

6

Interaction and Integration

Judean Families and Guilds at Hierapolis

Introduction

Previous chapters on family language and on immigrants show how recent studies of the diaspora are beginning to address regional variations among Judean (Jewish) gatherings and are giving attention to the relationships between these groups and the societies in which they found themselves.¹ Social-scientific approaches to migration and ethnicity can assist us in evaluating issues of identity and the relationships between minority groups, such as Judeans and Christians, and majority cultural groups.

The graves of those who had passed on can also further understanding of such cultural interactions among the living.² Leonard Victor Rutgers's study of Judean burials at Rome (second–fourth centuries), for instance, demonstrates this well and finds that instead “of living in splendid isolation or longing to assimilate, the Roman Jews . . . appear as actively and, above all, as self-consciously responding to developments in contemporary non-Jewish society.”³ Careful attention to burial customs in other parts of the empire can offer a new vantage point on questions of acculturation and identity among ethnic groups such as Judean gatherings.

This chapter explores cultural interactions with special attention to Judean epitaphs from Phrygian Hierapolis in Asia Minor in the second and third centuries.⁴ After discussing the evidence for Judean associations at this locale, I focus my attention on the recently republished family grave of P. Aelius Glykon and Aurelia Amia (ca. 200 CE).⁵ This grave

1. On Asia Minor, see, for example, Trebilco 1991, 167–85; Barclay 1996, 259–81, 320–35; Goodman 1998; Rajak 2002, 335–54, 355–72, 447–62; Harland 2003a.

2. On Judean burial in the diaspora, see, for example, van der Horst 1991; Williams 1994b, 165–82; Strubbe 1994 and 1997; Noy 1998, 75–89.

3. Rutgers 1994, 263.

4. Miranda 1999a, 109–55 (= *IHierapMir*); cf. *SEG* 49 (1999), no. 1814–36.

5. This inscription was recently republished (1992–93) with corrections by Tullia Ritti (formerly *CIJ* 777). I was able to examine the monument (in 2004) thanks to permission from Prof. Francesco D'Andria (director of the Italian Archeological Mission at Hierapolis) and the staff at the Hierapolis museum.

illustrates well the complexity of social and ethnic identities and the potential for interactions between Judeans and their neighbours in the cities of Asia Minor. It involves Glykon's bequest to local guilds of purple-dyers and carpet-weavers in order to regularly perform ceremonies at this family grave on both Judean (Passover and Pentecost) and Roman (Kalends) holidays.

Few scholars fully explore this family grave within the framework of burial practices among Judeans in Hierapolis and in relation to association life in Asia Minor. My approach here has significant implications for issues of ethnic and social identities among Judeans and others in a Greek city (*polis*). In looking at this case, I also work to resolve an ongoing debate regarding the composition of the guilds of purple-dyers and carpet-weavers mentioned in the inscription. While several scholars make known their differing views on the composition or ethnic identity of these groups (Judean, non-Judean, or mixed), few sufficiently investigate this issue in relation to other evidence for the purple-dyers at Hierapolis.

This case also offers opportunity to further examine dynamics of assimilation and cultural maintenance among cultural minority groups in the diaspora, building on the discussion in the previous chapter. Moreover, there are both indications of acculturation to the society of settlement and identifications with the cultural ways of the ancestral land among Judeans at Hierapolis.

Judeans at Hierapolis

Recent discoveries of graves have added to our knowledge of Judeans at Hierapolis. Elena Miranda's publication (1999) includes a total of twenty-three Judean grave inscriptions (out of a total of over 360 epitaphs from Hierapolis published by others). This includes thirteen new Judean inscriptions beyond those previously published by Walther Judeich (in 1898) and by Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti (in 1966–67).⁶ Most Judean inscriptions (*IHierapMir* 1–21) were found in the northern necropolis, which was extended from the time of Antoninus Pius (138–161 CE); monuments in that necropolis date mostly from the middle of the second to the third century CE.⁷ Two Judean tombs were found elsewhere in the area of the eastern burial grounds (*IHierapMir* 22–23).

The Judean inscriptions range in date from the second half of the second century to the third or fourth centuries based on onomastics, the use of names (especially the presence of Aurelius-related names), and on the forms of the lettering in relation to other dated inscriptions. It is difficult to date them with any more certainty, as none expressly supplies a date, and rarely are named figures known from other sources.

The majority of these Judean inscriptions (eighteen) involves an individual identified as "Judean" (Ἰουδαῖος) making provisions for the burial of him- or herself and family members, without explicit reference to a Judean community or gathering. Almost all of these

6. Those previously published are: *IHierapMir* 5 = *IHierapJ* 69 = *CIJ* 776; no. 6 = *IHierapPenn* 14; no. 8 = *IHierapJ* 72 = *CIJ* 778; no. 9 = *IHierapJ* 97; no. 10 = *IHierapJ* 104; no. 11 = *IHierapPenn* 30; no. 16 = *IHierapJ* 212 = *IGR* IV 834 = *CIJ* 775; no. 20 = *IHierapPenn* 46; no. 22 = *IHierapJ* 295; and no. 23 = *IHierapJ* 342 = *CIJ* 777. *IHierapJ* = Judeich 1898, 67–181. *IHierapPenn* = Pennacchietti 1966–67, 287–328. All twenty-three are also now included, with commentary, in Ameling 2004 (= *IJO* II 187–209).

7. Pennacchietti 1966–67, 293–94; cf. Ritti 1992–93, 42.



Figure 13. Grave “of the Judeans” from Hierapolis, with a menorah and lion (IHierapMir 6 = IJO II 187)

identify the owners of the grave and surrounding area and list other family members that were to be buried there. Several go further in following standard forms of burial inscriptions in this part of Asia Minor by warning that no one else should be buried there and by providing for fines in the event that anyone attempted to do so.⁸ Fines were most often payable to local civic institutions, including the “most sacred treasury” (ταμίον) of Hierapolis or, in one case, the civic elders’ organization (γερουσία).⁹ Several of those that specify fines also mention that a copy of the inscription was placed in the civic archives (ἀρχεῖον),¹⁰ which was another important formal institution in the Greek cities of Asia Minor. The act of placing a copy of these stipulations in the civic archives is suggestive of the formal legal procedures that would be followed in the event that provisions for care and protection of the grave were violated in some way.¹¹ These institutional factors point to areas of structural assimilation that I return to below.

Several inscriptions (three, or perhaps four, of the twenty-three) use terminology suggestive of an association of Judeans, providing the only available information about gatherings of Judeans at Hierapolis and the self-designations that these groups used (IHierapMir 5, 6, 14b, 16). The epitaph pictured in figure 13, which is inscribed with the plural possessive

8. IHierapMir 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 21.

9. IHierapMir 1 (γερουσία), 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10a, 18, 19, 21.

10. IHierapMir 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 18, 19, 21.

11. On grave violation (τυμβωρυχία) in Asia Minor, see IHierapJ 275, 312 (cf. Iasos 376, 392). IHierapJ 195, which also involves guilds, more directly indicates this legal context in providing a reward (of 800 denaria) for the “one prosecuting the case” for violation. See also Gerner 1941, 230–75, esp. pp. 250–58, and Strubbe 1991, 48 n. 9. For Judean references to the crime, see IJO II 146 (Thyattira), 174 (Akmoneia).



Figure 14. Grave mentioning the “people of the Judeans” at Hierapolis (IHierapMir 5 = IJO II 206)

“(Grave) of the Judeans” (Ἰουδαίων [sic]), alongside the depiction of a menorah and lion, likely refers to a *family* of Judeans, rather than an association (IHierapMir 6 = IJO II 187; cf. IHierapMir 10). Still, there are three other definite references to associations of Judeans.

Interestingly enough, each of the three epitaphs uses different self-designations for the groups in question. In one, a woman and a man explicitly identify themselves as belonging to the “people (τῶ λαῶ) of the Judeans” and make fines for violation of their grave payable to this group (see photo in figure 14):

The grave and the burial ground beneath it together with the base and the place belong to Aurelia Glykonis, daughter of Ammianos, and her husband Marcus Aurelius Alexander Theophilos, also known as Aphelias, of the Judeans. They will be buried in it, but it is not lawful for anyone else to be buried in it. If this is violated, the guilty one will pay a fine of 1000 denaria to the people of the Judeans (τῶ λαῶ | τῶν Ἰουδαίων).¹² A copy of this inscription was placed in the archives (IHierapMir 5 = IJO II 206; late second or third cent. CE).¹³

12. The designation λαός for a group is quite well attested in epigraphy for Judeans (cf. CIJ 662, 699–702, 704–8, 720; ISmyrna 296; DFSJ 31 = IJO II 26).

13. Trans. mine. Here and in the following inscriptions I follow Miranda’s readings of the text. Miranda (1999a) suggests the second half of the second century or early third based on the lettering and the onomastics (presence of Aurelia); Ameling (2004) dates this to the second half of the second century.

The Judean couple of this epitaph is following the standard form of burial inscriptions at Hierapolis, providing for fines to be paid for violation, in this case to a local association to which they presumably belonged.

A second inscription refers to the “settlement” (κατοικία) of Judeans in Hierapolis:

This grave and the surrounding place belong to Aurelia Augusta, daughter of Zotikos. In it she, her husband, who is called Glykonianos, also known as Hagnos, and their children will be buried. But if anyone else is buried here, the violator will pay a fine of 300 denaria to the settlement of the Judeans who are settled in Hierapolis (τῆ κατοικίᾳ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων) and 100 denaria to the one who found out about the violation. A copy of this inscription was placed in the archives of the Judeans (*IHierapMir* 16 = *IJO* II 205; mid- to late second cent. CE).¹⁴

Here the group is described with terminology that is commonly used by ethnically based associations. This is especially well attested in the case of associations of Romans (οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ρωμαῖοι), such as the “settlement” of Romans that existed at nearby Phrygian Apameia (northeast of Hierapolis) from the first to the third century, at least.¹⁵ This suggests that “Judeans” or “those from Judea”—with intertwined geographic, ethnic, and cultural implications—is the best way to translate the term here, as elsewhere. The seemingly redundant “settlement of Judeans who are settled in Hierapolis” also further suggests this sense of settled immigrants originally from elsewhere, involving migration either in this generation or some previous generation.

This inscription includes the common provision for storage of a copy of the inscription, but in this case this is expressly the archives “of the Judeans” rather than the civic archives. Use of the civic archives was the norm in other Judean (and non-Judean) inscriptions. This particular grave suggests a well-established Judean group (by the mid to late second century), such that it would begin to maintain its own archives for a time in imitation of the civic model.

One face (side b) of a third inscription, now published for the first time by Miranda, refers to a group of Judeans as “the most holy synagogue”:

(*Side a*)

The grave, the burial ground beneath it, and the area around it belong to Nikotimos Lykidas, son of Artemisios. In it he has buried Apphia, his wife. A copy of this inscription was placed into the archives (τὸ ἀρχεῖον). Judean (Ἰουδαϊκή).

(*Side b*)

The grave and the place around it belong to Aur. Heortasios Julianus, Tripolitan, Judean, now living in Hierapolis (Τριπολείτου Ἰουδέου, νοῖν οἰκο<ῶ>ντ[ος] | ἐν

14. Trans. mine. This rough date is once again based on the presence of the *gentilicium* Aurelius.

15. *IGR* IV 785–86, 788–91, 793–94; *MAMA* VI 177 (ca. 65–69 CE), 183. Cf. *CIG* 2287 (Athenians on Delos) and *OGIS* 595 = *CIG* 5853 (Tyrian merchants at Puteoli).

Εἰεραπόλι [sic]). In it he and his wife, Glykonis, will be buried, and let their children be buried here as well. It is not lawful for anyone other to be buried in it. If someone does such things, he will pay two silver coins to the most holy synagogue (τῆ ἀγιωτάτῃ συναγωγῇ) (*IHierapMir* 14 = *IJO* II 191; *side a*, late second century CE; *side b*, third or fourth cent. CE).¹⁶

The earlier of the two sides of the monument (*side a*) mentions only that the family members buried there were “Judean,” and does not mention a community. The reverse of the original inscription (*side b*) pertains to a family of Judeans whose relation to those buried earlier is unclear. The family’s identification of Aur. Heortasios Julianus as both “Tripolitan” and “Judean,” alongside his current status as a settler in Hierapolis, illustrates the potential for multiple social and ethnic identities. I return to this at various points in this study, particularly in connection with Glykon below and in chapter 7. This man was a previous inhabitant, or perhaps citizen, of nearby Tripolis.¹⁷ The family assigns any potential fines to “the most holy synagogue.” The descriptive term “most holy” (ἀγιοτατ-) and its synonyms are common self-designations among associations and civic bodies in Asia Minor and in Hierapolis specifically, which suggests other dimensions of acculturation to local custom on the part of this gathering of Judeans.¹⁸

Overall, then, the evidence from Hierapolis indicates that there was a notable number of Judeans living in this city in the period from the mid-second to the third or fourth century who openly identified themselves as such on their family tombs. Through the accidents of survival and discovery, we happen to encounter about twenty or so families who felt it was important to express Judean aspects of their identities in this way (two of them decorating their graves with a menorah or other related symbols). There was at least one ongoing gathering or association of Judeans, though few families chose to mention such an association on their epitaphs. By the late second century, an association of Judeans was organized enough to have its own archives. Still many of the known Judean epitaphs generally follow local custom in having copies of the inscription placed in, and/or fines for violation payable to, civic institutions of Hierapolis.

The Family Tomb of P. Aelius Glykon and Aurelia Amia

One epitaph at Hierapolis does not explicitly use the term “Judean,” nor does it refer to an established Judean association. Instead, it clearly indicates Judean connections by referring

16. Miranda’s (1999a, 125) dating depends primarily on the forms of the lettering in relation to other dated monuments at Hierapolis. Ameling (2004, 408) proposes that *side b* may date from the fourth century based on the use of *litra*, which Robert (1946, 106) suggested was characteristic of the fourth or fifth centuries.

17. Although likely the local Tripolis (cf. *IHierapPenn* 22), there are known cities of the same name in Pontus, in Syria, and in North Africa. Cf. Leon 1995 [1960], 153–54, 240 (Tripolitan synagogue at Rome).

18. Cf. *IHierap*] 40, 41, 342; *IHierapPenn* 25.



Figure 15. Grave of P. Aelius Glykon and Aurelia Amia, involving guilds of carpet-weavers and purple-dyers (IHierapMir 23 = IJO II 196)

to holy days, or festivals. The family grave of P. Aelius Glykon and Aurelia Amia dates to the late second or early third century of our era, based on the wife's family name, Aurelia, and the forms of the lettering.¹⁹ As shown in figure 15, this is a limestone sarcophagus (with a partially damaged lid) inscribed on its long side (facing northwest).²⁰ It is located in the southeastern necropolis of Hierapolis near the remains of the Martyrium of St. Philip, with no other surviving graves in its immediate vicinity. Tullia Ritti's rediscovery and thorough new reading of the inscription, which was first inadequately published in 1868, has significantly filled in previous gaps, including the important reference to the feast of Kalends in lines 9–10 and to the name of Glykon's wife.²¹

The inscription provides important evidence regarding cultural identities and the nature of Judean interactions with others in the Greek city. It reads as follows:

19. Cf. Ritti 1992–93, 48; Miranda 1999a, 132; Ameling 2004, 416.

20. Measurements: Bottom: approx. 239 cm long, 93 cm tall, and 135 cm wide. Lid: approx. 74 cm tall at its high point. Lettering: approx. 4 cm. The sarcophagus is located at the beginning point of the main gap between two hills near where the main walkway to the Martyrium of St. Philip (now) ends and the staircase ascending to the martyrium begins.

21. Previously partial or undocumented were line 1, much of line 2, lines 9–10, part of line 11, and line 13. For a list of publications of the *original reading* (= *CIJ* 777), which followed and corrected Wagener 1868, 1 (=Wagener 1873, 379–80.), see Ritti 1992–93, or Miranda 1999a, 131–32, no. 23. *New reading*: Ritti 1992–93; *AE* (1994), no. 1660; *SEG* 46 (1996), no. 1656; Labarre and Le Dinahet 1996, 102–3, no. 62; Miranda 1999b, 58–59, no. 23, and Miranda 1999a, 131–32, no. 23; Dittmann-Schöne 2000, 226–27, no. V.5.10; *IJO* II 196 (Ameling 2004).

This grave and the burial ground beneath it together with the surrounding place belong to Publius Aelius Glykon Zeuxianos Aelianus²² and to Aurelia Amia, daughter of Amianos Seleukos. In it he will bury himself, his wife, and his children, but no one else is permitted to be buried here. He left behind 200 denaria for the grave-crowning ceremony to the most holy presidency of the purple-dyers (τῆ σεμνοτάτῃ προεδρίᾳ τῶν πορφυραβάφων στεφανωτικοῦ), so that it would produce from the interest enough for each to take a share in the seventh month during the festival of Unleavened Bread (τῆ ἑορτῆ τῶν ἀζύμων). Likewise he also left behind 150 denaria for the grave-crowning ceremony to the sanhedrin of carpet-weavers (τῶ συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἀκαιροδαπισ<τ>ῶν), so that the revenues from the interest should be distributed, half during the festival of Kalends (τῆ ἑορτῆ τῶν καλανδῶν) on eighth day of the fourth month and half during the festival of Pentecost (τῆ ἑορτῆ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς). A copy of this inscription was placed in the archives (Ritti 1992–93 [published 1996] = *IHierapMir* 23 = *IJO* II 196, revising *CIJ* 777; see note for full Greek text).²³

Judean Aspects of Identity

The request that customary grave ceremonies be held on two Judean holidays clearly points to this family's identification with Judean cultural ways. Glykon has consciously made a decision that his death (and that of his family members) be commemorated indefinitely on the feasts of Unleavened Bread (in the month of Nisan [March-April]) and on Pentecost (the spring harvest festival), two of the most important Judean festivals.²⁴ The inscription nowhere identifies the owner (Glykon) as "Judean," as do some other Judean epitaphs at Hierapolis, but this would be unnecessary in light of the explicit mention of Judean holy days.²⁵

There is the question, then, of whether Glykon and his family descend from immigrants from Judea (or themselves migrated from Judea) or whether they were gentiles who adopted Judean practices ("Judaizers" as they are sometimes labelled in the literature) and then arranged that others (guild members) also engaged in these practices after their deaths. We cannot know for sure. As Ritti notes, seemingly "non-Judean" elements in the inscription which entail local or Roman practices, including the grave-crowning cere-

22. Or, possibly: "P. Aelius Glykon, son of Zeuxis Aelianus" (cf. Ameling 2004, 416).

23. [ἡ] σορὸς καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ αὐτὴν θέμα σὺν τῷ βαθρικῷ καὶ τῷ περικειμένῳ τὸ|πῶ Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Γλύκωνος Ζευξιανοῦ Αἰλια[νοῦ καὶ Αὐ]ρηλιας Ἀμίας | Ἀμιανοῦ τοῦ Σελευκου, ἐν ἣ κηδευθήσεται αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ | καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, ἐτέρῳ δὲ οὐδενὶ ἐξέσται κηδευθῆναι. Κατέλι|ψεν δὲ [κα]ὶ τῆ σεμνοτάτῃ προεδρίᾳ τῶν πορφυραβάφων στεφανωτικοῦ (δηνάρια) διακόσια πρὸς τὸ δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν τόκων ἐκάστῳ τὸ | αἰροῦν μη(νὸς) ζ' ἐν τῆ ἑορτῆ τῶν ἀζύμων. ὁμοίως κατέλιπεν καὶ τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἀκαιροδαπισ<τ>ῶν στεφανωτικοῦ (δηνάρια) ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα, ἀτι| ναc. να καὶ αὐτοὶ δώσουσι ἐκ τοῦ τόκου | διαμερίσαντες τὸ ἥμισυ ἐν τῆ ἑορτῆ τῶν καλανδῶν, μη(νὸς) δ', η', καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ ἐν τῆ ἑορτῆ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς. | ταύτης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον ἀπε<τέ>θη ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις.

24. See Barclay 1996, 415–16, on Judean festivals in the diaspora. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 14.256–58 and 16.45; Reynolds 1977, 244–45, no. 17 (feast of Tabernacles at Berenike, Cyrenaica, ca. 24 CE).

25. Cf. Ritti 1992–93, 59.

monies and the celebration of the Roman New Year, can readily be understood within the framework of a Judean family well adapted to life in Greco-Roman Hierapolis.²⁶ In this chapter, I approach the inscription with this Judean immigrant status as the principle working hypothesis.

This is not to discount the possibility that Glykon and his family were gentiles with a significant level of involvement in Judean practices, along the lines of the “god-fearers” in Aphrodisias in the fourth century (*IJO* II 14).²⁷ Shaye J. D. Cohen (1989) surveys a range of possibilities for gentiles’ interactions with Judeans (“Jews” in his terms) or with the Judean God, ranging from admiring some aspect of Judean cultural ways, to participating in certain Judean practices, to full adoption of Judean ways (including circumcision). He helpfully distinguishes between the potential participation of gentiles in certain Judean practices, such as festivals, and gentiles who recognize the God of the Judeans to the exclusion of all other gods, which may be relevant to the discussion further below of membership in the guilds. In the event that Glykon was a gentile adopting Judean practices and then arranging for others to participate in some way in the Judean festivals, then we would be witnessing signs of *enculturation* into the Judean minority group on the part of a non-Judean rather than *acculturation* of Judeans to local or Greco-Roman ways.²⁸ The problem is that, unlike the case of the “god-fearers” attested in an inscription from Aphrodisias, nothing in the Glykon inscription itself provides a basis for building a solid case that Glykon or his family was *gentile rather than Judean*.²⁹

Although there is no clear evidence that Glykon was a gentile, there is indeed corroborating evidence that some members of the purple-dyers’ guild mentioned in this inscription were gentiles. The discussion here explores multiple and intertwined facets of identities in the case of this family and the purple-dyers’ guild. In the conclusion, I return to the implications for acculturation depending on whether Glykon was a Judean or a gentile adopting Judean cultural customs.

Roman Facets of Identity and the Feast of Kalends

Alongside this family’s clear identification with Judean cultural ways are various signs of intertwined Hierapolitan, Hellenistic, and Roman elements, which I explore now. As previous chapters show, Judean identities were by no means incompatible with a sense of belonging within cities in the Greco-Roman world. Before considering indications of assimilation to local cultural life in Hierapolis, which inevitably also involves intertwined Roman elements, it is important to note Roman aspects of identity specifically.

First, P. Aelius Glykon’s name indicates that he is a Roman citizen. If the inscription predates or immediately follows the universal grant of citizenship in 212 CE (*Constitutio*

26. Ritti 1992–93, 59–60.

27. On the fourth- or fifth-century dating, now see Chaniotis 2002, 209–42.

28. On possible cases of gentile judaizing in Asia Minor and Syria based on Christian literary evidence, see Murray 2004.

29. On the difficulties in identifying inscriptions as Judean, Christian, or pagan, see Kraemer 1989; Williams 1997; Ameling 2004, 16–20. Miranda (1999a, 144–45) is attracted by the hypothesis that Glykon was a “Jewish sympathizer” but admits the difficulties here.

Antoniniana), as most suggest, then Glykon's choice to include his *tria nomina* (three names = praenomen, nomen, and cognomen) indicates some sense of pride in possessing the status of Roman citizen.³⁰ It is possible that Glykon or his ancestors were formerly slaves who gained Roman citizenship upon manumission, though there is nothing in the inscription or from other sources relating to Hierapolis that would confirm that. With regard to this man's cognomen or personal name, Glykon, it is worth mentioning that personal names with the root Glyk- ("sweet") are very common in Hierapolis and Phrygia generally, and that this was likewise quite common among Judeans at Hierapolis, including those mentioned on some other Judean graves at Hierapolis.³¹ This may well point to Glykon's place of birth as Hierapolis or somewhere else in Phrygia, suggesting that he is not a first generation immigrant. So even this man's name indicates Roman and Hierapolitan or Phrygian dimensions of his identities.

Beyond Roman citizenship, we lack clear indications of Glykon's social-economic status within Hierapolis. Still, it is worth mentioning that most monuments in which a family provides a foundation to a local association or guild to perform grave ceremonies, the deceased (or deceased-to-be) was a Roman citizen with some degree of wealth. Glykon's total amount of 350 denaria (200 plus 150) for the grave-crowning ceremonies (στεφανωτικόν) is greater than, yet comparable to, the case of Aurelius Zotikos Epikratos, who gave 150 denaria to the guild (συντεχνία) of nail-workers (*IHierapJ* 133). On the other hand, Glykon's foundation is less than Publius Aelius Hermogenes' substantial grant of 1,000 denaria to the guild of dyers (*IHierapJ* 195). Tiberius Claudius Kleon, whose position as high-priest suggests he is among the civic elites,³² donated the largest attested amount for a grave-crowning ceremony at Hierapolis, granting the sum 2,500 denaria to the civic elders' organization (*IHierapJ* 234). So Glykon is among many other Roman citizens there, some of higher and others of lower social-economic or civic status. We do not know whether he was a citizen of Hierapolis and, if so, whether he was among the civic elites who assumed important offices.

A second, more significant sign of Roman cultural ways has been revealed only with the new edition of the epitaph. Glykon chooses to have his family remembered not only on principal Judean holidays, but also on the feast of Kalends, the Roman New Year celebration (held in January). Glykon leaves funds (150 denaria) to the sanhedrin of carpet-weavers, specifying that half of the proceeds from the foundation be used during the feast of Kalends and half during Pentecost.

It is important to say a few words regarding this Roman New Year festival to assess

30. Of the twenty-three Judean epitaphs at Hierapolis, sixteen (including the Glykon inscription) provide a name that suggests Roman citizenship, and five of these are dated to the post-212 CE era by Miranda. Eleven are potentially cases of Judeans with Roman citizenship before the universal grant (mainly in the late second or early third cent. CE).

31. See *IHierapMir* 5, 11, 14, and 16 (cited earlier). See Miranda's discussion of onomastics among Judeans at Hierapolis (Miranda 1999a, 136-40).

32. Compare the high-priest Tiberius Claudius Zotikos Boa, who also held other important civic offices or liturgies including στρατηγός ("general"), ἀγωνοθέτης ("festival organizer") and πρεσβευτής ("elder"). He was honoured by both the "most sacred guild of wool-cleaners" and the "most sacred guild of purple-dyers" on two separate monuments (*IHierapJ* 40, 41; probably third century).

its significance here at Hierapolis. The sparseness of our evidence for the celebration of this particular Roman festival in Asia Minor makes the Glykon inscription all the more relevant to issues of provincial cultural exchanges in relation to Roman cultural practices (“Romanization,” to use the traditional term).³³ Michel Meslin’s study of the festival emphasizes two complementary dimensions: the official (“civic”) and the unofficial (“private,” in his terms).³⁴ The official side of the festival was focussed on vows for the well-being of Rome and its empire as one year ended and the new began. Pliny the Younger provides some limited evidence that this aspect of the festival was celebrated in northern Asia Minor (Bithynia and Pontus) by the early second century (Pliny *Ep.* 10.35–36, 100–101; cf. Suetonius *Nero* 46.4). The Glykon inscription now confirms the continuing adoption of this festival in another area of Asia Minor a number of decades later.

There were also unofficial dimensions to the Roman New Year festival, which would likely be of greater relevance to the situation within a local guild at Hierapolis. These informal celebrations were “anchored in the collective psyche of the Romans” and charged with social and cultic significance, as Meslin puts it.³⁵

Although the festival originally focussed its attention on the old Italian god Janus (two-faced protector of doors), its significance expanded beyond this focus. Ovid’s famous poetic tribute to the Roman festivals (the *Fasti*), written in honour of Augustus, emphasizes the exchanges of “good wishes” and gifts which accompanied the celebration, including “sweet” gifts (e.g., dates, figs, honey), as well as cash, indicating an omen of a sweet year to come (Ovid *Fasti* 1.171–94). Ovid also alludes to the common practice of workers dedicating their occupational activities in connection with the commencement of the new year (*Fasti* 1.169–70), which may be of relevance to workers such as the carpet-weavers at Hierapolis. A statement by Herodian, a third-century Greek historian, confirms the importance of “exchanging friendly greetings and giving each other the pleasure of interchanging gifts” (Herodian *Hist.* 1.16.2). If Tertullian’s negative assessment of Christians participating in New Year’s gift giving as “idolatry” is any indication, the exchange of gifts (*strenae*) specifically remained prominent as the festival made its way into the provinces, at least in regions such as North Africa around the turn of the third century.³⁶

It is likely these social aspects of celebrating the end of the old year and the beginning of the new, exchanging positive wishes and gifts, remained the focus of attention in many settings, including this case at Hierapolis. Not surprisingly, diaspora Judean attitudes and practices in relation to such festivals could extend beyond the views expressed in rabbinic writings (in the *Abodah Zarah* tractates).³⁷ Rabbinic sources simply assume that Judeans

33. Beginning in about 9 BCE and continuing at least into the second century, another new year’s celebration was held in the province of Roman Asia on the birthday of Augustus (September 23), and associations were sometimes involved in those celebrations (*IPergamon* 374; and *IEph* 3801). See Price 1984, 54–55; Harland 2003a, 94–95, 102.

34. For the following see Meslin (1970, 23–50) and Nilsson (1916–19, 54–55), who also notes the involvement of *collegia* in the celebrations.

35. Meslin 1970, 23 (trans. from the French is mine).

36. Tertullian *On Idolatry* 10 and 14; cf. *On Military Crowns* 12.3; *Apology* 35.7. On gifts (*strenae*) see Suetonius *Augustus* 57, *Tiberius* 34, *Caligula* 42.

37. Compare Tessa Rajak’s (2002 [1985], 358–62) discussion of diaspora Judeans and Greco-Roman festivals, although she did not have this case available to her.

should distance themselves from any relation to major gentile festivals, including Kalends specifically.³⁸

Funerary Practices and Associations in Asia Minor

The nature of this family's acculturation to local funerary customs can be better understood in relation to other Judeans in the city and in relation to other (non-Judean) Hierapolitans who involved guilds in funerary provisions. Glykon's choice to include guilds in funerary commemorations on Judean and Roman festivals excluded—whether incidentally or not—the local Judean association from any direct relation to the burial and upkeep of the family grave. Glykon was certainly not alone in failing to even mention the local Judean association on his epitaph, however. Many other known Judean and non-Judean epitaphs make no mention of any local association or synagogue with which the family was affiliated.

A discussion of funerary involvements among associations (including Judean groups) in western Asia Minor will provide important context here, pointing toward common burial customs shared by Judeans (or possibly gentile “Judaizers”) such as Glykon and his family.³⁹ There were three main ways in which guilds and other associations participated in grave-related activities. First, associations could play a role in the burial of their members, sometimes collecting ongoing fees for later use in funerary related expenses (actual burial or funerary banquets, for instance).⁴⁰ Local custom varied in the details and in the importance of this role, however. There is limited evidence that associations in some regions of Asia Minor might also have their own *collective* tomb or burial plot for this purpose. This was the case with the guild of flax-workers at Smyrna, who received a vault as a donation, and the guild of bed-builders at Ephesos, who dedicated a common burial plot.⁴¹ As with associations generally, it seems that collective burial by association was not the norm among Judeans in the diaspora. Instead, the shared *family* tomb was common among both Judeans and non-Judeans in Asia Minor (including those who happened to belong to an association).

Still, there is one clear Judean example of collective burial from Tlos in Lycia (in southern Asia Minor) that should be mentioned. There a man named Ptolemais adopted this local, Tlosian practice by preparing a common burial area (ἡρῶν) for his son and for “all the Judeans” (first century CE).⁴² This inscription plays a role in a recent debate regarding how common were such collective “Judean cemeteries” in the first two centuries (before the catacombs of Rome). J. H. M. Strubbe draws on the clear Tlos case to argue for the commonality of collective Judean grave plots in Asia Minor (using other less solid evidence

38. Cf. Hadas-Lebel 1979, 426–41; *y. Abod. Zar.* 1.1, II.E; *b. Abod. Zar.* 1.3.

39. On funerary practices, see Strubbe 1991, 1994, and 1997. On the role of associations in the Greek East see, for example, van Nijf 1997, 31–69, and Dittmann-Schöne 2000, 82–93.

40. Cf. Artemidoros *Oneir.* 5.82.

41. *ISmyrna* 218; *IEph* 2213; *IKilikiaBM* II 190–202; *IKos* 155–59; Fraser 1977, 58–70. Also see van Nijf 1997, 43–49.

42. *IJO* II 223 = *CIJ* 757 = *TAM* II 612.

along the way).⁴³ On the other hand, David Noy argues that “the existence of separate Jewish burial areas before the catacombs seems on the whole fairly unlikely.”⁴⁴ I would suggest that forms of Judean burial would be dependent on variations in local practice among associations and, in fact, at least two epitaphs from Tlos appear to confirm this point. Like the Judean epitaph, they involve a collective burial area (ἡρῶον). Each lists names (with no mention of familial relation among the names) of those who are to be buried within it, likely members of associations (*TAM* II 604 and 615). Margaret H. Williams makes similar observations regarding local variations in how specific Judean families adopted burial practices from the local (“gentile”) populations, which varied from one locale to the next.⁴⁵

Having noted this role of associations in the burial of individual members and a few cases of common burial by association, it is important to point out that there are many epitaphs that simply do not refer to such groups at all. So the Judeans at Hierapolis who failed to mention any affiliation with a Judean association or who did not involve a local guild in funerary arrangements there are not out of the ordinary in this respect.

A second funerary role involves associations being named as recipients of fines for any violation of the grave alongside other civic institutions (e.g., civic treasury, council, people, elders’ organization), or alone. Several guilds at Kyzikos are designated as recipients of any fines for violation of the grave, for instance, and a similar picture emerges at Smyrna. There two different families chose an association of porters who worked in the harbour.⁴⁶ So in some ways the synagogue leader at Smyrna in the second or third century (a woman named Rufina) was following local custom when she made fines for violation of her household’s grave payable to the “most sacred treasury” of Smyrna (1,500 denaria) and to an association (1,000 denaria), in this case the “people” (ἔθνος, *ethnos*) of the Judeans of which she was a leader or benefactor.⁴⁷

A third area of funerary involvement on the part of associations in Asia Minor entails groups being designated recipients of a foundation that made them responsible for visiting and maintaining the grave, including yearly (or more frequent) ceremonies at the site.⁴⁸ It was not necessarily the case that the owner of the grave was a member of the association in question, as cases involving multiple guilds also suggest (e.g., *IHierap*] 133, 227). It seems that the more important factor in decision making (on the part of the deceased-to-be or family members of the deceased) concerned choosing a group that could indeed be trusted to help protect the grave and fulfill other obligations, and sometimes this was a group to which a family member belonged.

Several inscriptions from Ephesus illustrate this function of associations, for instance. In one first-century epitaph, a silversmith and his wife designate the “sanhedrin” of

43. Strubbe 1994, 101–2.

44. Noy 1998, 81.

45. Williams 1994b, 173–74.

46. *IKyzikos* 97, 211, 291 (marble-workers, clothing-cleaners, and porters); *ISmyrna* 204, 205; cf. *IAlexTroas* 122 (coppersmiths, second cent. CE), 151–52 (porters).

47. *ISmyrna* 295 = *IJO* II 43 = *CIJ* 741. Cf. *IJO* II 154, 157 (Nikomedia, third cent. CE). It is worth mentioning that the self-designation ἔθνος is also used by other guilds and associations (e.g., *PKöln* 260, line 3; second cent. BCE).

48. On grave visitation, see Garland 2001, 104–20. On Roman burial practices, see Toyneeb 1971, 61–64. On crowns, see Goodenough 1953–68, 7.148–71.

silversmiths as recipient for any fines, but they also leave behind specific funds so that the group can “take care of” (κρήδεται) the grave site (*IEph* 2212).⁴⁹ In another, a physician and his wife leave behind an endowment for the “sanhedrin of physicians in Ephesos who meet in the museum” (μουσεῖον) to take care of the grave (*IEph* 2304). Quite important for present purposes regarding interaction and acculturation is the family epitaph of a chief physician at Ephesos (named Julius), who asked that “the Judeans in Ephesos” (not the sanhedrin of physicians) maintain the tomb.⁵⁰ It is unclear as to whether Julius was a Judean or not. Either way, Judeans are participating in local customs in places like Ephesos.

Along similar lines, a devotee of the Judean God (either a Judean or a Christian) in third-century Akmoneia donated several tools to “the neighbourhood of those near the first gateway” (*IJO* II 171).⁵¹ He did so on condition that this neighbourhood association yearly decorated his wife’s grave with roses (ῥοδίαια), most likely performing the Roman ceremony of *rosalia*, which often included a banquet.⁵² This offers an interesting parallel to Glykon’s request to have grave-crowning ceremonies held on the Roman New Year, led by the carpet-weavers’ association.⁵³ In both cases a traditionally Roman festival is adapted to local custom (involving associations) by families devoted to the Judean God, presumably omitting practices that would evoke honours for other deities (namely, sacrifice).

Guilds at Hierapolis and the Purple-dyers’ Identities

Turning to Hierapolis specifically, it is important to give some sense of what role the guilds played in funerary practices there, which will then shed more light on the significance of Glykon’s decision to include guilds (and the purple-dyers in particular) in his bequest. Of the sixteen extant inscriptions that refer to occupational associations at Hierapolis, ten

49. Cf. *IEph* 2402 (potters), 2446 (linen-workers).

50. *IEph* 1677 = *IJO* II 32 = *CIJ* 745 (second cent. CE). See *IEurJud* I 76 from Venosa for another Judean chief physician.

51. The inscription uses the so-called Eumeneian formula, which stipulates that violators will have “to reckon with the justice of God.” The formula is now known to be used by both Judeans and Christians, contrary to Ramsay’s (1895–97, 520) claim of Christian identification. Robert (1960b, 409–12) thought that the owner of the grave was probably Judean, based on the “Semitic” name of the man (Math[i]os) who sold the plot to Aur. Aristreas (assuming that they were “co-religionists”) and on the absence of other evidence of Christians in third-century Akmoneia (cf. Trebilco 1991, 78–80; Strubbe 1994, 72–73). For Judeans at Akmoneia, see *IJO* II 168–78. For Christians, see *MAMA* VI 336.

52. On associations and the *rosalia* festival in the Greek East, see *IG* X.2 260; Dimitsas 1896, no. 920; *CIL* III 703, 704, 707 (from Macedonia); *IPergamon* 374B; *CIG* 3874; *IKlaudiupolis* 115; *INikaia* 62, 95, 1283, 1422; *SEG* 49 (1999), no. 1790 and 2508 (from Asia Minor). Cf. Perdrizet 1900, 299–323; Trebilco 1991, 80–81. On *collegia* in the Latin West see Toynbee 1971, 61–64; Lattimore 1962, 137–41 (cf. *CIL* V 2090, 2176, 2315, 4015, 4017, 4448).

53. On the use of crown symbolism in Judean art, architecture, and literature, see Goodenough 1953–68, 7.149–52. For Judean adaptation of granting crowns as a form of honour for living benefactors, see *IJO* II 36 (Phokaia or Kyme; third cent. CE) and Bruneau 1982, 465–504; *NewDocs* VIII 12 (Samaritans on Delos; second-first BCE).

are epitaphs, and six of these expressly involve a guild or guilds in some ongoing grave ceremonies or superintendence of the grave (including the Glykon inscription). Most of these (four) involve the local practice of providing “funds for the grave-crowning” (στεφανωτικόν), which in this form of expression seems peculiar to the Lycos valley, primarily Hierapolis.⁵⁴ Another refers to the responsibility of a guild—purple-dyers or, if they fail, the livestock dealers—in “burning the incense (τῶν παπῶν) on the customary day” (*IHierapJ* 227b; ca. 190–250 CE). Furthermore, five of the ten epitaphs also mention guilds as recipients of any fines for violation of the grave.⁵⁵

Since there are cases involving several guilds on one epitaph, in all there are a total of ten guilds mentioned in connection with funerary arrangements in the extant monuments of Hierapolis: dyers, nail-workers, coppersmiths, purple-dyers, livestock dealers, water-mill engineers, farmers, wool-cleaners, carpet-weavers, and an unknown “guild.” The association of purple-dyers, in particular, stands out prominently as a favourite in the funerary monuments that have survived to us, appearing as recipients of fines or bequests for visitation ceremonies on nearly half (four out of ten) of the grave inscriptions involving guilds, including the Glykon family grave itself.⁵⁶

The fact that a family devoted to the Judean God specifically chose to call on the services of the purple-dyers, as well as the carpet-weavers (a guild known only from the Glykon inscription), begs a question regarding the composition of these guilds and the ethnic identities of guild members. This issue is important in evaluating possibilities regarding dynamics of assimilation and interaction here. Scholarly discussions of this inscription, including many based on the earlier reading, which lacked the reference to Kalends, address the question of whether the guilds were (1) solely Judean, (2) solely non-Judean (gentile), or (3) a mixture of both. Seldom do these scholarly discussions make reference to other epigraphical evidence for the purple-dyers at Hierapolis, however. Such evidence shows that for the purple-dyers, at least, the first option is untenable, the second plausible, and the third most likely.

Erich Ziebarth was among the first to suggest that these two guilds were solely Judean in membership, and other scholars have followed suit, including William Ramsay and Shimon Applebaum.⁵⁷ Most recently, Miranda suggests that the purple-dyers, at least, were solely Judean, based on the fact that Glykon chose to have the purple-dyers provide their services only on a Judean holiday. The bequest to the carpet-weavers, however, involves both a Roman and a Judean holiday, reflecting Glykon’s choice of separate holidays for the gentile and Judean members of that mixed group, in Miranda’s view.⁵⁸ However, the Glykon inscription does not give any clear indication that either of these guilds were distinctively Judean, nor that they stood out from other such groups in Hierapolis.

More important, a good number of inscriptions (seven in all) concerning purple-dyers at Hierapolis in this period (mid-second to early third centuries) show that, rather

54. *IHierapJ* 50, 195; *IHierapPenn* 45; *IHierapMir* 23 = *IHierapJ* 342. On this local ceremony, see Judeich’s notes to *IHierapJ* 195, as well as *IHierapJ* 133, 153, 209, 234, 270, 278, 293, 310, 336 (cf. *ILaodikeia* 84, 85).

55. *IHierapJ* 218; *IHierapPenn* 7, 23, 25, 45.

56. *IHierapJ* 133, 227; *IHierapPenn* 23 and *IHierapMir* 23 = *IHierapJ* 342.

57. Ziebarth 1896, 129; Ramsay 1900, 81, and Ramsay 1902, 98–101; Applebaum 1974b, 480–83.

58. Miranda 1999a, 140–45.

than being distinctively Judean, this guild consisted principally of gentiles (at the points we have any evidence for them) and were viewed as a typical guild in the community.⁵⁹ Thus, for instance, the purple-dyers (ἡ τέχνη τῶν πορφυραβά[φων]) joined with the city (*polis*) in about 209 CE to dedicate a portion of the theatre (two levels of the architrave) to Apollo Archegetes (“the Founder”), to other gods of the homeland, and to the emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla.⁶⁰ And beyond the Glykon inscription, none of the other four families who included the purple-dyers (or its leadership, “the board of presidents of the purple-dyers”) in funerary arrangements expressly indicates any Judean connections regarding either the family who owned the grave or the guild(s) in question, which goes by various titles at different points.⁶¹

When the “sacred guild of purple-dyers” (ἡ σεμνοτάτη ἐργασία τῶν πορφυραβάφων) set up its own honorary monuments for civic and imperial officials, once again there is no indication that they were distinctively Judean in composition.⁶² It is certainly possible, however, that the guild included Judeans in its membership when such honorary activities took place (the membership would no doubt change over generations), especially in light of evidence from elsewhere concerning Judeans’ interactions with imperial-connected individuals who were not Judean.⁶³ So, although we cannot necessarily assume that members in the purple-dyers were solely non-Judeans (gentiles), we do know that they were *not* solely Judeans during the era of the Glykon inscription.

In light of this, there are two main possibilities regarding the composition of these guilds. In either case this is evidence not only for the participation and integration of Judeans in civic life but also for Judean affiliations with, or memberships in, local occupational associations at Hierapolis. On the one hand, if the guild was composed exclusively of gentiles, as Judeich and Conrad Cichorius suggested early on, this is a Judean (or gentile “Judaizer”) following burial conventions of non-Judeans in Hierapolis (and Asia generally) by including guilds in funerary provisions.⁶⁴ In this case, the reason for Glykon’s asking these guilds (instead of a Judean group, for instance) to perform the grave rituals would presumably relate to the fact that he had contacts with purple-dyers and carpet-weavers

59. Cf. Judeich 1898, 174; Ritti 1992–93, 66–67. There are slight variations in the terminology used in reference to the purple-dyers (see n. 60). The purple-dyers are to be distinguished from the “dyers” (βαφεῖς), however, who formed a separate guild (*IHierapJ* 50 and 195).

60. Ritti 1985, 108–13.

61. *IHierapJ* 133 (designated simply τῶν πορ[φυραβάφων]); *IHierapJ* 227b (referring to τῷ συνεδρίῳ | τῆς προεδρίας τῶν πορφυραβάφων, “the board of presidency of the purple-dyers”); *IHierapPenn* 23 (referring to τῇ προεδρίᾳ τῶν πορφυραβάφων, “the presidents of the purple-dyers”). Cf. *IHierapJ* 156; *IHierapPenn* 37 (each involving a purple-dealer [πορφυροπώλης] with no Judean connection involved).

62. *IHierapJ* 42; *IHierapJ* 41= *IGR* IV 822 (probably third cent. CE). The use of “most sacred” is typical of associations, organizations, and civic bodies when they express their own identities, namely, when the group in question is the one having the monument inscribed (see n. 20; cf. *IHierapJ* 36, 40).

63. See Harland 2003a, 219–28.

64. Humann, Cichorius, et al. 1898, 46, 51, 174.

within commercial networks, perhaps as a regular customer, vendor, or benefactor of the guilds.⁶⁵

What seems even more likely is that, although consisting principally of non-Judeans, at Glykon's time these two guilds included individual devotees of the Judean God (Judeans, or perhaps gentile "Judaizers" or "Judaizing" Christians),⁶⁶ who happened to be purple-dyers or carpet-weavers. Paul R. Trebilco is among those who mention this third possibility, yet he is hesitant to take a stand on which of the three options seems most or least likely.⁶⁷ Suggesting the presence of devotees of the Judean God in the guilds would have the advantage of better accounting for Glykon's request that gentile guilds perform the customary grave ceremony on Judean holidays, and we know that Judeans sometimes did engage in clothing and other related occupations.⁶⁸

If this is indeed the case, then we can begin to imagine processes whereby ordinary gentiles might become gentile sympathizers or "god-fearers" (such as those at Aphrodisias in the fourth century). For the Glykon family's choice to corporately involve these guilds in celebrating Judean festivals would involve some gentiles who had little or no previous involvement in Judean practices. Social network connections based on common occupation could become the basis of new adherences, in this case perhaps leading to an increase in the number of gentiles with some level of attachment to the Judean God or to Judeans living in Hierapolis.⁶⁹ In fourth-century Aphrodisias, for instance, several Judeans and "god-fearers" came from occupations related to clothing production or sale (rag-dealer, fuller, boot-maker, linen-worker, and purple-dyer) and, in at least one case, the occupation of a named Judean (a bronzesmith) matches that of two "god-fearers," who are also bronzesmiths (*IJO* II 14b, lines 25, 46, 53). In chapter 1 I discussed the role of occupational networks in the foundation and growth of associations of various kinds, including some Judean gatherings.

If there were Judeans (or "god-fearers") as members of these guilds at Hierapolis, as I argue, Glykon's reasons for choosing these two guilds (rather than other known guilds) would involve a combination of factors, including his contacts (for commercial and/or benefaction purposes) with both Judeans and gentiles *and* his ethnic and cultural affiliations with fellow-Judeans (or at least gentile devotees of the Judean God) in Hierapolis. It is this combination of attachments that makes this third option concerning the mixed

65. It was common for wealthier individuals to call on the funerary-related services of a guild to which they did *not* belong (see the earlier discussion of Glykon's socio-economic status).

66. On Christians at Hierapolis, see below.

67. Trebilco 1991, 178–79. Kraabel (1968, 134–35) is among the first to mention this option. Ritti (1992–93) further explores this possibility and is less hesitant in suggesting that this may be a mixed guild. Miranda (1999a, 141–44) discusses evidence of Judean occupational organizations (in Palestine and Alexandria) at some length, and suggests that the purple-dyers were likely Judean and that the carpet-weavers may have been mixed. The new edition of Emil Schürer's work (by Vermes, Millar, and Goodman) states that "the members of the guilds must also have been influenced by Judaism" (Schürer 1973–87, 3.27). Cf. *AE* (1994), no. 1660 on the possibility of *thosebeis*.

68. Cf. *CIJ* 787, 873, 929, 931; Acts 16:14–15; 18:2–3.

69. Cf. Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, 116–23. Tessa Rajak and David Noy have shown that even those who were designated "synagogue leaders" may have been non-Judean benefactors of Judean groups, for instance. See Rajak and Noy 1993, 75–93; cf. Rajak 2002, 373–91.

composition of the guild most effective in making sense of the evidence. The theory that Judeans at Hierapolis maintained affiliations with or memberships in other groups or associations within the city is also consistent with Judean evidence from other areas.⁷⁰ In cases where we know the occupation of Judeans there is a range of activity comparable to the known guilds, and the fact that occupations are mentioned at all on Judean monuments suggests that this was an important component in their identities.⁷¹ So it is not too surprising to find Judeans affiliating with their fellow-workers within occupational networks and guilds. I will return to this important issue of multiple memberships in associations in chapter 7.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter I have discussed evidence for members of ethnic or cultural minority groups, namely Judeans at Hierapolis, adopting and adapting to local cultural practices and interacting with their Greek or Roman neighbours in the second and third centuries. The case of Hierapolis demonstrates well some dynamics of cultural and structural assimilation, and it is worthwhile placing this evidence within a broader social-scientific framework here.⁷²

In the previous chapter I discussed theories of assimilation that help to explain the processes of boundary negotiations that take place when members of two or more cultural groups interact. In particular, it is useful to distinguish between subprocesses of assimilation, the most important here being (1) cultural assimilation, or acculturation, (2) structural assimilation, and (3) dissimilation or cultural maintenance. I have explained each of these in some detail already, but further explanation of the second main subprocess, *structural assimilation*, is important here in connection with Judeans at Hierapolis.

Milton Yinger proposes that structural assimilation entails both informal and formal levels.⁷³ At the *informal* level, individual members of a given ethnic or cultural group can interact with persons from other cultural groups through personal, social network connections, including memberships in neighbourhoods, clubs, and associations.⁷⁴ The *formal* level of structural assimilation involves members of a particular cultural minority group participating in political, legal, social, or economic institutions of society.

These social-scientific insights provide a framework in which to make better sense of the ancient evidence—albeit fragmentary—for Judeans and Judean groups at Hierapolis and elsewhere in the empire. Moreover, both the form and content of the Judean epitaphs at Hierapolis illustrate both cultural and structural assimilation. First of all, we have seen that the form of Judean grave inscriptions indicates acculturation to patterns of other non-

70. See chapter 7 for evidence regarding multiple affiliations among Judeans.

71. See van der Horst 1991, 99–101; Shaye J. D. Cohen 1993, 10; Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, 116–23.

72. For others who have drawn on such social-scientific insights in studying groups in the ancient context see Balch 1986, 79–101; Barclay 1996; Noy 2000.

73. Yinger 1981; Yinger 1994. Cf. Marger 1991, 117–120.

74. Cf. Yinger 1981, 254; Marger 1991, 118.

Judean graves from the same locale.⁷⁵ Moving beyond the form of epitaphs to the content and its implications, it is important to notice somewhat subtle evidence of *formal structural* assimilation in relation to important institutions of the Greek city (*polis*). The inclusion of formal institutions, usually the civic (“most sacred”) treasury, as recipients of fines in many (nine) Judean inscriptions at Hierapolis (and on Judean epitaphs elsewhere) implied some level of civic responsibility for preservation or maintenance of the family tomb.⁷⁶ Violators would have to answer not only to the descendants of the family, if any, but also to the city of Hierapolis itself, so to speak. Including local associations, alongside civic institutions or alone, was thought to further bolster this insurance that the family grave would remain intact and undisturbed.

There are other signs of formal structural assimilation among Judeans here. Like their non-Judean counterparts, nearly half (ten) of the Judean epitaphs from Hierapolis (the Glykon grave included) clearly mention that a copy of the epitaph was placed in the civic archives. This, too, has a structural significance beyond its seemingly incidental mention. For placing a copy in the civic archives further ensured that, if anyone should fail to obey the will of the deceased or actually modify (or remove) the original inscription from the tomb, legal action could follow. This expectation of justice from relevant civic institutions is a significant indication of structural integration within local society.

It is within this context of interaction and acculturation that we can better understand the Glykon family grave itself. If, on the one hand, Glykon and his family were gentile sympathizers (or “judaizing” Christians, for instance)⁷⁷ who had adopted important Judean practices, which is possible though difficult to establish, then this provides an interesting case of Greek or Phrygian gentiles’ acculturation to the ways of local Judeans while also continuing in burial customs characteristic of Hierapolis and Asia Minor. Furthermore, the involvement of a guild (the purple-dyers) which did include non-Judeans (gentiles) in this number is suggestive of at least some level of acculturation to Judean practices on the part of these guild members at Hierapolis. Yet here it is the family, not members of the guilds, who have chosen to have the guilds participate on Judean holy days and on a Roman festival. Unlike the case of the “god-fearers” at Aphrodisias, there is no clear indication that the gentile guild-members were members in the synagogue or in an association devoted solely to the Judean God.

If, on the other hand, Glykon and his family were from Judea as immigrants or

75. Among these standard inscriptional patterns (including the common vocabulary used) are: (1) identification of the owner(s) of the tomb and surrounding area; (2) stipulations that no one else, beyond those designated, is to be buried on the site; (3) preventative measures of setting fines should the instructions be violated; (4) arrangements for payment of such fines to civic institutions (treasury or elders’ organization) and/or local associations (e.g., Judean synagogues, guilds); and, (5) deposit of a copy of the inscription in the civic archives.

76. Cf. *IJO* II 172 (Akmoneia), 216 (Termessos), 233, 238 (Korykos).

77. Literary evidence shows that followers of Jesus lived at Hierapolis already in the first century (Col 4:13) and continued in subsequent centuries (cf. Eusebius *HE* 3.31.3, 3.36.1–2, 4.26.1). The earliest openly Christian inscriptions from Hierapolis date to Byzantine times, when the martyrrium associated with Philip was established (cf. *IHierapJ* 22, 24; fifth century or later). Attempts by those such as Ramsay to identify other inscriptions as Christian based only on the inscription’s use of “unusual” language are problematic at best (e.g., *IHierapJ* 227 with notes by Judeich refuting Ramsay’s suggestion of Christianity in that inscription; see Ramsay 1895–97, 118–19, no. 28).

descendants of immigrants, this inscription provides further evidence of both cultural and structural assimilation among Judean families at Hierapolis. I have shown that the fabric of this family's identities consisted of intertwined Judean, Roman, and Hierapolitan strands. Most prominently with regard to Judean identity is the concern to have the grave visited on the festivals of Passover and Pentecost. Many Judean families did assert Judean aspects of their identities (in relation to non-Judeans) by using the designation "Judean," and some did so by including symbols such as the menorah on their grave monuments (*IHierapMir* 6, 12). In one case, for instance, it seems that connections with the homeland of Judea or Israel were expressed through a concern to have bones returned to "the ancestral land" (ἐκτὸς τοῦ διακομίσαντος ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν πατρῶ|αν γῆν; *IHierapMir* 19), a burial practice that is attested in only a limited number of other diaspora cases.⁷⁸ Still, the Glykon inscription stands out among the epitaphs of Hierapolis, and even Asia Minor or the empire, in its special concern to carry on Judean *customs* even after death, thereby continuing to express this Judean element of the family's identities within Hierapolis indefinitely.

At the same time, Glykon felt himself to be Roman in some sense, both in proudly indicating his status as Roman citizen and by choosing to include the Roman New Year festival as a time when the family would be remembered by a guild in Hierapolis. In fact, the rarity of epigraphic evidence concerning the celebration of this Roman festival in the provinces draws further attention to its significance here as a sign of the adoption of some Roman practices among Judeans, what has traditionally been labeled Romanization.

Alongside these Judean and Roman identifications, the family clearly experienced a sense of belonging within the community of Hierapolis specifically in many respects. At the formal structural level, this family, like other Judeans, deposited a copy of the inscription in the civic archives, indicating an expectation of some level of justice from local legal procedures and institutions. Furthermore, these Judeans were acculturated to Hierapolitan or Phrygian practice in leaving "grave-crowning funds" and followed regional custom in entrusting their final bequest to occupational associations. Not only that, but the family also chose one of the most popular and, it seems, widely trusted local guilds to fulfill this duty.

Both Glykon and the devotees of the Judean God who belonged to the guilds of purple-dyers and carpet-weavers further illustrate the potential for multiple affiliations with subgroups of local society. Such involvements in local groups are an important factor in processes of informal structural assimilation. Moreover, information concerning the Glykon family, as well as other Judeans at Hierapolis, points toward significant levels of integration on the part of these Judeans within the society of Greco-Roman Hierapolis alongside a continued sense of belonging with others who gave special attention to honouring the God of the Judean homeland. Now that we have looked at some cases of integration and positive intergroup relations, we can turn to instances of ethnic and other rivalries among associations in the civic context.

78. On transportation of bones to Jerusalem, see Williams 1998, 75–76; Josephus *Ant.* 10.94–95. However, see Tessa Rajak's discussion of the necropolis at Beth She'arim in the Lower Galilee, which, in her view, was "a glorified local cemetery, whose catchment area happens to be rather large" (including deceased from nearby diaspora locations, including Beirut, Sidon, and Caesarea; Rajak 2002 [1998], 494).