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ABSTRACT

According to Epiphanius (Panarion 30), Joseph of Tiberias built the first Christian churches in several towns in Galilee. This story of Count Joseph, a convert or apostate from Judaism to Christianity, provides an opportunity for insight into the state of Jewish-Christian relations in fourth-century Galilee.

Epiphanius, a native of Judaea who wrote circa 375 C.E. while bishop in Cyprus, has obtained a reputation as both tendentious and difficult to understand. But his boundless theological certainty enabled him to present abundant information about his opponents, as he was confident he could refute them.

That Epiphanius and Joseph met in Scythopolis between 355 and 360 C.E. appears reliably historical.

There were Jewish-Christians called Minim, Ebionites, and Nazarenes in Sepphoris, Nazareth, Capernaum, and Tiberias at the time of Joseph.

While there is no absolute evidence that Joseph built churches in these towns, it remains most plausible that he did, but rather unsuccessfully, if one considers the long-term establishment of Catholic Christianity there as his goal. Joseph's church-building attempts probably ended
before the Gallus revolt (351 C.E.); however, his building did not cause the revolt. Gallus was Arian and no defender of Joseph.

Of four proposed identifications of Joseph outside of Epiphanius' account, only one is plausible: Joseph, the author of *Hypomnēstikon*, a bible handbook and heresiology which merits further study. It relies on *Panarion*. Excluding later additions to the text, the perspective of the author seems consonant with that of Joseph as presented in Epiphanius.

The Joseph story in Epiphanius' *Panarion* provides significant information on fourth-century relations and polemics between Galilean Jews and Christians.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

State of the Question on Jewish-Christian Relations in Fourth-Century Galilee

Joseph of Tiberias, a convert or apostate from Judaism, formerly a close assistant to the Jewish patriarch, was made a count by Constantine, who authorized him to build the first Christian churches in Galilee. At any rate, such is the story told by the ultra-orthodox Bishop Epiphanius in his book Panarion, or medicine chest of remedies against heresies. What can one learn from such a story told by such a writer? This dissertation will argue that we can learn much about Jewish-Christian relations in fourth century lower Galilee.

While it is generally recognized that the fourth century saw major changes in the development and status of both Christianity and Judaism,¹ there is little consensus

on how these changes affected Jewish-Christian relations specifically in Galilee. As the center of rabbinic activity and the former home of Jesus, Galilee is an especially telling area in which to trace the development of the two religions and their changing relations. Important questions remain to be asked, among which are the following. At the beginning of the fourth century, how large a Christian population, if any, lived in predominately-Jewish Galilee? What varieties of Christianity were practiced there? Were both Jewish-Christians and Catholics living in Galilee? Did these groups live in harmony, in contention, or in some more nuanced variety of coexistence? Was the Gallus revolt of 351-2 C.E., for instance, motivated by anti-Christian feeling? Questions concerning the extent of the Gallus revolt\(^2\) and the earthquake of 363 C.E. remain to be clarified. Note that in Epiphanius' account his meeting with Joseph occurred between these two dates. A study of the Joseph account of Epiphanius can help address some of these questions.

---

\(^2\) The views of Peter Schäfer, "Der Aufstand gegen Gallus Caesar," In *Tradition and Reinterpretation* (Lebram Festschrift), ed. van Henten, 184-201 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986) and Dennis E. Groh, "The Gallus Revolt at Sepphoris?" American Schools of Oriental Research meeting, 1987 illustrate the extreme divergence of views, proposing, respectively, a small and a large uprising.
Some of the more wider-ranging influences such as those involving Constantine, Nicaea, Eusebius, Julian and his attempt to rebuild the Jerusalem temple, and the gradual eclipse of the halakhic authority of the nasi (patriarch) by Babylonian sages have been extensively investigated. But less well understood issues include the evolution of Jewish-Christianity, and whether fourth-century Jewish-Christians were a continuation of a first-century variety of Christianity (e.g., those around James in Jerusalem). As well, no consensus has emerged on the manner in which Jewish-Christian groups played a role in relations between Jews and Christians.

The question whether one can identify Jewish-Christian archaeological remains has stirred quite a vehement debate. This may be illustrated, for example, by the widely diverging interpretations of the excavations at Capernaum, with its synagogue just a stone's throw distant from a house church (a subject which will be taken up in Chapter 3). In another instance, a marble chancel screen from a church in Pella was originally described by its excavators as displaying Jewish iconography including a menorah; but recently one of the excavators reinterpreted the screen as

---

conveying no Jewish images. What had been seen as a menorah, a lulav, a citron, and a shofar was then interpreted, respectively, as a chalice, a Nilotic plant, a cuttle-fish, and a sea shell.

One can find learned yet oversimplified responses to the question of the presence of Jewish-Christians, both maximalist and minimalist responses. Some call nearly all early Christian artifacts (and even some possibly non-Christian artifacts) Jewish-Christian, as was the case when Daniélou described all early Christian theology. Though necessarily provisional and occasionally extreme, these research works raise important questions. Among the

---


8 An important critical study has just been completed: Joan E. Taylor, "An Analysis of the Archaeological Material Assigned to the Jewish Christians" (Ph.D. diss., Edinburgh University, 1989). n.v.
maximalists are Bagatti and some of his students of the Jerusalem Franciscan school; the Franciscans, not merely incidentally, are custodians and owners of the most obvious early Christian sites in Capernaum, Nazareth, and Sepphoris. While some Bagatti students may have seemed overeager to find evidence of Christianity, they are at least raising some of the right questions, which dismissive minimalists on occasion seem to reject automatically.

In such studies of Joseph as are available--mostly as portions of more broad histories--Epiphanius' account of Joseph of Tiberias receives little and mostly suppositious mention. Epiphanius himself is too little understood. Some dismiss this account as worthless. Lieu recently wrote, "The story he reports as told by Count Joseph is of little historical value." Others report it as reliable or interpret it inadequately. Still others who might have been expected to treat it ignore it, e.g., James Parkes and

---

9 The earliest Christian sites in Tiberias are not readily located.


Marcel Simon. This study begins with the assurance that these questions merit a more comprehensive and considered investigation than they have so far received.

Hypotheses presupposing either much or little influence of Christianity on Rabbinic Judaism, or vice versa—for example, that the rabbis were either much or little concerned with Christianity—are of little use. Surely it should be sufficient to perceive some concern, without attempting to portray it as necessarily either pervasive or absent. Such preconceptions obscure the Joseph story.

No scholarly work has yet presented an adequate account of Jewish-Christian relations in fourth century Galilee, even though new information and insights are accumulating via archaeology and textual study, rabbinic and patristic and "sectarian." This dissertation intends to contribute toward such an account by clarifying one aspect of that history.

After discussing the nature of the Joseph story and considering problems and opportunities presented by Epiphanius (in the remainder of chapter 1) and recounting the Joseph story with historical notes (in chapter 2), this dissertation will focus on two principle questions about

---

Joseph, which will provide the topics of chapter 3, whether he built churches and whether Christians were available in these towns to supply congregations; and chapter 4, whether Joseph is identical with other known figures. The study will include (chapter 5) a comparison of Epiphanius’ Panarion with a text written by a Christian named Joseph.

Survey of Research on Joseph and Research Potential

The story of Joseph of Tiberias interested me for a number of reasons. From the excavations at Sepphoris it became evident that we were not sure when Christianity first arrived at Sepphoris. The texts on Sepphoris were of little help; actually they were either quite contradictory and speculative or else they ignored the issue.14 Nor was the first church building securely dated or located, whether or not Joseph built it. Also, it was quite clear that no consensus existed on the question whether there were Jewish-Christians in Sepphoris, and, if so, when and how many.

These questions converged with another interest of mine: the history of the Essenes and the likelihood that Essenes wrote some of the Qumran texts. Among the ancient accounts of the Essenes is a little-known description

14 See chapter 3 for these contradictory theories.
provided by an otherwise unidentified author named Joseph.\textsuperscript{15} This Joseph described the Essenes in a way that was uniquely similar to Epiphanius' description, as it included Essenes (and Ossenes) among both the Jewish and Samaritan heresies. Eventually I learned that this author Joseph may have been the same person as Joseph of Tiberias who knew Epiphanius. This identification had been suggested as early as 1679, but the question had remained unresolved. These questions encouraged the initial research which provided the impetus for chapters 3 and 4.

Our questions about Joseph may begin with what name to use for him—whether, for instance, to call him Joseph the apostate as does Isaac Braydé\textsuperscript{16}, or Joseph the convert. Calling him a "Jewish-Christian," as does Pritz,\textsuperscript{17} can be misleading, because Epiphanius presents Joseph as orthodox even by his standards; Joseph could be considered "Jewish-Christian" only according to the loosest possible definition of the term. Joseph has even been called a

\begin{footnotes}

\footnote{Jewish Encyclopedia, 255-56.}

\end{footnotes}
saint \(^{18}\), though in more cautious times, he has been listed as "Giuseppe, conte a Scitopoli, santo (?)." \(^{19}\) More neutral terms, the *komes* or Count Joseph or Joseph of Tiberias (some, with less justification, prefer Joseph of Scythopolis) certainly seem preferable for use here.

The literature is scattered in place and type of observation. The relevant bibliography has never been gathered and surveyed; only piecemeal approaches have been made.

I consider Moreau's article \(^{20}\) the most important contribution on the subject of Joseph of Tiberias published in this century. Moreau provides a good but limited inquiry, pursuing the identification of Joseph of Tiberias and Joseph, author of *Hypomnēstikon*. Yet Koch, \(^{21}\) who also wrote on Joseph of Tiberias, overlooked it, even though he quotes Joseph the author of *Hypomnēstikon*, because that text mentions Ebionites. \(^{22}\) Also oblivious to Moreau's


\(^{22}\) Koch, ibid., 395, 400.
article as well as to the important earlier works concerning Joseph of Tiberias by Vossius\textsuperscript{23} and Reeland,\textsuperscript{24} are Rubin,\textsuperscript{25} Pritz,\textsuperscript{26} and Stemberger.\textsuperscript{27} So, of the five most sustained discussions of Joseph in this century, four of them are unaware of the first published, which is also the most important.

One of the few modern scholars to write on Joseph, Glenn Koch, in a sense asked the wrong question about Joseph, i.e., whether Joseph teaches us about Ebionites, to which he answers no, it "adds nothing to our understanding."\textsuperscript{28} This is a distortion of the natural boundary of the topic of Joseph. But, still, Koch's is a quite useful study which does gather considerable information on the subjects mentioned in Heresy 30. The Joseph story does not tell us primarily about Ebionites

\begin{itemize}
\item[23] Isaac Vossius, \textit{De Sibyllinis aliisque quae Christi natalem praecessere Oraculis} (Oxford: Theatro Sheldoniano, 1679).
\item[24] Adrian Reeland, \textit{Palestina ex monumentis veteribus} (Bativorum: G. Broedelet, 1714).
\item[28] Koch, ibid., 383.
\end{itemize}
because Joseph was not an Ebionite; he is merely included in Epiphanius' chapter on Ebionites as a digression. Rather, we would do well to ask whether his story conveys to us information about Jewish-Christian relations. Stemberger provides a brief survey. Rubin rejects any widespread early (i.e., fourth century) influence of Christianity in Galilee, which is arguable, but he dismisses the value of the story, which can have historical value even if it shows only early, unsuccessful missionizing. The literature often offers merely a note on one aspect of Joseph; few contributions build on earlier proposals. Much of earlier research either entirely rejects Epiphanius or follows an uncritical, apologetic tendency to accept Epiphanius. A more nuanced evaluation seems called for. We will ask historical questions, but, even if lacking some historical answers, Epiphanius' account still has potential, as polemic itself can be useful and instructive as an historic indicator. Joseph of Tiberias has already been used as a source on Jewish-Christian relations, so we may as well evaluate how apt these uses have been. At a minimum, the polemic content of the story will illustrate issues of the time.

The Christian literature on holy sites, curiously, includes no ancient references to Joseph. Joseph is not

---

29 Koch, ibid., does recognize this on page 382.
associated with Helena’s church foundations in Jerusalem and elsewhere. Perhaps Joseph was active later than Helena and later than Eusebius of Caesarea, who also does not mention Joseph. Not until the fourteenth century did Nicephorus Callistus present a tradition that Helena built various churches in Galilee.\textsuperscript{30} One might have expected Epiphanius to link Helena and Joseph, whether the Joseph story is true or not; but Epiphanius does not discuss them together. No quotes of the Joseph story in \textit{Panarion} are made by Socrates, Sozomen and later church historians, nor in letters (e.g. of Eusebius Vercelli) or extant Roman records. Perhaps the issue of Galilean churches received less attention because they were of less interest to pilgrims than Jerusalem.

We will construct no artificial chronological review of research (\textit{Forschungsbericht}) here because so few contributions build on earlier suggestions. It will be more useful for this dissertation to gather them and to take them up in subject-classified groups. For instance, the four suggested identifications of Joseph were all separately made; each one was made without any mention of the others.\textsuperscript{31} The methodology here will include preliminary coordinating of relevant patristic and rabbinic literature

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, Migne Patrologia Graeca 146, col. 112-13.

\textsuperscript{31} For these identifications see chapter 4.
and archaeology.

One finds a considerable amount of imagination in assessments of Joseph's influence. Avi-Yonah wrote that Joseph's conversion "shows a certain loss of nerve among some at least of the Jewish leaders."32 Contrast Ovadia: "All this was, however, of little avail for the success of his mission, which terminated in his failure to win any converts to Christianity." "He made it his task to fan the dimming sparks of Christianity in these communities."33

This dissertation will provide a mise au point. An extreme divergence of views is apparent, for instance, on when Joseph may have built churches. For example, Meistarmann confidently asserts that Joseph built "doubtless...after Gallus had reestablished his authority in the area,"34 i.e., after 352 C.E. Dubnow is among those who place Joseph's church construction just before the Gallus revolt: "Joseph tackled his task with ardor...This aroused resentment in the heretofore calm Jewish province, 


and led to an armed clash with the Roman authorities."\(^{35}\) For a third view, one may consult Taylor, who writes that his building ended before 340.\(^{36}\) Still others deny Joseph built any churches. An analysis of these divergent suggestions can help clarify the process of Christianization—to the extent it occurred—in the fourth century in Galilee.

**Difficulties and Opportunities in Using Epiphanius as a Source**

In this section I wish to show that, though Epiphanius, a native of Judaea, may indeed be a problematic author, he provides a wealth of information. Some critical historians appear reluctant to attempt to use data in Epiphanius because he is little admired. It will be worthwhile to recognize the potential usefulness of Epiphanius' cumbersome book, *Panarion*, not only because it recounts Joseph's story, but, further, because it preserves information on many other aspects of early Jewish and Christian relations.

When coming to Epiphanius some scholars seem to take

---


pains to characterize his stupidity and inflexibility as eloquently as possible, while simultaneously dismissing his value as a historical source, saying he merely repeats silly rhetoric he has heard or read. Of course he repeats some silly rhetoric and unlikely stories. Such a dismissal is the theme, for example, of Bart Ehrman's reading of Epiphanius' account of Egyptian gnostics.37 But this observation is less useful than the realization that Epiphanius was of a mind and in a position to collect a prodigious mass of information on varieties of Christians and others; moreover, he was sufficiently naive to present this information even though much of it testifies against his own often weak or artificial interpretation of history. The task would seem to be not artfully to reject Epiphanius altogether, but to develop skill at determining what portions are reliable, so we can benefit from his evidence. We will use his Panarion, written between 374-377 C.E., in particular his Joseph account, to investigate fourth century relations of Jews and Christians.

We will not presume that everything Epiphanius wrote can be relied upon at face value, but it should become obvious that he provides historical resources not yet fully

utilized. For example, when Epiphanius wrote that Ebion was a Samaritan,\textsuperscript{38} he revealed nothing about Ebion, since Ebion likely never existed. However, Epiphanius thought Ebion was a historical character, and by his comment he at least tells us more about how he uses the term Samaritan.\textsuperscript{39}

As examples of valuable information already recognized in \textit{Panarion} consider that it includes: extracts of the gospel of Marcion (Heresy 42.11); the letter of Ptolemy the gnostic (Heresy 33.3-8); Montanist oracles (Heresy 48); writings by Marcellus and his opponent Basil (Heresy 72); long quotations of Methodius writing on resurrection against Origen (Heresy 64); titles of many gnostic books (e.g., Heresy 26.8.1). This list could easily be extended, and further examples will be discussed in the course of this study.

In addition, and perhaps more important for this study than the texts he quotes, are the eyewitness reports of Epiphanius. Lipsius reasonably concluded that Epiphanius' "own observation" of the last fifteen or so of the heresies he described makes him "one of the most important contemporary authorities for the history of the Trinitarian and Christological controversies since the beginning of the

\textsuperscript{38} Heresy 30.1.5.

\textsuperscript{39} For more on the role of Ebion and the Samaritans, see chapter 3.
4th century." To give merely one illustration here, Epiphanius had travelled to Antioch to speak with the followers of Apollinarus; later he stayed in Rome at Paula's home with Jerome, where he encouraged Pope Damasus to continue in condemning Apollinarus, as the pope did in a letter to the exiles in Diocaesarea. Other illustrations of valuable reports from Epiphanius will follow.

Epiphanius has been seen as a clod. His "crass materialism" has been contrasted to Origen's spiritualism. Yet Origen and Epiphanius share a particular confidence. Epiphanius was a chief posthumous adversary of Origen, preferring literal to allegorical interpretation of scripture. Recall his exceedingly realistic interpretation of the garden of Eden's Euphrates: "I have drunk also from the great river Euphrates, not spiritual but actual water..." Epiphanius was confident that he could adequately refute any and all heresies--as Origen was certain that he could answer every objection of Celsus. Such confidence allows Epiphanius to report all he knows

---

40 R. Lipsius, "Epiphanius (1)," 154.


42 Epistle to John of Jerusalem 51. 5. (A Latin translation collected with Jerome's letters.)
without worry.\textsuperscript{43}

F. Conybeare wrote of Epiphanius, "...if such a writer ever told the truth, at least about his enemies, it must have been by accident."\textsuperscript{44} If this characterization is to be credited, then there must have been many accidents; note that Conybeare assumed Epiphanius possessed Jewish learning.\textsuperscript{45}

Some content themselves with colorfully dismissing Epiphanius; but he is still a valuable historical source, even if his reptilian characterizations are to be regarded as mere curiosities. Typically, Epiphanius has been either slavishly followed or disregarded. This study will give his testimony a chance before accepting or rejecting aspects of it; more remains to be gained from his own compendious dismissal of others than many scholars have allowed. When Epiphanius calls a group lizards or vipers, one would do well to resist this invitation to reciprocally react and reject the rest of his account with disdain.

\textsuperscript{43} For example, in Heresy 76, Epiphanius amply quotes his opponent, Aetius. See L. R. Wickham, "The Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomean," Journal of Theological Studies 19 (1968): 532-69.

\textsuperscript{44} F. Conybeare, Philo. About the Contemplative Life (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 320.

\textsuperscript{45} "The Gospel Commentary of Epiphanius," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 7 (1906): 318-32, especially 318: "The frequent appeals to Jewish tradition and Jewish Rabbis as his source encourages us to suppose that the author of this work was really Epiphanius." But this text may be spurious.
Of whom else would one read a study titled "Did Epiphanius know what he meant by heresy?"? One would not query whether Origen would know what he thought on the mind or Augustine on grace. Epiphanius did know in this case, though perhaps not in other cases. Young wrote that Epiphanius considered heresy a "division," but did not use it in any consistent system. Fraenkel and Moutsoulas consider whether he regarded heresy as a rather neutral term; but Riggi correctly concluded that for Epiphanius heresy "constitue toujours une rupture de l'unite primitive." Heresy for Epiphanius is a rebellion, a deviation, a splitting off, as at the tower of Babel, from the truth—namely, his interpretation of Nicene Christianity. Riggi and Young independently answered

46 Frances Young, "Did Epiphanius Know What He Meant By Heresy?" Studia Patristica XVII, part 1, 199-205 (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982).


49 See also Frank Williams' introduction to his translation of Panarion, book 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987), xxiv.

50 Riggi, 27.

51 See also Jon Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), 95.
Fraenkel and Moutsoulas.

To say that Epiphanius had a clear measure by which to reject heresies is not to claim that his Panarion is a systematically or structurally coherent book—far from it. But Epiphanius himself concedes that much of his work on tracing the genealogy of heretics is imperfect. Some of the heresies he described may no longer exist; he tells us, for instance, that the followers of Menander as a group are "entirely defunct."⁵² In addition, he does not claim to include all extant heresies; he had inquired about the Magi, thinking to include them, but did not.⁵³

B. Pearson wrote on Epiphanius a rather typical phrase, that he is "notorious for his inaccuracies...but..."; then Pearson notes some potentially-useful data on Melchizedekians.⁵⁴ As H. Chadwick put it, "few authors so tiresome contain so much indispensable information."⁵⁵

Epiphanius' translator F. Williams assesses him as one who relied on the creed as a guide to truth. He was not a creative theologian.⁵⁶ Nor was he a creative historian; he

---

⁵² Heresy 22.2.4.

⁵³ The book Hypomnēstikon by Joseph does include them; see chapter 5.


⁵⁶ F. Williams, Panarion, Introduction.
cared only about church history and was gullible for Christian sources.

Epiphanius was ahead of his time, if a reactionary can be so described: he was one of the first to condemn Origen, and he was an iconoclast before that term came into use. He records new ideas for us by rejecting them; he indicates new ideas by new rejections. As chapter 3 will propose, Epiphanius had a new disdain for an old name (Nazarene), which again was a first (or near-first) for a Christian.

His work evidences "considerable but undigested erudition" and combines "ingegno estremamente limitato e zelo esasperatamente fanatico." Examining this "undigested erudition" may seem uninviting, but can offer productive literary archaeology.

According to M. Sprengling, Epiphanius had "...a crabbed, old, single-track mind, and the track he covers is usually a sidetrack. He clearly knew too much for his own limited understanding...much information not to be found elsewhere." Extreme reactions to Epiphanius in early literature include attempts to prove all he wrote or,

---

57 Francis X. Murphy, Rufinus of Aquileia: His Life and Works (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1949), 66.


contrarily, to deny, e.g., even the existence of an ancient Jewish town of Nazareth and a historical Jesus--hagiographical, apologetic attitudes toward Epiphanius or the opposite. Epiphanius often admits uncertainty in history if not in theology. He wrote of Heresy 58, "Though I have often heard of the Valesians, I have no notion at all who this Vales was, where he came from, or what his teachings, admonitions or pronouncements were."60

He collected diligently, or, if one prefers, compulsively. Epiphanius' book may serve as a partial redemption of awkwardness, a service to history of the inept, a help with the history of error, error in a broader sense than heresy, redeeming for history the "crabbed old mind" and his collection of curiosities about people he found different.

It is precisely Epiphanius' lack of subtilty, nuance, or capacity to lie skillfully that helps historians, since he preserves information, whether it serves his purposes or not. One needs to understand the stiff old heresiologist.

Epiphanius was not always aware of the consequences of what he preserves, but he does not need to understand entirely what he preserves for it to be valuable.

As evidence of naivete in action, Epiphanius preserves

---

60 F. Williams trans., unpublished.
the story of a flight to Pella despite the accompanying awkwardness of the origins of Ebionites and Nazarenes, awkwardness which he fails to see. In this tradition, a divine oracle directed pious Christians to go to Pella, which they obeyed, and the next thing we read is that Pella is a hotbed of heresy. Leaving aside any detailed discussion whether this story is true, see e.g., Lüdemann who argues con; and Koester who argues pro. Without attempting here to determine that some Christians actually moved to Pella, the weakness of the case against the possibility is worth noting. Lüdemann gives a learned presentation of a weak argument: that the Pella Chamber of Commerce claimed apostolic Jerusalem Christian origins, an argument that may seem reasonable at first if one recalls the multiple claims for ownership of various relics. But, unlike the reliquary claims, Pella presumed itself as protector of Jerusalem Christians as did no other city. The location is reasonable; the area had been used as refuge for previous minority Jewish sectarian groups. Also, it could hardly be argued that Eusebius and Epiphanius, who

61 Panarion 29.7.7-8 and Weights and Measures 15.
preserve the tradition, had any interest in shoring up a trans-Jordanian claim to special early Christian habitation. Further, Lüdemann's supposition that the pseudo-Clement allusions to a flight from Jerusalem were written in the Pella area but without naming Pella in the text, adduced in defense of his case, actually weakens his case, since a false foundation myth would have explicitly named Pella in the pseudo-Clement texts. In any case, Epiphanius' dilemma—if he had noticed it—remains: how can devout Christians engender such heresy in Pella.

According to heresy 18 the Nasarenes "practiced Judaism in every respect...The Pentateuch however it did not accept." This may sound odd at first, but may not be, given their idea of false Biblical pericopes on sacrifice and eating flesh. Epiphanius gives different dates for the founding of Nazarenes and Ebionites, and he vacillates on whether Paul accepted the Nazarene name. This shows use of different sources not fully harmonized.

Epiphanius' inability to find a sure founder or origin time for the Ebionites and Nazarenes argues for an evolution of these groups.

---

64 Trans. Luttikhuizen, 95. Note the distinction between the Jewish Heresy 18 spelled with a sigma and the Christian Heresy 29 spelled with a zeta.

65 See Heresies 29 and 30.
Dechow\textsuperscript{66} notes a case in the Origenist controversy where Epiphanius "makes establishment of his own case impossible." Such slips help us access his data.

Epiphanius multiplies sects, as he does not recognize all their overlapping and evolution. He preserves and records the name variants and alternate names.

Several ancient groups claimed to be "observers of Torah" and manifested this claim in their self-designations. For this no writer provides more evidence—unwittingly or not—than Epiphanius.

Some of Epiphanius' seeming confusion in overlapping heresies actually accurately reflects some understanding of the name relations and evolution. As will be argued in chapter 3, Epiphanius appears to confuse Ossenes, Samaritans, Sampseans and Nasarenes (and Essenes, Therapeutae, and Nazarenes) partly because the names mean or claim essentially the same thing: they claim to be doers, guardians, keepers, and servants of Torah. Elkesaites arose from Ossenes/Sampseans/Nasarenes.

Of Heresy 19, Ossenes, from whom came the Elkesaites, Panarion notes their simultaneously high and low regard for the Jerusalem temple. This can be compared to Qumran where the sectarian highly valued the temple service, but rejected as illegitimate the contemporary priests.

\textsuperscript{66} Dechow, ibid., 357.
Incidentally, Epiphanius was aware of manuscript discoveries in the Judaean desert. "Concerning the fifth and sixth translations [into Greek of the Hebrew Bible], which were found in wine jars in Jericho after the persecutions of Verus, [v.l. Severus] in the time of Antoninus..."  

Epiphanius reports on Elkesai as a Jewish Christian, which may be debatable, but as was then understood, and as presented in the Cologne Mani codex. He reports then-current beliefs on pre-Christian Nasareans, Heresy 18, which compares with the Mandaean who claim to go back to John the Baptist, even earlier, and called themselves Nazarenes (nāsōrāyē). M. Black regards Epiphanius seriously on pre-Christian sects.

By his access to many sources and his inability to select what ultimately suits his purpose, Epiphanius preserves much information on Jewish-Christianity, including evidence or at least inference that they existed, since he attempted to account for them. His few attempts at revisionist history were occasioned by his refusal to consider an evolution of Christianity, or by his trying to meld disparate sources.

---

67 Dean trans., ibid., 34.

Epiphanius is not a clever dissimulator or dissembler; he is not imaginative, except, perhaps, in his animal image taunts.

Epiphanius lays out the areas of confusion in their most ramified form, which is a gift to historians since he is not subtle enough to color his account skillfully. He had a pedestrian but retentive mind.

Epiphanius was not entirely in control of the consequences or implications of his account and of the vast sources he presents. This creates both an opportunity and a problem. The issue is not only what he understood but what he preserved. Even his misinterpretations can be of interest; he preserves information in a quickly-changing world. We will offer suggestions on how to distinguish his sources from the imput of his own speculations.

He was a prodigious collector of data including some misrepresentation and legend, yes, but also fragments of many now-lost important texts. He was sufficiently naive to fail to see that the data he presents often testifies against his own interpretation of history; he turns over to us information which undermines that interpretation.

Epiphanius provides the first definite report of the birkat hamimin as including nosrim. He records the view that Ebionites were more heretical to Catholics than

69 Heresy 29.9.2.
Nazarenes, which is confirmed by rabbinic literature and by six Cairo Genizah MSS (and Seder Rav Amran). 70

He preserves some of Irenaeus' heresiology better than Irenaeus' translator. 71 As is well known, he preserves several gnostic texts and titles.

Information mixed with conjecture in Epiphanius need not be undervalued, because he preserves much not otherwise available, and does so in such a manner that at least some of it can be retrieved fairly reliably.

He provides enough clues to sort out some of his distorting assumptions. One can sometimes tell what confused him, whether this has to do with etymology (e.g. Heresy 53, Sampseans, where he preserves the name but vocalized it wrongly, see chapter 3) or with the relation between various groups, which may seem confused, but which actually provides substantial insight into the relations among groups and into the multiple names obtained by certain movements—a result, in part, of sources which reflect different perspectives and different stages of development.

Epiphanius admits using a combination of text, hearsay, personal witness and conjecture. He also admits

70 See chapter 3.

uncertainty. For instance, on Cerinthians or Merinthians: "...they are called Merinthians too, I am told. I am not sure whether the same Cerinthus was also called Merinthus, or whether someone else named Merinthus was a colleague of his. God knows!"\textsuperscript{72} He gives four alternate etymologies of "Samaritans" (Heresy 9)--here he does not care greatly since they are non-Christian. Also, he gives alternate origins, for instance, for Ebionites, Nazarenes, Elkesaites, and Valesians.

Wisse takes a minimalist position on Sethians, Epiphanius' Heresy 39, a group he claimed to have actually encountered as well as read about.\textsuperscript{73} Besides dismissing Epiphanius' claim without good reason, Wisse assumes, not logically, that the explanation or theory for production of Sethian texts which involves the fewest people is necessarily the most plausible. But, for example, if several anonymous MSS were found all from the same era, would it be the best guess that they were all written by one author? If Sethian literature could have been produced by a few private mystics, without any community, then Wisse assumed it was--ignoring Epiphanius as attesting to a group. It might posit a more orderly world if Epiphanius

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Panarion}, Heresy 28.8.1, F. Williams trans.

were merely a literary cut-and-paste worker, but such cannot be.

Wisse has now brought this minimalist approach to early Jewish-Christianity.74 While such a study may indeed be useful as a corrective, it does not provide the most plausible reconstruction of history, which after all is the aim of historical study. Similarly, Bart Ehrman's treatment of Epiphanius on the Phibionites is of use as a cautionary study, and it counters Epiphanius' rhetorical dismissal with an entertaining rhetorical dismissal of its own, but is also minimalist to a tendentious degree, and by no means offers the most plausible reconstruction of Epiphanius' meeting with Egyptian gnostics and extensive reading of their literature.75

Epiphanius' knowledge of languages presents a question more relevant for his use of written sources than for the Joseph story, but is worth noting here.

Jerome claimed Epiphanius knew five languages. "Must


75 Ehrman, ibid., argues that polemicists often slander their opponents with various charges of disapproved sexual conduct, which is true enough, but such an observation does not exclude the possibility that the charge is true. Ehrman also appears incredulous toward the possibility that a religious group could practice the rituals described in Heresy 26, though similar examples exist from antiquity until as recently as a case reported in the New York Times on May 2, 1990, page A17.
he be charged with a crime for knowing Greek, Syrian, Hebrew, Egyptian, and in part measure, also Latin.? Had Jerome make this claim on the basis of firsthand contact or by inference from the Panarion or merely supposition? Would it be safe for Jerome to exaggerate about this? Who would know if this were false? Jerome and Epiphanius had many friends and enemies in common.  

I will leave aside the question of Coptic; Greek and a little Latin are not at issue. How much Hebrew and Aramaic or Syriac did he know? It can in no way be argued that he knew none; it is merely a question of degree. He uses some Hebrew and Aramaic correctly. He had at least the ability to use some Semitic words, even if he sometimes mistakes them. Formulae, such as prayers, magical invocations or chants, which he sometimes garbles, do not always lend themselves to clear explanation or translation. Etymology by itself is not a clear test for language knowledge, because one who knows a language may have misconceptions about word origins: one can know the current usage of a word without knowing how

76 Against Rufinus, 2.22 (cf.3.6), 401/2 C.E., trans. John Hritzu. Fathers of the Church (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1965).

77 For extensive documentation and analysis of the dynamics of these relationships see the forthcoming study on the Origenist controversy by Elizabeth A. Clark.

it came to be so.

Biblical text variants are not an easy test of his language knowledge, since several issues or questions overlap in these determinations: e.g., is Epiphanius preserving a variant or does he misunderstand? Also, one must allow leeway for translations and textual transmission of Epiphanius' own text. It is one thing to show mistakes; but more telling to determine what he does know. Collections of his linguistic errors are presented by Gressman \(^79\) and Dummer.\(^80\)

Epiphanius knew some Hebrew and Aramaic. He made wrong presuppositions in "reading" an Elkesaite saying as magical, though he received it, via Irenaeus, in a backwards Greek transcription (Panarion 19.4). This may evidence his credulousness, but does not exclude language knowledge, in other words, that he might have been able to read it if he noticed the backward transcription. So one might conclude he was not bright enough to see it was reversed. He assumed Elkesaites could have a stupid text. His Hebrew version of backwards Aramaic is doubly wrong, but it takes some Hebrew—and no shyness—to make such an


attempt at it. (Irenaeus didn't try.) We should notice that not until 1858 was a solution published, and even then only after a backwards Arabic reading had been published.  

Awareness of -æoi/énoi endings for Ess- and Naz- is a significant indicator of awareness of (or at any rate recording of) language distinctions. Among the ancient writers only the multi-lingual Flavius Josephus also preserves Essénoi/Essæoi endings.

Epiphanius knew at least enough to interpret some Semitic texts; enough to preserve them; little enough so as to misinterpret them sometimes. Many of the previous Christian reporters (e.g., Irenaeus and Tertullian) didn't know much Hebrew. Epiphanius knew more Semitic language than Philo or Origen, though Origen had better help.

---

81 M.A. Levy, "Bemerkung zu den arabischen Analekten des Herrn Prof. Hitzig," Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 12 (1858): 712, who responds to Prof F. Hitzig's earlier article in the same volume which presents an Arabic (!) translation of the backwards Greek transcription. Ignaz Stern, writing in Ben Chanania that same year, n.v., also recognized the transcription as backward Aramaic.

82 See chapter 3.

83 Among the other discussions of Semitic language in Epiphanius see, e.g., William Adler, Review of The Panarion vol. 1, trans. F. Williams, in Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 3 (1988): 101-4 (which notes that Epiphanius implies he read the Aramaic Revelation of Elchasai); J. Nordmann, "Dusares bei Epiphanius," Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 29 (1875): 492-93 (which raises the question of knowledge of Arabic; cf. also heresy 58.1.2); M. Sprengling in J. Dean trans., Weights, forward; R. Pritz, ibid., 49 (on gazophylakion as a close but not exact translation of geniza in heresy 30.3.8). Several studies, e.g. Lieu, Epiphanius and Elliott, Hebrew, consider that Syriac
The Joseph account in Epiphanius was, partly, an eyewitness account (i.e., a combination of personal experience and hearsay/oral source). Whatever the problems in using Epiphanius for literary sources, the Joseph story is not from such a source.

Though much of what Epiphanius reports as heresy he has only read about, he also reports from his experience. We already noted his claims about the Egyptian gnostics (Heresy 26) and some "face to face inquiry" claimed with Sethians (Heresy 39.1.2). His claim of knowing of two sisters, contemporary leaders of the Ossenes (Heresy 19), may be hearsay. In Judaea his condemnation of Peter the Archontic (heresy 40)84 is presented as experience. Michael Stone considers historical Epiphanius' report of an early Armenian pilgrim.85

These parallels argue against the Joseph story being a later addition.86 Though source-critical problems abound elsewhere in Panarion, note that the Joseph account is not

may have his native language; this seems unlikely.


86 See chapter 2 for discussion of the available texts of Panarion.
such a case, but a report of hearsay and experience. The Joseph story is not directly part of the refutation of Ebionites, but is an aside.

A significant biographical issue concerning Epiphanius must be addressed, since many secondary sources can mislead one. Though it has often been asserted, there is no good reason to think that Epiphanius was a Jewish convert. The story is from late hagiography that his parents were Jewish and that he was converted by a itinerant Christian monk who visited his Judaean hometown, and performed miracles.\textsuperscript{87} But the notion that Epiphanius was Jewish has been an influential idea nonetheless, and continues to be repeated.\textsuperscript{88}

There is no evidence of Jewish parentage in Epiphanius' own works, as rightly concluded by Jon Dechow.\textsuperscript{89} So such Jewish rearing was not a motive for his use of the Joseph story--likely he would have revealed this link somewhere elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{87} The Greek text of this Vita, supposedly by his disciples John and Polybios, is printed with editions of his works. For a translation, see John Hackett, A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus (London: Methuen, 1901), 401-407.


\textsuperscript{89} Dechow, ibid., 32, noting that the probably-authentic letter of Epiphanius to Emperor Theodosius claims his parents were also Christian. See Nicephorus, Adversus Epiphanius, XV, 61.
in his writings, if it were so. Or, if one posits that Epiphanius avoided mentioning his supposed Jewish heritage, then Epiphanius' many enemies would likely have been pleased to mention it. The later claim that Epiphanius was Jewish may be of interest for analysis of its polemical purposes: was the story invented or imagined for evangelistic use?

The most extreme case of imagining Epiphanius as a Jewish-Christian is provided by Hugh Schonfield, who was at the time an advocate of a modern variety of Jewish Christianity. In 1936 he published his book, *The History of Jewish Christianity*.90 It is not a reliable book,91 but here we will note merely its frontispiece, which is a photograph of a manuscript miniature of Epiphanius, which Schonfield captioned, "A Fourth Century Jewish Christian, Epiphanius, Bishop of Costantia"! Not only did Epiphanius reject any and all varieties of Jewish-Christianity, but, increasing the irony, he also abhorred depictions of


91 For example, after retelling of Joseph's church building in Tiberias, Nazareth and Sephoris [sic], Schonfield wrote, "Inscriptions recording his foundation still remain." I have encountered no other mention of inscriptions naming Joseph in those towns. A letter I wrote to Mr. Schonfield's London address requesting some reference for this claim was not answered.
departed saints!  

There does not yet exist a good biography of Epiphanius. Jon Dechow provides a good bibliography. Among the provisionally-useful biographies are those of Tillemont, Lipsius, Schneemelcher, Nautin, and Williams. This dissertation will attempt to contribute to some future biography of Epiphanius a better understanding of his relationship with Joseph of Tiberias. Epiphanius' relationship with Joseph can be instructive not only for Epiphanius' view of Jews, Jewish-Christians and

---

92 Evidenced by his tearing down a painted church curtain in Anablaptha. He also argued against toleration of such images in a letter to Emperor Theodosius I.

93 Dechow, ibid., 25-43. Dechow's account emphasizes the Origenist controversy in Epiphanius' life. The bibliography does not include Thomas W. Mossman, Epiphanius: The History of his Childhood and Youth Told by Himself; A Tale of the Early Church (London: J.T. Hayes, 1874), which I have not yet seen; presumably, it is not reliable, since an autobiography is not otherwise attested.

94 M. L. de Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique (Venice: F. Pitteri, 1732) X, 484-521 and 802-809.


98 F. Williams, ibid., xi-xvi.
Arians, but--possibly—also Epiphanius' view of Anthropomorphites and Apollinarians.

A few facts of Epiphanius' life may be given briefly. He was born in Eleutheropolis, Judaea probably between 310 and 320 C.E. At a young age he became a monk, spending several years in Egypt, and an ardent adherent of Nicene Christian theology. He returned to his hometown and founded a monastery, which he led for many years. Soon after 355 he met the anti-Arian bishop and monk Eusebius of Vercelli at the home of Joseph in Scythopolis.

In 367 Epiphanius became bishop of Salamis (renamed Constantia) in Cyprus. There he began building what is the largest known basilica on Cyprus. He wrote Ancoratus, on well-anchored faith, in 374. In the following year he used the list of heresies already compiled in Ancoratus (12,7-13,8) to begin the Panarion, motivated partly by the request of monks in Beroea, Syria. Among his other writings are a Bible handbook titled Weights and Measures written in 392 and De Gemmis on the twelves stones of the high priest's breastplate written a few years later.

In addition to his magnum opus, Panarion, Epiphanius

---

99 If the case for identity of Joseph of Tiberias and Joseph, the author of Hypomnēstikon, as argued in chapters 3 and 4 is successful.

is known chiefly for his continuing struggle against heresy. His efforts against the reputation of the brilliant Origen are infamous. He also contributed, though less intentionally, to the demise of John Chrysostom. He died in 403 on a boat returning from Constantinople, where he had earnestly attempted to promote orthodox Christianity as he saw it—with mixed results.

Epiphanius intended to discourage heretics but he need not also discourage historians! So, at any rate, one hopes.
CHAPTER 2

EPHPHANIUS' ACCOUNT OF JOSEPH WITH COMMENTARY
ON ITS HISTORICITY

In this chapter we will follow the sequence of Ephphanius' text and make initial comments and observations on its degree of historicity and note various other aspects of the story, but with two major exceptions, reserving the following issues for later chapters: (1) Joseph's supposed church building, which includes the question of the religious affiliations of the population of the four towns, and (2) alternative, additional identities for Joseph of Tiberias; these two issues will be deferred until chapters 3 and 4, where they will receive detailed analysis.

We begin with notes on the text, namely Panarion 30. 4.1 to 12.9 on Joseph of Tiberias, as well as the previous few lines (3.7-9), which introduce a Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew as kept in a Tiberias geniza, thereby providing the occasion for the digression on Joseph of Tiberias.¹

¹ See Appendix for a translation of this passage by Frank Williams, from The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book I (Sects 1-46), Nag Hammadi Studies, 35 (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1987). Chapters of Panarion are cited as heresies; section and line numbers follow the heresy number; heresy 30 is the
The best available text is the critical edition by Karl Holl. Jürgen Dummer has prepared a moderately revised version of Holl's edition. Though his revision of *Panarion* 30 has not yet appeared in print, he shared his emendations of Holl's text with Frank Williams; according to the system of notation used by Williams in his translation, Dummer did not emend Holl's text in any part of the passage that concerns us.

The text is also available in several earlier editions. The first printed version, edited by Johannes Oporinus, appeared in Basel in several printings in 1544 and was supplied with a previously-available Latin translation by Janus Cornarius. Cornarius, who also translated works of Hippocrates and Galen, is carefully identified as a medical doctor (*medico physico*), presumably competent to interpret the *Panarion*, defined as box of medicine (*capsula medica*)

---


prescribed to remedy heresy. In 1622, in the wake of the Counter Reformation, Dionysius Petavius, S.J., published a Greek edition and new Latin translation; Petavius' work is reprinted in the *Patrologia Graeca* of Migne. It is a curious fact that after more than two centuries without a new edition of Epiphanius' works, two new Greek editions by Oehler and Dindorf appeared within the same six years as the Migne reprinting. Pierre Nautin has recently announced that he is preparing a new edition of *Panarion*.

---

5 *Contra octoaginta haereses opus, Panarium, sive arcula, aut capsula medica appellatum... Iano Cornario medico physico interprete* (Basel: R. Vuinterum, 1544).


8 *Epiphanii, Panaria eorumque anacephalaesosis*, 3 volumes, ed. Franz Oehler. (Berlin: A. Asher, 1859-61). This includes the Latin translation of D. Petavius.


for the Sources Chrétiennes series.  

Holl discussed the available manuscripts and stemma, in which he found evidence that various scribes had attempted to "improve" the text by atticizing his Koine Greek. He also persuasively argued that Anacephalaeosis, the brief and widely-circulated recapitulation of Panarion, was not written by Epiphanius. The Anacephalaeosis, usually included with editions of Epiphanius' works, does not reliably represent Epiphanius' larger work. This summary does not include any mention of Joseph of Tiberias, so we need not dwell on it. But it is worth noting that many writers, for example, Augustine and John of Damascus, who may appear to be influenced by the heresy descriptions of Epiphanius, have read only this summary. That the recapitulation was more widely-circulated than Panarion

---


itself may also help explain why Joseph's story is not explicitly commented on in any known ancient literature.

Jürgen Dummer has concluded that Holl himself in his own attempt at "improving" Epiphanius' text emended too often. Similarly, Riggi, in his critical edition and detailed discussion of Panarion Heresy 66, "Against Mani," omits various emendations of Holl. Frank Williams described Holl's work as "a carefully edited critical text," though a manuscript "sometimes gives a plausible sense unrestored." For further discussion of Holl's edition one may consult the account of its history by Irmshersher. Nautin proposed that a new edition could benefit from further study of the grammar and style of Epiphanius. In our passage, Holl used V (Vaticanus 503, the oldest MS, ninth century) and gave variants from M (Marcianus 125.


15 Williams, ibid., x.


1057 A.D.). Altogether, it appears that a new critical edition will not fundamentally change our access to the Joseph story. Unless Holl's reconstruction of the stemma is flawed, or unless additional early manuscripts turn up, a new edition would probably make more important contributions to other sections of *Panarion* than to our passage, e.g., sections that describe heresies that could be compared with manuscript finds such as Nag Hammadi, Qumran, Turfan, the Cologne Mani Codex, and so on. In any case, Holl has clearly indicated his emendations.

Dummer suggested no changes in our passage in *Panarion*. We will suggest at least one. We would do well to drop Holl's additional word "<genomenos>" at 4.1. Williams translates according to Holl's text, so he has "...Josephus of Tiberias, <born> during the old age of the Emperor Constantine..."¹⁸ This unnecessary emendation must be wrong because it would place Joseph's birth during Constantine's reign, which would make him too young to have gone to Constantine later in the story. Such a change would also make Joseph younger than the "seventy or even more" (5.1) when Epiphanius met him between 355 and 360. Therefore, Koch's translation is better: "...Joseph...from Tiberias who lived in the times of the blessed king Constantine when

¹⁸ Williams, ibid., 122.
the king <was> old..." 19 Since Epiphanius made no such suggestion, it would be unfair speculation to assume that he wrote this contradiction.

A new critical edition may help resolve other questions. For example, it could help clarify the differences between Panarion and Anacephalaesos. Here we will briefly note a source-critical issue, which a new critical edition might address.20 Can we be sure Epiphanius actually wrote the passage concerning Joseph? This section appears to be written in Epiphanius' style. It can be compared with other sections in which he claims personal contact as the source of his information: for example, Epiphanius' struggle with Peter the Arcontic in Judaea in Heresy 40; and his story in Heresy 26 of escaping from gnostic women in Egypt who, he says, attempted to seduce him; as well as other eyewitness accounts. The Joseph passage is, to my knowledge, present in all the manuscripts and editions which include Heresy 30. There is no evidence of such tampering in other sections of Panarion, unless one counts relatively localized changes due to confused transmission and atticing. In one case a creed evidently was changed in a manuscript of his earlier book Ancoratus

19 Koch, ibid., 118 (4.1).

20 I thank Professors James Strange and Dennis Groh for some interesting conversations on this and other issues.
(on "well-anchored faith"). At any rate, such changes do not appear to be characteristic of the transmission of Panarion—which is remarkable, given its size and varied subjects. The Panarion would not be an easy text to attempt to appropriate for some different point of view.

If the Joseph story were a foundation myth written by someone other than Epiphanius, it presumably would have been intended to account for and legitimate church foundations in Galilee towns as orthodox and relatively early; but it is not obvious who would be drawn to such a project. This leaves the question whether Epiphanius so intended it: is the Joseph story an attempt at revisionist—not just tendentious but entirely fictional—history by Epiphanius? Would he, for example, willfully place the story in the time of Constantine if it actually occurred during the rule of Constantius II, in order to make the church foundations seem earlier? As I hope to show, at least several aspects of the account appear based in fact, though such a grounding in reality does not exclude tendentious coloring of the story. While Epiphanius has often been accused of misrepresentation of a source or tradition, he was not essentially a creative, imaginative


22 The Anacephalaesosis could more easily have been changed to reflect differing interests or speculations.
writer who is known for producing new tales from whole cloth.

This study will not attempt a source-critical investigation and will proceed with the working assumption that Epiphanius indeed wrote the Joseph story, which he based on an embellishment of his own memories. The burden of proof to discredit Epiphanius' authorship would seem to be on those who would propose an alternative, less simple explanation for the origin of the text. Koch specifically set out to determine the various written sources used in writing Heresy 30; Koch concluded, "The nature of the sources does not suggest that Epiphanius assembled the Joseph story from written accounts, but rather points to oral tradition, which Epiphanius or others before him may have confused in minute details." While Koch may have underestimated the "minute details" that have become confused, I agree with him that Epiphanius is not using written sources at this point.

The Panarion may be the most historically-significant patristic text for which there exists no complete modern European language translation (except in Russian). It is remarkable that until Williams no such translation had been undertaken. Oxford University Press has announced another English translation, but it will be an abridgement; in any

---

23 Koch, ibid., 380.
case it has not been available for use here. A French translation will accompany Nautin's edition, if it is published. Our passage was not selected for translation by Klijn and Reinink. Hebrew translations are available in S. Klein and Z. Rubin.

Koch's translation of Panarion 30 in his useful dissertation was a welcome step, but it contains a few significant errors. It confuses Constantine and Constantius at 5.2 and 5.7, giving the former ruler though the text has the latter. This confuses the time when Epiphanius met Joseph, namely during the rule of Constantius II, who died in 361.

Koch also translates 30.5.3 to read concerning Joseph

24 Philip R. Amidon, ed. and trans. The Panarion of Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming, 1990). (Advertised as "including first-hand accounts of his encounters with sects and notable figures of his day....omitted are Epiphanius' extensive theological refutations, which are generally seen as unoriginal and of minor significance...")


26 Samuel Klein, Sefer HaYishuv (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1938), 71-3. (Hebrew)


that "in regard to his public life he lived in accordance with the Jews" after his conversion. The text has: "...hōti tōn emphānōn hupērchen para Ioudaiōs." Williams reads "that he had been a prominent Jew." The Williams translation suits the context better, since Epiphanius presented Joseph as one who had held high office among the Jews but who was now an orthodox Christian. The questionable translation by Koch misled Pritz in his article on Joseph. Pritz quotes Koch's translation and comments that it seems unusual that Epiphanius would not condemn Joseph for retaining Jewish religious observances.\(^{29}\)

Also at 9.4, which characterizes another resident of Scythopolis, we should not read with Koch: "a certain other, who was still a Jew...but on account of fear of the Jews he often spent time in the midst of Christians..." Rather, it is preferable to read with Williams: "He was still a Jew, from fear of the Jews, but he often spent time in Christian company..."

Williams has translated well, but we will need to refer to the Greek occasionally, e.g., for the characterization of the population of four Galilee towns. Following Holl, Williams unnecessarily adds "<rule>" at 11.10. Williams

translates according to Holl's text throughout. Unless otherwise noted, the translation of Williams will be cited in this dissertation.\textsuperscript{30}

Joseph is the main source for Epiphanius for these pious tales, whether Joseph was a trustworthy narrator or not. Joseph was an opportunist like his namesake Flavius Josephus who switched allegiance to Rome apparently motivated, at least in part, by political self-interest, but this being a trope does not make it untrue. We are left with the question, how much of the story was Joseph's invention; how much Epiphanius' invention?

The main subject of Heresy 30 is the Ebionites. In his dissertation Koch understandably sought information about Ebionites, but when he came to the Joseph portion of the chapter, he asked the wrong question, since Epiphanius made no claim that Joseph was an Ebionite. Koch titled his Excursus "The Count Joseph Story as a Possible Source for the Knowledge of the Ebionites."\textsuperscript{31} Actually, Epiphanius made an effort to distinguish Joseph from the Ebionites and to present him as orthodox (e.g., at 5.5), a fact Koch did not fully take into account.

Epiphanius begins his narrative about Joseph after mentioning that a gospel in Hebrew was kept in a synagogue

\textsuperscript{30} Williams, ibid., 30. 3.7 to 12.9 on pages 122-29.

\textsuperscript{31} Koch, ibid., 374-83.
in Tiberias. J. P. Siegal has discussed other manuscripts possibly kept in a Tiberias *geniza*;\(^{32}\) Siegal gathered information on a certain set of Hebrew Bible text variants not retained in the Masoretic text--vocalized in Tiberias--that may also have been kept in a Tiberias *geniza*, perhaps at the Severus synagogue. This synagogue, now excavated, is well known for its mosaic floor, which includes a large zodiac.\(^{33}\) Rabbi Meir, a Tiberias resident, is known to have had a scroll with these variants. Additionally, in his study of Rabbi Yohanan, Kimelman argues that Tiberian rabbis would collect and store opponent's texts for use in preparing for disputes.\(^{34}\) Rabbi Yohanan was an active disputant with opponents including, among others, *minim* and Origen, also known as collectors of variant readings and interpretations of scripture.

New Testament books purportedly written in Hebrew by the fourth century are not yet well understood by scholars. Epiphanius made several references to Hebrew gospels. Though we cannot attempt a full discussion of this complex subject here, a few observations are in order. There are

---


several sources, including Epiphanius, of quotations for various "Jewish-Christian" gospels. Additionally, there is the tradition, repeated by Epiphanius, that Matthew was originally composed in Hebrew. Epiphanius wrote that Matthew was written "in the Hebrew language and alphabet" (3.7) and that it was Hebrew by nature, Hebraikon phusei on (6.9). Such suggestions of the ancient sources are not well understood today at least partially because they presuppose an artificial division of the evidence. Attempts to sort out the various "Jewish-Christian" gospels, though helpful, are not finally persuasive. This lack of persuasiveness obtains even with the learned studies of Vielhauer\textsuperscript{35} and Howard.\textsuperscript{36} These attempts fail for at least three reasons: the sources are not always clear; the sources reflect changing perspectives on the terminology referring to the gospels of Ebionites, Nazarenes, and Hebrews, which have not been adequately assessed\textsuperscript{37}; the sources for "Jewish-Christian" gospels have been separated from the related sources for early gospel variants and


\textsuperscript{37} See chapter 3 for a contribution toward such an assessment.
early gospel harmonies.

A remark of Epiphanius that is often dismissed as an example of his notorious confusion may help illustrate the need for further research. In his description of Tatianists Epiphanius wrote that Tatian was the author of "the Diatessaron, which some call the Gospel According to the Hebrews." In this instance, it might appear that Epiphanius improperly mixed a gospel harmony and a "Jewish-Christian" gospel. But a relationship between early gospel harmonies and "Jewish-Christian" gospels is becoming evident in recent scholarship. Daniel Bertrand showed similarities between the "Gospel of the Ebionites" from which Epiphanius quotes in Heresy 30 and early gospel harmonies. Tatian, a student of Justin, whose lost Syntagma may have been available to Epiphanius, was not the first to produce a gospel harmony, nor were all the early gospel texts which were harmonized identical with later canonical copies. Klijn and Petersen have recently demonstrated the attestation of several identical readings in "Jewish-Christian" gospels and early versions and gospel harmonies. With good reason, Petersen has called for a

---

38 Heresy 46.1.9; Williams, 349.


40 R. Lipsius, Die Quellen der aeltesten Ketzergeschichte neu untersucht (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1875).
reconsideration that would cross-reference research into the text of Justin and the Diatessaron with the Jewish-Christian gospel fragments.\(^{41}\) Therefore, Epiphanius' comment linking the Diatessaron and the "Gospel of the Hebrews" may not have been so misinformed or ignorant after all.

Though Jewish-Christian gospel versions are not the main issue in the Joseph of Tiberias narration, we will briefly note some ongoing research that may eventually contribute to a better understanding of the milieu of Joseph of Tiberias. George Howard published a medieval Hebrew text that he claims is an edited version of a first-century C.E. version of the Gospel of Matthew, which he also argues is entirely unrelated to Epiphanius' "Gospel of the Ebionites."\(^{42}\) Howard's claim is not persuasive because his methodology assumes that any text portions paralleling the Greek or Latin versions must reflect medieval editing that is attributable to polemic purposes and that any portions that appear to be composed in Hebrew, because of puns, for example, must be first century


\(^{42}\) The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987).
original composition.\textsuperscript{43} Despite the failure of the book's thesis, it remains an excellent contribution to scholarship because it presents the earliest known complete Hebrew version of Matthew and compares it to several other versions of Matthew, including some fragments in Hebrew and Aramaic. Howard has contributed several other studies, including a comparison of this Hebrew Matthew version and Toldot Yeshu traditions,\textsuperscript{44} which, together, advance the study of the relation between Christian gospel versions and Jewish traditions about Jesus.

Among other recent studies that merit mention here is a proposal by A. I. Baumgarten that at least portions of the pseudo-Clementine literature, which Epiphanius used in characterizing Ebionites, were composed in Galilee; he claims the text shows familiarity with the debates within rabbinic Judaism in Galilee.\textsuperscript{45} Baumgarten builds on A. Marmorstein's analysis of Jews and Christians in Galilee.\textsuperscript{46} J.A. Overman's recent dissertation suggests that Matthew


\textsuperscript{46} "Judaism and Christianity in the Middle of the Third Century," Hebrew Union College Annual 10 (1935): 233-63.
may have been written in Lower Galilee. It would be premature to attempt a full account of the available fourth-century varieties of Hebrew and Aramaic Gospels and of Jewish-Christian Gospels, which are overlapping but not identical categories, since, for example, some Jewish-Christian gospels were written in Greek. As an additional complication, Epiphanius quoted the supposedly-Hebrew version of Matthew often called "Gospel of the Ebionites" in Greek. The Joseph story does not center on Hebrew and Aramaic gospels, but it certainly attests to their existence.

Joseph was an apostle (apostolos; Hebrew, shalihah) to the patriarch. That such messengers were dispatched by patriarchs is recorded in rabbinic literature, e.g., PT Hagigah 1, 76d. The functions of these officials were eventually limited by Roman legislation.

Any assessment of the historicity of the Joseph story needs to take into account the particular patriarchs Joseph claimed to know. Previous studies that have attempted to match the chronology of the narrative with the patriarch

---


have often mistaken either the chronology or the patriarchs referred to, or both.

When Epiphanius wrote *Panarion* the Patriarch was Gamaliel (or Gamliel) V. Though Epiphanius does not say this, he notes (4.2-4) that the patriarchs are descended from Gamaliel (II), whom we know as, among other things, the recorded initiator of the *Birkat Haminim* and as an opponent of Christianity according to B. Shabbat 116b. Rabbinic literature may have taken pains to specify the anti-Christian views of Gamaliel II because Christians extrapolated from the tolerant depiction of Gamaliel I in Acts the legend that Gamaliel I converted to Christianity. (In various gnostic texts, the name Gamaliel is even used for an angel.) The earliest known attestation of the legend that Gamaliel I converted to Christianity appears in the pseudo-Clementine Recognitions I. 65. 2 in the source known as *Ascents of James* (*Anabathmoi Jakobou*). Epiphanius used this source in Heresy 30. Such polemics provide some background for Joseph's story.

---

49 B. Berakhot 28b.

50 Discussed in chapter 3.


Polemics directed against some of the patriarchs did not originate solely from Christians. While in rabbinic literature Judah Nesiah was described as a "great man" (gadol), Judah III and Gamliel V were called insignificant or small (qatan) men. Given these varying perspectives, Lee Levine, in his study on patriarchs, could remark, "Epiphanius' account of Patriarchal life is a most important corrective."

Epiphanius was surely not close to the patriarch; they probably never met. Epiphanius admitted quite openly that he may not have correctly remembered the names of the two patriarchs who Joseph had described to him twenty or more years earlier (4.3 and 7.1-2). Epiphanius gives two names: Hillel and Judah, in that order. But, as we shall demonstrate, Epiphanius recalled the right names, but in reverse order.

The dates of the office of the patriarchs are not entirely agreed on; but Epiphanius is not the only uncertain source here. The confusion is not all of his making; the rabbinic sources are not easily sorted out in this case, partly because the various patriarchs named

---

53 PT Avodah Zarah 1, 1, 39b.

54 In, respectively, PT Baba Batra VIII, 2, 16a and PT Avodah Zarah 1,1, 39b.

Judah (after the first, Judah the Prince or nasi) are not always clearly distinguished. The chronological chart prepared for Encyclopedia Judaica\textsuperscript{56} gives the following fairly typical estimates of their dates:

- c270 death of Judah II (Nesiah)
- c290 death of Gamliel IV
- c320 death of Judah III (Nesiah II)\textsuperscript{57}
- c365 death of Hillel II (son of the above)
- c385 death of Gamliel V (son of the above)
- c400 death of Judah IV
- 425 Patriarchate abolished in the office of Gamliel VI

Avi-Yonah says Joseph was associated with Hillel II and Judah IV. Schoeps also suggests a late date, placing Joseph with Hillel II around 350.\textsuperscript{58} J. Taylor also proposed a late date, but presents an internally-contradictory scenario. Taylor writes, "Joseph is associated with Hillel II (Patriarch from 330 to 365) and was guardian to the boy

---

\textsuperscript{56} Volume 8, after column 766.

\textsuperscript{57} Levine, ibid., 677 suggests 309 C.E. as the last possible year of Judah III. The Encyclopedia Judaica entry on Hillel II begins his office in 330, about the same margin of possible error in the other direction.

\textsuperscript{58} H. Schoeps, \textit{Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums} (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949), 381.
Judah IV (d. 400) before converting to Christianity." Koch similarly associates Joseph with these two patriarchs. Taylor then conjectures that Joseph met with the Emperor "just before Constantine's death, in 337" and that "the earliest structure in Nazareth used by Christians was completed c. 340." Such a reconstruction of events fails to match Joseph's story because he joined with Christians only after the elder of the two patriarchs died. While the death of Hillel II is not securely dated, it was in any case after 358 C.E., the year in which he published rules for calendrical intercalation without requiring patriarchal certification of the moon cycles. Hillel II was also known to Emperor Julian (361-63). Therefore, Joseph could not have been an assistant to Patriarch Hillel II at his deathbed, and then have travelled to meet Constantine, because the emperor had died at least two decades earlier! In fact, if we would follow such a reconstruction, Joseph's conversion to Christianity would have to be dated later than his meeting with Epiphanius! Various scholars have proposed impossibly late dates


60 Koch, ibid., 375.

61 Taylor, ibid., 147.

62 This discrepancy seems worth noting in part because other portions of Taylor's research appear significant.
for Joseph—impossible, that is, if Joseph's story is to have any internal coherence. If the story is a fraud, of course it need not be free of contradictions; but it would posit a case without parallel to suppose that Joseph or Epiphanius would create a tale so blatantly anachronistic that Joseph went to Constantine to build churches before Joseph converted!

One might ask, alternatively, whether Joseph went to Constantius II rather than Constantine after the patriarch's death; but Hillel II died after Constantine II, which again eliminates that scenario. Therefore, Joseph must have claimed that he was associated with Judah III at his deathbed and the young Hillel II. Though H. Graetz dismissed the story as "an incredible tale," he correctly perceived that the two patriarchs referred to were Judah III and his son Hillel II. 63

Epiphanius states that the patriarch asked for and received baptism. This may be the weakest part of the story, in terms of history. That a patriarch converted is to be doubted. There is no evidence for it, only hearsay from a convert or apostate. On the other hand, it is not impossible, and may be an exaggeration of some show of

---

interest. Both Jews and Christians displayed some curiosity about the capacities claimed by the other group, for instance in healing, as will be illustrated below. But the patriarch's conversion must be seen as unlikely, and was more probably invented by Joseph than by Epiphanius. Conversion of the patriarch is not a priori impossible, but the burden of proof is surely on those who suggest the patriarch actually did so. It would be peculiar if a bishop had baptised a patriarch and then did not proclaim it; by implication this bishop kept a secret.

In fact, one of the more suspicious aspects of the story is this certain bishop from near Tiberias: "episkopon plesiochoron tēs Tiberiēon." (4.5) Rubin objects that there was no bishop known in Tiberias at the time.64 The earliest bishop known from Tiberias attended the Council of Chalcedon in 451.65 Bagatti, on the basis of Epiphanius, assumed that "we know...that at this time there lived in Tiberias a Judaeo-Christian bishop."66 If Epiphanius were right that Tiberias had no Catholic church at the time, then surely it had no Catholic bishop; but Epiphanius said


65 M. Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, (Paris: Typographia Regis, 1740), III, columns 705-08.

66 Church from the Gentiles in Palestine, trans., E. Hoade (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1971), 71. (my italics)
the bishop was from some unspecified place near Tiberias. In assessing the degree of probability of this story, it would be helpful to know more about how baptism was regarded by the local population in this time and place: the range of opinions, for instance, on whether baptism was regarded as a repudiation of Judaism.

Epiphanius goes on to narrate several pious stories, including some of Joseph's dreams and several occasions on which he was healed, all of which are seen as invitations for Joseph to convert. But, according to Epiphanius' account, it took several invitations.

Epiphanius also presents Joseph as anti-Arian. Gallus and Constantius II and Bishop Patrophilius of Scythopolis were Arians.\textsuperscript{67} Suggestions that Arian Christology was derived from the Ebionites have been dismissed by R. Lorenz.\textsuperscript{68}

Joseph read the "Gospel of the Ebionites" and Hebrew translations of John and Acts from the Tiberias geniza.

The young patriarch went to the baths at Gadara, (7.5)

\textsuperscript{67} For indications from Philostorgius, Constantius II, and Gallus' half-brother Julian that Gallus was Arian, see "Gallus (1) Caesar" in Dictionary of Christian Biography, ed. W. Smith and H. Wace (London: John Murray, 1880). The heretic Aetius served as tutor to Gallus; see Philostorgius, Hist. Ecc. 3, 27.

\textsuperscript{68} Arium Judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arios, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979).
which have only recently been excavated, and supposedly tried magical charms to seduce a Christian woman, but failed, as she was protected by the "seal of Christ." To this story one may compare another bath house confrontation between Tiberias rabbis and minim, each side using magical words, told in Talmud Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 25 d. 70

Another Jew reportedly told Joseph to believe in Jesus, according to this hearsay. Epiphanius reinforces the story with his own claims of hearsay from other Jews believing in the healing power of the name of Christ. (9.4)

Again Joseph was healed, but still did not convert. As a test of these powers, Joseph himself healed a naked maniac, exorcising a demon by means of the "name of God." (10.3) Interest in magic and healing are otherwise attested on both sides as attraction. For example, in Pal.T.Shabbat XIV, 5, 14d 71 someone whispered in the name of Yeshua Pantera and a certain child (of a Rabbi Joseph) recovered from an illness. But the child's grandfather said, "It had been better for him that he had died rather than thus."

In Cilicia, Joseph was caught by Jews while reading


70 R.T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, (London: Williams & Norgate, 1903),112 discusses the passage.

71 See also Herford, ibid., 108, and a parallel version in PT Avodah Zarah II, 2, 40d.
gospels, presumably in the canonical Greek form (as opposed to the Ebionite version), though this is not explicitly stated in the text (11.3). He was whipped. A bishop, again unnamed, rescued him. Though Epiphanius might have tolerated the Ebionite Gospel merely as a initial introduction to Christianity, as it piqued Joseph's interest, he could have regarded it only as a first step. Possibly this is another effort by Epiphanius to present the conversion as orthodox.

Seized once again, Joseph was thrown into River Kydnus (11.6), perhaps coincidentally in the region where Paul had lived.

Joseph received baptism "a little later." But we are not told who baptised him or where; by inference it was the previously-mentioned Catholic bishop in Cilicia.

Joseph went to Constantine, though in what city is not specified, perhaps Constantinople. Amnon Linder suggests that Joseph's visit may have influenced some of Constantine's later laws concerning Jews. Linder specifically suggests that a prohibition of persecution of converts issued on October 18, 329 could have been initiated by Joseph's report of persecution; Constantine imposed the penalty of death at the stake for Jews

---

72 The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1987), 124-25.
persecuting Jewish converts to Christianity.\textsuperscript{73}

Joseph was made a count and given a salary.(12.1)\textsuperscript{74} Constantine gave several of his acquaintances the title of kômes, despite his general social conservatism. Here, below, are several examples of references to counts which may be of interest either geographically or for comparison purposes. There are several offices which included the designation of kômes or companion, including the treasurer, comes thesaurorum, mentioned in PT Sanhedrin 30b—a function which would not be unrelated to Joseph’s experience as apostolos, collecting funds from synagogues.\textsuperscript{75}

In the prosperous Sardis community a Jewish kômes is memorialized on a mosaic floor.\textsuperscript{76}

In Sepphoris a synagogue inscription mentions one and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} Codex Theodosianus 16:8:1.
\item \textsuperscript{74} For mention of pay for conversions see, e.g., R. MacMullen, Christianizing the Roman Empire (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 88.
\item \textsuperscript{75} For rabbinic literature references to counts, see Samuel Krauss, Griechische und Lateinische Lehnmörter im Talmud Midrash und Targum (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1898), vol. 2, 509. A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire, 284-602, (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1964), 104-07, on Constantine's counts: "We hear of them in ecclesiastical affairs...Constantine also quite frequently appointed one of his comites to take charge of a diocese..."
\end{itemize}
possibly two Jewish counts, also holding the office of archisynagogos.77

Among the places the term kōnes is attested are the following: on Mt. Carmel on a Jewish grave inscription;78 in Eleutheropolis, Beth Guvrin, Epiphanius' hometown, on an inscription dating from the first half of fourth century;79 in Scythopolis, Joseph's retirement home, an inscription of a Byzantine period Christian governor;80 and in the Hammat Gader synagogue.81

Another ancient source for the phenomenon of Jewish counts appears in a Christian text. A pseudo-Augustine text, De Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae attests that Jews being made counts remained an issue in the fifth

77 B. Lifshitz, Donateurs et Fondateurs dans les synagogues juives (Paris: Gabalda, 1967),


century. In this polemic dialogue, "Ecclesia dixit:...Judaeum esse Comitem non licet."  

82 This text against the synagogues dates after 438 C.E. when Jews were disallowed public official functions  

83 and before 476 C.E.  

Epiphanius does not connect the Joseph story with any of Helena's church foundations. Since she died circa 330, Joseph’s church building attempts may well have been later.  

Joseph returns to Tiberias to build. (12.1)  

Joseph fires up lime kilns despite "sorcery," that is, attempts by Tiberians to prevent his construction project. Again, the question is whose magic is stronger? In a contest reminiscent of Elijah and the priests of Baal, Joseph said a blessing and managed to stoke the fires despite opposition. The crowd, in good literary style, proclaims "heis theos," "There is one god who gives aid to the Christians."  

85 Joseph used the Kavkav vessel,  

82 Migne Patrologia Latina 42, column 1133.  


kakoubion (12.6) a specifically well-known Galilean bowl.\textsuperscript{86} This may seem a small detail, but it links Epiphanius, rabbinic literature, and archaeology, and represents at least the type of cross-checking which can be useful.

Joseph completes a "small church," (12.9), using only part of the earlier foundations, though this has not yet been confirmed by archaeology.\textsuperscript{87}

Then he retires to Scythopolis.(12.9)

Epiphanius ends, vaguely, stating Joseph completed [teleiōs] buildings in Diocæsarea and certain other towns.(12.9) Then Epiphanius resumes his account of the Ebionites.

The date of the meeting of Epiphanius and Joseph has been suggested as 356 C.E.\textsuperscript{88} or 359\textsuperscript{89}, but generally without any supporting data. It must have been before Constantius II died in 361, so Pixner is mistaken in suggesting circa

\textsuperscript{52.}


\textsuperscript{87} See the chapter 3 section on Tiberias.

\textsuperscript{88} B. Meistermann, Guide to the Holy Land (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1923), 516. See also in the Acta Sanctorum entry on Joseph, July 22.

370. This meeting also dates after Eusebius of Vercelli, monk and bishop (one of the first to combine the two, as Epiphanius would also, from 367 C.E.), was exiled by the council at Milan in 355. Eusebius Vercelli, a Nicean and anti-Arian like Epiphanius, later went to Cappadocia and the Thebaid before being reinstated by Julian in 362. Therefore Epiphanius met Joseph with Eusebius Vercelli between 355 and 361, with the earlier portion being more likely.

In sum, the evidence suggests it is quite plausible that Epiphanius and Joseph actually met and that Joseph was indeed a convert or apostate.

Here is a provisional chronology:

c290 birth of Joseph of Tiberias

c320 death of Judah III

325 to 337 Joseph met Constantine

351 to 352 Gallus revolt

355 Eusebius Vercelli exiled to Scythopolis

355 to 360 Epiphanius and a retired Joseph met in

---


91 See Jerome, Viri. Illust. 96; Eusebius Vercelli's letters in Patrologia Latina 12, 949ff. In Epistle 2, Eusebius threatened a hunger strike if the Arian bishop Patrophilius would not allow his associates to visit him. See also the Histories of Socrates 1.35, 2.36-40, 2.43 and Sozomen 1.15, 4.9, 5.13. Also Holl, Panarion I, 338-9 and Koch, "Epiphanius," 379.
Scythopolis

358 Hillel II fixed calendar
361 Constantius II died; Julian's rule began
367 Epiphanius became bishop in Cyprus
374 to 377 Epiphanius wrote Panarion, partly on the request of monks in Boeria, Syria; Gamliel V is patriarch.

In the next chapters we will pursue the questions whether Joseph actually built churches in the lower Galilee, whether Christians already lived in these towns, and whether Joseph can be further identified as a historical figure.
CHAPTER 3

DID JOSEPH BUILD CHURCHES?

Epiphanius' Claim that Four Galilee Towns
Had No Christians before Constantine.

Epiphanius wrote that Joseph asked "...to build Christ's churches in the Jewish towns and villages where none had ever been able to found churches, since there are no Greeks, Samaritans or Christians among the population. This <rule> of having no gentiles [alloethnou] among them is observed especially at Tiberias, Diocaesarea, Sephoris, Nazareth and Capernaum." (Panarion 30.11.9-10)

In the first part of this chapter we will examine the assertion that these towns had no Christian residents at the time. We will argue that Epiphanius intended to report that no Gentile Christian communities resided in the towns and that no Catholic churches had been established. There is no reason to suppose Epiphanius ignorant on that point, and he would have no reason to deny any Catholic churches if such existed. But Epiphanius did not consider Jewish-Christian groups such as Ebionites and Nazarenes to be Christians; he did not consider their places of worship,
their synagogues, to be churches. Evidence from literary sources indicates that there were Jewish-Christians in these towns.¹

Literary sources:

Minim, Ebionites, and Nazarenes

In order to study carefully early Jewish-Christian heresies, one needs to make some sense of the group names Ebionites, Nazarenes, and minim. It is important to note that each of these three names sometimes referred to Jewish-Christians of one sort or another and sometimes did not refer to Jewish-Christians of any sort. And all three were sometimes used in contexts of controversy or polemic. Even today there may be as much disagreement as there is consensus regarding the significance of these names. Furthermore, the modern term "Jewish-Christian" lacks a generally-accepted definition. This imprecise modern term does not lend itself to easy definition, unless one assumes the questions of "who is a Jew?" and "what is the essence of Christianity?" have been satisfactorily answered. The ancient terms are more useful for historians. (Epiphanius did not use, and surely would have rejected, the term "Jewish-Christian.") Provisionally, I will use the term

¹ Therefore, for example, the map, "Località giudeo-cristiane della Palestina," Plate I in I. Grego, I Giudeo-Christiani nel IV Secolo: Reazione - Influssi (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1962) correctly includes the four towns, provided it is not asserted that the towns were predominately Jewish-Christian, which they were not.
"Jewish-Christian" here merely in the broad sense of a person in late antiquity who considered Jesus as Messiah and also observed some practices based on Torah such as calendar, circumcision, and diet. In addition, consideration of the subject of "heresy" requires care so that historians may describe fairly the conflicting perspectives involved.

Given all this, one might wonder with what presumption this chapter will attempt to contribute to the understanding of these three names. But prospects for clarifying these terms are not so bleak. All three names, and their variants, can be best understood by comparing their evolution and interaction. After all, the significance of the names changed over time, as did the idea of heresy itself. Though this approach will not answer all remaining questions, when one retraces the time sequence of the texts using the three names and also considers the perspectives of those who used them, some newly-apparent relationships do emerge.

In some times and places, heresy has been considered a distinction, specifically a distinction hoped for, the relevant setting in this instance being the centuries before the common era and even later when Greek philosophic schools

---

Such a definition is not precise, but would exclude, e.g., the case of one born a Jew who converted to Christianity and did not observe Jewish practices. The latter phrase is not sufficiently defined, but would exclude those Jewish practices (e.g., liturgical use of psalms) which were also appropriated by Christians. The difficulty inherent in this definition argues for attentiveness to alternate, ancient terms.
were vying for acceptance and prominence. As Marcel Simon and others\(^3\) have reminded us, many Greek philosophers wanted to be identified with a heresy, *hairesis*, in the sense of a chosen school of thought. One group earnestly desiring to be thought of as a heresy were the Skeptics. But various opponents rejected their aspiration to such status, saying that since Skeptics doubted so much, they could not be said to propound a coherent ideology and therefore represented not so much a school of thought as a doubtful attitude.

At the end of the first century, Josephus still utilizes the term "heresy" as a neutral or even positive term. In the Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees he saw examples of *hairesis*; Josephus also calls such a group a *tagma* (order) and a *genos*. For example, Josephus calls the Essenes a *genos*.\(^4\) In the case of Justin's list of Jewish heresies, the *Genistai* may be merely a tautological confusion, a *genos* appearing to him (or his source) equivalent to a heresy.\(^5\) In the Septuagint *genos*

---


\(^4\) *War* 1.78, 2.119; *Antiquities* 15.371.

\(^5\) *Dialog with Trypho* 80,4. Perhaps rabbis avoided if not rejected the name Pharisees along with all "kinds," *minim*. 
is used to translate the Biblical Hebrew word min.\textsuperscript{6}

Eventually of course heresy took on its current connotation of not only a choice or school of thought but a wrong choice, a despised variety of thought. The Hebrew term min\textsuperscript{im}--singular, min; abstract noun, minut--should be seen in this context. Though various other etymologies have been proposed, including, for instance, one using an acronym,\textsuperscript{7} min\textsuperscript{im} in the sense of heretics must be a development from Biblical Hebrew, where it means a kind or species, such as a kind, or genos, of fruit or grain.\textsuperscript{8} In Mishnaic and later Hebrew it keeps the Biblical connotation in some contexts and adds the new one in others. So far as I am aware min-as-heretic does not appear in any pre-70 CE text. It does not appear, except in the Biblical sense, in any of the thus-far-published Qumran texts.\textsuperscript{9}

So, minut, meaning heresy, like the Greek term for heresy, evolved from a generic sense to a specific sense, from a neutral or positive sense to a negative one. Minim was

\textsuperscript{6} E.g., Gen 1:11 kata genos. Cf. Ecclus 43:25, "all kinds of living things and sea monsters."

\textsuperscript{7} Ma'amin Yeshu Nosri, i.e., "believer in Jesus the Nazarene."


\textsuperscript{9} Also no instances appear in the unpublished concordance of Qumran manuscripts.
applied to kinds of Jews. In our historical case this gradual negativization of taxonomy is expressed in the Talmud Yerushalmi (Sanhedrin 29c), which presents Rabbi Yohanan as saying "Israel did not go into exile until they had been made twenty-four sects [kitot] of minim." So we have a set of related terms, similar in that they concern types or subdivisions: hairesis, minut, genos, also Justin's mention of the Meristai,\(^\text{10}\) probably from Greek merizein, to separate, and perushim,\(^\text{11}\) Pharisees when it is taken in the sense of separatists. (Perushim and paroshim have also been rendered as "specifiers.") Changes in meaning occurred in these terms as Judaism and Christianity were forming--and perhaps because they were forming.

The Hebrew term בְּשׁוֹנִים, the poor, Ebionites, follows this pattern from a generic positive sense to a specific negative one -- negative, that is, in the perspective of their opponents, such as Irenaeus, who is the first writer known to condemn Ebionites.\(^\text{12}\) Irenaeus of Asia Minor who became Bishop of Lyons certainly did not know Hebrew; he did not name the Ebionites, nor did he claim to, but merely reported a pre-

\(^{10}\) Dialog with Trypho 80, 4.

\(^{11}\) Perushim (plural passive participle with active force) or paroshim (nomen agentis) can mean "specifiers" as well as "separatists." Cf. Avot de R. Natan A 37: shevua perushim hem.

\(^{12}\) His Against Heresies, written circa 190. Hairesis was perhaps already negative in Justin's Dialog with Trypho 80,4, but in reference to Jewish heresies.
existent name. Evionim is a self-designation. This practice of self-designating obtains with most ancient group names, as A. I. Baumgarten has observed. Self-designations frequently are then, afterward, belittled by opponents, sometimes using derogatory puns. For example, Origen called Ebionites "mentally poor," which for Origen is a severe comment.

I don't wish here to digress in detail on the Pharisees, but it is worth noting that the name Pharisees obtained positive and negative connotations, even without recourse to Christian writings for the negative references. To use a somewhat inexact, but perhaps heuristically useful English analogy for the various senses of Pharisee, consider the word discriminating which can refer either to sophisticated, learned separatism or to bigoted separatism. In my opinion, the positive reference came first, and 4QMMT, Miqsat Ma'ase

---


14 First Principles IV, 3, 8, ptōches dianoias, poor of understanding.

15 4QpNah III 6-7 dorshe hahalagot, seekers or expounders of smooth things (cf. CD I 18), as pun on expounders of halakhot.
Hatorah, an important Qumran text, seems to suggest this.\textsuperscript{16} It says "parashnu miharov haa[m]..."; "we have separated ourselves from the majority of the peo[ple...] from intermingling in these [matters]." This Essene text, which contributes to the understanding of the term Pharisees, includes halakha that the rabbis later, in Mishna Yadayim characterize as Sadducean--thus exemplifying the need for an understanding of the dynamics of the development of these names.\textsuperscript{17} Later than 4QMMT the negative connotation of separatism predominated--hence it should not be surprising to find rabbinic ambivalence toward the term Pharisees, especially at a time when Jewish separatism was inherently less welcome than before. So we find for example in Tosefta Berakhot 3, 25 a text reminding readers that "the benediction concerning the minim is included with the [probably-earlier] one concerning the perushim." If we mix our frames of reference, here it looks as if Pharisees are condemning Pharisees.

To return to the Ebionites, poverty is given no positive regard in Greek thought, unlike in Hebrew Scriptures wherein


God has special concern for the poor. Evionim is an evolving name, not one given after a supposed eponymous founder, a culprit named Ebion, as Tertullian and Hippolytus imagined. Perhaps they assumed each heresy has one founder, or perhaps their source misunderstood references to a personified poor one, as found for example in the Qumran hymns (hodayot). In any case, there is no need to suggest, as did Professor G. Strecker, that "the designation Ebionaitoi ... probably originated in a concrete situation and was not a general label." Nor is it historically-useful, theological preferences aside, to dismiss Ebionites, as does Ray Pritz, as "at best only third generation." Rather, there was an evolution of this term.

In the Qumran manuscripts we read several references to the Evionim, clearly applied to the writer's own group, and sometimes used in parallel with other accepted self-

---


19 E.g., de praescript. haer. 33, 11 (ca. 200).

20 Refutatio omn. haer. VII 35, 1 (225 CE).

21 E.g., 1QH 2, 23 "Thou hast redeemed the soul of the poor one [nepesh'evion]," Verme tr.


designations. In the Qumran texts we have an interim stage in the development of the name, midway between the Biblical use and the heresiological use. In the Cave 4 pesher or commentary on Psalm 37 we have the semi-technical term 'edat ha'evionim, the congregation of the poor. These are Jewish writers identifying themselves as members of the 'evionim, among other names; groups, of course, may have more than one name. However, since there is no clear evidence of Christianity at Qumran, these are not Christian Ebionite texts, as, for example, J.L. Teicher claimed in a series of articles beginning in 1951.25

Yet, on the other hand, this theme of a congregation of the poor cannot be hermetically sealed away from any influence on the New Testament, as has been attempted by many writers, including Professor L. Keck.26 Whatever Paul may have meant when he referred to "poor saints in Jerusalem"27 -- and I won't speculate about that here -- it is clear that some New

24 E.g. 1QpHab 12.4, the simple of Judah, doers of the torah.


Testament and other contemporary writers were familiar with the thought-world represented in the Psalm 37 pesher. To note merely a few examples: In Matthew: "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (5:3; cf. Lk 6:20); "The poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt 11:5; cf. Lk 7:22); James 2:5 "Has not God chosen the poor (πτόχοι) of the world to be rich in faith...?" Test. of Judah 25.4 "Those who were poor for the Lord's sake shall be made rich." Etc. The term 'evionim plays a role at Qumran, though not a Christian role. This view of poverty also plays a role in the New Testament, though not a later-variety heretical one.

It is important to note that, in terms of church condemnations, Ebionites were attacked relatively early, that is, in the second century C.E., by Irenaeus. But the name was not consistent through history, as implied by the organization of Klijn and Reinink's otherwise useful book, Patristic

---


29 Note the apocryphal gospels assigned to Ebionites, Nazarenes and/or Hebrews which emphasize doing God's will and elaborate on the difficulty of the rich man (e.g. Origen, Com. on Matt. XV 14 on 19:16ff, Lat., "according to the Hebrews").

30 Compare J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and their Literature," in Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: G. Chapman, 1971), 439-40: "At some time time during the first two centuries...this designation would have been restricted to Jewish Christians who lived in Palestine and Syria and who continued to observe Mosaic Law." Compare the pseudo-Clementine literature.
Sources on Jewish-Christian Sects.  Theodoret of Cyr in the fifth century claimed Justin, Irenaeus, and Origen wrote against the Nazōraioi, when in fact none of them do, at least, not in their extant writings. The latter two did write against Ebionaioi. However, Theodoret either confused the names or used them differently than earlier writers. Also, Ebionites became progressively, perhaps retroactively, characterized as rejecting virgin birth, supposedly in contrast with Nazarenes. By the seventh century, Isidore of Seville claimed "The Nazarenes [Nazaræi] say that Christ is God....The Ebionites say that Christ is merely human...."

We turn then to the name Nazarene, or more precisely, to the range of names subsumed under this English word. In the New Testament of course, Nazarene often has the gentilic

---

31 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973). They attempt to classify the texts they select as belonging to Cerinthians, Ebionites, Nazoræans, Symmachians, or Elkesaites, but these categories are not five discrete and all-inclusive sets. This work tends excessively to reify the groups, then question them. Important texts by Justin, Hegesippus, Ignatius of Antioch, Aristo of Pella, etc., are not included. The translations are not always reliable (e.g., of forms of names).

32 Haer. fab. II 2 (ca. 453). Theodoret also (same reference): "The Nazōraioi are Jews."

33 Even the careful scholar J. A. Fitzmyer overestimates the consistency of patristic literature on this point. In "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and their Literature," 442 he claims Origen, Eusebius and Epiphanius say they reject virgin birth of Christ, but the first two claim two types of Ebionites, one which does, one which doesn't; Epiphanius says "I cannot say" (Panarion 30.7.6). The only point affirmed by all writers is torah-observance.

34 De haer. lib. X and XI.
sense, someone, namely Jesus, from Nazareth. I leave aside the question of how that town got its name, except to note that, according to the inscription found at Caesarea dated to circa 300 C.E., it was spelled nṣrt.\textsuperscript{35} Since it was spelled, then as now, with a tsade, not a zayin, if the town name refers to a Hebrew root it is nṣar rather than nazir. Occasionally in the New Testament there is evidently an additional distinction to the name Nazarene. Matt 2:23 says that when Jesus and family arrived in Nazareth, it fulfilled what the prophets (plural) said, namely, "he shall be called Nazōraios." Now, however one chooses to exegete this verse, which might involve decisions about the Matthean writer's own exegetical methods and knowledge of languages, it is evident that the name Nazōraios here was considered as conveying a honorable distinction in addition to carrying the gentilic connotation of the town name.\textsuperscript{36} In other words, whatever allusion and characterization the writer intended, it was a favorable one.

According to Acts 24:5 Paul was accused of being a leader of the Nazoraioi. The writer makes no effort to dissociate


\textsuperscript{36} The town name by itself was unimpressive according to John 1:46, Nathanael: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" See Krister Stendahl, "Quis et Unde--Who and Whence? Matthew's Christmas Gospel," \textit{Meanings: The Bible as Document and Guide} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 71-83, for an explanation of the geographic rationale, which, however, does not exclude an honorific aspect.
Paul from the name. As we know, elsewhere Acts (11:26) claims followers of Jesus were called Christianoi first in Antioch, presumably in the decade of the 40s. This claim is probably anachronistic, because, outside of Acts, Christianoi appears only one time in New Testament, in 1 Peter 4:16.\(^{37}\) If the name Christianoi were in use as early as Acts claims, it would most likely appear in New Testament more often. So Nazōraioi preceded Christianoi as a self-designation.\(^ {38}\)

It is worth noting that New Testament uses two forms for Nazarene: Nazōraioi and Nazarēnoi. The form Nazōraioi only is used in Matthew, John and Acts. Mark uses Nazarēnoi only. Luke uses both. It appears that Nazōraioi more accurately reflects the Semitic Vorlage.\(^ {39}\) This situation is paralleled by another ancient group name, Essenes, or more precisely in Greek Essaioi and Essēnoi. Writers with Semitic sources clearly prefer Essaioi; after Philo, these are Hegesippus, the author of Apostolic Constitutions, Jerome and Porphyry. The more-Hellenic writers, such as Pliny, Synesius, Hippolytus,

\(^{37}\) "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed..." Cf. Acts 26:28, a polemic reference.

\(^{38}\) Cf. Elias Bickerman, "The Name of the Christians," Harvard Theological Review 42 (1949): 109-124. Gentile "Christians" (defined inclusively) showed no hesitance or ambivalence toward the name (see, e.g., Ignatius of Antioch), despite modern suggestions that others named Christians.

\(^{39}\) The Syriac New Testament renders both forms as nāsrāyā. Note that Pharisaioi has only one Greek form.
Filaster, and Solinus, use Essēnoi. Only the multilingual Josephus and Epiphanius use both forms. This datum provides another indication that Epiphanius preserves some significant linguistic distinctions accurately. Josephus uses both forms in the same passage only once, in Antiquities 15, 371-2. Here Josephus gives a story from his source, a Hellenistic historian, maybe Strabo. The story about Menachem the Essene uses the Hellenistic form, Essēnoi. But when Josephus introduces this quotation he reminds the readers about this group; he begins: "The Essaioi, as we call a sect of ours..."

However, in both cases—Nazarenes and Essenes—the distinction between the two forms eventually becomes confused. Therefore, for example, the evidence disproves Professor L. Schiffman's claim that "Careful examination of the Latin text of Jerome indicates that he distinguished between the Nazarenes, Christians in general, and the Nazoraeans, the Judaizing Christians of whom he speaks at length." By the fourth

---


41 His lost History, in turn influenced by Posidonius.

42 ...hemin Essaioi kaloumenoi, genos...

43 Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism (Hoboken: Ktav, 1985), 58. Cf. note 45 (p.97): "Jerome consistently distinguishes between Nazaraei, the Jewish Christian sect of the Nazoraeans, and the Nazareni, the Nazarenes, a general designation for Christians." At least six of Jerome's 27 uses of Nazarene contradict Schiffman: e.g., he writes of the "gospel which the Nazareni and the Ebionites use" (in Matt. 12,13); "we who are now called Christians were called Nazaræi" (de situ et
century, thus, there was cause for confusion, though the varieties are worth noting in earlier texts.

In the fourth century Epiphanius condemned as heretics a group called Nazōraioi. Epiphanius does not present them as a new group, new in the fourth century, despite the impression given by Klijn and Reinink and others. Epiphanius himself records earlier references to Nazarenes. At this point, it may be worthwhile to mention an inscription. Inscriptions mentioning ancient sectarian groups are rather rare: think of Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenbes, Ebionites, Gnostics, etc., and whether any inscriptions including these names come to mind. In a third-century Middle Persian inscription the Zoroastrian priest Kartir condemns several other religions, for instance, Buddhism, thus reversing the previously-tolerant policy of Zoroastrians. He condemned also Jews, Christians and Nazarenes (Nazarai). Now, there is some dispute whether Nazarene here may refer to Mandeans or to Semitic-speaking "Christians" with

nom. loc. hebr. liber, de Lagarde ed. 143). On the other hand Jerome consistently uses the Essaioi form.

44 "As far as we know, Epiphanius was the first writer to mention the Jewish-Christian sect of the Nazoraeans," A.F.J. Klijn and G. Reinink. Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), 44. Epiphanius presents them as a first century group, present, alternately, at Jerusalem and Pella; hence he merely reinterprets.

the "Christians" here being Marcionites. But for our purposes, the point remains that if one wished to condemn all religions, at least in third-century Persia, one included Jews, Christians, and Nazarenes. It confirms a distinction between the names.

In his study on the Birkat Ha-Minim, the benediction or curse on minim, Reuven Kimelman provides good insight on the evolution of the term min, namely that it referred to heresies of Jews as reflected in Tannaitic literature and the Palestinian Talmud, whereas some gentile minim also appear in Amoraic Babylonian texts. However, Kimelman did not chronicle an evolution of the term Nazarene. In a favorable review of Kimelman's study, David Halperin nonetheless identified a substantial problem: it is unlikely that a minor group, an obscure fourth-century heresy, as he presents them, would merit mention in the daily (six days a week) liturgy.

Let us now consider the patristic use of the term. Tertullian wrote, circa 200 C.E., "According to the prophecy, the Creator's Christ was to be called a Nazarene. For that reason, and on his account, the Jews call us [present tense]

---


by that very name, Nazarenes."48 Eusebius wrote, more than a century later (before 331): "Nazareth. From this name Christ was called Nazoraean and we being now called Christians received in the past the name Nazarenes."49 Of course Jews still did in the fourth century use the term Nazarenes, or nosrim—and the Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian-speaking churches still use cognate forms of Nazarene. As an aside, note that the Greek Orthodox, Latin Catholic, and Protestant churches by and large continued to disown the name Nazarene until a little less than a century ago when in 1895 a poor congregation in Los Angeles formed the Church of the Nazarene.

Nazarenes, that is, nosrim, was added to the Birkat Ha-Minim sometime before 375 the date of Epiphanius' Panarion, though it was used only in some areas including parts of Palestine or Syria and only for a limited time. In six Cairo Genizah versions50 and in the Oxford manuscript of Seder Rav Amram51 with some variation, the portion of the benediction which concerns us essentially said "as for the nosrim and the minim, may they perish immediately." The term may have been

48 Adversus Marcionem IV 8 (ca. 210), E. Evans trans. "Nazaraeus...Nazarenos."

49 Onomasticon, p. 138, 24-25, ed. de Lagarde. "Nazoraios...Nazarenoi."


added when Nazarenes, taken as including Gentiles, no longer were clearly minim in the sense of a Jewish sect; or it may have been added when the term minim was insufficiently precise, since at that time it was occasionally applied to a non-Jew, either a pagan, a Samaritan, or also a "Sadducee" when "Sadducees" was used as a generic term, since the previous type of Sadducees no longer existed. In other words, the relationship between minim and nosrim had become insufficiently clear for the condemnation to be reliably inclusive without using both terms.\(^{52}\) So Epiphanius\(^{53}\) and Jerome\(^{54}\) were confused as to whether all Christians were condemned; and they in turn confused others. As with beauty, condemnation was in the eye of the beholders, and there is little reason to suppose they were of one mind. Notice that the Rabbis didn't condemn Ebionites since they observed Torah, and messianic beliefs were not sufficient cause for exclusion.

\(^{52}\) Kimelman, ibid., 233, rightly observes that, had Nosrim been in the original text of the Birkat Ha-Minim, it would have been called the Birkat Ha-Nosrim.

\(^{53}\) Panarion 29, 9, 2. "...three times a day...they [Jews] pronounce curses and maledictions over them [Nazōraioi] when they say their prayers in the synagogues...'May God curse the Nazōraioi.'"

\(^{54}\) Epistle 112, 13 (to Augustine, 404 CE). Speaking of "Ebionites who claim to be Christians": "Until now a heresy is to be found in all parts of the East where Jews have their synagogues; it is to be called Minaeorum [of the M.] and cursed by the Pharisees up till now. Usually they are called Nazaraeos...[they believe in virgin birth]...but since they want to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither Jews nor Christians."
Such a tolerant attitude compares with Justin's well-known live and let live statement that if Torah-observant Christians don't insist that all Christians keep these observances, he can tolerate them.\(^{55}\)

An example of confluence of the terms Ebionites, Nazarenes, and minim can be found B.T. Shabbat 116, in the context of a discussion on books of the minim.\(^{56}\) There we have several rabbis quoted in a consideration whether to save books of the minim, which may include sacred quotations and names, in the case of a fire. This text and a parallel in Tosefta Shabbat 13, 5 present a related issue. According to this account R. Tarfon said that if he were in danger from a snake he would enter a house of idolatry in order to escape from danger, whereas he would not enter a house of the minim, because, though idolaters do not acknowledge God and teach falsehoods, the minim do acknowledge God but still teach falsehoods. In other words, while one expects lies from gentile idolaters, the minim should know better. Babylonian Talmud Shabbat 116 specifies that there were two houses, buildings in which books of the minim would be found. The text records these as something like the Be\(^3\)Abidan and the Be (or "house of") Nisraphi: I say "something like" because the vocalization is uncertain, in fact the meaning is often

\(^{55}\) Dialog with Trypho 47.

\(^{56}\) B. Berakhot 28bf. tells of the composition of the Birkat Ha-Minim as requested by Gamaliel II.
regarded as unclear. In any event, in this account a consensus arises among the rabbis that one might enter the former house to save books but not the latter one.

This story is both preceded by and followed by references to Christianity, some of which appear only in a few manuscripts which escaped Christian censorship. These include, most agree, puns on gospels: evangelion taken to be a book of vanity (רvenida) or book of sin (ריוון-גילה). The story that follows, which actually quotes an Aramaic version of the Gospel of Matthew, involves Imma Shalom, wife of Eliezer ben Hyrcanos, and sister of Gamaliel, in a battle of wits with a Christian judge. For further evidence of derogations of Christianity in that account, I refer you to Burton Visotzky's recent article in the Journal of Jewish Studies.\(^57\) This article, among other things, does a good job in disproving claims by Johann Maier\(^58\) and others that there is no polemic with Christianity in this passage in the Talmud account. Given the fact that Christian books and books of minim are being discussed, and given the evidence that Christian censorship occurred in this portion of Talmud, we should at least consider that the text is referring to Jewish-Christian sects.


\(^{58}\) Juedische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in der Antike (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982). Maier also dates texts as late as can be argued, so polemic that hasn't been dismissed is seen as late.
Several other proposals are available for the names of the two houses, for instance, Ibadan in Persia or the Odeon of many cities. But the two terms need to be related for the passage to make sense. Given the fact that we know some rabbis condemned nosrim but not 'evionim, and that this evaluation parallels which house of the two they would enter, the most plausible interpretation, as suggested at least as early as 1845, is that the houses are the houses of 'evionim and nosrim, i.e. Ebionites and Nazarenes. It should be no surprise, therefore, if the Talmud's spellings reflect negative puns, perhaps using the roots avad, to destroy, to be lost, and saraf, to smelt, try, refine.

The rabbis condemned Nazarenes; church writers condemned Ebionites first; it took the prodigious condemner Epiphanius to condemn Nazarenes.

While working at the Duke Primate Center, where primates—mostly lemurs from Madagascar—are kept for observation and

59 Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, 165-69.


61 Together meaning something along the lines of an invitation to hell. See Jacob Lauterbach, Rabbinic Essays (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1951), 570.
conservation purposes, I was also studying the Panarion of Epiphanius, in which he condemns eighty selected heresies, and used ancient zoological handbooks as his genre model. Epiphanius dismisses his opponents as so many kinds of vipers, lizards, and the like. There may be some comparison between the dynamics of taxonomy in biology and in religious systems: who is human, humanoid, acceptably-human, and so on. At any rate, in our specific historical case, the evolution issue pertains to group names.

Elsewhere I have proposed that the Therapeutae, meaning servants or worshippers (not healers) and the Essenes, Essaioi, (from ḡosei ha-torah, "observers of torah") are also generic-become-specific terms. Philo could not resist writing that therapeutae can mean healers, but he does so only once. On the other hand Geza Vermes has for three decades often promoted the idea that Essenes were named not as a self-designation but by outsiders as healers, via Aramaic ḥassaya; however, no extant ancient writing in any language calls Essenes healers. John Allegro thought he found in a Qumran

---


64 On the Contemplative Life, 2.

65 E.g., in his reedition of E. Schürer's The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, Volume 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 559.
Cave 4 text some support for this idea, but his claim is now recognized as unlikely. We would do better to recognize that both Therapeutae and Essenes follow the generic to specific evolution described above. It would not fit the pattern for outsiders to give a group a positive name, one not found in their own literature.

For another example of generic-become-specific names, see Panarion 53, where Epiphanius explains Sampseans as deriving from shemesh, "sun," rather than the more-likely shamash, "servant," or in other words, analogous to therapeutae. We can compare the pun in the Mandaean Right Ginza, 210: 3, "I gave the sun to serve (shamish lhshamushia) people."

To study carefully Ebionites, Nazarenes and Minim one needs to take into account that the meaning of the names depend on the time, place, language, and the religious perspective of the speaker and the current range of other available names. In this period one needs to be aware of the

---


gradual negativization of taxonomy. The taxonomies of heresy used by the rabbis and the church writers interacted in a dynamic progression.

These observations are relevant specifically to lower Galilee in the fourth century because some of the minim described by rabbis as encountered in Sepphoris, Tiberias, and Capernaum are identical with Ebionites and Nazarenes as described in Epiphanius' *Panarion*.

Archaeological Considerations

Is there an archaeological record of Christians and Jewish-Christians in lower Galilee or, more specifically, in these four towns? It can be difficult enough to determine from material remains whether Christians or Jews or others used a particular house or cooking pot--indeed, in most specific cases, one cannot determine any such thing in a town with a mixed population. The question whether material culture preserves indications of Jewish-Christians, then, becomes even more difficult.

Other than inscriptions, one could be alert for objects, buildings, and symbols associated with a particular religion or culture. But even if one finds such remains, interpreting them can be difficult. A Jewish ritual bath (*migveh*) may not be instantly distinguishable from some other water installations, especially if, as at Sepphoris, some of them may predate the rabbinic texts which specify how a *migveh*
should be constructed. Then one needs ask whether all extant miqu'ot would adhere to rabbinic laws pertaining to ritual baths, even if constructed after the specifications were published. Logically, also, other people besides Jews intending to live according to rabbinic determinations of halakha could either construct such baths or move into an area already containing ritual baths. Also, presumably, some Jewish-Christians would use miqu'ot.

A similar difficulty obtains with houses of worship. While large, well-constructed, long-used, and well-preserved synagogues and churches are usually easily identifiable, the corollary, that small, poorly-preserved ones would reveal less, should be equally obvious. The difficulty of identifying a Jewish-Christian house-church--or as Epiphanius would call it, a synagogue of the Nazarenes or Ebionites--becomes greater.

Jewish and Christian symbols are not always obviously differentiable from each other and, it follows, from Jewish-Christian symbols. The context of the find naturally can help the interpreter. A clear menorah or a Christian-style cross found on a marble chancel screen inside a basilica would be easier to interpret than a cross and a menorah together found on a door lintel found not in situ.

The issues of the clarity of a symbol and the exclusivity of its users can be raised by individual finds. For example, to what extent could one safely assume that a Jew, say in
fourth-century Sephoris, might avoid using or owning a terra sigillata plate with some form of cross-shaped designs impressed on it? Or at what date would it seem odd to use, on an inscription, a chi-rho abbreviation without thinking that it raises Christian associations?

Rather than pursue these questions further theoretically, we will now turn to some aspects of the material remains in the four towns which sometimes pose such methodological problems.

Did Joseph build churches in:

Tiberias

Tiberias is the only town for which Epiphanius provides some more specific location than merely within the town for Joseph's supposed church-building. In Tiberias, we are told, Joseph attempted to use the unfinished Hadrianeum (Hadrianeon) as the foundation for a church. Presumably--though Epiphanius does not explicitly state this--the Emperor Constantine could make some claim to such a building, and authorize Joseph to convert it to church use. Unfortunately, we do not yet know where in Tiberias this Hadrianeum was situated. In fact, the very existence of such a building has been questioned; however, it would be peculiar for Joseph or Epiphanius to invent such a building had there not been one, since such an unnecessary invention, if known to be false, would undermine
the credibility of other portions of their story, which they presumably intended to be believable.

Though there have been excavations in portions of ancient Tiberias, the Hadrianeum has not been securely identified. Excavations prior to 1973 conducted by A. Druks and A. Kempinski did uncover a Late Roman basilica. Bagatti published a photograph of this basilica with the following caption: "Chiesa scavata nel 1965 da A. Driks [sic] e A. Kempiski [sic] e che si crede averci messo le mani il conte Giuseppe da Tiberiade transformando un edificio adrianeo." Bagatti completes his discussion of the excavations with the familiar sentiment, "attendiamo...la pubblicazione con grande interesse." Unfortunately, no detailed excavation report has yet been published. However, Y. Hirschfeld had access to the unpublished data and does not indicate that this building was an Hadrianeum or a church. On the basis of what is published, we must consider the question open, though some publications

---


70 B. Bagatti, Antichi Villaggi Cristiani di Galilea, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Collectio Minor, 13 (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1971), 55, Figure 32.

71 Ibid., 54.

72 Yizhar Hirschfeld, Tiberias: From its Foundation until the Muslim Conquest (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 1987), text on 115 and top plan on 116. (Hebrew)
lead one to assume the Hadrianeum has been excavated.  

Other than Epiphanius' text, and the incomplete results of archaeology, coins provide our only source for this building. According to Meshorer, "The [Tiberias city] coins of Hadrian of 119/120 C.E. represent a temple of Zeus—the temple mentioned by Epiphanius as the 'Hadrianeion in Tiberias'. This was the year of Hadrian's visit, and on this occasion the temple of Zeus-Jupiter shown on the coin may have been founded." In their study of architecture depicted on coins, Price and Trell argue that city coins "usually depict an actual piece of architecture within the city." They qualify this with the observation that the building may be represented with artistic conventions in a simplified form, for instance, with fewer columns shown on the coin than in the actual temple.

A contrary opinion appears in the master's thesis on

---

73 Douglas R. Edwards, "Tiberias," Harpers Dictionary of the Bible, 1069. "A stadium, forum, Hadrianem [sic] ...have also been discovered."

74 Ya'akov Meshorer, City Coins of Eretz-Israel and the Decapolis in the Roman Period (Jerusalem: The Israel Museum, 1985), 34, with illustration (my italics). The coin is also discussed and illustrated in A. Kindler, The Coins of Tiberias (Tiberias: Hamei Tiberia, 1961), 39.

Tiberias city coins by Devorah Reshel. She proposes that only an architect's model of a proposed building would need to have been completed for the coin to be issued and to curry favor with Rome. Goodman also assumes, without new evidence, that the temple was "never completed." We have insufficient data to decide the question, though even Reshel's proposal could accommodate a building dedicated to Hadrian which was not finished. Note that Epiphanius presents Joseph as having completed (teleios, 12.9) a small church there, perhaps, then, using only part of the Hadrianeum foundations.

Reuven Kimelman's dissertation on Rabbi Yohanan of Tiberias provides abundant information on the disputes between rabbis and minim, some of which occurred in Tiberias. Rabbi Yohanan is reported to have had several encounters with minim; after analyzing them, Kimelman quite correctly concludes, "The result of this investigation is that the most likely referent in the Min-passages of Ry [Rabbi Yohanan] is Jewish Christian." Note that it was Rabbi Yohanan who was quoted earlier in this chapter as punning on gospels as Savon-gilyon

---

76 Devorah Reshel, "Coins of Tiberias as an Historical Source." (M. A. thesis, Hebrew University, 1988), 100-103. (Hebrew)


79 Ibid., 202.
and saying that "Israel did not go into exile until they had been made twenty-four sects of minim." Kimelman translates a wonderful story about this Rabbi's struggle with minim, which is historical at least to the extent of that concern:

Rabbi Yohanan sat in his chair in the Great Synagogue of Sepphoris, expounding: God will hollow out the east gate of the Temple and its two wickets out of one pearl. A seafaring Min spoke up: Why, you cannot find a pearl even as large as a pigeon's egg, this person, sitting (in a teacher's chair no less) talks like this!

Afterwards, when he was sailing the Great Sea, his ship sank, and went down to the bottom of the sea where he saw ministering angels hollowing, shaping, and carving designs in an object. He asked them: What's that? They replied: It is the east gate of the Temple with its two wickets being made out of one pearl. Forthwith by a miracle, he escaped safely thence.

A year later, he returned and found Rabbi Yohanan sitting in his chair, expounding the same passage in Isaiah, and saying: God will hollow the east gate of the Temple with its two wickets out of one pearl. The man said: Old man, old man, all that you have to tell us, tell: all the glowing things you can say, say. If mine eyes had not seen what I saw, I would never have believed it. Rabbi Yohanan said: Had your eyes not seen what you have seen, you would not have believed what I was saying in my instruction in Torah? Thereupon Rabbi Yohanan lifted his eyes and looked at the man, and in that instant the man turned into a heap of stones.

For our purposes, one of the remarkable things about this story is that having a min appear in the Sepphoris synagogue causes no surprise; Jerome, after all, said ,with some hyperbole, that the minim were found "per totas Orientis synagogas."  

---

80 P Sanhedrin 29c.
81 Kimelman, ibid., 187, trans. of Pirge de Rav Kahana 18, 5.
82 Epistle 112, 13 to Augustine. Cf. Kimelman, ibid., 188.
In short, there is a good deal of evidence to corroborate Epiphanius when he writes of books such as the Gospel of the Ebionites causing concern enough for refutations by rabbis in Tiberias and elsewhere. But so far, little evidence supports the existence of the church Joseph built. It is worth noting that Epiphanius never claimed to see it, and gives no eyewitness description. The literature reflects the speculative nature of the question. M. Dothan writes that "the attempt of the small Christian community to erect a church during the rule of Constantine did not succeed."\(^{83}\) On the other hand, H. Dudman dates the church to 325 C.E., claims Joseph called it St. Peter's, and somehow knows that "no Tiberias Jew ever entered this church."\(^{84}\) This date presumably is a guess keyed to the Council of Nicaea in 325, and may be too early. The dedication to St. Peter, not mentioned by Epiphanius, may come from a tradition reported in the fourteenth century by Nicephorus; but, in Nicephorus' account, the St. Peter church was founded by Constantine's Mother, Helena.\(^{85}\) There is no evidence for any of these claims.

In conclusion, we simply do not have physical evidence

\(^{83}\) M. Dothan, Hammath Tiberias: Early Synagogues and the Hellenistic and Roman Remains (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), n. 38.

\(^{84}\) Helga Dudman and Elisheva Ballhorn, Tiberias (Jerusalem: Carta, 1988), 68-69 and chronology.

\(^{85}\) Nicephorus Callistus, Ecclesiastical History, Patrologia Graeca 146, columns 112-113.
of Joseph's church in Tiberias. But Epiphanius characteristically preserves the evidence of failure, since, despite whatever miracles may have been claimed, Joseph was run out of town.\textsuperscript{86} Hence, in my opinion, it is highly plausible that Joseph attempted to build a church in his old home town and that many of his former neighbors did not approve.\textsuperscript{87}

Nazareth

Unlike Tiberias, Sepphoris, and Capernaum, Nazareth is not mentioned in rabbinic literature at all. So it follows that no references to minim appear specifically linked with the town name Nazareth. Midrash Rabbah Ecclesiastes makes mention of Nizhana, but there is no reason to see this as a reference to Nazareth, despite claims to this effect.\textsuperscript{88} Not until the liturgical poems of Kallir (eighth century?) is the name found in Hebrew texts, other than in an inscription found in Caesarea which locates the twenty four priestly courses in

\textsuperscript{86} Because Joseph became unwelcome in Tiberias, the suggestion of C. Kopp, The Holy Places of the Gospels (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), 65, that Joseph was buried in Tiberias "where he had worked a long time" is unlikely.

\textsuperscript{87} Just before submitting this dissertation, I was pleased to learn that Dr. Yizhar Hirschfeld is now director of a long-term excavation of Tiberias which will begin in October, 1990.

as many Galilee towns. 89

Avi-Yonah's Gazeteer 90 locates and lists 18 of these 24 sites. Twelve of these 18 sites are referred to in rabbinic literature. Two of the others, which are not mentioned in rabbinic literature, happen to be the only two of the twenty four which are mentioned in the New Testament: these are Nazareth and Cana. Also, as a minor corollary, Sepphoris (one of the 24) is not mentioned in New Testament, though it is prominent in Rabbinic literature. In fact, none of the sites of the Sanhedrin and the patriarch are mentioned in New Testament (Yavneh, Beth She'arim, Sepphoris, Usha, Arav, Tiberias). These data are suggestive, though not statistically decisive, that both New Testament and rabbinic literature either avoid mentioning or are not interested in certain Galilee towns.

Another apparent reference to Nazareth appears in Julius Africanus' Epistle to Aristides as quoted in Eusebius' Church History I, 7 in a discussion of the genealogy of Jesus. This text may indeed preserve a reference to Nazareth, and, evidently, Julius Africanus interpreted his source as referring to Nazareth, but I would like to suggest an alternate interpretation. According to this text,


90 Gazeteer of Roman Palestine,Qedem Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology, 5 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1976).
"desposynoi," who came from "Nazara and Cochaba, villages of Judah, [and] they spread out over the rest of the country,"\textsuperscript{91} claimed descent from the family of Jesus. Such is the oft-repeated interpretation, and it may be the best interpretation, but it raises questions. First, the term desposynoi, presumably meaning "belonging to the lord or master," is not attested in other early patristic literature.\textsuperscript{92} Therefore, lacking parallels to indicate otherwise, desposynoi could also refer to followers of a master, i.e., disciples or servants of a master, rather than descendants. Secondly, Nazareth is not located in Judaea, as Julius Africanus seems to report.\textsuperscript{93} There are several locations of towns named Cochaba, which include sites in Galilee and Judaea and east of the Jordan; therefore this name is not decisive geographically.

If we allow the possibility that Julius Africanus misunderstood his source, the original reference could have been to the continued existence of partisans or followers (desposynoi) of the two most famous messianic claimants of the time, Jesus the Nazarene and Shimon called Bar Kochba.

\textsuperscript{91} \textit{apo te Nazapōn kai Kōchaba kōmōn Ioudaikōn.}

\textsuperscript{92} According to the Patristic Greek Lexicon of Lampe.

\textsuperscript{93} Julius could have meant "Jewish towns" rather than "Judaean towns," but the context suggests a geographic movement from a smaller area to a larger one. But Julius' source may not have shared Julius' geographic interpretation of these desposynoi. Cf. Panarion 29.7.7 and 30.2.8.
These disciples were not necessarily from Judaea, but they were Judaioi. The geographic and ethnic and religious senses of this term have been confused in many instances, including interpretation of inscriptions. So I conclude that, though Julius Africanus may have preserved a reference to Jewish-Christians residing in Nazareth, he may have told us something quite different than has generally been assumed.

The pilgrim Egeria in the 380s C.E. reported that in Nazareth "there is a big and very splendid cave in which she [that is, Holy Mary] lived. An altar has been placed there...Inside the city the synagogue where the Lord read the book of Isaiah is now a church..."94 The Piacenza pilgrim in 570 reported seeing a synagogue which kept a book "in which the Lord wrote his ABC" and visiting "the house of Mary [which] is now a basilica."95

Excavations in Nazareth in this century have revealed Nazareth as a small, Jewish town in the Roman period.96


Eusebius' Onomastikon 138: 24 confirms this description. This secure conclusion indicates the irrelevance of the speculation of a tradition of anti-Catholic (and anti-Epiphanius) writers that there existed no town of Nazareth in the first century C.E., which then became part of an argument that there is no evidence for the existence of a person Jesus of Nazareth. More to the point of this dissertation are the questions of which remains in Nazareth can be identified as Jewish, which Christian, and which, if any, as Jewish-Christian. Then we will ask whether Joseph of Tiberias might be associated with any of these remains.

Franciscan archaeologists have excavated at the site of the modern Church of the Annunciation and found evidence of several earlier structures. Among these structures, Bagatti describes one as "an early church dating from before the time of Constantine...built on the plan of a synagogue." Bagatti bases this description, in part, on a pool with seven steps, which he proposes to identify as a Jewish ritual bath and a


baptistery, and on graffiti including *XE MAPIA*. Another graffito, which he interprets as a picture of John the Baptist holding a cross, has recently been interpreted, plausibly, as a representation of a soldier.⁹⁸ A mosaic memorializing the third century deacon Conan provides one of the most obvious Christian traces.

Without entering into the arguments concerning the interpretation of all of the remains, most of which can not be directly relevant to Joseph of Tiberias, we can provisionally conclude the following: archaeology provides evidence of Jews and Christians in Nazareth before Constantine. Most plausibly, some of the Christian remains would be associated with Jewish-Christian, in part because Epiphanius recognized no Catholic Christian church there at the time of Constantine, yet archaeology demonstrates a presence of Christians, broadly defined.

Part of the difficulty in terminology arises from the differing uses of the terms "church" and "synagogue." Epiphanius wrote that the Ebionites, his heresy 30, "call their church a synagogue." (30.18.2) Remains of a basilica could be a synagogue or a church or a synagogue later used as a church or vice versa. Joseph, according to Epiphanius, was orthodox and built churches, not synagogues.

Bagatti suggested Joseph may have built a church but that the evidence was lost by later construction—obviously neither an impossibility nor a strong argument. Bagatti once wrote, "His [Joseph's] building, no doubt of small dimensions, may well have been altered when the Byzantine basilica was constructed." But in a later publication, Bagatti wrote that "regarding Count Joseph we can assume that he put up no building," since he was opposed in Tiberias.¹⁰⁰

Lacking evidence either for church-building by Joseph in Nazareth, or any reason to exclude the possibility, we will proceed to another claim, which at least we can fairly reliably dismiss. A tradition arose that perhaps Count Joseph was buried in Nazareth, under the convent of the Sisters of Nazareth. These remains, now underground beneath the convent, include several tombs from the Roman period. One of them came to be known, without, to my knowledge, any supporting evidence besides the chronological plausibility, as the tomb of Joseph the husband of Mary.¹⁰¹ Klameth, who assumes Joseph of Tiberias

---


did indeed build churches in Nazareth,\textsuperscript{102} muses on the possibility that Joseph of Tiberias might have been buried in Nazareth: "certainly that would have been the finest way of showing gratitude to this benefactor of the church."\textsuperscript{103} Even if one were to agree that such a burial would be "the finest way," such speculation hardly constitutes a strong argument for historicity. Kopp rejects Klameth's suggestion, but then suggests an equally unlikely burial place, Tiberias, "where he worked a long time."\textsuperscript{104} Since Joseph appears to have been run out of Tiberias, the suggestion that he was buried there seems problematic.

In sum, we do not yet know whether Joseph built a church in Nazareth; if he attempted to do so, it is possible that he may have been less than welcome by Jewish-Christians as well as by Jews.

Capernaum (& Tabgha)

The excavations at Capernaum have not proceeded without some controversy. The dating of the synagogues and church buildings is disputed, as is the state of Jewish and Christian relations in ancient Capernaum. But however one dates the well-known synagogue, which sits atop an earlier synagogue,


\textsuperscript{103} C. Kopp, \textit{ibid.}, 65, translating Klameth, \textit{ibid.}, 35.

\textsuperscript{104} C. Kopp, \textit{ibid.}, 65.
and the house-church which eventually was enclosed in a fifth-century octagonal church, it is quite clear that both were in use simultaneously. This dispute about Capernaum may reflect a continuing tradition of differing perspectives within ancient Capernaum.

Here at Capernaum, as at Tiberias, we have another suggested possible location within the city for Joseph's church-building, if one wishes to credit the suggestion (not made by Epiphanius) that Joseph rebuilt St. Peter's house church or place of pilgrimage. E. W. Saunders wrote that "...Count Joseph of Tiberias...secured permission to build a church on the site of Peter's house. Work began in 352."\(^{105}\) Saunders follows this statement with a footnote; but none of the sources he names, including Epiphanius' account of Joseph, justifies the identification of the site of Joseph's building as Peter's house, nor is there any evidence that work began in 352 C.E. Perhaps the date of 352 C.E. represents a guess based on the assumption that the time after the Gallus revolt would allow Roman control; however, this date seems late, since Constantine died in 337 and Joseph had been retired and settled in Scythopolis for some considerable time before Epiphanius met him between 355 to 360. Therefore, Saunders' reconstruction of events goes beyond the evidence.

What remains is the suggestion that, if Joseph built in

Capernaum, he may have contributed to the evolution of the site long held to be Peter's house. This house originally resembled the surrounding basalt-wall homes. Before the time of Joseph, the house had been plastered and had accumulated an extensive repertoire of graffiti, including Greek, Latin, Aramaic, and Syriac (Estrangela), some of it clearly Christian. This range of languages suggests either a rather mixed population in Capernaum or rather frequent visits by pilgrims. Egeria in the 380s mentions that the house of the apostle had been made into a church, "with its original walls still standing."  

Midrash Rabbah, Ecclesiastes I, 8, 4, records a story that alludes to several of the issues reflected in Epiphanius'
Joseph account. The rabbinic account locates in Capernaum minim who are identified as Jewish-Christians by an allusion to Jesus. Once again, healing and magic are portrayed as central concerns in Galilean Jewish and Christian relations. Epiphanius' narrative on Joseph recounts the same sort of competition between Jews and Christians in contest of powers associated with the religion of each.

Hanina, the son of R. Joshua's brother, came to Capernaum, and the minim worked a spell on him and set him riding on an ass on the Sabbath. He went to his uncle, Joshua, who anointed him with oil and he recovered [from the spell. R. Joshua] said to him, 'Since the ass of that wicked person has roused itself against you, you are not able to reside in the land of Israel.' So he went down from there to Babylon where he died in peace. 109

Joseph must have been familiar with Capernaum, and it would not be surprising had he made efforts to have some influence in the Christian community there; but again, we have no evidence specifically linking him to any of the expansions of the Capernaum house church. Though it would be reasonable to ask whether Joseph built in Capernaum, such a scenario would raise the question of Joseph's relation to Jewish-Christian groups.

Pixner claimed that the church Epiphanius said Joseph built at Capernaum was actually located at nearby Tabgha. "Since no church had been erected over the house of Peter in Capernaum by the mid-fourth century...we can assume that Constantine's license to Josepos was actually implemented on the outskirts of the town at Tabgha."\textsuperscript{110} Pixner seem use a rather limited view of church-building here. Joseph need not have built a major church to have become involved there. We will evaluate Pixner's case that Joseph may have built a basilica church (as opposed to a house-church) at Tabgha in chapter 4.\textsuperscript{111}

Finally, it remains another logical option that, if Joseph built in Capernaum at all, it could have been in another location than the "house of Peter," not yet located.

\textbf{Sephoris (Diocesarea)}

The renewed excavations at Sephoris help readdress the subject of the diffusion of Christianity in Galilee. Epiphanius reiterated that Joseph "completed buildings in Diocesarea and certain other towns." (12,9) The emphasis on completing buildings rather than simply building them might


reflect resistance in other towns in addition to that resistance Joseph experienced in Tiberias.

Sephoris in the fourth century had a majority Jewish population. Rabbinic literature attests to the presence of minim in Sephoris, some of whom were Jewish-Christians. In PT Sanhedrin 25 d several rabbis are discussing apparent feats of magic performed by magic and how they accomplish them by disreputable means. Among the observations reported: "R. Jannai said, 'I was walking in a certain street in Sephoris, and I saw a certain Min take a bird, and he cast it up and it fell down and was made into a calf'....R. Hanina ben Hananiah said, 'I was going along a certain place near the gate of Sephoris, and I saw a Min take a skull and cast it up and it came down and was made into a calf.'" Without speculating on the sorts of tricks this story makes reference to, it is worth reiterating that these concerns expressed in connection with Sephoris parallel those linked with minim in Tiberias and Capernaum. Several other references of encounters with minim were recorded in the names of various rabbis who lived in Sephoris.113

Perhaps the most significant of these literary encounters between a min and a rabbi in Sephoris is preserved in Tosefta

112 R. T. Herford, trans., ibid., 115.

Hullin 2:24 and in a somewhat different version, which also takes place in Sepphoris, in B. Avodah Zarah 16b-17a. According to the Tosefta version, Rabbi Eliezer was arrested on charges of minut. At the Roman court Rabbi Eliezer won his release after he said "The judge is reliable," which flattered the gentile governor, who thought Eliezer spoke of him, rather than of God. Eliezer wondered why he got into this difficulty and remembered: "Once I was walking in the street of Sepphoris. I chanced upon Jacob of Kefar Sikhnin, and he said a word of minut in the name of Yeshua ben Pantira (Jesus), and it gave me pleasure..."\textsuperscript{114}

This Rabbi Eliezer is the same as the husband of Imma Shalom, sister of the Patriarch Gamaliel II, all three of whom were discussed in the consideration of BT Shabbat 116 above, where books of the minim were at issue with a gentile judge. Whether any of these stories ever took place in any recognizable fashion, it is significant that it is Eliezer who is presented as encountering a min and consequent trouble on a Sepphoris street. R. Eliezer was known as a brilliant rabbi but one who was also excommunicated, by his brother-in-law Gamaliel II, for failing to adhere to the opinion of the majority of rabbis.

Christian writers confirm that Sepphoris had a Jewish majority in the fourth century. Eusebius of Caesarea tells of

\textsuperscript{114} Translation by L. Schiffman, \textit{Who was a Jew?} (Hoboken: Ktav, 1985), 71.
group of Christians martyred in a Jewish town in 308 C.E.; unfortunately the text has become confused as to whether he places this event in Diocaesarea or Diospolis, i.e. Lydda, so it does not provide certain evidence. During the rule of Valens, in 373, several anti-Arian Christians were exiled to Diocaesarea. Epiphanius preserves a theological document of one of these Egyptian exiles. Incidentally, the pope at the time of this exile, Damasus, who wrote these exiles a letter, was later accused of supposed misdeeds by a certain Jewish convert named Isaac; however, this incident occurred just after Epiphanius wrote Panarion, so it has no direct influence on the Joseph account; this Isaac apparently later renounced his Christian conversion. Theodoretus, writing in

---

115 Sephoris received the name Diocaesarea by the time of Antoninus Pius (note that Panarion 30. 4.1 uses both names, presumably because different readers would know different names); Lydda was named Diospolis under Septimus Severus.


117 Palladius, Lausiac History 117. Melania visited the exiles.

118 Panarion 72. 11-12.

119 Damasus, Epistle 7, Patrologia Latina 13, 370-371. See also Dechow, Dogma, 86.

the fifth century of the exiles under Valens, describes Sephoris as "that city which is inhabited by Jews, killers of our Lord."  

The Piacenza pilgrim in 570 C.E. venerated in Sephoris what was claimed to be what was claimed to be the water pitcher and basket of Mary. There are several indications of Christianity in Sephoris in the fifth century, including, e.g., representation by a bishop at the Chalcedon Council and various terra sigillata ceramic pieces with crosses dating from at least that early.

Though there is a good deal of evidence for Catholic Christianity later in Sephoris after the time of Joseph and indications of Jewish-Christian minim mostly before Joseph's time, speculation on Joseph's church-building in Sephoris has so far focused on three possibilities. It has been suggested: that his church-building caused the Gallus revolt;  

---

121 Church History IV, 22.
122 J. Wilkinson, Jerusalem Pilgrims, 79.
123 Pending the fuller excavation reports now in preparation, see on Sephoris, e.g., Eric Meyers, Ehud Netzer, and Carol Meyers, "Sephoris: Ornament of all Galilee," Biblical Archaeologist 49 (1981): 4-19; idem, "Artistry in Stone: The Mosaics of Ancient Sephoris, ibid, 50 (1987): 223-231. I have also participated in the Sephoris excavations and had access to the unpublished data of the Joint Sephoris Project of Duke and Hebrew Universities directed by Eric Meyers, Ehud Netzer, and Carol Meyers; in addition, the Sephoris excavation of the University of South Florida and other institutions, directed by James Strange, et al., kindly showed us their excavated areas, and participated in lively conversations.
that he built at a site excavated in the 1931 by Waterman; and that he built at the site of the Saint Anne church. I will argue that the first two are false and that the third is possible though unproven.

No ancient text, whether Jewish, Christian, Roman or other claims that the revolt, which supposedly began in Sepphoris, was motivated by anti-Christian sentiment, much less a specific church foundation. Gallus was an Arian partisan and Joseph was anti-Arian, so any scenario that has Gallus assisting Joseph is problematic. In any case, it is unlikely that Joseph built any church as late as 351 C.E., because Joseph was sponsored by Constantine, and likely was less highly regarded and supported under Constantius II. He was settled in Scythopolis and retired for some time and married again in Scythopolis—supposedly to resist being coerced into becoming an Arian priest! (Panarion 30.5.8)—all before meeting Epiphanius between 355 and 360. Epiphanius makes no mention of the Gallus revolt; had it been caused by Jewish resistance to a church building program, we can be fairly certain that Epiphanius would be happy to note such a

---


heretical response. Therefore I find that Joseph was not a direct cause of the Gallus revolt.

In 1931, Waterman uncovered a basilica, which he described as a church. It has been suggested that perhaps this church was built by Joseph of Tiberias. But it has since been shown that the basilica was not a church. Avi-Yonah, who first accepted the description of a church, wrote against it. More importantly, the excavations led by James Strange have shown by further excavation at that site that there is no reason to consider it a church. 

A much more substantial and more complex situation obtains with the site in and around and under the Crusader church of Saint Anne, now owned by the Franciscan Order, who have established an orphanage nearby on the property.

Several buildings previously occupied the space of the Crusader church. At least one of these was a synagogue, as evidenced by an inscribed mosaic found in situ. At least one Byzantine period building also stood on this land, and was eventually used as a church, as is shown by numerous architectural fragments. Unfortunately, the earlier

---


127 These data are mostly yet unpublished, but based on tours of the site and oral communication, which I am pleased to acknowledge. Provisionally, see James Strange, "Sepphoris (Sippori), 1986 (II)," Israel Exploration Society 37 (1987): 278-80.

128 P. Viaud, Nazareth.
excavations there have not been fully published. Even if they were published to the extent now possible, further excavations would probably be advisable to date properly the synagogue and the church. It may be that a basilica there was built as a synagogue and was later taken over as a church. It is also possible, but unproven, that this property was associated with Mary, and hence visited by the Piacenza pilgrim in 570 C.E.; at any rate the builders of the Crusader church associated it with Mary and her parents, traditionally named Joachim and Anne.

An inscription on a door lintel was found with these architectural fragments on the Saint Anne site.\textsuperscript{129} This inscription includes some text which is difficult to read, but in general it appears to be a synagogue dedication text.\textsuperscript{130} It includes the term archisynagogos three times and, probably, the term kômes twice, abbreviated both times. The inscription ends with a chi-rho abbreviation. Avi-Yonah considers this an abbreviation for lamprotatos.\textsuperscript{131} Lea Roth-Gerson also reads according to Avi-Yonah's interpretation of the

\textsuperscript{129} See F. Hüttenmeister, Die Antiken Synagogen in Israel I (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1977) for bibliography and several different readings.

\textsuperscript{130} See B. Lifshitz, Donateurs et Fondateurs dans les synagogues juives (Paris: Gabalda, 1967).

\textsuperscript{131} M. Avi-Yonah, Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions (The Near East, 200 B.C.-A.D. 1100). Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, Supplement to Vol. IX, 1940.
abbreviations. Such a reading, however, would have the same word abbreviated in two different ways in the inscription, once with a chi standing for a stop, once with a chi-rho standing for a stop and a rho. Also, in the first line, a chi with a circle above it is read as chi-omicron and not as a stop. Such inconsistencies suggest other interpretations should be considered.

In Sepphoris where Christianity, of some variety, was present and where several synagogues included congregations of different geographic origins, such as Babylonians and those from Gophna, a chi-rho abbreviation would not likely fail to be associated with Christianity, especially from the mid-fourth century and later. Therefore the possibility suggests itself that the inscription could reflect either use in a synagogue of Jewish-Christians or a synagogue later coopted by Christians. Epiphanius specifically mentions the office of archisynagogos among the Ebionites. (30.18.2) So the possible

---

132 L. Roth-Gerson, The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz-Israel (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 1987), 105-110. (Hebrew)

relevance of this inscription to the Count Joseph story merits further consideration. Further excavation in Sepphoris, both on the Franciscan property and elsewhere, will likely provide information.

In chapter 4 we will discuss a rabbinic story about Justa the Tailor of Sepphoris, which has been associated with Count Joseph.
CHAPTER 4

IS JOSEPH IDENTICAL WITH ANOTHER KNOWN INDIVIDUAL?

This chapter will present four proposed identifications of Joseph of Tiberias with figures mentioned in texts other than Epiphanius' Panarion. It is a notable fact that each of the four proposals was made independently; in the original presentations of these suggestions not one of the authors shows any awareness of the other proposed identifications. To my knowledge, this is the first time the four appear together.

By way of introduction, it will be worthwhile to note what nearly qualifies as a fifth published identification. Michael Avi-Yonah tantalizingly reports that "some scholars"—scholars he does not name—"have looked for a confirmation of Joseph's story" in a passage in Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin 99a.¹ A certain Rabbi Hillel says, in Avi-Yonah's translation, "Israel has no more a Messiah; for

they had devoured him in the time of King Hezekiah."² To this a certain Rabbi Joseph responded, "May the Holy One, Blessed be He, pardon Rabbi Hillel."³ Rabbi Joseph cites as his proof-text the messianic passage in Zechariah 9:9, which, he reminds his audience, was prophesied after the time of Hezekiah.

Without the references to the scholars who found this passage relevant to Joseph of Tiberias, one does not know how the connection was argued. Presumably they would note that Epiphanius mentions a Patriarch Hillel and that he or his father was said by Joseph to have been baptised. But the Hillel in this passage is not identified as a patriarch, though he may be the brother of the Patriarch Judah II. In any case, Hillel's statement here does not seem consonant with the story about the patriarch converting. Furthermore, that portion of Joseph's story is highly dubious. To credit this story as being relevant to our discussion, one would have to imagine this scene as occurring before the patriarch supposedly received baptism on his deathbed. But then one would be left with the question of why the compilers of the Gemara would wish to record the saying of the apostate Joseph, who in this case

² Note the (euphemistic?) translation of the word ḫlwhw, "...because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah," in the Soncino Press editions (e.g. London, 1969), trans. H. Freedman.

³ Ibid., 169.
defends the normative Jewish view against the minority opinion of Rabbi Hillel. So this text does not seem credible as providing any information on Joseph of Tiberias.

It would be useful to have an external check on Epiphanius' account. And, given that Epiphanius' reports are parallel to some data from rabbinic literature, e.g., his quotations from certain texts sometimes gathered as an "Apocryphon of Ezekiel"⁴, it is reasonable to consider whether Joseph of Tiberias appears in rabbinic literature and can be securely identified.

Justa of Sephoris

As early as 1714, Adrian Reeland suggested Joseph of Tiberias' life was paralleled by a rabbinic text, Song of Songs Rabbah 6:12.⁵ In this midrash several illustrative stories are offered for the verse "Before I was aware, my soul set me (upon the chariots of my princely people)" (Song 6:12). Among the interpretations:

Justa the tailor of Sephoris went up to court and ingratiated himself with the king. Said the king to

---


⁵ Adrian Reeland. Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus, Volume 2 (Bativorum: G. Broedelet, 1714), 999-1002.
him, "Ask a favour and I will grant it." He said to him: "Give me the governorship of our place." He conferred it on him. When he assumed the governorship he went down from it (?). Of those who knew him before, some said, "This is the same man," while others said, "this is not the same." One of them said to them: "Observe when he passes in the street. If he looks at the tailor's stool on which he used to sit and stitch, it is the same man"...he began to look at the stool...and they knew it was the same man. He said to them: "You are astonished at me, and I am astonished at myself more than you"; and they applied to him the verse, "Before I was aware, my soul set me..."  

S. Yeivin, in his "Historical and Archaeological Notes" on Sepphoris, wrote: "A certain Josephus (apparently the same as Justus mentioned in various sources of the period)[Yeivin footnote 22] a renegade Jew, was appointed governor of the place early in the fourth century AD." In his footnote 22 Yeivin cites Reeland and S. Klein in

---

6 Midrash Rabbah: The Song of Songs, ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1939), 274. Earlier in the text (page 273) this verse is applied to another Joseph, son of Jacob, as governor in Egypt.

apparent support of this identification.\textsuperscript{8} Klein in turn on page 60 (to which Yeivin referred) in turn cites Reeland, Sepp\textsuperscript{9} and Thomsen.\textsuperscript{10} Having checked all the above sources, I can say that Yeivin is mistaken in claiming any "sources of the period" other than Song of Songs Rabbah, the only ancient source cited. Thus statements such as Yeivin's (e.g.,"Early in the fourth century a man named Justus--perhaps a convert who had earlier gone by the name Josephus--was appointed governor of the city."\textsuperscript{11}) must be evaluated solely on the basis of this midrash.

While the parallel here is remarkable, if Justa were a convert, it would be difficult to understand the positive regard of him in this rabbinic tale--as if God made it his destiny to be an apostate. Rabbinic writings on apostates do not have this tone. Epiphanius does not mention that Joseph was a tailor, or was from Sepphoris, or that he was a governor. There is no mention in the midrash that Justa was a kōmes, though this term was well known by the rabbis. Nor is Justa related to Tiberias, a rival city to

\textsuperscript{8} Samuel Klein, "Sippori," In \textit{Various Research Articles on the Land of Israel} (Vienna: Menorah, 1924), 60. (Hebrew)

\textsuperscript{9} Johann Sepp, \textit{Jerusalem und das Heilige Land, volume 2} (Schaffhausen: F. Hurter, 1963), 141.

\textsuperscript{10} Peter Thomsen, \textit{Loca Sancta} (Halle a. S.: R. Haupt, 1907), 55.

Sepphoris.\textsuperscript{12} Though the stories share striking similarities, the identity—and consequent dating of Justa to the early fourth century—appears unlikely, in my opinion.

On the other hand, though we are unable to identify Justa the Tailor with Joseph of Tiberias, archaeological excavations at Sepphoris may have provided further information on Justa. In 1985, the first season of the Joint Sepphoris Project, an inscribed lead weight was uncovered.\textsuperscript{13} This hemi-litrin\textsuperscript{14} weight mentions a Justa. In the first report the inscription was translated as referring to an agoranomos (market-inspector) named Simon son of Aianos son of Justus (Iostos). Since this discovery, other lead weights found in Tiberias have been published.\textsuperscript{15} These have similar inscriptions concerning other agoranomoi with Jewish names. From them it now appears that the Sepphoris inscription, which includes some

\textsuperscript{12} Stuart Miller, "Intercity Relations in Roman Palestine: The Case of Sepphoris and Tiberias," Association for Jewish Studies Review 12 (1987): 1-24, denies a rabbinic rivalry between the two cities. Be that as it may, a governmental rivalry remains plausible.


\textsuperscript{14} Rabbinic literature includes references to the litra weights of Sepphoris: e.g., Tosefta Peah 4.10 and Sifre Deut. #317.

damaged letters, should be read as referring to two market-inspectors, namely Simon son of Aianos and Justus.\textsuperscript{16} This agoranomos may be identical with Justa the Tailor, since both are government officials in Sepphoris. While this may be plausible—more plausible than the Justa the Tailor and Joseph of Tiberias equation—the similarities do not amount to proof of identity. If this identity is credible, however, it would suggest a date earlier than the fourth century for Justa the Tailor, since nearly all evidence—including inscriptions and ancient literature—for the office of agoranomos predates the fourth century.\textsuperscript{17} The archaeological context of the find at Sepphoris suggests a Middle Roman date, i.e., second or third century C.E.,\textsuperscript{18} which is consonant with this line of reasoning, as the Sepphoris lead weight predates the fourth century.

\textbf{Yose of Ma'on}

Koch has suggested Joseph of Tiberias might be identical with Yose of Ma'on.\textsuperscript{19} Ma'on (or Beth Ma'on), near

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Qedar, ibid., 34. Professor Meshorer confirmed the revised reading in conversation in Jerusalem in 1989.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] As reported by Professor Eric Meyers.
\end{itemize}
Tiberias, was one of the villages assigned to the twenty-four priestly courses\textsuperscript{20} and ought not be confused with another Ma''on, to the south in Judaea, where a mosaic floor has been found. Yose (or Jose) appears in Palestinian Talmud Sanhedrin 20 c-d (2:6)\textsuperscript{21} and in Midrash Rabbah, Genesis 80.\textsuperscript{22}

In both accounts Yose expounds on Hos. 5:1f ("Hear this, O priests..."), though in the Palestinian Talmud this occurs in a Tiberias synagogue, while in the Midrash account it happens in a Ma'con synagogue. In each case Yose condemns the Patriarch for failing to distribute funds to priests. In the Midrash version, this charge angers the Patriarch Judah the Prince (Rabbi); in the Palestinian Talmud version the Patriarch is Rabbi Yudan (Judah II Nesiah). In both accounts Yose is examined. In the Talmud version, Yose's audience answers that the king takes the


money, whereupon Yose asserts "I am going to take my seat with them in court and to make a decision concerning them and blot them (the kings) out of the world. R. Yudan the Patriarch heard (about this attack on the rulers) and was angry." Neusner has added the two parenthetical explanations. It is possible that, rather than following Professor Neusner's suggested explication of "the kings," the text may make reference to those Jewish leaders who allegedly misappropriate these taxes, since this is the charge that would anger the patriarch. In any case such a possibility should not be excluded by the translation.

Neither patriarch mentioned, however, fits our time period--both are too early--though such anachronisms do not exclude the significance of parallels in rabbinic literature. The two citations do not agree on the precise historical context either, but nonetheless may reflect some social reality. It is conceivable that they could have been written after the time of Joseph of Tiberias.

Koch rightly notes the similarity of these passages with the Joseph story, but the connection is unlikely to be demonstrable or useful without a third source to compare. In any case, once again, the argument for a suggested identification is weakened by the lack of any reference to apostasy. A noted scholars' apostasy would need be explained or commented on in rabbinic literature, it would seem. In this connection, one could compare the
case of Elisha ben Abuya, Aḥer, also a Tiberias resident. Also, Epiphanius does not mention that Joseph was a priest, or was from Maʿon, or had this sort of dispute with the Nasi.

Koch presented his suggestion only as a parenthetical aside and did not really intend to argue in favor of it. These accounts, therefore, may be more useful as illustrative material referring to issues concerning the Nasi's authority than as arguments that have a significant bearing on the identification with Joseph of Tiberias.

Joseph buried in Tabgha

A third proposed identification with Count Joseph was recently published by Pixner.²³ Pixner, a sometime resident of the Benedictine community at Tabgha with its beautifully rebuilt Byzantine-style church commemorating the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, suggests that fourth-century church foundations, under the fifth-century now-restored walls, were built by Joseph. If these foundations date after 360 C.E., the theory becomes difficult, as Joseph would have been retired by then. Pixner writes:

the first tentative excavations in 1911 at

Tabgha...revealed "under the main entrance, serving as threshold to the cloister, a large basalt slab bearing the funerary inscription in Greek of a certain Josepos" (Schneider 1937:33). Unfortunately, in spite of repeated searches, the memorial stone, which presumably came from the first church, has not been found again. 

Pixner supposes Joseph built the church and was buried there. Tabgha is just several kilometers from Capernaum, and Pixner argues that this would be the church he built in the Capernaum area. This theory, however, involves several hypothetical assumptions.

Though the inscribed stone has been lost, a transcription and drawing of it was previously made. The term kömes does not appear in the transcription. This would seem to be an unusual omission on the burial stone of anyone with such an important title, as we saw from the several examples of such inscriptions mentioned in chapter 2.

If the inscription included mention of church building activity, naturally the case would be stronger, but it does not. In fact the inscription includes no cross—which might

---


25 Schneider, ibid., 1937, 33f; in the German edition, 1934, pages 30-32.
be expected from a church builder commissioned by Constantine—or any religious reference at all. A marble chancel screen with a cross was found in the excavation of this church.\textsuperscript{26} The inscribed stone seems to have received no reverential treatment. Actually, this stone, found "among the flags of the pavement,"\textsuperscript{27} presumably with the inscription side down, appears to be merely a reused stone. No associated burial was reported. Unless additional evidence appears, Pixner’s suggested identification of Joseph of Tiberias with Joseph of Tabgha must remain only an unsubstantiated and unlikely possibility.

An additional difficulty arises for this proposed identification because the earlier church at Tabgha may not even have been built until after Joseph was retired. Such a conclusion appears warranted. Loffreda conducted a limited excavation of the original church foundations in 1970. His sondage uncovered a coin that certainly dates from 395 to 408 C.E. and that was sealed in the foundation "in un contesto in cui si esclude la possibilità di une intrusione."\textsuperscript{28} While one might prefer more evidence than that provided by one coin, Loffreda reasonably concludes

\textsuperscript{26} Illustrated in Stanislao Loffreda, Sanctuaires de Tabgha (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1975), 62.

\textsuperscript{27} Schneider, ibid., 1937, 33.

that "la Cappella Primitiva non fu costruita prima
dell'anno 395."²⁹ This date would exclude any contribution
by Joseph of Tiberias, who was already an old man in 355-
360 when Epiphanius met him.

Though Pixner has written some provocative and
interesting studies of early church history in Israel,³⁰ I
would note that his article on Tabgha is not free of errors
of detail. He writes, "Born in Tiberias of a respected
Pharisee family, Joseppos..."³¹ Epiphanius does not name
Joseph's birthplace, does not mention his family relations,
except to note that he married twice, and does not ever use
the problematic term "Pharisee" anywhere in his account of
Joseph. Further, Pixner wrote that Joseph and Epiphanius
met "around the year 370,"³² whereas we have demonstrated
in chapter 2 that they actually met between 355 and 360.

Scythopolis would seem a more likely burial place for

²⁹ Ibid., 379.

³⁰ E.g., "Church of the Apostles Found on Mt. Zion,"
This article gathers and illustrates much of the previously-
available archaeological and literary data which tends to
suggest that the building now called the tomb of King David
was originally a synagogue and was used in the Roman and later
times, first by Jewish-Christians, then by the fifth century,
by Catholic Christians. Graffiti from this synagogue raises
questions of interpretation similar to those raised by
graffiti found in Capernaum. See also Emile Puech, "La
synagogue judéo-chrétienne du Mont Sion," Le Monde de la Bible

³¹ Pixner, op. cit., 197.

³² Ibid.
Joseph,\textsuperscript{33} since he lived there when he was quite old. Suggestive in this connection is the ossuary with the name Joseph (Ἰσυπός) that was found near Scythopolis (in Nahal Shaul).\textsuperscript{34} I mention this not to argue that this receptacle was actually used for his burial—the dating of the ossuary is not reported—but simply to show that further corroboration would seem to be needed for such a claim to be made with assurance. Joseph is a common name. A "Joseph" grave marker by itself is a rather slim basis for an identification—even if found in an area associated by name with Count Joseph, which Tabgha is not. In addition it should be recalled that Nazareth also has been suggested as the burial place of Joseph of Tiberias. Such a suggestion has, perhaps, even less to recommend it than the suggestion that the Tabgha burial proves an identification.\textsuperscript{35}

Though one can see how the confluence of factors and a possibly-contemporary church would raise the question, it would appear that Joseph of Tiberias was probably not buried in Tabgha.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{33} Our Joseph is called Joseph of Scythopolis in various modern accounts.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34} Joyce Raynor, "Social and Cultural Relations in Scythopolis/Beth Shean in the Roman and Byzantine Periods" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1982), 106.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{35} See the Chapter 3 section on Nazareth (above) for this theory and for the issue of Joseph Building at Nazareth.
\end{flushright}
Joseppus Christianus, Author of Hypomnēstikon

In 1679 Isaac Vossius argued that Joseph of Tiberias was identical with a Joseph who wrote a book called Hypomnēstikon.⁶⁶ Hypomnēstikon is a bible handbook and heresiology that, as far as is known, survives only in one tenth-century manuscript copy now in the Cambridge University Library, cataloged as Ff. I. 24, folios 104-196. The Duke University Library has a microfilm of the manuscript.⁶⁷ In chapter 5 we will provide further bibliography and description of the contents of Hypomnēstikon in the course of an examination of the perspective of its author, which can be compared with what we know of Joseph of Tiberias. For the present section, it will suffice to show that, as far as chronology is concerned, Hypomnēstikon could have been written during the lifetime of Joseph of Tiberias.

By far the best study yet published on Hypomnēstikon is an article by Jacques Moreau, a scholar who died in 1961.⁶⁸

---


⁶⁷ Microfilm reel M6254.

Moreau was primarily interested in the reports of persecutions of Christians found in *Hypomnēstikon*. He edits and discusses the text of chapter 139 which includes all of these references. The most recent of the persecutions listed was associated with the rule of Emperor Julian. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore that the author wrote after 361, and most likely later than 363, the year of Julian's death.

Moreau has argued in favor of the identity of the author of *Hypomnēstikon* with Joseph of Tiberias. His argument, at least insofar as the chronological possibility of the identification goes, is persuasive. *Hypomnēstikon* had been dated much later by various scholars. The most sustained argument and review of previous research on the question prior to Moreau has been presented by Franz Diekamp. In the only manuscript of *Hypomnēstikon* chapter 136 preserves quotes of Hippolytus of Thebes, who lived circa 650-750, so Diekamp argues for a later date. But Moreau, and others before him, considered this chapter an interpolation in the text. Moreau successfully demonstrates that the style of chapter 136 is different from the others.

1964.


in *Hypomnēstikon*.\(^{41}\) For example, the previous chapters were in the form of brief questions and answers, whereas the inserted chapter is a rambling digression on the relationship between Mary and Elizabeth and their families. Such a gloss appears to be an addition to the text and not determinative for the date of the original composition.

The author of *Hypomnēstikon* evidently subscribed to the tradition found in Julius Africanus and elsewhere that Jesus was born in the year 5500.\(^{42}\) Julius also assumed the world would last for 6000 years.\(^{43}\) Therefore, the author of *Hypomnēstikon* who shared this chronological assumption must have lived before 500 A.D.\(^{44}\) This dating of the composition, if found persuasive, would also support the view that the text assigned to Hippolytus was an addition, since Hippolytus lived after 500 A.D.

Perhaps more important for dating the text is a consideration of the heresies mentioned. Since the

---

\(^{41}\) Moreau, ibid. (original printing), 244-46.

\(^{42}\) See *Hypomnēstikon*, chapter 150.

\(^{43}\) In Chapter 1, Joseph asserts that Peleg, son of Eber, lived in the year 3000. Peleg means "division" in Hebrew and represents here the midpoint of world history, which is also the time of the tower of Babel and the dividing of languages. Epiphanius, in Heresy 2, calls the peoples of this time "'Meropes,' because of the 'divided' language." For more information, see William Adler, "The Origins of the Proto-Heresies: Fragments from a Chronicle in the First Book of Epiphanius' Panarion," *Journal of Theological Studies* (forthcoming).

\(^{44}\) Moreau, ibid., 245-6.
appearance of new heresies may be only a little less reliable than the deterioration of carbon 14, it becomes significant to consider which heresies appear in Hypomnēstikon and which do not. In short, only heresies known by the fourth century appear, and later notable heretical movements, such as the Nestorians and the Monophysites, go unmentioned in this orthodox text. Fabricius suggested that Hypomnēstikon fails to record any later heresies because the author merely relied on Epiphanius' Panarion.45 But Moreau adequately presents what the texts demonstrate: while Hypomnēstikon and either Panarion or Anacephalaeosis list many of the same heresies, there are significant differences.46 For example, while Epiphanius and his epitomist list sixty Christian heresies, Joseph gives sixty-two. These different presentations of heresy merit further study.

The author of Hypomnēstikon need not have lived later than the lifetime of Joseph of Tiberias. Either the author of Hypomnēstikon had read Epiphanius' writing or its summary or Epiphanius had read Hypomnēstikon. Possibly the authors knew each other.

In chapter 5 we will pursue the question of the perspective of the author of Hypomnēstikon.

45 J. Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti (Hamburg: T.C. Felgineri, 1723).
46 Moreau, ibid., 246-49.
CHAPTER 5

HYPOMNÉSTIKON: A WORK OF JOSEPH OF TIBERIAS?

Indications of the Book's Date and Perspective of the Author

The book Hypomnēstikon of Joseph is known only from one manuscript and is preserved in a codex which itself has an interesting history. The codex has been valued primarily because it contains the earliest known copy of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The manuscript was noticed in the library of Michel Choniates, metropolitan of Athens (and brother of Niketas Choniates, author of Thesaurus orthodoxiae). Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, obtained the codex and in 1242 translated the Testaments into Latin, bringing it to the attention of western European scholarship. His translation sparked a

---

debate concerning what variety of Judaism or Christianity (or Jewish-Christianity) would have produced such a text, with its particular ethical concerns and messianic references; the debate continues unabated today, with added options offered by redaction criticism and by comparisons with Qumran manuscripts. After the death of Grosseteste the codex was owned by the Friars Minor in Oxford; Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1575) took it from a monastery in Canterbury; at his death it went to Cambridge University, where it remains, catalogued as Ff. I.24 (1157). Hypomnēstikon ends with a poem which claims the text includes five books. However, this copy includes only some indications of this division (e.g., book three is not indicated), and the "books" are of uneven length; if there were indeed originally five books, this copy is either imperfectly numbered or an incomplete copy.

In addition to Hypomnēstikon and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the codex includes a copy of the Septuagint text of Chronicles, "The Enigma of Leo," and a poem on the rich man and Lazarus. However, though these may be of interest on their own, the manuscript history provides no reliable indications of the manuscript's early provenance. It may have been copied in Constantinople, but

---

2 The six-line poem, which may be a later addition, repeats the name of the author, Ἰσεύππου. It follows chapter 167, in column 176 in the Migne edition.
even this is uncertain. The hand of *Hypomnēstikon* has been dated to the late tenth century.³

The book *Hypomnēstikon*, the Greek text of which fills about eighty columns in Migne, is not quite like any other book, or to use Moreau's phrase, it is "une sorte d'hapax." Its author included selected information, mostly related to either Bible or heresies, but including much less easily-characterized material. Bypassing much of the unexceptional and uninteresting mere repetition of well-known texts and traditions, in what follows we will note portions of *Hypomnēstikon* which may be of interest either for characterizing the perspective of the author, or for comparison with Epiphanius. After all, if Joseph of Tiberias did indeed write *Hypomnēstikon*, he likely did so after meeting Epiphanius, because, as is especially evident in the chapters on heresy, the *Panarion* was a major influence. Joseph could have read about himself in *Panarion*.

The author of *Hypomnēstikon* apparently knew some Hebrew

---


and Aramaic.\textsuperscript{5} He gives the names of the months in the Jewish calendar (chapter 37; column 33).\textsuperscript{6} He gives Hebrew names for Biblical books, of which he considers twenty-two canonical. Among the non-canonical texts he includes Sarbeth Sabanaiel, a name also reported by Origen for Maccabees (25; 32). Joseph repeats the tradition found in Flavius Josephus\textsuperscript{7} that Ezekiel wrote two books; this may be noted because Epiphanius' Panarion (heresies 30.30 and 64.70.5-17) preserves two excerpts of an "Apocryphon" of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{8}

The author provides extensive geographic information. He locates the lands of the twelve tribes, using post-Biblical city names (31; 36-37); interestingly, he specifies Scythopolis, the retirement home of Count Joseph, as being within the tribe of Manasseh. He names 40 Semitic-named locations for the 40 years of wandering in the wilderness, (68; 62, 64-65) which may reflect post-Biblical

\textsuperscript{5} In what follows, Hypomnēstikon will be cited according to chapter numbers, found in the manuscript, and secondly, according to the column numbers for the Greek as printed in Migne.


\textsuperscript{7} Antiquities X, 6.

\textsuperscript{8} See James Mueller, "The 'Apocryphon of Ezekiel'..." (Ph. D. diss., Duke University, 1986). This work will appear in the JSOT Press Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplementary Series.
Jewish and possibly rabbinic interpretations. The text provides locations for Gog and Magog (166; 176) as well as other ancient geographic names, restated in later nomenclature. He mentions Beroia (139; 145), which may be noted since Epiphanius was asked to write Panarion by Paul and Acacius, monks in Beroia. The author, presumably Joseph of Tiberias, does mention the Tiberias sea.

Chapter two provides a listing of the high priests, number one being Aaron; number 81 is listed as Phineas, the last before Titus destroyed the temple.

Hypomnēstikon describes six Greek versions of the Hebrew scriptures (122; 124-125). Much of this account is similar to what can be found elsewhere, including in Origen and in Epiphanius' Weights and Measures. But here we have a new detail on the fifth version, that this text, found in a jar near Jericho, was written by a scholar who was a woman. "Pemptē de ekdosis heurethe en Ierichō, en pithois

---

9 The printed editions note the same topic in Josephus, Antiquities II, 6.

10 See their letter and the rescript of Epiphanius included in all editions of his works. It will be recalled that Jerome claimed to learn from Hebrew or Aramaic texts in Beroia.

11 Chapter 152.6; col. 169, this in recalling the apparition of Jesus associated with the catch of 153 fish.

12 The notes on this section (and some others) given in the Fabricius edition are much more useful than those in the Migne edition. Fabricius compares several other listings of high priests.
chalkois kekrummenē, ouk epigeagrammenē ton hermēnea. Phasi de auten hupo gunaikos hermēneusthai, to kai en oikia gunaikos epimelous en tois hierois logos heurasthai tous pithous."

Hypomnēstikon devotes a chapter (chapter 139; 145, 148-9) to persecutions of the church, listing twelve, beginning with Nero. The final section of the chapter presents Julian as a persecutor of Christians, and the most recent persecutor of those mentioned. It was this chapter of Hypomnēstikon which attracted Jacques Moreau and his teacher H. Gregoire to study the text. In his excellent article, Moreau provides an edition of the Greek text of chapter 139 and a discussion of its significance. For example, Moreau argues that Hypomnēstikon helps date the martyrdom of Polycarp circa 177, rather than circa 250.

An unusual interpretation of Isaiah 7 can be read in chapter 75 (75; 89, 92-93). Here Emmanuel, born of the ḫalūmah, is the son either of Isaiah or of King Achaz. The author does not present the birth in Isaiah as a virginal birth, apparently aware of the correct sense of the Hebrew text; but this passage is seen as a type for the later


14 J. Moreau, "Observations," 260-76, this being the second part of the article. The first part, pages 241-259, primarily contains an intelligent presentation of an argument which dates the composition of Hypomnestikon "vers 380."
virginal birth of Christ. This chapter in Hypomnemeron preserves a response to polemic, one which did not become the traditional response.¹⁵

The text lists 58 Greek methods of divination (144; 160–161, 164) including a quotation from Porphyry's letter to Anebon (144, 58; 164), a letter in which Porphyry expresses his skepticism regarding theurgy.

The Hebrew letters and numbers are given interpretations (26; 32–33). The chapter begins, "Alph, mathēsis. Beth, oikou. Gimel, plērōsis..." This may be compared with the mention of sacred names in the accounts of minim and Epiphanius' account of Joseph. E. Testa offers an interpretation of Hypomnemos's number and alphabet symbology, and considers it "Jewish-Christian:" this may be an instance where that term is not useful.¹⁶ However, Testa provides a useful comparison to somewhat similar treatments of the Hebrew alphabet found in Eusebius,¹⁷ Jerome,¹⁸ and Hesychius of Jerusalem¹⁹ (d. after 451).

¹⁷ Praep. Ev. X, 5 (Patrologia Graeca 21, 787–796) and XI, 6 (P.G. 21, 1147).
¹⁸ Epistle 30, Ad Paulam (Patrologia Latina 22, 441 f.).
Epiphanius also discusses number symbolism in his Treatise on Weights and Measures. Hypomnēstikon (151; 169) also offers a mystical explanation of the name Jesus as delivered by Gabriel. This passage notes the numerical value of the letters יוד (ten) and חט (eight) and claims that Jesus' name is related to the name of God kept in the ark.

The author includes some anti-Jewish language, against the synagogue (151; 169) and against Pharisees (57; 56).

He shows particular interest in James, the brother of Jesus (153, 4; 172 and 134; 142).

He notes that Matthew 2:23 refers to a prophecy, "he shall be called Ναζωραῖος," which does not appear in Hebrew scriptures; in referring to the verse he either paraphrases or gives a variant version (121; 124).

The last chapter specifies the twelve gemstones on the breastplate of the high priest (167; 176). Epiphanius also wrote a book on the gems used on the priestly robes. Epiphanius completed his gem text by the year 394 C.E., probably later than Hypomnēstikon, if Joseph of Tiberias is the author. Not only might the book on gems and

---

19 De Titul. Ps., Ps. 144, (Patrologia Graeca 27, 1310-18) and Ps. 110, (P.G. 27, 1147).

20 See Bagatti, Church from the Circumcision, 167.

21 See e.g., Riggi, Epifanio contro Mani, 401 for dating and bibliographic data on this text.
Panarion be compared usefully with Hypomnēstikon, but, as well, Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures, which actually includes more subjects than the title implies. The latter book was written, at the request of a Persian priest, also later than Hypomnēstikon if Count Joseph was its author. Therefore, it is possible that Epiphanius and the author Joseph both influenced some compositions of the other. They certainly shared many of the same interests.

Some information one might look for in Hypomnēstikon does not appear. There is no mention of a Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew, which Epiphanius wrote that Count Joseph had read. Hypomnēstikon does not name our Epiphanius.22 There is no mention of any revolt in Galilee during the rule of Gallus and no mention of the earthquake of 363 C.E. This Joseph does not recount stories of church building--but he does not identify himself in any explicit way, beyond the name Joseph.

Chapters 140-142 on Heresies

At this point it should be obvious that a comparison of heresies as described in Hypomnēstikon (chapters 140 for Christian heresies; 141 for Jewish heresies; 142 for

---

22 A different person, Epiphanes, a Secundian heretic, is mentioned (140, 19; 151), as he is in Epiphanius' Panarion, Heresy 32.3.2f.
Samaritan heresies) and Panarion is warranted. Epiphanius described 60 Christian heresies; Joseph gave 62.

Most of the Christian heresies listed are the same, though the names and descriptions and the sequence of the heresies vary, so simple numerical equivalencies between the two can not adequately describe their relationship. For example, Epiphanius' Pneumatomachoi (heresy 74) may or may not be considered as equivalent with Joseph's Macedonians (his number 61), though Joseph's account probably reflects a slightly later development of the same heresy. Epiphanius' Catharoi (heresy 59) are reasonably considered the practical equivalent of Joseph's Navati (number 35). Epiphanius' Collyridianos (heresy 79)—that is, those who idolize Mary and offer her cakes (kollyris)—are evidently called by Joseph Marianites (number 49). A separate monograph would be needed—and may be worthwhile—to evaluate all the relationships between these texts. For our present purposes, it will be most useful to concentrate on those four Christian heresies listed by Epiphanius but not

---

23 The best published discussion comparing these heresy descriptions may be found in Moreau, "Observations," 246–249. It seems very peculiar that so little literature exists comparing the heresy descriptions in Hypomnēstikon and Panarion. This may partly be a result of the fact that the Migne Patrologia Graeca (volume 106) mistakenly prints Joseph's text among tenth century compositions. Hence Moreau's discussion is taken up primarily with establishing a fourth-century chronology. The patrologies of Altaner and Quasten are among the reference books that do not even mention the Hypomnēstikon of Joseph.
by Joseph as well as those six Christian heresies listed by Joseph but not by Epiphanius.

Hypomnēstikon chapter 140 (col. 149f) includes the following Christian heresies:

Number 1, Herodians. Epiphanius lists them, but as the last Jewish heresy (heresy 20), rather than as the first Christian heresy. Whether a supposed group of Jews who considered Herod to be Christ should be listed as a Jewish or a Christian error, is, perhaps, the sort of question which would interest only heresiologists. In the context of this study, it will be worth noting that the Christian author lists them as Jewish, whereas the Jewish-born author gives them as Christians. This might seem a useless observation by itself, but Joseph also appears to follow Epiphanius more closely on Christian heresies, and almost completely on Samaritan heresies, but differs considerably on Jewish heresies, on which subject he relies more on Flavius Josephus.24 Joseph does not list Scribes (Epiphanius' heresy 15), Hemerobaptists (heresy 17), or Nasarenes (heresy 18) among his Jewish heresies.

Number 2, Theudians. This refers to the uprising involving a false prophet mentioned in Acts 5:36. Though Epiphanius did not find a place for them in his scheme of eighty heresies, he would presumably not object to their

24 Joseph also differs considerably with Epiphanius on Greek heresies (in chapter 143 and elsewhere).
condemnation, so this selection may tell us more about Joseph than Epiphanius. Joseph notes that they were condemned by Gamaliel.

Number 3, Egyptian Magi. They are not listed by Epiphanius as one of the eighty heresies, but it is noteworthy that Basil wrote a letter to Epiphanius responding to his request for information on the literature and practices of Magi. The letter dates to 377; perhaps it was too late to be used for the Panarion. Epiphanius did mention the Magi in the concluding section of Panarion, a chapter on faith.

Number 33, Artemianí. Named after Artemias of Asia Minor, who regarded Christ as human, but in whom the word of God lived; this is compared to the Theodosianists, which is the previous heresy in Joseph (number 32). Epiphanius has Theodosianists as heresy 54.

Number 39, Byrillians. This presumably involves a misspelling and should be Beryllians, after bishop Beryllus of Bostra, who taught that Christ was not a person before the incarnation. However, Beryllus recanted. Prominent among those who corrected him was Origen. Epiphanius no doubt would condemn the teaching, but may have omitted it either because of the recantation or because of a

---

25 Basil, Epistle 258, 4.

26 Expos. fidei, 13.
disinclination to credit Origen.

Number 62, Anthropomorphites. This appears to be the most significant Christian heresy listed by Joseph but not by Epiphanius. It could be the last listed by Joseph because it was the most recent and may have become controversial after Epiphanius completed *Panarion*. Or, Epiphanius may have omitted it because he was an Anthropomorphite! Interestingly, Joseph specifies that the area in which this heresy flourished was Eleutheropolis, which, perhaps not incidentally, was the hometown and site of the monastery founded by Epiphanius. Epiphanius was accused of being an Anthropomorphite. His accusers were his enemies bishop John of Jerusalem and Theophilus of Alexandria. Epiphanius did condemn the Audians (heresy 70) and does critique their view of the "image of God" in relation to Adam; but he appears more damning that they were a schismatic group and that they were Quartodecimian. Unlike some other heresies, Anthropomorphism may be a charge which does not lend itself to easy definition. We turn now to the heresies found listed by Epiphanius but not by Joseph. These differences could help characterize the outlook of Joseph, and whether, to him, Epiphanius would

---

27 See the forthcoming study by Elizabeth A. Clark on these charges made in the context of the Origenist controversy. See Jerome, *Against John of Jerusalem*, 11 and Apol. 3, 23; Socrates, *Hist. Ecc.* 6, 10; Palladius, *Dialogues*, 16.
appear to be an Anthropomorphite.\textsuperscript{28}

The following four Christian heresies appear in *Panarion* but not in Joseph's *Hypomnêstikon*.

Heresy 47, Encratites. They reject marriage and animal food and, in Epiphanius' description, they regard matter as evil.

Heresy 57, Noetians. Noetus of Asia Minor was a Monarchian, who seemed to Epiphanius' variety of orthodoxy to allow insufficient independence of the person of the son in the trinity.

Heresy 77, Dimorites and Apollinarians. They propose that Christ's human spirit or rational soul (\textit{psychê logikê}) was supplied by the Divine logos. From the perspective of Epiphanius, this allowed full divinity but not full humanity to Christ. The absence of this heresy appears to be the most significant. Moreau suggests that Joseph was himself an Apollinarian.\textsuperscript{29} This proposal, if true, would explain the absence of Epiphanius' next heresy.

Heresy 78, Antidicomarians. By this name, Epiphanius meant opponents of Mary, the opposition being non-recognition of the idea of her continuing virginity and supposition that she bore other children naturally.

\textsuperscript{28} It may be useful to recall that, concerning most Christian heresies, Epiphanius and Joseph agreed. They were both, for example, very strongly anti-Arian—as was Eusebius of Vercelli, with whom they both visited.

\textsuperscript{29} Moreau, ibid., 248-9.
Epiphanius indicated that this group claimed Apollinarus as its founder or, at least, as a member.

Here, I will suggest that the simplest hypothesis is that Joseph wrote Hypomnēstikon after receiving a copy of the Panarion and altered the order and selection and description of heresies. Some of the differences illustrated above appear to be of diagnostic value for this hypothesis.

Joseph's list was likely composed later than Epiphanius' because he includes some possibly later developments. Also Hypomnēstikon was later because it would be difficult to imagine two people independently devising such elaborate but similar heresiologies. And Panarion's structure, cumbersome and artificial as it is, appears to have grown out of Epiphanius' earlier book, Ancoratus, and to be an original scheme of Epiphanius. Hypomnēstikon makes no claims for its structure in terms of the genealogy of heresies, unlike Panarion. However, Hypomnēstikon does imply it includes all the known heresies.\(^{30}\)

Joseph's penultimate Christian heresy (number 61) became an increasingly noticed heresy after Panarion was written (it was completed by 377). This heresy, the Macedonians, was condemned in 381.

As mentioned above, Joseph (chapters 141 and 142) is

\(^{30}\) Moreau, ibid., 246.
the only ancient writer who follows (or agrees with) Epiphanius in explicitly listing Essenes as both a Jewish and a Samaritan heresy. However, either Joseph or his copyist did not understand Epiphanius' spelling of the Jewish group as Ossenes—correctly reflecting its Hebrew origin—so the text has both groups spelled with an epsilon.31

Joseph includes five Jewish heresies: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes who were celibate, Essenes who married, and followers of Judah the Galilean. The latter seems an odd choice, unless Joseph meant this heresy to include of all militant zealots. It may be worth recalling that Emperor Julian wrote of Christians as Galileans.

Joseph's Christian heresy number 5 is the Ebionites. Count Joseph's story appears, of course, in Epiphanius' chapter on Ebionites (heresy 30). Count Joseph and Joseph, author of Hypomnestikon, both considered themselves not to be an Ebionite.

Joseph's Christian heresy number 6 is the Nazoraioi, which he presents as a subset of Ebionites—a view consonant with the Jewish perspective as presented above in chapter 3. This suggests that one cannot properly study

31 A copyist may have "corrected" his spelling. The original text may have had "Ossenes" with an omicron (following Epiphanius), because otherwise a reader would expect some explanation of the repetition of the name "Essene."
Ebionites without studying Nazarenes\textsuperscript{32}, nor can one properly study Nazarenes without studying Ebionites.\textsuperscript{33} Study of either also calls for study of minim.

This study has shown that further research on the relation of Epiphanius and the author Joseph can be expected to produce further historical insights.

\textsuperscript{32} See Koch, "Epiphanius."

\textsuperscript{33} See Pritz, Nazarene Jewish Christianity.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS ON JOSEPH AS A SOURCE ON
JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS

Joseph of Tiberias was an actual person met by Epiphanius, and he did attempt to build churches in Galilee. Though no absolute evidence exists for this, it remains, given the considerable available circumstantial supporting evidence, the most plausible reconstruction of history. However, Joseph did not succeed in Tiberias and elsewhere, if by success one means the installation of a permanent, continuing Catholic presence.

All his attempts likely began in the 330s and ended well before 351 C.E., that is, before the Gallus revolt. Joseph was probably not identical with Justa of Sepphoris, Yose of Ma'on, or the Joseph mentioned in a Tabgha inscription, but it is quite plausible that he was the author of Hypomnēstikon.

The book Hypomnēstikon has been neglected as a historical source. It contains much data on Biblical exegesis, historical geography, and on heresies. It was written in the late fourth century, probably by the same Joseph whom Epiphanius met. Joseph's book post-dates the
Panarion, and includes information relevant to the changing attitudes toward various heresies. Portions of Joseph's book offer an untapped resource for the vital—if unlovely—role of Epiphanius in seeking to obliterate ideas associated with the memory of Origen. Future research on Epiphanius would do well to make use of Hypomnēstikon. Both Epiphanius' Panarion and Joseph's Hypomnēstikon will be better understood when they are studied together; together they offer insight into changing views of heresy.

Epiphanius attempts to present Joseph as orthodox, despite the fact that he discusses him in his chapter against Ebionites. This effort to present Joseph as Catholic (whether accurate or not) can be seen in his suggestion that, though Joseph read the Gospel of the Ebionites (the text which led into the digression about Joseph), it was not until Joseph read the (presumably Greek) New Testament while in Asia Minor that he finally converted. This trip to Asia Minor also obviates any potential problem about which bishop (and not a Jewish-Christian one) might be available near Tiberias to provide orthodox conversion.

Joseph did attempt to establish churches in various lower Galilee towns in which some Jewish-Christians lived. Evidence from patristic sources, rabbinic sources, and archaeology coheres to establish that a significant minority of Jewish-Christians, variously called Ebionites,
Nazarenes, and *minim*, indeed lived in Sepphoris, Capernaum, Nazareth, and Tiberias.

Joseph's church foundations were not very successful. He, as a count early in the post Nicaea era, represented a premature effort to Christianize Galilee in the direction Rome was now moving. Joseph got an unenthusiastic reception, which, however, makes his story no less a part of history.
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3.6 But again, when they choose to, they say, "No; the Spirit—that is, the Christ—came to him and put on the man called Jesus." And they get all giddy from supposing different things about him at different times.

3.7 They too accept the Gospel according to Matthew. Like the Corinthian and Merethians, they too use it alone. They call it, "According to the Hebrews," and it is true to say that only Matthew put the setting forth and the preaching of the Gospel into the New Testament in the Hebrew language and alphabet.

3.8 But by now some will have replied that the Gospel of John besides, translated from Greek to Hebrew, is in the Jewish treasuries. I mean the treasuries at Tiberias. It is stored there secretly, as certain converts from Judaism have described to me in detail. (9) And not only that, but it is said that the book of the Acts of the Apostles, also translated from Greek to Hebrew, is there in the treasuries. So the Jews who have been converted to Christ by reading it have told me.

4.1 One of them was Josephus—not the ancient Josephus, the author and chronicler, but a Josephus of Tiberias, born during the old age of the Emperor Constantine of blessed memory. This Josephus was awarded the rank of count by the Emperor himself, and was authorized to build a church for Christ in Tiberias itself, and in Diocesarea, Capernaum and the other towns. He also suffered a great deal from the Jews themselves before he came to the Emperor's notice.

4.2 For this Josephus was one of their men of rank. There are such persons, called "apostles," who stand next after the patriarch. They attend on the patriarch, and often stay with him day and night without intermission, to give him counsel and refer matters of law to him. (5) The patriarch at that time was called Elie. (I think that was how Josephus pronounced his name, unless I am mistaken because of the time). He was descended from the Gamaliel who had been one of their patriarchs. (4) One may suspect, and others have suggested this as well, that these patriarchs were descended from the first Gamaliel, the Savior's contemporary, who gave the godly counsel of stopping the abuse of the apostles.

4.5 When Elie was dying he asked the bishop who then lived near Tiberias for holy baptism, and he received it from him in extremis for allegedly medical reasons. (6) For he had sent for him, as though for a doctor, by Josephus, and he had the room cleared and begged the bishop. "Give me the seal in Christ." (7) The bishop summoned the servants...
and ordered water prepared, as though intending to give the patriarch, who was very sick, some treatment for his illness with water. They did what they were told, for they did not know. But pleading indulgence for his modesty the patriarch sent them all out, and was allowed the laver and the holy mysteries.

5.1 Josephus told me <this> in conversation. For I heard all this from his own lips and no one else's, in his old age when he was about seventy or even more. (2) For I was entertained at his home in Scythopolis; he had moved from Tiberias, and owned a notable estate there in Scythopolis. Eusebius of blessed memory, the bishop of Vercelli in Italy, was Josephus' guest, since Constantius had banished him for his orthodox faith. I and the other brethren had come there to visit him, and we were entertained too, along with Eusebius.

5.3 Now when I met Josephus at his home, asked him about himself, and found that he had been a prominent Jew, I also inquired his reason, and why it was that he had come over to Christianity. And I heard all this plainly (from him), not at secondhand from anyone else. (4) And since I believe the trouble over the man because of the Hebrew translations in the treasuries is worth recording for the edification of the faithful, I deliberately give Josephus' entire reason.

5.5 Josephus was not only privileged to become a faithful Christian, but a despiser of Arians as well. In that city, Scythopolis, he was the only orthodox Christian—they were all Arian. (6) Had it not been that he was a count, and the rank of count protected him from Arian persecution, he could not even have undertaken to live in the town, especially while Patrophilus was the Arian bishop. Patrophilus was very influential because of his wealth and severity, and his familiarity with the Emperor Constantius. (7) But there was another, younger man in town too, an orthodox believer of Jewish parentage. He did not even dare <to associate> with me in public, though he used to visit me secretly.

5.8 But Josephus told me something plausible and amusing, though I guess that <here he was joking too>. He claimed that after his wife died, fearing that the Arians might take him by force and make him a cleric—to soften him for conversion to the sect they would often promise him higher preferments if need be, and to make him a bishop. Well, he claimed this was why he had married a second wife, to escape their appointments!

6.1 But I shall resume my description of the reason for the patriarch's conversion, and also make Josephus' own reason plain in every detail to those who care to read it, in the words he used to me. (2) "Just as the patriarch was being granted baptism," he told me, "I peeped in through the cracks in the doors and saw what the bishop was
doing to the patriarch—found it out, and kept it to myself. (5) For besides," Josephus said, "the patriarch had a very ample sum of money ready, and he reached out, gave it to the bishop, and said, 'Offer it for me. It is written that things are bound and loosed on earth through the priests of God, and <that> these are what will be loosed and bound in heaven.' (4) When this was over," he said, "and the doors were opened, the patriarch's visitors asked him how he felt after his treatment, and he replied, 'Great! He knew what he was talking about!'"

6.5 Then <after> two or three days, with frequent visits from the bishop in the character of a physician, the patriarch fell asleep with a good hope in store. He had entrusted his own son, who was quite young, to Josephus and another very capable <elder>. (6) All business, then, was transacted through these two, since the patriarch, as a boy, was still childish, and was being brought up under their supervision.

6.7 During this time Josephus was considering what he should do, for because of the mysteries, his mind was often troubled over the subject of baptism. Now there was a "gazophylacium" there which was sealed—"gaza" means "treasure" in Hebrew. (3) As many had different notions about this treasury because of its seal, Josephus plucked up the courage to open it unobserved—and found no money, but books money could not buy. (9) Browsing through them he found the Gospel of John translated from Greek to Hebrew, as I said, and the Acts of the Apostles—as well as Matthew's Gospel, which is actually Hebrew. After reading from them he was once more distressed in mind, for he was somehow troubled over the faith of Christ. But he was prodded for two reasons now, his reading of the books and the patriarch's initiation. Still, as often happens, his heart was hardened.

7.1 While all his time was occupied with these things, the boy Eliezer had left to be reared as patriarch was growing up. (No one usurps the positions of authority among the Jews; a son succeeds a father.) (2) Just as the lad was reaching for vigor some idle youths of his age, who were used to evil, unfortunately met him. (I guess he was called Judas, but because of the time I am not quite sure.) (2) The youths of his age got him into many bad habits, seductions of women and unholy sexual unions. They undertook to help him in his licentious <deeds> with certain magic devices—made certain love-philtres and compelled free women, by incantation, to be brought against their will for his seduction.

7.4 Josephus and his fellow elder, who were obliged to attend the boy, bore this with difficulty. Often they charged him verbally, and admonished him. But he preferred to listen to the young men, and he hid
his indecencies and denied them. And Josephus did not dare to voice his accurations of him openly; he admonished him, however, as though from professional duty.

7.5 Well, they went to Gadara for the hot baths. There is an annual gathering there. Persons who wish to bathe for a certain number of days arrive from every quarter, to rid themselves of their ailments, if you please—though it is a trick of the devil. For where God's wonders have been, the adversary has already spread his deadly nets—men and women bathe together there!

7.6 There happened to be an unusually beautiful free woman in the bath. With his accustomed licentiousness the young man brushed against the girl's side as he strolled about in the hot-air room. (7) But being Christian, she naturally made the sign of the cross. (There was no need for her to break the rules and bathe in mixed company. These things happen to simple laypersons, from the laxity of the teachers who do not forewarn them through their instruction.) (8) Still, that God might make his wonders manifest, the youngster, I mean the patriarch, failed in his enterprise. For he sent emissaries to the woman and promised her gifts: but she insulted his messengers and did not yield to the pampered youth's futile efforts.

8.1 Then, when his helpers learned of the passion the boy had betrayed for the girl, they undertook to equip him with more powerful magic—as Josephus himself described to me minutely. (2) After sunset they took the unfortunate lad to the neighboring cemetery. In my country there are places of assembly of this kind, called "caverns," made by heaving them out of cliffs and bights.) (3) Taking him there the choruses who were with him recited certain incantations and spells, and did some things, with him and in the woman's name, which were full of impiety.

8.4 By God's will the other elder, Josephus' partner, found this out; and on realizing what was happening, he told Josephus. And he began by bemoaning his lot, and said, "Brother, we are wretched men and vessels of destruction! What sort of person are we attending?" (5) Josephus asked what the matter was, and no sooner were the words out of his mouth than the elder seized his hand and took Josephus to the place where the persons deemed to die, with the youth, were holding their assembly in the cemetery for magic. (6) They stood outside the door and eavesdropped on their proceedings, but withdrew when they came out. (It was not dark yet; it was just about sundown, and visibility was still good.) (7) After the monsters of impiety had left the tomb, Josephus went in and saw certain vessels and other implements of jugglery on the ground. He made water on them and covered them with a heap of dust, he said, and left
8,8 But he knew the kind of woman on whose account they had plotted these wicked things, and he watched to see whether they would win. (9) When the sorcerers did not win—the woman had the aid of the sign and faith of Christ—he learned that the young man had waited for the girl’s arrival on three nights, and later quarrelled with those who had performed the jugglery, because it had not succeeded. (10) This made Josephus’ third lesson—where Christ’s name was, and the sign of his cross, the power of sorcery did not prevail. But at this point he was by no means convinced that he should become a Christian.

9,1 Then the Lord appeared to him in a dream, and said, “I am Jesus, whom your forefathers crucified; but believe in me.” When even this did not convince him, he became very ill and was given up for lost. But the Lord appeared to him again, and told him to believe and he would be healed. And he promised and recovered, but again remained obstinate.

9,2 He became ill a second time in turn, and was given up as before. When his Jewish kin supposed that he was dying, they told him the words they continually repeat among themselves as a secret. (3) An elderly scholar of the law came and told him secretly, and said, “Believe Jesus, crucified under Pontius Pilate the governor, Son of God first yet later born of Mary, the Christ of God and risen from the dead. And believe that he will come to judge and quick and the dead.” I can truthfully say that, in outline, that same Josephus distinctly told me this.

9,4 But I have also heard this sort of thing from someone else. He was a Jew, from fear of the Jews, but he often spent time in Christian company, and he honored Christians and loved them. He travelled with me in the wilderness of Baita and Ephraim, when I was going up to the mountains from Jericho, and I said something to him about Christ’s incarnation, and he did not dispute it. (5) I was amazed—he was learned in the Law and capable of disputations—and I asked why he did not dispute, but agreed with me about Jesus Christ our Lord. I had got no further than this when he too revealed to me that he had been dying himself, and that they had told him secretly, in a whisper, “Jesus Christ, the crucified Son of God, will judge you.” (6) But let this be my record here, based on true report concerning these persons and with regard to this formula.

10,1 Josephus was still sick. And though, as I said, like the others he had heard ‘Jesus Christ will judge you’ from the old man, he was still hardened. But the Lord in His lovingkindness again said to him in a

20 Mysteries are said over the heads, and into both ears of the dying for their salvation at Ps 219-11.
dream, "Lo, I heal you; but rise up and believe!" But though he recovered again, he did not believe. (2) When he was well the Lord appeared to him in a dream once more, and demanded to know why he did not believe. But the Lord promised him, "If, as an assurance of faith, you choose to work any miracle in my name, call upon me and I will do it."

10, 3 There was a madman in the city who roamed the town, I mean Tiberias, naked. If he was dressed he would often tear his clothing apart, as such people will. (4) Josephus wished to test the vision, and though he still doubted it, he was awed. So he brought the man inside, shut the door, made the sign of the cross over it, and sprinkled it on the madman with the words, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth the crucified begone from him, demon, and let him be made whole!"

10, 5 Falling down with a loud cry, the man lay motionless for a long time foaming profusely and retching, and Josephus supposed he had died. (6) But after a while he rubbed his forehead and arose. And on standing up and seeing his nakedness he hid himself and covered his privy parts with his hands, for he could no longer bear to see his own nakedness. (7) In proof of his comprehension and sanity, after Josephus had dressed him in one of his own himatia, he came and offered many thanks to him and to God, for he realized that he had been cured through Josephus. He spread word of him in town, and this miracle became known to the Jews there. (8) Much talk ensued in the city, with people saying that Josephus had opened the treasuries, found the Name of God in writing, read it, and was working great miracles. And what they were saying was true, though not in the way they thought.

10, 9 Josephus, however, still remained hardened in heart. But the merciful God, who continually arranges occasions of good for those who love him, supplies them to those to whom he allows salvation. (11, 1) As things turned out for Josephus himself, after Judas, the patriarch we spoke of, grew up—I guess he was called that—to repay him, he awarded him the revenue of the apostolate. (2) He was sent to Cilicia with a commission, and on arriving there collected the tithes and firstfruits from the Jews of the province, from every city in Cilicia. (3) At this time he lodged next to the church, I do not know in what city. But he made friends with the bishop there, <went to him> unobserved, borrowed the Gospels and read them.

11, 4 <He was> very solemn, if you please, and immaculate, as apostles are—as I said, this is what they call the rank. And he was always intent on what would make for the establishment of good order, and he purged and demoted many of the appointed synagogue-heads, priests, elders and "decuriones" (meaning their kind of deacons or assistants). He
was thus hated by many. As though in an attempt to defend themselves against him, they showed no little zeal in prying into his affairs and finding out what he was doing. (5) For this reason a crowd of meddlers burst in upon him at home in his residence, and caught him perusing the Gospels. They took the book and seized the man, dragged him along on the ground with outrages, bore him off to the synagogue with no light mistreatment, and whipped him as the Law prescribes. (6) This made his first trial; however, the bishop of the town arrived and got him out. They caught him on a journey another time, as he described to me, and threw him into the river Cydnus. <When they saw> the current take him they presumed he had gone under and drowned, and were glad of it.

11,7 But he was given holy baptism a little later—for he was rescued (from the river). He went to court, made friends with the Emperor Constantine, and told him his whole story—how he was a Jew of highest rank and how the divine visions kept appearing to him, since the Lord was summoning him to his holy calling, and the salvation of his faith and knowledge. (8) But the good emperor—a true servant of Christ, and, after David, Hezekiah and Josiah, the king with the most godly zeal—rewarded him with a rank in his realm as I have said already. (9) He made him a count and told him to ask what he wanted in his turn.

Josephus asked only this very great favor from the emperor—permission by imperial rescript to build Christ’s churches in the Jewish towns and villages where no one had ever been able to found churches, since there are no Greeks, Samaritans or Christians among the population. (10) This <rule> of having no gentiles among them is observed especially at Tiberias, Decapolis, Sepphoris, Nazareth and Capernaum.

12,1 After receiving the letter and the authorization along with his title, Josephus came to Tiberias. He also had a draft on the imperial treasury, and the honor of a salary from the emperor as well.

12,2 So he made his first foundation in Tiberias. There was a very large temple in the town already, I think they may have called it the Adrianum. The citizens may have been trying to restore this Adrianum, which was standing unfinished, for a public bath. (2) When Josephus found this out, he took the opportunity; and as he found that there were already four walls raised to some height, made of stones four feet long, he began the erection of the church from that point.

12,4 But lime was needed, and the other building material. He therefore had a number of ovens, perhaps seven altogether, set up outside the city. (In the language of the country they call these “furnaces.”) But the ingenious Jews, who are ready for anything, did not spare their continual sorcery. Those natural-born Jews wasted their time on magic and impostery to put a spell on the fire, but did not entirely succeed.
12,5 Well, the fire was smouldering and doing no good; in a manner of speaking it had deviated from its own nature. When those whose task it was to feed the fire with fuel—I mean brushwood or scrub—told Josephus what had been done, he rushed from the city, stung to the quick and moved with zeal for the Lord. (6) He ordered water fetched in a vessel, (I mean a flask, but the local inhabitants call this a “cæcubium,”) and took this vessel of water in the sight of all—a crowd of Jews had gathered to watch, eager to see how it would turn out and what Josephus would try to do. Tracing the sign of the cross on the vessel with his own finger, and invoking the name of Jesus, he cried out, (7) “In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom my fathers and those of all here present crucified, may there be power in this water to set at naught all sorcery and enchantment these men have wrought, and to work a miracle on the fire that the Lord’s house may be finished.” (8) With that he wet his hand and sprinkled the water on each furnace; and the spells were broken, and in the presence of all, the fire blazed up. And the crowds of spectators cried, “There is (only) one God, the help of the Christians,” and withdrew.

12,9 Though they harmed the man on many occasions, he eventually restored part of the temple at Tiberias and finished a school church. He then left, but came to Scythopolis and made his home. However, he completed buildings in Dichaela and certain other towns. (10) So much for my account and description of these events, which I recalled here because of the translation of the books, the rendering from Greek to Hebrew of the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles.

13,1 But I resume the sequence of my argument against Ebion—because of the Gospel according to Matthew the progress of the discussion obliged me to give the sequel of the knowledge which had come my way. (2) Now in what they call a Gospel according to Matthew, though it is not entirely complete, but is corrupt and mutilated—and they call this thing “Hebrew”—the following passage occurs. “There was a certain man named Jesus, and he was about thirty years of age,” who chose us. And coming to Capernaum he entered into the house of Simon summoned Peter, and opened his mouth and said. (3) Passing beside the Sea of Tiberias I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew and <Philip and Bartholomew, James the son of Alphaeus and Thomas>, Thaddaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot. 25

25 Cf. Matt. 10:2-4 and Luke 6:14-16. But the list given here is not identical with other
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Avi-Yonah, Michael. Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions (The Near East, 200 B.C.-A.D. 1100). Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, Supplement to
Vol. IX. Jerusalem: Government of Palestine, 1940.


Crowfoot, J. W. Early Churches in Palestine. The Schweich


[Note: selected text editions of Ephipanius and translations are listed below by date of publication. For more detailed analysis of the writings of Ephipanius including versions, fragments, and spurious works, see Riggi, *Epifanio Contro Mani*, 399-403, and the encyclopedia entries by Nautin, 626-31, and Schneemelcher, 914-20, and the patrologies of Alinaner and Quasten.]


_____ . I. Ancoratus und Panarion, haer. 1-33, ed. Karl Holl. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 25,


Foerster, G. "Tiberias." Encyclopedia of Archaeological
182


. The Later Roman Empire, 284-602; a social economic and administrative survey. Norman, OK:
University of Oklahoma, 1964.


Juster, Jean. Les Juifs dans l'empire romain: leur


______. "The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 57 (1966): 54-78.


Klein, Samuel. "Sippori." In Various Research Articles on the Land of Israel, 44-76. Vienna: Menorah, 1924. (Hebrew)

______. Sefer HaVishuv. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1938. (Hebrew)

Klijn, A.F.J. "Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean


Le Boulluec, Alain. Notion d'hérésie dans la littérature


Maier, Johann. Jesus von Nazareth in der Talmudischen Überlieferung. Erträge der Forschung, 82. Darmstadt:


Meeks, Wayne, and Robert Wilken. Jews and Christians in


Moreau, Jacques. "Note additionnelle: Identification du


______. "Patriistique et Histoire des Dogmes: 2. Epiphane


Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the


Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. "An Unpublished


. "Joseph the Comes and the Attempts to Convert the
Galilee to Christianity in the Fourth Century C.E.
(Hebrew)


——. *According to the Hebrews (Toldoth Jesu)*. London: Duckworth, 1937.


Verlag, 1961.


1973-87.


ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Stephen Craft Goranson was born November 5, 1950 in Surrey, England, his father having been stationed there by the U.S. Navy. After a 1972 B.A. from Brandeis University, he worked as a librarian, then in the cooperative construction company Earth Works in Virginia. Daughter Anna was born in 1979. After publishing two articles in Revue de Qumran he came to Duke University, where he received an M.A. in 1986. In four seasons he participated in the excavations in Sepphoris, Galilee. He published articles or reviews in Biblical Archaeologist, Anchor Bible Dictionary and Religious Studies Review. He read papers at meetings of the Society for Biblical Literature, American Schools of Oriental Research, and North American Patristics Society. He was an Instructor at Duke and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.