

Between Polemic and Propaganda: Evoking the Jews of Fourth-Century Antioch

Christine Shepardson

University of Tennessee, Knoxville | cshepard@utk.edu

JJMJS No. 2 (2015): 147–182

Despite narratives that Jews had a long history in ancient Antioch (Antakya, Turkey), modern perceptions of the late antique city are often still shaped by John Chrysostom's aggressive Christian rhetoric. John's sermons encouraged readers to imagine shadowy rhetorical "Jews" lurking in demon-filled synagogues, rather than Jews as otherwise undifferentiated synagogue-attendees among the crowd at the hippodrome, members of the *bouleutērion*, and fellow vendors in the *agora* who closed their shops on the Sabbath and contributed public festival celebrations to the city's already busy calendar.¹ Decades ago Robert Wilken, Wayne Meeks, and others gathered the extant evidence for Jews in fourth-century Antioch,² but the quantity and lurid quality of the anti-Jewish

¹ It is difficult to represent the various shades of rhetorical construction and historical reality that the extant data represents. I have put the term "Jews" in scare-quotes when I want to highlight the narrative construction of the category, and have left it without when I intend the term to lean closer toward the historical than the rhetorical. Nevertheless, this binary choice does not capture the complexity of the situation.

² Robert Wilken's groundbreaking work explicitly addressed the problem that in his view most scholars except for Marcel Simon had largely "ignored" the Jews' "vital" presence in Antioch: Robert Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), xvi; see Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'empire romain (135–425)* (Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1964). Emmanuel Soler's book also asked readers to remember Antioch's Jews: *Le Sacré et le Salut à Antioche au IVe siècle apr. J.-C.: Pratiques festives et comportements religieux dans le processus de christianisation de la cité* (Beirut: Institut français du Proche-Orient, 2006), 2–3, 5, 107–11; see also Carl Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51.2 (1932): 130–60; Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961); Wayne Meeks and Robert Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978); Johannes Hahn, "Die jüdische Gemeinde im spätantiken Antiochia:

and anti-Judaizing rhetoric in Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies have continued to capture scholars' attention disproportionately to the other evidence.³ Furthermore, developments in the methodological norms of historical scholarship mean that many scholars today do not share Meeks and Wilken's confidence in the historical reliability of some of their sources, and have a more nuanced vocabulary for discussing the complexities of people and practices that seemed to John Chrysostom too "Jewish" to be "Christian" than existed when Meeks and Wilken wrote over thirty years ago.⁴ These methodological shifts also mean that recent scholarship more often sidesteps discussion of actual fourth-century Antiochene Jews to focus instead on the rhetorical world of Antioch as John Chrysostom imagined and presented it. Thus, despite these earlier studies, it is not uncommon for scholars whose explicit interest is not already Judaism to

Leben im Spannungsfeld von sozialer Einbindung, religiösem Wettbewerb und gewaltsamem Konflikt," in *Jüdische Gemeinden und Organisationsformen von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Robert Jütte and Abraham Kustermann (Vienna: Böhlau Press, 1996), 57–90; Bernadette Brooten, "The Jews of Antioch," in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City, Exhibition Catalogue, Worcester Art Museum, October 7, 2000–February 4, 2001; The Cleveland Museum of Art, March 18–June 3, 2001; The Baltimore Museum of Art, September 16–December 30, 2001*, ed. Christine Kondoleon (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 28–37; and Ari Finkelstein, "Julian among Jews, Christians and 'Hellenes' in Antioch: Jewish Practice as a Guide to 'Hellenes' and a Goad to Christians" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2011), 19–25.

³ See, for example, Christine Shepardson, "Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy," *JCS* 15.4 (2007): 483–516; Klaas Smelik, "John Chrysostom's Homilies against the Jews, some comments," *Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift* 39 (1985): 194–200; A. M. Ritter, "John Chrysostom and the Jews, a Reconsideration," *Ancient Christianity in the Caucasus* (1998): 141–54, 231–32; Pieter W. van der Horst, "Jews and Christians in Antioch at the End of the Fourth Century," in *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson (Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 228–38.

⁴ Daniel Boyarin's work is an excellent example of the wealth of scholarship in recent decades that challenged the coherence, separation, and monolithic nature of Roman "Judaism" and "Christianity," let alone so-called Jewish-Christians, Judaizers, or demi-Christians: Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). The nuances that such scholarship has introduced means that some of the assumptions and vocabulary of Meeks, Wilken, and other early scholars are dated, even though their scholarship was careful and sophisticated in its time. While I hope that this essay will update the conversation, I remain deeply indebted to the insightful and influential work of these earlier scholars.

paint a picture of fourth-century Antioch whose general public still seems largely devoid of Jews.⁵

Recent comments from Blake Leyerle, Paula Fredriksen, and Ross Kraemer have led me to revisit the evidence for Jews in fourth-century Antioch between the extremes of John Chrysostom's polemic and rabbinic propaganda,⁶ including material evidence from Apamea and Beth She'arim and literary evidence from Libanius, John Chrysostom, and the Palestinian Talmud.⁷ The variety of extant sources for fourth-century Antioch makes the city a valuable case study for late antique Jews and Jewish practices. The present essay offers a carefully contextualized analysis of this literary and material evidence, informed by the

⁵ See, for example, Isabella Sandwell and Janet Huskinson, eds., *Culture and Society in Later Roman Antioch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3; and Jaclyn Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Raffaella Cribiore's book on Libanius and religion has large index entries for Christianity and paganism, but none for Jews or Judaism: Raffaella Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013). Isabella Sandwell's book takes seriously the category of "the Jew" in John Chrysostom's writing, but she focuses on the rhetoric of identity construction rather than Jews themselves: Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

⁶ Blake Leyerle challenged those at the 2014 meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature to remember that John Chrysostom's vitriolic *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies were in some ways not representative of his larger corpus; Paula Fredriksen asked me to consider how my recent work on fourth-century Antioch could inform conversations about Jews in that city; and Ross Kraemer organized a 2015 Moskow Workshop at Brown University that asked participants to consider the evidence beyond rabbinic sources for Jews in the late antique Mediterranean. I thank them for being the muses behind this essay. I would also like to thank the two anonymous readers whose critical feedback proved to be extremely constructive.

⁷ While the emperor Julian wrote from Antioch in 362–63, including his text *Against the Galileans*, which specifically talks about Judaism and Christianity, most of his Antiochene writings do not say much about Jews in the city. For an excellent study on Julian's descriptions and relations with Jews, see Finkelstein, "Julian." Although it is tempting to include the fifth- and sixth-century writings of Antiochene natives and church historians Theodoret of Cyrrhus and John Malalas, in addition to those of the fifth-century Constantinopolitan church historian Socrates, their later contexts makes the relation of their stories to fourth-century experiences of the world more difficult to confirm.

methodological expectations of twenty-first century scholarship. It aims to rejuvenate academic conversations about Jews in late antiquity, and in fourth-century Antioch specifically, while also modeling an approach to highly rhetorical texts that grants neither their complete transparency nor opacity with respect to their historical context. While the number and location of synagogues in Antioch and its suburb Daphne, and the daily habits and self-descriptions of their attendees, remain unknowable, the evidence for the existence of synagogues and people in the community who are named *Ioudaioi*, *archisynagōgos*, *presbyteroi*, and *gerousiarchēs* is still persuasive, albeit to be used with a bit more caution about some of the details than earlier scholars expressed. Against the backdrop of that evidence, I argue, John Chrysostom's descriptions of contemporary practices that he associated with the synagogue and local Jews—explicitly differentiated in these cases from biblical “Jews”—provide a rare and therefore valuable non-rabbinic representation of post-temple Jewish practices.

Glimpsing Antiochene Jews: Inscriptions, Libanius, and the Palestinian Talmud

Despite Jews' participation in the daily life of the Roman Empire, scholars have historically tended to separate them and highlight their difference from other Romans, in part because it is only when Jews were distinct from their neighbors that they became visible as Jews in the sources that survive.⁸ As Shaye Cohen has notably brought to our attention, however, “the Diaspora Jews of antiquity were not easily recognizable—if, indeed, they were recognizable at all.”⁹ Cohen observed that “the boundary between Jews and gentiles in antiquity was not always clearly marked; the degree of social interaction between Jews and non-Jews was sufficiently great that it was not always easy to tell who was a Jew and who was not,”¹⁰ and that most of the time Diaspora Roman Jews “looked like everyone else, dressed like everyone else, spoke like everyone else, had names and occupations like those of everyone else, and, in general, closely resembled their gentile neighbors.”¹¹ Late antique Jews joined their neighbors at the theater

⁸ Leonard Rutgers has noted, for example, “Whereas Jews were traditionally seen as an isolated and inward-looking group, scholars expounding the new view of Jewish history turned this view upside-down” (Leonard Rutgers, *Making Myths: Jews in Early Christian Identity Formation* [Leuven: Peeters, 2009], 4).

⁹ Shaye Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 67.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 341.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 67.

and the baths,¹² and talked with them on the streets.¹³ Wealthy Jews owned slaves like other Romans of their social position.¹⁴ Wilken wrote, “Jews served as watchmen; as clerks in the market; in municipal waterworks; as police officers; in the military; and in other positions in the cities,” and “elsewhere in Syria, inscriptions mention other Jews . . . : goldsmiths, perfume makers, manufacturers, and traders in silk. . . . Jews in Caesarea were bakers, bathhouse attendants, workers in metal, and weavers. Some even worked in the theaters and

¹² Hayim Lapin commented both on rabbinic efforts to stem such participation as well as hints that their ideals were not reality when he wrote, “Those entertainments, theaters and what goes on in them about which rabbinic texts occasionally betray knowledge, are consistently coded as ‘gentile’ and negative”: Hayim Lapin, *Rabbis as Romans: The Rabbinic Movement in Palestine, 100–400 C.E.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 140. Theaters were likewise maligned by Christian leaders like John Chrysostom, who also associated Jews with horseraces (*Jud.* 1.4). See Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Pieter van der Horst has written about a bench in the Odeon of Roman Aphrodisias “inscribed with two seat-markers, one of them stating that the seats there belong to the Jews [τόπος Ἐβραίων], the other one on the adjacent row that these seats belong to the elderly Jewish Blues” (i.e., the circus faction), and van der Horst cites other evidence from Miletus and Tyre: *Jews and Christians in their Greco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 54; see also Ross Kraemer, “Giving Up the Godfearers,” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 5.1 (2014): 78. Lapin has noted that according to Palestinian rabbinic texts, Jews “may bathe in baths despite their ritual problems,” and he noted the “naturalization of bathing and bathhouses” in this Roman literature, in contrast to condemnations in the Babylonian Talmud (Lapin, *Rabbis*, 126–32). On Tertullian’s Christian antipathy for the baths, and on Jews participating in Roman bathhouse culture, see Paula Fredriksen and Oded Irshai, “Include Me Out: Tertullian, The Rabbis, and the Graeco-Roman City,” *L’identité à travers l’éthnique* (2015), esp. 122–23, 126–27. I thank my colleagues at the 2015 Moskow Workshop at Brown University for the citations to these Jewish seats in Aphrodisias, Miletus, and Tyre.

¹³ Wilken cited first-century inscriptional evidence from Cyrene for Jews as *ephebes*, boys who participated in their local *gymnasium* (Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 48); compare also an inscription from Iasos in Asia Minor (L. Robert, “Un corpus des inscriptions juives,” *Revue des Études Juives* 101 [1937]: 85–86). On the integration of Jews into Roman cities, see also Paula Fredriksen and Oded Irshai, “Christian Anti-Judaism: Polemics and Policies,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, v.4, ed. Steven Katz (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 985–98.

¹⁴ *CTh* 16.9.1; cf. 3.1.5. Wilken also noted these passages (*John Chrysostom*, 60).

participated in athletic events”;¹⁵ and Jews could be nominated to the municipal council.¹⁶ In Antioch Jews bought and sold in the marketplaces, celebrated festivals publically,¹⁷ and participated in local, regional, and imperial patronage systems.¹⁸ While it is not possible to construct a complete history of Jews in Antioch, Josephus claimed that Jews had lived in the city ever since Seleukos I Nikator founded it in 300 B.C.E., and references in Galatians (2:11–14), the Acts of the Apostles (11:19; 14:19), and Josephus describe Jews in the first-century city.¹⁹ Evidence from the second and third centuries is scarce, but since inscriptions and literary evidence survive for fourth-century Antiochene Jews, most scholars argue that significant numbers of Jews lived in the city throughout this period.²⁰ A close survey and analysis of the non-Christian evidence will

¹⁵ Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 48–49, 62. On Jews as gladiators, charioteers, and other athletic competitors, see Zeev Weiss, *Public Spectacles in Roman and Late Antique Palestine* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2014), 146, 192–93, 209–11. I thank Paula Fredriksen for pointing me toward this reference.

¹⁶ *CTh* 16.8.3.

¹⁷ E.g., John Chrysostom, *Jud.* 1.1.

¹⁸ E.g., Libanius, *Ep.* 1251; cf. *CTh* 12.1.157–58. In integrating Jews into narratives of late antiquity, Rutgers has reminded scholars not to overlook “the harsh realities that confronted so many inhabitants of the later Roman Empire when they found themselves in inter-group settings” (Rutgers, *Making Myths*, 4–5).

¹⁹ Meeks and Wilken relied heavily on Josephus and John Malalas for their far-reaching history (Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 1–13; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 36–37, 55; e.g., Josephus, *c. Ap.* 2.39; *Ant.* 12.119; *J.W.* 7.44); compare, for example, Downey, *History*, 79–80, 107–11. See also Kraeling, who engaged the rabbinic sources in greater depth (“Jewish,” 130–60). Meeks and Wilken also found “no reason to doubt the accuracy” of Acts’ basic representation of Antioch (*Jews*, 13). Given the methodological challenges of determining the reliability of these sources for centuries much earlier than their authorship, I have not followed these scholars in mixing contemporary and non-contemporary witnesses for fourth-century Antioch.

²⁰ E.g., Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 6; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 65. Socrates recorded a story of Christian violence against Jews in a small town between Antioch and nearby Chalcis (Socrates, *HE* 7.16), and scholars like Downey (*History*, 459–61) and Beat Brenk (“Die Umwandlung der Synagoge von Apamea in eine Kirche: Eine mentalitätsgeschichtliche Studie,” in *Tesseræ Festschrift für Josef Engemann* [Munster: Aschendorff, 1991], 13) have related this to the early-fifth-century imperial legislation regarding synagogues (*CTh* 16.8.25–27). Mayer and Allen, however, have correctly noted that the story cannot be verified and the legislation need not relate to an incident near Antioch: Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300–638 CE)* (Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2012), 38n, 112–13. I have thus removed this discussion from the current study of fourth-

provide an important foundation for the examination of John Chrysostom's Christian rhetoric that follows.

Material Evidence for Antiochene Jews

Constant habitation has unfortunately prevented any thorough archaeological search for Antioch's Roman past. In the 1930s, when the region was under French control, however, a Princeton-led excavation discovered numerous mosaic carpets from the wealthy Roman suburb of Daphne (Harbiye, Turkey), several Antiochene baths, and an important church in the Kaoussie (Qausiyeh) district; others of Antioch's Roman remains, such as aqueducts, the hippodrome, and city walls (as well as some Crusade-era architecture) are still visible around the city today.²¹ Modern building projects in the city continue to unearth new evidence on occasion, such as the third-century marble sarcophagus that was found near the Daphne Gate and is now on display in the Hatay Archaeology Museum. In addition, a Turkish and German team has recently done additional archaeological work around the city.²² Nevertheless, there has not yet been much material evidence recovered from Antioch that can definitively be identified with Jews, apart from a surface find of a broken marble slab with a menorah and

century Judaism in Antioch, though many earlier scholars include it (e.g., Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 36).

²¹ The Princeton excavations were published in a series of volumes: *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, Publications of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity, vol. 1: The Excavations of 1932*, ed. George W. Elderkin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934); *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, vol. 2: The Excavations, 1933–1936*, ed. Richard Stillwell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938); *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, vol. 3: The Excavations, 1937–1939*, ed. Richard Stillwell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941); *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, vol. 4.1: Ceramics and Islamic Coins*, ed. Frederick O. Waagé (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948); *Antioch-on-the-Orontes, vol. 4.2: Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Crusaders' Coins*, ed. Dorothy B. Waagé (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952). See also the more recent study of Antioch's churches: Mayer and Allen, *Churches*.

²² Hatice Pamir has released some initial observations: "Preliminary results of the recent archaeological researches in Antioch on the Orontes and its vicinity," in *Les sources de l'histoire du paysage urbain d'Antioche sur l'Oronte* (Paris: Université Paris 8, Vincennes-Saint-Denis, 2012), 259–70. The results of this project are planned in a three-volume series. See also Gunnar Brands, "Antiochia in der Spätantike: Prolegomena zu einer archäologischen Stadtgeschichte" (forthcoming).

partial inscription carved on it.²³ Some of the city's other material objects of course could have belonged to Jews, but there is no way to tell.²⁴

While there is little archaeological evidence from Antioch or Daphne that is distinctively Jewish, there are mosaics further south in Apamea that refer to a fourth-century *archisynagōgos* of the Antiochenes. In 1934, Belgian archaeologists excavated a building in Apamea that they identified as a late-fourth-century synagogue, situated "in the very heart of the city" on the beautifully colonnaded *cardo maximus* "approximately one hundred meters south of the main intersection."²⁵ The floor had a mosaic carpet that included a menorah, twenty Greek dedicatory inscriptions, and what appear to be a *lulav* and an *etrog*.²⁶ Inscription 1 read as follows: "At the time of the most honored *archisynagōgoi* Eusebios and Nemios and Phineos, and Theodōros the

²³ Brooten's article contains an image and brief description of this artifact (Brooten, "Jews," 28, 34). While the partial inscription is in the Greek alphabet, it appears to represent an Aramaic or Hebrew word (*ibid.*, 34); cf. Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 57; Stillwell, *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, vol. 2, 150–51.

²⁴ See Leonard Rutgers, "Archaeological Evidence for the Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Late Antiquity," *American Journal of Archaeology* 96.1 (1992): 101–18.

²⁵ Lee Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 258. While Levine agreed that the floor belonged to a synagogue, he has noted that one of its inscriptions used the term *naos* to refer "to the synagogue building" (*ibid.*, 260). This is Inscription 6 in the report published by E. L. Sukenik, "The Mosaic Inscriptions in the Synagogue at Apamea on the Orontes," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950/51): 541–51. The summary of the first field report for the 1934 excavation is F. Mayence, "La Quatrième Campagne de Fouilles à Apamée: Rapport sommaire," *L'Antiquité Classique* t.4.1 (May 1935): 199–204. This building was destroyed by the early fifth century and at some point also in the early fifth century a church was built on the spot (Sukenik, "Mosaic," 543); cf. Brenk, "Umwandlung."

²⁶ Rachel Hachlili has published a helpful survey of the archaeology of this building: Rachel Hachlili, *Ancient Jewish Art and Archaeology in the Diaspora* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 32–34, 198–204. Hachlili wrote, "The only Jewish symbol in the mosaic pavement is a simple menorah" (*ibid.*, 34; cf. 203); cf. Steven Fine, *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 126; Levine, *Ancient*, 258; Brenk, "Umwandlung," 8; Meeks/Wilken, 53–54. Nevertheless, a photograph in Sukenik's article suggests to me that the floor might also represent a *lulav* and *etrog* at the end of Inscription 17 (Sukenik, "Mosaic," 549 and Plate VIII between pages 544 and 545). I rely on Sukenik ("Mosaic," 543–50) for the Greek texts of these mosaic inscriptions and their numbering; I have made small changes to some of Sukenik's English translations. The inscriptions relevant to Antioch are also published with English translations in Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 53–54.

gerousiarchēs, and the most honored *presbyteroi* Eisakios and Saoulos and the rest, Ilasios, *archisynagōgos* of the Antiochenes, donated the mosaic entryway, 150 feet, in the year 703, the seventh of Eudyneos [January 7, 391]. Blessings on all.”²⁷ Another mosaic in the same floor (Inscription 2) said, “Ilasios son of Eisakios, *archisynagōgos* of the Antiochenes, for the security [ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ] of his spouse Phōtion [ΦΩΤΙΟΥ ΣΥΜΒΙΟΥ] and children, and for the security of Eustathia his mother-in-law, and in memory of Eisakios and Edesios and Hesychion [ΗΣΥΧΙΟΥ] his ancestors, donated the mosaic entryway. Peace and mercy on all your holy people.”²⁸ While these inscriptions tell us nothing about the practices of Ilasios or his family, or the size or location of Antioch’s synagogue building(s) or community, they do offer independent attestation for Antiochene Jews fewer than five years after the hostile *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies that John Chrysostom preached in the city in 386 and 387 C.E.

²⁷ Sukenik, “Mosaic,” 544.

²⁸ Sukenik, “Mosaic,” 544–45. The last name in this inscription has the same ending as the two men’s names before it, though scholars have taken it to refer to a woman, in part because Inscriptions 3 and 5 from the same floor refer to someone named Hesychion as the spouse [ΗΣΥΧΙΩ ΣΥΝΒΙΩ] of Thaumasis in one inscription and of Theodōros in another, just as Phōtion is the spouse [ΦΩΤΙΟΥ ΣΥΜΒΙΟΥ] of Ilasios in Inscription 2. It is worth noting that the inscription makes it grammatically impossible to distinguish whether these names should be rendered in English as Hesychios and Photios but still as wives, as Sukenik preferred (“Mosaic,” 545), suggesting that Hesychios was Ilasios’s mother (“Mosaic,” 551). Meeks and Wilken translated the names as Phōtion and Hesychios (*Jews*, 54), and Ross Kraemer believed that Inscription 3 represented a woman named Hesychion who was the wife of Thaumasis (Ross Kraemer, ed., *Women’s Religions in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2004], 165), although she has since pointed me to a more recent translation, for which I am grateful; see David Noy and Hanswulf Bloedhorn, eds., *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis, v.3: Syria and Cyprus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). These editors translated Inscription 3 as “Thumasi(us) with his spouse Hesychion’ [or ‘Thaumasis with her spouse Hesychius’]” (95). I have chosen to use Hesychion and Phōtion to set them apart from the more self-evidently masculine names that end with *-os*. It is worth noting, however, that Inscription 4 from this mosaic refers much more clearly to Ourania as the wife of Hierios by choosing the term *gynē* [ΟΥΡΑΝΗ ΓΥΝΕΚΙ] rather than *symbios/synbios*, just as Inscription 17 uses *gynē* for the wives [ΓΥΝΕΕΙΝ] of Eusebios and Veturios, and Inscription 18 uses *anēr/andros*, for Eupithis’s husband [ΑΝΔΡΟΣ]. If the mosaic intended to distinguish the relationships marked by *symbios* from these others, those distinctions are no longer clear.

Interestingly, there are also marked burials in Beth She'arim in the Galilee that appear to belong to the same wealthy family attested in these two mosaics from Apamea, with the "burial chamber of Aidesios, the *gerousiarchēs* of Antioch" and six more tombs in the chamber "belonging to Aidesios," including one for "Hesychnis."²⁹ It is tempting to read this latter inscription in light of the mosaics from Apamea, as scholars have done, and to see Aidesios the *gerousiarchēs* of Antioch buried in Beth She'arim as Edesios, the ancestor of Ilasios the *archisynagōgos* of the Antiochenes from the synagogue inscriptions; perhaps, too, we might associate the Hesychnis buried in Beth She'arim with Ilasios's and Edesios's relative Hesychnion.³⁰ Even if the similar names, each with ties to Antioch, are only coincidence, though, the inscriptions still mark the existence of Antiochene synagogue elders. Rachel Hachlili has observed that this Jewish necropolis in Beth She'arim was "the central burial ground for Jews from the Land of Israel and the Diaspora in the third–fourth centuries C.E.," noting that it often contained the primary burial of Jews who lived in the area and "the reinterred remains of Diaspora Jews."³¹ This evidence suggests that the secondary burial of notable Antiochene Jews in the necropolis at Beth She'arim would not have been unusual, distances notwithstanding.

The mosaics' geographical and chronological proximity to John Chrysostom's sermons cannot help but titillate the historical imagination. The named references in the inscription to Ilasios's father, spouse, mother-in-law, children, and ancestors paint a picture of a wealthy extended family active in a well-established synagogue.³² Did Ilasios and his family live in Antioch in the late fourth century?³³ Were they members of the very same synagogue

²⁹ I rely on the Greek text in Meeks and Wilken (*Jews*, 55); cf. Moshe Schwabe and B. Lifshitz, *Beth She'arim* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1973), nos. 141–44.

³⁰ Meeks and Wilken also included a more fragmentary Greek inscription from Tiberias that referred to Antioch in a burial for a woman named Leontina, which they dated to the late third or early fourth century (Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 56; cf. Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 57).

³¹ Rachel Hachlili, *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 514.

³² Sukenik also noted that a woman named Eustathia was mentioned in another inscription in the floor (Inscription 3), "where she takes part in a donation together with her son-in-law Thaumasis and her daughter Hesychnios." Sukenik posited, "Possibly Ilasios and Thaumasis were brothers-in-law" ("Mosaic," 551).

³³ Sukenik observed, "It is difficult to decide whether Ilasios was *archisynagōgos* [*sic*] of the Jewish community at Antioch, or of an Antiochene Jewish community at Apamea" ("Mosaic," 551).

community that John Chrysostom had only a few years earlier so viciously demonized? Did their titles signify their financial support of the synagogue and/or some role in its leadership?³⁴ Did Ilasios support the building in Apamea early in 391 in addition to, or instead of, a synagogue in Antioch and/or Daphne? Was Greek the family's primary language? What were the responses, if any, of the earlier generations of Edesios, Eisakios, Hesychion, and Eustathia to the emperor Julian's promise to rebuild the temple in the early 360s? Did the later generations of Ilasios, Phōtion, and their children hear about John's fiery sermons in 386–87? While such discussions would remain speculative, this material evidence at least reminds scholars to consider what our constructions of fourth-century Antioch would look like if we added Jews more substantively back into the cityscape.

Telling Tales: Non-Christian Literary Sources

In addition to the material evidence from Apamea and Beth She'arim, there are also some literary references from Libanius and the Palestinian Talmud that are relevant to the study of Jews and "Jews" in fourth-century Antioch. Libanius, the native son and official Greek sophist of Antioch from 354 until his death in 394, wrote copious letters and orations, some of which mention or address Jews.³⁵ The Talmudic references are much more difficult to date than Libanius's texts, but Meeks and Wilken included some rabbinic references that are useful in their study of Jews and Christians in Antioch. While I am not inclined to accept the Talmud's descriptions of earlier events in Antioch at face value, the stories themselves came to have their own canonicity and authority over time. Since scholars date the final redaction of the Palestinian Talmud to the late fourth or early fifth century, the rabbinic stories as we have them were almost certainly in circulation in, and are thus relevant for, our context of late-fourth-century

³⁴ Levine has documented "the extent to which the title *archisynagogos* [*sic*] was to be found throughout the Jewish world of late antiquity" (*Ancient*, 417), and concluded that while the meaning is not always clear, it appears to suggest "not only religious and financial roles, but political and administrative ones as well" (*Ancient*, 416). For the full discussion, see Levine, *Ancient*, 415–27.

³⁵ These sources are available, for example, in Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 59–81; and Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, v.2 (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 580–99.

Antioch in a way that is more difficult to guarantee for earlier periods or for places further from Roman Palestine.³⁶

In *Ep.* 1251 from the summer of 364, Libanius wrote to Priscianus, a Roman official of Palestine and Libanius's former student,³⁷ apparently on behalf of some Jews from Antioch.³⁸ Unfortunately, the term *Ioudaioi* is only found in the Vatican manuscript of this text, and in abbreviated form, but scholars have so far accepted the conclusion of Johann Jakob Reiske and the great Libanius scholar Richard Foerster that the term is original to the letter.³⁹ If this is correct, then Libanius knew people whom he called *Ioudaioi* in Antioch in 364, who appealed to him for help in his position as the influential sophist of the city.⁴⁰ Libanius wrote that “the *Ioudaioi* with us [τοῖς παρ’ ἡμῶν . . . Ἰουδαίους]” hoped to prevent Priscianus's reappointment of an unnamed senior official whom they strongly disliked and who had already once been put out of office. This takes place in the immediate wake of the emperor Julian's promise to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, his death in Persia, and the hasty appointment of the emperor Jovian. It is interesting to picture Antiochene *Ioudaioi* at this time as hoping to intervene in what they understand to be an unfavorable appointment,

³⁶ On the dating of the Palestinian Talmud, see Lapin, *Rabbis*, 42.

³⁷ For more information on Priscianus, see the entry for Priscianus (1) in A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, v.1 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 727.

³⁸ Meeks and Wilken were more sweeping in their claim that in this letter Libanius “acted as a patron for the whole Jewish community of Antioch” (*Jews*, 11).

³⁹ The Vatican manuscript served as the basis for the critical edition by Richard Foerster but not for the earlier edition by Otto Seeck, as discussed by Martin Jacobs: *Die Institution des jüdischen Patriarchen: Eine quellen- und traditionkritische Studie zur Geschichte der Juden in der Spätantike* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 269n209.

⁴⁰ Libanius described the *Ioudaioi* who approached him as “so many [τοσοῦτων]” and a “crowd [ὄχλος],” though it would be commonplace to exaggerate for rhetorical effect; I have translated this letter from the Greek text in Richard Foerster, ed., *Libanii Opera*, vol. 11 (Hildesheim: George Olms, 1963), 327; cf. Stern, *Greek*, 598. Richard Saller observed that local Roman officials participated in the ubiquitous patronage system, offering their influence, particularly in legal matters, in exchange for *gratia* such as monumental dedications, orations in their honor, or monetary gain: Richard Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), esp. 145–68. Saller used Libanius's interactions with Strategius on behalf of other Antiochenes as one example of this patronage system (cf. Christine Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014], 41–42). I am grateful to the University of California Press for permission to include in this essay a few small sections from my recent book.

and as asking a well-positioned Greek rhetor (and friend of the former emperor) in their own city to write to an official in Palestine to do so.⁴¹ Libanius positioned those who had come to him as a group separate from himself, but the fact that he agreed to write on their behalf, as he often did for other Antiochenes in need, shows that at least in his willingness to grant patronage he did not distinguish between these *Ioudaioi* and other citizens who came to him for help in negotiating the politics of their local and regional systems.⁴²

In addition to *Ep.* 1251, in *Oratio* 47 from the late 380s or early 390s,⁴³ soon after John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies, Libanius referred to people who had worked as tenant farmers for four generations on land that his family owned (perhaps in the agriculturally rich plain of Antioch outside the city) as *Ioudaioi*. Scholars have interpreted Libanius's phrase *Ioudaioi tōn panu* [Ἰουδαῖοι τῶν πάνυ] in numerous ways (Libanius, *Or.* 47.13),⁴⁴ but what led Libanius to call these farmers *Ioudaioi* and what the farmers would have understood by that nomenclature remain uncertain. At the very least, however, *Or.* 47 offers additional evidence that *Ioudaioi* was a category that Libanius used in order to identify and to distinguish these from other farmers (and in *Ep.* 1251,

⁴¹ I use *Ioudaioi* rather than the English word Jews here to stress that in comparison to John Chrysostom or the rabbinic texts, we have even less understanding what this Greek term signified to Libanius.

⁴² Sandwell commented that *Ep.* 1251 "shows us that Libanius was at least on speaking terms with some senior members of the Jewish community at Antioch and that these Jews saw him as someone they could ask to speak for them at a moment of crisis" (*Religious Identity*, 238).

⁴³ For a discussion about the date of this text, see A. F. Norman, *Libanius: Selected Orations*, v.2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 497–99.

⁴⁴ My reference to the Greek text of this oration is from the edition in Richard Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1906), 404–22, as also found in Norman, *Libanius*, 500–35. Norman included a useful summary of the many different ways that scholars have understood this phrase, including Zulueta's understanding that it referred to Judeans with land in Palestine; Juster's interpretation of "proper Jews," suggesting a religious difference from other Jews, a reading that Sandwell repeats (*Religious Identity*, 179); and Harmand's understanding that the term is derogatory, with which Norman agrees (Norman, *Libanius*, 496–97). Wilken documented earlier examples from Alexandria of *Ioudaios* being used as "a term of opprobrium" (Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 40). Meeks and Wilken translated the phrase as "some Jews—of that famous people" (Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 71).

Ioudaioi Antiochenes from others).⁴⁵ Whether or not the tenant farmers of *Or.* 47 were recognizably “Jews” to John Chrysostom, to Antioch’s synagogue leaders, or even to themselves, Libanius’s letter at least suggests, as Wilken noted, that Jews lived not only in Antioch and Daphne but also in the rural communities outside the city walls, an image that appears also in the *Tosefta* (*Dema’i* 2.1).⁴⁶

Eight other relevant extant letters by Libanius come from 388–93 and address someone he called “the Patriarch,” whom Moshe Schwabe persuasively identified as the Jewish Patriarch, or Hebrew *nasi*, in Palestine.⁴⁷ In 388, Libanius wrote to “the Patriarch” that the sophist was “grieved that such a *genos* [τοιούτου γένους] has suffered for so long a time” (*Ep.* 914.1),⁴⁸ and in 393 Libanius noted to the same addressee that people “who belong to that *genos*” have a habit “of helping everybody” (*Ep.* 1084.1).⁴⁹ While these letters never use the term *Ioudaios*, scholars have followed Schwabe’s detailed confirmation of Otto Seeck’s brief earlier suggestion that these letters addressed a Jewish rather than a Christian or other Roman leader, thus showing Libanius corresponding with a Jewish leader with some regularity on behalf of some of Antioch’s citizens.⁵⁰ While there are a few late-fourth-century references in Gregory of

⁴⁵ The different academic presumptions of earlier decades led Meeks and Wilken to speculate more freely about these workers than I have done here (Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 10–11).

⁴⁶ See Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 37; Brooten, “Jews,” 36. Sandwell reasonably described the farmers mentioned by Libanius in *Or.* 47 as “Jewish peasants” (*Religious Identity*, 114).

⁴⁷ As Schwabe summarized, Wolf (1738) suggested that this patriarch was the Christian bishop of Antioch; Sievers (1868) suggested that he was more likely a Christian bishop in Palestine, though he allowed that it could be the Jewish Patriarch; and Seeck said that the recipient was the Jewish Patriarch Gamaliel, though he did not specify which Gamaliel (Moshe Schwabe, “Letters of Libanius to the Patriarch of Palestine” [in Hebrew], *Tarbis* 1/2 [January 1930]: 86; cf. Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 59). I am grateful to Jacob Love for correcting my understanding of the details of Schwabe’s Hebrew article. Sandwell assumed that Libanius’s letters to the Patriarch addressed “the Jewish patriarch in Jerusalem [*sic*]” (Sandwell, *Religious Identity*, 113). For a thorough history of the institution of the Jewish Patriarch, see Martin Jacobs, *Institution*.

⁴⁸ For this letter, I have checked Foerster’s Greek text in *Libanii Opera*, vol. 11, 61–62; cf. Stern, *Greek*, 589. I have used Stern’s translation with only minor changes (*Greek*, 590). Note that “such a *genos*” implies a *genos* of an admirable quality; cf. Libanius, *Ep.* 1084.1.

⁴⁹ For this letter, I have checked Foerster’s Greek text in *Libanii Opera*, vol. 11, 200–201; cf. Stern, *Greek*, 593. I have used Stern’s translation with only minor changes (*Greek*, 593).

⁵⁰ See Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 11; Schwabe, “Letters,” 85–110; Otto Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906), 162. See also Martin Jacobs,

Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus that introduce the idea that a Christian leader could be called a patriarch,⁵¹ late antique texts applied the term most commonly to the biblical patriarchs of Genesis and then to a series of Jewish leaders in Palestine, and only rarely in the late fourth and increasingly in the fifth century to certain Christian bishops, making Schwabe's 1930 conclusion that Libanius's letters addressed a Jewish leader still the most plausible.⁵²

A fourth-century Palestinian Jewish leader's familiarity with Greek culture and his integration within the patronage systems of the empire will surprise scholars less now than they did almost forty years ago when Meeks and Wilken wrote that these letters by Libanius "provide an interesting and . . . astonishing picture of the relationship between cultured Jews and pagans at the end of the fourth century."⁵³ Nevertheless, the letters are still rare and valuable witnesses to some of the social networks and patronage processes between these influential figures. One of these letters (*Ep.* 1098) is "a charming letter on behalf

Institution. These letters represent Libanius's only use of the term "patriarch." His only uses of *Ioudaios* are in *Or.* 47 and *Ep.* 1251.

⁵¹ In 374 Gregory of Nazianzus described his father shaming other Christian leaders, who then bowed to him as their "patriarch," lawgiver, and judge (*Or.* 18.36); and in 381 at the Council of Constantinople, Gregory claimed that bishops could more accurately be called "patriarchs" (*Or.* 42.23). Gregory of Nyssa, at the funeral oration for Meletius at the same council in 381, referred to great bishops like Meletius as "patriarchs" (*Oratio funebris in Meletium episcopum*). Schwabe noted several of these late-fourth-century uses of the term (Schwabe, "Letters," 91).

⁵² It is unlikely to be a coincidence that Christians began to apply the title of patriarch to some of their bishops just as the Palestinian Jewish Patriarchate came to an end. On the end of the Jewish Patriarchate in 429, see Lapin, *Rabbis*, 20. For an overview of the Palestinian Jewish Patriarchate more generally, see Lapin, *Rabbis*, 20–25, 52–55; and especially Martin Jacobs, *Institution*. John Chrysostom used "patriarch" to refer to certain contemporary Jewish leaders, "those whom you are now calling patriarchs are not priests" (*Jud.* 6.5; cited also in Schwabe, "Letters," 96). The *Theodosian Code* referred to the Jews' contemporary patriarchs in three places (*CTh* 16.8.8 from 392, 16.8.13 from 397, and 16.8.14 from 399). For the dating, I rely on Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondia Constitutions: A Translation with commentary, glossary, and bibliography* (Union, NJ: The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd., 2001), 468. See also Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30). I am grateful to Andrew Jacobs for conversation about the use of the Greek term, and for the reference in Epiphanius.

⁵³ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 11. On scholars' growing acceptance of Jews' integration in the Roman Empire, see, for example, Rutgers, *Making Myths*, 3–4; Lapin, *Rabbis*.

of the Patriarch's son, who has dropped out of school after studying briefly with Libanius"⁵⁴ that led Meeks and Wilken to conclude, "It is apparent that the Patriarch himself was educated in Greek culture. . . . It is also clear that for some Jews in Antioch it was perfectly natural to work through the network of relationships involving the curial class and the old rhetorical schools."⁵⁵ If these letters indeed addressed the Jewish Patriarch, then they support a picture of at least one Jewish student in Libanius's classroom and of Jews' participation in the complex social and political networks of the region. In addition, the generosity that Libanius attributed to the Patriarch's *genos* in *Ep.* 1084 provides a welcome contrast to Chrysostom's hostile rhetoric.⁵⁶

The Palestinian Talmud, like Libanius, also refers to Jews in Antioch. While none of its stories alone tell us much about Jews in the fourth-century city, particularly since the Talmud's narratives should not be conflated with historical reality, it is worth noting where the rabbinic references echo other extant sources. Meeks and Wilken summarize the collection of material from the Palestinian Talmud that relates to Jews in Antioch as follows:⁵⁷

The Palestinian rabbis knew of a Beth Din in Antioch (p.Sanh. 3:2, 14a), and a number of them are reported to have visited the city. Some of the stories of R. Tanhuma bar Abba's disputes with gentiles over Jewish beliefs are set in Antioch (*Gen. Rab.* 19:4), and R. Simlai (3rd century) was also associated with Antioch (p.Kidd. 3:13, 35a). On occasion the Patriarch traveled to Antioch because of dealings with the Roman legate of Palestine who was often in Antioch (Sifre

⁵⁴ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 12.

⁵⁵ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 12. See Schwabe's discussion of the letters' classical allusions ("Letters," 106); I am grateful to Jacob Love for translating Schwabe's conclusion from the Hebrew for me.

⁵⁶ Sandwell noted that in *Ep.* 1084, Libanius complimented the Patriarch in the process of requesting a favor (*Religious Identity*, 113). John Chrysostom regularly used polemical language to describe "Jews," often conflating them with biblical characters, but sometimes using more contemporary accusations, such as his description of their patriarchs as "the peddlers, the merchants, those filled with all indecencies" (*Jud.* 6.5); see also his claim that Jews were gluttons (*Jud.* 1.4) and covetous thieves (*Jud.* 1.7).

⁵⁷ Meeks and Wilken had a tendency to grant greater historical reliability to the rabbinic texts' descriptions of earlier events than is current in some recent scholarship, so my interpretation of this evidence differs slightly from theirs (e.g., Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 9; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 37, 64–65).

Num. 84 [22a, ed. Friedmann]). After the revolt under Gallus two rabbis visited Ursicinus in Antioch, and the Palestinian Talmud depicts them as respected by the Roman general and on good terms with him (p.Ber. 5:1, 9a).⁵⁸

It is certainly likely, for example, that Jews traveled with some regularity between Antioch and Palestine, especially to the Galilee, not least based on the Beth She'arim burials of Antiochene Jews.⁵⁹ The reference in Sifre Numbers to the Jewish Patriarch's business trips to Antioch, and the Talmudic claim of visits from Palestinian rabbis to Roman officials in Antioch in the 350s, also supplement the material evidence from Beth She'arim. These in turn offer a narrative consonant with the conclusion that Libanius represented some Jews to a Roman official of Palestine in 364, corresponded with a Palestinian Jewish leader from 388 to 393, and briefly taught that leader's son. The descriptions in Genesis Rabbah 19:4 of disputes with Gentiles in Antioch, on the other hand, echo numerous literary descriptions throughout Christianity's early history that are not distinctive to Antioch. Nonetheless, whatever the relationship of these episodes narrated in Genesis Rabbah to reality, they reveal a similar literary enterprise to that undertaken by John Chrysostom, whose stories of "Jews" and "Christians" discussing differences in their beliefs and practices on the streets of Antioch will be discussed below.⁶⁰

Taken together, this material and literary evidence tells us little that is concrete about particular Jewish practices in Antioch, and would not be of much help in identifying anyone either as a synagogue-goer or a "Jew" as they walked down the city's streets. It does, though, confirm the likelihood that there was at least one well-established synagogue in fourth-century Antioch,⁶¹ that Greek was

⁵⁸ Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 12–13.

⁵⁹ While I am unaware of other evidence for a Beth Din in Antioch, which Meeks and Wilken accept without further discussion (*Jews*, 12), it would not be implausible since the other evidence suggests that there was a sizable community of Jews in the city, at least some of whom had financial resources and were engaged in political networks.

⁶⁰ Even Galatians 2 is relevant in this regard, although of course the category of "Christian" would have been anachronistic in Paul's time.

⁶¹ Like most scholars, I find the literary evidence for at least one synagogue in fourth-century Antioch and another in Daphne persuasive. There remains some confusion, however, over the interpretation of a reference in the sixth-century works of the Antiochene John Malalas. Downey notes that Malalas depicts Didius Julianus acquiring

a familiar language in Antioch's synagogue(s), that the titles of *archisynagōgos*, *presbyteros*, and *gerousiarchēs* marked people of significance among the participants, and that some of the people who bore those titles in the fourth century had connections with Apamea and Beth She'arim as well as the financial resources to donate part of a mosaic floor to the former and have their remains translated to a necropolis in the latter. The rabbinic sources suggest that, like Josephus, later Palestinian Jewish leaders assumed a history of Jews in Antioch and had something at stake in representing a connection between themselves, Antioch, and that city's Roman officials. For claims about what people might actually do in fourth-century Antioch to be recognizable as "Jews," however, we must turn to the polemical rhetoric of the Christian priest John Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom: Recognizing Jews and "Jews" through Christian Eyes

John's well-known homilies sought to prime his audience members to identify, among other things, fourth-century "Jews" according to John's definition.⁶² Such identifications may have required his audience to give new meaning to some familiar behaviors, such as celebrating holidays like Rosh Hashanah, and to add to that picture new information that might have surprised his audience, such as

the house of a prominent Jew named Asabinus in 193 C.E. (Downey, *History*, 499). Arthur Darby Nock has pointed out that Downey interpreted a Church Slavonic reference to "a synagogue named Savinian" as evidence for a synagogue named for this Asabinus, but Nock does not seem persuaded by Downey's "conjecture": Arthur Darby Nock, "Downey's Antioch: A Review," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 4.1 (1963): 51. Hahn refers to a synagogue named for Asabinus that was destroyed in the fifth century without addressing these concerns (Hahn, "Die jüdische Gemeinde," 3), citing Meeks and Wilken (*Jews*, 8–9). Finkelstein has quite recently accepted Hahn's claim (Finkelstein, "Julian," 20), but the evidence remains problematic. Scholars writing after Downey, Meeks, and Wilken have also challenged earlier scholars' claims that there was a synagogue that contained the relics of the Maccabean martyrs in Roman Antioch (see the discussion in note 76 below).

⁶² The provenance of most of John Chrysostom's sermons is difficult to determine. Even while earlier scholars have made suggestions, Wendy Mayer's careful study demonstrates that many of these attributions were based on assumptions that are difficult to substantiate definitively: Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom—Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005). Mayer's careful scholarship strips away all but the most indisputable evidence, and concludes that many attributions are not certain (*ibid.*, 469–73). Nevertheless, in most cases the traditional assignments are still the most plausible academic conclusions even if her work reveals the sometimes tentative assumptions that support them. This essay relies on texts from Antioch as much as possible.

John's claim that "the synagogue is not only a brothel and a theater, but also is a den of thieves and a lodging for wild beasts" (*Jud.* 1.3) and that "even demons dwell there" (*Jud.* 1.6).⁶³ John grew up in Antioch, became a deacon in 381 under Bishop Meletius, and was ordained as a priest in 386 under Bishop Flavian. His colorful and popular sermons later earned him the nickname "golden-mouth," and he spent the final years of his life as the controversial bishop of Constantinople, from 398 until his death in 407. Toward the beginning of his preaching career in Antioch, in 386 and 387, John preached a series of fierce sermons against the synagogue and all those who would enter it.⁶⁴ Descriptions of "Jews" in these and others of Chrysostom's homilies mix biblical depictions with additional vituperations against Antiochenes who saw no conflict in attending church sermons and synagogue festivals, baptized Christians who had defensible disagreements with him about Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy, and contemporary Sabbath-keeping synagogue-goers who might well have considered themselves Jews, along with a healthy dose of imagination.⁶⁵

⁶³ All translations from John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies are my own from the Greek text in PG 48.843–942. See also the English translation by Paul W. Harkins in FC 68 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1979). I accept the scholarly consensus that John's concern in these homilies is primarily those who participate in his church and also visit the synagogue, but in the process of this discussion John also makes several comments about how to identify "Jews" that are useful to the current study. On the difficulty of drawing clear distinctions between "Jews" and "Christians," see, for example, Boyarin, *Border Lines*.

⁶⁴ Wendy Pradels, Rudolf Brändle, and Martin Heimgartner have suggested a revised and more specific chronology for these *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies based on the additional manuscript that they published of the second homily in the series. Their analysis dates Homily 1 to either late August or early September 386, just before the Jewish holidays of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur; Homily 4 to the same festival time the following year, August 29, 387; followed soon after by Homily 2 (September 5); Homily 5 (September 9); Homily 6 (Yom Kippur on September 10); Homily 7 (September 12); and Homily 8 (September 19). Wendy Pradels, Rudolf Brändle, and Martin Heimgartner, "The Sequence and Dating of the Series of John Chrysostom's Eight Discourses *Adversus Iudaeos*" *ZAC* 6 (2002): 90–116. See the text they published in Wendy Pradels, Rudolf Brändle, and Martin Heimgartner, "Das bisher vermisste Textstück in Johannes Chrysostomus, *Adversus Iudaeos*, Oration 2," *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 5 (2001): 23–49.

⁶⁵ Excellent scholarship already exists on the challenges and dangers of trying to see "real" Jews behind the polemical anti-Jewish rhetoric of early Christian leaders. See, for example, Andrew Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in*

Nevertheless, his texts sometimes distinguish in interesting ways between the practices of contemporary Antiochene “Jews” and those of their biblical antecedents, contemporary practices that, he suggested, his audience could verify from personal experience. Narrative depictions cannot be taken at face value, and one person’s polemical rhetoric seldom represents another individual’s lived experience. In fact, scholars now routinely and persuasively note that Chrysostom’s hostility and effort to stress difference and force separation between “Christians” and “Jews” challenged the norms of his city.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, it remains worthwhile to examine what behaviors Chrysostom specified to his audience that they could expect from “Jews” who lived in their city in contrast to “Jews” he drew from Scripture.⁶⁷

The following analysis draws from a substantial but not exhaustive search of John’s writings that are most likely from his time in Antioch. My focus in reading John’s texts was to set aside his numerous depictions of “Jews” or Jewish practices that cannot be separated from scriptural references, such as references to Jesus’ gospel opponents, as well as his sweeping and most polemical claims, such as that all “Jews” are demonic or murderers. In both cases

Late Antiquity (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 200–209; idem, “The Lion and the Lamb: Reconsidering ‘Jewish-Christian Relations’ in Antiquity,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 95–118; Judith Lieu, “‘The Parting of the Ways’: Theological Construct or Historical Reality?” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994): 101–19; idem, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 12–13; Miriam Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), esp. 1–2, 166; James Carleton Paget, “Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity,” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1 (1997): 195–225. Most of my earlier scholarship has joined those who prefer to read such rhetoric for what it suggests about the text’s author rather than about Jews in their context: see, for example, Christine Shepardson, *Controlling*, 92–116; idem, *Anti-Judaism and Christian Orthodoxy: Ephrem’s Hymns in Fourth-Century Syria* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008). In this essay, however, I find it instructive to investigate the ways in which Chrysostom rhetorically distinguished Antiochene “Jews” from a variety of “Jews” he drew from Scripture, and how he represented contemporary practices associated with Judaism in Antioch.

⁶⁶ This was already strongly argued by Wilken (*John Chrysostom*, 66–94).

⁶⁷ Blake Leyerle has helpfully observed that another useful project would be to de-center John’s polemical *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies from his other texts to see what image of Jews and Judaism emerges without the disproportionate influence of those texts. I look forward to reading her discussion of this in the future.

the relation of John's rhetoric to fourth-century Antiochene Jews is imperceptible. Instead, I focused on his claims that are not so self-evidently grounded only in his Scripture, and particularly passages in which John told his audience that "Jews" acted a certain way "now" in Antioch, suggesting that his audience could confirm these claims for themselves.⁶⁸ While still rhetorically sophisticated, this narrative strategy of John's differs from his others; and although numerous studies examine his most polemical anti-Jewish language, none has focused exclusively on this other rhetorical approach in John's writings. While the majority of these passages are in John's *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies, additional discussions are scattered in his other writings, as Blake Leyerle reminded an audience at the 2014 SBL meeting in San Diego. Gathering and evaluating any available evidence that might offer information about Jews and Jewish practices in Antioch during the decade of John's preaching in the city will then supplement the material and literary evidence studied above to provide as full a picture as possible.

Locating "Jews" in Time and Place

One way that Chrysostom taught his audience to recognize "Jews" was by location.⁶⁹ "Jews" were in "Jewish" places, which for John included synagogues, a healing cave in Daphne, and the sites of distinctly "Jewish" festival celebrations. Suggesting in 386 that he had particular local synagogue buildings in mind, Chrysostom argued, "Although no idol stands [in the synagogue], still demons inhabit the place. And I say this not only about the synagogue here [in town], but about the one in Daphne as well" (*Jud.* 1.6). Chrysostom even implied that he had more specific knowledge of local synagogues, claiming, "There are some who think that the synagogue is a holy place" because "the Law is stored in it, and the books [τὰ βιβλία] of the Prophets" (*Jud.* 1.5).⁷⁰ Chrysostom repeated his

⁶⁸ Wilken includes many such passages in his own discussion of Jews in Antioch (*John Chrysostom*, esp., 55–94), although his analysis also includes John's hostile rhetoric (*ibid.*, 116–27). Wilken also sometimes appears to take John's narratives at face value when I would not, such as John's claim to have rescued a woman from being dragged into a synagogue in Antioch to swear an oath (John Chrysostom, *Jud.* 1.3; Wilken, *ibid.*, 79–80).

⁶⁹ I have discussed this material in more detail in Shepardson, *Controlling*, 92–116.

⁷⁰ Wilken also discussed Chrysostom's rhetoric about holy places and holy books (*John Chrysostom*, 79–83), as did Steven Fine, who contextualized Chrysostom's rhetoric in a

reference to familiar “synagogues of the Jews, those in the city and those in the suburbs” in 387 (*Jud.* 5.12); and in his reply to people in his church audience who respected them, he acknowledged that the books of the Law and the Prophets were indeed in the synagogue, but he rejected the argument that the sacred books made the place that contained them also holy (*Jud.* 6.6). Chrysostom declared that he particularly hated the synagogue in fact precisely “because although they have the Prophets, they do not believe the Prophets; because although they read the writings, they do not accept the witnesses” (*Jud.* 1.5). Chrysostom did not dispute that Jews “brought the Prophets and Moses along with themselves” into the synagogue (*Jud.* 1.5); he did reject their understanding of those texts.⁷¹

In addition to the books of the Law and the Prophets, Chrysostom also made some titillating references to an ark that he seemed to know stood in Antioch’s synagogue.⁷² He asked his church audience to compare this fourth-century ark to that described in the Bible, such as in Exodus and 1 Kings, noting that “the ark [κιβωτός] that is with the Jews now” has “no oil of anointing [χρισμός], no tablets of the covenant (1 Kgs 8:6–9), no Holy of Holies (1 Kgs 6:19), no veil (Exod 26:31–33), no high priest, no incense, no holocaust, no sacrifice, nor the other things that made that other ark then revered” (*Jud.* 6.7).⁷³

much broader discussion: *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 137–41.

⁷¹ Margaret Mitchell made the interesting observation that this phrase inverts the order of the Torah and Haftarah that developed in liturgical practice. Unfortunately, there is no way to know what significance John’s inverted phrase has for Antiochene synagogue practice in the late fourth century, particularly given his reference to the Law and Prophets (in this expected order) in *Jud.* 1.5, 6.6.

⁷² The term *kibōtos* is usefully flexible. In Chrysostom’s writings it usually refers to Noah’s ark, and sometimes to the ark of the covenant described in the Bible, but more rarely, as here, it can refer to a *kibōtos* in the synagogue, and occasionally to the container that held the relics of a Christian martyr (e.g., John Chrysostom, *In s. Iulianum martyrem* 4). The last example raises questions about efforts in Chrysostom’s community to compete with the *kibōtos* of the synagogue with a new powerful martyr-*kibōtos* of their own. I thank Margaret Mitchell for noting that Chrysostom also refers to Paul’s letters as a greater *kibōtos* than Noah’s (Chrysostom, *De laudibus sancti Pauli* 1.5).

⁷³ Compare Chrysostom’s similar list of missing accoutrements when he criticized the sounding of trumpets for Rosh Hashanah (*Jud.* 4.7). Joan Branham is among the scholars who have commented on the apparent effort to map the Jerusalem temple onto later synagogues: Joan Branham, “Mapping Sacrifice on Bodies and Spaces in Late-Antique Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium*, ed. Bonna Wescoat and Robert

Lee Levine has argued that Torah shrines were common in late antique synagogues, and mentioned that the building in nearby Apamea, for example, had a niche in its main hall that archaeologists believe held the Torah scrolls.⁷⁴ Steven Fine has found Chrysostom's descriptions of Antioch's synagogue consonant with other evidence for post-temple synagogue practices in their references to the Torah being read there and having a special place to store the Torah scrolls, and in their rhetoric of comparing the synagogue to the Jerusalem temple.⁷⁵ Chrysostom even made an intriguing comment that compared the ark [κιβωτός] that the Jews had in their local synagogue to little arks or containers that were for sale in Antioch's *agora* [τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πωλουμένων κιβωτίων], suggesting that unlike the harmless little arks for sale, the ark in the synagogue caused harm to everyone who approached it (*Jud.* 6.7).⁷⁶ Chrysostom's distinguishing here between biblical and fourth-century arks and practices raises the question of how much Chrysostom knew about a contemporary synagogue in Antioch, let alone what boxes/arks he expected his audience to recognize from the *agora*.

It is further noteworthy that Chrysostom tried to delegitimize the contemporary synagogue, its ark, and the practices of its congregants by reinterpreting the shared Scripture that he said granted the synagogue respect in the first place.⁷⁷ Preached to an audience whom he claimed was overly familiar

Ousterhout (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 201–30.

⁷⁴ Levine discussed this in more detail in a section on the Torah chest and Torah shrine (Levine, *Ancient*, 351–56). The beautiful Torah shrine from the synagogue in Dura Europos is also noteworthy, as Margaret Mitchell observed, though it is earlier than the fourth century and not as geographically or culturally proximate to Antioch as Apamea was.

⁷⁵ Steven Fine, *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 39–47. Regarding temple imagery in synagogues, see Branham, “Mapping,” 201–30.

⁷⁶ As a reviewer noted, John begins his discussion of the ark in *Jud.* 6.7 with a reference to the capture of the ancient ark by the Philistines (1 Sam 5). While this narrative focuses on competition with the Philistine's sacred places, and while John does also compete in fourth-century Antioch to make Christian places more powerful and more visible than the traditional temples and festivals of the gods, in *Jud.* 6.7 John compares the ancient Philistine temple to the fourth-century Antiochene synagogue rather than to Antiochene temples of the gods. For John's arguments regarding Antiochene temples, see Shepardson, *Controlling*, esp. 58–91, 163–203.

⁷⁷ See, for example, the discussion in Shepardson, *Controlling*, 98–116.

with these buildings, these homilies offer persuasive testimony that such *kibōtos*- and Scripture-laden buildings were actual Antiochene gathering places where leaders were reinterpreting the Law and the Prophets to support fourth-century Antiochene celebrations of Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, and Sukkot that were not bound to the temple or Jerusalem. This is a useful reminder that not only Christians, but *all* fourth-century scriptural communities among the empire's various "Jews" and "Christians," were actively marketing new and competing interpretations of the Scriptures of Israel in an effort to accommodate their new contexts.

Besides the synagogue, another local place that Chrysostom associated with "Jews" was a healing shrine in the suburb of Daphne known as the cave of Matrona, which was apparently popular among ailing Antiochenes regardless of their other ritual habits. Scholars have debated the cave's history and whether or not it was named for the mother of the Maccabean martyrs, but the locations of the cave and any fourth-century Antiochene buildings associated with the Maccabees are unknown today.⁷⁸ Chrysostom lamented that some people whom

⁷⁸ Martha Vinson distinguished between a place within the southwestern "Kerateion" region of the walled city of Antioch that she associated with a memorial of the Maccabees' death, and a cave in Daphne that she identified as a Jewish shrine that contained the Maccabees' relics, though Raphaëlle Ziadé rejected the cave's association with the Maccabees: Martha Vinson, "Gregory Nazianzen's Homily 15 and the Genesis of the Christian Cult of the Maccabean Martyrs," *Byzantion* 64 (1994): 179–85; Raphaëlle Ziadé, *Les martyrs Maccabées: de l'histoire juive au culte chrétien, les homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 119–20. Mayer and Allen survey the sources for our knowledge about places associated with the Maccabees in Antioch (Mayer and Allen, *Churches*, 90–93; cf. 143). Vinson linked the Antiochene site with a later Christian church dedicated to the Maccabees that Wendy Mayer says *may* have existed already in the time of John Chrysostom and that was called *receptus* by Augustine (John Chrysostom, *pan. mart.* 1; Augustine, *sermo* 300). Vinson and Lothar Triebel reject the claim, however, that this church was a converted synagogue, although Leonard Rutgers allowed that such a conversion was possible if it had not been a martyrrium until its Christian phase: Lothar Triebel, "Das angebliche Synagoge der makkabäischen Märtyrer in Antiochia am Orontes," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 9 (2005): 464–95; Leonard V. Rutgers, "The Importance of Scripture in the Conflict between Jews and Christians: The Example of Antioch," in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, ed. L. V. Rutgers, et al., 287–303 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998). See also Mayer and Allen, *Churches*, 92–94, 142–44, 185–86; Shepardson, *Controlling*, 114–15. Harkins, Meeks, and Wilken wrote before this scholarship and accepted assumptions by Marcel Simon and Glanville Downey that are no longer in the majority. See, for example, Marcel Simon, "La Polémique antijuive de saint Jean Chrysostome et le mouvement judaïsant d'Antioche,"

he considered to be “Christians” frequented this “Jewish” healing cave in Daphne: “For the pit [βάραθρον] there is more wicked, that which they call Matrona’s. For I heard that even many of the faithful go up there and sleep beside that place” (*Jud.* 1.6). In a later homily on Titus, Chrysostom referred to “those who observe the same fasts [with the Jews], who keep the Sabbaths, who go off to the places that are made holy by them; I speak about the place in Daphne, that cave [σπήλαιον] that is called Matrona’s, and that place in Kilikia that is called Kronos’s” (*In Titum hom.* 3.2).⁷⁹ These references could lead to evocative speculation about interactions among various Antiochenes at the healing shrine, but at the very least, they document another particular location that Chrysostom instructed his audience to associate with “Jews.”

Other places that Chrysostom asked his audience to avoid were locations of distinctly “Jewish” festivals (*Jud.* 1.1, 7). He expressed his concern that some in his audience would go to watch the spectacle of the festivals, and others would participate with Jews, “joining in their feasts and sharing their fasts” (*Jud.* 1.1), which seemed to many to “have something august and great about them” (*Jud.* 1.7). He warned his audience not to dance with Jews at the festival for Rosh Hashanah (*Jud.* 2.3), to avoid “the tents, which at this moment are pitched” among them for Sukkot (*Jud.* 7.1), and at Yom Kippur he criticized, “Do you fast with the Jews? Then also take off your sandals with the Jews, and walk barefoot in the *agora*, and share with them in their indecency and laughter” (*Jud.* 1.4).⁸⁰ Chrysostom argued that Scripture defined a particular place for such festivals—namely, in the earthly city of Jerusalem.⁸¹ What excuse could Jews have to

Annuaire de l'Institut de philology et d'histoire orientales et slaves 4 (1936): 140–53; Downey, *History*, 109–11; Paul Harkins, “Introduction,” FC 68 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1979), 44–47; Meeks and Wilken, *Jews*, 9, 30; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 36, 88.

⁷⁹ All translations from *In Titum hom.* 3 are my own from the Greek in PG 62.676–82. Wendy Mayer has called into question the assumptions that led previous scholars to identify Antioch as the provenance of this homily, though her conclusion is that there are “insufficient grounds for making a determination” for certain (Mayer, *Homilies*, 377–78, 472–73). The reference in this passage to the cave in Daphne seems to me to suggest an Antiochene provenance, Mayer’s useful observations notwithstanding.

⁸⁰ Compare with Wilken, *Jud.* 1.2 and Mishnah Ta’anit 4.8 (Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 65).

⁸¹ For a more in-depth discussion of Chrysostom’s understanding of the proper location for Jewish ritual, see Christine Shepardson, “Paschal Politics: Deploying the Temple’s Destruction against Fourth-Century Judaizers,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 62.3 (2008): 233–60.

celebrate their festivals in Antioch, John asked, “when it is clear that those [‘Jews’ of the Hebrew Bible] neither sacrificed, nor sang hymns in another land, nor did they observe any such fasts” (*Jud.* 4.4) outside of Jerusalem (*Jud.* 4.5). Even though contemporary Jews “have no hope” of regaining the *politeia* of their forbearers—nor even Jerusalem or the temple—John insisted, “they cannot bear to be silent in that way” of the biblical stories and refrain from holiday celebrations outside of Jerusalem (*Jud.* 4.4; cf. 4.5). Such holiday celebrations were publically visible but, like the contemporary synagogue ark, scripturally illegitimate, Chrysostom argued, and he urged Antiochenes to avoid all such “Jewish” places. Like for the building with the ark and scriptural books that Chrysostom labeled a synagogue, the evidence for the celebrations of these autumn holidays in Antioch in 386 and 387 seems very strong, even if scholars have reason to resist Chrysostom’s insistence on labeling all their participants “Jews.”

Besides the significance of place for identifying a person as a “Jew,” time, both in relation to the annual calendar and in relation to the eras of divine history, also played a role in Chrysostom’s representations.⁸² While all of Antioch’s citizens celebrated various festival days during the year, what days they celebrated would, Chrysostom claimed, identify them with one community or another.⁸³ Regarding the cyclical time of the annual calendar, Chrysostom agreed that God called upon a Christian to feast and to fast, but not at the same time as Jews. Chrysostom referred specifically to the troublesome timing of Easter, Passover, and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in *Jud.* 3, explaining that he would like to clarify, “What is *pascha*; what is *tessarakostē* (Lent); and on the one hand, what is Jewish, and on the other hand, what is ours? . . . What does the Feast of Unleavened Bread mean?” (*Jud.* 3.2), particularly since, “I hear this being said by many, that the *pascha* is together with the Feast of Unleavened Bread” (*Jud.* 3.3). He observed that Passover came once each year (*Jud.* 3.2), and criticized anyone who would consider “the Jews wiser” than the bishops at the Council of Nicaea in knowing what day Christians should celebrate (*Jud.* 3.3).⁸⁴

Margaret Mitchell usefully noted that in *Jud.* 1.4, Chrysostom makes a sharp distinction between the heavenly Jerusalem where Christians will live, and the earthly Jerusalem of the Jews.

⁸² Cf. Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 149–53.

⁸³ This is the subject of much of Soler’s book (*Le Sacré et le Salut*).

⁸⁴ Pradels, Brändle, and Heimgartner concur that the homily traditionally identified as *Jud.* 3 was presented between Homily 1 and Homily 4 on January 31, 387, and note that it addressed a different topic than the other homilies in this series (“Sequence,” 91). In this homily, Chrysostom is most upset with people he calls Christians who continue their traditional practices regarding Easter rather than adopting the decisions made on that

Comments about the calendar day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in 387 (*Jud.* 3.5) and about the timing of the upcoming Jewish fast (*Jud.* 4.1) suggest that John was familiar with local synagogues' festival calendar.

For Chrysostom, however, the Jews' bad timing included not only celebrating at the wrong time in the calendar, but also celebrating festivals that were outdated in a post-Resurrection and post-temple era.⁸⁵ He argued vociferously against the ongoing celebration of temple-related biblical holidays: "When God wished [the Jews] to fast, they became wide and fat, but when [God] wished that they would not fast, then they become contentious and they fast; when he wished them to offer sacrifice, they ran to idols; when he does not wish them to celebrate the feasts, they are eager to celebrate" (*Jud.* 4.4; cf. 1.2). In addition to arguing against the autumn Jewish holidays, John also interpreted certain biblical passages (e.g., Deut 16; 31:10–11; Exod 12; Num 9) to criticize spring Passover celebrations in Antioch because, he said, the scripturally—and thus, historically—appropriate time for them, too, had passed.⁸⁶ Chrysostom agreed that Scripture should be revered, and conceded that Scripture included injunctions to celebrate these holidays, but he argued that with the death and resurrection of the Messiah these holidays were no longer necessary, and with the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem they were no longer even possible. Thus Chrysostom associated "Jews" with certain places and certain festivals and fasts, and warned his congregants that where they went and when they observed holidays could make them too Jewish to be Christian.⁸⁷

matter at the Council of Nicaea in 325 (see Chrysostom, *Jud.* 3.1, 3.3). Both the Council of Nicaea and more immediately the Council of Antioch (341) condemned some Eastern Christians who continued to celebrate Easter on 14 Nisan; see Eusebius, VC 3.17–20; *Didascalia* 21; Shepardson, "Paschal," 233–35; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 76–79.

⁸⁵ Joshua Garroway provides an excellent analysis of John Chrysostom's complex rhetoric around his understanding of the transition of the role and interpretation of the law, particularly in relation to Jesus, who followed the law according to some Gospel stories and preached its fulfillment according to others: Joshua Garroway, "The Law-Observant Lord: John Chrysostom's Engagement with the Jewishness of Christ," *J ECS* 18:4 (2010): 591–615.

⁸⁶ See Shepardson, "Paschal," 233–60. On the topic of scriptural practices' invalidity after the temple's destruction, see also Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 148–53. The emperor Julian turned the tables on these arguments in some ways, criticizing Christians in his *Against the Galileans*, written in Antioch in the early 360s, for not following the practices expected by their Old Testament Scripture (e.g., 305D–333D).

⁸⁷ See, for example, Shepardson, *Controlling*, 92–128.

Identifying “Jews” by Thought and Deed

In addition to where people went and when they feasted and fasted, other behaviors could also, according to Chrysostom, identify them as “Jews,” providing an even thicker description of Antiochene Jews, refracted, of course, through John’s particular lens. In his depictions, John Chrysostom particularly focused on the celebration of Jewish festivals, as mentioned above, including the trumpets of Rosh Hashanah and the fast of Yom Kippur. In 387 Chrysostom complained that the Jews’ trumpets were “more unlawful than those in the theaters,” their fasts were worse than any drunken party, and the tents of Sukkot might as well be brothels (*Jud.* 7.1). Throughout his *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies, he described boisterous parties that accompanied the Jews’ holidays, and how they danced with bare feet in the *agora* along with a large crowd of other Antiochenes (*Jud.* 1.2; cf. 2.3). Chrysostom criticized Antiochenes’ participation in the Rosh Hashanah celebration by interpreting Amos 5:23 to support his claim that God “hates worship [λατρείαν] through kettledrums, lyres, harps, and other instruments” (*Jud.* 1.7). Our Septuagint text of Amos 5:23 mentions God rejecting “the sound of your songs” and “the strumming of your instruments [ψαλμὸν ὀργάνων σου],” though it does not specifically name drums.⁸⁸ Chrysostom’s polemic is extreme, but he appears to expect his audience to recognize his reference to the annual autumn holiday parties with kettledrums from first-hand experience.

Chrysostom also made other explicit claims about what “Jews” did “now”—that is, in his own time.⁸⁹ He claimed that Jews of his own day did not practice levirate marriage as described in Scripture (*In Matth. hom.* 70.2), and that they still practiced circumcision even though John believed that the appropriate time for it had passed (*Hom. in Gen.* 39.15; cf. *In Gal. comm.* 4.3).⁹⁰ He also specifically mentioned that Jews still observed the Sabbath (*In Ioh. hom.* 68.1; *In Titum hom.* 3.2; *In Gal. comm.* 1.6–7, 2.6, 4.3), that they kept the law generally (*In Ioh. hom.* 68.1; *In Titum hom.* 3.2; *In Gal. comm.* 2.6–7), and that they practiced a distinct ritual

⁸⁸ Quotations from the Septuagint are from Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979).

⁸⁹ In a *Homily on Acts*, Chrysostom lamented that no matter how often (or how loudly) he taught, those in his audience still swore in God’s name, while “in the synagogues of the Jews” the congregants did what the teacher [*didaskōn*] asked (*In Acta apost. hom.* 8.3). This text, however, likely stems from his time in Constantinople.

⁹⁰ John’s *In Heb. hom.* 33.2 also includes a reference to Jews still expecting the coming of a messiah, but the text cannot be located in Antioch.

washing (*In Ioh. hom.* 70.2; *In II Tim. Hom.* 6.4; *Catech.* 9.16),⁹¹ the last sometimes particularly after touching a corpse (*In I Cor. hom.* 20.4; *Catech.* 9.16).⁹² His *Homilies on the Gospel of John* say surprisingly little about its familiar “*aposynagōgos*” language, but in commenting on John 12:35 he asked, “How many things, then, do the Jews do now and not know what they do! But they are walking as one in the dark, supposing that they are advancing on the right path, but walking down the opposite, keeping the Sabbath, guarding the law and the observances of foods, but not knowing where they walk” (*In Ioh. hom.* 68.1).⁹³ Chrysostom again commented that even “now” contemporary local Jews “abstain from defiling blood and keep the Sabbath. . . . You are doing this now, and you do not carry burdens on the Sabbath” (*Jud.* 6.3). He also implied that in Antioch, Jews tithed to the synagogue, a behavior that he urged his audience to imitate in his church (*In I Cor. hom.* 43.5).⁹⁴ Such comments provide a glimpse into how Chrysostom trained his audience to recognize certain practices as belonging to “Jews” in their city.⁹⁵

In the process of teaching his audience his parameters for recognizing “Jews,” Chrysostom also taught them how to identify those acting “like Jews,” in the hope that, motivated by the polemical descriptions he gave of “Jews,” his audience would avoid such behavior and prevent it in others around them. He

⁹¹ Regarding references from Chrysostom and Theodoret to Jewish ritual bathing, see also Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 65.

⁹² Scholars have traditionally—and also recently—located John’s homilies on Matthew and John in Antioch in the years 390–91 (e.g., Garroway, “Law-Observant,” 594). John’s homilies on Genesis are traditionally dated to his time in Antioch in the late 380s, his commentary on Galatians to Antioch in the 390s, his catechetical instructions to Antioch around 390, his homilies on II Timothy and Titus to the 390s in Antioch, and his homilies on I Corinthians to his time in Antioch. Mayer’s important cautions notwithstanding (Mayer, *Homilies*, 469–73), these texts are still most likely from Antioch.

⁹³ This translation from John Chrysostom’s *In Ioh. hom.* 68 is from the Greek text in PG 59.374.

⁹⁴ Chrysostom again mentions Jews’ tithing in *Hom. in Phil.* 9.4, although in this case he appears to refer to scriptural “Jews” and does not stress as he does in *In I Cor. hom.* 43.5 that the tithing takes place in his local synagogue. I appreciate Blake Leyerle bringing this comparison to my attention: Blake Leyerle, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 87.1 (1994): 45.

⁹⁵ In the early 360s, the emperor Julian implied in a text from Antioch that contemporary Jews still circumcised, avoided certain foods, and celebrated the Passover and a time of unleavened bread (*Against the Galileans*, 238D, 305D–306A, 314C, 354A–B).

lamented, for example, “If any of you who are present or absent go off to the spectacle of the trumpets, or enter the synagogue, or go up to the [place] of Matrona, or join the fasting, or share the Sabbaths, or observe any other Jewish custom [Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔθος] great or small, I am undefiled [καθαρός] by the blood of all of you” (*Jud.* 1.8; cf. 8.5). He warned husbands to be careful that their wives were not lured to “the trumpets” lest they got caught up in the festival’s licentiousness; “For,” Chrysostom claimed, it was “the prostitutes [πόρναι], the effeminate [μυλακοί], and the whole chorus of the orchestra” who rushed to that festival (*Jud.* 2.3; cf. 1.2). While this rhetoric includes standard polemical slanders of sexual impropriety,⁹⁶ it is also in some ways specific about the existence of large annual festival celebrations that were associated with the synagogue but included a large and varied swathe of the city’s population.⁹⁷ In his third *Homily on Titus*, in this case his response to Titus 1:14, Chrysostom challenged those who added to the beliefs and practices that he condoned “as if the faith were not sufficient to justify,” asking them, “Why do you enslave yourself to the Law” (*In Titum hom.* 3.2). As he says a few lines below, “if they who are scrupulous about foods are not healthy, but are sick and weak [Rom 14:1],” then what about those who observe the Jews’ fasts, keep their Sabbaths, and go to their consecrated places (*In Titum hom.* 3.2). Those who acted “like Jews” included those who ran to the synagogue, and celebrated and fasted with “the Jews”; Chrysostom encouraged his audience to force their friends and family to break a “Jewish” fast by sharing a meal with them at home. He preferred that his audience not even “share a greeting” with “Jews” or exchange a word (*Jud.* 1.6; cf. 8.8), lest “the devil” steal the person and keep them “in Judaism [ἐν τῷ ἰουδαϊσμῷ]” (*Jud.* 1.8; cf. 2.1; 6.7).

John noted several reasons why someone in his audience might be drawn to the synagogue in these ways, including a respect for the books of the Law and the Prophets, as discussed above, and the belief that oaths sworn there “were more to be feared” (*Jud.* 1.3). Also on John’s list, however, was the Antiochenes’ admiration of “Jewish” healing abilities, which suggests additional behavior associated with “Jews” in the city. Dayna Kalleres has written, “In the case of fever, sickness, and disease,” Chrysostom’s congregants sometimes “went

⁹⁶ See, for example, the long history traced by Jennifer Knust, *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

⁹⁷ Among others, Wilken noted that Chrysostom’s condemnation of the Jewish festivals appears to have been out of step with many Antiochenes’ views (*John Chrysostom*, 67–68, 74–79).

to the synagogue—a place of notable holy power—to seek amuletic healing.”⁹⁸ Chrysostom tried to counter this respect by arguing that “Jews” served demons when they offered cures to bodily illnesses (*Jud.* 1.7). Chrysostom asked his audience to imagine that a Judaizer might justify patronizing a Jewish healer because the cure would be successful (*Jud.* 8.5). John complained, “If you get some small illness, will you immediately reject [Christ] as your master and run to the demons and desert to the synagogues?” (*Jud.* 8.6). As Kalleres discussed, Chrysostom did not deny the efficacy of the cures offered by *daimones* through Jewish healers,⁹⁹ though he warned that these were to test Christians, who had been forbidden from accepting such demonic cures (*Jud.* 1.7; cf. 8.5–8). The Jews’ “reputation for healing,” whether from incantations, amulets, charms, or spells, or from the incubation cave in Daphne, could lead a Gentile Antiochene to mingle with the city’s Jews (*Jud.* 8.5).

As seen with respect to Jewish festivals, Chrysostom frequently countered the scripturally based practices that he attributed to local Jews and those who acted “like Jews” with biblical arguments, trying to turn Antiochenes’ respect for the Scripture to his advantage. While most of the rhetoric in his *Commentary on Galatians* focused on the apostles Peter and Paul,¹⁰⁰ John also

⁹⁸ Dayna Kalleres, *City of Demons: Violence, Ritual, and Christian Power in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming), 72. See also Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, 83–88.

⁹⁹ Kalleres, *City*, 72–73.

¹⁰⁰ Given Chrysostom’s prolonged and vitriolic *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies, it is little surprise that most times that he accused a person of “Judaizing,” he criticized the behavior of fourth-century Antiochenes. It is worth noting, however, the ways in which Chrysostom sometimes also used the verb to refer to the behavior of the apostles Peter and Paul. In one of his Antiochene texts, *In illud: in faciem ei restiti*, a homily on the conflict described in Galatians between Peter and Paul in Antioch, Chrysostom sometimes distinguished between the behavior of the two apostles, though he noted that they shared the most important aspects of their preaching in common (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.381); all references to *In illud: in faciem ei restiti* are to the volume and page number of the PG edition of the Greek text. Chrysostom occasionally criticized Peter in distinction from Paul, however, for Judaizing by keeping food laws, circumcision, and other Jewish rites (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.381; cf. *In Acta apost. hom.* 32). Thus, Chrysostom sometimes lingers on Peter’s Judaizing (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.381), while emphasizing that Paul stopped his earlier following of the law to teach the Gentiles not to Judaize (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.382; cf. PG 51.383). Chrysostom

wrote, in response to Paul's exhortations against Gentiles' following the law, "Let those who even now Judaize and hold onto the Law listen, for these things are said also to them" (*In Gal. comm.* 2.8; cf. *In Gal. comm.* 2.7; *In Rom. hom.* 25.3),¹⁰¹ making it clear that he intended to paint a picture of behaviors that he knew, such as, "There are many among us now, both fasting on the same day with the Jews, and keeping Sabbaths in the same way" (*In Gal. comm.* 1.7).¹⁰² John later echoed that although "now not many" Gentiles in Antioch "are circumcised, they fast and keep the Sabbath with those [Jews]," thus excluding themselves from grace, for, Chrysostom argued from Gal 5:4, if Christ owes nothing to those who are only circumcised, how much greater is the danger on the one hand when "fasting and Sabbatizing are observed, and thus two commandments are kept rather than one" and on the other hand "due to the time that has passed" (*In Gal. comm.* 2.6; cf. *Jud.* 2.2). Circumcision, as a distinctive Jewish practice that Chrysostom suggested Gentile Judaizers were not often emulating, became a useful tool for his scriptural argument: "For if you keep the Sabbaths, why do you not also circumcise? And if you circumcise, why not also sacrifice? For if it is necessary to observe [the Law], it is necessary to observe the whole Law; and if it is not necessary to keep the whole, then neither

repeatedly portrayed Paul as preaching against Judaizing (*In Gal. comm.* 6.4; cf. *In Gal. comm.* 1.1), and argued that Paul condemned Judaizing in his own time, and that Scripture read correctly should teach his audience to condemn such behavior also in their own time (*In Rom. hom.* 25.3). One difficulty that John encountered in trying to separate Peter from Paul in terms of their adherence to Jewish law, however, was sparked by the description of Paul in Acts 21:20–26, which described Paul participating in temple rituals around the fulfillment of a Nazarite vow (cf. Acts 16:3, 18:18). John Chrysostom several times confirmed that Paul purified, shaved, and followed the law (e.g., *In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.375, 382, 384), even saying that Paul "Judaized" (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.382). John sorted this out by explaining that when they were all Jews, even Paul was compelled to Judaize, but then he stopped when he evangelized the Gentiles (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti* PG 51.384; compare *In I Cor. hom.* 22; *In Acta apost. hom.* 35, 46; contrast *In Rom. hom.* 16 and *In Gal. comm.* 5.3, in which Chrysostom said that Paul's behavior never made him a Judaizer). This recalls Garroway's discussion of Chrysostom's nuanced engagement with Jesus' equally complicated relationship to the law (Garroway, "Law-Observant," 591–615).

¹⁰¹ All translations from John Chrysostom's *In Gal. comm.* 2 are from the Greek text in PG 61.633–48.

¹⁰² All translations from John Chrysostom's *In Gal. comm.* 1 are from the Greek text in PG 61.611–34.

is it necessary to keep a part" (*In Gal. comm.* 2.6).¹⁰³ John thus interpreted Scripture to polarize his argument against Gentile Antiochenes, who he claimed observed the Sabbath and fasted with the Jews but chose not to circumcise and could not offer sacrifice at the Jerusalem temple.¹⁰⁴ Through their focus on those who acted "like Jews," these descriptions represent further accounts of how Antiochene church-goers could recognize John Chrysostom's "Jews" from their distinctive behavior.

In addition to where people went, when they celebrated, and what practices they observed, Chrysostom suggested that what people thought could also distinguish them as "Jews," although such descriptions almost certainly included Christians with different doctrines than his own.¹⁰⁵ He frequently encouraged the people listening to his sermons to imagine a conversation with a "Jew" on the streets of Antioch. Sometimes he suggested that the "Jew" would approach the listener, and other times he instructed his listeners actively to seek out such conversations. Regarding the former, one of John's *Homilies on Romans* taught his audience how to respond to challenges to Christian teachings, such as "when the Jew says to you, 'How by the accomplishment of one, the Christ, was the world saved?'" (*In Rom. hom.* 10.1).¹⁰⁶ There are also several

¹⁰³ Cf. John Chrysostom, *Jud.* 2 (Pradels, Brändle, Heimgartner 121rb, 122vb–123ra; Pradels, Brändle, and Heimgartner, "Das bisher vermisste Textstück," 32, 34). Meeks and Wilken argued that Chrysostom preached against some in his church community who circumcised (*Jews*, 32), but I understand John's rhetoric to apply the clear argument against circumcision from Galatians to the more pressing fourth-century issue John faced of participation in Jews' festivals and fasts (*Jud.* 2).

¹⁰⁴ It is unclear whether Chrysostom criticized people who intentionally joined in Jews' fasts or who rather intended to observe Christian fasts on days that happened to coincide with Jews' fasts. Chrysostom's rhetoric does not leave room for such distinctions. I thank the reviewer who raised this question.

¹⁰⁵ It became commonplace for Christian leaders to slander Christian opponents whom they considered to be "heretics" by calling them "Jews." See, for example, Christine Shepardson, "Exchanging Reed for Reed": Mapping Contemporary Heretics onto Biblical Jews in Ephrem's *Hymns on Faith*," *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 5.1 (2002): 15–33; Averil Cameron, "Jews and Heretics—A Category Error?" in *The Ways That Never Parted*, 345–60; David Brakke, "Jewish Flesh and Christian Spirit in Athanasius of Alexandria," *J ECS* 9.4 (2001): 453–81.

¹⁰⁶ This translation from John Chrysostom's *In Rom. hom.* 10, traditionally assigned to Antioch, is from the Greek text in PG 60.473–84. Compare other challenges and

places in John's homilies where he imagined members of his church audience intentionally seeking out a conversation with Jews (and/or with "Jews"),¹⁰⁷ and such conversation partners in turn evaluating and critiquing the behavior of local Christians.¹⁰⁸ John's rhetoric presumes that such conversations were plausible to John and to his audience, though it is unclear who "the Jews" were that each pictured.

As scholars challenge the scope and authority of the Palestinian (and Babylonian) rabbis in these centuries, it has become ever more pressing to identify sources for Jews and Jewish practices beyond the rabbinic texts. While many of these descriptions from John's homilies might seem largely predictable, they are still unusual in being non-rabbinic narrative perceptions of specific Jewish practices in a late antique Diaspora city. Like most early Christian anti-Jewish rhetoric, John's homilies elsewhere frequently conflated "Jews" of his city with biblical characters from the Old and New Testament. At least as interesting, however, are these examples when John claimed to speak specifically about what Jews did right then and there in his city. Jews in fourth-century Antioch, he claimed, circumcised, observed the Sabbath and did not carry burdens in public on that day, had dietary differences from other Antiochenes, had a distinctive washing ritual, and tithed. They celebrated Rosh Hashanah with the blowing of trumpets and a large public festival, Sukkot with booths in the city, Yom Kippur with a fast and dancing in the *agora*, and Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and all of these celebrations included uncircumcised Gentiles. Some Jews were effective healers; their synagogues contained an ark and books of the Law and the Prophets; and the material evidence suggests that some had titles of *archisynagōgos*, *presbyteros*, and *gerousiarchēs*. While Chrysostom tried to instill

conversations that Chrysostom imagined for his audience in *Hom. in Gen.* 49.7; *Jud.* 1.3; 3.4; 4.6; 5.1–3, 12; 6.3–4; 7.1.

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, *Jud.* 5.1–2; 7.6; *In Matth. hom.* 37.5; *In I Cor. hom.* 15.3.

¹⁰⁸ Chrysostom argued vehemently against going to horseraces, in part, he claimed, because when (non-Christian) Greeks and Jews saw someone who went to church attending the races, they would presume that the church's teachings were not followed and not powerful (*Hom. in Gen.* 7.2). Likewise, the fact that some of those whom Chrysostom considered to be Christians were practicing behaviors that he considered to be Jewish caused him to lament that when Jews saw those "who worship [προσκυνοῦντας] the Christ whom they crucified" following the Jews' own practices, the Jews would believe that their own practices were superior (*Jud.* 1.5). Blake Leyerle was correct to notice in her 2014 presentation at the SBL meeting in San Diego that John Chrysostom stresses conflict and differences when his writings imply there was a much wider range of interactions between his congregants and other Antiochenes.

in his audience polemical descriptions of Antiochene “Jews” as demons and crucifiers, he seemed to expect his congregants already to associate some of these other behaviors with familiar and respectable local synagogue-attendees whom John wanted to label “Jews” and tarnish with his new connotations.

Conclusion: Re-Imagining Antioch, Remembering the Jews

Although many of us who have written about John Chrysostom’s anti-Jewish and anti-Judaizing rhetoric have largely focused on his highly stylized polemic, his writings also offer persuasive concrete evidence that Jews lived in fourth-century Antioch along with church-goers who still associated Easter with Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and also along with Gentiles who joined Jews’ festivals, frequented their synagogues, and sought cures from Jewish healers. Unfortunately, no first-person voice like Libanius’s or John Chrysostom’s survives from fourth-century Antiochene Jews, so we are left to imagine them, like most Romans, through the voices of others and the scant material remains. While the rhetorical nature of Chrysostom’s homilies make them complicated sources for Jewish practices, time and again he distinguished contemporary Jewish practices from those of earlier times to an audience he assumed was familiar with Antioch’s contemporary synagogues and festivals (e.g., *Jud.* 6.4). John Chrysostom’s New Testament text of Galatians, for example, mentions Paul’s concern that his audience is inappropriately “observing special days, and months, and season, and years” (Gal 4:10), but the epistle particularly highlights Paul’s arguments against circumcision and dietary laws (e.g., Gal 2).¹⁰⁹ John himself, on the other hand, argued most vociferously against Sabbath observance and joining Jews’ fasts and festivals, explicitly stating that in his context these behaviors were of much greater concern than Gentile circumcision.

Most early Christian anti-Judaism is tied very closely to Christian Scripture, such as conflating Jews of the author’s period with Jesus’ opponents in the canonical Gospels or with the subjects of the prophets’ criticisms. While Chrysostom participated in those traditions, he also struggled to try to reattach fourth-century Antiochene Jews and their practices more closely to scriptural and temple-related rituals than they seemed currently to be, in order to make them easier to dismiss. For example, he argued that Scripture proved that

¹⁰⁹ This quotation is from the NRSV. I am grateful to Margaret Mitchell for highlighting the relevance of Gal 4:10.

Passover could not legitimately be celebrated outside of Jerusalem and that Sabbath observance was part of the same law that required temple sacrifice, apparently in an effort to confront a local synagogue community that accepted neither of these constraints. These arguments suggest that something in addition to Scripture and earlier temple-related practices—most plausibly observations of contemporary practices in his own city—provided the template for John Chrysostom’s descriptions of the behavior of fourth-century Antiochene Jews that did not conform to these biblical expectations.

To sketch fourth-century Antioch, we must take seriously the evidence “attesting to pagan gentiles (and eventually Christian gentiles) voluntarily in Jewish places, and to Jews voluntarily in gentile places.”¹¹⁰ What did Antioch’s synagogue leaders think of these Gentiles in their midst, participating in holidays, filling out the congregation on the Sabbath, popping in when the door was unlocked to swear an oath before the God of Israel? In fourth-century Antioch, like in third-century Carthage,¹¹¹ synagogue-attendees bought and sold in the *agora* alongside their neighbors most days of the week, sat with them at the theater, bathed together in the public baths, exercised at the *gymnasium*, slept beside them at the cave of Matrona, and greeted them as they walked alongside Antioch’s famous colonnaded and lamp-lit streets. John Chrysostom’s texts employ multiple rhetorical tactics to construct “Jews,” with the result that some of his descriptions more plausibly reflect local people and practices than others. While none of Chrysostom’s hostile rhetoric depicts “reality” in any straightforward way, this study has shown some of the ways in which his representations of post-temple Diaspora Jewish practices are nevertheless valuable. It is my hope that this essay will reinvigorate conversations that are at once theoretically sophisticated and historically responsible about Jews and Jewish practices in late antique Antioch, as well as commend some of John Chrysostom’s complicated but rich writings to the catalogue of non-rabbinic sources that can help nuance our understanding of Jewish communities and practices more broadly in the late Roman world.

¹¹⁰ Paula Fredriksen, “How Later Contexts Affect Pauline Content, or: Retrospect is the Mother of Anachronism,” *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History*, ed. Peter Tomson and Joshua Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 6.

¹¹¹ Fredriksen and Irshai, “Include Me Out,” 117–32.