius (Rom 16:23) (The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2000], 8–9). He concludes that the evidence is sufficiently credible to suggest that one and the same person may very well be in view (Ibid, 9).

716 See Part I, §2.3. Political Authority of the Popular Assembly in the Imperial Period.

203
imperial threat. The “John” who authored the polemical book of Revelation appears implicitly to corroborate this fact. Even though he addresses his seven communities in Roman Asia as ekklēsiai, he still sees a need for transforming them into an explicitly counter-imperial image. John’s depiction of his ekklēsiai as a heavenly, hegemonic, eschatological, Jewish polis, which rules the earth for eternity (Rev 21:2, 9-10), implies that he did not view ekklēsia, in and of itself, as a sufficiently anti-Roman identity.717

A fourth and perhaps most telling issue, not least from the standpoint of Egyptian politics, is that some Jews in Alexandria may have used ekklēsia terminology for public meetings (Spec. 1.324-325) and for voluntary associations (Virt. 108, Deus 111) during an era of direct and pervasive Roman governance.718 The distinct possibility of Jewish ekklēsiai operating in Alexandria, coupled with the Roman governor’s silence as to their existence in his defense before Caesar (Pro Flacco) seems instructive. If an ekklēsia identity was inherently counter-imperial, then the Roman governor could have pointed at Jewish ekklēsiai in Alexandria as being one more just cause for his indifference to the needs of the Jews during the Jewish pogrom in Alexandria (38 CE). Additionally, one would expect Greeks in Alexandria to have viewed the existence of Jewish ekklēsiai with some suspicion, if not even outright jealousy, since their boulē had been disbanded by the Romans and their civic ekklēsiai not reinstated. Yet, in spite of the politically charged atmosphere in Alexandria during the Julio-Claudian era (27 BCE–68 CE), no extant evidence survives over Roman or Greek concern about Jews adopting ekklēsia

717 See Part III, §3.4.1. Counter-Imperial Civic Ideology: John’s Ekklēsiai as Hegemonic Polis.
terminology. This indicates either that Jewish *ekklēsiai* did not exist, or were known only to Jewish insiders, or that Greco-Roman outsiders did not view Jewish *ekklēsiai* as an example of polemical rhetoric. If this third option is so, then, in a similar vein, Roman authorities elsewhere in the Diaspora also may not have perceived Pauline *ekklēsiai*, which existed during the same time but in different *poleis*, as counter-imperial ideologues.

Karl Donfried’s counter-imperial assessment of Paul’s address in the Thessalonian correspondence (“to the *ekklēsia* of the Thessalonians”) also bears revisiting in light of literary, numismatic, and inscriptional witnesses. First, the juxtaposition of the word *ekklēsia* with a “city-ethnic” in the New Testament is not unique to the Thessalonian correspondence. It also occurs within Colossians. Therein, (deutero-)Paul requests that his epistle to the Colossians be read “in the *ekklēsia* of the Laodiceans” (Col 4:16). Donfried does not discuss this passage. Since this use of the *nomen gentilicium* in Colossians does not appear to reflect counter-imperial rhetoric, it seems warranted to posit the same conclusion for Paul’s *adscriptio* “to the *ekklēsia* of the Thessalonians.”

Donfried’s interpretation of numismatic evidence is open to question too. He seems to assume that conclusions reached on Thessalonian coinage which use the simple “city-ethnic” *thessalonikeōn* are *ipso facto* valid in respect of Paul’s complete collocation *tēi ekklēsiai thessalonikeōn*. Validation of his assumption requires material evidence.

---

719 Col 4:16 reads, ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ (“have it read in the *ekklēsia* of the Laodiceans”).
wherein a “city-ethnic” is paired with the word *ekklēsia*, whether by itself (e.g., *ekklēsiai thessalonikeōn*) or within an enactment formula (e.g., *edoxe tēi ekklēsiai thessalonikeōn*).

Unfortunately, such evidence is lacking. There are no extant pre-Christ-follower, Macedonian inscriptional references to the civic *ekklēsia* of Thessalonica,\(^{720}\) and, thus, to the pairing of *ekklēsia* with a “city-ethnic.” Instead, the only example of a pre-Christ-follower, Macedonian inscription pairing *ekklēsia* with *polis* terminology does so using the actual name of the city (“of Amphipolis”),\(^{721}\) rather than the *nomen gentilicium* (“Amphipolonians”).\(^{722}\) If Amphipolis is an exemplar of Macedonian-wide *praxis*, then one would expect the Thessalonicans to have followed suit. This anomaly makes the reverse of Donfried’s argument true. Paul’s use of the “city-ethnic” (*thessalonikeōn*) with the word *ekklēsia* is thus not typical, numismatic evidence notwithstanding, but rather atypical, of Macedonian inscriptional *praxis*. Paul’s variance from formulaic Macedonian political terminology, then, would have served to lessen, not increase, perceptions that his *adscriptio* in 1 Thessalonians evinces political rhetoric.

Paul’s atypical formulation may even have been confusing to his Thessalonican readership since his pairing of *ekklēsia* with a *nomen gentilicium* only occurs in inscriptions from non-Macedonian *poleis*. These *poleis* are at a fair geographical and chronological remove from Paul’s Thessalonican *ekklēsia*. Two inscriptions are from the

---

\(^{720}\) Of the fourteen inscriptional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* which hail from Macedonia, only four can be dated with confidence before the 4th century CE: *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 36 (243 BCE); *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 41 (243 BCE); *Meletemata* 22, *Epig. App.* 37 (2x *ekklēsia*; 200–175 BCE).

\(^{721}\) The inscription from Amphipolis is undatable. It contains only two words (*uniklēsia*). See *AE* (1932) Chr., 1,2 (Makedonia [Edonis]—Amphipolis; n.d.).

Aegean island of Kos and date to the 4th century BCE. The other six inscriptions are from the Hellenistic-era and come from Epeiros (Epirus).

Epeiros is located on the Adriatic Sea, across the Pindos mountain range from Thessaly. All six inscriptions from Epeiros collocate ekklēsia with a nomen gentilicium within an enactment formula (e.g., edoxe tai ekklēsiai). One inscription is dated prior to Epeiros becoming a Roman province in 167 BCE. The other five date from 163 BCE to 136 BCE. One formalizes a treaty and the other four enact proxeny decrees.

It is conceivable that Paul mirrors Epirote inscriptive praxis given the preeminent position of southern Epeiros, generally, and of its foremost city, Nicopolis, specifically, within the Roman empire. Nicopolis was founded by Augustus himself (28 BCE) in honour of his naval victory (nikē) over Antony and Cleopatra in the Ambracian Gulf at Actium (31 BCE). He made it into a free polis like Athens or Sparta. Nicopolis eventually became the capital of southern Epeiros and Akarnania thereby becoming the

\footnotesize

723 Tit. Calymnii 1 (ἐδοξε ταί ἐκκλησίαι ταί Καλυμνίων); Tit. Calymnii 70 (ἐδοξε ταί ἐκκλησίαι ταί Καλυμνίων).
725 Cabanes, l’Epire 541.5 (Dodona, 342–330 BCE): ἐδόξε ταῖ ἐκκλησίαι ἡκκλησίαι τῶν Μολοσσῶν).
726 SEG 35.665 (Ambrakia, 160 BCE): ἐδοξε ταί τε βουλαί καί ταί ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Ἀμβρακιωτῶν; IBouthrotos 8 (150 BCE?): ἐδοξε ταί βουλαί καί τε ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Πρασαίβων; IBouthrotos 9 (c. 136 BCE?): ἐδοξε ταί βουλαί καί ταί ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Πρασαίβων; IBouthrotos 10 (post-163 BCE): ἐδοξε ταί ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Πρασαίβων; IBouthrotos 11 (post-163 BCE): ἐδοξε ταί ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Πρασαίβων.
727 SEG 35.665.
728 IBouthrotos 8, 9, 10, 11.
729 Hammond, Epirus, 46; Wiseman and Zachos, Landscape Archaeology, 2–3.
most important polis in Western Greece. If the late Hellenistic-era Epirote practice of collocating ekklēsia with a “city-ethnic” was still current in the early Imperial period, then a general awareness of Epirote praxis could have spread beyond western Greece into the other Hellenic regions Paul visited during his earlier missionary journeys (e.g., Macedonia, Thessaly, Phokis, Achaia). If any of Paul’s readership were familiar with this Epirote praxis, some confusion may have arisen in their minds as to why Paul addresses his Thessalonican ekklēsia members with an Epirote political formula.

By way of summary, then, one can say that, while literary considerations ambiguate the claims of Horsley and Donfried, it would appear that the added weight of Greek inscriptive evidence tips the scale away from a counter-imperial interpretation of Paul’s choice to designate his communities as ekklēsiai.

2.2.3. Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Parallel Political Organization?

The third element in my thesis statement on the ideological self-presentation of Paul’s ekklēsiai engages with van Kooten’s claim that they formed “a trans-local parallel political association” which mirrored three levels of political organization—municipal/regional, provincial, and empire-wide. Van Kooten grounds his three-tiered political perspective in Paul’s concept of two parallel “commonwealths” or “states.”

---

730 The territory of southern Epiros includes Ambrakia, much of Akarnania, and western Aetolia. There was a forced relocation of many residents from within those regions to Nicopolis (Hammond, Epirus, 687; Wiseman and Zachos, Landscape Archaeology, 3). See n. 726 where one of the inscriptions that use the “city ethnic” is from Ambrakia (SEG 35.665).

731 Van Kooten claims that “Paul’s contrast between two types of ἐκκλησία is an expression of his view on two types of πολίτευμα [Phil 3:18-20], a distinction which finds its background in the Stoic doctrine of dual citizenship” (“Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 522).

732 In line with other scholars, van Kooten assumes that politeuma means “the commonwealth” or “state” (“Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ,” 522). Politeuma is not infrequently used of a colony of foreigners or relocated veterans (CIG 5361, III add. 5866c; PTebrynis 32, 9; 17 [2nd cent. BCE]; Ep. Arist. 310).
My assessment of van Kooten’s position will suggest that while his political understanding of Paul’s *ekklēsiai* is possible, it seems to read the evidence too politically. Van Kooten depicts the three-tiered trans-local association of Christ-followers as holding two allegiances concurrently: first and foremost to the heavenly *kyrios* and *sōtēr*, Jesus the *Christos*, and secondarily to the earthly *kyrios* and *sōtēr*, the Roman emperor. Van Kooten is not original in this line of reasoning, but he is in his claim that Paul saw his trans-local association of *ekklēsiai* as an empire-wide “commonwealth” or “state.”

As previously discussed, van Kooten makes three exegetical moves to support that contention. First, he claims that Paul hints at a provincial level of organization when he adds geo-political descriptors to the plural form of the word *ekklēsia* (e.g., “the *ekklēsia* of Galatia”; 1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2). Second, he envisions a “universal, even global notion of ἐκκλησίαι” by translating Paul’s phrase *pasai hai ekklēsiai tôn ethnōn* as “all the *ekklēsiai* from the nations” (Rom 16:4). Third, he then adduces a global meaning for two other pluralized *ekklēsia* references: “all the *ekklēsiai* of Christ” (Rom 16:16) and “all the *ekklēsiai* of the saints” (1 Cor 14:33b). These three interpretations are built upon the foundation of van Kooten’s translation of *politeuma* as “commonwealth” (Phil 3:20). Other translations of the word *politeuma* are possible, however. These place into question van Kooten’s three-tiered view of Paul’s *ekklēsiai*.

---

733 See, for example, Stegemann and Stegemann (*The Jesus Movement*, 263–64, 273–76, 286–87), and McCready (“*Ekklēsia* and Voluntary Associations,” 59–73).

734 Van Kooten, “*Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*,” 537.

735 Van Kooten argues that “this universal network of the ἐκκλησίαι of the nations…are then further defined as ‘all the ἐκκλησίαι of Christ’” (“*Εκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*,” 537).
2.2.3.1. Dual Politeuma?

Van Kooten’s view that Paul is contrasting the “commonwealth” (politeuma) of Christ-followers with the politeuma of Rome (Phil 3:20) is dependant on his assumption that Paul reflects “the Stoic notion of two kinds of citizenship, and the existence of two commonwealths [politeumata].” Three factors question such a presupposition. First, Richard Ascough, Philip Harland, and John Kloppenborg claim that the work of Lüderitz dispels previous scholarly notions that politeuma necessarily connotes a body formally recognized by political institutions, such as the citizenry of a polis, or a colony of immigrants who are given semiautonomous political status therein. Instead of the translation “citizenship,” Gennadi Sergienko claims that Greek and Jewish literary sources use politeuma in the generic sense of “governing authority.”

---

736 Van Kooten, “Ἐκκλησία το/uni1F18κκλησία το/uni1FE6 θεο/uni1FE6,” 528. For detailed discussion by van Kooten of Paul’s appropriation of the Platonic-Stoic conception of dual citizenship in his depiction of a heavenly politeuma, see, idem, “Philosophical Criticism of Genealogical Claims and Stoic Depoliticization of Politics: Graeco-Roman Strategies in Paul’s Allegorical Interpretation of Hagar and Sarah (Gal 4.21-31),” in Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham (TBN 13; ed. M. Goodman, G. van Kooten, and J. van Ruiten; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 361–85, esp. 372–85.

737 Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, Associations in the Greco-Roman World, 190–91.


739 Mary E. Smallwood championed the view that politeuma was used of “a recognized, formally constituted corporation of aliens enjoying the right of domicile in a foreign city and forming a separate, semiautonomous civic body, a city within the city” (The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian [Leiden: Brill, 1976], 225). For a survey of subsequent scholarly perspectives on the meaning of politeuma as it relates to the Jews of Alexandria during the 1st cent CE, see Barclay’s excursus on the legal status of Jews in Alexandria (Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 62–70).

740 Gordon D. Fee translates politeuma as “citizenship” even while acknowledging that “the concept of ‘citizenship’ itself is poorly attested” (Paul’s Letter to the Philippians [NICNT 50; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 378 n. 17). Gennadi A. Sergienko studied about 150 occurrences of politeuma in Greco-Roman and Jewish literary sources and came to the same conclusion as Fee: the term “citizenship” is “indeed poorly attested—if attested at all—as the meaning of πολ/uni1F77τευ/uni03BCα” (“Our Politeuma is in Heaven!”: Paul’s Polemical Engagement with the “Enemies of the Cross of Christ” in Philippians 3:18–20 [Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2011], 161; see also 231–36). He claims that within Greco-Roman and Jewish literary sources “governing authority” is the more consistent definition employed (Ibid, 167–69).
Second, with respect to epigraphic sources, recent scholarship contends that \textit{politeuma} is best translated as “community”\textsuperscript{741} or “corporate body.”\textsuperscript{742} This being the case, \textit{politeuma} is not a political term (“commonwealth”) so much as it is a sociological term (“social network”). Inscriptional examples of non-civic groups adopting a \textit{politeuma} identity include: associations of soldiers,\textsuperscript{743} an association of women constituted bi-

\textsuperscript{741} In their sourcebook on ancient synagogue terms, Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson translate \textit{politeuma} as “community” in two early 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE Egyptian inscriptions (\textit{CIZ} 70 and \textit{CIZ} 71) (\textit{The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book} [AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008], nos. 131, 132).

\textsuperscript{742} Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg also translate \textit{politeuma} in \textit{CIZ} 70 and \textit{CIZ} 71 with a term denoting a non-civic “community”: “the term \textit{politeuma} (translated ‘corporate body’ in this volume), which can also be used in reference to a body of citizens (as at Chios), is attested for associations of various types” (\textit{Associations in the Greco-Roman World}, 190). Philip Harland notes that \textit{politeuma} “was used of regular associations including [two Imperial period] ‘corporate bodies’ of Phrygians at Alexandria [3 BCE; \textit{IAlexandriaK} 74 = IG XIV 701 = IGRR I 458] and of devotees of the goddess Sachypsis in the Fayum in Egypt [3 BCE; \textit{SIG} \textsuperscript{3} 1107]” (\textit{Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities} [New York/London: T&T Clark, 2009], 41). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg translate \textit{IAlexandriaK} 74 as “Gaius Julius Hephaistion, son of Hephaistion, having served as priest of the \textit{politeuma} (‘corporate body’) of Phrygians, dedicated this to Phrygian Zeus” (\textit{AGRW}, no. 316). For Greek text and translation of \textit{SIG} \textsuperscript{3} 1107, see Lüderitz, “What Is Politeuma?” 191. Lüderitz comments that “the \textit{politeuma} may have been founded by Harthotes (perhaps through a testamentary act of donation), and it was presided by a προστάτης—in Egypt the most common expression for the chairmen of all kinds of associations and clubs. The \textit{politeuma} had a τόπος in the temple of Sachypsis and was also named after the goddess. All these details would lead to the conclusion that this ‘politeuma’ was a club of the type otherwise often called κοινός or κοινόν, commonly termed ‘cult association.’ This is also the opinion of all scholars commenting on this inscription” (Ibid, 192).

\textsuperscript{743} A dedicatory inscription (\textit{SEG} 20.499; 112/111 or 76/75 BCE) mentions a \textit{politeuma} of soldiers stationed in Alexandria. \textit{SEG} 20.499 reads, “To Zeus Soter and Hera Teleia, the \textit{politeuma} of the soldiers brought to Alexandria, their chairman Dionysios of Callon and secretary Philippos of Philippos, the founders, ex voto, year 6” (Lüderitz, “What Is Politeuma?” 192). Lüderitz observes that “the \textit{politeuma} of soldiers had a chairman and a secretary—both common posts in antique corporations. Attached to these is the designation κτήτορα. A κτήτορα in such a context is a founder either of a building (e.g., a temple) or of an association” (Ibid, 192). Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg mention three painted graves for soldiers in Sidon (Syria/Phoenicia; early 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent BCE) which designate the association of their living comrades as a \textit{politeuma} (“corporate body”) (\textit{AGRW}, nos. 271, 273, 274, respectively): (1) \textit{OGIS} 592 (see also, TH. Macridy, \textit{RevBib} 13 [1904]: 549–50 [A]): “The \textit{politeuma} of Kaunians set this up for Hippolytos(?) and Apollonides, sons of Hermagoras”; (2) TH. Macridy, \textit{RevBib} 13 (1904): 551 (no. 2): “The \textit{politeuma} of the Pisidians of the Ternessians near Oenoanda set this up for their own citizen”; (3) TH. Macridy, \textit{RevBib} 13 (1904): 551–552 (no. 3): “The \textit{politeuma} of Pinarians set this up for Kartadis son of Hermaktibilos, Lycean. Farewell courageous and painless one!”
annually, and some Judeans in Egypt. In each of these sources, a political agenda does not come to the fore in the voluntary associations’ self-description as a politeuma.

Third, if one consolidates the witness of literary ("governing authority") and epigraphic ("community/corporate body") sources, then Paul’s phrase “our politeuma is in heaven” (Phil 3:20) also is not in its essence a political statement. Rather, Sergienko claims that Paul presents his ekklēsia in Philippi as a socio-religious association (thiasos) in concert with other Greco-Roman voluntary associations which use politeuma terminology. The key difference for Paul, though, is that his politeuma in Philippi, which he calls an ekklēsia, answers exclusively to a heavenly and not to any competing earthly “governing authority,” not least the local Imperial cult. He is thus contrasting “our politeuma” (a heavenly politeuma) with that of “his opponents [i.e., other Christ-followers] who pride themselves on belonging to a local πολίτευμα (voluntary

---

744 Lüderitz notes that “in the temple complex of Zeus Panamaros [Stratonicæa, Caria, Asia Minor]…every second year the ‘Heraia’ was celebrated (the Hera festival), which was a festival of the women. Free and slave women were ‘called’ by the priests into the temple, the ‘Heraion,’ and received wine and money…Instead of expressions like ‘all the women’ three texts mention that ‘the politeuma of the women’ had been called or received” (What Is Politēuma? 189). See further in Gaston Deschamps and Georges Cousin, “Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros,” BCH 15 (1891): 169–209, esp. 181 (no. 123), 204–206 (no. 145), and Georges Cousin, “Inscriptions du sanctuaire de Zeus Panamaros,” BCH 28 (1904): 20–53, esp. 40 (no. 23). Inscription no. 23 reads, “The generous organizers of the Hera festival having invited the politeuma of women, gave to the rest of the women each one denarius, as well to those who came to the city with their husbands.” Inscription no. 123 reads, “The priest in the [year] of the Hera festival Menippos Leontos for the adoption of Heirokleus Koraeus [and] the priestess Papiaina Menestheos […] invited also the politeuma of women.” Inscription no. 145 reads, “Having invited also the politeuma of women [to take part] in the Hera festival.”

745 CJZC 70, 71 (Berenice, Cyrenaica). See text in n. 354.

746 The strength of Sergienko’s interpretive move is lessened, however, in view of the fact that there is no extant literary or inscriptional evidence by which to claim that some Philippian associations self-identified as a politeuma. Sergienko can only extrapolate such a scenario from the precedent of epigraphic evidence from Egypt and Asia Minor. He presumes, firstly, that since politeuma is used as a group designation by some associations of soldiers (e.g., CJZC 70, 71; Egypt) “the word undoubtedly had currency among former servicemen” (Our Politeuma is in Heaven! 158). This fact leads him then to assume not least that Roman veterans in Philippi may also have formed a politeuma association.
association)’ and who “compromised their ultimate allegiance to the heavenly πολίτευμα…in their [continued] allegiance to a different κύριος and σωτήρ, i.e., to the Roman emperor.” If Sergienko is correct, then Paul is not aiming his oppositional rhetoric directly at Rome, nor, is he claiming to oversee a trans-local “commonwealth” of ekklēsiai which parallels the religio-political entity that is Rome.

2.2.3.2. Three Levels of a Trans-local Parallel Political Organization?
Not only does van Kooten’s foundational assumption seem open to question—his translation of politeuma as “commonwealth”—but so do the three exegetical moves he makes within that interpretive paradigm. First, the burden of proof would seem to be on van Kooten to demonstrate that the phrase “the ekklēsiai of Galatia” (1 Cor 16:1; Gal 1:2) is not simply referring to multiple ekklēsiai within a given region (Galatia). It seems a logical leap to assume that “the ekklēsiai of Galatia” refers to a formal association of communities in Galatia which together comprise a regional koinon.

Second, van Kooten’s politically-oriented translation of pasai hai ekklēsiai tôn ethnōn (Rom 16:4) as “all the ekklēsiai from the nations,” rather than as “all the ekklēsiai of the gentiles,” while syntactically possible, seems exegetically secondary. The focus of Rom 16:4 is upon Paul’s gratefulness for two of his most faithful co-workers, Priscilla and Aquila (16:3), who “risked their necks for my life.” Given his status as the apostle to the gentiles (Rom 11:13), one imagines that gentile Christ-followers also

---

747 Sergienko, “Our Politeuma is in Heaven!” 160.
748 Sergienko, “Our Politeuma is in Heaven!” 18.
749 Van Kooten translates the genitive tôn ethnōn, first, as a geo-political reference (“nations”) rather than as a socio-ethnic referent (“gentiles”), and, second, as a genitive of separation (“from the nations”), rather than as a partitive genitive (“of the gentiles”).
750 Rom 16:4 reads, in part, οἷς οὐκ ἔγω μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἄλλα καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἔθνων (“to whom not only I but also all the ekklēsiai of the gentiles give thanks”).
would have been grateful for the support of Priscilla and Aquila in Paul’s missional work. The translation “all the ekklēsiai of the gentiles” makes this fact more explicit.\footnote{The fact that ekklēsiai existed which consisted predominantly, if not even exclusively, of gentile participants is demonstrated in Paul’s Philippian ekklēsia. For an interpretive approach that views Paul’s use of the word ethnē as a reference to “conquered nations” rather than as an ethnic marker (i.e., “gentiles”), see Lopez, Apostle to the Conquered, 17–25.}

Third, the demographics of Paul’s diasporic ekklēsiai obviate van Kooten’s claim that Rom 16:16 and 1 Cor 14:33b-35 each allude to a universal political organization of ekklēsiai. Paul’s modifiers (“of Christ,” “of the saints”) can be accounted for simply in the fact that his ekklēsiai in Rome and Corinth consisted of a corpus mixtum of Jews and gentiles. As such, the phrases “ekklēsiai of Christ” (Rom 16:16) and “ekklēsiai of the saints” (1 Cor 14:33b-35) become descriptors sufficiently generic and theologically inclusive enough to incorporate Christ-followers of all socio-ethnic backgrounds.

2.2.3.3. Hoi Hagioi as a Sub-Group Designation? (1 Cor 14:33b-35)

If consideration is given to three hypotheses, then there may be another way to interpret the phrase en pasais tais ekklēsiais tōn hagiōn in 1 Cor 14:33b-35.\footnote{The Greek reads, ὃς ἐν πᾶσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν (1 Cor 14:33b-34a).} First, the word ekklēsiai may simply refer to the semi-public meetings of a group of Christ-followers (“meetings”), not necessarily to Christ-follower “communities” or “congregations.” Second, the term hoi hagioi may reflect a socio-religious group designation (“the holy ones”), not only a theological descriptor (“the saints”). Third, the injunction of the hoi hagioi against women speaking en tais ekklēsiais (14:35a) may reflect the praxis of a different group of Corinthian Christ-followers than those aligned with Paul’s apostolic authority.
When translating the term *ekklēsiai* in 1 Cor 14:33b, Greco-Roman usage allows that the plural form may simply refer to “meetings/assemblies.” This possibility is enhanced given the fact that Paul pairs *ekklēsiai* with the preposition *en* (“in all the *ekklēsiai*”), a fact not mentioned by van Kooten. This type of syntactical construction occurs another four times within chapter fourteen of 1 Corinthians (*en tais ekklēsiais* [14:34]; *en ekklēsia* [14:19, 28, 35b]).

The anarthrous phrase *en ekklēsia* could simply be translated as “in assembly” rather than as “in community.” If so, then a similar meaning may be intended by Paul for the articular, plural phrase *en (pasais) tais ekklēsiais* (1 Cor 14:33b, 34a)—“in (all) the assemblies/meetings.”

The Christ-followers who convene these *ekklēsiai* are described by Paul as being *hoi hagioi* (14:33b). Some scholars suggest that the term *hoi hagioi* is occasionally used in reference to the group identity of a sub-group of Christ-followers. Trebilco forwards a number of instances in Paul’s Corinthian correspondence wherein *hoi hagioi* appears to be a sub-group designation. He particularly notes the “formulaic way” in which Paul speaks of the Jerusalem collection as being *eis tous hagious* (1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1, 12), which, he says, “has suggested to many scholars that οἱ ἅγιοι was originally a self-designation that was used by the Jerusalem church.”

A number of commentators suggest a similar meaning for the term *hoi hagioi* in the book of Acts. Pervo, Barrett, Fitzmyer and Trebilco each favour viewing *hoi hagioi* as a sub-group identity for the original community of Christ-followers in Jerusalem (“the holy ones”).

---

753 In 1 Cor 14:28 Paul enjoins a person wishing to speak publicly in tongues to be silent *en ekklēsia* (“in the meeting”), if no one is available to translate.

in the book of Romans \((klētois hagiois; \text{Rom 1:7})\)^755 is interpreted by Robert Jewett as potentially being group identity terminology. He hypothesizes that Paul is addressing “another circle” of Christ-followers in Rome, that is, “Jewish Christians, loyal to or associated with Jerusalem.”^756 Despite these assertions, no scholar yet appears to have applied that precedent to 1 Cor 14:33b and interpreted the phrase \(hoi hagioi\) as being the self-designation of a sub-group of Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers.

If one does just that, then the ostensible statements of Paul in 1 Cor 14:33b-35 with regard to women not being allowed to participate publicly in semi-public worship assemblies \((ekklēsiai)\) can be read in a different light. This possibility increases if one also incorporates the view of some scholars that Paul is not speaking about the worship \(praxeis\) of his \(ekklēsia\) communities, but rather that he is citing the dictum of a sub-group of Christ-followers, such as male traditionalists, who sought to ban women from speaking during communal gatherings \((ekklēsiai)\).^757 Although such an interpretation is hotly

---

755 The collocation \(klētois hagiois\) can be translated as “to the saints/holy ones,” “to those who are holy,” or “to those who are called to be holy.” Irrespective of which translational option is chosen, commentators (and bible translators) assume that Paul is making either a theological, ethical, or eschatological statement about his Corinthian and Roman addressees: they are \(hagios\) (“holy”) and thus should live holy lives that reflect their future status in heaven as “the holy ones” (see, for example, Trebilco, \textit{Self-designations}, 105–109, 112–13; Tucker, \textit{Remain in Your Calling}, 128).

756 Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 114. Jewett notes that the appositional phrase \(agapētois theou\) could also be a technical collective designation for Jerusalemite Christ-followers.

contested, if one assumes that 1 Cor 14:33b-35 cites a rule enacted by Jerusalem-loyal hoi hagioi in Corinth when they gathered for worship in their assemblies (ekklēsiai), then Paul is not stating doctrine for his communities (ekklēsiai). Rather, Paul is then simply restating, or even quoting, the doctrine of hoi hagioi in Corinth (e.g., those who say, “I belong to Cephas”[?]; 1 Cor 1:12). If one was to re-read 1 Cor 14:33b-35 as Paul’s quotation of a dictum of hoi hagioi, the following paraphrase could result:

“As in all the meetings of the [other] sub-groups of Judean Christ-followers known as hoi hagioi, [our rule here in Corinth is], ‘Let the gynai (women/wives[759]/prophetesses[760]) allowed to speak, and it is to them that this rebuke is addressed...[thus] he quotes what some Corinthian Christians have been saying, and then refutes it (see 6:12-13; 8:4-6; 10:23; 15:35-36; cf. 4:8)” [the word “only ones” in v. 36 is masculine not feminine] [In v. 36] Paul is then said to be telling these traditionalists that “since they, the men, did not originate God’s word...they are therefore not the only ones to whom God’s word has come. Hence, they have no right to try to bar women from full participation in public worship” (New Testament, 346).

Dissenters include Gordon D. Fee (The First Epistle to the Corinthians [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987]), Richard B. Hays (First Corinthians [Interpretation; Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1997]), and David E. Garland (First Corinthians [BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003]), 667. Fee disputes the possibility that in 1 Cor 14: 33b-35 Paul is quoting the rule of a different sub-group of Christ-followers: “There is no hint in v. 34 that Paul has suddenly taken to quoting them; there is no precedent for such a long quotation that is also full of argumentation (two explanatory ‘for’s’); it presupposes the unlikely scenario that some in the church were forbidding women to speak—and especially that the quotation would come from the same Corinthian letter that is otherwise quite pro-women (see on 7:1-7; 11:2-16). On the whole, therefore, the case against these verses is so strong, and finding a viable solution to their meaning so difficult, that it seems best to view them as an interpolation” (Corinthians, 704–705). Hays prefers viewing this pericope as a gloss and considers any reading of these verses as a quotation as being “farfetched in the extreme” (First Corinthians, 248). Garland states that “no evidence exists elsewhere in this letter that the Corinthians held this view or that a significant Jewish element was imposing conservative synagogue traditions on the church’s gatherings. In fact, the letter suggests the opposite. Paul seeks to curb the Corinthians’ unruly and wayward expressions of freedom rather than to encourage them” (First Corinthians, 667).

J. D. G. Dunn notes that the Greek word gynē could be translated as “wife” rather than as “woman” (“Reconstructions of Corinthian Christianity and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians,” in Christianity at Corinth: the Quest for the Pauline Church [ed. E. Adams and D. G. Horrell; Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox, 2004], 295–310, esp. 306). If so, then Paul is saying that it is “improper for a wife to sit in judgment on the prophecy offered by her husband (14:29)” (Ibid, 306). Stephen Barton sharpens Dunn’s point. He notes a ‘sense of place’ is here also involved. Since a semi-public association (ekklēsia) is meeting in a private space (oikos), the question then becomes which space’s rules are to be given priority—“the prophetess’s (wife’s) liberty to prophesy, or the wife’s (prophetess’s) subordination to the paterfamilias, the head of the family/house?” (“Paul’s Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth,” NTS 32 [1986]: 225–46, esp. 225). See also, Robert Allison, “Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor 14:33b-36): What Did Paul Really Say, and What Did It Mean?” JSNT 32 (1988): 27–60.
remain silent in the meetings. For they are not allowed to speak but let them be subservient, just as also the nomos (law/Torah/association constitution) says.  

But if they wish to learn, let them ask their own husbands at home. For it is shameful for a gynē (woman/wife/prophetess) to speak in a meeting’.”

Three contextual considerations accord with such a re-reading. First, it fits the immediate context of ch. 14 where Paul moves from describing acts of public speaking en ekklēsia (14:1-25) to prescribing specific ways in which public speaking should be enacted during an ekklēsia (14:26-33a; e.g., tongues, prophecy). After ostensibly quoting the praxis of the hoi hagioi sub-group in Corinth in relation to their gynai (14:33b-35), Paul asks two rhetorical questions which together imply that he does not accord primacy of place to the hoi hagioi with respect to their interpretation of scripture.  

In the immediately succeeding verses (14:37-38), Paul makes explicit what he only implies in 14:36; he too has the necessary apostolic authority to write “a command of the Lord” (14:37). In this respect, then, Paul implies that the restrictive worship praxis of the hoi hagioi is not necessarily divinely sanctioned; Paul has apodeictic authority as well (14:37-38). Paul’s command, though, is a more egalitarian one: “[men and women] be eager to prophesy” as long as “all things” are “done decently and in order” (14:39, 40).

---

760 Adam D. Hensley further nuances the translation of gynē (“women/wives”). He argues that in both 14:27-32 and 14:33b-35 Paul’s rhetorical target is prophetesses, not simply women in general, and specifically, prophetesses who “prophetically evaluate the prophecies of others” (“σιγαω, λαλεω, and οποσασω in 1 Corinthians 14:34 in Their Literary and Rhetorical Context,” JETS 55/2 [2012]: 343–64, esp. 350 [author’s emphasis]). If so, then translating ekklēsia as “meeting” is even more appropriate given that Paul’s critique of prophetesses who overstep their boundaries en tais ekklēsias presumes a context in which Christ-followers are gathered for corporate worship, teaching and admonition (14:26-33).

761 There are at least three possible translations of the word nomos (14:34): social law (civic), religious law (Torah), or sociological law (voluntary association constitution). For use of the word nomos among Greco-Roman voluntary associations for association rules/guidelines/constitution, see Part III, §2.2.1. Paul’s Ekklesia: Alternative Civic Ideology?.

762 1 Cor 14:36 reads, “Or did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only ones it has reached?”
Second, if 1 Cor 14:33b-35 is the dictum of hoi hagioi and not of Paul, then, within the larger context of 1 Cor 11–14, two apparent contradictions are removed: Paul’s affirmation that each ekklēsia member has the right to prophesy (14:31) and his statement that gynai are already prophesying in the Corinthian community (11:5).

Third, identifying hoi hagioi, and not simply male traditionalists, as the group being cited in 1 Cor 14:33b-35 is consistent with the claim of C. K. Barrett that in 1 Corinthians 5–16 Paul focuses primarily upon challenging the “nomistic” attitudes of the Cephas faction.763

If one allows the conclusion that, in 1 Cor 14:33b-35, Paul does not explicate his own rule, then at least two approaches scholars use to avoid painting Paul with a misogynist brush become moot: 1 Cor 14:33b-35 need not be a non-Pauline interpolation764 nor a marginal gloss.765

763 C. K. Barrett associates each leader mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12 (Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ) with a distinctive theological position that is addressed elsewhere in the letter (“Christianity at Corinth,” in Essays on Paul [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 1–27; idem, “Cephas and Corinth,” in Essays on Paul [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 28–39). Thus, for example, he sees the Apollos group as placing a premium upon issues such as gn̄ōsis, logos, and sophia, the topics primarily addressed in 1 Cor 1–4, and the Cephas group as adopting “nomistic” attitudes which came to expression in the rejection of eating meat sacrificed to idols, of litigation in secular courts, and of non-kasrut based observances during the Lord’s supper, topics found in 1 Cor 5–16 (“Christianity at Corinth,” 4).


By way of summary, then, van Kooten rightly attempts to bring a needed corrective to interpretive models which understand Paul’s use of the word *ekklēsia* as being, at the same time, both political and counter-imperial. He attempts to stake out the middle ground by claiming, *contra* Horsley, that the very fact of being politically organized does not necessitate the corollary conclusion that Paul’s trans-local association of *ekklēsiai* reflect counter-imperial ideology. While I concur with van Kooten’s assessment, I do not accord with his corollary conclusion that Paul’s trans-locally connected *ekklēsiai* formed a three-tiered organization.

2.2.4. Paul’s *Ekklēsia*: A Trans-local Jewish Voluntary Association?

The fourth element of my thesis statement on Pauline communities suggests that, by designating collectively as *ekklēsiai*, they self-present as a trans-local network of Jewish voluntary associations, that is, semi-public synagogue communities. The fact that literary and epigraphic evidence is generally silent as to the existence of Jewish *ekklēsia* associations in the Greek East may indicate that, as a group designation in the Diaspora, *ekklēsia* largely was ‘free.’

How might diasporic Jews have viewed such a messianic Jewish association? If they were familiar with the public *ekklēsiai* in Judea mentioned by Josephus, then Paul’s multi-ethnic *ekklēsiai* could have been perceived as claiming to extend public Jewish society to the Diaspora. This would present his communities as ‘satellites’ in relation to

---

*la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Acts du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), contributions supplémentaires* (ed. P. Andrist; Lausanne, Switzerland: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009), 199–226. 766 In my section on *ekklēsia* and supersessionism I expand further upon how a Jewish heritage is intrinsic to Paul’s portrayal of his *ekklēsia* communities (Part III, §2.3. Ekklēsia as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?).
Jewish civic institutions, and thus as *loqui* for the full expression of all facets of Jewish life, including its ethno-religious, social, political, economic, and judicial dimensions.

If, on the other hand, the Egyptian and Judean evidence is indicative of a wider use of the word *ekklēsia* for Jewish associations, then *ekklēsia* was not ‘free’ in the Diaspora as a group designation. Nonetheless, even in this scenario, Paul’s *ekklēsiai* could have been perceived as extensions of Jewish institutions, but in this case of semi-public synagogue associations named *ekklēsia*.

Either way, the use of *ekklēsia* terminology socially identifies Paul’s communities with Jews, Jewishness, and “Judaism,” and provides them with a terminological foothold for developing social interaction with diasporic association synagogues. Whether social interaction actually took place, however, remains an open question. Mark Nanos suggests such a scenario in the Roman West. He does not, however, address the possibility that some non-messianic Jews and Pauline Christ-followers held a permanent *ekklēsia* identity in common.

---

767 Mark Nanos appears to argue that social interaction between Christ-followers and Jews in Rome is indicated in the social identification of the Christ-followers’ “righteous gentiles” with Jewish *praxeis*, such as textual interpretive techniques and worship practices. He identifies examples of social identification as being “archeological evidence, shared literature such as hymnals and prayer books, the maintenance and even appropriation of nonrabbinic and apocryphal texts in Christian literature, shared language and idioms, Sabbath observance and food regulations, even the same form of meeting and administrative responsibilities” (*The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996], 69–71).

768 Stephen Spence problematizes such a claim by noting that social identification with Jewish practices, at most, speaks only to some of the internal dynamics operating within the Roman Christ-following community. In other words, one can say that Roman Christ-followers inculcated a Jewish *ethos* but not necessarily that external social interaction with the Jewish synagogal community also took place (*The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study* [ISACR 5; Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004], 8–11, 61–63).
2.2.5. Paul’s Ekklēsia: A Trans-local Greco-Roman Voluntary Association?

The fifth element of my thesis statement on Paul’s ekklēsiai is that even though in their essence they were a trans-local Jewish socio-religious association, his ekklēsiai were still “socially accessible to Greco-Romans.” Scholars have assessed the organization of Paul’s ekklēsiai along the lines of four ancient non-civic models: the household, \(^{769}\) philosophical schools, \(^{770}\) the synagogue, \(^{771}\) and the voluntary association. \(^{772}\) Kloppenborg

---

\(^{769}\) See Ok-pil Kim, “Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Household, and Empire in 1 Corinthians 1–7,” (PhD diss., Drew University, April, 2010).

\(^{770}\) Paul does demonstrate ideological affinity with Platonic and Stoic thought (see George H. van Kooten, n. 736 and Michelle Lee, n. 833). Edward Adams provides a concise survey of those scholars who suggest that Greek philosophical schools are a good paradigm for understanding how Paul organized his ekklēsiai (“First-Century Models for Paul’s Churches: Selected Scholarly Developments since Meeks,” in After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-five Years Later [ed. T. D. Still and D. G. Horrell; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2009], 60–78, esp. 73–74). Stanley Stowers highlights “seven closely connected areas in which the Hellenistic philosophies and Pauline Christianity possessed similar features” (“Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?” in Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide [ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 81–102, esp. 89). Some common features include: conversion, “a technology of the self” (Ibid, 92), and an emphasis on intellect (Ibid, 93). Stowers does not, however, claim that “Pauline Christianity” was a philosophy (Ibid, 89), only that it shared “the structural features that made it philosophy-like” (Ibid, 100–101).

\(^{771}\) Some of the ways in which Christ-follower ekklēsiai are said to demonstrate affinity with synagogue gatherings includes functions within worship gatherings such as reading and interpretation of scripture, communal prayer, and commensality (1 Cor 11:17-34; 14:26), the settling of legal affairs within the community (1 Cor 6:1-7), and the collection sent by gentile ekklēsiai to the Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem, which somewhat resembles the praxis of diasporic synagogues in sending envoys to Jerusalem for the purpose of delivering the Temple tax (Meeks, First Urban Christians, 80–81; James Tunstead Burtchaell, From Synagogue to Church [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 284–88). Burtchaell contends that Jewish synagogue officers formed the inspiration for the official leadership of ekklēsiai. Examples are said to include episkopos (Phil 1:1) as an analogous archisynagogōgos and the common usage of presbyteroi (1 Pet 5:1; Jas 5:14; Acts 20:17). Some of these praxeis within Jewish synagogues, however, are also mirrored in Greek and Egyptian voluntary associations. This suggests that socio-religious practices within Pauline ekklēsiai were also influenced by Greek, not simply by Jewish, associations. For a list of twelve similarities between diasporic Jewish synagogue communities and Greek and Egyptian voluntary associations, see Mantel, “Men of the Great Synagogue,” 82–91. Examples include correlations in titles for association officials (e.g., archisynagogōs, presbyteros, grammateus), judicial independence, regulatory nomoi, and penalties for disregarding nomoi.

\(^{772}\) Meeks, First Urban Christians (1983). McCready acknowledges that Christ-follower ekklēsiai demonstrate congruency with other 1st century CE models for group life such as synagogues, the “household” (oikoi), and philosophical schools (“Ekklesia and Voluntary Associations,” 62). For updated perspectives on Meek’s proposals, see both Edward Adams (“First-Century Models,” 60–78), and John S. Kloppenborg (“Greco-Roman Thiasoi, the Ekklesia at Corinth, and Conflict Management,” in Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians [ECIL 5; ed. R. Cameron and M. P. Miller; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011], 191–205). For a judicious critique of four of Meek’s apparent operating assumptions, see...
provides a helpful nuance for any strict categorization of Christ-follower communities as Greco-Roman voluntary associations. He argues that “Graeco-Roman associations are ‘good to think with,’ not necessarily because Christ groups were typical associations, but because we have rich data from ancient associations that can generate heuristic questions for interrogating the data from Christ groups.” With this caveat in mind, Wayne McCready specifically explores how Paul’s organization of his communities as trans-locally connected voluntary associations, and of his designation of those

---

Stanley Kent Stowers, “The Social Sciences and the Study of Early Christianity,” in Approaches to Ancient Judaism, vol. 5 (ed. W. Green; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 149–181, esp. 172. Meeks’ application of modern sociological models (i.e., Bryan Wilson’s “small groups” sect theory) to ancient groups appears to assume, though, that commensurability is valid across vast reaches of time (1st vs. 20th centuries), geography (Mediterranean vs. North America) and culture (dyadic/collectivist vs. individualistic cultures). Additionally, his functionalist approach seems reductionist in that he prioritizes Émile Durkheim’s focus on ritual to explain social cohesion, while minimally incorporating a Strict Intentionalist perspective which focuses on the cohesive value of a moral community with shared beliefs and values.

One variance between early Christ-follower communities and Greco-Roman voluntary associations includes weekly instead of monthly banquets. Pilhofer suggests other variances. He does so, though, only by resorting to an argument from silence which brings him to claim that early Christ-followers, unlike many other voluntary associations, did not charge membership dues, initiation fees, monthly dues, or a contribution to a taphikon (Peter Pilhofer, “Ökonomische Attraktivität christlicher Gemeinden der Frühzeit,” in Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt: Greifswalder Aufsätze 1996–2001 [WUNT 145; ed. P. Pilhofer, with assistance from J. Börstinghaus and E. Ebel; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2002], 194–216, esp. 208).


associations as *ekklēsiai*, relevantly connects his Christ-followers socio-politically to Greco-Roman culture. He sees their group identity as having facilitated their missional success by providing an air of familiarity for Greco-Roman outsiders, especially those with prior experience of associational life.\footnote{McCready states that “the point to be emphasized is that the concept of *ekklēsia* as a vehicle for claiming universal salvation was matched with a social institution capable of transcending a local village, town, or city to unite the church into a collective whole” (“Ekklesia and Voluntary Associations,” 69).}


It makes eminent sense that voluntary associations offered an initial reference point that placed churches comfortably within the parameters of Graeco-Roman society—especially when the Jesus movement consciously and deliberately wished to appeal to gentiles. Indeed, the diversity of voluntary associations was an attractive feature, for it allowed experimentation and development by the ekklēsiai while at the same time providing a special type of belonging that created a form of community definition that was distinct from the larger society.\textsuperscript{778}

While McCready’s point relative to the missional relevance of Paul’s ekklēsiai in the Greek East stands, he fails to assess how their identification as Jewish voluntary associations factored into that missional relevance. This lacuna is not accidental, however. McCready claims, incorrectly, that little evidence exists for synagogues, and thus, for Jewish voluntary associations, in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE.\textsuperscript{779} A more accurate presentation of the evidence would be to state that the missional relevance of Paul’s diasporic ekklēsiai derived from their self-presentation as Jewish voluntary associations whose social functioning also reflects Greco-Roman cultural dynamics.

\textbf{2.2.6. Paul’s Ekklēsia: Socio-Ethnic Dēmokratia and Counter-Oligarchic Civic Ideology?}

The sixth and final element in my thesis statement on Pauline ekklēsiai relates to the degree of dēmokratia and political authority still extant among civic ekklēsia in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE. I argue that Paul’s trans-local network of non-civic voluntary associations,

\textsuperscript{777} Inscriptional evidence for voluntary associations paints a picture of them as “groups of people gathering and organizing themselves into an extended family” for the fulfillment of a number of functions such as “athletics, sacrificing to a god, eating a common meal, and regular socializing...[even] for decent burial of members” (McCready, “Ekklēsia and Voluntary Associations,” 62). See Harland for extensive descriptions of fictive kinship relationships employed within voluntary associations (Dynamics of Identity, 63–81 [“brothers”], 82–96 [“mothers,” “fathers”]).

\textsuperscript{778} McCready, “Ekklēsia and Voluntary Associations,” 69–70.

\textsuperscript{779} McCready, “Ekklēsia and Voluntary Associations,” 62–63.
each of which reflect alternative civic ideology, could very well have been perceived as pro-‘democratic,’ and perhaps also as counter-oligarchic, participants, rather than as counter-imperial ideologues, within the ubiquitous “ekklēsia discourse” of the newly developing political culture of the Greek East during the 1st century CE.

2.2.6.1. Pro-Dēmokratia Political Culture in the 1st Century CE

By designating his communities as ekklēsiai Paul socio-linguistically places them into the centre of a vibrant “ekklēsia discourse” taking place within the Greek East. For a description of socio-linguistic theory, especially as it relates to the book of Daniel, see Anatheia Portier-Young, “Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book,” VT 60 (2010): 98–115. She applies the work of socio-linguists R. B. Le Page and Andrée Tabouret-Keller who “maintain that every linguistic act is at the same time an act of identity. Recognizing that language serves not only communicative purposes but also social ones, they emphasize the creativity of speakers—and writers—who project a universe through language and ‘invite others to share it’” (Ibid, 104). In this regard, Paul’s adoption of an ekklēsia identity for his Christ-followers would invitingly have projected a democratic universe for those Greco-Roman outsiders who were considering joining his non-civic groups.

The literary works of Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, and Theon are replete with references to the contemporary relevance of civic ekklēsiai in the ongoing socio-political culture of their day. The provenance of these authors makes Asia Minor, where many of Paul’s ekklēsiai were located, the geographical hotbed for this politically dynamic concept.

As previously discussed, this “ekklēsia discourse” is but one aspect of what Onno van Nijf calls the political culture of Asia Minor. Van Nijf argues that political culture is

780 For a description of socio-linguistic theory, especially as it relates to the book of Daniel, see Anatheia Portier-Young, “Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book,” VT 60 (2010): 98–115. She applies the work of socio-linguists R. B. Le Page and Andrée Tabouret-Keller who “maintain that every linguistic act is at the same time an act of identity. Recognizing that language serves not only communicative purposes but also social ones, they emphasize the creativity of speakers—and writers—who project a universe through language and ‘invite others to share it’” (Ibid, 104). In this regard, Paul’s adoption of an ekklēsia identity for his Christ-followers would invitingly have projected a democratic universe for those Greco-Roman outsiders who were considering joining his non-civic groups.


782 Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE) was born in Chaeronea (Boeotia) in central Greece. Dio Chrysostom (c. 40–c. 115) is also known as Dion of Prusa or Dio Cocceianus. He was born in Prusa, a town in Bithynia. Theon’s progymnasmata was written c. 95 CE.
evident in three non-institutional aspects of cultural life in Asia Minor: monuments of leadership, emotive communities, and festive communities.\(^{783}\) A political culture facilitated the ongoing need for the negotiation of power between the elite dominated boulē and the dēmos. Euergetism by the elite, and honorific reciprocation by non-elites through monumentalism, were two sides of the same political coin, so to speak, in Asia Minor. Their interplay served to maintain pax in the polis by facilitating the bi-lateral flow of political influence back and forth between the oligarchic elite and the non-elite dēmos, thereby averting direct Roman intervention.\(^{784}\) Both of these political strategies form a backdrop for understanding what could be called “Paul’s politics of redistribution” among his diasporic ekklēsia, particularly those in Asia Minor.

2.2.6.2. Pauline Ekklēsiai and Political Culture in Asia Minor

It is within the burgeoning political culture of the Greek East, and not in the Roman West, that Paul experienced the greatest success in his gentile mission. There are at least three ways in which Paul’s appropriation of an ekklēsia identity for his Christ-followers seems to have tapped into that political dynamic in ideologically positive ways.

First, in a very real sense, Paul was a ‘political’ figure,\(^{785}\) particularly since politics and religion were integral parts of the same cultural whole.\(^{786}\) Paul’s politics,

\(^{783}\) See bibliographic references in n. 183.

\(^{784}\) Van Nijf argues that the public use of honorific language implicitly pressures the honorand to live up to the public impression created of him or her. In this way, the dēmos, whether individuals or voluntary associations, plays an active role in the process of political identity construction even without having been formally granted any official political office or even role (Civic World, 73–130; idem, “Public Space,” 217–23).

\(^{785}\) I use the term “politics” as defined by Max Weber: “politics for us means striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power, either among states or among groups within a state” (“Politics as a Vocation,” in From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology [2d ed.; ed. B. S. Turner; New York: Oxford University Press, 1958], 77–128, esp. 78). His definition is founded on his presupposition that “a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory” (Ibid, 78; author’s emphasis).
however, derive from the other-worldly politeuma ("governing authority"; Phil 3:20) of a heavenly polis ("the Jerusalem above"; Gal 4:26). Udo Schnelle aptly summarizes Paul’s political status: “Pauline theology is political to the extent that the new symbolic universe it mediates directly concerns peoples’ lives as citizens, their way of life.” This new symbolic universe is described with terminology which a Greco-Roman readership would have found familiar from the political realm of imperial ideology (e.g., salvation, peace, grace, righteousness/justice, and the titles kyrios and sōtēr).

A second way in which Paul’s ekklēsia communities self-presented in politically positive ways involves their internal organization. As the apostolos of a new symbolic universe, Paul organized his non-civic ekklēsiai as socio-religious ‘sites’ for enacting that symbolic universe within their various poleis. Paul’s communities demonstrate a “politics of equality,” or what I call “socio-ethnic dēmokratia.” The dēmokratia evident within

---

786 Bruce Malina states that “the social institutions known as religion and economics did not exist as discrete, self-standing, independent institutions in antiquity. In antiquity, there were only two focal, freestanding social institutions: kinship and politics, yielding domestic economy, domestic religion, political economy, and political religion” (“Social-Scientific Approaches and the Gospel of Matthew,” in Methods for Matthew [MBI; ed. M. A. Powell; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 154–93, esp. 170). Steve Mason identifies six culturally intrinsic aspects of ‘religion’ which were integrated into the warp and woof of everyday life in early antiquity: ethnos, cult, philosophy, kinship traditions/domestic worship, astrology/magic and voluntary association (collegia/thiasoi) (“Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” JSJ 38 [2007]: 457–512, esp. 482–88). See also Alan Storkey’s analysis of Jesus’ ‘politics’ (Jesus and Politics: Confronting the Powers [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005], 38) and Richard A. Horsley’s exploration more generally of religion and politics in the Second Temple period (Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007]). See also Brent Nongbri who claims that in antiquity there was no conceptual category that could be designated as “religious” as opposed to “secular” (Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013]). Paula Fredriksen argues not only that “religion” was integrated into everyday life but that “religion” was in fact integrally tied to ethnicity: “in Mediterranean antiquity, cult defined ethnicity and ethnicity defined cult” (“Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul’s Gospel,” NTS 56 [2010]: 232–52, esp. 234).

787 See Sergienko’s definition of politeuma as “governing authority” (“Our Politeuma is in Heaven!” 167–69).

Paul’s fictive dēmos, known as ekklēsia, derives from a heavenly polis, “the Jerusalem above” (Gal 4:26). In general, Paul’s socio-ethnic dēmokratia involves the equitable sharing of kratos among each ekklēsia member, or fictive ekklēsiastēs (Gal 3:28). Overall, opportunities for participation within a Pauline ekklēsia are presented as transcending barriers of gender, social standing, and ethnic background. Gender does not stand in the way of females being allowed to prophesy and pray when the ekklēsia gathers (1 Cor 11:5, 13). Paul also enjoins his ekklēsia members to remain in the social (slave/free; 1 Cor 7:21-24) and ethnic (circumcised Jew/uncircumcised Greco-Roman; 1 Cor 7:18-19) station in which they were found at the time of their call (1 Cor 7:17, 20).

Given the foregoing, one can say that the range of participants within a Pauline ekklēsia

---

789 Each member of the Athenian ekklēsia was called an ekklēsiastēs (ἐκκλησιαστής) (Plato Gorg. 452e, AP.25a; Aristotle Pol.1275a26, Rh.1354b7). To be considered an ekklēsiastēs, one, firstly, had to be a citizen of the Athenian polis, and not less than eighteen years of age (Xen. Mem. 3.6.1). Since new citizens (epheboi) usually had to do two years of military service before being enrolled on the register of a deme, one normally did not participate in an ekklēsia until the age of 20 (Gustave Glotz, The Greek City and Its Institutions [New York: Barnes and Noble, 1929/1969], 152; see also Hansen’s definition of ephebos in The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology [trans. J. A. Crook; Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999], 354). One also, secondly, had to be free of any legal suspicion (e.g., atimia). Atimia was imposed on Athenians who were negligent in their civic duties or indebted to the state. A person under atimia was deprived of the right to legal protection, the right to enter the market-place and the sanctuaries, and all political rights (Hansen, Athenian Democracy, 350). Each ekklēsiastēs had the right to attend, speak and vote (Hansen, Athenian Assembly, 212; see also, idem, Athenian Democracy, 353).

790 In 1 Cor 11:2-16, Paul does not place into question the right of women to prophesy. He focuses instead upon clarifying an appropriate process for them to do so; they are to wear a headcovering. Paul also affirms the partnership of women in his diasporic mission (Phil 4:2-3, Euodia and Syntyche; Rom 16, Phoebe, Prisca, Mary, Junia[?], the mother of Rufus, Julia, and the sister of Nereus). Scholars who affirm the role of prophetesses within Pauline ekklēsiai include David E. Aune (Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 195–98), Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins [New York: Crossroad, 1983], 230–33, 294–309), Antoinette Clark Wire (The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul’s Rhetoric [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 116–34, 229–32), and Ute E. Eisen (Women Officeholders in Early Christianity: Epigraphical and Literary Studies [trans. Linda M. Maloney; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000], 63–87). Pliny implies that female prophets continued to function within Christ-follower communities in Asia Minor into at least the early 2nd cent. CE (Letter 10.96.8). He mentions 2 “slave women” (ancillae) whom the Christ-followers referred to as ministrae, which is Latin for the Greek word diákonoi (Eisen, Women Officeholders, 173).

791 See n. 21 (Boyarin) and n. 648 (Tomson, Nanos, Runesson, and Tucker) for bibliographic details on scholars who claim that Paul promotes the continuation of social and ethnic identities in Christ.

---
stretches beyond that generally found in Greek *ekklēsiai*, particularly with respect to participation of women and slaves. The demographics of Pauline *ekklēsiai* are consistent, though, both with Greco-Roman voluntary associations and Jewish public synagogues (e.g., Judith, Josephus), not least with respect to the inclusion of women and slaves among their members. As such, Georgi describes Paul’s ideological stance as being one of “libertarian and democratic universalism [and]…socially egalitarian pluralism,” irrespective of his community members’ social or ethnic standing. Thus, one could say that, within the non-civic “city writ small,” which Paul calls the *ekklēsia* of Christ-followers, socio-ethnic *dēmokratia* is depicted as going beyond the *praxeis* enacted within classical Athenian-style *dēmokratia*.

If some Greco-Roman outsiders, especially Roman authorities, also perceived Pauline communities as communal ‘sites’ of socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*, then, by identifying his Christ-followers as *ekklēsiai*, Paul creates a type of political ‘defense mechanism.’ It would be difficult for Roman suspicions to be aroused over a voluntary association in the Greek East, the socio-religious *praxeis* of which portrays it as a paragon of civic order and *dēmokratia*, and the very name of which situates it in the centre of the “*ekklēsia* discourse” in Asia Minor.

Paul’s “politics of equality,” while benefiting his *ekklēsia* members socio-religiously and politically, also would have benefited the society within which they lived.

---

792 By the 2nd cent. CE, though, “femaleness” in the Greek East had moved in from the political margins. Harland provides numerous examples of inscriptive uses of the terms “mother” and “daughter” in relation to civic and official organizations (e.g., *polis, dēmos*) (*Dynamics of Identity*, 88).

793 See n. 705.

794 See n. 706.

It may even be that it was Stoic alternative civic ideology which provided Paul with an example of how to bring “other-worldly” concerns to bear within “this-worldly” societies. Stoics viewed the kosmos as the true commonwealth. Stoics sought to bring all earthly poleis into conformity with this true commonwealth, the guiding principle, or nomos, of which was the nous. They defined nous as the rationality presupposed in a mind that is in harmony with the law of “right reason” (orthos logos). This orthos logos is neither a social nor a divine construct, but rather a transcendent principle to which both gods and humans are subject. When a polis rejected or neglected this transcendent law, Stoics saw it as their responsibility to intervene in civic politics.

In not dissimilar fashion, Paul takes his socio-political cue from what could be called a ‘kosmos-polis.’ In his case it is the “Jerusalem above” (Gal 4:26). His guiding nomos was not “right reason,” as important as that was, but rather the “nomos of Christ” (1 Cor 9:21) which guides ethical choices in Paul’s proclamation of the gospel of Christ (1 Cor 9:16). Paul’s ethics are founded on the mandate of love (1 Cor 13:4-8a; Gal 6:2; cf. Gal 5:14: “love your neighbour”). Given Paul’s priority of inculcating God’s love within human affairs, he seems to have focused his socio-political efforts on infusing “agapic communalism,” as Jewett calls it, within his fictive cleruchies (ekklēsiai) of the

---

796 For example, Arius Didymus, ap. Eusebius, PE 15.15.3-5.
797 Chrysippus, Marcian 1 (SVF 3.314).
798 Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 114.
799 1 Cor 9:21 reads, “I am not free from God’s law but am under Christ’s law.” Gal 6:2 reads, “bear one another’s burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ.” Identifying “love” as the essential characteristic of the “law of Christ” is consistent with Paul’s previous claim: “the whole [Mosaic] law is summed up in a single commandment, ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’” (Gal 5:14).
“Jerusalem above.” Their internal praxis of “agapic communalism” would inevitably have affected the external realities of local oligarchic rule and of polis life, particularly when Paul’s ekklēsia members would try to bring redress to the inequity found in the interplay of social and ethnic identities at municipal levels of Greco-Roman society.

Paul does not appear to be directly involved, though, in bringing redress to the political power imbalances between the dēmos and boulē, or between the polis and imperium (e.g., Rom 13:1-7). Paul’s politics purportedly leave direct political

---

800 Jewett makes clear that the guiding principle behind Paul’s honor system was not “love patriarchalism,” that is, benefaction based upon hierarchical social stratification (65–66), but rather “agapic communalism” (Rom 13:8a) (Romans, 69). This agapic communalism makes Paul’s “honor system” one of unrestricted social interaction. Its democratic and egalitarian principles level the socio-economic playing field, so to speak, between the “administrative slaves” and aristocratic patrons within Paul’s ekklēsiai (Ibid, 60–61, 64–66; on Rom 16:10-11, see 952–53, 965–68). Affecting a breakdown of hierarchical separation among Christ-followers within the public sphere inevitably affects other socio-economic relationships which those self-same Christ-followers have with Greco-Roman outsiders in their social and work worlds.

801 Regarding Paul’s concern for the poor and socio-economically disadvantaged see the seminal study by Bruce Longenecker, Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

802 Schnelle states that “Paul adopts no intentional political stance in the modern sense…There is no direct anti-Roman or even Roman-critical statement in Paul. On the contrary, Rom 13:1-7, the only direct statement from Paul with regard to the Roman Empire, specifically calls for its authority to be acknowledged” (Theology of the New Testament, 225). John Barclay concurs. He writes that “there is no evidence that Paul had the Roman empire or the imperial cult particularly in view, and that, better understood, Paul’s theology is deeply political but in a way that makes Rome not a central player in the history of the world, but a bit part, a member of a largely undifferentiated crowd, in a drama governed by much greater and more pervasive [cosmic] powers…we see Roman propaganda subverted precisely by not being challenged, but by being subsumed and relativised within a larger framework of explanation” (“Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant to Paul” [paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA., Nov. 16–20, 2007], 3, 19). Both Robert Jewett and Neil Elliott read Rom 13:1-7 counter-intuitively through anti-imperial lenses. Jewett sees Rom 13:1 as “thoroughly subversive” of Roman imperial ideology in that Paul depicts Rome’s rise to power as due to God’s sovereign choice rather than politico-military might. This sovereign God is the same one who raised Jesus from the dead after he was martyred by the same Roman state that God himself had placed into power. Paul’s implied message then is that not just Christ-followers, but even “Christ-killers” must submit to the God of the crucified Christ (Jewett, Romans, 789–90; idem, “Response: Exegetical Support from Romans and Other Letters,” in Paul and Politics: Ekcleisia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Krister Stendahl [ed. R. Horsley; Harrisburg, PA: TPI, 2000], 58–71, esp. 66–67). Neil Elliott uses James C. Scott’s distinction between public and private “transcripts” of the powerful and subordinate (Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcript [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990]) and Fredric Jameson’s insights into the social functions of narrative (The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981]). Elliott concludes that Rom 13:1-7 gives witness to the pragmatic Paul who in recognition of the dominance of imperial ideology is
intervention in the hands of a sovereign God (Rom 12:19) who establishes governing authorities with the right to “bear the sword” (Rom 13:4), or in Weberian terms, with the right to “the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force.”

Euergetism, or benefaction, is a third way in which Paul tapped into the political culture for socio-religious purposes. Benefaction finds expression both internally within Paul’s trans-local network of ekklēsiai and externally towards other sub-groups of Christ-followers (e.g., the hoi hagioi in Jerusalem; Rom 15:25-31; 1 Cor 16:1-4). As the primary apostolic authority of his ekklēsiai, Paul accepted benefaction (Rom 16:2, 23) and encouraged the socio-religious praxis of the “politics of equality” within each ekklēsia.

Paul sought to redress inequities in wealth (rich/poor), social status (slave/free; 1 Cor 7:17-24), ethnic pre-eminence (Jew, gentile; Gal 3:28), and gender roles (Gal 3:28; Rom 16:1-2; 1 Cor 11:1-16), to name a few.


Paul appears to have accepted patronage from Phoebe in Cenchrae (see n. 714). This problematizes Horsley’s claim that Paul sought to “embody radically different economic relations (avoid patronage)” (“1 Corinthians,” 251) (see my interaction with Horsley in Part III, §2.2.2. Paul’s Ekklēsia: Counter-Imperial Ideology?).

The inclusive and egalitarian impulse in Gal 3:28 is sometimes understood as supporting a universalism that transcends categories of race/ethnicity/peoplehood. Barclay remarks that for Paul’s Christ-followers social identity is no longer central “in the context of their new community” since “the ethnic identity of Paul’s converts was simply irrelevant” (Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 385). Bruce Hansen demurs but locates disparate ethnic identities into only one ethnicity: Israel. He argues that the baptismal unity formula in Gal 3:28 (and in 1 Cor 12:13; Col 3:11) is Paul’s vision of a social unity “of the believers as a new ethnic group patterned on the identity of Israel as re-envisioned through Christ” (All of You Are One [London: T&T Clark, 2010], 31; see also 116, 192, 195, 196). Denise Buell argues to the contrary: By “saying that Christianity is open to all was not mutually exclusive with defining Christians as
Externally, Paul promoted euergetism through one unprecedented economic act.\textsuperscript{807} Paul orchestrated a sizeable collection among his trans-local \textit{ekklēsiai} for \textit{hoi hagioi} in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{808} Paul’s collection was political insofar as it demonstrated that the civic ideology of an alternative society could cross socio-ethnic boundaries for the socio-economic betterment of an affiliated association, in this case Christ-followers loyal to the apostles in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{809} This act of financial munificence undoubtedly served to vitiate any socio-religious conflict which may have developed between differentiated sub-groups of Christ-followers (\textit{ekklēsiai} and \textit{hoi hagioi}). These sub-groups apparently were centred in different geographical locales (Syrian Antioch or Jerusalem), gave their loyalties to different apostolic authorities (Paul or Peter, James and John), and generally focused their missional activities upon different target groups (gentiles and/or Jews).

As the organizer of this magnanimous gift, Paul implicitly placed himself in the role of benefactor for the apostles in Jerusalem. Reciprocity from the Jerusalem apostles by means of honour through monumentalism would have been his natural due. There is no indication that Paul either expected or received such reciprocity from the Jerusalem apostles. It may be, however, that in his letter to Jerusalem-loyal Christ-followers in Rome (\textit{klētoi hagioi}; 1:7), Paul is attempting to cash in on the socio-religious currency members of an ethnic or racial group. In many early Christian texts, defining Christians as members of a people reinforces rather than conflicts with assertions of Christian universalism” (Why This New Race?: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity [New York: Columbia University Press, 2005], 138). See also Tucker, \textit{Remain in Your Calling}, 57 n. 116, 144–145.

\textsuperscript{806} Regarding wealth redistribution, see Longenecker, \textit{Remember the Poor} (2010). He argues that care for the impoverished was integral to Paul’s gospel and common practice in the \textit{ekklēsiai} he oversaw. Regarding the redistribution of social and ethnic status, see Tucker, \textit{Remain in Your Calling} (2011).

\textsuperscript{807} Horsley, “1 Corinthians,” 251.

\textsuperscript{808} See Rom 15:25-31; 1 Cor 16:3; cf. 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8–9.

‘owed’ him by their ‘mother’ community in Jerusalem. Paul mentions that he will stop in Rome after delivering to Jerusalem the collection that was gathered by his ekklēsiai in Macedonia and Achaia (Rom 15:22-31). The hospitality of the Jerusalem-loyal Roman community is then requested (Rom 15:32) before Paul continues on to Spain. By explicitly mentioning the leading role he is playing in organizing the collection for Jerusalem, Paul implicitly reminds the Roman Christ-followers of their own failure to fulfill their obligations to their mother community. In this, Paul rhetorically underscores his right to request reciprocity from the Roman Christ-followers in the form of hospitality and, thereby, to gain their support of his mission of establishing ekklēsiai in Spain.

There is a fourth correlation with the political culture of the Greek East. Paul’s ekklēsiai mirror at least two of its non-institutional aspects: emotive communities and festive communities. Although Asia Minor is the hotbed of political culture, Paul’s Corinthian correspondence provides an illuminating example of how a fictive political culture was inscribed among his Hellenic Christ-followers.

The phrase “emotive community” describes Paul’s Corinthian ekklēsia in every sense of the word. His Corinthian correspondence attests to a lively debate among upwards of four factions (“I belong to Paul/Apollos/Cephas/ Christ”; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:4).810

810 Scholars interpret the factionalism in Corinth along theological, ideological, or personal ‘fault lines’. C. K. Barrett aligns each leader mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12 with a distinctive theological position (see n. 763: “Christianity at Corinth,” 1–27; idem, “Cephas and Corinth,” 28–39). Ideological interpretations, on the other hand, relate the divisions to social alignments. Floyd V. Filson champions the view that factionalism developed between rival house congregations in Corinth (“The Significance of the Early House Churches,” JBL 58 [1939]: 109–12). Gerd Thiessen refines Filson’s view by suggesting that wealthy householders aligned themselves as benefactors for the different persons named in 1 Corinthians, thus, resulting in partisan-based groupings among the Christ-following community (The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth [ed. and trans. J. H. Schütz; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982], 54–57). For a critique of Thiessen, see Bengt Holmberg, Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 36–37, 40. Personal attachments, instead, become the evaluative grid for
They are in debate over *nomoi* that order their associational life,\(^{811}\) some of which touch upon the *nomoi* of Greco-Roman voluntary associations.\(^{812}\) Emotive factors associated with these types of issues undoubtedly were exacerbated simply by virtue of the fact that the semi-public worship assemblies were each called an *ekklēsia*.\(^{813}\) Within the civic *ekklēsia*, each *ekklēsiastēs* was allowed free expression of their opinion. The Corinthian Christ-followers may also, then, have felt entitled to similar displays of emotion when they gathered *en ekklēsia*, much to the detriment of harmonious *ekklēsia* life.

Not all emotion would have been negative, though. Positive, or festive, emotion would also have been engendered during the time that “members only” *ekklēsiai* were convened. Paul’s commitment to socio-ethnic *demokratia* allowed for the development of festive community among all members (male or female, slave or free, rich or poor) by means of regular reciprocity in honouring one another through prophesying (1 Cor 11:1-17; 14:1-33), teaching (1 Cor 14:26), praying (1 Cor 14:14-17), singing (1 Cor 14:14-17; John K. Chow and Andrew D. Clarke. They downplay ideological concerns and examine the role which patron-client relationships may have played in the formation of factional groupings in Corinth (Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* [JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 106; Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* [AGJU 18; Leiden: Brill, 1993], 89–95). Along these lines, see also, L. L. Wellborn, “On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 85–111. Kloppenborg develops the insights of Chow and Clarke into a scenario wherein different sub-groups of collegia domestica (patron-based households) or *thiasoi* (cult-based private associations) mix in public meetings, such as common meals (“Greco-Roman *Thiasoi,*” 209–212).\(^{811}\)

Conflict surfaces in numerous contexts within Paul’s Corinthian correspondence. In-fighting among the Corinthian Christ-followers is evident in Paul’s use of terms such as *erides* (“rivalries”) and *schismata* (“divisions”) (1 Cor 1:10-17). Communal meals become venues for *schismata* and *haireseis* (“factions”) (1Cor 11:17-19). Community members are in litigation against one another (1 Cor 6:1-8). Some Corinthian Christ-followers participate in meals in pagan temples, or perhaps even during the meetings of private cultic associations (1 Cor 8–10). Paul’s authority is being challenged by those whom he calls false apostles (2 Cor 11:13) and “super-apostles” (2 Cor 11:5).\(^{812}\)

See the discussion of voluntary association *nomoi* (Part III, §2.2.1. Paul’s *Ekklēsia: Alternative Civic Ideology*?).\(^{813}\) Only in Corinth does Paul both designate his community as an *ekklēsia* (e.g., 1:2) and then speak separately of them as regularly convening *ekklēsiai* (“meetings”; 11:18; 14:19, 28).

---

\(^{811}\) Conflict surfaces in numerous contexts within Paul’s Corinthian correspondence. In-fighting among the Corinthian Christ-followers is evident in Paul’s use of terms such as *erides* (“rivalries”) and *schismata* (“divisions”) (1 Cor 1:10-17). Communal meals become venues for *schismata* and *haireseis* (“factions”) (1Cor 11:17-19). Community members are in litigation against one another (1 Cor 6:1-8). Some Corinthian Christ-followers participate in meals in pagan temples, or perhaps even during the meetings of private cultic associations (1 Cor 8–10). Paul’s authority is being challenged by those whom he calls false apostles (2 Cor 11:13) and “super-apostles” (2 Cor 11:5).

\(^{812}\) See the discussion of voluntary association *nomoi* (Part III, §2.2.1. Paul’s *Ekklēsia: Alternative Civic Ideology*?).

\(^{813}\) Only in Corinth does Paul both designate his community as an *ekklēsia* (e.g., 1:2) and then speak separately of them as regularly convening *ekklēsiai* (“meetings”; 11:18; 14:19, 28).
26), eating together (1 Cor 11: 17-34)\(^814\) and the sharing of spiritual gifts with one another (charismata; 1 Cor 12:4-11; 14:1-40).

If one does a rhetorical-critical reading of the issues dealt with by, and in, Paul’s Corinthian ekklēsia, then those issues can be reframed metaphorically using the following civic terminology. As the fictive president (‘epistatēs’) of his Corinthian ekklēsia,\(^815\) Paul oversees a socio-economically diverse dēmos (1 Cor 1:26; 6:9-11).\(^816\) Paul mentions that the following ‘agenda’ (programma or prographē) items arose formally en ekklēsia and informally outside of assembly times: fictive eisangelia over sexual mores (1 Cor 5:1-13);\(^817\) unwarranted resolution of judicial issues outside of the ekklēsia (1 Cor 6:1-11);\(^818\)

---

\(^814\) The practice of Corinthian Christ-followers to eat “the Lord’s supper” (1 Cor 11:20) whenever they gathered en ekklēsia (1 Cor 11:18) is significantly more frequent than the usual once a month banqueting schedule among Greco-Roman associations (collegial/thiasoi) (John S. Kloppenborg, “Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership,” in Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London and New York: Routledge, 1996], 16-30, esp. 22). See Harland for correlations between the Corinthians’ love feast and the socio-religious functions of feasts in voluntary associations (Associations, 56–61) and the possibility of “wildly transgressive” behaviour during them (Dynamics of Identity, 163–69).

\(^815\) See n. 697. Gillihan cites San Nicolò’s work on Hellenistic Egypt which claims that one common rule within the nomoi, or regulations, of voluntary associations was that internal brawling among members was subject to internal sanctions. The president was most often the person given the necessary authority to mete out fines or other penalties (Civic Ideology, 87–88).

\(^816\) See n. 697. Gillihan cites San Nicolò’s work on Hellenistic Egypt which claims that one common rule within the nomoi, or regulations, of voluntary associations was that internal brawling among members was subject to internal sanctions. The president was most often the person given the necessary authority to mete out fines or other penalties (Civic Ideology, 87–88).

\(^817\) See n. 697. San Nicolò notes that one common rule within the nomoi, or regulations, of Hellenistic Egyptian voluntary associations was that fellow members were prohibited from suing one
concern over mixed marriages (2 Cor 6:14-18); the status of slaves and masters (1 Cor 7:17-24); the need to receive and honour benefactors (1 Cor 9:1-18); the role of women in ekklēsia (1 Cor 11:1-16; 14:33b-35); assembly protocol for prophetic ‘rhetors’ and other ekklēsia members when gathered en ekklēsia (1 Cor 14:1-40); and ‘foreign policy’ initiatives, such as the collection of financial support for Jerusalem-based Christ-followers (e.g., 1 Cor 16:1-4; Rom 15:25-31) by Paul’s trans-local association of Macedonian and Achaian ekklēsiai (Rom15:26). Such a metaphorical re-reading underlines the integrated nature of politics and religion; the concomitant conclusion that Paul pursued a real-world political agenda, whether of a neutral (van Kooten) or of a counter-imperial (Horsley) nature, is not required. Paul’s civic ideology formed a political ‘defense mechanism’ for, not a political movement of, Christ-followers.

another in public courts. Lawsuits were arbitrated by a special juridical committee within the association (Civic Ideology, 87–88).

819 Paul exhorts the ‘citizens’ of his Corinthian ekklēsia not to enter into partnership with ‘non-citizens’, that is, those whom he calls “unbelievers” (apistoi; 2 Cor 6:14, 15). This injunction presumably also includes marriage partnerships. This concern, that only a marriage of two Christ-follower ‘citizens’ be allowed within the Corinthian ekklēsia, fictively mirrors citizenship policy in classical Athens established by Pericles in 451/450 BCE. Aristotle affirms the continuance of this policy in his day (mid-4th cent. BCE) (Arist. Pol. 3.1275b). Aristotle notes that qualifications for being considered a natural born citizen had changed from needing only an Athenian father to requiring two Athenian parents who are lawfully wedded (έξ ἀστήρ καὶ ἐγγυητής).

820 See Appendix #5 for the fifteen Greek inscriptions in which the manumission of slaves is legitimated by a civic ekklēsia.

821 The word koinon can denote a trans-local alliance between two or more poleis (e.g., “τῶν Βοιωτῶν”; SIG 457.10 [Thespiae, 3rd cent. BCE]), or between non-civic groups such as guilds or associations (“τὸ κ. τῶν τεκτόνων”; PΟxy 53.2 [4th cent. CE]) (see also LSJ, κοινός, καὶ ὁ τί, ὁς καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ). Oligarchs across the Greek East during the Imperial period developed both formal and informal trans-local alliances. See n. 147 for discussion of “the koinon of Asia” which Macro anachronistically describes as an exclusively religious institution which oversaw the provincial imperial cult that was situated in Pergamon. Informal alliances between polis oligarchs were based upon educational, cultural, and political commonalities (Judith Perkins, Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era [RMCS; New York: Routledge, 2009], 23–24).
2.2.7. Summary: Pauline Ekklēsiai and Greco-Roman Politics

When it comes to usages of the word *ekklēsia* within Paul’s undisputed writings, I have suggested that, in its function as a permanent collective identity, *ekklēsia* reflects civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society that is not counter-imperial, nor a trans-local parallel political organization, but rather a trans-local Jewish voluntary association that was socially accessible to Greco-Roman participants, which, through its use of fictive political terminology, self-presented as a pro-‘democratic,’ counter-oligarchic participant in the ubiquitous “ekklēsia discourse” of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society, particularly in Asia Minor.

The positive ‘political’ nature of these new pro-‘democratic’ communities particularly comes to the fore in the Corinthian correspondence. Paul’s two (or three) letters are replete with examples of how comprehensively his new symbolic universe re-orders earthly politics. By prioritizing “agapic communalism” as the social expression of the “*nomos* of Christ” (1 Cor 9:21; 13:4-8a; Gal 6:2; cf. 5:14), love becomes the rationality (*nous*) to which all other human *nomoi* must conform. Paul’s love-based, socio-ethnic δημοκρατία, thus, undermines socio-economic stratification among the members of his Corinthian *ekklēsia*. Paul’s *ekklēsia* politics also can be said to lead to societal change as the members of his *ekklēsiai* interact with their social and political worlds. This religio-political agenda diverges from the counter-imperial pictures painted of Paul by scholars such as Horsley and Donfried. Perhaps, in respect of *ekklēsia* related arguments, the time has now come to lay down the counter-imperial brush and re-paint Paul’s *ekklēsiai* with more positive socio-political brushstrokes.
2.3. Ekklēsia as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?

Not only do Paul’s multi-ethnic ekklēsiai express pro-‘democratic’ ideology, their group designation also evokes pro-Jewish rhetoric. It accomplishes this in at least six respects. Three relate to Paul’s portrayal of his communities as Jewish sacred space (1 Corinthians, Romans). He depicts his ekklēsiai: (1) as the body of the Jewish Christos (Messiah); (2) as the living temple of God; and (3) as a sacred synagogue community within which Christ-followers are metaphorically manumitted from enslavement to sin.

The other three ways evoke uses of the word ekklēsia in Jewish sources. Two I have already explored. The word ekklēsia refers to two types of Jewish synagogue communities: diasporic semi-public associations, such as Philo’s Alexandrian ekklēsia in Virt. 108, or public synagogue assemblies located in Judea. The other way still to be explored is the Septuagint’s use of the word ekklēsia for the historical nation of Israel.

---

822 John J. Collins notes that one of the earliest usages of the term Christos for a coming Davidic king is found in the Psalms of Solomon, which can be dated to at least the mid-1st century BCE given historical allusions to the Hasmonean dynasty and the death of Pompey (48 BCE) (The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 49). Not all Jews in the 1st century CE, whether in Judea or the Diaspora, held messianic expectations. But some did. With respect to Judea, Josephus describes three kingly messianic pretenders (Judas, Simon, Atrongeus) who arrived in the wake of the death of Herod the Great (4 BCE; B.J. 2.55f). The sectarian Qumran expected either one messiah (“the <messiah> of Aaron and Israel”; CD 12.23-13.1; 14:18, 19) or two (“the messiahs of Aaron and Israel”; 1QS 9.11; the priestly messiah and the messiah of Israel; 1QSa 2.11, 20). In 4QFlorilegium (4Q174 10-11) the sectarian messiah is identified as “the branch of David” (see also 4Q285 5.iii). This identification of a messiah with the Davidic lineage is also evident in Ps. Sol. 17:21 (“son of David”) and 17:32 (christos kyrios). According to Kenneth Atkinson these two titles are only used of messianic kings in post-HB literature (“On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17,” in The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition [ed. C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000], 106–23, esp. 107).
2.3.1. Ekklēsia as the Body of the Jewish Messiah

Paul metaphorically identifies his Corinthian ekklēsia and, later, the Roman Christ-followers, with the body of the Jewish Christos (1 Cor 12:27; Rom 12:5).\(^{823}\) Some scholars look for Paul’s source(s) in pre-existing literary and cultural constructs that include the Jewish concept of corporate personality,\(^{825}\) the Gnostic Redeemer myth,\(^{826}\) the body of Adam from rabbinic Judaism,\(^{827}\) and the temple of Asclepius in Corinth.\(^{828}\) Other scholars have sought for the source of Paul’s “body of (the) Christ” imagery in his experiences. These include the Damascus Road theory\(^{829}\) and the celebration of the Eucharist.\(^{830}\)

---

\(^{823}\) Paul writes to the Corinthians, “Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. And God has appointed in the ekklēsia first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues” (1 Cor 12:27, 28). Therein, Paul appears to parallel “the body of Christ” with “the ekklēsia,” and “individual…members” with “apostles…prophets…teachers [etc.].” See also (deutero-)Pauline Col 1:18b, 24.

\(^{824}\) See Robert Jewett’s detailed discussion of possible sources for Paul’s “body” metaphor in Paul’s Anthropological Terms: a Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 200–304. See also Michelle V. Lee, Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ (SNTS 137; Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 8.

\(^{825}\) In this theory, Christ incorporates the church within himself analogous to the way in which a Hebrew Bible figure incorporated ancient Israel within himself as their inclusive representative. See the studies by Albert Schweitzer (The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle [New York: Holt, 1931]) and Ernest Best (Interpreting Christ [New York/London: Continuum, 2000]).

\(^{826}\) Ernst Käsemann, Leib und Leib Christi (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1933); Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1951), 1:175–83; Walter Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth: an Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians (trans. John E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971). The Gnostic Urmensch consisted of a gigantic body which came to earth. This body was imprisoned in the physical world. Although the Urmensch escaped, pieces of his body remained incarcerated on earth.

\(^{827}\) W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1980), 55–57; Jewett, Paul’s Anthropological Terms, 239–50. Paul is said to have derived the “body” metaphor from the rabbinic doctrine of the unity of humanity in Adam. In this perspective, Adam’s body was symbolic of humanity’s oneness. Paul’s idea of new humanity “in Christ” enlivened by the Spirit is an analogous concept.


\(^{829}\) Seyoon Kim, The Origin of Paul’s Gospel (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1984), 252–56. He argues that Paul’s conception of the unity of Christ and his people came from his conversion experience.
Michelle Lee argues for another source—Stoic conceptions of the universal body of humanity, otherwise known as cosmopolitanism. Lee argues for conceptual intersections between Paul, and universalism, especially Stoic cosmopolitanism, since “Paul’s method of linking community identity as a body and corporate ethical exhortation is similar to what is found in Stoic paraenesis.” This conjunction of body metaphor with ethical injunction is unheralded outside of Pauline and Stoic conceptions.

Paul adds a Jewish twist to that Stoic body imagery, though, with the prepositional phrase “of Christos.” Thus, Paul’s exemplar of moral lifestyle is not simply a human sage. His exemplar is the resurrected Jewish Christos, Jesus. Paul’s use of “the body of (the) Christos” metaphor (Rom 12:5) would have been particularly relevant in Nero’s Rome given Seneca’s promotion of Stoic thought. The predominantly gentile when the risen Christ encountered him (“Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?...I am Jesus who you persecute”). This is problematic in that, so far as Paul was concerned, he was directly persecuting the followers of Christ, not Christ himself.

Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (2006). Daniel Richter’s study on the reception history of cosmopolis conceptions suggests a definition of cosmopolitanism: “a set of ideas clustered around the principle that the human community is, biologically speaking, an undifferentiated whole” (*Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire* [Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011], 18). Richter (2011) does not include in his bibliography the important studies by Lee (*Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* [2006]) and Buell (*Why This New Race?* [2005]). Buell’s study is broader than Lee’s, both in the Christian sources she considers (1st and 2nd centuries CE) and in the ideological concerns she explores. Buell examines competing claims for universalism and ethnic identity in early Christianity.


Michelle Lee cites the unpublished dissertation of Leigh Clasby Viner who “argues that exemplars, as especially seen in the Stoic sage, are used in conjunction with principles in Stoic ethics. In particular, ‘such exemplars help to bridge the gap between the individual moral choices and actions’” (“Moral Paradigms and the Stoic Sage” [Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University, 2002], 3; cited in Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*, 199).
population in the Roman community of Christ-followers\textsuperscript{834} would have gained increased missional relevance with their Greco-Roman neighbours when using what, on the surface, appears to be a recognizably Stoic conception—“the (universal) body (politic).”

Jewish Christ-followers would also have benefited. The predominantly gentile Roman community still had longstanding ties with the apostles in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{835} Through Paul’s portrayal of all Roman Christ-followers as one unified (Stoic) body of (the Jewish) Christos, he implicitly legitimates the right of the recently returned Jewish Christ-followers, including his ekklēsia leaders Aquila and Priscilla, to equal participation as members and leaders of that “body” of Christ-followers in Rome.

\textsuperscript{834} I intentionally avoid attaching the name ekklēsia to the original community of Roman Christ-followers. William Campbell, among others, points out that the only group of Christ-followers in Rome whom Paul specifically addresses as ekklēsia was a small group who met in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:3-5a) (“The Addressees of Paul’s Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?” in \textit{Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11} [ed. F. Wilk and J. R. Wagner, with the assistance of F. Schleritt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 171–95, esp. 181). Along with Jewett (\textit{Romans}, 61), a number of scholars contend that at least five “house churches” are represented in Paul’s greetings section, four of which are headed by gentile leaders. See Wolfgang Wiefel (“The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity,” in \textit{The Romans Debate} [rev. and exp. ed.; ed. K. P. Donfried; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991], 85–101, esp. 95–101); Paul S. Minear (\textit{The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans} [Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003], 7); J. D. G. Dunn (\textit{Romans} [2 vols.; WBC 38A, B; Dallas: Word Books, 1988], 2:891); and Peter Lampe (“The Roman Christians of Romans 16,” in \textit{The Romans Debate} [rev. and exp. ed.; ed. K. P. Donfried; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991], 216–30, esp. 229–30). The five house congregations are said to be: the ekklēsia in the oikos of Prisca and Aquila (16:5a), those among the slaves of Aristoboulus (16:10b), those among the slaves of Narkissos (16:11b), hoi adelphoi (“the brothers”) who are with Asynkritos et al. (16:14b), hoi hagioi (“the holy ones”) who are with Philologos et al. (16:15b). Jewett cites prosopographic evidence to the effect that gentile leaders were in charge of the four non-ekklēsia groups (\textit{Romans}, 953). Bernard Green challenges the concept of multiple Roman congregations altogether with his claim that there was only one ekklēsia in first-century Rome (\textit{Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries} [London/New York: T&T Clark, 2010]). This is, of course, problematic if the only Christ-followers in Rome who were part of an ekklēsia were those who met in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:3-5a).

\textsuperscript{835} In Acts 2, Jews from a number of regions throughout the Roman empire are said to have heard Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost, some of whom came to faith in Jesus as the Christos (2:36-41). This group could be said to include Jews who came from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Acts 2:9; cf. 1 Peter 1:1) and Jews and gentile proselytes from Rome (Acts 2:10; Rom 1:7, klētoi hagioi).
2.3.2. Ekklēsia as a Living Temple of the Jewish God

Another way in which Paul depicts his multi-ethnic ekklēsiai as Jewish sacred space is as fictive architecture, specifically as the temple of God (naos theou). Paul is not alone among Jewish Second Temple or New Testament writers in his conception of a people as a temple. He is alone, though, in conceiving of a people-group named ekklēsia as a fictive naos.

The Covenanters at Qumran are one Jewish community which fictively self-identified as the Temple. In CD, they refer to themselves as “a holy house.” A more explicit identification of the community with the Temple is found in 1QS 8.5-6. Therein the “council of the Community” is called “a holy house for Israel [i.e., Temple] and the foundation of the holy of holies of Aaron.” The Covenanters’ self-portrayal as Jewish sacred space was exclusivist, even supersessionist, in nature. David Aune claims that their self-identification as a temple of God was “an intermediate situation in which they rejected the existing temple cult and lived in expectation of the rebuilding of the true and

---

836 Individual Christ-followers are depicted as being the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:19, 20). The corporate body of Christ-followers is also portrayed as a temple of God (local ekklēsia: 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 2 Cor 6: 16; universal ekklēsia: Eph 2:19-22).


839 The Hebrew translated “the holy of holies of Aaron” reads קדשו כארוסי אָהָרֹן.
unpolluted eschatological temple.” The Covenanters apparently saw themselves as the living replacement for the corrupt Temple and its establishment.

By contrast, Paul’s temple metaphors are ideologically ambiguous. Bertil Gärtner makes four observations from 2 Cor 6:14-18: (1) the community is identified as the “the temple of God”; (2) this ‘living temple’ is indwelt by the Spirit of God; (3) the indwelling Holy Spirit makes the ‘living temple’ holy; (4) this holy state demands holy living from each member of the ‘living temple.’ The key question, however, is whether Paul’s metaphorical conflation of Jewish temple and Christ-follower community reflects supersessionist theology. Bertil Gärtner thinks so. He argues that the implication of the Spirit of God ‘dwelling’ in the Christ-follower ekklēsia is that “God’s Shekinah no longer rests on the Jerusalem temple, but has been removed to the Church.” In this he implicitly aligns Pauline ‘living temple’ imagery with the replacement ideology of the Covenanters at Qumran who also saw themselves as the ‘living temple.’

Gärtner’s supersessionist conclusion is not a necessary one, though. Paul’s metaphorical transformation of his Corinthian ekklēsia into the temple of God could just as readily have been a way for Paul to merge his Christ-followers with their Jewish ethno-religious roots, rather than as a way to differentiate them from a Jewish heritage. John Lanci, Albert Hogeterp, Nijay Gupta and Paula Fredriksen each argue that Paul does not replace the Temple in Jerusalem with his ekklēsia of Christ-followers in Corinth. They contend, rather, that his depiction of his multi-ethnic ekklēsia as fictive Jewish

---

architecture presents Christ-followers as an indelible part of pluriform Second Temple Judaism.\footnote{John R. Lanci points out some significant problems with the interpretation that Paul sought to replace the Jerusalem Temple with the Corinthian community (A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery [SBL 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1997], 11–18). In a similar vein, see also Albert Hogeterp (Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence [BTS 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006], 358), Nijay K. Gupta (Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul’s Cultic Metaphors [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010], 205–11), and Paula Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations,” 232–52. Fredriksen counters supersessionist interpretations of 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16: “I argue the opposite: Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he values supremely. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone. This is not an either/or situation: for Paul, God’s spirit dwells both in Jerusalem’s temple and in the ‘new temple’ of the believer and of the community (Rom 9.4; cf. Matt 23.21)” (“Judaizing the Nations,” 248 [author’s emphasis]).}

Paul is not the sole New Testament writer to depict Christ-followers as a ‘living temple.’ Other works such as the Gospel of John and 1 Peter follow suit either explicitly (1 Pet 2:4-5; 4:17)\footnote{1 Pet 2:5 reads, in part, “like living stones, let yourselves be built into a spiritual house.”} or implicitly (John 14:2, cf. 2:19-22).\footnote{For a fuller discussion of the Gospel of John’s implicit portrayal of Christ-followers as a living Temple, see Robert Gundry, “In my Father’s House are many ἱππαξ (John 14:2),” ZNW 57 (1967): 68–72; Mary Coloe, Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007); and Ralph J. Korner, “The Gospel of John’s Jesus: the Way into a Place, into a People, or into a Person?” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, LA, 22 November, 2009), 1–12.} John uses temple terminology metaphorically of all Christ-followers (John 14:2; “my Father’s house”). His phrase “Father’s house” is not terminology that is symbolic of “heaven.”\footnote{See Korner, “The Gospel of John’s Jesus?” 1–12. I argue that the New Testament understanding of people as sacred space challenges an exclusivist soteriology that finds its basis in John 14:6 (“I am the way, the truth and the life”). Specifically, by recasting “the father’s house” (John 14:2) as the “Temple/New Jerusalem/people of God,” rather than as “heaven,” the focus of interpretation moves away from Jesus as “the way” for one to enter a place (“heaven”) towards Jesus as “the way” for one to enter a people (“the living Temple”). Additionally, then, the emphasis of Jesus’ statement in John 14:6b (“no one comes to the Father except through me”) shifts away from claiming a mediatory role for his disciples’ access to the place where the Father resides (“heaven”) towards an assertion of Jesus’ unique role in mediating the disciples’ direct access to the Father during their earthly lifetime for the purposes of ministry effectiveness (John 14:7-13) and personal intimacy (John 14:20-23).} Although these two writings depict their Christ-followers as a temple of God, neither employs
**ekklēsia** terminology, nor correlates *ekklēsia* with that temple of God.\(^{847}\) This reinforces the need to avoid translating *ekklēsia* as “church” if, by the word “church,” one means a collective designation that was used universally by all Christ-followers in the early Jesus movement. Only some Christ-followers are identified in the New Testament as belonging to, or self-designating as, an *ekklēsia*.

**2.3.3. Ekklēsia as a Sacred Jewish Synagogue**

A third way in which an *ekklēsia* identity expresses a Jewish heritage extends out from Paul’s presentation of the Corinthian *ekklēsia* as a living temple (*naos*). Paul’s depiction of the Corinthians as Jewish sacred space places his *ekklēsia* into metaphorical continuity with Greek and Jewish manumission praxis. Contemporaneous Greek manumission protocol in Delphi involved the manumission of slaves within a sacred structure (e.g., the temple of the Pythian Apollo),\(^{848}\) with the occasional ratification by decree of a civic *ekklēsia*.\(^{849}\) Paul analogously depicts his Corinthian “*ekklēsia cum naos*” as a legitimating ‘site’ for the fictive manumission of Christ-followers from their old

---

\(^{847}\) 1 Peter uses a pluralistic identity (*Christianoi*) not a collective one (e.g., *ekklēsia*), for its addressees in Asia Minor (1 Pet 4: 16).

\(^{848}\) Elizabeth Leigh Gibson notes that over 1300 manumission inscriptions from central Greece have been recovered. These span four centuries and recount release ceremonies at the temple of the Pythian Apollo (*The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom: Release in the Prayer House* [TSAJ 75; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999], 37). Of these, there are at least 15 inscriptions which include a reference to the civic *ekklēsia* as the legitimating authority (See Appendix #5).

\(^{849}\) Greek manumission ceremonies, especially those practiced in central Greece (e.g., Delphi; 4th cent. BCE to 1st cent. CE), routinely recount that the official redemption payment (*timas*) (whether figurative or literal) is made in a temple to a god, most often in the temple at Delphi to the Pythian Apollo. Occasionally, this transaction, which involved the change of a slave’s status (e.g., *aphēkē eleutheron*, “set free”) into a “freedperson” (*apeleutheros*), is formally enacted through a public decree that is authorized within a civic *ekklēsia*. An inscription is then commissioned to officially commemorate the manumission (e.g., *FD* III 2:120; Delphi, uncertain date), upon which official witnesses (*martys*) are also noted. Sometimes these guarantors are the temple priests themselves (e.g., *FD* III 6:31, Delphi, 1–20 CE). The primary purpose of these *martys* or “human guarantors…[is to] act as the god’s agent, insure that potential claimants not harass the former slave” (Runesson, Binder and Olsson, *Ancient Synagogue*, 154).
master called “sin” to a new master, Jesus the Jewish Christos (1 Cor 7:17-24). Paul’s fictive manumission ideology reflects the manumission ceremonies of Bosporan Jews (1st to 4th cents. CE), which, in turn, mirror Delphic manumission praxis.

Jews of the Bosporus Kingdom, however, do not set a slave’s formal release (aphiēmi) into freedom (eleutheria) within the context of a pagan temple. Rather, the manumission of slaves by Jewish owners is set within a sacred synagogal structure (proseuchē) and adjudicated under the auspices of the previous owner’s heirs and “the synagogue of the Jews” (tēs synagogēs tōn Ioudaion).

Given that ekklēsia also is a Jewish synagogue term, and since Paul considers his Corinthian ekklēsia as Jewish sacred space (“temple of God,” 1 Cor 3:16, 17), Pauline Christ-followers and the Bosporan Jewish synagogue community share a common

---

850 See also Rom 6:17-19. If one assumes that the Roman Christ-followers, in general, do not self-designate as an ekklēsia, then Paul is consistent in not using ekklēsia terminology in his pericope on fictive manumission in Romans 6.

851 The Bosporus Kingdom (1st to 4th cents. CE) was located along the north shore of the Black Sea, above the Asia Minor region of Bithynia and Pontus, both of which formed the south shore of the Black Sea.

852 The manumission of Jewish slaves by Greek owners, however, was enacted within pagan temples. One example is the only manumission inscription found among the many epigraphic remains of Oropus (3rd cent. BCE), a polis that is situated along the Boeotian-Attic border. The Greek text and translation is by David M. Lewis: “Phrynidas (will release) Moschos to be free [τὸν ἔνατον ἔλευθερον] dependent on no one man. But if anything happens to Phrynidas (i.e., if he dies) before the time elapses [πρὸ τοῦ τὸν χρόνον διεξελθεῖν], let Moschos go free [ἔλευθερος ἀπίτω μόσχος] wherever he wishes. To Good Fortune [Τῇ Χῆι ἄγαθῇ]. Witnesses [μάρτυρες]…(Set up) by Moschos son of Moschion the Jew at the command of the god Amphiaraos and the goddess Health [τοῦ θεοῦ Ἀμφιαράου καὶ τῆς Γιειάς]…commanded [συνεπιτροπής] to write it [ἀναθέτουσι] on stone and set it up on the altar [πρὸς τῷ Βωμῷ]” (“The First Greek Jew,” JSS 2.3 [1957]: 264–66, esp. 264).

853 For example, CIRB 70/CIJ 1.683 (81 CE): ἀφείμαι ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸς σου εὐχῆς θερπτὸν μου Ἡρακλάν ἔλευθερον:

854 CIRB 70/CIJ 1.683 reads, in part, συνεπισυνεντότων δὲ καὶ τῶν κληρονόμων μου Ἡρακλείδου καὶ Ἐλεικωνιαδός, συνε[π]ρ[ε]πευόμην δὲ καὶ τῆ[ς] συναγωγῆ[ς] τῶν Ἰουδαίων (“both with the consent of my heirs Heracles and Heliconias and with the joint guardianship of the congregation of the Jews”; translation by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson [ASSB, no. 124]). Gibson demonstrates convincingly that Jews of the 1st century CE did own slaves and that they followed, and adapted, Greco-Roman protocol regarding the management of slaves (Jewish Manumission Inscriptions, 66–70).
function: as sacred communities, they play host to, and legitimate thereby, the
manumission of slaves, whether metaphorical (Corinth) or real (Bosporus Kingdom).

Paul’s missionary travels may have apprised him of Bosporan Jewish
manumission *praxis*. During his second missionary journey (49–52 CE), according to
Acts 15:36–18:22, while en route to Troas, Paul journeyed through the province of
Mysia, south of the Black Sea (Acts 16:7, 8). His inspiration to sacralize his non-civic
*ekklēsiai* may also have come from his time in Mysia, or perhaps simply while in
Ephesos. 855 Only a few years after his Mysian visit, Paul wrote his Corinthian and Roman
correspondence, the only two of his undisputed epistles wherein he depicts Christ-
followers as Jewish sacred space. 856

One factor which distinguishes Paul’s manumission ideology from Roman-style
manumission procedures is Paul’s allusion to the ongoing *paramonē* obligations
mandated of manumitted slaves (1 Cor 7:24b; *menētō para theou*). *Paramonē* clauses are
found in one-fourth of Delphic Greek inscriptions and are replicated in Bosporan Jewish
manumission ceremonies. 857 A *paramonē* clause is a legal requirement for the new

855 See n. 209 for the Greek text of the seven inscriptions which attribute a sacral dimension to
their civic *ekklēsia* through their use of the phrase “*hiera ekklēsia.*” Five of the inscriptions are from Asia
Minor, with two hailing from Mysia and three from Ephesos.
856 Paul’s Corinthian correspondence was completed c. 55 CE and his Roman epistle c. 57 CE (at
the earliest).
857 Of the 1300+ manumission inscriptions from central Greece, 302 of them include a *paramonē*
style clause (*para/oun*; *para/uenetw*; *para/ueinatw*; *para/ueinou*). Of these 302 inscriptions from
central Greece, 5 include pair the word *ekklēsia* with a *paramonē* style clause. They hail from the region of
Phokis, in which Delphi is situated. The five inscriptions are *FD III* 6:31 (Delphi, 1–20 CE), *FD III* 6:27
(Delphi, 1–20 CE), *IG IX,1* 193 (Tithora, beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE), *IG IX,1* 126 (Elateia, 2nd cent.
BCE), and *FD III* 2:120 (Delphi, n.d.). See Appendix #5 for full text of the Greek inscriptions.
“freedperson” (*apeleutheros*) to “remain with” (e.g., *parameinaτo*) his previous owner until that owner dies. In this regard, Greek manumission is not emancipation.

In analogous fashion to the Greek *paramonē* clause, the manumitted slave of a Jewish owner is also placed under ongoing obligations. Unlike Greek *praxis*, however, those obligations are not to the previous owner. Rather, the Bosporan *apeleutheros* is obligated to a new owner—the *proseuchē* (“prayer hall”).

Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson claim that the sacredness of the *proseuchē* is demonstrated in the manumitted slave being enjoined to show both “deference and devotion” (*thōpeias* and *proskarterēseōs*) to the *proseuchē* under the auspices of the synagogue community. Elizabeth Leigh Gibson contends that this implicit *paramonē* duty

---

858 *FD III* 6:31 (c. 20 CE) reads, in part, παρα/uni03BCεν/uni1F73τω δ/uni1F72 Τρυ[φ]/uni1F73ρα Ν/uni1F77κωνι π/uni1F71ντα τ/uni1F78ν τ/uniFB6ς ζω/uni1FB6ς α/uni1F50τ<ο/uni1FE6> χρ/uni1F79νον ποιο/uni1FE6σα τ/uni1F78 /uni1F10πιτασ/uni1F79/uni03BCενον /uni1F00νενκ[λ]/uni1F75τως.

859 Gibson clarifies that in Greek manumission procedures “service for the life of the former owner was the most common *paramonē* obligation, but a variety of other arrangements were possible. These include providing service for a limited number of years (*SGDI* 1775, 1796, 1801, 1807), providing replacement slaves (*SGDI* 1717), learning a trade (*SGDI* 1899 and 1904), serving a designated party after the original owner’s death (*SGDI* 1742, 1747, and 1884), and agreeing to live in a specific town (*SGDI* 1774 and 1801)” (*Jewish Manumission Inscriptions*, 40, 26).

860 *CIRB* 70/*CIJ* 1.683 (81 CE) reads, in part, χωρ/uni1F76ς /uni1F30ς τ/uni1F74ν προσευχ/uni1F74ν θωπε/uni1F77ας τε κα/uni1F76 προσκαρτερετων δω τ/uni1FF6ν κληρ<ο/uni1FE6>ων /uni03BCου /uni1F29ρακλε/uni1F77δου κα/uni1F76 /uni1F19λικωνι/uni1F71δος, συνεπεπροπευο/uni1F7Bσης δω κα/uni1F76 τ/uni1FC6ς συναγωγ/uni1FC6ς τ/uni1FF6ν /uni1F38ουδα/uni1F77ων (“except that he show devotion and diligence towar d the prayer hall; both with the consent of my heirs Heraclides and Heliconias and with the joint guardianship of the congregation of the Jews”; translation by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson [*ASSB*, no. 124]). Examples of inscriptions which suggest that synagogues were considered sacred include *JIGRE* 9 (*CIJ* 2.1433; 2nd cent. BCE); “the sacred [precinct] [hieros peribolos] and the prayer hall [proseuchē]”; *ASSB*, no. 143) and *JIGRE* 24 (*CIJ* 2.1441; [140–116 BCE]; *ASSB*, no. 159). Examples of Jewish literary sources which view synagogues as sacred space include Philo (Flacc. 41–53; Alexandrian *proseuchai* are said to possess “sacred precincts” [hieros peribolos] [40–41 CE]; *ASSB*, no. 138), Josephus (A. J. 16:162–65; a decree of
involves the provision of labour services, rather than requiring conversion into a god-fearer. If the main purpose of Bosporan Jewish proseuchai was the same as that claimed by Jutta Leonhardt for Alexandrian proseuchai during Philo’s time, then a sacred proseuchē provides the opportunity “to show reverence to benefactors” for their euergetism through the reciprocity of “praise and thanksgiving.” The provision of labour services is a very practical way of extending ongoing “praise and thanksgiving” to the newly manumitted slave’s ‘benefactors,’ that is, to the entire synagogue community.

It is only in 1 Cor 7:21-24 that we find the juxtaposition of manumission ideology with ekklēsia terminology. Paul teaches the Corinthian slaves and masters that, upon becoming members of the ekklēsia, their social status, but not necessarily their social stratum, reverses. A slave (doulos) whom Christ has redeemed is now called a "freedperson in the Lord" (1 Cor 7:22, apeleutheros kyriou), while a “freeperson” (ho

Caesar Augustus which presumes synagogues as being sacred and inviolable; ASSB, no. 120), and mishnaic texts (m. Meg. 3:1-3, esp. 1 [200 CE]; the sale of a community’s synagogue building to an individual is said to “degrade its sanctity”; ASSB, no. 82)

The word θωπε/uni1F77α is variously translated as “deference” (Runesson, Binder and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 156, 158) or “diligence” (Binder, http://www.pohick.org/sts/bosporus.html; accessed March 21, 2011). Gibson contends that θωπε/uni1F77α, which is frequently required from the ex-slaves in the inscriptions, is “the attitude with which the servant should perform his service” (Jewish Manumission Inscriptions, 148). David Noy (RBL review 03/25/2000) applauds her translation over against Liddell and Scott’s “flattery, adulation” (p. 373).

Gibson contends that the slaves’ own religious position was irrelevant, contra Levinskaya who sees manumitted slaves as being an important source of godfearers (Irina Levinskaya, The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996]). With respect to the singular phrase theon sebōn in CIRB 71, Runesson, Binder, and Olsson note that even though the emendation suggested by Bellen and Lifshitz (theo(n) sebōn) is problematic, it does accord with the fact that “the release requirements prescribed…would be necessary only if the freed slaves were Gentiles” (Ancient Synagogue, 160).


Stegemann and Stegemann differentiate between social stratum and social status (The Jesus Movement, 61). Any stratification analysis essentially presupposes social inequality. Social stratum is a measure of one’s political and economic assets. Social status is a less concrete measure. Status relates primarily to the esteem in which a person is held by those within his circle of influence. Status also tends to vary depending on one’s social circle. Thus, a person’s status will fluctuate when talking about his/her family status, or status within a religious group or a guild, and so forth. A stratification system cannot express this multidimensional social situation and it does not have to. Strictly speaking it considers only the social system called society.
eleucheros) is now considered “a slave of Christ” (1 Cor 7:22, doulos Christou). This leveling of the social playing field, so to speak, releases each Christ-follower from enslavement to socio-economic stratification so that they can practice unrestricted social interaction whenever they gather for displays of “socio-ethnic dēmokratia” en ekklēsia (e.g., Gal 3:28; “no longer slave nor free”).

Paul follows up his comments about status equalization among ekklēsia members with a concluding statement. Its ambiguity has long puzzled scholars (1 Cor 7:24b): “In whatever condition you were called, brothers and sisters, there remain with God.” If one translates menetō para theō (7:24b) with an eye to the paramonē formula (e.g., paramenetō, FD III 6:27), then Paul invites the Corinthians to subject their obligation to human masters (7:23) under a higher obligation to God (7:24b). This paramonē-style obligation lasts for as long as God, their master and ‘benefactor,’ lives. Since God lives forever, each doulos of Christ has a lifelong obligation to God the Father, and, by familial extension, to their Father’s sacred synagogue institution, the “naos of God” (1 Cor 3:16, 17), also called the “ekklēsia of God” (Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1). Thus, in 1 Cor 7:24b, Paul’s

---

867 Dale Martin states that Paul “does not simply redefine the status of Christian slaves; he also redefines the status of free Christians” (Slavery As Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990], 65).

869 Paul’s apparent analogy to a Greek praxis clause is not precise. In Greek praxis a manumitted slave is obligated to serve their old master for the duration of that master’s life. In Paul’s fictive schema, the manumitted slave of “sin” is no longer obligated to serve their old master, not because the old master “sin” has died, but, rather, because the slave has died to their old master (Rom 6:2, 6, 7). The flip side of that same coin is that each Christ-follower becomes the slave of a new master, “righteousness” (Rom 6:18) and, thus, to God himself (Rom 6:22), through their participation in the resurrected life of Jesus the Christos (Rom 6:4, 5, 11). Now that each doulos of God is alive in Christ, their paramonē obligation is to be directed to him as their new master (and to their new master’s community of Christos-followers). In this regard, they are to “present [their] members to God as instruments of righteousness” (Rom 6:13).
implicit message could be that within the Father’s surrogate sacred *proseuchē*—the *ekklēsia*—each *doulos* manumitted from sin is to praise and thank God (1 Cor 14:15-17).

The letter to the Philippians contains explicit evidence that the apostle Paul was acquainted with Greek manumission practices, and in particular with the *paramonē* clause. In Phil 1:1 Paul affirms his status as a *doulos* of Christ Jesus. In Phil 1:25 he indicates his familiarity with Greek *paramonē* obligations in that he employs the literal meaning of the simple form of *menō* and the metaphorical meaning of the compound form (*paramenō*), and both within the space of a single sentence.\(^{870}\) In 1:25a Paul says that he will physically remain with the Philippians (*menō*). In 1:25b he states why he chooses physically to remain with them: as a *doulos* of Christ Jesus (1:1), he has a lifelong apostolic obligation (*paramenō*) to Christ’s *ekklēsia* in Philippi to help them find fullness of life in Christ (“for your progress and joy in the faith”; 1:25c).\(^{871}\)

One could summarize Paul’s fictive manumission ideology as follows: Paul portrays the *ekklēsia* of Christ-followers as a sacred Jewish synagogal ‘place’ *within which* individual Christ-followers are metaphorically manumitted from their previous master “sin,” *towards which* individual Christ-followers are to remain obligated for life

---

\(^{870}\) Phil 1:25 reads, in part, ο/uni1F36δα /uni1F45τι /uni03BCεν/uni1FF6 κα/uni1F76 παρα/uni03BCεν/uni1FF6 π/uni1FB6σιν /uni1F51/uni03BC/uni1FD6ν ε/uni1F30ς τ/uni1F74ν /uni1F51/uni03BC/uni1FF6ν προκοπ/uni1F74ν κα/uni1F76 χαρ/uni1F70ν τ/uni1FC6ς πίστεως.

\(^{871}\) Friedrich Hauck notes that “in Phil. 1:25 Paul characteristically changes the expected avoidance of martyrdom (μένειν, “to remain alive”) into the ethical παρα/uni03BCένω πάσιν υμῖν εἰς τὴν ύμων προκοπήν καὶ χαράν τῆς πίστεως...Selfish desires are subordinated to the service and furtherance of the congregation” (“παρα/uni03BCένω,” *TDNT* 4:578). The verb παρα/uni03BCένω only occurs twice in Paul’s writings (1 Cor 16:6; Phil 1:25), and only two additional times in the rest of the New Testament (Heb 7:23; James 1:25). James’ injunction that “a hearer [of the word]” must be a “doer of the work” would have held greater ethical import for his hearing/reading audience if the command (παρα/uni03BCείνας) would have been understood as placing a *paramonē* obligation upon each hearer, both towards their synagogal community (2:2) and to their *ekklēsia* association (5:14). It is understandable that Hauck neglects to observe such allusional connections since he only cites Greek literary sources; he does not investigate epigraphic sources, and, thus, any Greek manumission inscriptions, in his consideration of παρα/uni03BCένω occurrences.
through displays of righteous praxeis to ekklēsia members, for whom their primary allegiance is to a new master, “God,” and to whom is due their undying praise and thanksgiving for His eternal benefaction of grace.

2.3.4. Ekklēsia as Jewish Sacred Space and Paul’s Gentile Mission

Paul’s portrayals of his ekklēsiai as Jewish sacred space (body, temple, synagogue) positions his communities as being the fulfillment of prophetic texts which speak of the eschatological return of Jews and the pilgrimage of gentiles. It is in the eschaton that all ethnicities are envisioned as streaming to the cosmic mountain upon which sit both Jerusalem, also known as the “centre of the earth” (Isa 24:13; Ezek 38:12), and the temple of God (Isa 2:1-4; 45:14; 66:20). Ezekiel adds a messianic connection. He pictures God making “the region around [his cosmic] hill a blessing” (Ezek 34:26) by sending his messianic shepherd David to tend the sheep of Israel (Ezek 34:20-31).

Paul could be conflating eschatological pilgrimage imagery in the identification of his multi-ethnic ekklēsiai as Jewish sacred space. His ekklēsiai of “the Jerusalem above” (Gal 1:1; 4:26) are symbolically depicted as eschatological communities, each of which is a temple of God (1 Cor 1:2; 3:16, 17), a sacred site for freeing gentile and Jewish slaves (1 Cor 7:17-24), and the body of the Jewish Christos (1 Cor 12:27, 28). It should be noted, though, that Paul does not personally subscribe to the eschatological pilgrimage

---

872 Some Second Temple Jews expected that “Israel’s full restoration…[would] set the stage for an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations” (Terrance L. Donaldson, Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997], 193).

theology of some Second Temple Jews. As Terrence Donaldson points out, the “fullness” of the gentiles occurs during the time before Israel is saved (Rom 11), not in the eschaton after Israel is saved. Thus, the most one can say is that the “Gentile mission is linked more to the ‘not yet’ of Paul’s eschatological duality than to its ‘already.’”

Paul’s multi-ethnic ekklēsiai, then, become fitting spatial ‘locations,’ or ‘geographical’ centrepoints, if you will, for the influx of gentiles (and Jews) into communities whose risen Messiah has already inaugurated the eschaton, but not yet completed it. Thus, if a Corinthian interlocutor had asked Paul, “Where do the Jews and gentiles assemble in the eschaton?” Paul may very well have responded with, “it is already happening (1 Cor 10:11) in the ekklēsia (meeting; 14:28) of the multi-ethnic ekklēsia tou theou (community of God; 1 Cor 1:2) in Corinth among whom the eschaton has already been inaugurated by the resurrection of the Messiah” (1 Cor 15:1-58).

---

874 Regarding Romans 11, Donaldson notes that: “It is the ‘fullness of the Gentiles’—the completion of the Gentile mission—that brings the period of Israel’s rejection to an end, and triggers the final salvation of ‘all Israel’ (vv. 25-26), the resurrection of the dead (v. 15), and so on. Israel’s full restoration, far from setting the stage for an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations, actually brings the period of Gentile salvation to an end” (Paul, 193).

875 Donaldson, Paul, 193.

876 B. J. Oropeza suggests the possibility that Paul’s term ekklēsia tou theou (e.g., 1 Cor 1:2) may “have been derived from the apocalyptic idea of a holy assembly that would arise in the last days” (LXX Joel 2:16; hagiasate ekklēsian) (review of Paul Trebilco, Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament, RBL 10/2013, 1–5, esp. 4; see also Oropeza’s forthcoming commentary on 2 Corinthians for the Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity series [ed. Vernon Robbins and Duane Watson; Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Press]). Oropeza surmises further that since Paul, and Luke, reference Joel 2:28-32 “in relation to Christian conversion by calling on the name of the Lord, and [that] the passage is associated with the last days...the text of Joel, then, would seem to be influential for early Christian self-identity, and perhaps it influenced the movement’s self-perception as an end-time ekklēsia anticipated in the prophetic discourse” (RBL 10/2013, 4).

877 Paul has been said to evince “inaugurated eschatology,” otherwise known as an “already/not yet” theological schema. G. E. Ladd succinctly summarizes this theological position: “For the believer the ‘ends of the ages’ have arrived (ta tele ton aionon, 1 Cor 10:11). It is possible that this unique expression is used precisely to designate the fact that the two ages—this age and the Age to Come—overlap, that the first
2.3.5. The Ekklēśia of Israel (LXX)

Paul not only evokes pro-Jewish rhetoric through his three-fold depiction of Christ-follower ekklēsiai as Jewish sacred space. He also does so by collectively designating his communities with the same Greek term (ekklēsia) that is used in the LXX for the ethno-religious nation of Israel (e.g., LXX Josh 8:35). He is not alone among Second-Temple Jews in lexically correlating a sub-group with the qhl of Israel. First, the LXX uses ekklēsia only in translation of the Hebrew word qhl. Second, the Covenanters use qhl as a sub-group identity within the Damascus Document (CD), but not in 1QS where yahad is their self-designation of choice.

part of the Age to Come reaches back into the last part of the old age, so that the period between the resurrection and the parousia is a period ‘between the times,’ or better, a period that belongs to two times” (A Theology of the New Testament, 371). For Ladd’s full discussion of Paul’s “already/not yet” eschatology see pp. 360–73. For a discussion of the related concept “inaugurated eschatology,” see Stanley Grenz, Theology for the Community of God (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 793–796. Paul’s ekklēsia can be said to be an eschatological community in the sense that Jesus, the risen and enthroned Christos, is already present invisibly in the midst of his Christ-followers, who now await his visible revelation at the future parousia.

878 In LXX Josh 8:35, God’s covenantal people are still called ἐκκλησία (HB: qāhāl) after having entered the land: οὐκ ἦν ῥῆμα ἀπὸ πάντων, ὅν ἐνετείλατο Μωυσῆς τῷ Ἰσραήλ, οὐκ ἀνέγνω Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ ὅσα πάσης ἐκκλησίας υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, τοῖς ἀνδράσιν καὶ ταῖς γυναιξιν καὶ τοῖς παιδίοις καὶ τοῖς προσήλυτοις τοῖς προσπορευομένοις τῷ Ἰσραήλ (8:35 [HB]: “There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua did not read before all the assembly of Israel, and the women, and the little ones, and the sojourners who lived among them”).

879 Heinz-Josef Fabry notes that “the earlier texts apparently still understood qāhāl as a fully valid self-designation for the community itself.” As an example, he cites 4QMMT where, early in the community’s formation, this letter from the “teacher of righteousness” listed “various factors excluding a person from the ‘community’ (qāḥāl), apparently a Qumran-Essene interpretation of Dt. 23 (cf. 4QFlor 1:4). It thus seems that the community in Qumran did not reject the term qāhāl as a self-reference until a later period” (“ירח,” TDOT 12.546–61, esp. 559).

880 Within CD, qēhal occurs at 7:17 (“the King is the assembly”), 11:22 (“trumpets of the assembly”), and 12:6 (“he may enter the assembly”).

881 The Deuteronomic tradition of associating qhl (LXX ekklēsia) with a continuing group identity for the community of Israel, as opposed simply with a temporary assembly for the community, is evident in 1QSa 2.4 and 4Q396 1–2i line 40. Fabry sees qhl as a fully functional self-designation of the authorial community at Qumran (TDOT 12:559). Du Toit also sees the qhl in 1QSa 2.4 as “most probably refer[ing] to the congregation of Israel” (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 135 [author’s emphasis]). See my discussion of Philo’s use of Deuteronomy 23 (Part II, §4.1 Egyptian Jewish Voluntary Associations Name Ekklēsia? Philo).
The way in which *qhl* is used at Qumran is significant for my purposes in at least one respect. We have evidence here of a socio-religious sub-set of ethno-religious Israel (the [pre-] Covenanters) choosing symbolically to self-identify in a permanent fashion with (or as) the Israel of the desert tradition (*qhl*). If Paul’s use of terminology that is extant elsewhere only in 4QMMT (“some of the works of the Law”) reflects an awareness of the (pre-)Covenanters distinctive theology, then might he also have been aware of another theological concept of the Covenanters: their adoption of *qhl* as a distinctive sub-group identity?\(^{883}\) Paul appears to mirror the etymological trajectory of 4QMMT and CD by delimiting the meaning of *ekklēsia* (*qhl*) away from designating the ethno-religious nation of Israel towards designating a socio-religious sub-group of Israel.

Paul goes one socio-ethnic step further than do the Covenanters. He applies this ‘Israelite’ identity to communities comprised both of Jews and gentiles (Rom 9–11). This type of *corpus mixtum* would have been unthinkable for the Covenanters. The Covenanters’ polemic against other Jewish circles, possibly even against the Temple

\(^{882}\) Fabry notes that the root מָשָׁה occurs c. 50 times, but “strikingly, it does not occur at all in 1QS…” (*TDOT* 12:559).

establishment in Jerusalem (e.g., 4QMMT), demonstrates that only an exclusive number of Jews were granted membership in the Covenanters’ self-designation as the qhl.

In Rom 9–11, Paul reinforces the union of gentiles with historical Israel. Paul contends that gentile Christ-followers are grafted into the ‘sacred tree,’ so to speak, known as ethno-religious Israel (Rom 11:17-27). If gentile Christ-followers become one with Israel in God’s salvation history, then so do the Christ-follower communities of which those gentiles are a part—Paul’s ekklēsiai. Thus, Paul’s trans-local association of ekklēsiai can be considered as being a part of Israel, rather than as being a replacement for Israel. Even Gal 6:16, wherein Paul appears to present his Galatian ekklēsia as the “new Israel,” need not contradict a non-supersessionist reading of Rom 11:17-27.

884 There are at least three general theories as to the literary intent of the sectarian document known as 4QMMT: historic extramural polemic, contemporary extramural polemic, or contemporary intramural paraenesis. Maxine Grossman reads 4QMMT as an ideological tradition of extramural polemic within the community at Qumran (“Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” RevQ 20 [2001]: 3–22). Hogeterp suggests that 4QMMT is historic extramural polemic. He sees 4QMMT as having “ideological significance within the Qumran community precisely because it goes back to a historical document rather than being a historicising text after the fact” (Paul and God’s Temple, 82). S. D. Fraade reads 4QMMT as intramural paraenesis intended for communal candidates and neophytes (“To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees,” RevQ 19 [2000]: 507–26). Hogeterp notes at least one problem with Fraade’s perspective (Paul and God’s Temple, 78). He cites the observation of S. Morag that linguistic and stylistic differences from the Community Rule, among other noted sectarian documents, are sufficiently significant to preclude its consideration as intramural paraenesis (“Language and Style in Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah – Did Moreh Ha-Sedeq Write This Document?” Tarbiz 65 [1995–1996]: 210–33). For examples of specific correlations between the authorial community of 4QMMT and the Temple establishment, see Hogeterp, Paul and God’s Temple, 79–81.


886 Hansen, for example, views Gal 6:16 as being a supersessionist statement: Paul “identifies the church with ancient Israel (Gal 6:16; 1 Cor 10:1, 2; 12:2; Col 1.12-14; 2.11)’ (All of You are One, 41).

887 Du Toit explicates a non-supersessionist interpretation of Gal 6:16: “how did Paul envisage the relation between this new ἐκκλησία and Israel? In a bold statement (Gal 6.16), he called the church ‘the
Paul may only intend what the author of 1 Peter does in his letter to Christ-followers in Asia Minor (1 Pet 1:1). Reidar Hvalvik argues that 1 Peter presents Christ-followers as being “equal with Israel,” not as a replacement for Israel. Both 1 Peter and Paul’s letters to the Romans and Corinthians metaphorically identify Christ-followers with sacred Israelite institutions such as the Temple and its cult (1 Pet 2:5; Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 12:27; 2 Cor 6:16). If Hvalvik’s conclusion for 1 Peter is also applied to Paul’s Christ-followers, then Paul’s ekklēsiai also constitute multi-ethnic, messianic sub-groups of pluriform Second Temple Judaism.

2.3.6. Summary: Pauline Ekklēsiai and Jewish Ethno-Religious Identity

I have identified six ways in which Paul can be said to link his multi-ethnic, diasporic ekklēsiai with a Jewish heritage, three are correspondences with Jewish sacred space, and three relate to lexical correlations in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus. Their combined witness questions claims that Paul sees the ekklēsia as having superseded Israel of God. This re-definition of Israel may either imply that the church replaced the historical Israel or that ‘Israel’ now includes Israelite as well as non-Israelite believers. Π/uni1FB6ς /uni1F38σρα/uni1F75λ in Rom 11.26 vindicates the latter option. The future coming together of π/uni1FB6ς /uni1F38σρα/uni1F75λ will signal the final stage of a long trajectory originating in the desert traditions of Israel. This emphasizes salvation-historical continuity, not discontinuity (“Paulus Oecumenicus,” 141–42). Christopher Zoccali mirrors du Toit’s interpretation of Gal 6:16: “Therefore, based on Rom 2:29 and Gal 6:16 one could conclude that Paul would indeed make the polemical claim that Christ-following Gentiles are more truly ‘Israel’ than Jews who fail to believe (cf. Phil 3:13). Yet, Paul explicitly warns in Romans 11 against any such triumphalism and supersessionism among his gentile converts (cf. 1 Cor 4)…they have become part of Israel’s story (cf. 1 Cor 10:1ff; Rom 1:1-4; 9:4-5; 11:16-18; 15:8-12)” (Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present [Salem, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010], 116–17 [author’s emphasis]). See also Caroline Johnson-Hodge, If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 131.

Although Reidar Hvalvik uses the term “new Israel” when speaking of 1 Peter’s appropriation of Israelite covenantal terminology, he does not mean thereby that Peter is “advocating a ‘replacement theology.’ It is not said that the believing Gentiles have taken the place of the Jews. What is said is that believing Gentiles are equal with the Israel of the Old Testament. In Christ they have now become the people of God” (“Jewish Believers and Jewish Influence in the Roman Church until the Early Second Century,” in Jewish Believers in Jesus: the Early Centuries [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 179–216, esp. 205 [author’s emphasis]).
ethno-religious Israel in God’s salvation history, and adds an exclamation point to the conclusion reached by Runesson, Binder, and Olsson: “It is thus not possible to argue that when a group of Christ-believers use ekklēsia to designate their institution…they are departing from either ‘the Jewish community,’ from ‘Jewishness,’ or from Jewish organizational forms, as has so often been assumed.” One could say that adopting a permanent ekklēsia identity allowed early Christ-followers, from an institutional perspective, to disavow any perceptions that they were parting ways with “Judaism.” This being the case, then Paul’s ‘ekklēsia identity construction project’ did as much to root his multi-ethnic ekklēsiai into the ethno-religious ‘tree’ of Israel (Rom 11:17-24), as it did to present his communities as active pro-dēmokratia participants in the political culture of the Greek East.

2.4. Summary: The Nature of the Pauline Ekklēsia

The following picture emerges when one puts all of the pieces together which I have added to the scholarly puzzle that is ekklēsia usage among first-generation Christ-followers. Paul is a legitimate candidate for the honour of being the first Christ-follower to adopt ekklēsia as a permanent sub-group identity within the first-generation Jesus movement. Among New Testament writers, he is the most prolific and diverse in his use of ekklēsia terminology, and, of those six writers who unequivocally use ekklēsia as a permanent sub-group identity, only his writings date prior to 70 CE. Irrespective of one’s stance on Paul’s status as the originator of a Christ-follower association known as ekklēsia, it is abundantly clear, though, that he made a creative, and distinctive,

---

889 Part III, §2.3. Ekklēsia as Ethno-Religious Identity: Supersessionist Ideology?
890 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 11 n. 21.
contribution to the semantic range of the word *ekklēsia*: he created a non-civic, multi-
ethnic voluntary association comprised of Greeks, Romans, ‘barbarians,’ and Jews.

The widespread use of *ekklēsia* terminology within the Greco-Roman and Jewish
worlds gave Paul’s voluntary associations an increased missional relevance within the
Diaspora. To Greco-Romans, his *ekklēsia* reflected civic ideology for the creation of an
alternative society that could have been viewed as a pro-‘democratic,’ counter-oligarchic
participant in the ubiquitous “*ekklēsia* discourse” of the newly developing political
culture. There is no counter-imperial rhetoric necessarily inherent in Paul’s use of
*ekklēsia* as a group identity. Rather, he equips his *ekklēsiai* to affect the fabric of
everyday *polis* life in positive ways through their inculcation, and public expression, of
love-based “socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*.”

There are at least six ways in which Paul’s use of *ekklēsia* as a permanent group
identity could have been perceived by Jews as interconnecting his multi-ethnic, diasporic
*ekklēsiai* with a Jewish heritage. Paul metaphorically transforms his multi-ethnic
*ekklēsiai* into three examples of Jewish sacred space: the temple of God, the body of the
Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred Jewish synagogue. Additionally, his multi-ethnic
communities self-designate with the same name used, firstly, of the ethno-religious
nation of Israel in the desert (LXX), secondly, by ostensibly contemporaneous non-
messianic Jewish voluntary associations in Alexandria and Judea, and, thirdly, of public
synagogues in the land (e.g., Sirach, Josephus). The multi-faceted integration of Paul’s
Christ-followers with the Jewish community, Jewishness, and Jewish organizational
forms suggests strongly that Paul does not intend his designation of multi-ethnic
communities as ekklēsiai to communicate supersessionist ideology. My ensuing examination of ekklēsia usage in the rest of the New Testament also does not necessitate any conclusion to the effect that Christ-followers viewed themselves as a replacement for Israel.
3. The Development of Ekklēsia Usages after Paul

Outside of Paul’s undisputed writings, the word ekklēsia occurs with some frequency in eight New Testament writings which together represent four different literary genres: epistle, homily, gospel, and apocalypse. As previously discussed, genre considerations are important factors in how one interprets ekklēsia references. For example, ekklēsia usage in homiletical and epistolary literature may be prescriptive for, rather than descriptive of, the community so addressed. Ekklēsia terminology in the Gospel of Matthew may reflect the author’s contemporaneous community more so than it does Jesus’ historical situation. The Apocalypse, as resistance literature, could very well ascribe group identities for rhetorical, or even polemical, purposes. In this section I will organize my evaluation of the non-Pauline writings into four genre categories. My specific priority will be to assess which ekklēsia occurrences refer to a permanent group designation, and to explore the resultant ideological implications.

3.1. Ekklēsia in Epistolary Literature: Deutero-Pauline, James, 3 John

The “elder” John (3 John) and (deutero-)Paul each use ekklēsia unequivocally as a permanent group identity for their respective communities, particularly those in Asia Minor (e.g., Ephesos). The diasporic epistle of James is ambiguous in its lone use of the word ekklēsia (5:14), while the author of 1 Peter does not use ekklēsia at all in the epistle he addresses to communities in Asia Minor (1 Pet 1:1).

---

891 The “John” who wrote the book of Revelation also addresses his Christ-follower communities as ekklēsia. One of those seven ekklēsiai is located in Ephesos.
3.1.1. Ekklēsia in Deutero-Pauline Writings

When it comes to the semantic range of the word ekklēsia in (deutero-)Pauline writings, one of Schmidt’s four categories predominates: the universal ekklēsia. Within the epistle ostensibly addressed to the Ephesians, the word ekklēsia occurs nine times (1:22; 3:10, 21; 5:23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32). Each mention is universal in scope and speaks of an ekklēsia that is the sum of all Christ-followers in every place.

The word ekklēsia occurs three times in Colossians (1:18b, 24; 4:15). In the first two occurrences, the ekklēsia is identified as the universal body of Christ (1:18b, 24). The third reference is to a local group of Christ-followers which meets in the home of Nympha (4:15). This ekklēsia reference, however, could simply imply a temporary identity assumed by the community while gathered en ekklēsia in Nympha’s house.

Within the Pastoral Epistles (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus), the word ekklēsia only occurs three times, all within 1 Timothy (3:5, 15; 5:16). The anarthrous phrase ekklēsias theou is used twice in chapter 3 (vv. 5, 15), but not necessarily each time with the same

---

892 Textual-critical evidence suggests that the epistolary address “to the Ephesians” (Eph 1:1) may not be authentic.
893 Andrew Lincoln notes that “here in Eph 1:22, following Col 1:18, 24 where ekklēsia is used in apposition to soma as a designation for the new community in Christ, the reference is to the universal Church, the Christian community in its totality. This is also the case in the other eight uses of the term” (Ephesians [WBC 42; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990], 67). Robert Banks argues that the nine references to ekklēsia in Ephesians are to a heavenly assembly which is permanently in session (Paul’s Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Historical Setting [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Exeter: Paternoster, 1980], 44–47).
894 Markus Barth and Helmut Blanke note that there is some question as to the authenticity of the first ekklēsia occurrence (1:18b) (Colossians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [ABY 34B; trans. Astrid B. Beck; New York: Doubleday, 1994], 227). Col 1:15-20 is a hymn divisible into two sections beginning at each occurrence of the words “he is” (hōs estin). The first part speaks of creation (1:15-18b) and the second of redemption (1:18c-20). The phrase tēs ekklēsias in 1:18b breaks the thematic cohesion of the hymn by awkwardly inserting the theme of soteriology. As a result, Ernst Käsemann considers it a later interpolation (“Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie,” Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen [2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 1:34–51).
895 Col 4:15 reads, τὴν κατ’ οίκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν.
The first occurrence of *ekklēsias theou* is set within a discussion of the qualifications of an *episkopos*. Depending on the geographical reach of this position, the *ekklēsias theou* (3:5) could refer to a local community, to a regional *koinon*, or even to a provincial-level association known as *ekklēsia theou*. At the very least, a local designation is intended, especially if the *ekklēsias theou* in 1 Tim 3:5 is contiguous with the *ekklēsai tou theou* mentioned by Paul in 1 Corinthians (e.g., 11:16). Further on in chapter 3, the author again refers to the *ekklēsias theou* but this time he adds the adjectival modifier *zōntos* ("living") (3:15). Therein, he equates "the house(hold) of God" and "the foundation of the truth" with "the *ekklēsia* of the living God." The most natural interpretation of the confluence of all three terms is that the word *ekklēsia* refers to the universal community of Christ-followers across the Roman empire. The final *ekklēsia* occurrence in 1 Timothy has clear reference to the local assembly of Christ-followers and is used in the sense of a permanent collective identity (1 Tim 5:16).

While a universal definition of *ekklēsia* predominates in the (deutero-)Paulines, the closest Paul’s undisputed writings come to referring to a universal *ekklēsia*, which encompasses the sum total of all Christ-followers in every place, is found in 1 Cor 12:28. It is not an *unambiguous* reference, however, since it is possible, though perhaps not probable, to limit the purview of this passage to the Corinthian *ekklēsia*. If one does so,

---

896 There are two occasions in the New Testament where the anarthrous phrase *ekklēsias theou* occurs (1 Tim 3:5, 15). It may not entail a reference to a universal entity known as “the church of God,” of which each *ekklēsia* is its local expression. Rather, (deutero-)Paul may simply be using the phrase *ekklēsias theou* in a general sense as an ideal linguistic category under which each *ekklēsia* of Pauline Christ-followers self-identifies: each community is “of God.” It is the character of God, then, which provides the evaluative grid through which Timothy can judge specific progress being made in each local *ekklēsia* under his care relative to leadership development (bishops [3:1-7], deacons [3:8-10], and women [3:11-13]).

897 1 Tim 5:16 reads, “let the *ekklēsia* not be burdened [with the care of false widows].”
then Paul’s list of gifted ministers (e.g., apostles, prophets; 12:28-30) would refer only to Christ-followers located in the Corinthian ekklēsia. In other words, Paul would not be commenting upon the types of gifted ministers which should be evident in other ekklēsiai outside of Corinth. However, this does not accord with Paul’s comment a few verses later that all of the ministry giftings in Paul’s list are in fact not active within the Corinthian ekklēsia (12:31: “earnestly desire the greater gifts”). This begs the question, then, as to why Paul would create a list of ministry giftings, the full complement of which the Corinthians could never aspire to. It is less problematic to assume, therefore, that when Paul implicitly equates “the body of Christ” (12:27) with the ekklēsia (12:28) within which all gifted ministers are found (12:28-30), that Paul is referring there both to a universal body of Christ and to a universal ekklēsia, each of which the Corinthian Christ-followers express locally in their communal gatherings.

There is at least one political implication to viewing the ekklēsia in 1 Cor 12:28 as a universal entity. Scholars of the “political Paul” view the (deutero-)Pauline writings, in general, reflecting accommodation, rather than resistance, to the Roman empire. Neil Elliott is illustrative in this regard. He interprets Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles as being part of a “canonical betrayal” in which the later Paulinists present Paul in socially conservative ways so as to facilitate conformity of their present communities to the values and structures of the Roman Empire. This being the case, it logically follows, then, that the (deutero-)Paulines’ use of the word ekklēsia as a supra-local

designation for the sum total of Christ-followers across the entire Roman empire also follows suit: the ideology behind a universal _ekklēsia_ encourages accommodation rather than resistance. This being the case, and if the _ekklēsia_ in 1 Cor 12:28 is a universal entity, then a similar conclusion can be reached for the Corinthian epistle: Paul’s _ekklēsia_ ideology therein reflects accommodation rather than resistance. Such a conclusion is consistent with my argument elsewhere that the ideology behind Paul’s _ekklēsia_ usages is _pro-dēmokratia_, not counter-imperial.

3.1.2. _Ekklēsia_ in James

The epistle of James uses the word _ekklēsia_ only once (5:14). This occurrence is set within the context of summoning leaders ( _tous presbyterous tēs ekklēsias_ ) for the purpose of visiting a sick member so as to pray for that person’s healing. The collocation _tous presbyterous tēs ekklēsias_ uses the word _ekklēsia_ with any one of three possible meanings: a semi-public meeting, a temporary collective identity, or a permanent collective identity. If one translates this collocation through the lens of Greek epigraphic evidence, however, it is less likely that _ekklēsia_ refers to a permanent collective identity.

The lexically related phrase _presbeis tēs ekklēsias_ occurs within numerous inscriptions, one of which is dated to the 1st century CE (Ephesos; _SE_ 210*2; 29 CE).\(^899\)

\(^899\) The term πρέσβυς, whose comparative form is πρεσβύτερος (e.g., Jas 5:14) occurs in Greek inscriptions and refers to official delegates commissioned on behalf of the _dēmos_ through a vote in an _ekklēsia_ (See Günther Bornkamm, “πρέσβυς, πρεσβύτερος,” _TDNT_ 6:651–83).

\(^900\) _SE_ 210*2 recounts the election of _presbeis_ by the _boulē_ through decree of the _gerousia_ for a political mission to emperor Octavian on behalf of the entire _polis_ of Ephesos (Ephesos, 29 CE; see also _JōAI_ 62, 1993 [Hauptbl.], 114, Nr. 2). Octavius informs the _polis_ that he had received the decree of the _gerousia_ which was given to him by nine “delegates of the [Ephesian] _ekklēsia_” (πρέσβε[ις] τῆς ἐκκλησίας), each delegate of whom he specifically names.
SE 210*2 explicitly differentiates the *presbeis tès ekklēsias* from the *dēmos.* This implies that, in SE 210*2, *ekklēsia* only has reference to the public assembly and not to a temporary collective identity assumed by the *dēmos* during that civic assembly. Other inscriptions also suggest that the word *ekklēsia* means “assembly” when juxtaposed with the collocation *presbeis tès ekklēsias.* These inscriptions indicate that it is within an *ekklēsia* (the civic assembly) that *presbeis* are elected by the *dēmos* on a time-limited basis to serve as their official emissaries or delegates for a specific mission.902

If James mirrors Greek inscriptionsal praxis, then the officials (*presbyteroi*) delegated by the gathered community to pray for the sick in their homes were chosen at an *ekklēsia* (5:14). In this scenario, *ekklēsia* has reference to a semi-public meeting, and not to the gathered community. If so, then congruent with Greek inscriptionsal evidence, once the officially sanctioned function of James’ *presbyteroi tès ekklēsias* is complete

---

901 SE 210*2, in its entirety, reads [Αὐτὸς Καίσαρ θεοῦ υἱός, ὃπατος τῷ ἑ, ἀυτός[κράτισω τῷ ζ′, ἑ[Ἐφεσίων βο[λή, δήμῳ χαίρειν; με]τὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ύπα[ί[νω Θεόδω[ρος, Μέγινων, Πρωτογένης, Ἠρακλείδης, Εὐσαρ[ίος, Ἀσκλη[πιάδης, Ἀριστο[ων, Ἀγαθή[ωρ, Μηνάδο[ος[τῆς ἐκκλη[σίας <ἀπέδοσαν τ′> ἐμοὶ τῷ παρὰ τῆς γερουνι[ας[ψή[ρες[ἀ[x]δὲκέξαρν τε ἀκολού[θις τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ δ[ίακε[μενοις· δίῳ τῷ τε σύστημα τῆς γερουνιας[ἀποδέχομαι],[περὶ[ς τῆς ἔλεος] ὁ ἐμ[είς ἄνω[νύμους[, καὶ τὰ τείματα καὶ] φιλάνθρωπα. Ἐρρωσθε. Since Octavian separately refers both to the Ephesian *dēmos* and *ekklēsia,* it would seem that he does not use the word *ekklēsia* as a temporary collective designation for the *dēmos* during the course of their meeting *en ekklēsia.*

902 Aside from SE 210*2, three other inscriptionsal examples serve to demonstrate that *pri[sβεις* are authorized as delegates through an official vote during an *ekklēsia.* An inscription dated to 3 BCE (*IG XII Suppl 143*, Troas — Lampasakos) is most explicit regarding the use of a vote in an *ekklēsia:* χειροτόνησα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐφόδιον τῷ πρεσβεύτα (see also *IMT SuedlTroas* 579; Troas, 80–70 BCE: χείρισα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρεσβευτὴν πρὸς Θασίου). Two mid-Hellenistic period inscriptions describe how *pri[sβεις* were authorized as delegates through an *ekklēsia.* The first is *IG XII Suppl 139* (Aegean Islands; Ionia — Mileto[s, 167 BCE?): ὃπως[_decor][o] καὶ Μιλά[νις παρακολούθωσι τὰ τῷ δάμῳ εὐχαριστήσα, δειξὰ πρεσβεύτων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξῆλθε. In the second inscription, the *dēmos* of the Athenian clerarchy of Delos (*I Delos 1498, 160–150 BCE*) held a formal *ekklēsia* (ἐκκλησία θαιρία) in their *ekklēsia[στήριον* (ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησιαστήριῳ) in which they voted upon delegates (πρεσβεῖς) whom they would send to the Athenian *boul[ē* and *ekklēsia* on their behalf (χειροτόνησα δὲ καὶ πρεσβεῖς ἢ πρὸς οἴτινες ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων βουλῆν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν παρακαλέσουσι τὸν δήμον). See my assessment of *I Delos 1498* in Part I where I discuss the Tyrian Herakleistai and their approval of delegates for an embassy to Athens. The delegates of this voluntary association were chosen within a synod assembly, which they called an *ekklēsia* (Part I, §3.2.3. The Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos).
(praying for healing), their role as presbyteroi ends. In this regard, Jas 5:14 paraphrases as follows: “Call the elders who were delegated by the community at a regular worship assembly (ekklēsia) for the purpose of going to pray for the sick in their homes.”

If the presbyteroi in James’ diasporic community comprise that community’s permanent overseeing ‘council’ (fictive boulē?) instead, as do presbyteroi in some Greco-Roman voluntary associations,903 then the phrase presbyteroi tēs ekklēsias could still be translated with “assembly,” rather than with “congregation,” in mind. Jas 5:14 would then read: “Call the elders who oversee the regular worship assembly (ekklēsia) for the purpose of having them go and pray for the sick in their homes.”

James’ use of the word synagōgē (2:2) also allows for the interpretation of ekklēsia (5:14) as a semi-public community gathering.904 If the phrase “your synagōgē” refers to the building of a Jewish synagogue community, within which James’ halakhic observant Christ-followers meet, then his Christ-followers differentiated their “members only” meeting from other synagogue gatherings by naming their meeting ekklēsia.905

Given that at least one sub-group of Judean Christ-followers self-identified collectively as synagōgē, the phrase “your synagōgē” could also refer to a collective identity assumed

---

904 Jas 2:2 reads, “For if someone enters your synagōgē” (ean gar eiselthē eis synagōgēn hymōn).
905 This option, then, identifies the curious members who visit the Christ-followers’ worship assembly as most likely belonging to the Jewish synagogue community, since Jews and Christ-followers all meet in the same synagogue building. Dibelius’ observation could support this: “neither the rich nor the poor man seem to belong to the community” given their unfamiliarity with the Christ-follower’s social praxis (James, 134–35). Two other interpretations of the word synagōgē are possible: (1) a ritual assembly of Jewish Christ-followers (Richard Bauckham, “James and the Jerusalem Community,” in Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 55–95, esp. 58) or (2) a building owned by Christ-followers and dedicated for their ritual worship assemblies (Scot McKnight, The Letter of James [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 183). These two usages of the word synagōgē are anomalous with respect to other New Testament writings.
by James’ diasporic Jewish Christ-followers.\textsuperscript{906} In this case, the term \textit{ekklēsia} again refers to a semi-public assembly, but one convened by a \textit{synagogē} of Christ-followers.

In sum, James’ epistle can not unequivocally be said to use the word \textit{ekklēsia} as a permanent group identity. If James uses \textit{ekklēsia} as a temporary group identity instead, then, as in Greek inscriptions, James’ community of Christ-followers can also be said to convene assemblies which are called \textit{ekklēsiai}.

\subsection*{3.1.3. \textit{Ekklēsia} in 3 John}

Within the Johannine epistles the word \textit{ekklēsia} is mentioned explicitly only in 3 John (vv. 6, 9, 10). John the \textit{presbyteros}\textsuperscript{907} is writing in the 90s CE,\textsuperscript{908} to diasporic

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{906} At least one sub-group in the early Jesus movement explicitly self-identified as \textit{synagogē}, the Nazarenes of Transjordan (Bastiaan van Elderen, “Early Christianity in Transjordan,” \textit{TynBul} 45.1 [1994]: 97–117; Wolfram Kinzig, “The Nazoreans,” in \textit{Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries} [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 463–87). Martin Dibelius notes instances where \textit{synagogē} refers to meetings of early Christ-followers in patristic-era writings: (1) Ignatius (Pol. 4:2: “Let the \textit{synagogai} be more numerous”; late 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. CE), \textit{The Shepherd of Hermas} (11:9: “a \textit{synagogē} of righteous men”; also 11:13, 14; 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. CE); and (2) Dionysius of Alexandria (mid-3\textsuperscript{rd} cent. CE) who calls the assemblies \textit{synagogai} (Eus. \textit{HE} 7.9.2; 7.11.11, 12, 17) \textit{James} (Hermeneia; rev. ed.; ed. H. Greeven; trans. M. A. Williams; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], 133). Ralph Martin adds one more patristic reference to the word \textit{synagogē} being used as a designation for a public meeting of Christ-followers gathered for the purpose of worship: Epiphanius’ \textit{Haer.} 30.18.2 (\textit{James} [WBC 48; Waco, TX: Word, 1988], 61).

\textsuperscript{907} Raymond Brown summarizes five different explanations for the identity of \textit{ho presbyteros} in 2 John. Of the five possible identities of John the \textit{presbyteros}, three connect the post-70 CE Johannine community back to the original community of Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem, the community to which the apostle John initially belonged. The three with Jerusalem connections, which are named by Raymond Brown, are: “One of the apostles for whom \textit{presbyteros} served as another designation…A companion or disciple of Jesus who was not one of the Twelve Apostles…A disciple of the disciples of Jesus and thus a second generation figure” (\textit{The Epistles of John} [AB 30; New York: Doubleday, 1982], 648–51). The other two candidates for “John” are: “An elderly man of dignity and importance…[and] one of the college of presbyters (elders) in charge of the community from which II John was sent…” (Ibid, 648–51).

\textsuperscript{908} Stephen S. Smalley favours a date in the 90s CE, given his assumption that the Gospel of John was written around 85 CE (\textit{1, 2, 3 John} [WBC 51; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984], xxxii). Raymond Brown’s diachronic theory locates the composition of 3 John between 100 and 110 CE (\textit{The Épîstles of John}, 101).
\end{footnotesize}
Christ-followers, most likely in Asia Minor, and potentially in Ephesos. The presbyteros seems to affirm that the community, of which Diotrephes is a leader, self-designates collectively as an ekklesia (3 John 9). The other two usages of ekklesia in 3 John fall within the semantic range of a meeting and perhaps also of a temporary designation for the community while in that meeting (3 John 6, 10). In 3 John 6, the

---

909 There are various identifications made of the community to which the Johannine epistles are addressed. Smalley identifies two groups in the Johannine community: “Jewish-Christians . . . [who] still felt a loyalty to Judaism and Hellenistic-Christians . . . [who] were still influenced by the beliefs enshrined in Hellenistic systems of salvation, which depended on a dualist (‘gnostic’) background” (1, 2, 3 John, xxiii). Raymond Brown’s diachronic history of the community behind the text sees two groups: John’s adherents and those whom Brown terms “secessionists.” The secessionists prioritize a “dualistic christology and a perfectionist anthropology” which presages the 2nd century docetic, gnostic, and Cerinthian groups (Epistles of John, 69–71).

910 The tradition of identifying Asia Minor as the provenance for the epistles goes back to Irenaeus who claimed to be dependent on “all the presbyters who had been associated in Asia with John” (Irenaeus, AH 2:22:5; 3:3:4; cited in Eusebius, HE 3:23:3f). Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesos, also attests to the same tradition (Eusebius HE 3:31:2f; 5:24:3f). Nauck has suggested a Syrian provenance (Die Tradition und der Charakter des erstern Johannes briefes [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957], 165). I. Howard Marshall is unconvinced since Nauck’s view is dependent on his interpretation of 1 John 5:6f, which Marshal says “has not found general acceptance” (The Epistles of John [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], 47).

911 Moving outwards from the assumption that the epistles address the same community as does the Gospel of John, most commentators see the epistles’ provenance as being the same as that of the Gospel’s. Brown observes that the combined witness of the four writings requires “a metropolitan center with many house-churches of Johannine Christians . . . and that within reasonable traveling range there were provincial towns with Johannine house-churches to which II and III John were addressed (Epistles of John, 101–102). Brown identifies three possible locations which match those criteria: Ephesos, Syrian Antioch, Alexandria (Epistles of John, 101–102). Brown favours Ephesos, as do others such as Smalley (1, 2, 3 John, xxxii) and Georg Strecker (The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, 3 John [Hermeneia; trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1996], xl–xli).

912 Raymond Brown notes that Gaius is not the leader of the ekklesia; Diotrephes is. He suggests that each is a leader of a separate house-ekklesia in the same general area (Epistles of John, ix, 101). Given Diotrephes’ opposition to John the presbyteros, and to visiting missionaries in general (v. 10), John addresses his epistle to Gaius instead, requesting that his hospitality to other missionaries (hoi philoi) be extended to John’s emissary, Demetrius.

913 In 3 John 9 the presbyteros says, “I have written something to the ekklesia” (Ἐγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ). This indicates that he uses the word ekklesia as a permanent collective designation and not as a name for the formal meeting of the community.

914 3 John 6 reads, οἱ ἐμαρτυρημένοι σοι τῇ ἁγάπῃ ἐνωπίων ἐκκλησίας (“they [hoi philoi] have testified to your love before the ekklesia”). If the meaning behind Paul’s anarthrous prepositional phrase en ekklesia (e.g., 1 Cor 14:28) is analogous to that behind John’s anarthrous prepositional phrase enōpion ekklessias, then John the elder is only referring in verse six to the semi-public meeting in which Gaius’ ekklesia gathers. At the most, 3 John 6 refers to a temporary collective identity while the community is together in their meeting. 3 John 10 reads, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει (“and expels them [hoi philoi]
testimony of hoi philoi is “before the people when gathered together en ekklesia.” In 3 John 10, the expulsion of hoi philoi by Diotrephes does not necessarily mean from membership in the local body of Christ-followers (ekklesia). It may only refer to the expulsion of hoi philoi from the community’s gathering (ekklesia). In this case, translating ekklesia as “church” (e.g., NRSV, NASB, NIV) in 3 John 6 and 10 could be misleading. In those verses, ekklesia may not refer to a permanent group designation.

Although no explicit mention of an ekklesia is made in 2 John, Georg Strecker convincingly argues on the basis of 3 John 9 that the community in 2 John is being addressed as an ekklesia. In 3 John 9, the presbyteros states that he previously wrote “something to the ekklesia.” The “something” which he previously wrote is the epistle of 2 John. This makes the community to which 2 John is written an ekklesia. Strecker is much less convincing, though, in his corroborating evidence. He claims that the phrase eklektē kyria (2 John 1) alludes to the Greek public assembly known as the ekklesia kyria. The ekklesia kyria was the most important ekklesia in classical Athens until that city-state’s overthrow in 322 BCE.

---

915 For the use of hoi philoi as a group designation by Greco-Roman voluntary associations, see Philip Harland (Dynamics of Identity, 45, 71, 93). Some examples of inscriptions which use “the friends” (hoi philoi) as technical terminology for a voluntary association’s self-designation include: IGLAM 798 (Kotiaion, Aezanatis valley); Hasos 116; IMagnMay 321; IDidyma 502 (a Dionysiac group); IMylasa 571–75; TAM V 93 (Saitai); 225 CE; ISmyrna 720; MAMA III 580, 780, 788 (Korykos); SEG 35 (1985), no. 1337 (Amastris, Pontus); IPrusaOlymp 24 (1st cent. CE); IAsMinLyk I 69 (Xanthos, Lycia); IG III 1081, 1089, 1102 (Athens, cf. 120s CE; ephebes); and IGUR 1169 (Rome).

916 2 John 1 reads, in part, eklektē kyria kai tois teknois autēs (“to the elect lady and her children”). Strecker contends that in 2 John an ekklesia is implicitly presumed given the use of the term κυρία for the addressee (2 John 1; ‘Ο πρεσβητέρος έκλεκτή κυρία). While κυρία is not infrequently translated “to the chosen lady” (NRSV, NIV, NASB), Strecker sees here an allusion to the ἐκκλησία κυρία of classical Athenian times (The Johannine Letters, 221, 263). For support, Strecker only cites the
Three factors challenge his claim. First, no other New Testament text alludes to the collocation *ekklēsia kyria*. Second, he cites as evidence only one literary source and entirely neglects epigraphic sources. Third, in the over 250 epigraphic mentions of an *ekklēsia kyria* (4th cent. BCE to 1st cent. CE), none identify a body of people as an *ekklēsia kyria*, not even temporarily so during the course of an *ekklēsia kyria*.

So how do the occurrences of *ekklēsia* within 3 John compare with Paul’s usage?

3 John mirrors Paul’s presentation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* who hold communal assemblies called *ekklēsiai*. Neither author unequivocally uses *ekklēsia* in a universal sense or as being part of a universal entity known as *ekklēsia*. If Acts is correct in designating the community in Ephesos as an *ekklēsia* (20:28), then the question can be asked if there was any socio-religious continuity in Ephesos between the later Johannine *ekklēsia* (90s CE) and the earlier *ekklēsia* spoken of in Acts.

### 3.2. Ekklēsia in Gospel Literature: Matthew

Anders Runesson identifies at least three examples of 1st century CE Jewish synagogue communities “within the same ‘category’ as Graeco-Roman

---

918 See n. 269 for details on the four types of *ekklēsia* convened in ancient Athens (*kyria*, *synklētos*, *archairesia*, and *nomimos*).
919 Other mentions of an *ekklēsia kyria* are found in Asia Minor (47x), the Aegean Islands (22x), central Greece (1x), and Peloponnesos (3x). Only two date to the 1st century CE: (1) Peloponnesos, *Peek, Asklepieion* 35(2), see also *IG IV²,1* 84, ll. 24, 41, Epidauria — Epidaurus: Asklepieion, 40–42 CE. It reads, ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ θράτειρῳ τῶν προέδρων ἑπεφημίζεις Πλάτων ἡροτάδης καὶ συνπρέπειοι … καὶ τὸν πάππον Λαμπρίαν, ὕπο τοῦτων πριτυμέων φανηται φανερά πάσιν ἡ ἀθηναῖοι …; (2) *St.Pont. III 141* is from the region of Pontus and Paphlagonia, *polis* of Amasia. It reads, Διὶ Στρατίῳ [δ δήμος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ] κυρία ἐπὶ τῆς συνήθεις Πομπηίου — — — — τοῦ(?)) κανδίδου, νεσκορούντος γ’ [— — — — — — ο]ν᾽ ἄγριππανοῦ, ἐκ τῶν συν λα[λ]ε[λεγμένον χρημάτω]ν, #000 ἔτους #000 ρα’. #000.
associations…[These are] Essene association synagogues,\(^{920}\) Pharisaic association synagogues\(^{921}\)—and the association synagogue of the Mattheans. These association synagogues were all different expressions of first-century Jewish identities.\(^{922}\) Although some scholars, including Runesson, identify the Mattheans as an *intra muros* Jewish synagogue association, such a designation is still hotly debated.\(^{923}\) If the Matthean community did self-designate collectively as an *ekklēsia* (Matt 16:18) and meet in assemblies called *ekklēsiai* (Matt 18:17),\(^{924}\) as is implied in a mirror reading of Jesus’ words,\(^{925}\) and if *ekklēsia* is a synagogue term, as Runesson, Binder, and Olsson suggest\(^{926}\)

---

\(^{920}\) Runesson claims that “the Qumran community is best understood as an association” (“Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 113 n. 63). He cites two studies in particular upon which he bases that claim: (1) Klinghardt, “The Manual of Discipline,” 251–67; and (2) Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (NTOA 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). A more recent, and more thorough, proponent of this view is Gillihan (*Civic Ideology* [2012]).

\(^{921}\) Runesson notes that in Matthew the phrases “their synagogues” (10:17) and “your synagogues” (23:24) “indeed refers to Pharisaic associations,” and that in 12:9 “it is possible that we have a reference to a Pharisaic association synagogue” (“Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 124 and 121, respectively).


\(^{923}\) Runesson, “Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 96–98. Runesson provides an extensive list of scholars who hold either to *intra muros* or *extra muros* opinions (Ibid, 96 n. 3).

\(^{924}\) Jesus is recorded as saying, “I will build my *ekklēsia*” (Matt 16:18; *oikodomēsō mou tēn ekklesian*) and “speak to the *ekklēsia*” (*eipei tei ekklesia*) and “if he does not listen to the *ekklēsia*” (Matt 18:17; *ean de kai tēs ekklaus parakousēi*).

\(^{925}\) A mirror reading entails hearing in Jesus’ words the self-perceptions of Matthew’s contemporary reading audience. In this regard, then, Jesus’ use of the word *ekklēsia* would in actuality reflect a retrojection of the Matthean community’s own self-designation. Saldarini sees some definitional ambiguity in Matthew’s *ekklēsia* usage: “It is not completely clear that Matthew uses *ekklesia* [*sic*] as a proper name for his group; it is clear that the group meets in an assembly that is somewhat institutionalized, because it exercises disciplinary power (18:17) and has the authority to make decisions in God’s name (16:19; 18:18-19). It has permanence because God promises to protect it against the ‘gates of Hades’ (16:18). It is built by and belongs to Jesus (16:18) who is present when only two or three are gathered together in his name (18:20)” (*Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community*, 116). For a judicious critique of mirror readings, see, Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were Gospels Written?” in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9–48.

\(^{926}\) ASSB, nos. 201–203, 216.
and as I have argued above, then Runesson’s description of the Mattheans as a Jewish association synagogue gains reinforcement.\(^{927}\)

Furthermore, if the Mattheans are an *intra muros* community within pluriform Second Temple Judaism, then they demonstrate that the adoption of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity is not a supersessionist move, but may in fact have served further to root their community within a Jewish heritage. Runesson claims such an *intra muros* status for the Mattheans, and categorizes them, along with the Essene and Pharisaic association synagogues, as being “different expressions of first-century Jewish identities.”\(^{928}\)

There are a number of ways in which the Mattheans are said to identify socially with 1st century Judaism(s). Saldarini states that the “Matthean group was so closely related to the Jewish community that it functioned as a reformist movement or sect within Judaism.”\(^{929}\) Craig Evans cites a number of correlations between the Jewishness of

---

\(^{927}\) While recognizing Bauckham’s incisive challenge of interpretive approaches that prioritize mirror readings of the Gospels, I will contextualize my discussion here within the interpretive framework that Matthew was the spokesperson for a specific community of Christ-followers and that the particular way in which he fashioned his Gospel addressed the peculiar needs of his community. Challenges to Bauckham’s critique of mirror readings include Philip F. Esler (“Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s *Gospels for All Christians*, *SJT* 51 [1998]: 235–48) and David C. Sim (“The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham,” *JSNT* 24 [2001]: 3–27). Anders Runesson argues that an ancient text can “never [say] much about the places where it was intended to be read,” at least insofar as an audience beyond its local context is concerned (“Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 461). Runesson does contend, however, that since “local circumstances and conditions would consciously or unconsciously but necessarily have made their way, to a greater or lesser extent, into the written product…we may therefore always be able to say at least something about the context in which the text was produced” (Ibid., 461).

\(^{928}\) Runesson, “Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 464.

\(^{929}\) Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community*, 114. Saldarini details the socio-religious makeup of the Matthean community: “Matthew’s group is thus a sect within first-century Judaism, in the widened sense of the term being used here. Matthew uses polemical and apologetic language that makes the boundaries between his group and other groups clear. His quarrel is mainly with the leadership of the Jewish community and the emerging rabbinic group, which is influencing that leadership. The Matthean group has created a counterorganization that is still reformist and millenarian/revolutionist but has deemphasized the thaumaturgical…and is] becoming more conversionist in its orientation” (Ibid, 115).
Matthew’s Gospel and Jewish Second Temple texts and communities.\(^930\) Michael White asserts that Matthew’s “ethical obligations are defined in remarkably Jewish (explicitly Pharisaic) terms of Torah observance (Matt 5:17–21, cf. 28: 19–20), where the distinction is in terms of superiority to other Jewish modes of observance.”\(^931\)

When it comes to halakhic issues, such as Torah fidelity, David Sim raises the bar. He claims that Matthew’s Gospel mandates that “both Jewish and Gentile followers of Jesus needed to observe Torah in its entirety.”\(^932\) Runesson seeks more precisely to place the Mattheans within a definable sub-group. He identifies numerous correlations between the Gospel and Pharisaic ritual observances.\(^933\) This leads Runesson to locate the Matthean *ekklēsia* within a sub-group of pluriform Second Temple Judaism which he calls “Apostolic Judaism.”\(^934\) Given the Jewishness presupposed of Matthew’s

---

\(^930\) Craig A. Evans writes, “The arrangement of the genealogy into three periods of fourteen generations, the Moses typology (in the infancy narrative and in the presentation of Jesus’ teaching in five major blocks of material—each concluding with the Pentateuchal phrase ‘and when he finished’; e.g., Deut 31:24; 32:45), the appeal to five prophecies in the infancy narrative as fulfilled, the five antitheses in the Sermon on the Mount, the mountain motif, the haggadic embellishments, the familiarity with the diversity of text types available in Palestine, (now attested much more fully thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls), the familiarity with Jewish customs and interpretive traditions, the emphasis on fulfilling Torah so that one’s righteousness exceeds even that of the Pharisees, and finally, the references to the ‘house of Israel,’ to whom the good news of the kingdom is to be proclaimed, testify to the utter Jewishness of the Gospel of Matthew” (“The Jewish Christian Gospel Tradition,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* [ed. O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik; Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 241–77, esp. 244).


\(^933\) Runesson claims that “if we search Matthew’s Gospel we will find a) that the text accepts most of the ritual practices central to Jewish identity, and b) that it adds nothing that we would be able to term ‘non-Jewish’ or ‘un-Jewish’.” Runesson cites five categories of ritual observances: prayer, almsgiving, fasting, Torah/commandments, and public ritual reading of Torah in synagogue settings (“Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 465).

\(^934\) “Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 95–132, esp. 100, 100 n. 13, and 105.
readership, one can readily situate his community, as one can James’, as meeting within a synagogue building and/or as being part of a synagogue community.\textsuperscript{935}

If the social location of the Matthean community was within formative ‘Judaism,’ then where might its geographical \textit{locus} have been? Scholarship locates the Matthean community either in Galilee\textsuperscript{936} or in diasporic Syrian Antioch.\textsuperscript{937} If Paul does in fact infer

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{935} Salda\-rini notes that “Matthew’s use of the word \textit{ekklēsia} and his polemical references to ‘their/your’ synagogues prove that he and his group were totally separated from Judaism and institutionalized as a Christian community…” Matthew probably used the word \textit{ekklēsia} to denote his group in order to differentiate himself from his opponents in the Jewish community…He may also have been influenced by the practice of other groups of believers-in-Jesus who called their assemblies \textit{ekklēsiai}…His use of the other Greek and biblical term for assembly, \textit{ekklēsia}, may have been a counterclaim against his opponents among the Jewish leadership. Just as they claimed to lead the assembly (\textit{synagoge}) of Israel, so Matthew claimed to lead the assembly of Israel according to the teachings of Jesus. Tagawa notes that Matthew half-consciously identifies Israel and his own group as one: ‘[Matthew] is clearly aware of the fact that the people Israel and the Christian Church are not directly equal, but on the other hand, he confuses them because both are the milieu in which he finds his own existence. From this confusion arises the dilemma of the Jewish–Christian problem’” (\textit{Matthew’s Christian–Jewish Community}, 119–20; cf. Kenzo Tagawa, “People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew,” \textit{NTS} 16 [1969–70]: 159).
\item \textsuperscript{936} The apparent conflict between the Mattheans and formative ‘Judaism’ leads some scholars to posit Galilee rather than Antioch as a more likely location for such a debate since Galilee is closest to formative ‘Judaism’. J. Andrew Overman pioneered this view (\textit{Matthew’s Gospel}, 158–59; later restated in his \textit{Church and Community in Crisis}, 16–19). Other scholars who favour Galilee include Daniel Harrington (\textit{The Gospel of Matthew} [SP 1; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991], 9–10) and Anthony J. Saldarini (“The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish–Christian Conflict in Galilee,” in \textit{The Galilee in Late Antiquity} [ed. L. I. Levine; Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1992], 26–27). Aaron Gale locates Matthew’s community in Sepphoris, the largest, wealthiest, and most cosmopolitan city in Galilee (\textit{Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew’s Gospel} [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 41–63). Runesson too leans toward Sepphoris, but also considers Tiberias as another likely location (“Behind the Gospel of Matthew,” 462). Sims states that locating the Mattheans within Sepphoris is problematic, though; Josephus notes that during the Jewish war (66–70 CE) Sepphoris suffered extensive damage at the hands of his Galillean soldiers (\textit{Vita} 373-380; \textit{B.J.} 2.645-646). As such, Sim asks, first, why the war and its aftermath did not receive greater emphasis in the Gospel, and, second, would the Matthean community have had “the resources or even the will to compose a long and complex text such as Matthew?” (“Reconstructing,” 24).
\end{itemize}
that Jewish association synagogues named *ekklēsia* existed in Judea during his day (Gal 1:22; 1 Thess 2:14), then it is not unreasonable to assume that, in the post-70 CE era of the Matthean community, such Jewish *ekklēsiai* had spread to Galilee, the new *locus* of formative ‘Judaism.’ If so, then by self-designating as an *ekklēsia* the Mattheans implicitly self-present as an *intra muros* Galilean synagogue association.

Antiochean provenance for a Matthean *ekklēsia* is also possible. Three assumptions lead to such a conclusion. First, if, as I have suggested earlier, *ekklēsia* was a group designation assumed only by diasporic Pauline Christ-followers, and not by pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Judea, then only diasporic Christ-follower communities self-designated as *ekklēsiai*. This excludes a Galilean provenance. Second, if both Jewish (Acts 11:19) and gentile (e.g., Acts 11:19-30; 13:1-3) missions were sponsored by the Christ-follower community in Syrian Antioch, and if that community self-identified collectively as an *ekklēsia* (Acts 11:26), then it does not seem unreasonable to assume that the later Matthean *ekklēsia*, with its halakhic concerns, is a ‘progeny’ of the Antiocheans' Jewish mission.

### 3.3. *Ekklēsia* in Homiletic Literature: Hebrews

The homily known as the book of Hebrews uses the word *ekklēsia* twice (2:12; 12:22b-23).\(^{938}\) In Heb 2:12 the author cites LXX Ps 21:22 verbatim (*en mesō ekklēsia*; “in the midst of the assembly/congregation”). The word *ekklēsia* in LXX Ps 21:22 translates

---

the Hebrew word *qāhāl* (Ps 22:23). The *qāhāl* in Ps 22:23 can refer either to a meeting or to a (temporary) collective identity (“in the midst of the assembled people”). The word *qāhāl* recurs three verses later (Ps 22:26), but this time within the phrase *bēqāhāl rāb*. The LXX translates this phrase as *en ekklēsia megalē*. Both the Hebrew and Greek phrases can be translated either as “in the great assembly” or as a temporary collective designation: “in the great congregation.” If the word *qāhāl* in Ps 22:26 has the same meaning as that assumed in Ps 22:23 (i.e., “meeting”), then LXX Ps 21:22, which translates Ps 22:23, more than likely also refers to a meeting (“in the midst of the people’s assembly”). Thus, if in his citation of LXX Ps 21:22 (*en mesō ekklēsia*), the writer of Hebrews intends the same meaning for the word *ekklēsia*, then the *ekklēsia* in Heb 2:12 refers to the people’s assembly, not to the assembled people.

Use of the word *ekklēsia* in 12:22b-23a is even more ambiguous. The controlling factor for defining the phrase *ekklēsia prōtotokōn* (12:23a), according to Harold Attridge, is “the precise construal of the term, ‘festive gathering’ (*πανηγυρεύει*).” He lists three translational options: (1) “to the myriads of angels in festive gathering and to the *ekklēsia* of the firstborn”; (2) “to the myriads, a festive gathering of angels (and an *ekklēsia* of the firstborn)”; or (3) “to the myriads of angels, a festive gathering and *ekklēsia* of firstborn.” Attridge favours the first option “since it most closely conforms to the

---

939 The NRSV (Ps 22:25) translates the Hebrew text of Ps 22:26 as “From you comes my praise in the great congregation.”


balance of the phrases describing the new holy mountain” in 12:22-24. This makes the people of God, rather than angels, the referents for ekklēsia prōtotokōn (12:23a).

Irrespective of whether the phrase ekklēsia prōtotokōn speaks of humans or of angels, ekklēsia could refer either to a “meeting” or to a universal collective identity (the sum total of all God’s servants). The concept of a universal people-group named ekklēsia existing in the heavenlies prior to the eschaton is foreign to the rest of the New Testament, including the writings of Paul. Thus, since each of the pre-70 CE authors posited for Hebrews is associated with Paul’s apostolic mission, one would expect that Heb 12:23b also would not speak of a heavenly people-group. It seems preferable, therefore, to translate ekklēsia in Heb 2:12 and in 12:22b-23 with the sense of “meeting.”

3.4. Ekklēsia in Apocalyptic Literature: Revelation

The book of Revelation is addressed to seven ekklēsiai of Christ-followers in the Roman province of Asia, each of which is located in a different polis. The word ekklēsia occurs twenty times, always in reference to the permanent designation of a community. The majority view dates the composition of the text somewhere within the

---

942 Attridge, Hebrews, 375. Heb 12:22a reads, “but you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.” Unlike 12:22b–23a where the appositional pair occurs first (“to the myriads of angels in festive gathering”), in 12:22a the appositional pairing concludes the phrase (“to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem”). Attridge, though, does not see this as diminishing support for the first translational option (Ibid, 375 n. 63).

943 A related concept does find expression in the book of Revelation, but only after the start of the eschaton, and only through the symbolic conflation of ekklēsia and polis imagery (the seven ekklēsiai as one New Jerusalem; Rev 21:9, 10). I explore this symbolic imagery in my section on Revelation.

944 The list of potential authors for the epistle to the Hebrews include Barnabas, Apollos, Priscilla (and Aquila), Silas (otherwise known as Silvanus), Epaphras and Timothy (Attridge, Hebrews, 1–6).

945 The seven poleis in Roman Asia are Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamon, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea.

946 Rev 1:4, 11, 20; 2:1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23, 29; 3:1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 22; 22:16.
reign of Domitian (81–96 CE). The author self-identifies as “John” (1:4, 9; 22:8). The opinio communis does not view him as the apostle John but as an itinerant prophet who had intimate knowledge of the Hebrew scriptures, and who was so well known to his seven ekklēsiai that he needed only to mention his first name.

The author gives little indication of how his ekklēsia communities functioned within their poleis. It can be safely assumed from the apocalyptic content of his letter that he is not interested in having his seven ekklēsiai maintain continuity with earlier Pauline

---

ekklēsiai and enact a socio-ethnic form of dēmokratia.\textsuperscript{950} In fact, the positive fashion in which the ekklēsia identity of his communities may have been viewed in the political culture of Roman Asia only would have undermined the author’s apocalyptic polemic. As such, “John” required an offsetting counter-imperial identity. The metaphorical transformation of his seven ekklēsiai into an empire-encompassing polis serves that purpose well. His ekklēsiai are fictively depicted as together comprising a 2200 cubic km, counter-imperial, Jewish ‘kosmos-polis’ named “the New Jerusalem” (21:9, 10, 16). Such imagery allows “John” to aim the cross-hairs of his alternative civic ideology past individual poleis in Roman Asia to the centre of the imperium itself, the city of Rome.

The metaphorical portrayal of the seven ekklēsiai in Roman Asia as ‘the Jewish City writ large’ also serves the author’s ethno-religious purposes. He is able to affirm that Jewishness is intrinsic to the ethno-religious makeup of his seven diasporic ekklēsiai in the eschaton and beyond, even into eternity. This convergence of counter-imperial and pro-Jewish, or non-supersessionist, ideology, within a single literary work and in such a sustained and visually explicit manner, suggests the value of exploring Revelation’s use of the word ekklēsia in fuller measure than the other non-Pauline literary works.

\textsuperscript{950} The book of Acts records that Paul himself established at least one ekklēsia in Roman Asia, in the polis of Ephesos (Acts 19:1-8; cf. 20:17-38). (Deutero-)Paul names at least one other ekklēsia in Roman Asia which was loyal to Paul’s apostolic authority (Laodicea; Col 4:16). Paul, who potentially writes four decades before John, also speaks of a regional affiliation of ekklēsiai in the Roman province of Asia (1 Cor 16:19), although Paul does not give the exact number. These “ekklēsiai of Asia” send greetings to the Christ-followers in Corinth (1 Cor 16:19).
3.4.1. Counter-Imperial Civic Ideology: John’s Ekklēsiai as Hegemonic Polis

In Rev 21:9, 10, John implicitly identifies the New Jerusalem, which descends out of heaven, as being “the bride, the wife of the Lamb” (21:2, 9, 10). In a brilliant twist of plot, one could say that the “people of God” have now become the “place of God.” While the citizenry of some Greek poleis did self-identify inscriptionally as a polis, John’s transformation of an entire socio-religious group (e.g., the ekklēsiai of Roman Asia) into a fictive polis appears to be distinctive. It would have taken Stoic, Cynic and Epicurean conceptions of a universal commonwealth one exponential step further. This is particularly true of Stoic conceptions of the ideal city. Stoics espoused two types of ideal polis. In Republic, Zeno “proposes an ideal communist city, all of whose citizens are wise.” This city is located in a single territory. Cicero, the Roman Stoic, revised Zeno’s ideal polis by broadening its geographical reach to include the

---

951 Rev 21:9, 10 reads, “Then one of the seven angels…came and said to me, ‘Come, I will show you the bride, the wife of the Lamb.’ And in the spirit he carried me away to a great, high mountain and showed me the holy city Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God.”
952 Robert H. Gundry claims that “John wanted his Christian readers…to see in the New Jerusalem, not their future dwelling place, but—what was even more heartening—their future selves and state” (“The New Jerusalem: People as Place, not Place for People,” NovT 29 [1987]: 254–64, esp. 264).
953 See n. 113 in which I mention Greek enactment decrees wherein the politai of a polis self-depict as a polis (ISE 53, SEG 33:317 and SEG 33:391).
954 See n. 701 for a summary of Stoic civic ideology.
955 Cynic civic ideology views every person as a “citizen of the kosmos,” or as Diogenes defined himself, as a κοσμοπολίτης, and claim an intimate relationship with the founders of the kosmopolis itself, that is, the gods (D.L. 6.37, 72) (Gillihan, Civic Ideology, 108).
956 Gillihan notes that Epicureans simultaneously affirmed the value of the Athenian polis, and later Greek and Roman empires, while critiquing their inadequacies, and concurrently seeking to establish alternative societies congruent with their alternative civic ideology (Civic Ideology, 97).
958 Richter questions scholarly assertions that Zeno envisaged “a cosmopolitan ‘world-state’ coterminous with the oikoumenē” and suggests that he, like Plato and Aristotle, attempted “to perfect the institution of the classical polis” (Cosmopolis, 62). Richter claims Zeno did not do away with the regionally delimited polis contra to what Plutarch and Eratosthenes may have thought (Ibid, 62).
entire *kosmos*. Cicero’s ‘*kosmos-polis*’ is comprised of more than the wise; “it also includes the vicious and the stupid.”

Relative to the ethical makeup of the *dēmos* in the New Jerusalem, John differs from Cicero but sides with Zeno. John conceives of a virtuous *polis* community which excludes “those who practice abomination and lying” (Rev 21:27). When it comes to the geographical reach of the New Jerusalem, John differs with Zeno but sides with Cicero. While Cicero’s ‘*kosmos-polis*’ is conceptually abstract, John’s concretizes his ‘*kosmos-polis*’ by depicting it as a virtuous *dēmos*, consisting of at least seven earthly cleruchies (*ekklēsiai*), which together comprise a *polis* which stretches over much of the *oikoumenē*.

The area of John’s walled city (approx. 5 million km$^2$) far surpasses the unwalled territory controlled by any hegemonic Greek *poleis*. Sparta was the largest with an area of 8,000 km$^2$. The ostensible presentation of John’s heavenly *polis* as a territorial state also diverges from Greek conceptions of a *polis*. Hansen notes that Greeks never attempted “to unite all the city-states and create one large territorial state.”

---

959 Cicero states that “the universe is as it were the common home of gods and men, or a city that belongs to both” (*ND* II 154; trans. Schofield, *Stoic Idea*, 65). In *ND* II Cicero claims to expound Stoic doctrine. Schofield states that Cicero’s “faithful doxographic status” is confirmed by Arius Didymus as cited in Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* xv 15): “the universe is as it were a city consisting of gods and men, the gods exercising leadership, the men subordinate” (*Stoic Idea*, 66).

960 Morrison, “Utopian Character,” 249.

961 Mogens Hermann Hansen discusses four hegemonic *poleis*: Sparta, Kyrene, Thessalonike, and Demetrias, the last two of which grew by synoikism, not by conquest (“The Hellenic Polis,” in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation*, vol. 21 [ed. M. H. Hansen; Copenhagen: Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s, 2000], 141–88, esp. 150). Hegemonic *poleis* were ruled from the centre even if their territory consisted of a number of independent *poleis* (Ibid, 150).

962 Hansen notes that “one important point emerges with unerring certainty: the Hellenic world remained a world of *poleis* and no attempt was ever made to unite all the city-states and create one large territorial state like that created in the 19th century. To the Greek mind such an idea was as remote as, e.g., the abolition of slavery” (“The Hellenic Polis,” 150).
within which to contain its territory. Even without the benefit of modern cartography, John’s readers in Roman Asia would doubtlessly have interpreted the immense size of the city as a counter-imperial claim: it is through John’s heavenly “people-polis” that God’s sovereignty extends over Rome itself.\footnote{963}

3.4.2. Post-Supersessionist Theology: A Multi-ethnic People as a Jewish Polis

The fictive depiction of God’s people as ‘the heavenly city writ large,’ however, represents more than simply political ideology. It is also ethno-religious ideology of a type that would have broadly resonated with a Jewish audience. The author inculcates a Jewish heritage for his multi-ethnic ekklēsiai in at least three ways: through Jewish literary genres, a Jewish polis, and a Jewish temple-polis.

Greg Carey notes, firstly, that “Revelation stand[s] in a tradition of Jewish visions about Imperial rule.”\footnote{964} Revelation correlates with Jewish visionary literature in its theology, terminology, and apocalyptic genre.\footnote{965} As an apocalypse, Revelation is anomalous, though, in having an epistolary framework. This fact opens up the possibility,\footnote{963 If one anachronistically measures (“as the crow flies”) the distance between Jerusalem and Rome then a measurement of 1432 miles/2305 kms results.\footnote{964} Greg Carey highlights other Jewish elements in Revelation: “John himself is Jewish. His name is Jewish. The letters to the seven churches assume that the addressees are Jewish…there has been no split between the followers of Jesus and ‘Judaism’…John builds his Apocalypse upon the foundation of Jewish Scriptures” (“The Book of Revelation as Counter-Imperial Script,” in In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance [ed. R. A. Horsley; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008], 157–82, esp. 159).\footnote{965} The Greek word ἀποκάλυψις (Rev 1:1), from which the modern word “apocalypse” is derived, simply means “revelation.” It was not “until the end of the second century that Christian copyists and commentators…first bestowed the term ‘apocalypse’ on a select corpus of Jewish sources” (James C. VanderKam and William Adler, eds., The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity [CRINT III, vol. 4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996], 8). In this regard, anything formally classified as apocalyptic has primary reference to the “revelation” of heavenly mysteries. These mysteries, though, need not necessarily be of an eschatological nature. Rather, they may simply involve heavenly “revelations” of what is true throughout all of human history and not just in the eschaton (e.g., the tour of the heavenly luminaries in 1 Enoch). For a list of the formal characteristics of the literary genre “apocalypse,” see J. J. Collins, “The Jewish Apocalypses,” Semeia 14 (1979): 23–44.}
not yet suggested by scholarship, that Revelation’s covenant-based apocalypse\footnote{Kenneth Strand explores the covenantal format of the book of Revelation (“A Further Note on the Covenantal Form in the Book of Revelation,” \textit{AUSS} 21/3 [1983]: 251–64). He finds all of the basic elements of the ancient Hittite suzerainty-treaty formulary in Rev 1:5–22:21: (1) \textit{preamble} (1:5a); (2) \textit{historical prologue} (1:5b-6); (3) \textit{stipulations} (the seven letters (2:1–3:22); calls to faithfulness and loyalty (e.g., 6:9-11; 7:12-13; 12:11, 17; 14:12-13; 16:15; 18:4; 20:4); (4) \textit{witnesses} (22:16a, 17a, 20a); and (5) \textit{blessing-and-curse formulation} (22:7b, 14a, 18-19) (Ibid, 253–54). Strand notes that “the whole concept of vassal obligation within the covenant relationship is built upon the prior goodness of the suzerain…Obedience to the covenant stipulations—summarized in the book of Revelation as ‘the commandments of God’ and ‘the testimony of Jesus’ (12:17; cf. 14:12)—represents the Christian’s obligation of love that stems from Christ’s own prior love…and goodness’” (Ibid, 264).} may also reflect another Jewish literary genre: a “covenantal letter to the Diaspora.”\footnote{Donald Verseput, “Genre and Story: The Community Setting of the Epistle of James,” \textit{CBQ} 62/1 (2000): 96–110.} Donald Verseput identifies five extant texts of this sub-genre of Jewish epistolary literature: Jer 29:1-23; The Epistle of Jeremiah; 2 Macc 1:1-9; 1:10–2:18; 2 Baruch 78–86, and the epistle of James.\footnote{Verseput, “Genre and Story,” 101–102. Verseput contends that “The relevance of this epistolary type to the reading of James’ epistle is not difficult to grasp. On the heels of the salutary address to the ‘twelve tribes of the Diaspora,’ James’ introductory challenge to rejoice in the face of tribulation (1:2-8) is most plausibly read against the familiar Deuteronomic backdrop. For James, as for the other writers of the sub-genre, the exilic existence of Israel was a painful experience requiring perseverance in hope of God’s ultimate triumph on behalf of his people” (Ibid, 102).} Verseput states that a covenantal letter to the Diaspora evinces a tone of consolation in light of future hope. Such a letter has six characteristics: (1) “an authoritative center, typically Jerusalem”; (2) “consoled the assembled communities in the Jewish Diaspora”; (3) “in the midst of the affliction”; (4) “occasioned by their evil circumstance”; (5) “admonished them regarding their covenant responsibilities”; and (6) “in hope of the expected restoration.”\footnote{Verseput, “Genre and Story,” 99–101.} The tone of present consolation in light of future hope is clearly germane to the symbolic message of the book of Revelation. Although one of Verseput’s six genre characteristics is not explicit (provenance from Jerusalem), it
may be implicit.\textsuperscript{970} The other five elements of a covenantal letter to the Jewish Diaspora are expressly evident within the book of Revelation.\textsuperscript{971}

A second way in which Revelation intrinsically unites its seven \textit{ekklēsiai} with a Jewish heritage is by calling the hegemonic \textit{polis} “the New Jerusalem.” The expansive size of the eschatological Jerusalem exponentially reinforces Jewish Second Temple conceptions of Jerusalem’s centrality as the “navel/centre of the earth.”\textsuperscript{972} This is seen in “John’s” portrayal of the New Jerusalem as the culmination of God’s salvation history: the old and new covenant people of God are symbolically united into one eschatological Jewish \textit{polis}.\textsuperscript{973} The Covenanters at Qumran partially mirror Revelation’s conception of people as \textit{polis}. In their pesher on Isaiah 54:11 (4QpIs\textsuperscript{d}, 4Q164), the Covenanters interpret the sapphire foundation stones of Isaiah’s ideal Jerusalem as a reference to their community (4Q164 1 ii).\textsuperscript{974} This symbolism is approximated in the Apocalypse’s portrayal of the twelve apostles of the Lamb as the twelve-fold foundation of the New

\textsuperscript{970} This is particularly evident with respect to the first characteristic, “an authoritative center, typically Jerusalem.” One can hardly call the Isle of Patmos an authoritative center from which John’s ‘epistle’ was sent. But perhaps in the case of Revelation (and maybe even the epistle of James) it is not a geographical centre (e.g., Jerusalem), but rather a person, as the authoritative representative of that centre (e.g., an apostle-prophet; cf. Eph 2:20; 3:5), who fulfills that particular literary requirement of a “covenantal letter to the Diaspora.” This possibility is enhanced if the “John” of the Apocalypse is the apostle by the same name whose socio-religious roots are centred in Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{971} The book of Revelation, as a New Covenantal letter to the Christ-follower “Diaspora,” would have: (1) “consoled the assembled communities in the Christian Diaspora” (e.g., the seven \textit{ekklēsiai} [2:1–3:22]); (2) “in the midst of the affliction” (e.g., Smyrna [2:8-11] and Pergamon [2:12-13]); (3) “occasioned by their evil circumstance” (e.g., Philadelphia [3:7-13]); (4) “and admonished them regarding their covenant responsibilities” (e.g., Ephesos [2:1-7], Sardis [3:1-6], and Laodicea [3:14-22]); and (5) “in hope of the expected restoration” (e.g., the concluding promises of eternal reward for each of the seven churches [2:7, 11, 17, 26-28; 3:5, 12, 21]).

\textsuperscript{972} Jerusalem is called the “navel of the earth” in \textit{Jub} 8:19 and is said to be situated in the “middle of the earth” in \textit{1 Enoch} 26:1, \textit{Sib. Or.} 5:249, and \textit{Arist.} 83. As already mentioned, in the HB, Jerusalem is the city which is implicit in the descriptor “the navel/centre of the earth” (Isa 24:13; Ezek 38:12).

\textsuperscript{973} The city gates each have the name of one Israelite tribe inscribed upon them. Each of the twelve foundations has the name of one Jesus’ apostles inscribed upon them (21:12-14).

\textsuperscript{974} 4Q164 1 ii reads, “[Its interpretation:] they will found the council of the \textit{yachad} [‘community’], the priests and the people…the assembly of their elect.”
Jerusalem (21:14, 19-12).\(^{975}\) There is one key difference, though. The faithful in Revelation’s ‘kosmos-polis’ comprise the entire city, not simply its foundations.\(^{976}\)

A third way in which “John” communicates Jewish ethno-religious ideology is in his depiction of his multi-ethnic polis as a Jewish sanctuary.\(^{977}\) The cubic form of John’s ‘kosmos-polis’ is reminiscent of the shape ascribed to the Holy of Holies in the Israelites’ Desert tabernacle\(^{978}\) and in the Solomonic Temple in Jerusalem.\(^{979}\) Revelation’s transformation of the Old and New covenantal people of God into a fictive Temple-polis positions “John’s” New Jerusalem as being the eschatological fulfillment of the Jewish hope for a renewed and purified Temple.\(^{980}\) This hope is found in Jewish Second Temple writings such as the apocalyptic works of 1 Enoch,\(^{981}\) 4 Ezra,\(^{982}\) 2 Baruch,\(^{983}\) the Qumran sectarian work 4Qflorilegium,\(^{984}\) and the non-sectarian, non-eschatological Temple Scroll.

---


\(^{976}\) John unites into one sacred space (21:9, 10) all faithful non-messianic Jews (the twelve tribes), represented symbolically as the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:1, 13), and all multi-ethnic Christ-followers (21:24-27), whose twelve apostles are symbolically portrayed as the twelve foundations of the polis (21:14).

\(^{977}\) John notes that he “saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb” (21:22), that holiness extends to all parts of the temple-city (“nothing unclean will enter it”; 21:27), that only the pure will enter the city (21:27; 22:3, 14, 15), and that the (chariot) throne of the God and of the Lamb is set within its midst (22:3, 4).

\(^{978}\) In Exod 26:15-30 the vertical boards of the tabernacle are described as being ten cubits high.

\(^{979}\) 1 Kgs 6:20 describes the inner sanctuary as being 20 cubits cubed. See further Briggs, Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation (1999).

\(^{980}\) See Gärtner, The Temple (1965).

\(^{981}\) In the Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 85–90), Enoch sees an eschatological city situated on a mountain which has no tower (temple). In both 1 Enoch and Revelation there is no temple. This implies in each case that the entire city will be the sanctuary of God; 1 Enoch does not portray its city as a people, though.

\(^{982}\) 4 Ezra 7:26: “the city which now is not seen shall appear, and the land which now is hidden shall be disclosed.”

\(^{983}\) 2 Baruch describes a pre-existent city and temple to be revealed in the eschaton.

\(^{984}\) 4Qflorilegium (4Q174) speaks of an eschatological temple personally built by the hands of the Lord (הרי השוכב: “the place/temple of Adam”; 4Q174 3.vii). Unlike Rev 21:24, 4Q174 does not envision foreigners co-existing with God and his saints.
Additionally, “John’s” inference that his Temple-polis replaces “heaven” mirrors Jewish portrayals of heaven as a temple. This imagery is found in 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, 3 Baruch, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.

In contradistinction to Revelation’s multi-ethnic New Jerusalem, the Covenanters’ self-portrayal as Jewish sacred space is exclusive in nature. Even though they pictured themselves as a living Temple (CD, 1QS), that imagery communicates their self-perception as a living replacement for the corrupt Temple and its establishment.

Although John also is polemical in his use of Temple-polis imagery, his polemic is not directed against the Temple and its establishment; Jerusalem’s Temple lay in ruins by this time. John’s portrayal of God’s people as a gargantuan, hegemonic, Temple-polis can only have one rhetorical target: the Roman religio-political imperium and its


986 John locates the throne of God and of the Lamb within the New Jerusalem before which “his servants will worship him . . . reign forever and ever” (Rev 21:5). Prior to the eschatological consummation of all things (6:12–22:21), John had located the throne of God “in heaven” (4:1-5:14, esp. 4:1).

987 The Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1–36) describes a heavenly sanctuary, modeled on the Herodian Temple, through which Enoch travels on his way to God’s presence so as to intercede for the Watchers (fallen angels).

988 The Testament of Levi (2nd cent. BCE) “originally included three heavens, although in some forms of the text (α) 3:1-8 has been modified and expanded in order to depict seven heavens” (OTP 1.788). The uppermost heaven is the dwelling of God (T. Levi 3:4). This contrasts with John’s portrayal of the entire cubic New Jerusalem as being the dwelling of God.

989 3 Baruch (1st to 3rd cents. CE) appears to presume a cultic temple given the priestly role of the archangel Michael.

990 In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–407), heaven is depicted as a temple wherein the angels officiate the liturgy. Members of the community participate in the heavenly liturgy offered by the angels when they participate in the worship of the community (see Carol Newsome, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition [HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985]).

991 See n. 838 for references in CD and 1QS.
pantheon of deities. In this, the Apocalypse reflects an alternative, not revolutionary, civic ideology that is both counter-imperial and non-supersessionist.

A comparison of the *ekklēsia* ideology found in Revelation with that evident in other non-Pauline literary works, including Acts, yields the following results. First, only Matthew, Acts, 3 John, the (deutero-)Paulines, and Revelation employ *ekklēsia* unequivocally as a permanent group identity for their respective communities. Second, only the deutero-Paulines and the Gospel of Matthew expressly use *ekklēsia* in a universal sense. Revelation does so only implicitly when it metaphorically transforms its seven *ekklēsiai* into a universal, eschatological *polis*. Third, five writers speak of a permanently designated *ekklēsia* community residing in Ephesos: (deutero-)Paul (Eph 1:1[?]; cf. 1:22; Col 4:10), John the Elder (3 John 9), the author of Acts (20:28), and the “John” of Revelation (Rev 1:4, 11). The use of *ekklēsia* terminology by Christ-followers located in Ephesos during the 1st century CE does not necessitate identifying them as counter-imperial ideologues. Such political ideology only emerges with “John’s” depiction of his Ephesian Christ-followers as a hegemonic Jewish *polis*.

As one approaches the Apostolic Fathers, it is not so much political but rather ethno-religious issues which become more pronounced in their use of *ekklēsia* terminology. By the second century CE, the Jewishness of *ekklēsia* members becomes less prevalent, and in some cases, even abandoned. Revelation may even presage such an ideological shift. The “John” of Revelation appears to contrast *ekklēsia* with *synagōgē*,
especially in his pejorative phrase “synagōgē of Satan” (Rev 2:9; 3:9). While some later non-Jewish Christ-followers read this verse as justification for their parting of ways with Jews, the 1st century readers/hearers of Revelation may very well have interpreted it in two other ways. First, since synagōgē is not an inherently Jewish term, the “synagōgē of Satan/the opposer” could refer to a Greek voluntary association or civic entity. It does seem, though, that a Jewish association is in view since John states that the members of this synagōgē “say that they are Jews/Judeans, and are not” (Rev 2:9; 3:9). If a Jewish group is in view, then, second, the phrase “synagōgē of Satan” may simply reflect “a parting of ways” within Judaism(s), not between two so-called “religions” called “Judaism” and “Christianity.” Three factors suggest this: (1) the ‘Jewishness’ of Revelation’s text; (2) the probability that this Jewish text is describing an inner-Jewish debate; and (3) the fact that both ekklēsia and synagōgē are used as collective terminology for Jewish communities. If Revelation dates to the end of the 1st century, then the bifurcation of ekklēsia and synagōgē parallels both the praxis of one of the early

---

992 Aside from persecution in Smyrna and Philadelphia by the “synagogue of Satan,” John mentions that one Christ-follower was purportedly killed in Pergamon (2:13), a polis where the Imperial cult overseen by the koinon of Asia existed. He does not specifically name any persecuting agent. Even though Pergamon is identified as the location of “Satan’s throne” (2:13), David Aune claims that a Jewish synagogue community is not one of the possible referents for John’s polemical phrase (Revelation 1–5 [WBC 52A; Waco, TX: Word, 1997], 182–84).

993 A second century BCE example of a non-Jewish synagōgē, in this case of the neoi of a polis, is extant in a civic honorary decree from Thessaly (I.Thess I 16; Kierion: Sphades, c. 125 BCE; cf. IG IX.2 259): ἐκκλησία<ς> [γενομένης] ἡννομόου, [ἐμφανισμὸν] ποιησάμενων τῶν ταγών…[--] τῆς τῶν νέων συναγωγῆς. A late 1st century BCE Alexandrian papyrus records the decree of a synodos devoted to emperor Augustus (SB XXII 15460=Brashear 1993, 14-15=Papyrus written by the same association as the inscription BGU IV 1137; 5 BCE [August 21]): “In the twenty-fifth year of Caesar…at the synagogē which met in the house of the synodos of the archakolothoi (“principal followers”) of emperor Augustus Caesar…whose synagogōgos (“synagogue leader”) is Primos and whose president is Ioukoundos” (AGRW, no. 280 [see also AGRW, no. 63]). See examples of other “synagogue” terminology used by non-Jews in AGRW, nos. 39, 54, 63 (archisynagogōgos) and nos. 84, 85, 87, 291 (synagogōgos).

patristic writers (Ignatius), and the demise of synagōgē as a group identity for Jewish Christ-followers (the Nazoreans of Transjordan). 995

3.5. Ekklēsia in Patristic Literature

In the hands of the Apostolic Fathers, the semantic range of ekklēsia both shrunk and grew. 996 Patristic literature does not use ekklēsia in the sense of “assembly” but delimits its semantic domain to that of a permanent identity, whether local or universal. A local group named ekklēsia is evident in 1 Clement. 997 In this the author parallels Paul’s adscriptio from 1 Corinthians. 998 The (deutero-)Pauline and Matthean predilection for using ekklēsia in its universal sense is reflected by a number of the Apostolic Fathers (Barn. 7:11 999; 2 Clem. 14:2a 1000; the writings of Ignatius [8x]; 1001 Didache [3x] 1002).

995 See n. 906.
996 The Apostolic Fathers are thought to have written in the 1st century or in the first half of the 2nd century. The five authors are Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and the authors of Didache and of the Shepherd of Hermas.
997 Although 1 Clement “is customarily dated to the end of the reign of Domitian (95 or 96 CE)... one may [best] place the composition of 1 Clement between A.D. 80 and 140” (Laurence Welborn, “1 Clement,” ABD 1.1060).
998 “The ekklēsia of God which dwells at Rome to the ekklēsia of God which dwells at Corinth, to the called, made holy by a will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Clement, Introduction; see also 44:3a and 47:6). As in Paul’s time, the ekklēsia in Corinth was again suffering from factions and schisms. This letter seeks to reverse the expulsion of certain presbyters from the Corinthian ekklēsia.
999 Barn. 7:11 reads, “But why is it that they place the wool in the midst of the thorns? It is a figure of Jesus set for the ekklēsia, because whosoever wants to take away the scarlet wool must suffer much because the prickly bush is formidable, and being oppressed He is lord of it.” This passage’s interpretive significance is in its very anti-Jewish stance and extremely allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. In this, it accords with the Alexandrian school’s interpretive approaches. The anticipation of a rebuilt temple (16:3-4) places the composition of the Epistle of Barnabas sometime between temple destruction (70 CE) and Hadrian’s reconstruction (c. 135 CE) (Jay Curry, “Epistle of Barnabas, The,” ABD 1.613–14).
1000 2 Clem. 14:2a reads, “I do not suppose that you are ignorant that the living ekklēsia is the body of Christ. For the Scriptures say God made man, male and female. The male is Christ; the female the ekklēsia.” This formulation is reminiscent of Ephesians 5:22-33. 2 Clement is not an epistle but a sermon addressed to a congregation (Stephen C. Walke, “The Use of Ecclesia in the Apostolic Fathers,” ATR [1950]: 39–53, esp. 42). It has been dated from 120–140 CE (Harnack) to c. 170 CE (Lietzmann) (Robert M. Grant, “2 Clement,” ABD 1.1061).
1001 Ignatius, Eph. 5:1; 17:1; Trall. 2:3; Phil. 3:2; 5:1; 9:1; Smyrn. 1:2; Pol. 5:1. Of the eight passages in which Ignatius uses ekklēsia in its universal sense, only Trall. 2:3 is disputable. In that one instance, it may simply refer to the ekklēsia of God in Tralles rather than to the ekklēsia of God universal. It
The relationship between *Didache* and the literary works of Matthew and James is distinctive within the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers. *Didache* and Matthew both appear to address an intra-Jewish dispute, possibly with Pharisaic elements, and do so in polemical fashion. Didache differentiates itself from Matthew, though, in its lack of concern over “who can decide on the correct interpretation of Torah, a matter that is central to Matthew.” James’ concern with Jewish wisdom instruction is also reflected in *Didache*, but, unlike *Didache*, James “is not crudely polemical.”

reads, “And they also who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must be in every way pleasing to all men. For they are not deacons (servants) of food and drink, but servants of the *ekklēsia* of God; they must therefore guard against blame as against fire.”

*Did. 9:4; 10:5; 11:11.* The word *ekklēsia* is synonymous with the gathered total of all Christ-followers “from the ends of the earth” (9:11) and “from the four winds” (10:5) into God’s kingdom. *Did.* 11:11 enigmatically reads, “though he enact a worldly mystery of the *ekklēsia*.” The *Didache* is generally dated at the latest to the early years of the 2nd cent. CE. Stephen J. Patterson writes that “when the similarities between the Didache and Barnabas, or the Shepherd of Hermas, are no longer taken as proof that the Didache is literarily dependent upon these documents, the trend is to date the Didache much earlier, at least by the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, and in the case of Jean-P. Audet, as early as 50–70 C.E.” (*The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* [Foundations and Facets; Sonoma, CA; Polebridge Press, 1993], 173). Udo Schnelle dates *Didache* about 110 CE (*Theology of the New Testament*, 355).

Robert A. Kraft provides a survey of scholarly perspectives on the provenance of the *Didache*: “that most commentators now seem to opt for Syria (Audet 1958; Hazelden Walker 1966; Rordorf and Tullier 1978) or Syro-Palestine (Niederwimmer 1977) as the place of origin is not in itself an indication that the supporting evidence is compelling; Egypt (Kraft 1965) and Asia Minor (Vokes 1970) also have their supporters” (*Didache, The,* “*ABD* 2.197).”


*Did. 9:4; 10:5; 11:11.* The word *ekklēsia* is synonymous with the gathered total of all Christ-followers “from the ends of the earth” (9:11) and “from the four winds” (10:5) into God’s kingdom. *Did.* 11:11 enigmatically reads, “though he enact a worldly mystery of the *ekklēsia*.” The *Didache* is generally dated at the latest to the early years of the 2nd cent. CE. Stephen J. Patterson writes that “when the similarities between the Didache and Barnabas, or the Shepherd of Hermas, are no longer taken as proof that the Didache is literarily dependent upon these documents, the trend is to date the Didache much earlier, at least by the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, and in the case of Jean-P. Audet, as early as 50–70 C.E.” (*The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* [Foundations and Facets; Sonoma, CA; Polebridge Press, 1993], 173). Udo Schnelle dates *Didache* about 110 CE (*Theology of the New Testament*, 355).

Robert A. Kraft provides a survey of scholarly perspectives on the provenance of the *Didache*: “that most commentators now seem to opt for Syria (Audet 1958; Hazelden Walker 1966; Rordorf and Tullier 1978) or Syro-Palestine (Niederwimmer 1977) as the place of origin is not in itself an indication that the supporting evidence is compelling; Egypt (Kraft 1965) and Asia Minor (Vokes 1970) also have their supporters” (*Didache, The,* “*ABD* 2.197).”

Anders Ekenberg underscores the fact that *Didache*’s polemic against the hypokritai (*Did. 8:1-2; cf. 2.6; 4.12; 5.1*) “has its closest correspondence in the gospel of Matthew...*Did. 8:2* comes especially close to Matt 6:5, 16” (“Evidence for Jewish Believers in ‘Church Orders’ and Liturgical Texts,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* [Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 640–58, esp. 643). See also, Johnathan A. Draper, “Christian Self-definition against the ‘Hypocrites’ in Didache 8,” in *The Didache in Modern Research* (AGJU 37; ed. J. A. Draper; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 223–43, esp. 231ff. Marcello Del Verme adds a note of caution. Since “*Did. 8:1-2* does not indicate that followers of Jesus were expelled from worship in the synagogue; therefore the mention of ‘hypocrites’ in *Did.* 8 does not lead to the supposition that such individuals are Pharisees or Jews...[but rather] one large group with factions, perhaps to be comprehended as Christian Jews” (*Didache and Judaism: Jewish Roots of an Ancient Christian-Jewish Work* [New York: T&T Clark, 2004], 147). For a detailed comparison of the Matthean community with Pharisaic sub-groups, see Runesson, “Rethinking Early Jewish–Christian Relations,” 95–132. On Matthew and *Didache*, see also Anders Runesson. “Building Matthean Communities: The Politics of Textualization,” in *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings* (WUNT 271; ed. Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 379–408, esp. 389–393.
Two observations arise from these comparisons. First, the communities of Matthew and the didachist did not adopt *synagōgē* terminology, as did at least one other group of Jewish Christ-followers (e.g., the Nazoreans), or “Jewish Christians,” as Oskar Skarsaune calls them. Instead, by self-designating as *ekklēsiai*, both communities identify with another synagogue term, one which other Jewish associations appear already to have adopted in Egypt and Judea. By presuming to be part of a universal *ekklēsia* association, the Mattheans and didachists, firstly, differentiate themselves from the regionally delimited *ekklēsiai* of non-messianic Jews, and, secondly, affirm their rootedness both in “common Judaism” and in a trans-local stream of “messianic Judaism” which ostensibly spans the Roman empire. Second, since the universal *ekklēsia* and polemical rhetoric found in Matthew and *Didache* are lacking in James, one could

---

1005 Bauckham, “James and the Jerusalem Community,” 94.
1006 Verheyden, “Jewish Christianity,” 134.
1007 Oskar Skarsaune identifies as “Jewish Christians” those Jews who came to believe in Jesus but “at the same time continued a wholly Jewish way of life” (“Jewish Believers in Jesus in Antiquity—Problems of Definition, Method, and Sources,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Christians* [Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007], 3–15, esp. 4). In addition to ethnicity and recognition of Jesus as messiah, Torah observance is a key distinguishing feature of what Skarsaune, in agreement with Mimouni, calls a “Jewish way of life” (Ibid, 9; cf. Simon Claude Mimouni, “Pour une definition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien,” *NTS* 38 [1991]: 161–86). Skarsaune cites two categories of “Jewish Christians”: first, those called Ebionites and Nazoreans and, second, “those unnamed Jewish believers, spoken of by Justin Martyr, who believe Jesus to be the Messiah and practice a Jewish way of life” (Ibid, 9). The actual term “Jewish Christian” or “Christian Jew” (*hebraeus Christianus*) finds at least one basis in antiquity “in the Latin prologue to the (now lost) Latin translation of Aristo of Pella’s *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, = Ps. Cyprian *Ad Vigilium Episcopum de Judaica Incredulitate* (3d cent.)” (Ibid, 6). Skarsaune prefers the phrase “Jewish believers in Jesus,” or “Jewish believers” for short, for those who “chose to become more or less ‘orthodox’ Christians within mixed communities, often with a Gentile majority” (Ibid, 4).

1008 See n. 14 for E. P. Sanders’ definition of “common Judaism,” which I follow in this study. Del Verme suggests that “the phase of ‘cohabitation’ of Christian Judaism with other contemporary Judaisms is well documented by the *Didache*, in particular by the earlier strata of the work, which may be dated before 70 CE” (*Didache and Judaism*, 75).
suggest that James’ diasporic community comprises a stream of Christ-following Jews different from the ekklēśia association presumed in Matthew and Didache.\footnote{Verheyden identifies a common thread which joins these three communities that display “many ways and various ‘degrees’” of what it means to be “Jewish Christian” (“Jewish Christianity,” 134). He asks, “what is it that holds them together and might link them to other such groups? The answer is probably not to be found in matters of ethics, or ritual and praxis, nor in doctrine, but in the way these various groups and communities are positioning themselves in relation to the Judaism they originated from, hence in what Garleff calls the formal criteria. What these groups have in common is, negatively, that they do not outrightly reject their Jewish roots and religious heritage, nor do they even struggle to free themselves from it, but, positively, rather try to ‘master’ their past and keep it functioning as well as possible within the new reality that is installed with and by Jesus and that they also fully recognize as such” (Ibid, 134–35; cf. Gunnar Garleff, Urchristliche Identität in Matthäusevangelium, Didache und Jakobusbrief [BVB 9; Münster: LIT, 2004], 26–47). Verheyden explains Garleff’s two formal criteria as having “to do with indicators of continuity and differentiation, with how a group or community creates a link with its own past and roots and with how it also demarcates its present situation from that past” (“Jewish Christianity.” 129).}

Stephen Walke observes that there are three other patristic usages of the word ekklēśia which stretch its semantic range beyond that found in the writings of the New Testament\footnote{Walke, “Ecclesia in the Apostolic Fathers,” 49–51.} First, 2 Clement speaks of a pre-existent ekklēśia in heaven, one which existed prior to the resurrection of Jesus Christ (2:2; 14:1a, b, 2b, 3a, 4a).\footnote{For example, 2 Clem. 14:1a reads, “Therefore, brothers, when we of God shall do the will of the Father, we shall be from (or of) the first ekklēśia, from the spiritual, from that which was created before the sun and the moon.” 2 Clem. 14:3a reads, “Now the ekklēśia being spiritual was manifested in the flesh of Christ showing us that, if any one of us guard her in the flesh and defile her not, he shall receive her in the Holy Spirit; for the flesh is the anti-type of the Spirit. No one therefore having defiled the antitype shall receive the authentic.”} Walke notes that this almost Platonic conception is unattested elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers.\footnote{Walke, “Ecclesia in the Apostolic Fathers,” 49.}

Second, Ignatius appears to be unique in his application of the collective term ekklēśia to an individual. In Trall. 12:1 he writes: “I greet you from Smyrna together with the ekklēśiai of God which are present with me, men who according to all things have refreshed me in flesh and also in spirit.”\footnote{In Ign. Eph. 1:6, a not dissimilar concept surfaces: “Seeing then that I received in the name of God your whole congregation (ekklēśia) in the person of Onesimus, a man of inexpressible love and your bishop. . . .”} Walke comments that this concept may
presage later descriptions of the Bishop as being not only representative of his diocese, but “also in a very real sense equal to, or a personification of, his diocese.”

Third, the anachronistic English translation “Catholic Church” does not represent any of the semantic domains of the collocation *katholikē ekklēsia*. This collocation occurs five times in the Apostolic Fathers, once in Ignatius (*Smyrn. 8:2*) and four times in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (Introduction, 8:1a; 16:2; 19:2). Walke suggests that, at the very least, Ignatius intends the universal sense of the word *ekklēsia*, rather than of some later institution called the “Catholic Church.” At least one late Imperial Greek inscription can be said to attest to the continued use of the phrase *katholikē ekklēsia* in a non-institutional, universal sense into the 4th century CE. Walke also notes another

---

1014 Walke, “Ecclesia in the Apostolic Fathers,” 50. See n. 208 where later Christ-followers’ concept of priest as the personification of people is presaged somewhat in the eponymous priesthood of Hellenistic-era Phrygian Laodicea.

1015 *Smyrn. 8:2* reads, “Wherever the Bishop appears let the people be present, just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the *catholic ekklēsia* (καθολική ἐκκλησία).” One example of a reference to the “Catholic Church” in the Martyrdom of Polycarp is found in the Introduction: “The *ekklēsia* of God which dwells in Smyrna to the *ekklēsia* of God which dwells in Philomelium and to all the sojourning of the holy *catholic ekklēsia* in every place” (πάσαις τα/ς κατ/ά πάντα τόπον τ/ης ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας). The Greek lexemes καθολική ἐκκλησία underly Polycarp’s other three references: (*Smyrn. 8:1a*) “Now when he had at last finished his prayer, after remembering all who had ever even come his way, both great and small, high and low, and the whole *catholic ekklēsia* of God which dwells in Philomelium and to all the sojournings of the holy *catholic ekklēsia* in every place” (κοι/νρίον τ/ν ε/λαβεστ/ν τρ/πεσβυτ/ρων {²⁶πρεσβυτ/ρων}²⁶ Φαυστ/νου κα/ς ∆ων/ς τ/ς καθολικ/ς κα/ς /ποστολικ/氐ς /γ/ας /κκλησ/氐ας Φιλιππησ/氐ων). Similar terminology is found, in part, in another 4th cent. CE inscription (*SEGM 19:719*), but in
meaning attributed by Ignatius to καθολική. He states that “Ignatius means not only ‘universal’ but also ‘true.’” Polycarp appears to employ the same double entendre about fifty years later when he addresses issues related to Gnosticism and Montanism.

Justin Martyr not only conceives of a universal ἐκκλησία but also of a universal συναγωγή (Dial. 134; c. 132–135 CE). Membership in the ἐκκλησία and in the συναγωγὴ is divided along ethno-religious lines:

[Justin Martyr] reserves ‘church’ (ἐκκλησία) for non-Jewish Christian institutions, while the synagogue could serve as the home of Christ-believing Jews as well as Jews who did not share this belief. Such a distinction is not evident in earlier sources, where both designations could be used either for Christian or non-Christian (Jewish) institutions.

Ignatius, however, does not conceive of Torah observant Jewish Christ-followers belonging to the synagogue, let alone even to his Antiochean ἐκκλησία; his ἐκκλησία is alienated from its Jewish roots.

This alienation became a fait accompli, in many respects, when in 380 CE Theodosius I issued an edict that all subjects of the Roman empire should worship the Christian God. Daniel Boyarin claims that this edict represents the birth of ‘religion’ as a

---

1017 Walke, “Ecclesia in the Apostolic Fathers,” 51. In commenting on the superfluousness of the term “catholic” within the context of Smyrn. 8, Walke states that “its use here must mean that there was some group in schism or in heresy which denied the Bishop, which broke the unity of the Church, and against whom an adjective of generality or universality was necessary” (Ibid, 51).

1018 Walke comments that “We can hardly avoid this inference, because the word is used so naturally and so often without any preparation. The Catholic Church is the universal Church, that which is ‘throughout the world,’ but it is also the true Church, that which has Jesus Christ for its Shepherd” (“Εκκλησία in the Apostolic Fathers,” 52).

1019 Dial. 134 reads, “Now Leah is your people and the synagogue [συναγωγή]; but Rachel is our Church [ἐκκλησία]. And for these, and for the servants in both, Christ even now serves.”

1020 Runesson, Binder, and Olsson, Ancient Synagogue, 272.

1021 Mag. 10.3 (2nd cent. CE) reads, “it is monstrous to speak of Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism.”
separate social category, a ‘religion’ now known as “Christianity” and institutionally represented in the “Catholic Church.” By then the demographics of this “Christian” institution known as the “Catholic Church” were predominantly gentile, with the word “church” also doubling as a term for the structures (“basilicas”) within which the “Catholic Church” met. This 4th century development in how the ekklēsia of “Christians” was conceived (“Catholic Church” and “church buildings”) was significantly different from how the concept of ekklēsia (“assembly”) was understood by early Christ-followers and perceived by Greco-Romans and Jews of the 1st century CE. Ekklēsia life was considerably different “before Church.”

3.6. Summary: Pauline and Post-Pauline Ekklēsia Usages

My review of non-Pauline and early patristic writings now affords the opportunity for some broad-based conclusions relative to all ekklēsia usages within Christ-follower literature up to the mid-2nd century CE. First, if the author of Acts uses ekklēsia

---

1022 Daniel Boyarin, “Semantic Differences; or, ‘Judaism’/’Christianity,’” in The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (ed. A. Becker and A. Reed; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 65–85, esp. 77. J. Andrew Overman is similarly disposed: “Up to the fourth century it is difficult to speak reliably about so-called Christianity and Judaism. The distinction between these two groups across the Roman Empire simply does not obtain in a consistent and thorough enough manner” (“Problems with Pluralism in Second Temple Judaism: Matthew, James, and the Didache in Their Jewish-Roman Milieu,” in Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings [ed. H. van de Sandt and J. Zangenberg; Atlanta: SBL, 2008], 259–70, esp. 259). Ancient Mediterranean societies knew nothing of ‘religion’ as an autonomous socio-religious entity disconnected from ethno-cultural identities. See n. 786 in which (1) Steve Mason identifies six culturally integrated aspects of ‘religion’ which were integral to the warp and woof of everyday life in early antiquity, (2) where Bruce Malina notes that religion and economics “did not exist as discrete, self-standing, independent institutions in antiquity,” (3) where Brent Nongbri claims that ‘religion’ is a false category through which to investigate ancient societies, and (4) where Paula Fredriksen emphasizes the unified nature of cult and ethnicity.

1023 One 4th cent. CE Egyptian inscription (Pan du désert 27; 340/1 CE) appears to use katholikē ekklēsia for the institution known as “the Catholic Church,” although there is enough ambiguity in the phraseology to infer a reference to a church building being constructed (κατασκευάζοντος) in Porphyrites Mons (Gebel Dokhan). Pan du désert 27 reads: Φλαιώς Ἰούλιος ὁ διασημότατος ἤγεμών θηβαίος ὁ κατασκευάζοντος ἐνταῦθα καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, επὶ τρίτος ἐπισκόπων Μαξιμιανοπόλεως.
provincially when writing about pre-Pauline Christ-follower communities, then Paul’s communities are the only sub-group within the pre-70 CE Jesus movement which self-designated collectively as ekklēsiai. Majority opinion ascribes a post-70 CE date to other authors and writings which use the word ekklēsia as a permanent group identity.1024

Second, not all Christ-follower communities in the Diaspora are explicitly identified as ekklēsiai. The Jewish writings of James and Hebrews use ekklēsia but not unequivocally as a permanent group identity. In 1 Peter the word ekklēsia is notable by its absence. This is even more striking since 1 Peter addresses Christ-followers across Asia Minor, which is where Paul established ekklēsiai (Galatia, Roman Asia), and where, only a few decades later, the author of Revelation writes to seven ekklēsiai (Roman Asia).1025

Third, not all Christ-followers within the same polis self-designate as an ekklēsia. Paul’s epistle to the Romans appears to be a case in point. Paul requests the addressees of his epistle, whom he does not call ekklēsia, to extend greetings to an ekklēsia that meets elsewhere within a house owned by Aquila and Priscilla (16:3-5). Paul’s other four ekklēsia occurrences in Romans all refer to his diasporic communities (16:1, 4, 16, 23). The fact that Paul is not the founder of the Roman community helps explain why the rest of the Roman community does not appear to self-identify collectively as an ekklēsia.1026

1024 Matthew, Acts, Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 3 John, Revelation, 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Barnabas, Didache, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and the writings of Ignatius and Justin Martyr. Since, as historiography, the book of Acts may have priorities other than presenting historical fact for its own sake, its description of pre-Pauline communities self-designating as ekklēsiai need not be taken at face value.

1025 1 Peter 1:1 reads, “To the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.”

1026 I provide here a brief review of scholarship relative to the potential birth and makeup of the Roman community. Acts 2 claims that Jews from a number of regions throughout the Roman empire heard Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost. Some of those who came to faith in Jesus as the Christos (2:36-41) include Jews from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Acts 2:9; 1 Peter 1:1) and Judeans/Jews and gentile
Fourth, not all Christ-followers within the same worshipping community self-designate as an *ekklēsia*. Paul’s Corinthian correspondence is illuminating in this regard. Terms such as *hoi hagioi* and *ekklēsia tou theou* may indicate distinctive group designations assumed by some of the factions within the Christ-following community of Corinth (1 Cor 1:12; 3:4-6; 11:16; 14:33b-35).

Fifth, in relation to the Corinthian community, Paul may even use *ekklēsia* for ideological purposes. Within the course of only one of the Corinthians epistles (1 Corinthians), Paul employs all four of Schmidt’s definitional categories for the word *ekklēsia* in describing four out of the six possible group sizes identified by Meeks. 1 Corinthians, thus, becomes in many respects not only a ‘manual’ of *ekklēsia* terminology but even a ‘manifesto’ of *ekklēsia* ideology. From many different angles, proselytes from Rome (Acts 2:10; cf. Rom 1:7, *klētoi hagioi*). Philip Esler suggests that the “Rome-born Judeans” and “non-Judean synagogue-attenders and reverers of the Judean God (called ‘God-fearers’ in the NT)...could either have returned to Rome taking the gospel with them or passed it on to Roman visitors to Jerusalem” (*Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 101). For support of Esler’s view, see Richard Longenecker who cites evidence from church fathers such as Eusebius (303 CE) and Ambrosiaster (4th cent. CE) (*Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul’s Most Famous Letter* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 69–73). Contra Eusebius’ contention that Peter introduced the gospel to Rome (*EH* 2.14.6; cf. 2:17.1 and *Chron* 261F), Longenecker favours the view of Ambrosiaster that Jewish Christ-followers, who already lived in Rome did (*Introducing Romans*, 71–73). This view dovetails with Acts’ inference that Roman Jews and proselytes who came to Christ on Pentecost returned to Rome and began a community of Jewish Christ-followers.

1027 Eleven of the combined total of thirty-one *ekklēsia* occurrences directly refer to the *ekklēsia* (“congregation”) in Corinth or to its *ekklēsia* (“meeting”) (1 Cor 1:2; 6:4; 11:18, 22; 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28; 2 Cor 1:1). Another sixteen occurrences implicitly assume that the Corinthian *ekklēsia* is trans-locally connected to other Pauline *ekklēsiai* (1 Cor 4:17; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16; 12:28; 15:9; 16:1, 19 [2x]; 2 Cor 8:1; 18, 19, 23, 24; 11:8, 28; 12:13). Some of the different groups of trans-locally connected Pauline *ekklēsiai* include the *ekklēsiai* “of God” (1 Cor 10:32), “of Galatia” (1 Cor 16:1), “of Asia” (1 Cor 16:19), and “of Macedonia” (2 Cor 8:1). Three occurrences may be references to non-Pauline congregations (*hoi hagioi*) which use the word *ekklēsia* in reference only to their “meeting” and not as a collective identity (“congregation”) (1 Cor 14:33b, 34, 35).

1028 Meeks’ third and fourth group types are not represented within 1 (and 2) Corinthians. Paul does not speak either of a trans-local association located across geographical regions but aligned along ethnic or other criteria (e.g., ‘the *ekklēsiai* of the gentiles’), or of a trans-local assembly (*hē ekklēsia*) which is comprised of a number of local assemblies in any given region (“the *ekklēsia* throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria”; Acts 9:31).
Paul, the apostolic overseer of the Corinthian community, not only depicts *ekklēsia* life to the Corinthian Christ-followers, but he prescribes it. Paul applies these dictates even to those who do not yet appear to self-identify as a member of a Pauline *ekklēsia* (e.g., the *hoi hagioi* who “belong to Cephas”[?]; 1:12).

Sixth, Paul does not unequivocally use the word *ekklēsia* in a universal sense. The closest he comes is in 1 Cor 12:27, 28 where he equates the *ekklēsia* with the body of Christ, although it is not impossible that the *ekklēsia* of which he is writing may only be the Corinthian community. By contrast, within post-70 CE writings, the universal sense of *ekklēsia* is unmistakably present. The universal sense of *ekklēsia* comes to predominate within the Apostolic Fathers, with three new etymological developments surfacing. The word *ekklēsia* is used of a pre-existent community in heaven (2 Clement), of a bishop as the personification of the whole congregation (Ignatius), and of a *katholikē* congregation, that is, a “universal and true” congregation (Ignatius, Polycarp).

---

1029 1 Cor 4:17 (“Timothy...[will] remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus, as I teach them everywhere in every *ekklēsia*”); 1 Cor 7:17 (“this is my rule in all the *ekklēsiai*”); 1 Cor 11:16 (“we have no such custom, nor do the *ekklēsiai* of God”); 1 Cor 14:19 (“nevertheless, en *ekklēsia* I would rather speak five words with my mind”); 1 Cor 16:1 (“you should follow the directions I gave to the *ekklēsiai* of Galatia”).
4. Conclusion: Part III

I began the third part of this thesis by suggesting that Paul’s diasporic communities are just as viable of a choice for the distinction of being the first sub-group in the Jesus movement to self-designate as an *ekklēsia* as are pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christ-followers in Jerusalem. I then examined Paul’s undisputed writings for the socio-political and ethno-religious implications of that terminological move. Politics in Imperial Greek *poleis* provided a basis for assessing the socio-political implications of a non-civic group self-identifying with a civic identity (*ekklēsia*).

My political findings form a six-point position statement: each Pauline *ekklēsia* reflects civic ideology for the creation of an alternative society, which is not counter-imperial, nor a trans-local parallel political organization, but rather a trans-local Jewish socio-religious voluntary association, whose membership was open to Greco-Roman participants, and which could have been viewed as a pro-‘democratic,’ counter-oligarchic participant in the ubiquitous “*ekklēsia* discourse” of the newly developing political culture of 1st century CE Greco-Roman society.

My ethno-religious findings identify six ways in which a permanent *ekklēsia* designation could be said to root Paul’s multi-ethnic Christ-followers in a Jewish heritage. Three ways are by literary depiction: Paul metaphorically transforms his *ekklēsiai* into the temple of God, the body of the Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred Jewish synagogue. The other three ways are by lexical association. *Ekklēsia* is the same designation used by contemporaneous non-messianic Jewish voluntary associations in
Egypt (and perhaps Judea), by public synagogue assemblies in Judea, and by the translators of the LXX for the nation of Israel.

My research advances scholarship on Pauline *ekklēsiai*, specifically those in Asia Minor, in at least two respects. First, I problematize counter-imperial interpretations of Paul’s *ekklēsiai* by assessing the political implications of their adoption of a civic identity through the lens of the political culture in Asia Minor. Second, I not only explore analogies between Pauline *ekklēsiai* and the *proseuchai* of Bosporan Jewish *synagogai*, but I contend that Paul’s designation of his communities as *ekklēsiai* was ideologically motivated for the purpose of linking his Jewish and gentile Christ-followers with a Jewish heritage.
Conclusion

As my study of the word *ekklēsia* has wound its way through the corridors of time, a number of doors of enquiry have opened into its use within Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christ-follower sources. This journey of enquiry has discovered that before its translation as “church” or “the Church,” *ekklēsia* had a much broader semantic range.

With respect to Greek and Roman sources, *ekklēsia* referred to the civic assemblies of the citizenry (*dēmos*) of a Greek *polis*, to a temporary group designation for the *dēmos* while meeting in their *ekklēsia*, and to some semi-public assemblies of non-civic groups in the Greek East (Delos, Samos, Sinuri). I have suggested that a voluntary association which self-designated as an *ekklēsia* could very well have been seen as a positive, rather than as a counter-imperial, participant within Greek *poleis*. If some Greco-Roman outsiders, especially Roman authorities, perceived Pauline *ekklēsiai* also as being communal ‘sites’ of socio-ethnic *dēmokratia*, then, by giving his non-civic groups a political identity, Paul provided them with a type of ‘defense mechanism.’ It would have been difficult for Roman suspicions to have been aroused over a voluntary association in the Greek East, the socio-religious *praxeis* of which portrays it as a paragon of civic order and *dēmokratia*, and the very name of which situates it in the centre of the “*ekklēsia discourse*” in Asia Minor.

Within Jewish sources, *ekklēsia* was used for various assemblies of, and even as a supra-local identity for, the ethno-religious nation of Israel, for publicly accessible gatherings of Jews during the Hellenistic (Judea) and Imperial periods (Judea and Alexandria), and for the permanent group identity of at least one semi-public, non-civic group in Philo’s Alexandria (Virt. 108). When it comes to early Christ-follower sub-
groups, Binder has identified the need for a focused study on “the emergence and development of the Christian ekklēsia,” specifically with respect to its function as a “sectarian synagogue.” Given that ekklēsia is a synagogue term, one of the goals of my study has been to begin the process of understanding “the emergence and development” of those early Christ-follower ekklēsiai as “sectarian synagogues,” or perhaps better, association synagogues. Its use by intra muros groups within pluriform Second Temple Judaism, and its subsequent adoption by Pauline Christ-followers, becomes another factor by which to problematize scholarly suggestions that Paul was “parting ways” with Judaism(s), ‘Jewishness,’ or Jewish organizational forms or that Paul was supersessionist in his ekklēsia ideology.

It seems clear, though, that no such thing as a “Christian ekklēsia” existed in the 1st century CE, if by that term Binder means a universal ekklēsia consisting of all Christ-followers within the Roman empire. Not every Christ-follower community appears to have self-identified as an ekklēsia. The New Testament only explicitly attributes ekklēsia as a permanent collective identity to Christ-follower groups which were apostolically aligned with Paul, the “elder” John, the “prophet” John, or Matthew.

By the turn of the century, however, patristic writers appear to employ ekklēsia in more standardized fashion as a universal entity to which all Christ-followers belong. This terminological development glosses over regional variations in how Jewish Christ-followers, in particular, self-identified (e.g., hoi hagioi, synagogē), and plays right into the hands of Ignatius and Justin Martyr who created an ethnic bifurcation between

---

1030 Binder, Into the Temple Courts, 24.
ekklēsia and synagōgē communities. Justin Martyr conceives of Christ-followers belonging to a universal ekklēsia or to a universal synagōgē, with non-Jews belonging to the ekklēsia and Jewish Christ-followers to the synagōgē. Ignatius appears to have gone a step further. He no longer countenanced the praxeis of ethno-religious Jews within his Christ-follower community in Antioch. By the time of Theodosius I this ethnic alienation became the norm when the religio-political institution that was the universal ekklēsia came to consist almost exclusively of gentiles. Not least by this time the semantic range of ekklēsia lost its primary meaning as a community of people and shifted in its definitional focus to identifying the institutionalized “Catholic Church” and the structures (“basilicas/churches”) within which “the Church” met.

Ethical implications arise from the knowledge that one can translate ekklēsia as “meeting” rather than only as “congregation,” or anachronistically as “church.” At least two passages in the New Testament come into clearer focus as a result. First, if one translates ekklēsia as “meeting” in 3 John 6 and 10, then that ancient community did not enact a disciplinary strategy for “church discipline” which entailed the exclusion of members from the community itself. Rather, rebellious members were excluded from participation in that community’s worship “meeting.” It can be assumed that the disciplinee was still able to interact with the community outside of assembly times.

Second, if, in 1 Cor 14:33b-35, one both translates ekklēsia as “meeting” and assumes that the silence imposed upon women during that “meeting” reflects the practice of a non-Pauline sub-group of Christ-followers who self-designate as hoi hagioi, then
Paul can not be labelled as a misogynist, but rather as one who affirms the right of women to participate publicly in his communities’ *ekklēsiai*.

Campbell’s dictum that identity precedes theology appears to have particular application to Paul’s epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, particularly if one presumes that not all Christ-followers within those two communities self-designated collectively as *ekklēsiai*. Paul’s theology, especially his fictive portrayal of Christ-followers as the temple of God, the Body of the Jewish *Christos*, and a sacred manumission synagogue, can then be seen as having as its primary goal the construction of a socio-religious bridge. This bridge is not for the crossing and mending of a Jewish–gentile ethnic divide, but rather of “a denominational divide,” so to speak, between Paul’s *ekklēsiai* and those Christ-followers who hold different apostolic allegiances, particularly to the apostles in Jerusalem (e.g., *hoi hagioi*).

At least two directions for further study evolve out of the present study. I phrase them as questions. First, “at what point in his apostolic mission did Paul first adopt the idea of a permanent *ekklēsia* identity?” and, second, “what are the self-designations of other Christ-followers who did not designate collectively as an *ekklēsia*?” Two pluralistic sub-group identities factor prominently in answering both questions: *hoi hagioi* and *Christianois*. It would seem that an opportune moment has now arrived for a

---

1031 See Trebilco, *Self-designations*, 122–63 (*hoi hagioi*), 272–97 (*ho Christianos*). The author of Acts records that the sub-group identity *Christianois* originated in Antioch and was adopted by the community there only after gentiles were incorporated (Acts 11:19-30). This raises the question as to whether an exclusively Jewish identity (*hoi hagioi*) was no longer tenable for the Antiochean Christ-followers’ newly *multi-ethnic* community. The term *Christianois* would have fit the new socio-ethnic realities of the Antiochean community well in that it still maintained their indelible rootedness in a Jewish heritage (i.e., *Christos* as the Jewish Messiah), but had a semantic range broad enough to allow for gentile inclusion (i.e., *Christianois* indicates followers of the *Christos*, irrespective of ethnicity). The primary
comprehensive reassessment of group identity construction among early Christ-followers and to re-read their writings, which collectively are known canonically as the New Testament, with an ear to the implied conversations between differentiated ‘denominational’ sub-groups. Some are in conversation with each other, such as the Christ-follower communities in Rome and Corinth. Other Christ-follower ekklēsiai are only literarily attested decades later, whether in Roman Asia (e.g., the ekklēsiai of the elder John and of the prophet John), or in Galilee or the Diaspora (the Mattheans). It is my hope that this study has provided a sufficiently firm foundation upon which to build the next step of reconstructing a diachronic picture of group identity formation within the early Jesus movement.

apostolic allegiance of the Christianoi, however, was still with the Jerusalem apostles (Acts 11; 1 Peter 4:16). Thus, once the gentle mission under Paul’s apostolic authority began to develop, a new collective identity would have become necessary. Paul chose ekklēsia. 1 Peter does not use ekklēsia terminology when writing to its diasporic addresses in Asia Minor (Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia; 1 Peter 1:1). Christ-followers are referred to individually as Χριστιανός (1 Pet 4:16). Christianos only occurs four times within early Christ-follower writings (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16; Did. 12:4). Didache uses Christians in a matter of fact way as insider terminology. Didache instructs an itinerant preacher to live “as a Christianos with you, not idle” (πας μὴ ἄργος μὲθ’ ὀμοίων ζησοτε Χριστιανός). Extended discussions of Christianos as a socio-religious sub-group identity within the early Jesus movement include: Heinrich Karpp, “Christennamen,” in Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum; Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt (29 vols; ed. T. Klauser [Stuttgart: Hiersennann, 1950], 2.1115–38); Tim Hegedus, “Naming Christians in Antiquity,” SR 33 (2004): 173–90; Treblico, Self-designations, 272–97; and most recently, the unpublished dissertation of Eric Rowe (“Called by the Name of the Lord: Early Uses of the Names and Titles of Jesus in Identifying His Followers” [Ph.D. diss., The Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, 2012]), 119–57). For specific discussions on the origin of the term Christianos, see Paul Achtemeier who suggests that “the language of Acts 11:26 implies” that Christianos is “outsider language,” but without further comment (1 Peter [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996], 313 n. 114). Charles Bigg notes that Christianos “is of Latin formation,” yet without much explanation (The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude [ICC; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902], 179). Peterson argues that the ending –ανος indicates its origin in a Latin speaking milieu. Peterson suggests it goes back to Roman officials (“Christianus,” in Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis: Studien und Untersuchungen [ed. E. Peterson; Rom et al.; 1959], 64–87, esp. 66–77; cited in Reinhard Feldmeier, The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text [trans. P. H. Davids; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008], 227). Outsiders other than Tacitus who designate early Christ-followers as Christianoi include Suetonius (Vit. 6.16.2), Pliny (Ep. 10.96) and Lucian of Samosata (Alex. 25; Pergr. mort. 11–13, 16). See Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, 179; Leonhard Goppelt (A Commentary on 1 Peter [EKK; trans. John E. Alsup; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 309); Ernest G. Selwyn (The First Epistle of St. Peter [2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1955], 225); and J. Ramsay Michaels (1 Peter [WBC 49; Waco, TX: Word, 1988], 268).
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Appendix #1: *Ekklēsia* in First Century BCE Inscriptions

*Sardis* 7.1 8, Lydia, Sardis, 5–1 BCE: ἐπὶ τῶν ἑαυτῶν εὐνουχῶν, παραγινόμενος τὸν ἑαυτὸν τὸν ἐκ τῆς συναχθείας δημοτελεῖ ἐκ<κ>λησία τὴν ἀποπρεπεῖαν ἐποιεῖτο, ὁ δὲ δήμος ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτὸν.


*Agora* 16 335/2 1051+1058/SEG 24.141, Attica, Athens, 30–22/21 BCE: This decree reflects dealings with the klerouchs in Lemnos and recounts the Athenian decision to send four emissaries with the text of a decree to Lemnos, one of whom was a herald (κηρεύοντα) of the *boule* and *demos*; [ἐπὶ ...c.11... ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς c.20...... προτερανής] ἐγράμματα[ται] ταυτας... c.20 c.16... πρυτανας τῆς ἐκκλησίας κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τῶν προέδρων ἐπεφηρίζεν... c.7.. Διώροθεου... και συμπρόθεος[ν] ἐδόθην τῷ δήμῳ.

*IDid* 218II, Ionia, found between Didyma and Karakuyu, c. 38/24 BCE: *Prophētēs* inscription for (Lysimachos?) ἀνήρ εὐαγγελιστής και φιλόδοξος; προσανεφεύρεσαι ν δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀποκαθιστήσεις τῆς ἐν πρὸ τέρον ἔκκλησίας Λεμνοῦ δήμου καὶ τοῦ νόμου.

*SEG* 55:608, Thessalia (Pelasgiotis) — Larisa, c. 70 BC: Citizenship decree for Zobios and Dionysios of Chalkis; προτερανής τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν Zobias Ζωβίου, προεξόνθερου θεσσαλοῦ, καὶ Δυνούσιος Ζωβίου Χαλκιδεύων τοῦ καὶ ἐπαξιῶτος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τὸν ἐξερευνήτως τοῦ ἐδίκου τοῦ ἀπολογοῦντος καὶ αἴτησένιον αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτείαν Φιλοκράτους τοῦ Ἀντιοχοῦ. It has been decided by the ἐκκλησία, and it is (appropriate??) to dispatch a man to lead things, and (decarcerated) ambassadors to the proconsul in accordance with the proposal which our δῆμος adopted for the purpose of being deliverers and benefactors of the Romans; and whatever the general may command, and anything else for the polis...


---


IK 6.7 (IMT NoerdlTroas 7). Troas, Äg. Inseln — Thasos, Agora von [Aa: Lampsakos], 100–66 BCE; δεδομένος τε βουλής και των δήμων, τήν βουλήν προβουλεύοντος καθ’ δ’ τιμηθέται προδειγμα Διονυσίδωρος ἔξενεγκέιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, συντελεύθη δι’ ὅσ’ ἐν τοῖς δήμοις δόξην.  

Resolved by the boule and the demos, since the boule made a probouleuma according to which Dionysidorus will be honoured by proxeny before the ekklesia, let it be decided as the demos sees fit.

IG II 1028, Attica, Athens, 100/99 BCE; Βοήθεια δύναται ἑνέτει οἰκείου, ἑνέτει τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τοῖς θεάτριοι τῶν προεδρῶν ἐπεφθη! Εἰς ἔτη τῆς Ἀρετῆς Παυκείους καὶ συμπρόεδρον:  


The Praetor [or Proconsul who] has either Asia or Macedonia as his province shall, within the ten days immediately after he learns that this law has been confirmed by the People in the assembly, take an oath to do everything that he is required to do in this law and shall not do anything contrary [to its provisions] with malice or ill-will.  

IG XII, 1 3, Rhodes and S. Dodecanese, Rhodes, somewhere between the 1st cents. BCE to CE: A decision to purchase olive oil is transacted by the demos in the ekklesia; [ἐδοξεν τοι δήσιμον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῷ Ἀρταμίτιῳ μνήμῃ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, οἵτινες θησευσαν καὶ πωλησαν τὸ ἔλαιον ἕκ τον οἰκ[υ]νάσιον?] ἀφθονος.

I Myl 102/Mylasa 25, Caria, found at Mylasa, 1st or 2nd cent. BCE: Honorary decree by boule and demos for Mos[chio]n Aristeidou: Φιλιπποῦ τοῦ Διοφάντου ἐπελθόντος ἐπί τῇ βουλήν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δηλώσαντος τῇ διοικήσει σώμα αὐτοῦ[ō] ἐφυσχαγωγημένον ἢκται εἰς Μύδον, αἰρέθεις πρεσβευτής πρὸς Μυᾶδους.

After Philip and Diophanus came before the boule and the ekklesia, and made known that his (lifeless??) body had been brought to Myndos, an ambassador was chosen (to go to) Myndos.

Myl 207 (see also I Myl 206/Mylasa 83, 212/Mylasa 87, 1st or 2nd cent. BCE): Decree of phyle of Otrontodeis concerning purchase of land from Thraseas; ἐπελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ Θρασσάς ἐπί τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ηὑς δὲ τῆς ὠνής τῶν προγεγραμμένων τοῖς κτηματωνίαις εἰς γραμμένα πάντα αὐτοῦ θρασσάς παρὰ τῶν ταμίων τῆς καὶ ἔξει αὐτῷ Ἐκκλησίαν ἐκ καθάπερ φόρον τοῖς τῆς φυλῆς ταμίαις ἐπὶ μὴ Ροδίου λεπτοῦ δραχμάς ἐκατόν, And Thraseas comes before the ekklesia νῖς them giving advice of the sale to the (owners??)…the same Thraseas…everything (was recorded??) according to the treasurers (of...) and he will…(maintain) the things within his patrimony and the (will own) what is outside of it, and for those things which (may be [leased??]) a titube of 100 drachmas per year (will be paid) {something about “what remains outside Rhodes[?]”}


---


Appendix #2: *Ekklēsia in First Century CE Inscriptions*

Meletemata 11 K2, Macedonia, Makedonia (Mygdonia) — Kalindoia (area of Kalamoto), 1 CE; 1 έτους · η' και μ' · και · ρ' οί πολιτάρχαι προβοσκευασμένων τῶν βουλευτῶν καὶ γενομένης ἐκκλησίας εἶπαν ἐν τοῖς δήμωι.


Lindos II 419, Aegean Islands, Rhodes and S. Dodecanese, Rhodes, 22 CE; ἐπανελλέξεθαι ἀργυρίῳ ἐν τοῖς δίλοις ἐν ταῖς ἀγγελίαις τῷ λαγκρανίῳ μὴνι’. 

*Peloponneseos, Peek, Asklepieion* 35(2) (see also *IG IV* 1.84, II. 24, 41), Epidauria — Epicuriou, Asklepieion, 40–42 CE; ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τοῖς θεάτρωι, τῶν προεδρῶν ἐπεψήφιε τίτλον Παλῶν Ἱεροστάδης καὶ συνπρόεδροι.

*IScM* III 32 (see also *SEG* 16.428), Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis (Mangalia), 50–75 CE; The ἀρχιερατικὴ ἐκκλησία is mentioned twice: (1) δ[ι][ε]δχθαί [οὐν τῷ δάμῳ ἐπιηθήθα] αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς· θάνατος τοῦ δήμου [ἐν πόθη] [δὲ] [ἀ]υτοπεριφορᾷ καὶ συνόδῳ καὶ διαμοθηνίᾳ καὶ Καισαρίῳ καὶ πανηγύρει καὶ ἀρχιερατικὴ ἐκκλησία; (2) ἐκουρθῇ τὸ ψήφισμα τούτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀρχιερατικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκχίσθη.

*Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 76.72, Galatia, N. — Ankara (Ankara), 50–100 CE; Τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῷ Βουλαίῳ, κατὰ ἀναγορεύσειν βουλῆς καὶ δήμου, τειμηθέντα πολλάκις ἐν ἐκκλησίαις, ἀνδρίας ἐν [εκείνῃ].

*IScM* III 34 (see also Dacia 2 (1925) 126, 8), Thrace and the Lower Danube, Scythia Minor, Kallatis (Mangalia) — Arsa, 50–100 CE; ἐδοξάζε ἐν τῇ ἀρχιερατικῇ [ἐκκλησίᾳ].


*IG VII* 2713, Megaris, Oropia, and Boiotia, Boiotia — Akraiophia, 67 CE; (I) Ἀὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ λέγει· (II) συνελθὼν τῶν ἤχλων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προσεφέρων τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα.

*FD III* 4:61, Delphi, Phokis — Delphi, 75–100 CE; ἐδοξάζε τῇ Δελφῶ[ν πόλις], ἐν προσκλήτωι [ἐκκλησίᾳ].

*FD III* 3:233, (see also *SGDI* 2731), Delphi, Phokis — Delphi, 80–95 CE; μηνὸς ᾿Αμαλίου γ’, ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εὑραμίθεντος Ἀρχελάου τοῦ Ὑγίνου τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου.
The regular occurrence of the ἐκκλησία in 1st cent. CE Delphi is implied by the prepositional phrase ἐν ἑννόμῳ ἐκκλησία.

*St.Pont.* III 141, Pontus and Paphlagonia, Pont. — Amasia, 98/99 CE; Δί Στρατίω [ὁ δήμος ἐν ἐκκλησία] κυρία ἐπὶ τῆς συνήμαρχας Πομ[πωνίου — — — τοῦ(!)] Κανδίδου, νεωκορούντος γ' — — — — — — — — οὗ Ἀγριππιανοῦ, ἐκ τῶν συνλεγήμένων χρημάτων. #000 ἔτους #000 ρα’ #000.

*Iscr. di Cos EV* 75bis (see also *Historia* [Milan] 8 [1934]: 433, 434), Cos and Calyma, Kos — Kos, 1st or 2nd cents. CE; [— — ἔδοξε τῇ ἐκκλησία(?) — —].
Appendix #3: *Ekklēsia* in Second Century CE Inscriptions

*IG* IX.1 193, Phokis, Lokris, Aitolia, Akarnania, and Ionia Islands, Phokis — Tithora, beginning of the 2nd cent. CE: δοῦσας τὰς πόλεις τὸ ψάρισμα ἐπὶ ἀρχοντὶ Ἑλλανείτω ᾿Ελλανείκου ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. μάρτυρες: Σώκλαρος Ἀριστίνως, Ἐὕφρων Στράταγου, Τείμων Νεικινέτου.


*I Eph* 27A + Add. p. 2/Ephesos 115 (see also Curtius, *Hermes* 4 [1870]: 201–203, no. 12 [part]; *GIBM* 481, 481*; *Fie* II no. 27A; *Laum* 74, 1–7 [part]; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, 1–134; *SEG* 15, 698), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Honorary decree of *boule* and *demos* of Ephesos honoring Gaius Vibius Salutaris for his benefaction paying for statues of Artemis, Trajan, Clotina, Senate, equites, and Ephesos; Ephesos, 104 CE: Honorary decree of *boule* of Ephesos, *gerousia* of Ephesos, *ephebeia* of Ephesos, and so on, and accepting benefaction; one of three ἐκκλησία occurrences reads as follows: τῇ τε νομὴν ἅρχει ἑπατικοῦ ἐτοὺς θυσίας καὶ εἰς τὰς γενέτειράς ἐν τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ ἐπάνω τῆς σελίδος τῆς βουλῆς μετὰ τῆς χρυσῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκόνων.

*I Eph* 27B + Add. p. 2/Ephesos 212 (see also *GIBM* 481, 481*, 728, 749; *Fie* II no. 27B; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, ll. 134–332; *SEG* 15, 698); found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Letter of Caius [Vibius] Salutaris offering benefaction to *boule* and *demos* of Ephesos in form of legal document; ᾧ[πε][τε] καὶ αὐτ[ά]ς τίθε[σ]αι εν ταῖς ἑκκλησίαις ἐπάνω τής σελίδος τῆς βουλῆς μετὰ τῆς χρυσῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκόνων.

*I Eph* 27E/Ephesos 153 (see also *GIBM* 481, 481*; *Fie* II no. 27E; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 3, ll. 414–430), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE; ὅπως ἔξη τοῖς χρυσοφ[ορόσταις τῇ θεῷ] φέρειν εἰς τὰς ἑκκλησίας καὶ τοὺς ἀγώνας τὰ ἀπεικο[ν]ύματα καὶ <τάς> εἰκόνας τὰ καθιερωμένα [α ὑπὸ Γαῖο]ν Ὀνειβίου Σαλουταρίου ἐκ τοῦ προνάου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος.

*I Eph* 35/Ephesos 830 (see also *CIL* III 141957α4; *ILS* 7193; *Fie* II no. 28b; Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 4; Smallwood, *Doc. s Nerva* 493α [part]), Ionia, found at Ephesos, 104 CE: Dedication (in Latin and Greek) to Artemis Ephesia and *gerousia* of Ephesos, by C(aius) Vibius Salutaris; ἄτινα καθιέρωσεν, ἵνα τιθῆται κατά ἐκκλησίαις ἐπὶ τῶν βάσεων, ὡς ἡ διάταξις αὐτοῦ περιέχει.
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IGR 3.704/Serta Harteliana 1/7. Lycia, Kyaneai (Yavu), 138–161 CE; χρόνοι ψηφισμάτων τειμητικών και ἐπιστολῶν γραφιῶν ἤγεμον καὶ ἀντιγραφῶν περὶ ἱάσονος... Ἀρτεμισίου γ’ ἐκκλησίας ἀπόλογος.

IG XIII.3 326, see also IG XIII,3 Suppl. p. 283, Doric Sporades, Thera, 149 CE; ἐν ἐγκύκλιοις ἄκριβης, ἐν πρακτορείας ὑγιῆς, ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ στρατηγικάς δίκαιος, ἐν ἐπιδόσει πολείτων μεγαλόψυχος φανερός, ἐκκλησίας ἀγομένης ἐννόμω τῇ σήμερον ήμέρᾳ, παρελθῶν εἰσὶν γγείλειν βουλή καὶ δήμῳ τὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει Βασιλικήν στοάν.

Boch, Quellen Ankara 263, 201, Galatia N. — Ankara [Ankara], 150–200 CE; Ζωτικόν Βάσσου, άνδρα ἀγαθόν, ὑόν φυλής ια’, φυλαρχήσαντα φιλοτέμως καὶ ἀστυνομήσαντα ἀγώνις κὲ ἐργὸν ποιήσαντα πολυτείμητον ἐν κοιμητίᾳ ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων κὲ καθ’ ἡμέραν πολλά παρέχοντα τῇ φυλῇ, τειμηθέντα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίας κἐ βουλῇ, φυλή ἱα’ Νέα Όλυμπιάδ.[c].

IMT NoerdtTroas 8, see also IK 6,34, Troas, Tr.: nördl. Troas — Lampsakos (Lapseki) [Αa: Eresos od. Methymna?], 2nd cent. CE?: (1) proclamation of a decree regarding a crowning; δεῖξαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβεῖα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν παραγεγομένων πρὸς λαμψακανός [τῷ] [τῇ] ψάφισμα ἀποδώσει καὶ ἀξιάζεισαι ποιήσασθαι τῇ ἀναγεγελίαν τῶν στεφάνων καὶ παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις καὶ ἵνα ἀναγραφῇ τὸ ψάφισμα τότε [εἰς] [σ]τάλαν λευκῷ λίθῳ καὶ ἀνατέθῃ ἐν τῷ ἐπίφανεστάτῳ τῷ τόπῳ: (2) voting by show of hands; χειροτονησόμεθα δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐφόντον τῷ πρεσβευτᾶ ποσσᾶν [ἀμερᾶν δεῖς — — — ].


Strubbe, Cat. Pessinus 13 (see also CIG 4085 w/ Add.p.1111 — ShMünchen 1860.194, 197 — OGIS 537, IGR 3.226), Galatia, N. — Pessinous (Ballihisar), 2nd cent. CE or later (PHI dating; U of Hamburg dates Strubbe, [2005] 25, Nr. 13 to the second half of the 2nd cent. CE; http://s145739614.de/onlinede/ result.php?lang=en&id=10; accessed August 18, 2012); πᾶσαι τῇταις τιμηθέντα ἐν ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῇ βουλῆ ἐν δήμῳ, ἀνδριάντων ἀν[α]στάσει καὶ εἰκόνων [ἀναθέσαι], ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν <κ(α)ί> εὐνοιας τῆς εἰς [ἑαυτούς].

IG IV 853, Peloponnesos, Saronic Gulf, Corinthia, and the Argolid, Troizen — Methana, 2nd cent. CE?: Reference is made to the formal title of a member of the ἐκκλησία — οἱ ἐκκλησιασταὶ; αἱ συναρχικαὶ πάσαι κα[ι] οἱ ἐκκλησιασταὶ ἐπιαν.
Appendix #4: Spreadsheet Categories for Epigraphic *Ekklēsia* Occurrences

In order to facilitate the efficient organization and comparative research of all *ekklēsia* occurrences within Greek epigraphic sources, a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet with thirty-nine categories was created into which each *ekklēsia* occurrence listed by PHI was inputted.

The database is searchable by three hierarchical categories. If one searches by “dating,” “region,” and “verbal form that is juxtaposed with *ekklēsia*,” respectively, then Excel sorts all *ekklēsia* occurrences first by those of similar date, then, within those similarly dated sources, by regional locations, and, finally, of those *ekklēsia* occurrences which have a similar date and occur in the same region, Excel sorts alphabetically by modifying participles (e.g., *synelthōn*, *synagagōn*).

**Lexeme Search:** *ἐκκλησία*, *ἐκκλησίη*, *ἐκκλησία*, *ἐκκλεσία*, *ἐγκλησία*

**Location-Geographic:** Asia Minor

**Location-region/province:** Ionia

**Location-city:** Ephesos

**Location IN the city:** ἐν τῶι θεάτρῳ

**Date---**

---1B.069---

1B=1BCE; 1C=1CE; 0.069 = year 69

**Epigraphical Title:** *Didyma* 314

**Description:** Hydrophoros inscription for Artemo Antipatrou

**Did PHI website tagging miss *ἐκκλησία* occurrences?** Packard Humanities Institute divides multiple *ἐκκλησία* occurrences in one inscription into multiple website references. The actual *ἐκκλησία* occurrence referenced by PHI in each individual search engine hit is bolded and underlined.

**Literary source:** *IG*, *SEG* (The source titles are hyperlinked to the PackHum website)

**Secondary source:** website (e.g., PackHum)

**Tertiary source:** Ralph Korner’s Word document file name

**Multiple occurrence?** E.g., also cf. Aegean *ID* 1499, 1501, 1504, 1505

**Lexeme:** *ἐκκλησία*

**Morpheme:** *ἐκκλησίαν*

**Parsing:** N = nominative, G = genitive, D = dative, A = accusative, PT = participle

**Actual phrase:** εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν; δεδέχθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις

**Immediate context for phrase:** δεδέχθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὸν δᾶμον τὸν Θεαγγελ/ων παῖναι δ/οκέων τοῖς ἐπαίνεσαι

**Preposition?** ἐν, εἰς

**Article?** ταῖς, τὰν, τὴν

**Adjectival modifier:** κυρία, ἐννόμω

**Adjectival use of *ἐκκλησία*:** χειροτόνησαι δὲ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις προσβεύσαιν

**Verbal modifier (morpheme):** δεδέχθαι

**Verbal modifier (lexeme):** δοκέω

**Verb + *ἐκκλησία* phrase:** δεδέχθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.
**Definition of ἐκκλησία:**
M = a Meeting; P = a People who are meeting; B = a Building; I = an Institution

**Restored ἐκκλησία reading?**
5 = # of letters restored in the word ἐκκλησία.

**Epigraphic title/1st sentence:** ἔδοξε ταί πόλει ἐν ἀγορά τελειῶι σὺν ψάφοις ταις ἐννόμοις

**Political reference?** Y =yes, N =no (religious), A =association, U =unsure

**Political Terms in ἐκκλησία sentence:** e.g., ψήφισμα, ἀρχοντος

**Stock political formulae in the rest of the epigraphic source?** δεδυχθαι τω δήμω

**Association terminology in epigraphic source?** διατελεὶ κοινῆ (I merely record occurrences of terminology that can also used for ‘associations’ while recognizing that such terminology has other possible meanings. As such, I do not assume that the occurrence of ‘association’-like terminology means that a voluntary association is being referenced)

**Religious terms in epigraphic source:** Διονύσιοις, θυσίαις

**Location of inscription:** ἀναγράφει το ψήφισμα και εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλεῖῳ

**Manumission context?** ἐν ἐννό[μο] ἐκκλησίαι, ἀφίητι Ἀσωπόδωρ[ος — — —] ἐλεύθερον

**Type of epigraphy:** engraving, ink, woodcut

**Material source:** marble, wood
Appendix #5: *Ekklēsia* Occurrences in Manumission Inscriptions (Central Greece)

1. Of all extant insessional mentions of the word *ekklēsia* at least 16 are set within a manumission context.
2. Of these 16 manumissions connected with a civic *ekklēsia*, all 16 occur within inscriptions found in central Greece (Phokis, Boeotia, Locris, W.).
3. Of these manumission inscriptions from central Greece, 15 are for individual slaves, and 1 is for an ‘enslaved’ region—Achaia/Pelopponesia/Corinth.
4. *FD* III 2:120 is an example of how the word *ekklēsia* functions within a public manumission decree (Delphi, uncertain date).
   - In its first line, the decree indicates that the manumission inscription should be posted in the temple of the Pythian Apollo (Ἀναγραφὴ ἀ αὐτὰ ἀπελευθέρωσις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου).
   - The second line contains formulaic elements that confirm the date and legally binding nature of this decree (Ἀρχοντὸς Νικάνδρου, μηνὸς ἔκτου, ἐν ἑννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, γραμματεύοντος τῶν συνεδρῶν Ἐπικράτεος τοῦ Νέωνος).
   - The third line declares the freed status of Ἀγὼν, the manumitted slave (Ἀφίησι Ἀγῶν καὶ Τίμανδρος Λαοδίκαν ἐλευθέραν), yet enjoins him, through a paramonē clause, to remain obligated to his former master Timandros as long as Timandros should live (παρὰ Τίμανδρος ἕχω καὶ ζῷος Τίμανδρος).
   - Summary: The contents of the second line replicate four of the six formulaic elements normally found in the standard opening of an Athenian-style decree, with only Athenian tribal and prytaneia details missing because Delphi is not part of Attica (cf. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 219–220). Any combination of these four formulaic elements provide precise dating and affirm the legally binding nature of the subsequent enactment formula (ἐδοξεν τὴ…; “resolved by…”). The four formulaic elements in *FD* III 2:120 are: (1) the name of the eponymous magistrate is given followed by his title in the genitive (i.e., Ἀρχοντὸς Νικάνδρου; “during the archonship of Nikandros”); (2) the month is given (μηνὸς ἕκτου “in the eighth month”); (3) the approval of an *ekklēsia* is confirmed (ἐν ἑννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ); (4) other officers, such as the secretary of the council, are cited (γραμματεύοντος τῶν συνεδρῶν Ἐπικράτεος τοῦ Νέωνος; “while Epikrateos of Neōnos was secretary of the Synedroi”). McLean observes that “the name of the secretary gave official sanction to public documents and became a means of identifying and dating decrees, in the same way we might assign a document an identification number for easy reference” (Ibid., 219).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Aphiēmi Manumission?</th>
<th>Paramonē Clause?</th>
<th>Other Verbs of Manumission?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD III 2:120</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Yes; ἐν ἐννοίᾳ ἐκκλησία, ἀφίητι ἐλευθέραν</td>
<td>Yes; παραμεύρει Ἰησοῦν</td>
<td>ώς ἀπελεύθερον τῷ ἂνκλαπτῷ καὶ ταῖς πόλεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀργυρίου μνάς τρίακοντα,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII 2713</td>
<td>67 CE, Akraiaphia</td>
<td>Political freedom for the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCH 108 (1984) 366.4</td>
<td>20-46 CE</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD III 6:27</td>
<td>1-20 CE</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Yes; παραμενεῖν</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπέδοτο, σῶμα οἰκ[ε]γ[ε]ν[ε]ς, τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθερίᾳ</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἤπειρον τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ ἐπ᾽ ἐλευθερίᾳ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD III 6:31</td>
<td>1-20 CE</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX.1² 3/205</td>
<td>137/6 BCE?</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Aphiēmi Manumission?</th>
<th>Paramonē Clause?</th>
<th>Other Verbs of Manumission?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGDI II 2097</td>
<td>140-100 BCE</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ἐν ἐννόμω ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀνέθηκε ... συνευδόκεντων τοῦ τε πατρὸς αὐτὰς ... τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Πυθίῳ σώμα γυναικείον, through the lawful assembly [ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ?] of the city of the Euantheians, he handed over ... being in agreement ... to Apollon in Phaistinos a slave, a woman ... for freedom at a price in silver of five minas. Guarantors according to the law ... Witnesses: the citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPPADAK IS 1920.1</td>
<td>Post-165 BCE, Boeotia, Phaistinos, Sanctuary of Apollo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 193</td>
<td>2 cent BCE, begin Tithora</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes; ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν συνέδρων, ... ἀφίνετι ἐλευθέρα[ν ... κατ-α-δουλίζοιτο ... ποθίεροι τῷ] Ἀσκλαπίῳ ἄργυρίου μνᾶς</td>
<td></td>
<td>εἰ δὲ τις κατ-α-δουλίζοιτο ..., ἀποτεισάτω ποθίεροι ποθίεροι τῷ] Ἀσκλαπίῳ ἄργυρίου μνᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 120</td>
<td>2 cent BCE Elateia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes; ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφίνετι τὸν [εαυτάς] δ[οὺλον] ... ἐλευθέρον ... [σ]υνευδόκ[ε]ο[ύ]σας και [τὰς ματρὸς ... ἁπεκληρο[ν] τὸν ψαφισμα ἐπί ἀρχοντι ... ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, μάρτυρ[ες]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 122</td>
<td>2 cent BCE Elateia</td>
<td>Yes; ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφίσχατο τὸν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀλλ’ ἐλεύθερος νομίζ[ε]σθαι[()] καὶ ἀνέπαφος ἔστε[()] ὁ καταδουλ[ίζομενος] ἁπ[οπειρῷον] τῷ Ἀσκλαπίῳ ἄργυρίῳ [τάλαντον],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 124</td>
<td>2 cent BCE Elateia</td>
<td>Yes; ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφίσχατο τὸν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀποτεισάτω ὁ καταδουλιζόμενος αὐτὸν ἄργυρίῳ τάλαντον ποθίερον τῷ Ἀσκλαπίῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 125</td>
<td>2 cent BCE Elateia</td>
<td>Yes; ἀφίσχατο ... ἐν ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν συνέδρων, ... ἐπεὶ κατέβαλον τὰ λύτρα τὰ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων, ἱερατεύον[τος τῷ] Ἀσκλαπίῳ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀποτεισάτω ὁ καταδουλιζόμενος ἅργυρίῳ τάλαντον ποθίερον τῷ Ἀσκλαπίῳ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Aphiēmi Manumission?</td>
<td>Paramonē Clause?</td>
<td>Other Verbs of Manumission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 126</td>
<td>2 cent BCE</td>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>Yes; [αφίητι ... ἐλευθέραν] ... ἐν ἑννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν [συνέδριων]</td>
<td>Yes; παραμείνασαν ... ἀχρί καὶ ζώῃ Δίων.</td>
<td>ἀποτεισάτω δὲ ὁ καταδουλιζόμενος ζαμιάν ποθέρον τῷ ἀσκλαπιῷ ἀργυρίῳ τάλαν[τον].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG IX,1 127</td>
<td>2 cent BCE</td>
<td>Elateia</td>
<td>Yes; [αφίητι ἐλευθέραν— — —] ἐν ἑννόμῳ ἐκκ[λησία] τῶν συνεδρίων ... ὁ καταδουλιζόμενος] ... ἀργυρ[ίου τάλαντον ποθέρον τῷ ἀσκλαπιῷ.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ἀποτεισάτω δὲ] καταδουλιζόμενος ... ἀργυρ[ίου τάλαντον ποθέρον τῷ ἀσκλαπιῷ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix #6: 

**Ekklēsia in Greek Literary Works**

At least 1063 *ekklēsia* occurrences in Greek literary works (5th cent. BCE–3rd cent. CE) (excluding Josephus, New Testament writers and later Christian authors)

http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/searchresults?target=greek&all_words=e%29klhsi%2Fa&all_words_expand=on&phrase=&any_words=&exclude_words=&documents= 

Accessed Feb. 10, 2011

**Most Numerous *Ekklēsia* Citations by Author:**

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus has 225 occurrences
- Plutarch has 142 occurrences
- Diodorus Siculus has 101 occurrences
- Demosthenes has 76 occurrences
- Aeschines has 57 occurrences

**Ekklēsia** Citations Listed Alphabetically by Author

Lucian, Bis accusatus sive tribunalia 1 Lucian, De parasito sive artem esse parasiticam 1 Lucian, Nectyomantia 2 Lucian, De morte Peregrini 1 Lucian, Pseudologista 1 Lucian, Deorum concilium 3 Lucian, Quomodo historia conscribenda sit 1 Lucian, Dialogi mortuorum 2 Lucian, Dialogi deorum 1 Lycurgus, Against Leocrates 1 Lysias, Against Agoratus 6 Lysias, On the Property of Aristophanes 1 Lysias, On the Scrutiny of Evandros 1 Lysias, Against Ergocles 1 Pseudo-Xenophon, Constitution of the Athenians 1 Pausanias, Description of Greece 11 Plato, Laws 2 Plato, Republic 1 Plato, Apology 1 Plato, Euthyphro 1 Plato, Statesman 1 Plato, Alcibiades 1 3 Plato, Gorgias 3 Plato, Protagoras 1 Polybius, Histories 35 Plutarch, Aemilius Paulus 3 Plutarch, Agis 1 Plutarch, Alcibiades 3 Plutarch, Antony 1 Plutarch, Aratus 2 Plutarch, Aristides 3 Plutarch, Cimon 1 Plutarch, Demetrius 1 Plutarch, Nicias 6 Plutarch, Pericles 4 Plutarch, Romulus 1 Plutarch, Solon 4 Plutarch, Brutus 1 Plutarch, Camillus 2 Plutarch, Cato the Younger 3 Plutarch, Cleomenes 2 Plutarch, Comparison of Lysander and Sulla 1 Plutarch, Lives, Caius Marius Coriolanus 3 Plutarch, Crassus 1 Plutarch, Demosthenes 6 Plutarch, Dion 6 Plutarch, Fabius Maximus 3 Plutarch, Marcellus 1 Plutarch, Pelopidas 1 Plutarch, Phocion 8 Plutarch, Pompey 4 Plutarch, Publicola 2 Plutarch, Sertorius 1 Plutarch, Sulla 2 Plutarch, Tiberius Gracchus 4 Plutarch, Timoleon 6 Plutarch, Caesar 1 Plutarch, Lycurgus 4 Plutarch, Caius Marius 4 Plutarch, Pyrrhus 1 Plutarch, Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 1 Plutarch, Septem sapientium convivium 1 Plutarch, Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata 4 Plutarch, Regnum et imperatorum apophthegmata 4 Plutarch, Apophthegmata Laconica 1 Plutarch, Apophthegmata Laconica 1 Plutarch, Parallelia minora 1 Plutarch, De defectu oraculorum 2 Plutarch, An virtus doceri possit 1 Plutarch, De garrulitate 1 Plutarch, Quaestiones Convivales 5 Plutarch, An seni respublica gerenda sit 1 Plutarch, Praecepta gerendae reipublicae 1 Plutarch, Vitae decem oratorum 2 Strabo, Geography 1 Theophrastus, Characters 4 Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War 32 Xenophon, Anabasis 3 Xenophon, Apology 1 Xenophon, Hellenica 14 Xenophon, Memorabilia 2

Additional Ekklēsia Occurrences within Non-Greco-Roman Literary Works:
Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae 40, Flavius Josephus, De bello Judaico libri vii 7, Flavius Josephus, Vita 1, Greek Anthology, Volume V 1, Elegy and Iambus, Volume I 1, Elegy and Iambus, Volume II 1
Appendix #7: *Ekklēsia* as Voluntary Association Terminology

English translations by Patrick Hogan

I. Previously Suggested Examples of *Ekklēsia* as Voluntary Association Terminology

(1) An Association of the Wrestlers held an *Ekklēsia*.

McCabe 1986, no. 119/Samos 119


Regions: Aegean Islands, incl. Crete (IG XI--XIII): Samos (IG XII, 61)
With Leukippos presiding; on the seventh day of the month of Lenaion it was resolved by the athletes in the palaistra of the elders, who were gathered in an assembly (ekklesia): since Histiodoros the son of Herodes has from the beginning been desirous of fame and continues to show himself attentive and dedicated to the athletes among the elders; and since while serving as gymnasiarch, he has conducted himself well in all the matters pertaining to his office and has not omitted any opportunity for pursuing honor; and since he showed suitable care for the supply of olive oil; therefore, in order that we too show ourselves to be people who honor good and noble men in a fashion worthy of their benefactions towards us – it has been resolved by the koinon of the older athletes in the palaistra of the elders that Histiodoros the son of Herodes be praised for his excellent conduct towards the athletes...

(2) A Merchant Association of Tyrian Herakles held an Ekklesia in the Temple of Apollos

IDelos 1519/ ID 1519/CIG 2271/Foucart no. 43

http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main?url=oi%3Fikey%3D63955%26bookid%3D1%26region%3D7%26subregion%3D15
Regions: Aegean Islands, incl. Crete (IG XI-[XIII]): Delos (IG XI and ID)
Delos — 153/2 BCE

ἐπὶ Φαιδρίου ἀρχοντος, Ἕλαφηβολιώνος ὁγδόει, ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· Διονύσιος Διονυσίου ἄρχηται εἶπεν· ἐπείδη Πάτρων Δωροθέου τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνόδου, ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἀνανεωσάμενος τὴν ύπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι εὐνοίαν εἰς τὴν σῦνοδον, καὶ ὁ πολλάς χρείαις παρείσχεται ἀπροφασίστως, διατελεῖ δὲ διὰ παντὸς κο[ι]-νεῖ τε τῇ συνόδῳ λέγων καὶ πράττειν τὰ συμφέροντα καὶ κατ' ἱ-δίαν εὐνοὺς ύπάρχον ἐκάστωι τῶν πλοιζομένων

10 ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων, νῦν [δ’ ἔτι] μᾶλλον ἐπὶ ηὐζημέ-
νης αὐτῆς μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐνοίας παρεκάλεσες τὸ κοινὸν ἐξαποστείλαι πρεσβεῖαν πρὸς τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθη-
ναίων ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν ὧν κατασκευάσουσιν τέ-
μενος Ἡρακλέους τοῦ πλείστων [ἀγάθων] παρατίου γ[ε]-

15 γονότος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀρχηγοῦ δὲ τῆς πατρίδος ὑπὸ [ρ]-
χοντος· αἱρεθεὶς πρεσβευτὴς πρὸς τὴν βουλήν καὶ τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, προθύμως ἀναδεξάμενος ἐ-
πλευσεν δαπανῶν ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἐμφανίσας τε τὴν τῆς συνόδου πρὸς τὸν δήμον εὐνοίαν παρεκάλεσεν
αυτόν καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπετελέσατο
tὴν τῶν θειατέων βούλησιν καὶ τὴν τῶν θεῶν τιμήν <συνηύξησεν>
καθαπέρ ἦρμοτεν αὐτῶι περιλανθρωπικῶς δὲ
καὶ πλείονας ἐν τοῖς ἀρμόζουσιν καιροῖς, εἰρήκεν
dὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς συνόδου ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαστάτωι

καὶροῦ τὰ δίκαια μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας καὶ φιλοτι-
μίας καὶ ἐδέξατο τὸ τὸν θίασον ἐφ’ ἡμέρας δύο ὑπὲρ
τοῦ θοῦ· Ίνα οὖν καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἀπαρά-
κιλητὸν ἐαυτὸν παρασκευάζῃ καὶ ἡ σύνοδος φαί-
nηται φροντίζουσα τῶν διακειμένων ἀνδρῶν εἰς ἐαυ-

τὴν εὐνοικῶς καὶ ἀξίας χάριτας ἀποδιδοῦσα τοῖς
eὐεργέταις καὶ ἔτεροι πλείονες τῶν ἐκ τῆς τοῖς συνό-
dου διὰ τὴν εἰς τοῦτον εὐχαριστίαν ἤζωται γί-
nωνται καὶ παραμιλλῶνται φιλοτιμούμενοι

περιποιεῖν τι τει συνόδωι· ἀγαθὴ τύχει·

δεδόχθαι τοίς κοινῷ τῶν Τυρίων Ὅρκλειστῶν
ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων ἐπαινέσαι Πάτρων Δω-
ροθέου καὶ στεφανώσαι αὐτὸν κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν χρυ-
σῶν στεφάνων ἐν ταῖς συντε[λού]μεναις θυσίαις
τῶι Ποσειδώνι ἄρτητι ἔνεκεν καὶ καλοκαγαθί-

ας ἢς ἔχων διατελεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Τυρί-
ων ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων· ἀναθείναι δὲ αὐ-
tοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα γραπτὴν ἐν τοίς τεμένει τοῦ
‘Ἡρακλέος καὶ ἀλλαχῆ ὧν ἀν αὐτῶς βούληται· ἔσ-
tω δὲ ἁσμόβολος καὶ ἀλειτοῦχητος ἐν ταῖς

γινομέναις συνόδοις πάσαις· ἐπιμελές δὲ ἔστω
tοῖς καθισταμένοις ἀρχιθνασίταις καὶ ταμίας
καὶ τῶι γραμματεῖ ὅπως ἐν ταῖς γινομέναις θυ-
σίαις καὶ συνόδοις ἀναγορεύηται κατὰ ταύτην
τὴν ἀναγόρευσιν· ἡ σύνοδος τῶν Τυρίων ἐμπό-

ρων καὶ ναυκλήρων στεφανοὶ Πάτρων Δωροθέου
ἐνεργέτην· ἀναγραφάτωσαν δὲ τόδε τὸ ψῆ-
φισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ σημάτωσαν ἐν

tῶν τεμένει τοῦ Ὅρκλεος· τὸ δὲ ἔσομεν ἀνάλομο[α]

εἰς ταύτα μερισάτω ὁ ταμίας καὶ ὁ ἀρχιθνασίτης.
With the archon Phaidrias presiding; on the eighth day of Elaphebolion an assembly (ekklesia) was held in the sanctuary of Apollo. Dionysios the son of Dionysios, the head of the association, proposed: since Patron the son of Dorotheos, a member of the synod, has come to the assembly (ekklesia) and renewed the goodwill that he has shown to the synod; and because without hesitation he has supplied many of the needs of the synod, and he continues in every way to speak and act in a way beneficial to the common synod, and to remain personally well-disposed to each of the maritime merchants and ship-owners; and since now with the goodwill of the gods thus increased the koinon has asked him to serve on an embassy to the people of Athens to request that a place may be given to them where they will establish a sacred precinct for Herakles, who has been responsible for the majority of the benefits enjoyed by mankind and who is the leader of the country; and since having been chosen as an ambassador to the council and people of Athens, he eagerly undertook the task and sailed at his own private expense, and he made the request while showing the goodwill of the synod towards the people of Athens, and for this reason he accomplished the will of the members of the association, and he increased the honor shown to the gods, just as it was fitting for him to do; and since he dealt in a kindly fashion with many people at appropriate times, and also spoke justly on behalf of the synod at a very critical moment with every mark of eagerness and ambition; and since he hosted the association for two days on behalf of his son. - [IN] Therefore, in order that he keep himself willing and able to serve henceforth; and in order that the synod show its kind consideration of men so well disposed towards it and render to its benefactors worthy thanks; and in order that more other men belonging to this synod may emulate him because of the thanks shown to him, and that they be ambitious to surpass him in benefiting the synod. - Good Fortune - Let it be resolved by the synod of the Tyrian Merchants and Ship-owners of Herakles to praise Patron the son of Dorotheos and grant him a golden crown for a year during the sacrifices performed for Poseidon on account of the excellence, goodness, and nobility that he continues to have towards the koinon of the Tyrian Merchants and Ship-owners; and to dedicate a painted image of him in the sacred precinct of Herakles and in another place of his choosing; let him be exempt from making contributions and performing liturgies in all the synods; and let the chiefs,
treasurers, and secretary of the association see to it that during the sacrifices and synods he is publicly announced in the following way: “The synod of the Tyrian Merchants and Ship-owners crowns Patron the son of Dorotheos as its benefactor.” Let them record this decree on a stone stele, and let them set it up in the sacred precinct of Herakles, and let the treasurer and head of the association divide the expense thus incurred for these measures.

With Dionysios the son of Dionysios presiding as the head of association, and Patron the son of Dorotheos serving as priest.

The people of Athens.

The synod of the Tyrian Merchants and Ship-owners.1035

(3) *IGLAM* 1381–1382/CIG 4342


Zeno the son of Theodoros, the manager of theater, dedicated this. He donated 3,000 towards a gymnastic contest celebrating his birthday, and he gave gardens by the hippodrome as a gift to the auspicious assembly (*ekklesia*).


The council and the people honored Zeno the son of Theodoros, the manager of the theater and of the public works of the city...for giving gardens by the hippodrome as a gift to the auspicious assembly (*ekklesia*).

(4) *OGIS* 488


(b) For the online version of *OGIS*, vol. 1 see: http://www.archive.org/stream/orientisgraeciin01dittuoft#page/656/mode/2up

(c) For the online version of *OGIS*, vol. 2 see: http://www.archive.org/stream/orientisgraeciin02dittuoft#page/n5/mode/2up

For *OGIS* 488, see volume 2, pp. 121–122.

1035 See also the full translation of *IDelos* 1519 in *AGRW* no. 223.
Greek text of OGIS 488
Ἐν Καστωλλῷ χώμῃ Φιλαδελφών, γενομένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν χωμητῶν πάντων, καὶ βουλευσαμένων αὐτῶν διελέσθαι τὸν ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς ἀγρὸν ἐν τοῖς ιδίοις ὁρισι τόπῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Ἀγάθωνος μάνδραις ὑπαρχόν, ἔφ’ ὧν πάντες ὦ χωμῆται—]}

Latin comment by OGIS editor in Note 3:
Hoc unum est exemplum γερουσίας pagi, sed collatis eis quae not. 2 exposita sunt hoc nihil miri habet. Non est cur dubitemus, quin etiam in pago, ut in civitatibus Asianis, gerusia collegium hominum aetate provectiorum fuerit.

English Translation:
In the village of Kastollos of the Philadelphians, after an assembly (ekklesia) was held by the gerousia and by the rest of the villagers, and after the councilors resolved to divide up a field that lay within the boundaries of their village, in the place called Agathon’s, a field that was bounded by hills, since all the villagers...
II. New Example

Sinuri Inscriptions (Sinuri 73/8 and 24a/22)
The group indicated in Sinuri 73 and 22 is a syngeneia, not a polis nor a koinon. A syngeneia is a kinship based group, whether biological or mythical. The syngeneia in Sinuri 73 appears to be either some local group or a ‘virtual’ group within a group. Its identity in the fourth century (Sinuri 73/8) is not clear but in the Hellenistic period (Sinuri 24a/22) a different syngeneia met there which clearly was some kind of subdivision of Mylasa. Louis Robert’s investigations appear to support an identification of the 4th century BCE syngeneia at Sinuri as being functionally equivalent to a voluntary association. See Le Sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa (Paris: L’institut français d’archéologie de Stamboul, 1945); idem., “Decret d’une syngeneia Carienne au sanctuaire de Sinuri,” Hellenica VII (1949): 59–68.

Sinuri 73 = Sinuri 8 in PHI
http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main?url=oi%3Fikey%3D262400%26region%3D3D8%26subregion%3D2627%26bookid%3D524%26caller%3Dsearch%26start%3D152%26end%3D164
Honorary decree of syngeneis of Peleũs for [ ... ] Nesaios, with curse for violation, on two fragments of white marble; 350/344 BCE; found at Sinuri. Robert, Sinuri no. 73 (PH); Robert, Sinuri no. 73 (PH); Robert, Sinuri no. 73 (PH); Robert, Sinuri no. 73 (PH); BE 1944:168; Wilhelm, 1944:168; Wilhelm, SAWW 224, IV, 1947, 3-5, 11-20 (= Akadschr. III 251-253, 259-268); BE 1948:215; Hellenica 7, 63-64; BE 1950:181; *Hornblower, Mausolus M5.

Hornblower, Mausolus M5
1
[έδοξεν] Πελεκωδος συγγενεύσι
[συνελθούσι πάσιν' vacat]
[έκκλησις κυρίης γενομένης EN.
[c.4.] Νησαιωι καλοί κάγαθωι vacat
5
[γεγε]νημένωι εις αυτούς καὶ ἐμπε[δύσαντι?]
[c.4. τὴν ἐντολὴν τὴν 'Ιδριέως καὶ 'Αδα[ς καὶ?]
[c.6. Ἀσθαὶ αδελφὸν ἐαυτῶν αὐτ[ὸν τε]
[καὶ ἐκγ[όνοις το[ῦ]ς τότο[υ] εἰς τὸν ἀ[ei χρόνον]
[μετέ]χοντα πάντων ὁσων? καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις μετα]-
10
[διδο]ται Πελεκωδος συγγε[νεύσι καὶ]
[δεδο]σθαὶ αὐτ[ῶι E.EN.φ[όρη]ων[?]
[πάν]των ἀπέλειαν πλήν ἀπο[μαίν]των]
[ἐὰν δὲ της ταύτης παραβαίνη ἡ ἅκυρα π[οιη]τοῖς]
[ἐπικα]τάρατος ἐστω αὐτός τε καὶ τὰ τοῦ[τοι]
It was resolved by all the assembled families of Pelekōs: during a legally held assembly (ekklesia) for Nisaios, who has been a noble and good man towards them and who has enforced the ordinance of Idris and Adas...their own brother and the descendants of this man henceforth and who shared in all...He is given a share with the other families of Pelekōs. and that he receive immunity from taxes without contribution. And if anyone violates these resolutions or renders them invalid, let him be accursed and all his (property be excluded) from this god.

**Sinuri 24a = Sinuri 22 in PHI**

http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main?url=oi%3Fikey%3D262414%26region%3D8%26subregion%3D27%26bookid%3D524%26caller%3Dsearch%26start%3D19%26end%3D129

Fragment of honorary (?) decree of kyria [ekklesia] mentioning [...] Leō[n]tos], on block of white marble; Hellenistic?; found at Sinuri: *Robert, Sinuri no. 24a (PH); ΒΕ 1944:168.

**Robert, Sinuri no. 24a**

1
[—] Λέοντες —
[τος —] κυρίας
[ἐκκλησίας —]
[—] ἈΗΣ
5
[—] Ὄπια
[—] ΣΑΝ
Appendix #8: Synagō and Eis Ekklēsian: Greek Sources

I. Greek Writers Pairing Synagō With Ekklēsia But Not With Eis Ekklēsian

Thucydides (c. 460 BC – c. 395 BC; Athens; The Peloponnesian War 2.60.1) Xenophon (c. 430 – 354 BC; Athens; Anabasis 1.3.2) and Demosthenes (384–322 BCE; Athens; Letters; 1.5).

II. Greek Inscriptions Pairing Synagō With Ekklēsia But Not With Eis Ekklēsian

Samos 4 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)

συναχθῆναι μὲν τ[ήν ἐκκλησίαν? —]

Samos 119 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)

ἐδοξὲν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῇ γεροντικῆ παλαίστρα, συναχθείσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν·

Samos 120 (n.d.; Samos, Aegean Islands)

1 ἐπὶ Τίμωνος Τ[αυρεβόνος ἐμβολίμου νουμηνία· ἐκκλη[σίας συναχθείσης·

Aphrodisias/BCH 1972, 443–45 (1st cent BCE(?); Aphrodisias, Caria, Asia Minor)

Honorary decree of koinon of Hellenes in Asia for Dionysios Iasonos and Hierokles Iasonos of Aphrodisias and Tralles; I; found at Aphrodisias καὶ κληθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου συναχθεῖσης ἐκκλησίας

IvO 52 (138 BCE; Olympia, Elis, Peloponnesos)

ἐκκλησία συνήχθη κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ ἐν τῇ προειρημένη ἡμέρᾳ,

Milet I 3, 145/Miletos 42 (200/199 BCE; Ephesos, Ionia, Asia Minor)

Honorary decree for Eudemos Thallionos, who established and regulated administration of school;

τῇ δὲ ὁγδόη ἀνομένου τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς, ἐπειτὰ ἡ ἐκκλησία συναχθῇ, τίθεσθαι ἐν τῇ ὥρχιστρα τρίποδα καὶ θυμίατρον, τοὺς δὲ ἱερεῖς τὸν τε τοῦ ἔρμου τοῦ ἔναγωνου τοῦ ἐν τῇ παλαίστρᾳ τῶν παίδων καὶ τόν τῶν Μουσῶν καὶ τόν ἱεροκήρυκα καὶ τοὺς κεχειροτονη

EKM 1. Beroia 1 (200–166 BCE; Makedonia [Bottiaia] — Beroia, Macedonia, northern Greece)

synaxheisēs ἐκκλησίας Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου, ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρᾶ, Κάλλιππος Ἰπποστράτου ἔπαιν·

Rigsby, Asylia 52c (242 BCE; Askleion, Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)


[καὶ τῶν θεωρῶν συναχθείσις ὑπὸ τ]ῶν στρατηγῶν ἐκκλησ[ίας]·
SEG 51:1055 (242 BCE; Asklepieion, Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)
Decree of an Ionian city concerning the asylia of Kos. No description.
[καὶ τῶν θεωρῶν συναχθείς ὑπὸ τί ὀν στρατηγῶν ἐκκλησίας]

IosPE P 33 (3rd cent. BCE(?); Olbia, north shore of the Black Sea)
tῶν δὲ ἀρχόντων συναγαγόντων ἐκκλησίαν

SEG 47:1280 (post-241 BCE; Asklepieion [stoich.], Cos and Calyma, Aegean Islands)
Decree of Samos?

IMT Adram Kolpos 732 (319–317 BCE; Aiol.Mys.: Adramyttenos Kolpos — Nasos/Poroselene? [Alibey Ad.]: Nasos [Dulapi], Mysia, Asia Minor)
eἰς μίκρον συνάγαγε; Ιμπλιμπλιμπλιμπερσασ

SEG 25:687 (Hellenistic period; Thessalia [Magnesia] — Korope, Thessaly, central Greece).
Regulations concerning the cult of Zeus Akraios.

Iasos 4.33-110/Iasos 4 (195/190 BCE; found at Iasos, Caria, Asia Minor)
Honorary decree of demos (of Iasos) for King Antiochos (III) and Queen Laodike (III)

Sardis 7,1 8 (5–1 BCE; Lyd. — Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)
ἔπι τοῦ Γαίων χαράν καὶ περὶ ὀλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εὐνοιαν, παραγενόμενος τε ἐν τῇ συναχθείς δημοτελεί ἐκ-κλησίαν τῆν ἀποπρεπεῖαν ἐποιείτο, ο δὲ δήμος ἀποδέξαμεν αὐτόν

Sardis 7,1 8 (5–1 BCE; Lyd. — Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)

IGRR 4.1756 (5–1 BCE; Lyd. — Sardeis, Lydia, Asia Minor)

IC II xii 20 (227–224[?] BCE; Crete, W. — Eleutherna, Crete, Aegean Islands)
ἐὰν δὲ μὴ συναγαγόσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἢ τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς μὴ προσαγάγοσθαι ἢ χρηματίσωσιν ἀλλὰ τί πρὶν ἢ ἀπόκρισιν δοῦναι τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς,
IC II xii 20 (227–224[?] BCE; Crete, W. — Eleutherna, Crete, Aegean Islands) συναγέτωσαν [οι κόσμοι την ἐκκλησίαν ἐν δέκα ἡμέραις ἄφ’ ἢς ἄν πα[ραγένονται οἱ πρεσβευταί).

Melete mata 11 K1 (late 2nd to mid-1st cents BCE; Macedonia [Mygdonia] — Kalindoia [area of Kalamoto, Macedonia], northern Greece)

III. Inscriptions Pairing Synagō With Unmodified Eis Ekklēsian

Only one inscription: Samos 119 ἔδωξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῇ γεροντικῇ παλαιστραί, συναχθέσιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

IV. Literary Authors Pairing Synagō With Unmodified Eis Ekklēsian

Polybius (ca. 200–118 BC; Arcadia of Macedonia)

Polybius uses synagō plus ekklēsia 13 times
Polybius uses synagō plus unmodified eis ekklēsian 5 times

Polybius, Histories

book 1, chapter 45: [2] θουλόμενος ἀκεραίοις ἀποχρήσασθαι ταῖς ἐκατέρων ὁρμαῖς πρὸς τὴν διά τοῦ πυρὸς ἐπίθεσιν τοὺς ἔργοις, συνήγη πάντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν:
[2] He wished to take advantage of the excited feelings of both parties, before they cooled, in order to organise an attempt to set fire to the works of the besiegers. He therefore summoned the whole army to a meeting,


[6] As for Philip, being in need of corn and money for his army, he summoned the Achaeans to a general assembly by means of their magistrates. [7] When the assembly[not ekklesia but plethos] had met, according to the federal law,

[10] Seeing what the disposition of the magistrates was, Caecilius demanded that the public assembly should be summoned, to which the Achaeans magistrates demanded to see the instructions which he had from the Senate on these points: and when he gave no answer to this demand, they said that they would not summon the assembly for him

book 22, chapter 12: [5] Ἀπελογήθησαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Καικίλιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχόντων ὁι παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρέσβεις ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ, φάσκοντες οὕθεν ἀδικεῖν αὐτοὺς οὐδ' ἀξίους ἐγκλήματος ὑπάρχειν ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ συνάγειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν:
[5] But the ambassadors from the Achaeans offered an explanation also to Caecilius in the Senate, on behalf of the magistrates, asserting that "They did not act wrongly or deserve blame for refusing to summon the assembly,


book 23, chapter 5: [16] ἐπεὶ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς Ναύπακτον ἔγραψε τῷ στρατηγῷ καὶ τοῖς δαμιουργοῖς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, κελεύων συνάγειν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν,
[16] Having landed at Naupactus, Flamininus addressed a despatch to the Strategus and Demiurgi bidding them summon the Achaeans to an assembly; to which they wrote back that "they would do so, if he would write them word what the subjects were on which he wished to confer with the Achaeans;"


Diodorus Siculus (Sicily, wrote between 60 and 30 BCE).
Diodorus uses synagō plus ekklēsia 18 times.
Four time he uses synagō plus unmodified eis ekklēsian
One time he uses synagō plus unmodified eis tēn ekklēsian

book 14, chapter 38: [4]... ὡς παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἡράκλειαν συνήγαγεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὰ πλήθη, καὶ περιστήμας αὐτοῖς ὀπλίτας συνέλαβε τοὺς αἰτίους καὶ πάντας ἀνείλεν, ἄντας περὶ πεντακοσίους.
[4]...As soon as Herippidas arrived in Heracleia he called an assembly of the people, and surrounding them with his hoplites, he arrested the authors of the discord and put them all to death, some five hundred in number.


book 15, chapter 74: [5] ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος ὁ νεώτερος διαδεξάμενος τὴν τυραννίδα, πρῶτον τὰ πλήθη συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν παρεκάλεσε τοῖς ὁικείοις λόγοις τηρεῖν τὴν πατρισιαράδοτον πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐνοιαν, ἐπεῖτα τὸν πατέρα
[5] Dionysius the younger on his succession to the tyranny first gathered the populace in an assembly and urged them in appropriate words to maintain toward him the loyalty that passed to him with the heritage that he had received from his father;

book 16, chapter 10: [3]... το/uni1F7Aς δ/uni1F72 /uni1F04λλους /uni1F10κ τ/uniFF6ν δυνατ/uni1FF6ν το/uni1FD6ς παρατυχο/uni1FE6σιν /uni1F45πλοις 
sυνεσκεύασεν. συναγαγ/uni1F7Cν δ/uni1FBD /uni1F05παντας ε/uni1F30ς κοιν/uni1F74ν /uni1F10κκλησίαν /uni1F00πεφαίνετο /uni03BC/uni1F72ν /uni1F11αυτ/uni1F78ν 
κειν /uni1F10π/uni1F76 τ/uni1F74ν /uni1F10λευθέρωσιν τ/uniFF6ν Σικελιωτ/uni1FF6ν,
[3]...and equipped the rest as well as he could with weapons that came to hand. Then 
having brought them all to a general assembly, he disclosed that he had come for the 
liberation of the Greeks of Sicily, 

Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes with an English Translation 

book 17, chapter 94: [5] ώσ δ’ ἐπανηλθον οἱ στρατιώται πολλῶν πλῆθος ἁγαθῶν ἐκ τῆς 
προνομῆς εὐρήκοτες συνήγη πάντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. διελθὸν δὲ λόγον πεφρονιησμένον 
περὶ τῆς ἔπι τοὺς Γανδαρίδας 
[5] When the soldiers returned laden with wealth from their expedition, he brought them 
together to a meeting. He delivered a carefully prepared speech about the 
expedition against the Gandaridae

Plutarch (46–120 CE; born to a prominent family in Chaeronea, Boeotia, a town about 
twenty miles east of Delphi)
Plutarch uses synagō plus ekklēsia 15 times
Plutarch uses synagō plus unmodified eis ekklēsian 7 times

Plutarch, Aemilius Paulus
chapter 11: [1] εἰωθότων δὲ τῶν ὑπάτειάν λαβόντων οἰον ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι τινα χάριν 
καὶ προσαγορεύειν φιλοφρόνως τὸν δήμον ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος, Αἰμίλιος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν 
συναγαγὼν τοὺς πολίτας τὴν μὲν προτέραν ὑπάτειαν μετελθεῖν ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀρχῆς 
δεόμενος
11. [1] It was the custom for those who obtained the consulship to return thanks, as it 
were, for the great favour in a friendly speech to the people from the rostra; but Aemilius, 
having gathered an assembly of the citizens, said he had sued for his first consulship 
because he himself wanted office,


Plutarch, Caesar
chapter 19: [2]... συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐκέλευσεν ἄπιέναι καὶ μὴ κινδυνεύειν παρὰ 
γνώμην οὕτως ἀνάνδρως καὶ μαλακῶς ἥροντας, αὐτὸς δὲ ἔφη τοῦ δέκατον τάγμα 
μόνον παραλαβόν ἔπι τοὺς βαρβάρους πορεύεσθαι,
[2]… he called them together[^2] [“into assembly” is implied] and bade them be off, since they were so unmanly and effeminate, and not force themselves to face danger; as for himself, he said he would take the tenth legion alone and march against the Barbarians; *Plutarch. Plutarch’s Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1919. 7.


**Plutarch, Caius Marius**

*chapter 33: [3]… ως ἀνεχώρησαν ἁμφότεροι, συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς στρατιώτας, Ἀπορῶ, φησί, πότερον εἰπὼ τοὺς πολεμίους ἀνανδροτέρους ἢ ύμᾶς: [3]… and both sides had withdrawn, he called an assembly of his soldiers and said to them: ‘I do not know whether to call the enemy or you the greater cowards; *Plutarch. Plutarch’s Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1920. 9.


**Plutarch, Fabius Maximus**

*chapter 3: [4]… peri δὲ ταύτης ως πρώτων ἢκουσεν ὁ στρατηγὸς Πομπύνιος, συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸν δήμον ὡς περιπλοκάς ὀυδὲ παραγωγάς ἀλλ’ ἀντικρῆς ἐφῆ προσελθὼν ‘Νενικήθα, ὡς ἄνδρες Ῥωμαίοι, μεγάλη μάχη,
[4] but as soon as Pomponius the praetor heard of this second defeat, he called an assembly of the people, faced it, and without roundabout or deceptive phrases, but in downright fashion, said: ‘Men of Rome, we have been beaten in a great battle; *Plutarch. Plutarch’s Lives*, with an English Translation by. Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1916. 3.


**Plutarch, Lycurgus**

*chapter 29: [1]… οὕτως ἀγαθεῖς καὶ ἀγαπήσας τὸ τῆς νομοθεσίας κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος ἐν ξέρω γενομένης καὶ ὁδῷ βαδιζόμενης, ἐπεθύμησαν, ὡς ἰσοπάποι ἐπὶ ἀνθρωπίνης προνοίας, ἀδάνατον αὐτήν ἀπολιπεῖν καὶ ἀκίνητον εἰς τὸ μέλλον, συναγαγὼν οὐν ἀπαντας εἰς ἐκκλησίαν,


**Plutarch, Pericles**

*chapter 33: [5] τὸν δὲ δήμον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν οὐ συνήηγε δεδιώς βιασθήναι παρὰ γνώμην, ἀλλ’ ὠσπερ νεώς κυβερνήτης ἀνέμου κατιόντος ἐν πελάγει θέμενος εῦ πάντα καὶ κατατείνητα τὸ ὀπλα χρήτα τῇ τέχνῃ,
And he would not call the people together into an assembly, fearing that he would be constrained against his better judgement, like the helmsman of a ship, who, when a stormy wind swoops down upon it in the open sea, makes all fast, takes in sail, and exercises his skill,


Chapter 43: [2] εὕθς οὖν ἐπιβάς Ἰταλίας ὁ Πομπηῖος καὶ συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ τά πρέποντα διαλεχθέος καὶ φιλοφρονησάμενος,

[2] Pompey, accordingly, as soon as he set foot in Italy, held an assembly of his soldiers, and after he had said what fitted the occasion, and had expressed his gratitude and affection for them,


Pausanias (2nd century CE during Hadrian, Antonius Pius, Marcus Aurelius; a native of Lydia; he was certainly familiar with the western coast of Asia Minor, but his travels extended far beyond the limits of Ionia. Before visiting Greece, he had been to Antioch, Joppa and Jerusalem)
Pausanias uses *synagō* plus *ekklēsia* only once.
Pausanias pairs *synagō* with the unmodified phrase *eis ekklēsian* only once.

Description of Greece

book 4, chapter 5: [6]... οἱ δὲ τῶν Μεσσηνίων βασιλείς τοὺς μὲν πρέσβεσιν ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι βουλευόμενοι μετὰ τοῦ δήμου τὰ δόξαντα ἐπιστελούσιν ἐς Σπάρτην, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνων ἀπελθόντων ἐς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς πολίτας συνήγον.

[6]...The Messenian kings replied to the ambassadors that after deliberation with the people they would send the findings to Sparta and after their departure they themselves summoned the citizens to a meeting.

Appendix #9: Verbs with Eis Ekklēsian: Josephus

I. Antiquities of the Jews

A. Eis Ekklēsian and No Verb

(1) book 4, section 22: (rebellion against Moses) ἀνηρέθιστο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ βάλλειν τὸν Μωυσῆν ώρμήκεσαν, εἰς τε ἐκκλησίαν ἀκόσμως μετὰ θορύβου καὶ ταραχῆς συνελέγοντο, καὶ πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς του θεου στάντες ἐβόων ἥκειν τὸν τύραννον καὶ τῆς ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ δουλείας ἀπηλλάχθαι τὸ πλῆθος, τῇ τοῦ θεου προφάσει βίας προστάγματα κελεύοντος

(2) book 19, section 332: (rebellion against King Agrippa) Καὶ δὴ τις ἐν τοῖς Ἰεροσολύμοις ἀνήρ ἐπιχύριος ξακριβάζειν δοκεῖν τὸ νόμιμον, Αἰαὼν ἡν ὁνομα τούτῳ, πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἀλίας τηνικάδε τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς Καισάρειαν ἔκδημηκότος ἐτόλμησαν αὐτοῦ καταταγεῖν, ὡς οὐχ ὅσιος εἰς, δικαίως δ᾽ ἂν εἰργοῖτο τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς εἰσόδου προσηκούσης τοῖς ἐγγενέσιν

B. Synagogō and Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 3, section 300: (Moses) εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν θροίζει τὸ πλῆθος

C. Other Verbs and Eis Ekklēsian

Athroizō and Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 3, section 300: (Moses) εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἄθροιζε τὸ πλῆθος

Dialuō and Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 3, section 306: (Moses) Οὐ δὲ ἀπορον ἡκουσαντο τὴν κτῆσιν τῆς γῆς ὑπελάβασαν καὶ διαλυθέντες ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅπως γυναῖξι καὶ παισίν ὀλοφυρόμενοι διήλθην, ὡς οὗτον ἐργώ τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθοῦντος λόγῳ δὲ μόνον ὑπεπαινομένου

Exreō and Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 3, section 292: (Jehoshaphat) ἐχρωντο τοῦ πλῆθους εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας: Heikō and Eis Ekklēsian

(1) book 4, section 24: (Moses) ἤκειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

383
Parerchomai and Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 9, section 10: (Jehoshaphat) τις προφήτης παρελθ/νεσήν τήν ἐκκλησίαν
Proagō and Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 16, section 393: (Herod) καὶ προαγαγῶν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τριακοσίους
(Syn)Kalēō and Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 3, section 84: (Moses) οὖν συγκαλέσας τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
(2) book 7, section 370: (King David) εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συγκαλέσας τοὺς ἄρχοντας
(3) book 12, section 164: (Joseph, son of Tobias, nephew of Onias the high priest) συγκαλέσας τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
(4) book 13, section 216: (Simon Maccabeus, high priest and ethnarch) καὶ δῇ τούτ’ ἔπειθεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καλέσας τὸ πλῆθος
Synerchomai and Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 4, section 35: (Moses) τῇ δ’ ἐπιούσῃ συνήλθον εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρατευχόμενοι
(2) book 9, section 250: (King Pekah [implied]) ὁ δὲ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν λαὸς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνελθὼν
Syntrexō Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 3, section 307: (rebellion against Moses and Aaron) πρωὶ δ’ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συντρέχουσι, δι’ ἐννοιας ἔχοντες καταλεύσαντες τὸν τε Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἀρώνα ἐπὶ τὴν Αἰγυπτον ὑποστρέφειν,

II. Jewish War

A. Synagō and Eis Ekklēsian
(11) book 1, section 666: (Queen Salome) ἥδη τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ συνῆγον αὐτούς εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

B. Other Verbs and Eis Ekklēsian
Proeimi and Eis Ekklēsian
(1) book 1, section 654: (Herod) γενόμενος πρόεισιν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
Synerchomai and Eis Ekklēsian
(3) book 4, section 162: (Ananus) Καὶ δὴ συνελθόντος τοῦ πλῆθους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
Athroiō and Eis Ekklēsian
(2) book 7, section 412: (The principal men of the gerousia) ὁρῶντες δ’ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπόνοιαν οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας οὐκέτ’ ἀσφαλές αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον περιοράν, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀθροίσαντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς ἱουδαίους
Appendix #10: Categorization of *Ekklēsia* Occurrences in the New Testament

**Four Definitional Categories for New Testament Uses of the Word *Ekklēsia***

1. = a title for the semi-public, ritual assembly or meeting of early Christ-followers;  
2. = the collective sum of all Christ-followers while gathered together in assembly;  
3. = a collective designation for those self-same Christ-followers even outside of their assembly times;  
4. = a reference to the supra-local, or universal *ekklēsia*, of which regional *ekklēsiai* are local manifestations.

*NRSV* translates *ekklēsia* occurrences as “church” in 112 verses (114 occurrences).

**Emic or Etic Classification**

*Emic* = a group designation by which the writer’s referents self-identify  
*Etic* = the writer’s own group terminology, which is not also the *emic* terminology of his actual referents. The writer may use his own group terminology because it is more familiar to his reading audience than is the *emic* terminology by which the writer’s referents self-identify.

---

**Latin Text Translations**

**Matt 16:18**

(3) or (4)

*Emic*

καγώ δὲ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ζδοῦ σὺ κατασκεύασοιν αὐτής.

“And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my *ekklēsia*, and the gates of Hell will not prevail against it.”

**Matt 18:17**

(1)(2) or (3)

*Emic*

ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρακούσῃ, ἐστῶ σοι ὡσπέρ ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης.

“If the member refuses to listen to them, tell it to the *ekklēsia*; and if the member refuses to listen even to the *ekklēsia*, let such a one be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector”

**Acts 5:11**

(3)

*Etic*

καὶ ἔγενετο φόβος ἐργαζόμενων τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντως τούτων ἀκούοντας ταῦτα.

“And great fear seized the whole *ekklēsia* and all who heard of these things”

**Acts 7:38**

(2) or (3)

*Emic (using LXX term)*

οὖν ἔστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἄγγελου τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὅραι Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, δέ εἶδον δόγμα ἦν ἡμᾶς δούναι ἡμῖν, Moses is referred to here. “He is the one who was in the *ekklēsia* in the wilderness with the angel who spoke to him at Mount Sinai, and with our ancestors; and he received living oracles to give to us.”

**Acts 8:1**

(3)

*Etic*

Σαλὸς δὲ ἦν συνεδριάσας τῇ ἁναρέσει αὐτοῦ. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ ἡμέρα διωχθὸς μεγάς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς Ἰεροσολύμων, πάντως δὲ διεσπάρθησαν κατὰ τᾶς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας πλῆν τῶν ἀποστόλων.

“A severe persecution began against the *ekklēsia* in Jerusalem.”

**Acts 8:3**

(3)

*Etic*

Σαλὸς δὲ ἐλευθέρως τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κατὰ τοὺς οἰκους εἰσπροευμνός, σὺρὼν τε ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας παρεδίδοσα εἰς φυλακήν.

“A Saul was ravaging the *ekklēsia* by entering house after house.”

**Acts 9:31**

(3)

*Etic*

‘Η μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία καθ’ ὀλίγη τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας εἶχεν εἰρήνην οἰκοδομούμενη καὶ πορευομένη τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιληπθέντοι.

“Meanwhile the *ekklēsia* throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace and was built up”

Acts 11:26 “News of this came to the ears of the ekklēsia in Jerusalem” καὶ εὐρήν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀντίσχειαν. Ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλων συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάσκει ἤχλον ἰκανόν, χρηματίζοντας, πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐν Ἀντίσχειᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανόν.

Acts 12:1 “So it was that for an entire year they met with the ekklēsia and taught a great many people” Κατ’ ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν Ἑρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χειρὰς κακοσαί τινα τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

Acts 12:5 “About that time King Herod laid violent hands upon some who belonged to the ekklēsia τ/μ/ν/π/κ/κκλησίας.

Acts 13:1 ήσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντίσχειᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι τὸ ἐν Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλουμένος Νίγερ καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἑρώδου τοῦ τεταράχρονος σύντροφος καὶ Σαῦλος.

Acts 14:23 “Now in the ekklēsia at Antioch there were prophets and teachers” χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς κατ’ ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους, προσεύχοντες μετὰ νηστειῶν παρέθεντο αὐτὸς τῇ θυρῇ τῆς πίστεως.

Acts 15:3 “And after they had appointed elders for them in each ekklēsia” Οἱ μὲν οὖν προσευχόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησαν ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἠγίσεν τοὺς ἐδεικνύονθαν πίστεις.

Acts 15:4 “When they arrived, they called the ekklēsia together” “And after they had appointed elders for them in each ekklēsia” παραγεγράμμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησαν ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἠγίσεν τοὺς ἐδεικνύονθαν πίστεις.

Acts 15:22 “the apostles and the elders, with the consent of the whole ekklēsia, decided to choose men from among their members” τότε ἐδόξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκλεξαμένους ἀνδρὰς εξ αὐτῶν πέμψαν εἰς Ἀντίσχειαν τοὺς Ἱωάννην καὶ Βαρνάβα, ἵνα ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις Βαρσαββᾶ καὶ Σιλία, ἀνδρὰς ἠγιασμένους εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς,

Acts 15:23 “the apostles and the elders, with the consent of the whole ekklēsia, decided to choose men from among their members” “And after they had appointed elders for them in each ekklēsia” παραγεγράμμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησαν ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἠγίσεν τοὺς ἐδεικνύονθαν πίστεις.

Acts 15:41 “He went through Syria and Cilicia, strengthening the ekklēsiai” διήρχετο δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ καὶ [τῇν] Κιλικίαν ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας.

Acts 16:5 “So the ekklēsiai were strengthened in the faith” Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐπερευθοῦν τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπερίσσευσαν τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ’ ἡμέραν.

Acts 18:22 “He went through Syria and Cilicia, strengthening the ekklēsiai” καὶ κατεδώκοντος εἰς Κασιάραιαν, ἀναβάς καὶ ἀποσαμόσοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατέβη εἰς Ἀντίσχειαν.

Acts 19:32 “some were shouting one thing, some another; for the ekklēsia was in confusion,” ἕλθεν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἐκφάνον· ἵνα γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεκριμένη καὶ οἱ πλειοῦς οὐκ ἠρέσατο τίνος ἐντὸς συνεληλυθησαν.

Acts 19:39 “If there is anything further you want to know, it must be settled in the regular ekklēsia.”
Acts 19:40
(1) or (2)
Emic
καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδὲνός αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος περὶ οὗ [ο]ῦ δυνησώμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον περὶ τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης, καὶ ταύτα εἰπὼν ἀπέλυσεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

“When he had said this, he dismissed the ἐκκλησία.”

Acts 20:17
(2) or (3)
Emic
Ἀνά δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἑφεσον μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

“From Miletus he sent a message to Ephesus, asking the elders of the ἐκκλησία to meet him.”

Acts 20:28
(3) or (4)
Emic
προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ὦ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐδέστο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἴματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

Rom 16:23
(3)
Emic
tο/uni1FE6κκλησί/uni1FB3 το/uni1FE6θεο/uni1FE6τ/uni1FC7ο/uni1F54σ/uni1FC3/uni1F10ν Κορίνθ/uni1FF3, /uni1F21γιασ/uni03BCένοις /uni1F10ν Χριστ/uni1FF7/uni1F38ησο/uni1FE6, κλητο/uni1FD6ς

"To the ἐκκλησία of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son."

Rom 16:16
(3)
Emic
“I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the ἐκκλησία at Cenchreae.”

Rom 16:4
(3)
Emic
ο/uni1F30τινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἀσωτὸν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, οὐς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστοῦ ἄλλα καὶ πάσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἑθῶν,

"to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the ἐκκλησίαι of the Gentiles."

Rom 16:5
(2) or (3)
Emic
καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. ἀσπάσασθε ἑπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, δς ἔστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστὸν.

Emic
"Greetings also the ἐκκλησία in their house.”

Rom 16:16
(3)
Emic
ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλιματίᾳ ἁγίῳ. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Rom 16:23
(3)
Emic
ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γαίος ο ἐξόνος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἑραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός,

“Gaius, who is host to me and to the whole ἐκκλησία, called to be saints, together with all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours.”

Acts 20:17
(2) or (3)
Emic
τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἐν παντὶ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

1 Cor 1:2
(3)
Emic
To the ἐκκλησία of God that is in Corinth, to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, together with all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours.”

1 Cor 4:17
(1) or (3)
Emic
“For this reason I sent you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, to remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus, as I teach them everywhere in every ἐκκλησία.”

1 Cor 6:4
(1)(2) or (3)
Emic
βιωτικά μὲν οὗν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενισμένους εἰς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῦτοις καθίζετε;

“If you have ordinary cases, then, do you appoint as judges those who have no standing in the ἐκκλησία?”

1 Cor 7:17
(1) or (3)
Emic
Εἰ μὴ ἐκάστῳ ως ἐμερίσθημεν τὸ κύριος, ἐκατον ως ἐκκλησίζην ὁ θεός, οὕτως ἐπεριπατεῖτω καὶ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πᾶσαις διατάσσομαι.

“However that may be, let each of you lead the life that the Lord has assigned, to which God called you. This is my rule in all the ἐκκλησίαι.”

1 Cor 10:32
(3)
Emic
Ἀπόδοκοσι καὶ Ὀυδαίας γίνεσθε καὶ Ἑλλησία καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ,

“Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the ἐκκλησία of God.”
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1 Cor 11:16 (3) “But if anyone is disposed to be contentious—we have no such custom, nor do the ekklēsiai of God”

1 Cor 11:18 (1) “when you come together in an ekklēsia [NRSV; “as an ekklēsia”] I hear that there are divisions among you”

1 Cor 11:22 (3) “Or do you show contempt for the ekklēsia of God and humble those who have nothing?”

1 Cor 12:28 (3) “And God has appointed in the ekklēsia first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues.”

1 Cor 14:4 (2) or (3) “but those who prophesy build up the ekklēsia”

1 Cor 14:5 (2) or (3) “unless someone interprets, so that the ekklēsia may be built up”

1 Cor 14:12 (2) or (3) “strive to excel in them for building up the ekklēsia.”

1 Cor 14:19 (1) “nevertheless, in an ekklēsia [NRSV; “in church”] I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.”

1 Cor 14:23 (2) or (3) “If, therefore, the whole ekklēsia comes together and all speak in tongues,”

1 Cor 14:28 (1) “but if there is no one to interpret, let them be silent in the ekklēsia and speak to themselves and to God.”

1 Cor 14:33 (1) “for God is a God not of disorder but of peace. (As in all the ekklēsiai of the saints…”)

1 Cor 14:34 (1) “…women should be silent in the ekklēsiai. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says…”

1 Cor 14:35 (1) “If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in the ekklēsia.”
1 Cor 15:9 'Εγὼ γὰρ εἰμί ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς σύκ εἰμί ἰκανός καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος,
(3) ἤτοι ἔδιωξα τὴν εἰκότητα τοῦ θεοῦ·
Etic “because I persecuted the ekklēsia of God”

1 Cor 16:1 Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους ὡσπερ διέταξα ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας,
(3) οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποίησετε.
Emic “Now concerning the collection for the saints: you should follow the directions I gave to the ekklēsia of Galatia.

Ασπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἀσίας, ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ πολλὰ Ἀκύλας καὶ

1 Cor 16:19 Πρὸ σκαῦν τῇ κατ’ οἴκου ἀυτῶν ἐκκλησία.
(2) or (3) ‘The churches of Asia send greetings’
Emic “Aquila and Prisca, together with the ekklēsia in their house, greet you warmly in the Lord”

2 Cor 1:1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ ᾿Ιησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ο ᾿Αδελφός τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ ὁδῇ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πάσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν δή τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ,
(3) Emic “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, To the ekklēsia of God that is in Corinth, including all the saints throughout Achaia:”

2 Cor 8:1 Γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας,
(3) Emic “We want you to know, brothers and sisters, about the grace of God that has been granted to the ekklēsia of Macedonia;”

2 Cor 8:18 συνεπέψυμεν δὲ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀδελφόν οὗ ᾧ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησίων,
(3) Emic “With him we are sending the brother who is famous among all the ekklēsiai for his proclaiming the good news”

2 Cor 8:19 οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησίων συνεκδῆσθε ἡμῶν σὺν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονομένῃ ὑπ’ ἡμῶν πρὸς τὴν [αὐτοῦ] τοῦ κυρίου δόξαν καὶ (1)(2) or (3) προσβιβαζόμεθα ἡμῶν,
Emic “and not only that, but he has also been appointed by the ekklēsia to travel with us while we are administering this generous undertaking”

2 Cor 8:23 εἶτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου, κοινονός ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός· εἰτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίων, δόξα Χριστοῦ.
(1)(2) or (3) Emic “as for our brothers, they are messengers of the ekklēsiai for the glory of Christ”

2 Cor 8:24 τὴν σὺν ἐνδείξεω τῆς ἁγίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν καυχήσεως ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐνδεκάνωμεν εἰς προσώπων τῶν ἐκκλησίων,
(1)(2) or (3) Emic “Therefore openly before the ekklēsiai, show them the proof of your love”

2 Cor 11:8 ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα λαβὼν ὑπόνιον πρὸς τὴν ὑμᾶς διακονίαν,
(3) Emic “I robbed other ekklēsiai by accepting support from them in order to serve you”

2 Cor 11:28 χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτῶν ἤ ἐπίστασας μοι ἡ καθ’ ἡμέραν, ἢ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησίων.
(3) Emic “I am under daily pressure because of my anxiety for all the ekklēsiai.”

2 Cor 12:13 τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἡσυχήσθη ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ μὴ ὅτι αὕτως ἐγὼ ὑμῖν
(3) κατενάχθη σὺν χώρᾳ· χαίρως χαίρως μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην.
Etic “How have you been worse off than the other ekklēsiai”

Gal 1:2 καὶ οἱ σὺν ἡμῖν πάντες ἀδελφοὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας,
(3) Emic “and all the members of God’s family who are with me. To the ekklēsiai of Galatia”

Gal 1:13 ἦκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἡμᾶς ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ ἴουδαίωμι, ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἔδιωκα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπάρθη αὐτήν,
(3) Etic “I was violently persecuting the ekklēsia of God and was trying to destroy it.”
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Gal 1:22  "And I was still unknown by sight to the ekklēsia of Judea that are in Christ;"

Eph 1:22  "And he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the ekklēsia,"

Eph 3:10  "so that through the ekklēsia the wisdom of God in its rich variety might now be made known to the rulers"

Eph 3:21  "To him be glory in the ekklēsia and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen.

Eph 5:23  "just as Christ is the head of the ekklēsia, the body of which he is the Savior"

Eph 5:24  "just as the ekklēsia is subject to Christ"

Eph 5:25  "just as Christ loved the ekklēsia and gave himself up for her,"

Eph 5:27  "so as to present the ekklēsia to himself in splendor"

Eph 5:29  "just as Christ does for the ekklēsia"

Eph 5:32  "This is a great mystery, and I am applying it to Christ and the ekklēsia"

Phil 3:6  "as to zeal, a persecutor of the ekklēsia"

Phil 4:15  "when I left Macedonia, no ekklēsia shared with me in the matter of giving and receiving"

Col 1:18  "He is the head of the body, the ekklēsia"

Col 1:24  "flesh I am completing what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the ekklēsia"

Col 4:15  "and to Nympha and the ekklēsia in her house"
Col 4:16
(1)(2) or (3)
Emic
καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ’ ὑμῖν ἡ ἑπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικείων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ.

"And when this letter has been read among you, have it read also in the ekkōlēsia of the Laodicēans"

1 Thess 1:1
(3)
Emic
Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουάνος καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικής ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ,

"Paul and Silvanus and Timothy, to the ekkōlēsia of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"

1 Thess 2:14
(3)
Emic
ἐκ τῆς ὑμῶν ἡμέρας, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσιῶν ἐν τῇ ἱεραρχίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὰ ἀνατέθηται καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἱδίων συμφυλιῶν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοί ὑπὸ τῶν ἱουδαϊῶν,

"For you, brothers and sisters, became imitators of the ekkōlēsiai of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea"

2 Thess 1:4
(3)
Emic
καὶ δείκνυμι ὑμῖν ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐγκαυχάσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπόμονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως.

"Therefore, we ourselves boast of you among the ekkōlēsiai of God for your steadfastness and faith"

1 Tim 3:5
(3)
Emic
εἴ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου οἰκοῦ προστίθηται οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμεληθῆται;

"if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how can he take care of God’s ekkōlēsia"

1 Tim 3:15
(4)
Emic
ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ ὑμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ὡς ἐστὶν ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἱόντως, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας,

"you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the ekkōlēsia of the living God"

1 Tim 5:16
(3)
Emic
εἴ τις πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας, ἔπαρκεὶς αὐταῖς καὶ μὴ βαρεῖσθω ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἵνα ταῖς ὄντως χήραις ἐπαρκέσῃ.

"let the ekkōlēsia not be burdened, so that it can assist those who are real widows”

Philem 2
(3)
Emic
καὶ Ἀπφία τῇ ἄδελφῃ καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ συστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ κατ’ οἰκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ,

"and to Apphia, our sister, and to Archippus, our fellow soldier, and to the ekkōlēsia which meets in your house.”

Heb 2:12
(1)(2) or (3)
Emic
λέγων ἀπαγγέλω τῷ οἴκῳ σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσῃς se, "in the midst of the ekkōlēsia I will praise you’’

Heb 12:23
(1)(2) or (3)
Emic
καὶ ἐκκλησίας πρωτοτόκων ἄπογραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ κρίτῃ θεῷ πάντων καὶ πνεύμα τινες πεπληρωμένων

"to the ekkōlēsia of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven"

James 5:14
(1) or (2)
Emic
ἀσθενεῖς τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσκαλεσάθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσευκάθωσον ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἀλείψαντες [αὐτοὺς] ἔλατε ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ κυρίου,

"They should call for the elders of the ekkōlēsia”

3 John 6
(1) or (2)
Emic
ἐὰν ἐμφαρτύρησαν σοὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας, οὐς καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμψας ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ;

"they have testified to your love before the ekkōlēsia”

3 John 9
(2) or (3)
Emic
Ἐγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἄλλα οἱ φιλερωτέων αὐτῶν Διοτρέφῃς οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς.

"I have written something to the ekkōlēsia”

3 John 10
(1) or (2)
Emic
dia touto, edan eltheo, upomnikhe so autou tata erga ak poi ei logoi pourois filoxarwn hmais, kai mutairokimos epist toustois ouste autous epi dechetai tous adelphous kai tous boolumenous kalliei ei kei tis ekklisias ekballai.

“and even prevents those who want to do so and expels them from the ekklésia”

Rev 1:4
(3)
Emic
Iomaiynhs tais epta ekklisias tais en tis Ais chaires omhe kai eirnhe apo o on kai o hne kai o erekimos kai apo ton epita pneumatow an enwpon ton thronon autou

“John to the seven ekklésiai that are in Asia:”

Rev 1:11
(3)
Emic

“John to the seven ekklésiai that are in Asia:”

Rev 1:20
(3)
Emic

“As for the mystery of the seven stars that you saw in my right hand, and the seven golden lampstands: the seven stars are the angels of the seven ekklésiai, and the seven lampstands are the seven ekklésiai

Rev 2:1
(3)
Emic

“Tou aggelou ths en Efeseos ekklisias graphe"

“To the angel of the ekklésia in Ephesus write”

Rev 2:7
(3)
Emic

“O echon oux akousatw ti to pneuma legei taia ekklisias.

“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklésiai”

Rev 2:8
(3)
Emic

“Kai to aggelou ths en Smyrne ekklisias graphe"

“To the angel of the ekklésia in Smyrna write”

Rev 2:11
(3)
Emic

“O echon oux akousatw ti to pneuma legei taia ekklisias.

“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklésiai”

Rev 2:12
(3)
Emic

“Kai to aggelou ths en Pergamum ekklisias graphe"

“To the angel of the ekklésia in Pergamum write”

Rev 2:17
(3)
Emic

“O echon oux akousatw ti to pneuma legei taia ekklisias.

“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklésiai”

Rev 2:18
(3)
Emic

“Kai to aggelou ths en Thyatira ekklisias graphe"

“To the angel of the ekklésia in Thyatira write”

Rev 2:23
(3)
Emic

“Kai ta tekna auths apoktenw en thanta. kai genvsontain pioso ai ekklisiasi oti egw eimi o erasunon nephrou kai karhias,

“And I will strike her children dead. And all the ekklésiai will know that I am the one who searches minds and hearts”

Rev 2:29
(3)
Emic

“O echon oux akousatw ti to pneuma legei taia ekklisias.

“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklésiai”

Rev 3:1
(3)
Emic

“Kai to aggelou ths en Sardeis ekklisias graphe"

“And to the angel of the ekklésia in Sardis write”
Rev 3:6 (3) Emic  ὦ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.  
“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklēsiai”

Rev 3:7 (3) Emic  Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Φιλαδελφείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον·  
“And to the angel of the ekklēsia in Philadelphia write”

Rev 3:13 (3) Emic  ὦ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.  
“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklēsiai”

Rev 3:14 (3) Emic  Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον·  
“And to the angel of the ekklēsia in Laodicea write”

Rev 3:22 (3) Emic  ὦ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.  
“Let anyone who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying to the ekklēsiai”

Rev 22:16 (3) Emic  Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψα τὸν ἁγγελόν μου μαρτυρῆσαι ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ρίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυίδ, ὁ ἀστήρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωίνος.  
“It is I, Jesus, who sent my angel to you with this testimony for the ekklēsiai. I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star”
Appendix #11: *Ekklēsia* Occurrences Not Yet Listed by PHI (as of Feb. 2014)

1. **LSCG 150A (2x)** (Cos, Cos; late 5th cent. BCE), αἱ καὶ μὴ ἐκκλησίαι δόξει ἐς δαμόσουν ἐργὸν [“unless the assemblies decide (that the work was carried out) for public work”]; φαίνοντω δὲ τοῖ ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ τεμένος ... ἐς τὰν ἐκκλησίαν κατὰ τὸν ιαρὸν νόμον καὶ τὸν μαστρικόν

2. **LSCG 150B (2x)** (Cos, Cos; late 5th cent. BCE), ἐξέστω — — — [αἱ καὶ μὴ] ἐκκλησίαι [δόξη καταχρῆσθαι] εἰς τι τῶν ἱερῶν; ἐπὶ ταῖ ἐκκλησίαι ἐπικυρωθῆ

3. **Agora I 6524 (Sculpture)** (Athens, agora; 337/6 BCE) (I could not locate the Greek text): “The secretary of the Council shall inscribe this law on two stelai of stone and set one of them by the entrance into the Areopagus, that entrance, namely, near where one goes into the Bouleuterion, and the other in the Ekklesia.”

4. **SEG 38.1462.B lines 6–46** (Oinoanda, Lycia; 124–125/6 BCE), ἀρτεμισίου σεβαστὸς ἀγών σαλπίζειν καὶ κηροῦσιν τὸν κλησίν τούτοις ἐς τις τὸν δικαστὴν ἐς τοῦ νεικίας δοθῆσαι ἔννοιαν τὴν ἀρχαίον γέροντα, διά τοῦ ποιήσασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ διόλου δημοτικῆς εἴκοσι πιστῶν·

5. **SEG 38.1462.C lines 47–102** (Oinoanda, Lycia; 124–125/6 BCE), Γενέσθαι δὲ 96 δοῦ καὶ ταύτην τεθήναι ἐν τῇ πρὸ τῆς βιωτικῆς στοάς ἐπὶ τῶς ἐστωτὶ ἀνδριάντι γραφῆσαι τὰς τῷ ἔπαινον φήμης καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῇ ἐγκυμονάρᾳ, ἄγω τῷ νεκρὶ ἐκβιβάζειν *οerness, φιλοδοξίας διακενὸς διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·

6. **PAPPADAKIS 1920.1** (Erateine, Boeotia, Central Greece; post-185 BCE), a manumission inscription (I could not locate the Greek text): “(Being agonothete Lykon of Physkos), in (month seven)(on the fifteenth), through the lawful assembly (ennomos ekklēsia) of the city of the Euantheians, he handed over,... for freedom at a price in silver of five minas”

7. **McCabe 1986, no. 119/Samos 119 (Samos, Ionia, n.d.)** ἐπὶ Λευκίππου· Ἰηναιώνος ἕδεξεν τοῖς ἀλειφομένοις ἐν τῇ γεροντικῇ παλαιώτατοι, συναχθῆσαν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐπείδη Ἰστιώδος Ἰρώιδου, πειραδίας διακεκίμενος εἰς ἀρχής·

8. **IGLAM 1381–1382** (Aspendus, Pamphylia; 153/2 BCE) εἰς εὐφημον ἐκκλησίαν ἔχαριστο κῆπους πρὸς τῷ ἐπιδρόμῳ... and εἰς εὐφημον ἐκκλησίαν ἔχαρισα μενον κῆπους π[ρος τῷ] ἐπιπρόμοιο...

9. **OGIS 4** ἐγ χυρὶα ἐκ λησα[14]

10. **OGIS 58** ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης

11. **OGIS 193** καὶ ἀποκαταστήσας τὴν τε πρὸ τῆς κηρύσσαν τοῖς δήμῳ καὶ τοὐς νόμον,

12. **OGIS 480** κατ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ


14. **OGIS 771** ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τοῖς θεάτροι.