

-serving as heads of the synagogue in the year 391 is an important piece of evidence for the debate as to whether more than one archisynagogos could serve simultaneously.¹¹¹ Probably Theodoros the gerusiarch presided over the council of the elders,¹¹² who seem to be too numerous to mention.

How Ilasios fits into this picture is unclear. His title, archisynagogos of the Antiochenes, surely cannot imply that he was the sole synagogue head in Antioch, as Jean-Baptiste Frey imagines.¹¹³ In such a large city as Antioch, which had a considerable Jewish population, there must certainly have been many synagogue heads.¹¹⁴ Perhaps Ilasios served as synagogue head for a group of people from Antioch who had moved to Apamea and become part of the community there.

3. Reconstruction of the Office of Head of the Synagogue

The reader with a sensitivity for chronology, geography, genre and religious tradition will doubtlessly be overwhelmed by the variety of material cited, and cited side by side, as if Moesia were Jerusalem and the first century were the fifth. This colorful mixture of quotations of the friends and enemies of the ancient synagogue heads should at the very least remind us of how little we know of the office they held. The dream of every historian of religion is to trace a development, to differentiate, to set the late fourth-century Apamean synagogue head in sharp relief against the first-century Roman one. It is not for lack of desire that this will not be done. It is for lack of evidence.

If there is not enough evidence to trace a development, there is also not so little evidence as to evoke general despair of knowing anything. The evidence clearly permits us to say, for example, that "head of the synagogue" was one of the best, if not the best, known titles of synagogue office. One could call Alexander Severus the "Syrian archisynagogus" and the meaning was clear. I would propose the following reconstruction of what seems to have been the leading office in the ancient synagogue.

Was there more than one synagogue head in each synagogue?

The evidence (Mark 5:22; Acts 13:15; CII 766, 803; possibly Acts 18:8,17) suggests that more than one synagogue head could serve in a synagogue at a time. No ancient source limits the number to one.¹¹⁵

How was a head of the synagogue selected?

There seems to have been more than one method of selection. The two inscriptions mentioning synagogue heads who were sons of synagogue heads (CII 584, 1404) and the one mentioning an infant head of the synagogue (CII 587) suggest that the office was hereditary. The two inscriptions mentioning a head-for-life of the synagogue (CII 766, 744), as well as the one which possibly speaks of a person having been head of the synagogue five times (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 85), suggest that not all held the office for life and that some were selected in a way other than by inheritance. Although election is not mentioned in connection with synagogue heads, it should not be excluded as a possibility. If there is a kernel of truth to the note in Palladius (Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom 15) about the patriarch's appointing synagogue heads, then this could be seen in connection with Cod. Theod. 16.8.15 with its mention of "persons whom the patriarchs have placed in authority over others." This would mean that among those officials whom the patriarch appointed were included some heads of the synagogue.

What were the functions of the head of the synagogue?

If the synagogue was for "the reading of the law and the teaching of the commandments" (CII 1404), then it is logical to assume that the synagogue head was responsible in a special way for seeing that this was done. Our sources confirm this. Given the thrust of the baraita in b. Pesah 49b, it seems that the head of the synagogue was a person learned in the law. It follows that a major function of the head of the synagogue was the exhortation and spiritual direction of the congregation (Lk 13:10-17; possibly Acts 18:12-17), which included teaching (Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho 137; Epiphanius, Panarion 30.18.2). It was the synagogue heads who invited members of the congregation to preach (Acts 13:15); apparently they did not themselves read from scripture unless no one else was able (t. Meg. 4.21). M. Yoma 7:1 and m. Soṭa 7:7-8 report on a special liturgical function accorded to one synagogue (or assembly?) head during a holiday service. The synagogue heads, together with the elders, collected money from their congregations to be sent to the patriarch (Cod. Theod. 16.8.14,17). While responsibility for erecting new synagogues and restoring old ones was not limited to the head of the synagogue, synagogue

heads were among those who felt especially responsible for the building and restoration of synagogues, drawing upon their own funds when necessary (CII 722, 744, 756, 766, 803, 804, 1404, etc.¹¹⁶). It is possible that synagogue heads were often members of leading families who were financially able to perform this service.

Using the analogy of Diaspora Jewish leaders today, the ancient Diaspora head of the synagogue was probably both a leader for the congregation and representative of the congregation vis-à-vis non-Jewish neighbors and Roman authorities. (Possibly Acts 18:12-17 is to be seen in this light.) As in the Jewish Diaspora today, the civic and religious functions were probably seldom sharply distinguished.

What was the relationship between the head of the synagogue and other synagogue officials?

The head of the synagogue seems to have been the leading functionary in the ancient synagogue. In inscriptions, wherever synagogue heads are mentioned, they are mentioned first in the list (CII 766, 803). In the Theodosian Code the order varies (cf. Cod. Theod. 16.8.4,13,14). In m. Yoma 7:1 and m. Soṭa 7:7-8 the head of the synagogue occurs before the sexton and after the high priest and the adjutant high priest; in other words, here too, the head of the synagogue is the first of the synagogue officials named, (if the reference is to a synagogue official). In the baraita in b. Pesah. 49b the head of the synagogue does not occur first in the list, but rather after scholar and great ones of the generation and before charity treasurer and teacher of children, but then this is not a list of synagogue officials.

That the head of the synagogue was the main synagogue functionary is further supported by the fact that the title is the one chosen by Alexander Severus's enemies to mock his friendship with the Jews and is the one used in Hadrian's letter to Servianus to single out the typical Jewish official for mockery.

Was the head of the synagogue identical with the archon?

It seems that in most cases archisynagōgos must be distinguished from archōn (CII 265, 553, 766; the Western text of Acts 14:2). The identification between the two implicit in the synoptic comparison of the Jairos story (Matt 9:18,23; Mark 5:22,35,36,38; Luke 8:41,49) could be a loose use of terminology,

a reflection of a time or place in which the two terms were interchangeable, or a mistake.

4. The Role of Women Synagogue Heads

Given the evidence for women heads of the synagogue, and using the proposed reconstruction of the office of synagogue head as a base, what can one say about the role these women might have had? Or did they even have a role? Perhaps the title was purely honorific after all?

The two arguments adduced in favor of the title's being honorific are:

1. The women received the title from their husbands (M. Weinberg, S. Krauss, S. W. Baron, J.-B. Frey, A. C. Bandy);
2. In the later period the title was honorific for both women and men (S. Reinach, Th. Reinach);
3. In the case of women, the title must be honorific (E. Schürer,¹¹⁷ J. Juster).

Erwin Goodenough's translation, which makes Theopempte a man, will not be discussed here.

Concerning the wife thesis, one searches in vain for the husbands in question. In the three inscriptions with women synagogue heads, no husbands are mentioned. Further, Rufina and Theopempte give the impression of a certain autonomy (control of one's own funds, household and business affairs); if they were married, the marriage seems to have allowed for a certain independence on the part of the women. The fact that Theopempte's son Eusebios does not bear a title shows that, if his father had one, he did not inherit it. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that Theopempte could have received the title from her husband, but it does call into question the connection between women's titles and children's titles made by modern scholars, the implication being that the former are the wives of, the latter the sons of, synagogue officials. Finally, in the three inscriptions where wives of synagogue heads are named (CII 265, 553, 744), they do not in fact bear the title of their husbands. In other words, there is no case where both husband and wife are called synagogue heads. Where women are called synagogue heads, we have no evidence that they were even married at the time of the inscription.

No less questionable is the thesis of the brothers Reinach that in the later period the title was honorific for both women and men. From the survey of the evidence for synagogue heads it