APPENDIX 2

CATALOGUE OF BIBLICAL TEXTS RELEVANT FOR THE
INTERPRETATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN FISH SYMBOLISM

For New Testament passages I cite the original Greek. For Hebrew Bible passages, I use the Greek Septuagint, except in one case, since Hebrew was not used in virtually any of the relevant early Christian passages. **Bold lettering** refers to direct quotations.

———

I. THE CALL OF THE FISHERMEN

1. Matthew 4.18-22

18`Περιπατοῦν δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁλάσσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν δύο ἄδελφους. Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ· βάλλοντας ἀμφὶβλήστρον εἰς τὴν ὁλάσσαν· ἦσαν γαρ θείες. 19καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· δεῦτε ἐπίσο μου, καὶ ποιήσω θείες θείες ἀνθρώποιν. 20οὖθεν εὐθέως αφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἱκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

20 καὶ προβὰς ἐκείθεν θεῖον ἄλος δύο ἄδελφους, ἤλακοβὸν τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰολάννη τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ Ζεβεδαίου τοῦ πατρος αὐτῶν καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα καὶ ἔκλεψαν αὐτούς. 21οὖθεν εὐθέως αφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἱκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

2. Mark 1.16-20

1Καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὁλάσσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἄδελφον Σίμωνος ἀμφὶβλήστρον ἐν τῇ ὁλάσσῃ· ἦσαν γαρ θείες. 2καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐπίσο μοι, καὶ ποιήσω θείες γενέσθαι θείες ἀνθρώποιν. 3καὶ εὐθείας αφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἱκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. 4καὶ προβὰς ἠλάκοβεβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰολάννη τὸν ἄδελφον καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα. 5καὶ εὐθείας ἐκάλεσαν αὐτούς, καὶ αφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαίου ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν ἔμπιθον ἐπίσο αὐτών.


1ἀκοίνων δὲ ἐν τῷ ποὺ ἄλος ἐπικείεθαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκοίνων τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ αὐτός ἦν ἄτος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην ἐν εννιάσαρετ· καὶ θόν δόθη ἁπλὰ αὕτη αὕτη παρὰ τὴν λίμνην. 2οὖθεν θείες αὐτοῖς ἐπίσο τοῦ πλοίου ἔμπιθον τὰ δίκτυα. 3μήκος ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, ἀκοίνων τῶν ἄλον, ἁπλῶς θεία καὶ ἑπάνω αὐτῶν ἀνθρώποιν καὶ ἀκοίνων τῶν λόγων τοῖς ἄλον. 4καὶ ἔπεα τῶν ἄλον παρασκεύασεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. 5καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλον ἀκοίνων καὶ αὐτῶν ἄριστα τὰ δίκτυα ἱκολούθησαν αὐτῶν.


1ἀποκριθῆς Σίμων ἐπιστρέφει· ἐπιστατα, διὰ ἡλικίας τοῖς κοιναῖς διὰ ἡλικίας τοῖς κοιναῖς διὰ ἡλικίας τοῖς κοιναῖς. 2καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες συνέκλεασαν πλήθος ἑξῆς πολὺς, διερρήσατο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. 3καὶ κατένευσαν τὸς μετόχος αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἄλομον πλοίῳ τοῦ ἅλκους τοῖς κοιναῖς διὰ τοῦ ποὺ ἡμᾶς κατενεῖσαν αὐτῶν. 4καὶ ἠλάκοβεν καὶ ἠλάκοβεν ἦλακοβον ἵππων ἅλκους, ἔφερεν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς χσῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ ποὺ ἦλακοβον ἄριστα τὰ δίκτυα. 5καὶ καταρτίζοντες τὰ δίκτυα ἱκολούθησαν.
II. THE POST-RESURRECTION FISHING EXPEDITION

1. John 21.1-8

1 Μετὰ ταύτα ἀφανέρωσεν πάλιν Θείης, τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβέτριδος· ἀφανέρωσεν δὲ οὗτος. 2 ἤσαν Αϊών Σίλων Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς Ηλεγόμενος Λάυσιμος καὶ Ναθαναήλ ἐξὸς Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ οἶκου Ζεβεδαίου καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. 3 λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίλων Πέτρος· ἐστάψατε ἐλευθερίαν. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἄρχομενα καὶ ζητεῖς σοι· ἁρμόζειν καὶ ἀνέβησας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἐν ἀκέλειν τὴν νυκτί ἀπάσας οὐδέν. 4 προὶς δὲ ἔδη γενομένης θότη ἤρην εἰς τὸν αἵμαλλον. οὐ μέντοι ἤθελενεν ἐμαυθῇν ὅτι ἤρην ἡμῖν. 5 λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς· Εἰ ἤρην· παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἥξετε; ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ· οὐ. 6 ἂδε ἠπνεῖν αὐτοῖς· βάλετε εἰς τὸ δεξία μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εἴπερθετε. βάλεκαν οὖν, καὶ ὀφείλεται αὐτὸ αὑλώνται ἤθελον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν ἠρῆν. 7 λέγει οὖν Ἕ ἐκ τῆς μαθητῆς ἀκέλειν δὲ ἠγαπα ἤρηες τοῦ Πέτρου· ἐκυρίῳς ἡμῖν. Σίλων οὖν Πέτρος ἀκούσας ὅτι ἐκύριος ἦσιν τὸν ἐπενδυτὴν διεζόσατο, ἤ ποι γυμνὸς, καὶ ἄβαλεν ἄκαμον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. 8 οὐδὲ αὐτοί μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοίῳ ἠμέλησαν, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν ἀκρίνες ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἀπὸ πηχάδος διακοσίων, σφόντες τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἠρῆν.

See John 21.9-14 in Section VII below.

III. THE COIN IN THE FISH AS A PAYMENT TO THE TAX COLLECTORS

1. Matthew 17.24-27

24 Ἐξόθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Καφαρναούμ οὐδέραξα αὐτοῖς τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ εἶπαν· ἐδιδάσκαλος ἦν ὦ τελειταί διάδραμα; 25 λέγει· ναί. καὶ ἠλθόντα εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν προσέφησαν αὐτὸν ἐλθουσιν ἠιόν· τι σοὶ δοκεῖ; Σίλων· οὔδεξίσεις τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τίνος λαμβάνοντι τέλη φήμης; ἀπὸ τῶν νυκτὸς αὐτῶν φήμα τῶν ἄλλοτρίων; 26 εὐθύντως δὲ· ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων. ἢν αὐτῷ ἡ ἤρησιν; ἢν γαῖα ἔλευθεροι εἰσὶν οὐδέρι. 27 ἦν δὲ μὴ σκαυνᾶλασσεμεν πορευθεῖς εἰς θάλασσαν βάλε δίκτυον καὶ τὸν ἁναβάντα προτὸν ἤθελον ἄθροι· καὶ ἀναλεξάς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰρήσεις στατήρα· ἀκέλειν λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς ἂντι ἴμην καὶ σοι.
IV. THE PARABLE OF THE NET

1. Matthew 13.47-50

47 Πάλιν ἤματι ὁ άτιν ψευδελία τῶν ὀφανθῶν σαγήνη βλαβεῖσθαι ὡς τὴν
ὔλισσαν καὶ Ἰκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγωγή. 48 ἐν ὦτη ἐπερικύρη
ἀναβαλάντες ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγαλμαν καὶ καθόπαντες συνέλεξαν τὰ καλά ἐκ ἧνη,
σαρπα Ἡ ἧμαλ. 49 οὕτως ἔσται ὃ ἐν τῇ συντελεῖται ἰδίας; ἐξελέπων τοὺς
ἡγελούν καὶ φορμοῦσιν τοὺς πονηροὺς ἶκ μέσον τῶν δικαίων 50 καὶ βαλοῦσιν
ἄτους ἐκ τῆς κάμινοντος πυρῶς ᾧ ἔσται κλαυθοῦμαι καὶ ἔβρυγμος ἰδόντων.

V. THE MULTIPLICATION OF LOAVES AND FISH

1. Matthew 14.13-21

13 ἀκούσας δὲ Ἐθναζε ανεχάνθην ἀκεθεῖ ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἡμῖν τόπον κατὰ ἱδιαν
καὶ ἀκούσαντες ὠθηλοῦ ἱκολοῦνθαν αὐτῷ πιπεῖ ὀπῳ τῶν πόλεων. 14 καὶ ἐξελθὼν
εἶδεν πολὺν ἁλον καὶ ἀπελαγιάσθη εἰς αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπερέσευσεν τῶν ἀρρόσθενι
αὐτῶν. 15 ὡθις ἡ γενομένη προσπῆλαν αὐτῷ ἐξαίθηται λέγοντας ἡμῖν ἐρν ἔτος
καὶ ἱερὰ ἐπὶ παραθέεν ἀπόλουσαν εἰς τᾶς κόμας ἁγοράσσουσιν ἄνωτας
βρόματα. 16 ἐδε ἔπειν αὐτοὺς οὐ χρείαν ἦμοις ἀπέθελι, ὡς ἄτους φαγεῖν.
17 ὁ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτοῖς οὐχ ἔχομεν ὅτε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἐθνα. 18 ὃ
de ἐκεῖνος πέρετέ μοι ὅτε ἄτους. 19 καὶ κελέσας τοὺς ἁλοὺ ἰνακλινθήκατε ἐπὶ τῷ
χόρτῳ, λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἐθνα ἐναλλάξας εἰς τὸν ὀφαλον
εὐλόγησεν, καὶ κλάσας ἐδοκεῖ τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῖς ἄρτους σᾶς μαθήτα τοῖς
ἄλοιποι πάντες ἐμερστήθησαν, καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεύον τῶν
κλαμιμάτων ὀδοίκα κορίνους πλήρεις. 21 ἄνδρας ἐφεσε πεντεκαλβίοιο χωρίς
γνακίκον καὶ παίδιλον.

2. Mark 6.32-44

32 καὶ ἀπήλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἡμῖν τόπον κατὰ ἱδιαν. 33 καὶ εἶδον ἄτους
πέρετας καὶ ἀπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῆ ὀπὸ πανδὸν τῶν πόλεων συνεδριαμὸν ἀκε
προσῆλαν αὐτοὺς. 34 καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ἁλον καὶ ἀπελαγιάσθη ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς,
ὅτι ἦν ἐπὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἱχνα πομένα καὶ ἤρατο διδάσκασιν ἄτους πολλά. 35 καὶ
ἡ ἐρα πολλῆς γενομένης προσελάντες αὐτῷ ἐξελάθησαν ἐκ τῶν ἄτου εὐλόγησεν, καὶ κλάσας ἐδοκεῖ τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῖς ἄρτους σᾶς μαθήτα τοῖς
ἄλοιποι πάντες ἐμερστήθησαν, καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεύον τῶν
κλαμιμάτων ὀδοίκα κορίνους πλήρεις. 21 ἄνδρας ἐφεσε πεντεκαλβίοιο χωρίς
γνακίκον καὶ παίδιλον.

-1-
tithēin aitōs, kai toús dòu ἰθάνας ἁμέριζέν πάσιν. kai ἔραγον πάντες kai ἀχορτάζοντας. 43 kai ἤραν κλάσματα δόδεκα κορίτιν ἀπλώσατα kai ἀπό τῶν ἰθάνων. 44 kai ἦσαν oἰθραγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους pεντακαίσχλιοι ἄνδρες.

10b... Kαὶ παραλαμβάνων αὐτοὺς ἠπεχόρησεν κατ’ ἰδίαν εἰς τὸν ἱλικτὸν ἔθνος. 11 οἴκοθεν ἱκλοῦν ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ἐκ νεοεξελομένων αὐτοῖς ἀλλαγεὶς αὐτοὺς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς χρῄζαν ἔσχοντας βρατασίας ἦτο. 12 ἔνθα ἡ μείρα ἄρετα κλῖνεις προσελθόντες δὲ ὀδοιποδοκές ἔθαν αὐτῷ ἀπλόντον τὸν ἥλιον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλως κόρμας καὶ ἄργους καταλαβόσον καὶ κυριοφονεῖν ἀποτιμιῶν, ὅτε οὐ ἐν ἄρημο τοῦ ἀχμήν. 13 εἶπον δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς ὅταν αὐτοὶ τῆς ἐφεξῆς φάτε. ἦθεν ἐκάνειν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἤμιδεν θερτοὶ πέντε καὶ ἱππάς ὑδάς εἰς πάντα τὸν ἱλικτὸν βρατασία. 14 ἠπείρον ἄρτους πεντακαίσχλιοι. εἶπον δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθήτας αὐτοῦ κατακλίνατε αὗτοις κλίσας [ἀσεῖ] ἀναπνέσον τοὺς ἀρτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασαν καὶ ὀδόντος τὸς μαθηταῖς παραπεσεῖται τὸ ἥλιον. 15 καὶ ἔραγον καὶ ἀχορτάζοντας πάντες. καὶ ἦρθη τὸ περισσεύοντας στὸ κλασμάτω πόρνων πόδεα.

4. John 6.1-15
1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπήλθεν Ἐλληνος πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλατίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος. 2 ἡκολούθησε δὲ αὐτῷ ὄρος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐθερέων τὰ συμμιστὰ ἔποιε ἐπὶ τῶν αἵτων ὑπονοον. 3 ἀνήλθεν δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἔλατο κάθιντα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. 4 ἦν δὲ ἡμέρα τὸ πάσχα. 5 Εὐαγγέλη τοῦ Ιωάννου. 6 ἢπάρας οὖν τοὺς ἄθρωπας Ὁσίους καὶ ἀναδόθησεν ὅτι πολὺς ἄθρως ἐκτείνεται πρὸς αὐτοῦ λέγει πρὸς Φιλίππου: 7 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ἦν δὲ Φιλίππου. ἄνασαν ἄνθρωποι ἅρτοι οὐκ ἔκοψαν αὐτοὺς ἦν ἕκαστος βραχυ [τῇ] λαβόν. 8 λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Ἀνάδειξο τούς ἰδιότητος Σίμωνος Πέτρου. 9 ἤς τοις παιδαρίον δόθη ἢς ἤς πέντε ἄρτους κριθήνου καὶ ὅποιοι ἄθρωμα ἄλατα ταῦτα τῇ ἐκ τοις οὕτως. 10 εἶπον Ἐλληνος: ποιήσατε τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ἀναπετέμεστε. 11 ἦν δὲ χρότος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. ἀνέσεσαν οὖν οἰκόνυδες τὸν ἁρίτημον ἐκ πεντακαίσχλιοι. 12 ἤπαθεν οὖν τοὺς ἄθρωπους Ἐλληνος καὶ ἀναστήσατας διδόκειν τοὺς ἀνελήμπτους ἐφοίνικας καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὕφρων ὥσα ἠθέλον. 13 ἦν δὲ ἀνεπλήρεσαν λέγει τοὺς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ: ἀναφέρατε τα περισσεύοντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μὴ τῇ ἐπολύνηται. 14 ἤγγισαν οὖν καὶ ἀνέδεικνυτε δόδεκα κορίτας κλαματισμοῦ τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθὴν ἐπερήσασαν τοὺς λαβοῦντας. 15 ἔθαν άθρωοι ἐπολύνον ἄρτος ἀνθροὶ ἐφορμήθης ἐφαρμογός ἐκ τῶν κόρμων. ἐστιν ὅτι ἔχουσιν ὅτι μέλλουσα ἄρχεσθαί καὶ ἐπαύσαν μαθητοὺς ἔκ τῶν κόρμων. ἔνθα ἦσαν oἰθραγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους πεντακαίσχλιοι ἄνδρες.
VI. THE OTHER MULTIPLICATION OF LOAVES AND FISH

1. Matthew 15.32-38

32 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔπεη: σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θλοῦν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἔφη: μετὰ προσκέπασάς μοι καὶ ὁκ ἦσαν τὸ φάγοντι· καὶ ἀπόλυσα αὐτοὺς ὑποτευχήσας αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τὸν θλοῦν, μὴ ἔξασθεν ἐν τῷ θρόω. 33 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτὸς ἐξαρπάζονται: πόθεν ἤμεν ἐν ἐρμίᾳ θρότοι τοφοῦτοι ὡστε σωτάσαι θλοῦν τοσοῦτον. 34 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: πόσως θρότους ἔστε; οὐδὲ εἴπαν· ἐστα καὶ ὅλη γῆ θάνται. 35 καὶ παραγέεσα τῷ θρόῳ ἀναπεσεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· ἐλαβέν τοὺς ἦρτος καὶ τοὺς ἔθθας καὶ ἑσχαρισθήσεσα θλασαν καὶ ἄδιδαν τοὺς μαθητὰς, οἶδε μαθητάς τοῖς θλοῖς. 36 καὶ θράγγον πάντες καὶ ξορτάσθησαν. καὶ τὸ περισσεύον τὸν κλασμάτων ἦραν ἐστα σπουδᾶς πλῆρεις. 37 οἶ δὲ ἐσθίοντε ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χαρίς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

2. Mark 8.1-9

ἰ ἐν ἑκάστας ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦς θλοῦν ἤθος καὶ μή ἐχόντων τὸ φάγοντι, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς: σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θλοῦν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἔφη: μετὰ προσκέπασάς μοι καὶ ὁκ ἦσαν τὸ φάγοντι· καὶ ἀπόλυσα αὐτοὺς ὑποτευχήσας αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τὸν θλοῦν, μὴ ἔξασθεν ἐν τῷ θρόω. 2 καὶ ἀπεκδήμησαν αὐτῷ ἐξαρπάζονται ὡστε σωτάσαι θλοῦν τοσοῦτον· καὶ ὁκ ἦσαν ἄδιδαν τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῖς θλοῖς. 3 καὶ θράγγον πάντες καὶ ξορτάσθησαν. καὶ τὸ περισσεύον τὸν κλασμάτων ἦραν ἐστα σπουδᾶς πλῆρεις. 4 οἶ δὲ ἠσθίοντε ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χαρίς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

VII. THE POST-RESURRECTION FISH MEAL


41 ὅτι δὲ ἀποτελόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ τιμῶντων ἔπεαν αὐτῶν: ἔστε τῷ βρωδείμων ἀνύδοτος; 42 οἶ δὲ ἔδοκεν αὐτῷ ἔθθος ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους (with this addendum in some texts: καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίους τηροῦν)· 43 καὶ λαβὼν ἀνύδον αὐτῶν θράγγον.
2. John 21.9-14

9 ἐὰς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην καὶ ψάριον ἐπικελμένον καὶ ἄρτον. 10 λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἶχησοι· ἀνέγκατε ἀπὸ τοῦ ψάριον ἄν ἀπιστεύτε νῦν. 11 ἀπεβή οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸ δίκτυον εἰς τὴν γῆν μεστὰν ὕδωρ μεγάλον ἔκατον πεντήκοντα τριώδον· καὶ τοσοῦτον ἦπειρον οὐκ ἔστρεψε τὸ κίτρον. 12 λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἶχησοι· δέχετε ἄριστησατε. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπέλθει τοῦ μαθητῶν ἄξιον αὐτὸν· σὺ τίς εἶς εἴδοτες ὅτι ἐξουρος ἄστιν. 13 ἐρχεται θησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδων αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ψάριον ἔμισθος. 14 τοῦτο ἡ ἀκρίβεια τῆς ἀποκάλυψεν τοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐπερείπε τὸν νεκρόν.

VIII. FISH, EGG, AND SERPENT

1. Luke 11.11-12

11 Ἰδε, δεν ἦς ξιώδος τὸν πατέρα αὐτήσει ἔναν ἔχθον, καὶ ἀντὶ ἔχθος ἂν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει; 12 ᾨδε, αὐτήσει φόν, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίλον.

IX. DIFFERENT KINDS OF FLESH

1. 1 Corinthians 15.39

Οὕ πάντα σάρξ ἐκατερ χρήματα σάρξ ἄλλα θηλύ, μέν αὐθρόπων, θηλύ δὲ σάρξ κτήνων, θηλύ δὲ σάρξ πτηνών, θηλύ δὲ ἔχθον.

X. THE CREATION OF WATER CREATURES

1. Genesis 1.20-21

20 Ἐπει δὲ δὲ ἔθεος ἔξαγαγεν τὰ ὕδατα τὰς πάντας ψωμίδων ἐκονίσων . . . 21 καὶ ἐποίησεν ἔθεος τὰ θήρια τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος καὶ τὰ κτήνη κατὰ γένος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔπτετα τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν. καὶ εἶδεν ἔθεος ὅτι καλὰ.
XI. THE CREATION OF WATER

1. Genesis 1.9-10

καὶ ἐπέσεν Θεός Συνανήθη ὁ θάλασσας τῷ ἐστιν τῷ ὅφρανον ἐκς συνανθείην μὲν, καὶ ὅφραν θέηρα, καὶ ἐγένετο οὐτός, καὶ συνήθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐστιν τῷ ὅφρανον ἐκς τῷ Θεοῦ τοῦ τῷ ἐστιν. καὶ θάλασσα, καὶ ἐκέλεσσεν Θεός τὴν ἐγένετον τῆς καὶ τὰ συνηθεία τῶν ἔδωκεν ἐκέλεσσεν θαλάσσας, καὶ εἶδεν Θεός ὅτι καλὸν.

XII. THE CREATURES OF THE SEA

1. Psalm 103.25

αὕτη τὰ ἐγενέσθαι μεγάλη καὶ εὐφύχωρος, ἀκεφαλεῖα, ἄν ὁ οὐκ ἦσαν ἁριθμός, ζῶα μικρὰ μετὰ μεγάλων.

XIII. THE PROHIBITION OF FISH WITHOUT SCALES AND FINS

1. Leviticus 11.9-11

καὶ τὰ ἄγα, ἐφάγεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὅφραν τῇ ἐλασίν, πάντης, ὅσα ἄστιν αὐτοῖς πτερυγία καὶ λεπίδες ἐκ τοῦ ὅφραν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θαλάσσας καὶ ἐκ τοῦ χειμάρρους, τῶν πάντων. θάλασσας, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ χειμάρρους, ἀπὸ πάντων. ὁ ἐφάγεσθαι τὰ θάλασσας, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων πσατῆς ἀρκεῖς τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ δεδομένα ἀστίν: 11 καὶ βδελύγματα δεδομένα δεδομένα ἀστίν ποταμοῦ βδελύγματα δεδομένα ἀστίν. 12 καὶ πάντα, θάλασσας, ἀπὸ πάντων ποταμοῦ βδελύγματα δεδομένα ποταμοῦ: δεδομένα ποταμοῦ δεδομένα ποταμοῦ δεδομένα ποταμοῦ.

XIV. FISH COMPARED TO HUMAN BEINGS

1. Habakuk 1.14:

καὶ ποὸς σοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἡ ἀγάλης τῆς ἡ χώθης τῆς θαλάσσης
XV. FISH FOR HEALING

1a. Tobit 6.1-9

1. Ἐδεί πορευόμενοι τήν ἡλθον ἐφέρας ἀπὶ τοῦ τήριν ποταμοῦ καὶ ἠμέλλοντο ἁκεῖς. 2. τὸ δὲ παιδάριον κατέβη περικλώσασθαι, καὶ ἀνεπήδησαν ἅθις ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ καταπελθεῖ τὸ παιδάριον. Ἐδεί ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῶι Ἐπαλμόν τοῦ ἥθους, καὶ ἀπέκτισαν τὸν ἥθους τὸ παιδάριον καὶ ἀνάβαλεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. 3. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῶι Ἐξέγγειλος Ἀνάτεμε τον ἥθυν καὶ λαβὼν τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὸ ἱππαρ καὶ τὴν χολὴν θεὶς ἀφαλότος. 4. καὶ ἔποιησεν τὸ παιδάριον ἀεὶ εἶπεν αὐτόι Ἐξέγγειλος, τὸν δὲ ἥθυν ἀπήγαγεν ἄφραγον. —— 5. καὶ ὦδειν αὐτῶι ἄσφαλέοι. ἔσοι ἠγίσασαν ἄν ἑκβατάνοι. 6. καὶ εἶπεν τὸ παιδάριον τὸ ἄγγελῳ Ἱζερμα Ἰδέλφε, τι ἄντι τὸ ἱππαρ καὶ ἱκαρδία καὶ ἤχωλ τοῦ ἥθους; 7. καὶ ἐπέβαλεν αὐτῶι Ἱκαρδία καὶ τὸ ἱππαρ, ἄν τινα ἄληθη. 8. Ἐδεί χολή, ἔχειται ἄνθρωποι. ἐκεῖ λευκόματα ἀν τοῖς ἄθαλμοι καὶ ἐκαθήσεται.

1b. Tobit 7.17

17. καὶ ἄν εἴσεληθες εἰς τὸν γυμνόνα, λήμψῃ τέφραν θυμιμάτων καὶ ἐπιθησίες ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας καὶ τοῦ ἱππαρτοῦ τοῦ ἥθους καὶ κατεύθυνε, καὶ ἀφασινθήσεται τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ φευξεται καὶ σφίξεται τον αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.

1c. Tobit 8.2-3

1. Ἐδεί πορευόμενοι ἄνεισθης τῶν λόγων Ραφαήλ καὶ ἡλαβην τὴν τέφραν τῶν θυμιμάτων καὶ ἐπέκτισαν τῇ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἥθους καὶ τοῦ ἱππαρ καὶ ἤκατεν. 2. ὥστε ἀφασίνηθη τὸ δαιμόνιον τῆς σοφίης, ἔφυγεν εἰς τὰ ἀνδρατα Λαγώπτων . . .

1d. Tobit 11.8, 11.10-13

8. σοὶ οὖν ἂιρισθέντα τὴν χειλῆν εἰς τούς ἄθαλμοις αὐτοῖς; καὶ δηθείς διατρήσεις καὶ ἀποβαλεῖς τα λευκόματα καὶ ἔθεσες σε . . . 10. καὶ τοῦτο ἔθρεπτο πρὸς τὴν ἦλθαν καὶ προσέκοπτεν. Ἐδεί υἱός προσδοκαμέν αὐτός 11. καὶ ἀπελάβητο τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ προσέπασεν τὴν χειλῆν τῶν ὕθομα αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἄθαλμος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ λέγον Θάρσει, πάτερ. 12. ἐκεῖ δε συνεδρήσεται διετρήσεις τῶν ὕθομα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεησεν ἀπὸ τῶν κανθόν τῶν ὕθομα αὐτοῦ τα λευκόματα. 13. καὶ ἠδών τὸν ἡθον . . .

XVI. The Sacred River and Its Fish In the Messianic Age

1. Ezekiel 47.9-10

9. καὶ ἔστη πιάτα ψυχῆ τῶν ὦν τῶν τῶν ἠκέζωντον ἀπὶ πάντα. ἔγρα ἐν ἐπέλθη ἄκει ἀνταμόνος, ζήσεται καὶ ἔσται ἁκεῖς ἅθις πολὺς σφόνδυροι, ότι ἔσοι ἀκεῖς τὸ βότρο τούτο, καὶ ἄνασει καὶ ζήσεται. 10. ἐγρα ἐν ἐπέλθη ἐποταμός ἁκεῖς ζήσεται. καὶ στήσονται ἁκεῖς ἄντι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀντί πάντων. ἐγρα ἐν ἐπέλθη ἐποτάμως ἁκεῖς ζήσεται. . .
The Avercius inscription is probably the most significant piece of evidence relevant to the interpretation of early Christian fish symbolism. In order to understand that symbolism, it is necessary to investigate a number of matters that are not immediately related to the interpretation of the fish. These matters provide an overall context, outside of which the use of fish as symbols makes no sense. This is especially the case in the Avercius inscription, which (as I argue in Chapter 3) is a rather carefully structured document where words and phrases are all interrelated. In order to avoid cluttering the discussion of fish symbolism and losing the thread of the argument (a great danger, since the Avercius inscription is so complex), I have therefore placed a number of issues in this appendix.

I. THE DISCOVERY AND HISTORY OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

For a long time, scholars were familiar with the *vita* of a certain bishop of Hierapolis, Avercius,\(^1\) who was reknowned for his miracles and for his travels throughout the Mediterranean area, especially Rome, Syria and Mesopotamia. So highly respected was he that, according to some manuscripts of the *vita*, in Syria and Mesopotamia, he was dubbed “equal to the apostle (i.e. Paul)” (\(\text{καὶ κατά παπποστόλοις}\))\(^2\) and it would seem that his *vita* portrayed him, both in regard to his miraculous actions and to his travels, as one who imitated Paul.\(^3\) For his most significant action, he exorcised

---

\(^{1}\) There are three titles in Greek. I offer the versions given by T. Nissen (*S. Abercii Vita*): 1) *Bίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἀν αὴρος πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ καταποστόλου Ἁβερκίου = Life and Citizenship of Avercius, Our Father Among the Saints and Equal to the Apostle* (MS Parisinus 1540; MS Hier. Sabeus 27; and MS Mosquensis 379); 2) *Μετάφρασις εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἀν αὴρος πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἁβερκίου = Summary of the Life and Wonders of our Father Avercius Among the Saints* (MS Coisilianus 110); 3) *Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἀν αὴρος πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἁβερκίου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄριστον ἀρχαίων = Life and Citizenship of our Bishop of Hierapolis, Avercius, Among the Saints* (Simeon Metaphrastes). On the manuscript tradition, see n. 27 below.


\(^{3}\) The mention of Paul in the inscription and the description of his travels throughout the Mediterranean offer further confirmation of this. See pp. 342-47 above for the relation between travel and fish symbolism.
the terrible demon that afflicted the daughter (Lucilla) of the emperor Marcus Aurelius and the empress Faustina (presumably in 163 C.E.). As punishment for the demon, he required him to carry a stone altar from the hippodrome in Rome back to Hierapolis. It is, on this altar, the vita explains, that he commissions the inscribing of his funerary inscription.

Since many scholars regarded the vita as a compendium of miracle stories and as factually erroneous in several instances (such as the earthquake in Smyrna), they not only considered the vita to be of virtually no historical value, but they also thought that the inscription was an imaginary invention of the author. In contrast, others, especially William Ramsay, regarded the reference to the monument and text of the inscription, as well as select parts of the vita, as worthy of serious historical consideration.

Prior to Ramsay, all commentators had considered the city of Hierapolis mentioned in the vita to be the well-known city in the Lycus Valley on the Meander River in what became known in late antiquity (after Diocletian) as the province of Phrygia Pactiana—a designation which seemed to cast further doubt on the historicity of the vita, since the bishop Apollinaris held his office at the same time that Abercius was supposed to have lived (in 171 C.E.), the era of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, (161-180 C.E.) and have travelled considerably after his visit to Rome (in 163 C.E.). Yet, basing himself on the reference in the vita to Small Phrygia, as well as on the description of the travel routes of the imperial messengers discussed in the vita—routes which made no sense for a journey to Hierapolis on the Meander—Ramsay suggested that it was not the Meander Hierapolis that was intended, but rather the much less well-known and very remote city of Hieropolis, located in the immediate vicinity of two other cities, Brouzos and Otrous, in what became known in late antiquity as the province of Phrygia Salutaris in the valley of Sandukli. The major metropolis of this region was Synnada, far to the northeast of the other area of Phrygia whose major metropolis was

4. For very sketchy summaries of scholarship prior to Ramsay, see L. Duchesne, “L’épitaphe d’Abercius,” 159-60. For the most comprehensive summary of the vita, see H. Thurston, 340-44.

5. See all the citations under “Ramsay, W.” in my Bibliography, but especially “The Tale of St. Abercius.”


7. On the division of Phrygia into two provinces, see n. 25 below. On the origins, etymology, and interchangeability of the names Hierapolis and Hieropolis (for any city with these Greek names), most fundamental is W. Ramsay, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia 2:680-82. Hieropolis seems to have been the older name and was based on the centrality of the hieron (ἱερόν, “temple sanctuary”) in Asia, as opposed to Hierapolis, which reflects the Greek idea of the centrality of the city (thus the use of the adjectival form ἱερός, which modifies πόλις).
As an indication that the vita was historically accurate in some other regards, Ramsay learned that the hot springs mentioned in it are indeed still present on the Hamam-Su River in the valley of Sandukli. 8

In 1882, in his exploration of the valley of Sandukli, Ramsay discovered a stone column in front of the mosque at Kelendres with a funerary inscription in dactylic hexameters of a certain Alexander, the son of Antoninus (now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum). 9

As a citizen of a select city, I have commissioned this (monument) while living in order that I might have here a public place for my body.

My name is Alexander, son of Antoninus, the disciple of a holy shepherd.

This was written in the sixth month of the year 300 (216 C.E.). 10

Peace to those who pass by and remember me. 11

---

8. As one can see in n. 42 in Chapter 3, the presence of hot springs proves important for the interpretation of fish symbolism in the Avercius inscription. For another attempt to rehabilitate the historicity of the vita, see H. Thurston (“The Story of St. Avercius,” 348-50), who, among other things, argues that the earthquake in Smyrna, which is referred to in the vita, may not refer to the famous earthquake of 173 C.E., but rather to a smaller earthquake in 152 C.E.

9. For a photograph, see A. Ferrua, “Nuove osservazioni,” 285, fig. 2.

10. That is, as calculated from the date of the Roman conquest of Phrygia by Sulla in 84 B.C.E.

11. For a sketch of this inscription, see that reproduced from Ramsay,
Since, as far as I know, there are no extant pagan peace salutations to passers-by (while there are several early Christian epigraphic examples of such peace salutations) and since the use of the word “peace” (εἰρήνη) on inscriptions was distinctively Christian (or Jewish) in antiquity, the reference to peace in this inscription makes it most probable that it was Christian. In addition, the reference to a disciple of a shepherd suggests a Christian context more easily than a pagan one.

Upon examination of the text of the Avercius inscription in Text # I.1 in Appendix 1, the first six verses of this inscription, with the exception of some minor differences (especially the reference to Alexander instead of Avercius), repeats verses one to three and verses twenty to twenty-two of the inscription of Avercius. This repetition suggested to Ramsay that the inscription of Avercius served as an epigraphic model in the Sandukli area. Following the description of the location of the Avercius inscription as having been near the hot springs at the outskirts of the city—which makes no sense for the Meander Hierapolis, whose hot springs were situated in the center of the city—he found in the entrance of the men’s bathroom at the outskirts of Hieropolis two fragments of a marble bōmos (βόμος = “altar”) with part of the inscription inscribed on them (now in the Sezione Lapidaria of the Museo Pio Cristiano in the Vatican Museums).

Confirming the description of the vita, the remains of the epigraphic monument suggest that the text of the inscription was inscribed on a nearly square stone monument in the form of a bōmos, as was common for Phrygian funerary monuments. As some have pointed out, its lettering

---

Cities and Bishoprics 2:721 (1897).

12. See my discussion of the Pectorius inscription in pp. 371-88 above for an especially important use of peace.

13. See Appendix 3.7 below for further discussion of this point.

14. "... καὶ λίθον τινὰ τετράγωνον, μήκος τε καὶ πλάτος θὸν, τάφον ἔκτικτον κατασκευάζει καὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῷ λίθῳ ἀφιεται τοῦ τῶν δέτι ἀπογραμμα αὐτῷ ἀγγαράξας.” [“... And he prepared for himself a tomb, a square stone of equal length and width, and he set up an altar on the tomb for carving his inscription on it.”]: Simeon Metaphrastes in Nissen ed. 121:25. Or ”... καὶ τα—σκεύος—α—σεν ἔκτικτος τύμβων ἱσοτετράγωνον καὶ τὸν βωμὸν, ὅν κατα πρόσ—τας—αν αὐτοῦ ᾦς—γεν ἁδαιμόν υπὸ τῆς Θόμης, ἡτοι—σεν ἀπάνω τῷ τύμβῳ ἀγγαράξας εἰς αὐτὸν θεόπνευστον ἑκ—γραμμα... [“... he set up for himself a completely square tomb and the altar, which the demon carried from Rome at his (Avercius’) command. He placed it above the tomb and carved a divinely inspired inscription on it ...”]: various mss. in Nissen ed. 53:2-5. For exact measurements and confirmation of its nearly
is irregular and off-line——also a common characteristic of Greek funerary inscriptions from Phrygia, and (therefore) not necessarily indicative of a late date. The original layout of the inscription is not certain, and many have proposed a variety of schemes, making use of the three lateral sides of the cube. Yet, based on the layout of the Alexander inscription, it seems most probable that the entire text of the inscription was inscribed on one side, what one might call for the sake of convenience the south side. On the east side, a stonemason inscribed a garland—an image found frequently found on epigraphic monuments throughout the Mediterranean area.

---

square form, see A. Ferrua, “Nuove osservazioni,” 287-89.


17. For a review of the various schemes, see A. Ferrua, “Nuove osservazioni,” 284-86. Of particular note is that of C. Robert (“Das Grab des Abercius”), since he argues for a two-stage inscribing of the epitaph on all four sides. Asserting that the lettering of the extant portion of the inscription was cramped, he proposed that verses 1-6 and 20-22 were written at an early date, and that verses 7-19 were inserted by Avercius at the end of his life (that is, after he had completed his travels). But Robert claims that there was not enough space for a neat inscription, and, thus, the cramped character of the lettering is explained by this. Yet, as Abel points out, this sort of lettering is typical of many Phrygian inscriptions: “Étude sur l’inscription d’Abercius,” 344-47.

18. For the view that only one side of the inscription was inscribed, see A. Ferrua, “Nuove osservazioni,” 284-86, as well as the sketch of the layout offered by W. Ramsay, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia 2:721.

19. On the general use of garlands in Graeco-Roman iconography, see especially M. Honroth, Stadtrömische Girlanden.
II. DATE OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

For the dating of the Avercius inscription, it is of greatest importance to evaluate its relationship to the Alexander inscription. Most definitive for the priority of the Avercius inscription is the irregular scansion of v. 3 of the Alexander inscription (with an extra half-foot), which is most readily explained as the insertion of ΄Αλέξανδρος ᄄΑντονίου, whereas the scansion of line three of the Avercius inscription works. This suggests that, when copying the Avercius inscription, Alexander had his own name inserted, but could not make the scansion right. Furthermore, the frequent angular forms of the “sigma” and “epsilon” in the Avercius inscription, as opposed to the more commonly lunate forms of the same letters in the Alexander inscription suggest (although admittedly without absolute certainty) that the Avercius inscription was older. 20

It is most likely, therefore, that the Avercius inscription antedated 216 C.E. (the date of the Alexander inscription). Further specification of the date is more uncertain, although one clue provides some aid. In his Ecclesiastical History (5.16.1-5), Eusebius quotes part of an anti-Montanist treatise by an anonymous author, who mentions that it is addressed to a certain Avircius Marcellus (Ἅρκιος Μάρκελλος). In so doing, the author also refers to “our fellow presbyter, Zoticus of Otrosis” (τοῦ μητροπολίτου Ζωτίκου τοῦ Ὄτρωνος)—that is, a fellow presbyter of the author and of Avircius. Since Hierapolis and Otrosis are located so closely to one another in a remote area of Phrygia, it is probable that the man named Avircius Marcellus is none other than the Avercius of Hierapolis mentioned in the Avercius inscription. 21

---

20. For this view of the paleography, see G. B. de Rossi, ICUR 1:XVIII; and T. Zahn, “Avircius Marcellus von Hieropolis,” 67, n. 1.
21. While some interpreters reject this on account of the different spellings of the names (see especially A. Ferrua, “Nuove osservazioni,” pp. 282-283; and W. Wischmeyer, “Die Aberkiosinschrift,” pp. 26-27), such a discrepancy can be explained. As Wischmeyer points out, both of these spellings (as well as variants of them) are to be found in inscriptions throughout the Mediterranean. The spelling Ἄφρο-κιος (= Avercius) is a Latinized/Romanized version of the more original Ἀβρό-κιος (= Avercius), which is closer to its Phrygian roots in Asia Minor. Since Avercius lived primarily in the second half of the second century C.E. and Eusebius lived in the fourth century C.E., it is, in my opinion, very possible that Eusebius, at a time when a great number of indigenous names were Latinized, simply was more familiar with the Latinized version of the name. It is not surprising that the spelling of Ἀβρό-κίος is found in an inscription from the hinterlands of Phrygia, where Latin/Roman onomastic influences may have had less of an effect.
addition, the name Avercius is not common, and the existence of two mentions of a person named Avercius and Avircius, probably from the same geographical area, suggests likely identification.\footnote{Because of a statement in Eusebius (EH 5.16.19), it would seem most likely that Avercius received this treatise in 192/93 C.E.\footnote{Thus, I would conclude that the inscription should probably be dated somewhere between 192/93 and c. 212 C.E.}}

III. FORMAT OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

The text of the inscription is based on three different groups of sources: the two fragments of the inscription, the Alexander inscription, and the version of the inscription given in the \textit{vita} of Avercius, the original source of which is to be dated to the late fourth or early fifth century C.E.\footnote{Other interpreters reject the identification of Avercius with Aviricius Marcellus, because they see the inscription as pagan. For a discussion of this problem see Section 3.6 below.}

22. It is also possible that there could be a familial relation between the two different Avercius’, but the prominence of both of them in the Christian community (see pp. 351-55 above for the high status of Avercius as indicated by the inscription) suggests they are the same person.

23. EH 5.16.19: "\begin{quote}
πλέον γὰρ ὁ ἱστορικὸς \πάντη εἰς ταύτην τὴν ἔμεραν ἔσθε εὐεργετήκην ἔργα, καὶ οὕτως ἐργάζόμενος ἐσθε καὶ θο-λ-ικὸς κόσμῳ γέγονεν πόλις-σωμα, ἄλλα καὶ Χριστο-τι-νον ήσεν καὶ Μολον εἰρήνη διαμονος ἐξ ἑλλοι Θεοιν ["For it is more than thirteen years ago today that this woman (the Montanist Maximilla) passed away, and there has been in this world neither local nor universal war, but rather, out of the pity of God, continual peace for Christians."]\end{quote} Different interpreters take different views in regard to what interval of time these thirteen years referred, but it seems most likely to have been the reign of Commodus (180-192 C.E.), since this period was relatively peaceful as far as Christians were concerned. On the other hand, the reign of Septimius Severus (193-211 C.E.), was, as some have suggested, not so peaceful as far as Christians were concerned (e.g. the edict against the Christians in 202, the martyrdoms in North Africa, etc.). On the Severan period and martyrdom, see W. H. C. Frend, \textit{Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church}, 302-46.

24. Since Avercius states that he commissioned the inscribing of the inscription while alive (ζωῆς, v.2)——apparently a frequent occurrence in Phrygia on pagan, Jewish, and Christian inscriptions from antiquity——the date of 212 C.E. at the end of the chronological range is suggested by the assumption that one should expect some reasonable interval of time to have elapsed between the commissioning of the monument and
That the inscription was split into two pieces at that time and that there were places where emendations had to be made, is suggested in an early tradition of the vita: “Thus, here one understands the text of the inscription, but time has removed a little of the precision and caused it to be understood faultily.”

This is further confirmed by the variations in the readings at the juncture where the marble stone broke—that is, at v. 12. On the other hand, the author of the vita would also seem to have had access to the entire inscription rather than solely to the fragments to which one now has access. Thus, the vita provides the textual evidence

Avercius’ actual death—which had to have been prior to 216 C.E.

25. Ramsay (“The Tale of Saint Abercius, 342-47) dates the vita somewhere between 363 and 385 C.E. on the following basis. The division of Phrygia into two provinces (Phrygia I and Phrygia II) by Diocletian seem to be reflected in the vita by the reference to Little Phrygia (Φρυγία Μικρό)——that is, as opposed to Great Phrygia. This would date it to no later than 297 C.E. On the other hand, the designation Phrygia Salutaris does not occur in the vita. Since this designation begins to appear at the end of the fourth century C.E., and since it does not occur here, a date prior to the end of the fourth century is suggested. One should also know that Phrygia Pactiana was governed by a consularis in 535 C.E., while the vita, on the other hand, refers to a praeses or πράεσεως, which, according to another source (Notit. dignit. orient I), governed Phrygia Pactiana in 405 C.E. Since the imperial messengers in the vita go first to Byzantium after their voyage from Brundisium, a date after 330 C.E. is likely, because prior to 330, voyages from Brundisium generally arrived at Ephesus. Clearly the vita was written after 330 C.E., when Constantinople was the capital of the eastern empire. Finally, the vita refers to the emperor Julian’s ascension of the corn dole, instituted by the empress Faustina, in thanks for the healing of her daughter (363 C.E.).

I am not so confident that the absence of a reference to Phrygia Salutaris dates it prior to the end of the fourth century C.E., since arguments ex silentio are notoriously difficult to make. I would prefer to give wider latitude and argue that the vita could have been written anywhere from 363 to 535 C.E. Duchesne (“L’épitaphe d’Abercius,” 155) prefers a fifth or sixth century C.E. date. One should also not forget that Ms. Parisinus 1540 of the vita mentions Phrygia Salutaris. Further investigation, however, needs to be done on this matter.

for critical words and passages which one would otherwise not possess. Finally, the process of reconstructing the text of the inscription is further complicated by the presence of at least six different traditions of the vita and a total of more than forty-two manuscripts.  

IV. TEXT-CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

Verse 2: The Mss. have θαρω or καιρόν, but φανέρως is attested by the Alexander inscription. It is not surprising that a Christian after Constantine and Theodosius would not have understood the need for public proclamation. The Mss. read

27. The standard critical edition of the vita of Avercius is that by T. Nissen, S. Abercii Vita (1912) with a discussion of the manuscript traditions. For another critical evaluation and summary of the manuscript traditions, see A. Abel, “Étude sur l’inscription d’Abercius” (1929): 326-333. Abel and Nissen suggest the following breakdown in chronological order (Greek Tradition = 1-4) 1) Thirty-seven manuscripts for the vita of Simeon Metaphrastes (also known as Logothetes, fl. c. 960 C.E.), the Latin translation (by Surius) of which may be found in PG 115:1211-48; 2) Ms. Coisilianus 110 (in Paris); 3) Ms. Hierosolymitanus Sabeus 27 and Mosquensis 379; 4) Ms. Parisinus 1540; 5) Russian version——a translation, evaluation, and commentary of which may be found in W. Lüdtke and T. Nissen, Die Grabsschrift des Aberkios, 1910; and 6) Armenian version. A translation of the Armenian version of the inscription may be found in F. C. Conybeare, “Harnack on the Inscription of Abercius,” 1895. Within these six different groups one might cite three basic families: 1) Simeon Metaphrastes; 2) Ms. Parisinus 1540, Ms. Hierus. Sabeus 27, Ms. Mosquensis 379, and the Russian version; and 3) MS Coisilianus 110. In general, the earliest manuscripts date to the tenth century C.E. and the latest to the fifteenth century C.E. Of course, most of them go back to ancient originals; see p. 759 and n. 25 in this appendix above for possible date of the vita. While I have not evaluated thoroughly the manuscript tradition of the entire vita, one provisional observation may be in order. At least in regard to the Avercius inscription, the Russian version does not seem to go back to as early an archetype as Nissen and Abel suggest. It constantly expands upon the text of the inscription and often offers clearly very late translations and interpretations.

28. For the text of the inscription, see Text # I.1 in Appendix 1. I only include important variations and points of reference.
ἀνθάδε, but this is a metrical error.

Verse 3: θεός is necessitated by metre, and the Mss. probably simply reversed the two words for syntactical reasons.

Verse 4: Another variant for θρεσί is oθρεσί.

Verse 5: Other Mss. read πάντα and/or καθαρσίδοντας. Because of this, Ramsay (1897) suggests κατὰ πάνθι
φιλοντας in order to restore the rhythm. But this is a much more radical alteration than my reading.

Verse 6: Various attempts have been made to fill the lacuna: e.g. Russian version = τα φόμης; Pitra (1855) = τα ζωῆς; Grégoire (1933) = φυλάξαι; Strathmann and Klauser (1950) = . . . ν ἀπαντὰ τα. 29

Verse 7: Ramsay says that he saw an “eta” after ΒΑΣΙΛ . . . , and thus he reads βασιλίαν (“king”), 30 but the close inspection of Calder and Ferrua suggest that the “eta” was never there. 31 The Mss. read ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΝΑΘΡΗΣΑΙ, where the first nine letters could be read as either βασιλείαν (“queen”) or βασιλείαν (“kingdom” or “capitol city”). The former makes no sense, because the mention of two queens is redundant, while the latter is confirmed in the Russian version. Wischmeyer proposes βασιλία (“capitol city”), 32 but I would prefer (as would most editors) to keep the reading of the Mss.

Verse 11: There are numerous conjectures for what follows ΣΥΝΟ, but that of W. M. Calder——συνομαίμος——


30. See Cities and Bishoprics 2:722-23 (1897).

31. W. M. Calder, “The Epitaph of Avircius Marcellus” and A. Ferrua, “Nuove Osservazioni.” In any case, the author of the vita seems to assume that the word “king” was not there, since the vita explains that the emperor was absent during the visit of Avercius to Rome.
seems most plausible, since it is based on other epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor. This evidence suggests that early Christians in Phrygia used συνομήνος in the sense of ἀδελφοί (“brothers”). The MSS. have συνομηνήρος (“congregants”), but this is not an attested Greek word. Some other conjectures are: συνομηθής (“companions”) = Ramsay; συνομήθης (“friends”) = Ramsay; and συνομήλεος (“associates”) = Lightfoot.

Verse 12: This line marks the break in the stone, but Παφλοῦ, though difficult to read, is decipherable. ἀπί θυρών (“in a carriage”) is the conjecture of Hirschfeld and later supported by Wehofer, and followed by most authors since that time. The MSS. read θυρόθεν, but the “omicron” of θυρών is clearly decipherable on the stone. Ramsay’s proposal of ἄπομην (“I follow”) as a contrast to προῆγε (“leads”) is certainly a valid alternative.

The attempt of Dietrich to read a “nu” and an “êta” (with the resultant word νηστις, “fasting”) instead of a “πι” and a “ιοτα” at the beginning of . . . ΣΤΙΣ is based on his own attempt to interpret the inscription as pagan. But his reading is contradicted by close observation of the letters, which are in fact clearly a “πι” and a “ιοτα.” Thus, the word is almost certainly


33. ”The Epitaph of Avircius Marcellus,” 2-4.

34. The text as given in “Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia,” 427; and in The Academy.

35. Cities and Bishoprics 2:727.


37. Respectively “Zu der Aberkiosinschrift”; and “Philologische Bemerkungen,” 61.

38. Cities and Bishoprics 2:727 (1897).
Πιστις, as all the Mss. themselves attest. For the same reasons, the attempt of Hirschfeld to read Πιστις instead of Πιστις is incorrect.40

Verse 15: All the Mss., except Parisinus 1540, incorrectly read δοκε, evidently because they did not concern themselves with metrical issues.

The Armenian version adds the surprising gloss “as a symbol.” While this was clearly not in the inscription, it suggests that the transcriber was at least interpreting in the right direction, as my own interpretation of the use of the fish as a symbol suggests.

Verses 15-  The grammatical subject of these verses has vexed scholars ever since the discovery of the inscription. Most have opted for πιστις, but there is no syntactical reason why it could not also be παρθένος κυρία. It is very possible that the ambiguity is intentional and that both faith and the holy virgin are in some sense seen as providing the meal.

Verse 19: This is a problematic line metrically: The placement of the name Avercius produces an extra half-foot. Thus, Lightfoot suggests Ἡρία, and Ramsay suggests Ἕρία. Zahn suggests the reading Ἕρία instead of ἠρία in order to make the meter work.42 Although there is reason for correction, the solution remains too uncertain, and I preserve the version of the vita.

Verse 22: Since Ἡρία is a metrical problem, Ramsay proposes Ἡρία.43 But it is unclear why the author of the vita would have reverted to


40. "Zu der Abercius-Inschrift."


42. T. Zahn, “Avircius Marcellus von Hieropolis.”
the older version of the city name (‟αρπόλις), which by late antiquity was much less commonly used than the newer version (‟αράπολις). One would have expected the author to have kept the “alpha.” In any case, the Alexander inscription confirms the reading of the vita. It is possible that the word ἀράπολις is chosen because of the emphasis on the πόλις (“city”) in the inscription (‟αράπολις and πολιτής in v. 1), as also in the Alexander inscription.

V. THE PAGAN CONNOTATIONS OF WORDS AND PHRASES IN THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

In his groundbreaking and extremely significant study of the Avercius inscription, Wolfgang Wischmeyer demonstrates that one can better understand most of the words and phrases in the Avercius inscription by examining their pagan associations as found on pagan inscriptions. While his purpose was limited to identifying the meanings of specific words and phrases in particular inscriptions and, while he does not investigate the interplay of Christian referents and associations in the Avercius inscription, he lays the first part of the foundation for any study of complex symbolic networks in the Avercius inscription. I now continue that work in this appendix entry, since my argument for the multivalent character of fish symbolism in the Avercius inscription is partly confirmed by the multivalent character of other words and phrases in the inscription.

The very fact that many scholars tried to argue that the Avercius inscription was pagan, indicates that the language of the inscription is complex and multivalent. As Wischmeyer points out, terms such as “looking down” (καθοροφόντας), “queen” (βασιλισσα), “great” or “large” (‟εγίλος), “golden-sandalled” (‟ερυσσοπέδαλος), “faith” (‟ελπις), and “holy” (‟ευς) often describe pagan deities, or refer to them, or are appropriate in a pagan religious context. For example, inscriptions describe both Hera and Isis as queens. Adjectives formed by compound with “gold” (‟ερυσ) are often used to describe pagan deities, and “gol-

43. W. Ramsay, passim.
44. See n. 7 above.
45. ”Die Aberkiosinschrift als Grabepigramm.”
den-sandalled” was applied to Hera and Hecate. Homer describes Zeus as “looking down from Mt. Ida” (Δίας καθόροντος). Inscriptions refer to almost all the gods as great, but the word is especially applied to the Cabiri at Samothrace (Θεοῖς μεγάλοις) and to Zeus. Faith was considered an abstract deity in antiquity (especially in Rome, where the cult of Fides was extremely old, but apparently to some extent also in regions of Greece). Consequently, she is often described in literature, mentioned in inscriptions, and pictured in iconography. The image of faith leading a carriage is reminiscent of the images of the goddess victory leading the Roman emperor or general in reliefs of their processional adventus.

Other deities also served as guides for human beings, such as “Hera, guide” (Ἡρᾶ διήγητος). Demeter, Aphrodite, Artemis, and the nymphs are all described as holy in some inscriptions. “Holy” commonly describes any item associated with a pagan deity and has the sense of being dedicated to that particular deity.

Furthermore, boasting that one is a citizen of a particular city is a common topos found on inscriptions, and ἀκλεκτή πόλις appears on at least

48. Il. 11.337; 13.4; etc.
49. See references listed in W. Wischmeyer, “Aberkiosinschrift,” 32.
50. For references, see especially G. Piccaluga, “Fides nella religione romana di età imperiale.” See also “Fides” in PW; F. Dölger, IXΘΥΣ 2:482-83; C. Becker, “Fides”; and D. Lührmann, “Glaube.” In general on the issue of abstract deities, consult J. R. Fears, ‘The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology.”
51. Suggested by W. Wischmeyer, “Aberkiosinschrift,” 42. For fuller discussion of the adventus ceremony in late antiquity, see S. McCormack, Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity.
52. Pausanias 2.11.2.
53. See references listed in W. Wischmeyer, “Aberkiosinschrift,” 29. I should add that in literature this goes back to Homer, who describes Artemis as χρυσόμο-νος Ἀρτέμις Ἑγή (Od. 5.123; 18.102)—the first word being one of those χρυσο- compounds that are so often applied to deities; Persephone is also described as holy (Od. 11.386).
54. E.g. see references under ἑσινος in any of the major Greek dictionaries.
References to shepherds pasturing their flock on mountains is a common bucolic theme in Greek and Latin poetry. “Chaste” is one of the prevalent pagan meanings for ἀθυρμάτῳ. Strikingly, an erotic poem describes love in almost exactly the same terms as v. 5 of the Avercius inscription:

Δισσός ῞Ερως αἰθεὶς ψυχῆν μιαν. ὅ τὰ περισσά
ὀφθαλμοὶ πάντῃ πάντα κατοσσαμενοί

Double Eros burns one soul. Oh eyes that look down upon all things everywhere, beyond what is necessary.

“Eyes looking down everywhere” is precisely the theme of v. 5. Similar to v. 6, the composer of an inscription from Ravenna speaks of “having taught the playing of musical phrases.” The reference to a kingdom/capitol city clearly refers to Rome both in its both broad sense as an empire and in its more narrow capacity as a capitol city. While the reference to a queen can also refer to Rome, it more generally refers in this period to the empress. Adjectives which have in their compounds a


57. See the references listed under ἀθυρμάτῳ in any of the major Greek dictionaries.


61. And in an earlier period it can refer to Hellenistic queens. See W. Wischmeyer, “Aberkiosinschrift,” 38-39, as well as the appropriate entries in the major Greek dictionaries. It is impossible to determine if the story of the visit of Avercius to the empress Faustina has any historical validity. Most interpreters think that it was a fabrication based on the vita author’s interpretation of the inscription. As Ramsay points out, making the imperial family into semi-Christians was a
reference to gold, such as “golden-robed” and “golden-sandalled,” suggest the general preference of royalty for clothing, accoutrements, and homes gilded with gold.\textsuperscript{62} Since it is known that seal rings were extremely popular throughout the Roman empire,\textsuperscript{63} \textit{σφραγίς} could very well have referred to a seal ring.\textsuperscript{64} If \textit{σφνομή} is the correct reading, it is also well-attested in pagan inscriptions.\textsuperscript{65} In addition, inscriptions show that \textit{δύνας} was particularly associated with the carriages of high officials.\textsuperscript{66} For pagan interpretations of the adjective \textit{καθαρός} ("pure"), see n. 19 in Chapter 3; and for pure wine, see p. 546 above. In addition, pagan inscriptions, especially inscriptions from Asia Minor, frequently threaten fines.\textsuperscript{67} That this is a relatively high fine would suggest that the deceased was an important person.\textsuperscript{68}

In terms of the non-textual aspects of the inscription, I should indicate that the garland on the east side of the Avercius monument is a common pagan image found frequently on both Greek and Latin inscriptions.

common stratagem of many late antique and early Byzantine hagiographers: “The Tale of Saint Abercius,” 348. That Avercius came from a remote city in the hinterlands of Phrygia would seem to confirm this. Yet, why does the inscription refer to a queen? It could refer simply to the church as I suggest below, but none of the other words in the inscription have this simple type of reference solely to a Christian item. The possibility must remain open that Avercius saw the empress while in Rome, although the healing of her daughter may well have been a later accretion in the story.

62. For a discussion of this, see T. M. Wehofer, “Philologische Bemerkungen zur Aberkiousinschrift,” 80-81. As he mentions, especially striking is the reference to the entirely golden tunic of Elagabulus (\textit{usus est aurea omni tunica}) in S.H.A., Elagabulus 24.

63. See V. Chapot, “Signum” (with references).

64. On this word referring to seal-rings, see also p. 341 above.


67. E.g. see the numerous inscriptions collected in\textit{ MAMA}.

throughout the Mediterranean. In addition, I already observed above that the epigraphic monument in the form of a square altar or bomos was common in Asia Minor.

VI. THE DEBATE OVER THE POSSIBLE PAGAN ORIGINS OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

In 1894, Gerhard Ficker proposed that Avercius was in fact a priest of Attis who went to see the rock of Pesimunte, which was included in the statue of Cybele in Rome. According to him, the reference to a queen in fact referred to this statue. Although it is clear that Ficker intended his argument as part of a protestant anti-catholic polemic against the primacy of Rome, two years later in 1896, Albrecht Dietrich supported Ficker’s thesis in a more intelligible and apparently objective way. He proposed that Avercius went to Rome for the ceremony of the marriage in 220 C.E. between the emperor Elagabal as sun god (Ἥλιος) and the heavenly goddess Urania (Οὐρανία), who, according to Dietrich, was equated with the queen of the heavens (regina coelestis or βασιλείσση τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The sun god was represented by means of the aniconic coni-
Both Ficker and Dietrich argued for the association of Avercius with Attis on several grounds, the most important of which are the following: Attis/Adonis is described as a “shepherd” (pastor); he is described as having had many eyes (ευρυόμυςτος); and he is described as “holy” (σχόνος). Moreover, both interpret λαός as λαίς (“stone”), and both see the trip of Avercius to Syria as a syncretistic amalgam of the Attis cult and the Syrian Goddess (Dea Syria/Atargatis). Because he supposedly was a priest of Attis, he alone had the opportunity to eat fish—which were prohibited as sacred animals for the laity.

There are several general problems with these theses. First, no reference to Attis exists in the inscription. Second, Attis is described as a shepherd and as holy, but is never explicitly labelled “a holy shepherd.” Third, the Avercius inscription does not describe the shepherd as having a myriad of eyes. Fourth, the inscription implies that everyone ate the fish, not just the priests. Fifth, the interpretation of λαός as “stone” (λαίς) is based on a very obscure use of the word which is attested only in a very few sources, whereas by far the most normal meaning of λαός is “people.”

As to the specific individual arguments of each, I would argue that, in regard to Ficker, no reference to Cybele occurs in the inscription. In regard to Dietrich, I would argue, that first, as I have observed, ΒΑΣΙΛ. . . probably does not refer to “king.” Second, the evidence adduced for the argument that the title of queen applies to the goddess Ourania is faulty. Third, neither Elagabalus nor the heavenly goddess are mentioned in the inscription. Fourth, the date of the bizarre marriage ceremony of Elagabalus is 220 C.E., while, as I have argued, the Avercius

74. Herodian Hist. 5.6.4 describes the marriage, while Herodian Hist. 5.3.5 describes the black stone.

75. Whereas, for example, Christ was labelled with a similar adjective; see immediately below.

76. On priests and priestesses eating fish, see pp. 176, 179, 193 (n. 244) above.

77. For critiques of both Ficker and Dietrich, see A. Abel, “Étude sur l’inscription d’Abercius,” 389-94 (1929). For a critique of Ficker, see also L. Duchesne’s review of G. Ficker (1894). The most important critiques of Dietrich are the following ones: T. M. Wehofer, “Eine Neue Aberkioshypothese” (1896); L. Duchesne, review of A. Dietrich (1897); and F. Cumont, “L’inscription d’Abercius et son dernier exégète” (1897).

inscription in fact predates the Alexander inscription of 216 C.E. Forth, a black stone was not likely to have been described as “bright” or “shining,” as λαμπρός implies in v. 9.

For many of the same reasons, in 1895 Adolph von Harnack argued that the Avercius inscription could not be Christian. Coming to the defence of Ficker, but not accepting his specific positions, Harnack argued that this inscription reflected a syncretistic form of Christianity that was not orthodox, but gnostic. For example, the king (although this is probably an incorrect translation) and queen could refer to a gnostic syzygy. To justify his claim of syncretism, he adduces the text “Narration of Events Taking Place in Persia,” which he argues is syncretistic, but I argue in Chapter 3 falls within the Christian mainstream. For full discussion of fish symbolism in this text and the Christian character of the texts, see pp. 371-405 of this chapter.

VII. THE EVIDENCE FOR THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

If one divides the evidence into internal and external, one finds confirmation that the Avercius inscriptions is most probably Christian. Since the Avercius inscription is situated in the ancient vita of an early Christian saint and is understood by that vita to be Christian, it is consequently clear that many ancient Christians also thought the inscription to be Christian. In addition, the archetype of the vita seems to have been

79. See Appendix 3.1-2. Rather, Dietrich follows the scheme of C.-Robert who suggested a two-stage chronology in the inscribing of the inscription—the second stage coming after 216 C.E. (as outlined on n. 17 above).

80. There are other minor arguments for a pagan origin of the Avercius inscription, but these also are unsatisfactory. In this regard, see A. Abel, “Étude sûr l’inscription d’Abercius,” 388-89.

81. Zur Aberciusinschrift.

82. For a critique of Harnack, see the following: L. Duchesne, “Épitaphe d’Abercius” (1896); A. Abel, “Étude sûr l’inscription d’Abercius,” 389-94 (1929).

written in the remote area of Phrygia, where the inscription was found.\textsuperscript{84}

This suggests that early Christians in that area were familiar with the actual physical location of the inscription (they certainly knew it well enough to transcribe it) and recognized it as a Christian monument. Generally, it is a good principle to assume that persons who lived close to the period of a monument and who thought it to belong to one group or another, are to be believed, unless there is definitive evidence to the contrary. Furthermore, an identifiably Christian inscription——the Alexander inscription——copies six verses of the Avercius inscription. It is most probable that individuals would have taken the trouble to imitate an epitaph, if they had some kind of connection to the deceased in that epitaph. In this case, the most probable connection is Christianity. Finally, if I am right that Avercius in the inscription is the same person as the Christian Avircius Marcellus in the \textit{Ecclesiastical History} of Eusebius, further confirmation of the Christianity of the inscription is found.

In regard to the internal evidence of the inscription, one can divide that into roughly three categories: 1) those words or phrases which have a predominantly Christian background and are probably or almost certainly Christian; 2) those words or phrases which have in part a pagan background, but because of the context in the inscription, are probably or almost certainly Christian; and 3) those words or phrases which are not obligated to have a Christian referent, but which, though they have a pagan background, also clearly could refer to a Christian referent. To this I would add a sub-category designated as 3', namely those words and phrases, as well as the carved image of the garland and the physical shape of the epigraphic monument, which have a pagan background, but were perfectly acceptable to most Christians. This sub-category is intended as a response to those interpreters, who could not imagine that certain aspects of the inscription could be acceptable to early Christians. The latter two categories (2 and 3) are of course closely related, since they both refer to a pagan background, but it is important to distinguish them, because the second category helps to establish positively the Christian character of the inscription, while the third category can only be advanced once the Christian character of the inscription is established. In addition, the formation of a second category is crucial for understanding the fish symbol and those items associated with it (Paul, faith, the water spring, bread and wine, and the holy virgin). I deal with the second category almost entirely in Chapter 3 rather than in this appendix, since it is directly related to fish symbolism.

As to those words and phrases which are probably or almost certainly Christian (Category 1), I begin with the phrase, “having Paul in my carriage” (Παύλου ἐξεσπέρασεν). Although it is possible that this could

\textsuperscript{84} As Ramsay has shown; see pp. 753-54.
refer to an individual named Paul, there are no similar expressions in pagan inscriptions or literature of which I am aware. On the other hand, it is known that early Christians such as Ignatius, believed that in their missionary travels, they followed in the footsteps of Paul. In addition, early Christians describe the mission of Paul as having covered both the east and the west, as well as having extended to Syria and having included Rome—not dissimilarly to the Avercius inscription. In regard to the reference to Paul, it is most likely that the inscription refers to Paul in such a way that one might understand Avercius as guided by the person of Paul and the ideal of Faith.

85. A. Dietrich suggests that he could be a travel companion of Avercius: Die Grabschrift des Aberkios, 49.

86. E.g. Ignatius, Ad Ephesios 12.2: "... Παύλου συμμάκασε τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μνῇ, τοῦ μητροτρημάτου, ἐξουσιαριστοῦ, ὅτε γέεννος τοῦ Μωυσίου, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εὐφρέθη ἐκείνῃ ἐκεῖνα τὰς ἁπατήσεις τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Παύλου..." ["... fellow initiates of Paul, who was sanctified, approved of, worthy to be made blessed, and in whose footsteps may I be found when I attain to God..."]. In the fifth or sixth century C.E. Antiochene Martydom of Ignatius 5 (in J. B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers 2.2), Ignatius desires to follow the footsteps of Paul to Rome: "... κατὰ τοῦ ᾿Ιησοῦ ζωῆς καθίσαντον ἐνθελὼν τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου..." ["... wishing to travel in the footsteps of the apostle Paul..."].

87. 1 Clement 5.6: "... καθισθεὶς γενόμενος ἄν τε τῷ ἄνας-το-λῃ καὶ ἄν τῇ δύσῃ: "He was a herald in both the east and the west." I show on p. 344 above that the river Euphrates and the Mesopotamian city of Nisibis refer to the eastern extent of the Roman empire.

88. On early Christian texts for Paul in Syria, see for example Epistula Apostolorum 33; for early Christian texts on Paul in Rome, see for example 1 Clement 5.6. Of course, Avercius does not go to Spain (Romans 15.24, 28), and thus there is not a precise imitation. It may well be that Christian communities in Spain were not sufficiently well-established in the time of Avercius for early Christians to visit (as is evidenced by the lack of reference after Paul to early Christian journeys to Spain). In any case, one can see that the focus of travel for Avercius, as for many early Christians, was Rome (see pp. 351-55 above).

89. Some have suggested that, by referring to Paul, Avercius actually referred to the letters of Paul; e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers 1.2:497. In this case, one could cite Acts 8.28, in which the Ethiopian eunuch, while seated in his chariot, reads the book of Isaiah: "καθίσμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνιόχησεν τὸν προφήτην Ἐσαίαν." ["And seated on his chariot, he read the prophet Isaiah."]
In any case, “Paul” clearly refers to the early Christian apostle. This is significant for the interpretation of fish symbolism, since it is the offering of the fish that specifically characterizes the Pauline journey of Avercius.

In addition to Paul, I should mention the word λαδός, which is only rarely found in pagan inscriptions, but, on the other hand, is found not infrequently in ancient Jewish inscriptions—apparently referring to the Jewish community. As confirmation of this, λαδός in the New Testament is a term sometimes used to indicate Jews in general or Jews as opposed to gentiles. And in the New Testament, as well as early Christian literature, it can also generally refer to the Christian community. Consequently, it is probable that Avercius is drawing on the ancient Jewish epigraphic use of this term, as well as on the Christian literary use of the word, in order to indicate a Christian community. In fact, in another city in Phrygia, the other Hierapolis on the Meander, is found an third century C.E. inscription using λαδός for the Jewish community there.

In any case, Avercius would very likely have been familiar with the letters of Paul and used their portrayal of Paul as a guide for himself. I do not, however, know of any example of early Christians bearing the actual letters of Paul, but the possibility should probably not be excluded. If one accepts the reading of Ramsay, Παύλον ἔποιη λαδός (rather than ἔπι Λαδοῦ), this would make even more unlikely the reference to the actual possession of Pauline letters and more likely the interpretation given above.


91. See L. Kant, “Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin,” 693. To this I would also add the following examples: B. Lifshitz, Donateurs 31 (Nyssa, Caria; third to fourth centuries C.E.); CH 720 = Donateurs 9 (Mantineia, Arcadia; fourth century C.E.) where the deceased (Aurelio Elpides) is called “father of the people,” πατήρ λαοῦ; and CH 662 (Elche, Spain; fifth to sixth centuries C.E.).

92. For references, see H. Strathmann, “Λαδός.”

93. For references, see H. Strathmann, “Λαδός.”

94. CH 776: “. . . τῷ λαῷ τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ” (“to the people of the Jews”).
As an addendum, I should indicate that it is not clear if the word θέσις in v. 2 does, or does not, fit into this category.\(^95\)

Although images of shepherds (Gk. ποιμήν; Lat. pastor) are important in numerous genres of ancient Greek and Latin literature,\(^96\) and I have already shown that the word “holy” (ἐγνώς) was used in both pagan religious and semi-religious contexts,\(^97\) yet the phrase ποιμήν ἐγνώς is not found in pagan literature or inscriptions. At the same time, an analogous phrase (ποιμήν ἁγιός) is found in Clement of Alexandria’s Hymn to Christ (v. 30),\(^98\), and that phrase was also possibly inscribed on a gold glass in the form of a monogram.\(^99\) Consequently, the phrase is probably to be seen as having been Christian. Although the phrase, “disciple of a holy shepherd” (μαθητής ποιμένος ἐγνώς) is not found in early Christian texts outside of the Alexander inscription, nevertheless, considering the extensive literary and iconographic tradition of depicting Christ as a shepherd (often the chiropous), the phrase makes better sense in a Christian context than in any other pagan one. By using the word μαθητής, Avercius could admittedly be referring to the normal secular use of μαθητής as “student” or “pupil,” but, given the almost certain association of the phrase ποιμήν ἐγνώς with Christ, it should most likely be seen in relation to the tradition of regarding the followers of Christ as his religious disciples.\(^100\)

95. While the word θέσις in verse two of the inscription is rather infrequently used as the word for grave in the pre-Constantinian period, the sequence——cross + θέσις + name——is very common in the fourth century C.E. on Christian inscriptions. See W. Wischmeyer, “Aberkios-inschrift,” 28. Yet, it is difficult to determine whether, prior to the fourth century C.E., the word was simply a rare pagan term used to fill the space for metrical reasons or was actually a word that was associated with early Christian remains, since so few pre-Constantinian Christian inscriptions are extant or are identifiable.

96. See p. 340 above.

97. See pp. 104, 189-90.

98. = Text # II.C.1. ἐγνώς and ἐγνώς are synonyms. Of course, the normal expression is “good shepherd” (ἐποιμήν ἑκαλός), as, for example, in John 10.11. For metrical reasons, that would not work in the inscription of Avercius or in the hymn of Clement.


100. For instance, it was frequently used for pupils of philosophers: e.g. Onesicritus who was a pupil of Diogenes: Diogenes Laertius, Lives 84.
As a further clue to the Christian character of this inscription, see the discussion in Chapter 3 concerning the relationship between Book 5 of the Sybilline Oracles and passages in the Avercius inscriptions. See also the discussion of the Maritima inscription from the catacomb of Priscilla in Rome.

Also reminiscent of the language in the Avercius inscription is a passage in the Septuagint version of Ps. 44.10b, where a queen is described as wearing a golden *hymatium*:

```
παρέστη βασίλισσα ἀκ δεξιῶν σου ἢν βασίσμος
dιαχρύσω περιβεβλημένη πεποκυμένη
```

On your right, a queen wrapped in many colors
stands in a hymatium woven of gold

Early Christian writers interpreted the queen in the passage to refer to the Christian church. For example, Clement of Alexandria says in *Paedagogos* 2.10:

```
καὶ ἐλλόγιος τοῦτο πάλιν διὰ Δαβῖδ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου λέγων
εἴθορανειν σε θυγατέρες βασιλέων ἢν τῇ τιμῇ σουν· παρέστη
βασίλισσα ἀκ δεξιῶν σου ἢν βασίσμος διαχρύσω και
κροσσοτοις χρυσοῖς περιβεβλημένης. οἶκ αὐξήθησα τὴν τριφυτη-
kτήν μεμήνυσαν. ἄλλα τον ἀκ πίστεως συναφομενόνακήρα
τον τὸν ξελεμένιον κόσμον τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδόλοκεν. ἢν ἐν
ἀδόλος ἠπειροῦ ἐξ χρυσοῦ διαπρέπει καὶ ὁξυρόσοι, οἶ
ἀκλεκτοι. ὁχρυσόν.
```

If the Logos sings this about the Lord through David by saying——the daughters of kings enjoy you in your honor. A queen stands on your right in a hymatium woven of gold and wrapped in golden tassels——he did not reveal voluptuous clothing, but showed the pure ornamentation of the church that was woven from the faith of those who are shown mercy. By means of it, Jesus was conspicuous as gold, and the golden tassels are the chosen ones (i.e. Christians).

---

101. See pp. 324-25 above and Endnote 2 in Chapter 3.

102. See pp. 348-49 above.
In addition to the identification of the queen with the Christian church,\textsuperscript{103} the emphasis on gold in Clement recalls the Avercius inscription, as perhaps does the mention of faith and of the “select” or “chosen” (\textit{σκληρετοί}).

In any event, while I have already noted that the word βασίλευσα ("queen") can refer to pagan goddesses and to empresses, it should now also be clear that βασίλευσα can refer to the Christian church in early Christian literature. In particular, the association of a queen with golden garments and accoutrements finds special resonance in Jewish and Christian literature.

Yet, since golden garmenty is also characteristic of royalty in pagan literature, it is probably appropriate to put βασίλευσα in the above-mentioned third category, although the general similarity to the \textit{Sibylline Oracle} passage and to the passage in Clement makes its category placement somewhat difficult.\textsuperscript{104}

In regard to the third category (since I cover the second category in Chapter 3 itself), I focus on a few words and phrases, which I believe are of special relevance for the interpretation of fish symbolism. At the outset, it is of particular importance to remember that I assume that I have already proven the Christian character of the Avercius inscription.

In vv. 12-16, three words are of particular note. As indicated, “faith” (\textit{πίστις}) could be an abstract goddess. Yet, in the context of a Christian inscription, it is difficult to imagine not considering the importance of the idea of faith in early Christianity—especially since Avercius seems to have modelled himself on Paul, for whom (and for his followers) faith was such an important component of being a Christian. Thus, it is probable that the reference, at least in part, refers to the early Christian emphasis on the importance of faith.

In addition to these words in vv. 12-16, I should mention again that συνομομός (if one accepts it as the correct reading) is a word attested in

\textsuperscript{103} See further Justin Martyr, \textit{Dialogue} 63.4. Also reminiscent of the golden-clothed queen is another woman with special garmenty found in \textit{Rev.} 12.1, who was regarded by some early Christians as the Church. For example, see Hippolytus, \textit{On the Antichrist} 61: "\textit{τήν μὲν οὖν γυναῖκα τήν περιβεβλημένην τον ἠλιόν σωφρότατα τήν δὲ κλη τῷ δώλοις τὸν λόγον τον πατριδών.}" ["He showed that the woman enrobed with the sun was most clearly the Church, which put on the paternal Logos above the radiant sun."] This passage also suggests the marriage between Christ and the church.

\textsuperscript{104} See Endnote 2 in Chapter 3.
pagan inscriptions. It apparently refers to family, kindred or relations, while in Christian inscriptions it seems to refer to the members of the Christian community—similarly to ἀδελφοί (“brethren”), which is also found in Christian inscriptions from Asia Minor. That Avercius would refer to those whom he met on his voyage as his brethren suggests the kind of familial salutation that would normally accompany pagan inscriptions, but clearly here with a new twist in that he does not mean flesh and blood family.

Moving away from vv. 12-16, I would point to v. 5 with its reference to the holy shepherd, “who possesses huge eyes, which he cast down everywhere” (φθαλμος θεου μεγαλους παντις καθοροντας). Not only do all-seeing eyes characterize pagan deities, but they are also an important attribute of God both in Jewish and Christian literature and inscriptions. Likewise, while the motif of shepherds pasturing their sheep on plains and mountains is found in pagan bucolic literature, it may well call to mind in a Christian inscription the good shepherd who shepherds his sheep in paradise and on earth—the former of which is often referred to exegetically in terms of mountains.

105. E.g. Dittenberger, SIG 3 527.71 (Dreros). For a discussion of the description of early Christianity as family and its relation to fish symbolism, see pp. 335-36 above.

106. For references, see W. H. Calder, “The Inscription of Avircius Marcellus.”

107. For a Christian inscription, see SEG 6.370: "Πρωτον μεν θεον τον παντα ορθα..." [“First I will sing of God, who sees everywhere.”] For a Jewish inscription, see CII 696 (Thebes, Phthiotis), "... ορθους τος θεον..." ("... of the seeing God...") and CII 725, II. 9-10, "κυριε θεον ὑπορθων" [“Oh Lord, who sees everything”], as well as a discussion of this material in L. Kant, “Jewish Inscription in Greek and Latin,” 702-03, and A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 418. For literary evidence, see a plethora of references in F. Dölger, IXΘΥΣ 2:468-69. See also the reference to the “unsleeping eye” (ἀκοῦν μητος φθαλμος) of God in Basil of Caesarea in Text # V.1 (7.5).

108. See the sources collected in F. Dölger, IXΘΥΣ 2:466-68: Origen, Homily on Genesis 9.3; Cyprian of Antioch, Confession 16; Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 3.20.3; Methodius, Banquet 3.6; and Martyrdom of Polyarp 19.2.
While the individual words ἄρματα and πιστός in v. 6 are found frequently in pagan and early Christian literature, 109 the phrase ἄρματα πιστὸς is not found in either of them. On the other hand, as a phrase, it is very much reminiscent of the description of the New Testament as the “holy scriptures” (Ἑρᾶ ἄρματα). 110

Also belonging to this third category are the references to χρηστός and to “seal” (σφραγίς). 111

As mentioned above, the sub-category 3 is largely a response to the objections of those who argue that certain features of the Avercius inscription are too pagan to be attributed to an orthodox Christian monument. Of course, from my examination of the Avercius inscription in general, it should be clear by now that almost all its words and phrases are laden with both pagan and Christian connotations. Thus, from the outset, it is difficult to imagine, simply because an attribute of the inscription is pagan, that that would contravene the Christian character of the monument. Early Christians simply used the language and materials which were available to them, and they happened to be from a pagan culture. Even what many regard as one of the most Christian of all symbols——fish——is clearly interpreted by Christians through its pagan associations, as Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrate.

In specific regard to the objections of Harnack and others, it is now known, for example, that many early Christian inscriptions carried not only threats of fines, but curses as well, against those who would bury another person in their tomb. 112 Likewise, the altar or bomo style of monument is characteristic of all Phrygian funerary monuments, including Christian ones. 113


110. Frequently found (for example) in Origen; see F. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ 2:472-73.

111. For the former see p. 323 above; for the latter see Endnote 4.

112. E.g. see many of the inscriptions collected in W. Ramsay, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia; and Th. Zahn, “Avircius Marcellus von Hieropolis,” 83-84. As a case study, useful are Jewish and Christian curse formulae from Asia Minor, particularly ἵνα κακοπάθη τὸν Θεόν (he/she shall have to reckon with God”) used especially in inscriptions from Eumeneia. See for a start L. Robert, “Épitaphes d’Eumeneia de Phrygie” (with some specific references to Ramsay) and my discussion in “Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin,” 685-86, 705.
Finally, the veiled/mystical language of the inscription does not make it pagan. For the better part of the first two centuries of Christianity, Christian monuments did not reveal their Christian character, and it is therefore impossible to determine which monuments are Christian. Toward the end of the second century C.E. and at the beginning of the third century C.E. are found certain monuments that bear the first indications of Christianity. In Rome, in the cemetery of San Sebastiano, epigraphic monuments use the image of the fish apparently to indicate Christianity, while in Phrygia in Asia Minor curse formulae are found in the form ἐσται αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (“he/ she shall have to account with God”) that can indicate either Jewish or Christian origins.

In general, this type of oblique imagery and language gave indication of Christianity on Christian monuments in the period prior to Constantine. Thus, it is their veiled character that characterizes early Christian inscriptions, and, in that regard, the Avercius inscription appropriately fits in with other early Christian inscriptions of the same period. Of course, it is significant that fish imagery figures on early Christian monuments prior to Constantine as an indication of Christianity, and its presence in the Avercius inscription therefore suggests the same kind of oblique indication of Christianity.

114. See pp. 591ff above.
115. See n. 112 above.
116. The so-called “Christians for Christians” (Χρηστιανοὶ Χρηστocrατικοί) inscriptions from Phrygia are an exception: E. Gibson, The «Christians for Christians Inscriptions» in Phrygia.
117. For a sober view of the problem of veiled Christian inscriptions, see W. M. Calder, “Early Christian Epitaphs from Phrygia.” The use of the word φυλακράτιος (“public”) may suggest a degree of openness not always found on early Christian inscriptions, but this does not make it either Montanist (as in the so-called “Christians for Christians” inscriptions in Phrygia; see previous footnote) or anti-Montanist (e.g. as an open proclamation of orthodoxy). Based on his interpretation of φυλακράτιος and συνεργατικός, Ramsay (“Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia,” 266-67) suggests that the Avercius inscription was anti-Montanist; his argument is unconvincing, however.
VIII. PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN REFERENCES IN THE
EPIGRAPHIC FORMULAE OF THE AVERCIUS INSCRIPTION

In the Avercius inscription, the formulaic portions (vv. 1-2 and 17-22) contain items that are standard in Phrygian epitaphs: mention that the inscribing was done while alive, mention of age, and mention of a threat of a fine. It is interesting to note, however, that in their midst are found isolated indications of items which one can best label as non-traditional: namely v. 19, which has no pagan epigraphic parallels; and possibly ἀνακτόρος in v. 1, which, although it is found on one pagan inscription from Phrygia, is extremely rare. Whether these are direct indications of Christianity by themselves is unclear, but, in any case, considering the Christian character of the inscription as a whole, they easily take on a Christian connotation and might in fact be considered Christian insertions into an otherwise standard pagan format.

Thus, the general tenor of these two sections is that of a pagan epitaph from Phrygia, with occasional intimations of Christianity. In a sense, this sets the stage for the interpretation of all the symbols of the inscription, since many of them, such as the fish, have pagan associations, but, at the same time, bear Christian associations as well. From a literary point of view, the two sections are connected by the repetition of the syllable πολ-: πολεμος (v. 1), πολεμις (v. 1), and θεροπόλεα (v. 22).

118. In general on the characteristics of Phrygian inscriptions (including these), see the materials collected in the relevant vols. in MAMA.

119. For example, ἀνακτόρος can indicate the Christian elect, as shown in the above-mentioned passage from Clement (see pp. 775-76 above). In addition, ἀνακτόρος πολις can indicate the heavenly city; see sources collected in A. Abel, “Étude sur l’inscription d’Abercius,” 357-58.

120. For a comparative analysis of this issue in the Avercius and Pectorius inscriptions, see the relevant sections in Chapter 3.
APPENDIX 4

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL ON THE PECTORIUS INSCRIPTION

I. TEXT CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE PECTORIUS INSCRIPTION

For text of the inscription, see Text # I.2 in Appendix 1.

v. 1: Some propose [- ὦτος] (“holy”) instead of [- θεόν] (“divine”), but that is unlikely since it adds an extra syllable, which is metrically dubious.

v. 2: Also the reading ζωήν (“life”) instead of πηγήν can not be completely excluded. But πηγήν is much more likely, since the general similarity of the Pectorius inscription to the Avercius inscription suggests a reference to a water spring and since letter measurements (although here not conclusive) indicate that the three letters (“eta,” “gamma,” and “eta”) of πηγήν would more likely fit the missing gap better than the two letters (“omega” and “eta”) of ζωήν.

v. 7: Numerous readings have been made here, many of them based on the reading Γαλιλαδος (“Galilean”) instead of ὅρα λιλαδο. But the letter in question is clearly a “rho” and not a “gamma.” Thus, ὅρα λιλαδο is evidently correct.

Instead of χῶρας, Guarducci reads ἐσθης ὑγρας τι (“fed on by fish”), though a close examination of the inscription would seem to suggest other letters. Furthermore, it is difficult to understand the meaning of the sentence with this word included.

v. 11: Numerous readings have been proposed for this fragmentary verse, none of them certain, as the following examples attest: Franz (Ἅγνοιν θεόν ναόν μνήσεω Πεκτορίου = “Upon seeing the fish, remember Pectorius, its son”); Borret and Leemans (Παλαθι και ψυγής μνήσεο Πεκτορίου = “Be gracious and remember the soul of Pectorius”); Wordsworth (Παλαθι και δυναμον μνήσεο Πεκτορίου = “Be gracious and remember the slave Pectorius”); Pitra (Παρθώνος ερθήσει μνήσεο Πεκτορίου = “In the peace of the fish, remember Pectorius”); Rossignol (Σίνουμα εσε, τεσωρ μνήσεο Πεκτορίου = “I beseech you, remember your Pectorius”); Kétsch (Παρθώνος διν δείκνυο μνήσεο Πεκτορίου = “Remember Pectorius, a fish in a meal”); and Secchi (Σίνουμας Υψίδο Πεκτορίου = “Be merciful on your son; remember Pectorius”). I follow the reading of Lenormant, which O. Pohl includes in his text (although I underdot the final “omicron”).