

PART TWO

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

CHAPTER VI

DID THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE HAVE A WOMEN'S GALLERY OR SEPARATE WOMEN'S SECTION?

In a lecture on the Galilean synagogue ruins held on December 16, 1911 in Berlin, the great Judaica scholar Samuel Krauss said to his audience:

Now that we are inside the synagogue, let us first of all--as politeness demands--look for the rows of the seats of our dear wives, on the supposition that something will be found which could be viewed as the remains of a "Weiberschul"¹ in the synagogue ruins.²

Following the demands of politeness, Mr. Krauss did look for, and did find, the remains of what he called the women's gallery in the ancient Galilean synagogues.³ The majority of modern Judaica scholars and archaeologists follow Krauss in both method and result, i.e., they look for a women's gallery and they find one.⁴

The significance of the question of the women's gallery for the question of women as leaders in the synagogue should be clear. If all ancient synagogues relegated women to a side room, a balcony or to the back of the prayer hall, perhaps even further separating them from the men by a lattice work or a translucent or even opaque curtain, as the contemporary Orthodox synagogue does, then it is indeed difficult to imagine that the women discussed in the previous chapter had any official functions in the synagogue, at least during the religious service. This type of seating arrangement does not imply "separate but equal." It is true, of course, that the Jewish service cannot be compared, for example, with a Roman Catholic mass, where the entire focus of the service is the altar and what goes on there. Certainly many Orthodox women feel that they can say their prayers behind a curtain as well as were they seated together with the men. Nevertheless, the reading of scripture, the sermon and the leading of prayers in an Orthodox synagogue all occur in the men's section. When the Torah scroll is carried around it is a focus of attention; everyone who has the opportunity to touch it is overjoyed. Needless to say, that same Torah scroll is not passed from the hands of the men into the hands of the women, so

that the women up in the gallery might also have the opportunity to touch it. No, instead the women peer down to what is happening below, sometimes leaning over the railing to get a better look. In some synagogues the women cannot hear the sermon well from where they are seated, and in most they cannot see well. If they are behind a curtain, they can only see shadows and outlines. If, by analogy, we use the contemporary Orthodox seating arrangement as the background against which to interpret the titles borne by ancient Jewish women, then it is in fact difficult to come to any other conclusion than that these women had no official function.

But just how strong is the archaeological and literary evidence that the ancient synagogue possessed a women's gallery? Upon what do Krauss and his colleagues base their theory? A survey of the archaeological and literary evidence for the women's gallery can answer that question.

A. Is there Archaeological Evidence for a Women's Gallery or a Separate Women's Section?

In our century numerous synagogues have been excavated in Palestine and in the Diaspora. Sometimes the remains are minimal, such as a single inscription. Other remains are quite sufficient for drawing up a complete floor plan. In no case has an actual gallery been found. All of the galleries in all the architects' reconstructions are reconstructed and not extant. In order to decide whether these reconstructions are convincing, a survey of the evidence from the major sites is necessary. We should remember, however, that monumental remains can only tell us whether a side room or gallery existed, not whether it was for women. Theoretically, donative inscriptions could speak of a women's gallery, room for women or divider between the women's and men's sections, but none do.

1. Synagogues in Roman and Byzantine Palestine

With the exception of the Theodotos inscription (CII 1404),⁵ there exist no undisputed synagogue remains from the Second Temple period. This is probably due to the fact that the floor plans of the earliest synagogues differed little from those of normal houses and cannot be identified by archaeologists as synagogues, if by "synagogue" one means a building whose main function was to house the worship service.⁶ The first possible synagogue ruin from the first century was discovered at Masada,⁷ Herod the

Great's fortress near the Dead Sea. In its present state, the structure can be dated to the period of the Zealot occupation during the First Jewish Revolt (66-73 C.E.); it is unclear whether the original Herodian building was also a synagogue before being remodeled by the Zealots. The building, approximately 10.5 by 12.5 meters in size, is located directly on the casemate wall on the northwest side of the plateau. The original Herodian building had an anteroom, and the main room had had five pillars along the northern, western and southern sides. When the Zealots remodeled, they removed two of the columns of the western row, and tore down the wall dividing the anteroom from the main room, placing the two pillars where the wall had been. They also built a small room (3.5 x 5.5 m) in the northwestern corner with an entrance from the main hall and set up a four-tiered row of plastered benches along the north, west and south walls and a single bench on the eastern entrance side.

In addition to the structure's clear nature as an assembly room, the discovery of scripture fragments (Deuteronomy and Ezekiel) found buried under the floor (as if in a geniza?) added to the conviction that the building in question was indeed a synagogue. However, since we know little about the layout of first-century synagogues, one should not consider the identification as a synagogue a closed matter.

Concerning the women's gallery, it is clear that there was none, and the small room in the corner is clearly unsuitable as a women's room as it has no separate entrance. All worshipers sat in the one main room on the benches along the walls.

At Herod the Great's fortress, Herodion,⁸ just southwest of Bethlehem, a structure very similar to the one at Masada was found. The room (14 x 10 m), with an entrance in the east, was remodeled by the Zealots during their occupation (66-70 C.E.). It had a nave and two side aisles with four (or perhaps six) columns on each side and a three-tiered row of stone benches along the sides and back. Due to its clear nature as an assembly room and because of the similarities to the synagogue at Masada, it is likely that this too was a synagogue. As at Masada one searches in vain for a women's gallery.

A further first-century public building which is most likely a synagogue was found in Gamla,⁹ the Jewish fortress in the Golan Heights destroyed by the Romans in 67 C.E. One enters the building through a narthex and proceeds through a vestibule into the main prayer hall, which, like Masada and Herodion, is lined with rows of benches. Four rows of columns run parallel to

the walls. The synagogue is approached in its southeast corner by stairs coming up the side of the hill.¹⁰ An article in the Biblical Archaeological Review¹¹ states that these stairs possibly led to an upper gallery, and a photograph of the synagogue at Capharnaum, which also has stairs, is printed as a parallel. Further excavation in the summer of 1979, however, has revealed that these steps are the continuation of a road leading up the side of a hill to the synagogue. They should, therefore, be seen as leading to the synagogue itself rather than to a gallery.

Migdal¹² (Magdala) and Korazin¹³ (Arabic: Khirbet Karaza; N.T.: Chorazin) have also been in the discussion of first-century synagogues, but both must now be excluded.¹⁴

After the first century, synagogue ruins become much more identifiable and much more varied in their architecture. In a number of these ruins archaeologists have conjectured the existence of an upper gallery for women or of a separate room for them. This is on the basis of evidence ranging from one pillar base to a number of pillars, entablature and stairs. In a number of other cases no one has claimed that any provision for separation existed.

Eshtemoa' (Arabic: es-Samu')¹⁵ in Judea, south of Hebron, is an example of the latter category. One enters the building (13.3 x 21.3 m) on the east side through a narthex with two pillars and two columns. In the prayer hall itself it is the Torah niche in the long northern wall, rather than on one of the narrow walls, which orients the synagogue towards Jerusalem. Two-tiered stone benches line the north and south walls. There seem to have been no columns in the prayer hall itself. Without columns there could have been no upper gallery, and one can see from the floor plan that there is no place for a separate room for women. The synagogue can be dated to the fourth century.

A further case where there seems to be no women's gallery is the synagogue at Beth She'an.¹⁶ The room in question is roughly square (7 x 7 m) and part of a larger complex including the house of a man named Leontius and a court. One entrance was through the court on the north, and a second entrance was from the east. The excavators have assumed the existence of a niche in the south wall (towards Jerusalem). There were benches along the walls. One can see that all synagogue worshipers sat together in one room. The date is from the middle of the fifth to the sixth century.¹⁷

In a further number of cases where remains for a gallery could conceivably have been found, the archaeological reports mention none. These are cases where one finds sufficient remains to expect some evidence for an upper story if one existed. They include: Beth She'arim (352-53),¹⁸ Beth Yerah (dating ranging from 4th to 6th C.),¹⁹ Qatsrin (4th C.),²⁰ Jerash (4th/5th C.),²¹ Isfiya (5th/6th C.),²² Jericho (6th/7th, possibly 8th, C.),²³ Na'aran (6th C.).²⁴ Khirbet Sumaq (3rd C.),²⁵ Tell Menora (6th C.),²⁶ Gaza (6th C.),²⁷ Rehov (4th/7th C.),²⁸ Ma'oz Hayyim (4th/5th C.),²⁹ Hammat Teverya (north of the hot springs--3rd/4th C.).³⁰

There are a number of synagogue ruins, particularly in Galilee, where excavators have reconstructed a women's gallery on the basis of various pieces of evidence. Let us now turn to these.

The synagogue at Capharnaum on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee is one of the best-preserved synagogues found in Israel. The white limestone structure is a basilica with a nave and two side aisles. A third row of pillars runs parallel to the back wall. The structure is oriented towards Jerusalem. Three doors on the south wall provide access to the nave and two side aisles respectively. The prayer hall is adjoined by a court with a colonnade carrying a portico along the northern, southern and western walls, leaving the central court open. At the outer northwestern corner of the synagogue proper there is a small structure made of black basalt (like the rest of the village, but in contrast to the white limestone of the synagogue itself). This structure is flanked by stairs leading up and away from the back, i.e., northern wall of the synagogue.

The first major excavation of the synagogue was undertaken in 1905 by Heinrich Kohl and Carl Watzinger. According to their reconstructed model, a women's gallery, which was reached by the basalt steps at the northwest corner, extended over the two side aisles and across the back of the synagogue proper, being supported by the columns below.³¹ Their two-story model is reprinted by Erwin Goodenough,³² Stanislaw Loffreda,³³ Zev Vilnay,³⁴ etc. A printed reconstruction like this tends to achieve a life of its own; one soon forgets which stones are actually there and which ones were called into being by the artist's pen.

This reconstruction assumes that women would have entered the gallery by the stairs attached to the black basalt annex at

the back. The gallery would have had Doric columns of a slightly narrower width than the Corinthian columns below.³⁵

The reconstruction should be clear and indeed looks plausible. Let us now examine the actual remains of this gallery. The visitor to the reconstructed synagogue at Capharnaum does not see a gallery. What is it that would archaeologically force us to assume the existence of such a thing? It is not the basilica style that would necessitate one, for indeed most basilicas did not have galleries.³⁶ Nor do we have the remains of a gallery: the floor, the railing, the walls behind it, the lintel of the door leading into it. There do exist several Doric columns of a diameter slightly less (10 cm less) than that of the columns of the prayer hall. Further, one finds several fragments of what could have been the architrave of the upper row of columns and the first steps of a staircase located at the back of the synagogue, i.e., at the northwest corner next to the basalt structure. The best evidence for a gallery consists of these steps in the back, which could possibly lead up to a gallery door. This theory presupposes a rather narrow, winding, outside staircase leading up to a rather elegantly decorated gallery. An alternative interpretation would be that the basalt staircase served the basalt structure to which it is attached. This is, in fact, the way the most-recent excavators of the synagogue, Virgilio Corbo, Stanislaw Loffreda, and Augusto Spijkerman, interpret it. They take the basalt structure (Installation 143) to be some type of storeroom and surmise that the staircase leads to an upper level of the storage area.³⁷ This reconstruction is also based on their observation that too few fragments of the alleged gallery have been found and that the winding staircase is too narrow to assume that women used it for the regular sabbath services.³⁸

Just four kilometers north of Capharnaum lie the ruins of Korazim.³⁹ The synagogue measures 16.7 by 22.8 meters and is divided by two rows of columns into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns forming a further aisle along the northern side. A small room which could be entered only from the inside extended out into a courtyard, which was about five meters in width. Between the wall of this courtyard and the small room were found several steps. Nahman Avigad writes, "Apparently, these were part of a staircase leading to the upper story."⁴⁰ Other evidence from Korazim for a gallery consists of fragments of smaller columns as well as fragments from a frieze, which is

reconstructed as having run along the upper portion of the walls of the gallery.⁴¹

The synagogue in an-Nabraten (Hebrew: Nevoraya),⁴² just north of Safed was surveyed by Kohl and Watzinger in 1905 and recently excavated under the direction of Eric M. Meyers, James F. Strange, and Carol L. Meyers. Because the excavations began in 1980, only preliminary reports are available.⁴³ The excavators surmise that Kohl and Watzinger are relatively accurate in assessing the dimensions at 16.9 x 11.65 m.⁴⁴

Two rows of four columns run north-south; one entered through a single entrance in the southern facade, and there must also have been one entrance in the north. Eric Meyers notes that the "presence of smaller column fragments and pedestals suggest a possible portico on the southern side."⁴⁵ In 1905 Kohl and Watzinger found a single base to a column outside of the building on the south (front) side, the diameter of which is 46 cm, in contrast to the bases inside which have a diameter of 66.5 cm and conjectured that the base could be the single remain of a gallery.⁴⁶ However, due to the smallness of the building they concluded that a better guess is that the building had only one story and that there existed a separate room for women on the same level on the north side, the northern door being the entrance to this women's section.⁴⁷ Erwin Goodenough comments, "Since guessing is all that can be done, my guess is that women were left out altogether."⁴⁸ Presumably the base of a column found in 1905, which served as the base not only of a column but in fact of a whole gallery, was among those fragments found in the campaign and taken possibly to be part of a portico, which means that the fragments lay near where they had originally stood.

The two varying interpretations of these fragments are a good illustration of the difficulties inherent in the women's gallery hypothesis at many sites. Kohl and Watzinger reconstruct an entire gallery on the basis of one fragment and in the absence of a staircase, while the recent excavators suggest a more plausible interpretation of the same data. As to Goodenough's theory that women did not come to the synagogue, one can only ask on what evidence he bases his view.

One of the best preserved synagogues in Galilee was found in Bar'am (Arabic: Kafr Bir'im),⁴⁹ eleven kilometers northwest of Safed. The large building (15.2 x 20 m), probably to be dated to the third century, had a porch on the south side (facing Jerusalem), which was supported by eight columns. There were

three front entrances leading into the prayer hall, which was divided by two longitudinal rows and one transversal row of columns into a nave surrounded by three side aisles.

Kohl and Watzinger⁵⁰ assume the existence of a gallery. Their evidence consists of one base for a column 49 cm in diameter and the fragments of a pillar with a diameter of 43 and 44 cm. These items being of a lesser diameter than the others found, Kohl and Watzinger assume that they must have belonged to an upper gallery. They further suggest that an Ionic capital found in the house of village priest, a capital having a diameter of 45 cm, would fit well for an upper gallery. This is a rather motley collection of evidence. The only common denominator seems to be the diameter, which is in all three cases less than that of other columns found inside the prayer hall. It is by no means clear, however, that these three architectural fragments have anything to do with a women's gallery or even with each other. One cannot exclude the possibility that these three fragments belonged to a gallery, but we have no particular reason for assuming that the one base, the fragments of a pillar and the Ionic capital are the sole surviving elements of a gallery, rather than elements from some other part of the building. What definitely speaks against the gallery thesis is the lack of even the trace of a staircase providing access to such a gallery. In their floor plan, Kohl and Watzinger have added a reconstructed staircase on the outer northwestern corner of the building (as at Capernaum), punctuating it with question marks.⁵¹ While such reconstruction is not an illegitimate endeavor, one should be aware that there is not a single bit of evidence to support this. Since Kohl and Watzinger's time, when this corner was as yet uncleared, the whole synagogue area has been cleared and partially restored. In a visit to the site in June 1978, I was able to find no traces of a staircase.

It is worthwhile to compare Kohl and Watzinger with two more recent scholars. For Erwin Goodenough the gallery was no longer a thesis to be supported by evidence, but a fact to be cited. He reprints Kohl and Watzinger's floor plan, with its reconstructed staircase, commenting that the synagogue had "columns carrying a balcony on the east, north and west sides"⁵² and that, "Steps seem to have gone up to the gallery on the north side of the building as at Capernaum."⁵³ Nahman Avigad writes, "The facade undoubtedly was two stories high and terminated in a Syrian pediment, but no traces of such a pediment have been found." He further comments, "No remains of the upper story were

found."⁵⁴ It is unclear whether Avigad discounts the evidence cited by Kohl and Watzinger or whether he has overlooked it. In any case, he is willing to stick to the theory of an upper story, even in the face of no evidence at all. Since Avigad's plan has no reconstructed staircase,⁵⁵ there is no way of knowing how he would provide access to such a second story.

There is one more piece of evidence to be considered. When the Dutch traveler C. W. M. van de Velde was in the village of Bar'am in the middle of the last century, an old man told him about an upper "story with pillars," which had stood in his youth, but which had been destroyed by an earthquake.⁵⁶ This does make more credible the possibility of a gallery, although the problems raised above still remain, particularly the lack of a staircase. However, a "story with pillars" could mean anything from pilasters set high up on the walls to an actual second story. A further question is how much credence one should give to such a second-hand report.

In conclusion, while a gallery at Bar'am cannot be excluded, the burden of proof rests upon the proponents of a gallery. The meager evidence cited to date is simply not sufficient to suppose the existence of such a gallery.

One of the most fascinating of the ancient synagogues is the one excavated at Khirbet Shema'⁵⁷ in Upper Galilee. Built directly into the hill, it offers the visitor a spectacular view of the hills of Galilee. The entrance from the top of the hill is by steps leading down into the prayer hall, and, the building being of the broadhouse type, one would turn upon entering to face the long wall with the beam in order to be oriented towards Jerusalem. The building is about 11 by 15 meters in size. There were two building periods, the first in the third century (Synagogue I), the second in the fourth or fifth century (Synagogue II). The first synagogue was probably destroyed in an earthquake.

The gallery posited by the excavators in the same place for both Synagogue I and Synagogue II was probably constructed of wood which rested on bedrock at the western side of the synagogue.⁵⁸ It is posited that those entering the gallery either turned to the left into the gallery at the top of the stairs leading down to the main prayer hall or, more likely, entered by a separate door in the north wall (in Synagogue II).⁵⁹ The hypothesis is that the gallery was meant for women and that a back entrance to the gallery would insure a total separation of

the sexes. The evidence for such a door is a trace of a cutting in the bedrock into which the threshold would have fit.⁶⁰

In comparison with other synagogue ruins, Khirbet Shema' lends itself to the reconstruction of a gallery reasonably well. At least one can say that a space exists which could plausibly be a gallery; in the other ruins that space must first be created. Nevertheless, here, as with the other posited galleries, one must carefully distinguish between what actually exists and what must be reconstructed. The evidence for the gallery consists of the bedrock upon which it may have rested and a slight indentation in the bedrock which may have been meant to receive the threshold for a door leading into the gallery. What is not extant is any of the gallery itself. In light of this lack, the excavators suggest that it may have been made of wood,⁶¹ and that some of the smaller pieces found in the main prayer hall may have belonged to the gallery.⁶² Nor have remains of the actual western wall been found. At the northwestern corner, one finds only bedrock, making the exact line of the wall and of a northern door a matter of reconstruction.⁶³

Thus, Khirbet Shema' does bear evidence for a space of some sort upon bedrock, but the actual gallery, wall and door must be entirely reconstructed. Even if one were to accept the existence of a wooden gallery, rather than assuming an area for storage or some other purpose, there is no archaeological reason for assuming that it must be for women. Maybe a gallery existed for no other reason than that the builders wanted to make the best use of the space available to them and decided that a gallery was the best way to utilize the bedrock.⁶⁴ What is clear from this is that while the analogy of other synagogues could be used to posit the existence of a gallery at Khirbet Shema', Khirbet Shema' itself, due to the particular problems raised by its building site, cannot be used as an analogy for other synagogues.

Just one kilometer to the north of Khirbet Shema', also on a hill, were found the ruins of the synagogue of Meiron,⁶⁵ probably dating from the second half of the third century. The building, cut out of the rock on the northeastern side of the hill, is about 27 by 13.5 meters in size. Very little of the building has survived. Kohl and Watzinger⁶⁶ were the first to posit the existence of an upper gallery, and later archaeologists have not called this into question. The evidence for such a gallery consists of the base of a corner column, the diameter of which is somewhat less (47 cm) than that of other columns which were found (60-69 cm). Even Kohl and Watzinger recognize that

this is rather meager evidence upon which to reconstruct an entire gallery, and they concede that the fragment in question may have belonged to a narthex, as in Bar'am, although no traces of such a narthex remain, making such a suggestion fairly speculative. What is significant about this suggestion, however, is that it shows that a column, base or capital of lesser diameter than others found on a given site could have come from several parts of the synagogue, with narthex, aedicula and forecourt being alternative suggestions to gallery.⁶⁷

Just outside of Gush Halav (Arabic: al-Jish),⁶⁸ a Maronite village not far from the Lebanese border, are found the ruins of a synagogue, the first phase of which dates from ca. 250-306. The building was last used as a synagogue in around the middle of the sixth century. The prayer hall of the synagogue measured 13.75 by 10.6-11.0 meters. Two rows of columns divided the room into a nave and two side aisles. According to Kohl and Watzinger, three columns against the back wall formed a further row of columns. In their view, it was by these three columns which the hypothetical women's gallery would have been supported. The evidence given by Kohl and Watzinger for such a gallery consists of two Ionic capitals, 39 and 42 cm in diameter respectively, a drum of a column 41 cm in diameter and a small ashlar with a carved rosette which would form part of a wall frieze, the supposition being that the frieze ran along the back wall of the gallery.⁶⁹

In 1977-78 Gush Halav was re-excavated under the direction of Eric M. Meyers, and further side rooms were discovered, the function of which is unclear. The excavators note that especially "the function of the area to the north between the outer and inner wall has been difficult to determine."⁷⁰ They suggest that there was a gallery across the north end of the building. "This gallery would have been entered either from outside the basilica or possibly from within by wooden stairs, although there are no traces of such an entrance."⁷¹

As further evidence for such a gallery they note, "The debris underneath the architectural dump of the final phase of the synagogue (VIIIb) was virtually sterile, suggesting a kind of raised gallery area above it."⁷² They do not suggest that this hypothetical raised area was for women. Note that although the recent excavators call this hypothetical raised structure a gallery, they envisage something quite different than Kohl and Watzinger had imagined. The putative raised area is simply a

raised platform in the main prayer hall rather than an upper story gallery.

The synagogue found in Arbel⁷³ in Galilee, six kilometers northwest of Tiberias, measures 18.2 by 18.65 meters and is separated into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, a third row of columns extending along the northern side. The synagogue probably dates from the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. The evidence for a women's gallery consists of the base of a column with a molded side and bottom as if it were meant to be placed on top of another row of columns.⁷⁴ The diameter of the column fitting this base would be 41 cm; one shaft of this diameter, as well as one other base without the molded side and bottom portion, but of the same size, were also found. On the basis of these three pieces of evidence, Kohl and Watzinger conclude:

It is therefore certain that there was a two-story structure also in Arbel, a structure with a gallery on three sides above the ambulatory formed by the columns; the entrance to the gallery was probably directly from the slope which juts into the south wall.⁷⁵

What of this entrance? Are any traces of it extant? Kohl and Watzinger show on their plan a small room, noting that the entrance to the gallery was probably above it.⁷⁶ In other words, no trace of a staircase has been found. As for the column base in question, the form does indeed make one think that it was placed above something else, and the theory of a second row of columns is a quite attractive one, although why only one of these was found on the site, while quite a number of other columns are still there, is a question which remains unanswered. If we nevertheless assume a second row of columns and do not assume a stone staircase which later disappeared or a wooden staircase (the latter should by no means be excluded), there remains the possibility of a pseudo-gallery, i.e., of a second row of columns above the first, creating the look of a gallery, a device which would not be unprecedented in ancient architecture. A number of dressed stones with engaged columns were also found on the site of the Arbel synagogue, which Kohl and Watzinger suggest ran along the northern wall behind the gallery. This reconstruction would fit in with either a genuine or a pseudo-gallery.

Samuel Krauss is of the opinion that the women did not sit in a gallery at Arbel, but rather on the tiered stone benches found at the sides, which he calls "terraces." Krauss writes:

Now if our assumption concerning the purpose of this loft [i.e. the terrace] is correct, then one cannot really speak of a separation of the sexes in the ancient synagogues of Galilee, and we would therefore have to concede that all of the Reform congregations which build their synagogues with only a loft for the women on the two long sides of the building are right.⁷⁷

His words, spoken in 1911, make clear what has been at stake here. For a Jewish scholar to admit that there may not have been a women's gallery in the ancient synagogue would be to raise the question as to just how much a necessary part of the Jewish tradition the women's gallery really is. Krauss was confronted with the Reform congregations of his day, for whom the equality of the sexes was an important issue and who had begun to do away with the strict separation between the sexes in the worship service. Krauss perceived the absence of a women's gallery at the ancient synagogue of Arbel as a threat to the practice of having women sit in a gallery or closed-off women's section in the Orthodox synagogues of his day.

The ancient synagogue in Umm al-'Amad⁷⁸ in Galilee, a few kilometers due west of Arbel, dates to the turn of the fourth century. The prayer hall is 22.55 by 14.06 meters in size. Two rows of columns divide it into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns running along the back wall. On the basis of several columns of lesser diameter than the others, Kohl and Watzinger suggest that there may have been a gallery,⁷⁹ although they do not press this hypothesis because the diameter of all the columns is quite variable. No stairs have been found at Umm al-'Amad.

In Hammat Teverya (Tiberias; Arabic: Tabariya),⁸⁰ on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, just south of the hot springs, were found the layered ruins of several buildings dating from the third through the eighth centuries. The earliest recognizable synagogue, dating from the second half of the third century, is 13 by 14 meters in size and is divided by three rows of columns into a nave and three side aisles. Moshe Dothan suggests that the side aisle to the extreme left may have been a women's section, adding, "nevertheless, there was no trace of wall or other division between this aisle and the remainder of the hall, though there may have been some temporary partition (such as a curtain) between the columns."⁸¹ After the second synagogue was destroyed at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, the "Severus Synagogue," also measuring 13 by 14 meters,

was built. Here, too, one assumes that the side aisle to the extreme left may have been for women.⁸²

When this synagogue was destroyed in the fifth century a synagogue in the form of a basilica was built. One entered through a narthex into the main prayer hall, which had an apse at the southwest side and was divided by columns into a nave and two side aisles, with a third row of columns running along the northwest side. The hypothesis is that these columns bore a women's gallery which would have extended over the side aisles and along the back aisle. No evidence is listed for this hypothesis.⁸³

In Ḥammāt Gader (Arabic: al-Ḥamma),⁸⁴ 7.5 kilometers to the southeast of the Sea of Galilee, a synagogue was found which measures around 13 by 14 meters and probably dates from the first half of the fifth century. Erwin Goodenough believes that a small room on the east side with a bench running along its east wall was meant for women.⁸⁵ Eliezer Sukenik, who takes this small room to be a schoolroom, imagines that there was a women's gallery. Sukenik writes:

The remains of the synagogue are practically confined to the foundation. Consequently no data are available for a restoration of the superstructure. It may, however, confidently be inferred that the basilica was provided with a gallery for women worshippers, from the massive pillars at the north-east and north-west corners of the colonnade, features which are shared by our synagogue with those of Chorazin, Capernaum and some other sites.⁸⁶

Since there exist no material remains from the gallery, it is difficult to understand why it may "confidently be inferred" that one existed. Sukenik is working on an analogy with other synagogues where he believes that the women's gallery is archaeologically certain. As this survey of the evidence shows, the gallery is far from being archaeologically certain at the other sites.

The ruins of a synagogue, probably dating from the third century, were found in Umm al-Qanatir⁸⁷ in the Golan Heights, 19 kilometers to the northeast of Ḥammāt Gader. The building is 14 by 19 meters in size and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, with a third row running along the back (west) wall. Kohl and Watzinger conjecture that a gallery ran along the north, west and south sides.⁸⁸ No trace of a staircase has been found. As evidence for the hypothetical gallery, Kohl and Watzinger cite a fragment of the base of a half column (found in front of the building) which would fit with the

fragment of a shaft of a half column. The fragments could have decorated the wall of the gallery. Kohl and Watzinger further note that there are two types of capitals and suggest that the one type could have been for the lower story and the other for the gallery. Goodenough, in citing Kohl and Watzinger's reconstructed gallery, is faced with the dilemma of where to place the Torah shrine. Although the main entrance is in the east and Jerusalem to the south, Goodenough writes, "The Torah shrine with its Shekinah could not have stood anywhere but in the east, for it is inconceivable that women would have been allowed to stand or pass above it"⁸⁹ (i.e., in the gallery). Presumably Goodenough is in some way identifying women with impurity and implying that the men would not tolerate this impurity above the sacred Shekina, but the meaning of his thought is rather unclear here.

Mention should be made here of ad-Dikka,⁹⁰ which is located on the eastern side of the Jordan river, four kilometers north of where it enters the Sea of Galilee. The building, 15.3 by 11.9 meters in size and divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns, probably dates from the third century. Even Kohl and Watzinger admit that there is not enough clear evidence to reconstruct a gallery.⁹¹ They note the existence of one base, one shaft and one capital, as well as a double quarter column from a corner. No trace of a staircase has been found. It is unclear why this evidence, i.e., several fragments of columns and no stairs, should be insufficient at ad-Dikka, while at most of the other sites where Kohl and Watzinger reconstruct a gallery there is not a bit more evidence to support such a hypothesis. In spite of their caution in the text, Kohl and Watzinger nevertheless show a gallery in their reconstruction sketch of the synagogue.⁹²

The synagogue in Beth Alpha,⁹³ famous for its beautiful and well-preserved mosaic, is situated 7.5 kilometers northwest of Beth She'an and can be dated at the latest to the end of the fifth century. The basilica is 10.75 by 12.4 meters in size and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of pillars. One entered the prayer hall through a narthex. Sukenik believes that the entrance to a gallery extending over the two side aisles and the narthex was through a small side room to the west of the prayer hall. No traces of the gallery or of the reconstructed stairs in this small room remain.⁹⁴ Asher Hiram suggests that this small room may have been a schoolroom.⁹⁵

The ruins of a third- or fourth-century synagogue were found in Caesarea Maritima.⁹⁶ It was 9 by 18 meters in size and is of the broadhouse type. Michael Avi-Yonah believes that the synagogue possibly had a gallery.⁹⁷ The evidence consists of the fact that the columns and capitals found were of two sizes, 50 and 25 cm respectively; the reports include no mention of stairs. The synagogue was destroyed in the middle of the fourth century and a new one built in its place in the middle of the fifth. No mention is made of this synagogue having had a gallery.

In 'En-Gedi⁹⁸ on the western side of the Dead Sea were found the remains of a synagogue around 12 by 15 meters in size, consisting of a nave and side aisles on the east and west sides, with a further aisle at the south end with stepped benches. A narthex ran along the western side. A number of smaller rooms surround the prayer hall; two of these can be entered from the prayer hall itself. The others are accessible only from the outside. In one of these outer rooms, traces of stairs were found which could have led to a gallery.⁹⁹ Further, an Aramaic donative inscription, found in the western side aisle, speaks of "the great (?) steps," which Dan Barag takes as possibly referring to the steps leading to the gallery.¹⁰⁰ Benjamin Mazar, on the other hand, translates "the upper (?) step."¹⁰¹ Thus, there is not a consensus as to what this inscription refers to. The inscription itself is clearly later than the other mosaic inscriptions, which are from the late Byzantine period,¹⁰² so that whatever step or steps the inscription refers to must be a later addition to the synagogue. The synagogue itself is a Byzantine-period reconstruction of an early third-century synagogue and was probably in use until around 530.¹⁰³

The synagogue ruins in Khirbet Susiya¹⁰⁴ in Judea, thirteen kilometers south of Hebron, probably date from the fourth or fifth century. The building, 9 by 16 meters in size, is of the broadhouse type. One entered the prayer hall through a courtyard and then a narthex. Extending along the south side of the prayer hall are two rooms, which could be entered through the narthex, the second room also from an outside door. At the southern end of the narthex are the remains of several steps, which have been taken as leading to a gallery,¹⁰⁵ which was a later addition and would have extended over these two side rooms and possibly the narthex. It is also possible, however, that these steps led to an area above the courtyard. In the small southwestern room, a stairs was later installed when the room was used for storage.

In addition to the monumental remains, one inscription has been adduced as evidence for a synagogue gallery. The inscription,¹⁰⁶ written in Aramaic with the last two words in Greek, was found in Dabbura in the Golan Heights. Partially reconstructed, it reads, according to Dan Urman:

אלעזר ברן ... [ר]בה עבד עמון|דיה דעל מן
[ΡΟ]ΥΣΤΙΚΟΣ ΕΚΤ[ΙΣΕΝ ... [י]מיהו | רפצו

El'azar the son of . . . made the columns above
the arches and beams . . . Rusticus built (it).¹⁰⁷

The inscription, probably dating from the third century, consists of two lines carved in three fragments of a basalt architrave, the total length of which is 110 cm. Urman writes concerning "the columns above the arches and beams":

These seem to be columns standing on top of a construction of arches and beams or pilasters. In a synagogue such columns could only be in the upper gallery, that is, the women's gallery.¹⁰⁸

We have seen from the survey thus far that there is no archaeological reason to assume the existence of a women's gallery and that the evidence for any kind of a gallery at all is surprisingly meager. Nevertheless, one could take this inscription as independent evidence for a gallery.

The inscription is not unambiguous, however, and before we simply accept it as evidence for a gallery, the vocabulary must be carefully examined. It is not "gallery" which is mentioned, but "columns." These "columns" could indeed be the columns of a gallery, but they could also be demi-columns built into the wall or the columns of a pseudo-gallery, i.e., a row of columns placed on the architrave for decoration and giving the appearance of a gallery. There is, however, one architectural difficulty with the gallery or pseudo-gallery reconstruction. If these fragments are a portion of the architrave on which the columns rested, which it is reasonable to assume, the donative inscription usually being fairly close to the object donated, where are the arches? The Palestinian synagogues have usually been reconstructed as being trabeated rather than arcuated, and this architrave itself would fit in with the reconstruction. Further, the word kippattā can mean "arches" and passimayrā can mean "beams," but kippā can also mean "arched doorway"¹⁰⁹ and passim (Hebrew and Aramaic) can, and usually does, mean "door post."¹¹⁰ An alternative suggestion would be that these fragments do not

come from an architrave at all, but from a lintel,¹¹¹ and that the passmayvâ are door jambs and the kippattâ are rounded arches of the type found above the central door in Bar'am. What, then, would the columns be? Perhaps they are tall columns of the type found in Bar'am in the porch. This would be a rather loose interpretation of dê 'al min, however, so that this interpretation, like that of Urman, does not solve all of the architectural problems. It must be concluded that this inscription is possible evidence for a gallery.

What can we conclude from this survey? First, it is clear that a number of Palestinian synagogues had no gallery. These include the three first-century synagogues, Masada, Gamla and Herodion--if these are indeed synagogues--as well as Beth She'an, Eshtemoa', and probably also the other synagogues where archaeologists have not even thought of reconstructing a gallery. As for those synagogues where archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, we have seen that the evidence ranges from literally no evidence at Beth Alpha, Ḥammad Teverya (south of the hot springs, basilica synagogue) and Ḥammad Gader to the base of one corner column at Meiron, the base of one column (and possibly some additional fragments) at an-Nabraten and one base, one shaft and one capital at ad-Dikka to several steps, fragments of smaller columns and fragments of a frieze at Korazim and steps, several Doric columns and several fragments of an architrave, as well as a number of demi-columns, at Capharnaum.

Archaeological reconstruction must be based on analogy and on material evidence from the site in question. In my view, most excavators of the Palestinian synagogues have taken for granted that there exists solid evidence at other synagogues for a (women's) gallery, and have therefore maximalistically interpreted the minimal evidence at their own sites. One searches in vain for the archaeologically well-founded example of a synagogue with a gallery. Capharnaum has long served as the prime example of a synagogue with a gallery, but, as we have seen, the most recent excavators are of the opinion that they do not have sufficient archaeological evidence to assume the existence of a gallery.

The most serious barrier to the reconstruction of a gallery seems to me to be the lack of staircases. It is simply unrealistic to suppose that campers would have selectively removed all traces of a staircase while leaving behind courses of ashlar, numerous pillars and entire mosaic or flagstone floors. Conversely, the best candidates for having had galleries are those

synagogues where traces of staircases have been found. A staircase is at least solid evidence that people ascended to something. However, even here caution is advised. Gamla is a good example of the need for caution. The first reaction at finding the steps outside the Gamla synagogue was that they led to a gallery. Further excavation showed that the steps formed the culmination of a road leading up to the synagogue. Of the Palestinian synagogues there are five with traces of a staircase: Gamla, Capharnaum, 'En-Gedi, Khirbet Susiya and Korazim. Gamla must be excluded for the reasons just mentioned. As for the others, the possibility must be taken very seriously that these steps led to a gallery. However, one must also note that in none of these cases is it clear that the steps in question actually led to a gallery. At Capharnaum the most recent excavators believe that the steps led to a storage room. At 'En-Gedi the steps are situated in front and to the side of the narthex among a number of rooms surrounding the synagogue proper. The steps could have led to a gallery, but they could just as easily have led to the roof or second story of one of the adjoining structures. The reconstruction of a gallery at Khirbet Susiya seems fairly plausible on the basis of the steps, which are located in the narthex and must therefore lead to something above either the prayer hall or the courtyard. The difficulty at Khirbet Susiya, however, is that no other finds indicating a gallery have been found. Further, one must remember that there are also steps in the second small room to the south of the prayer hall which apparently led to a storage room; these should remind us of the variety of things to which steps can lead. Korazim has both steps and some fragments which could have come from a gallery, and therefore a reconstructed gallery does not seem implausible, although here again the steps could have led to the roof or second story of the storage room on the northwest corner of the building or to another installation. In spite of all these difficulties one can say that a reasonable case can be made for the existence of a gallery at Capharnaum, 'En-Gedi, Khirbet Susiya and Korazim.

Khirbet Shema' is a special case and must be treated separately. Here stairs are not necessary, due to the synagogue's being built into the side of the hill. As with the four synagogues just mentioned, here, too, it is not implausible that a gallery existed. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that nothing remains of the gallery itself except the bedrock on which it may have rested and a trace in the stone which could

have been for a door. The several small pieces of architecture found among the ruins could just as easily belong elsewhere as in the gallery.

As for the other synagogues discussed where archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, one must say that the evidence is entirely insufficient to support such a hypothesis.¹¹² The fragments of columns and capitals which have been assigned to the galleries of the various sites, if all taken together, would hardly be enough for one single gallery. Why should campers and builders in search of reusable materials have carefully selected columns, capitals, bases and architraves just from the gallery, leaving behind considerably more of the first story? No synagogue has been found where more of the gallery was extant than of the first story, and yet if left to chance this situation should certainly occur. In addition to the lack of stones from all of these hypothetical galleries, we are confronted with the lack of stairs leading up to them. Now, one could begin reconstructing wooden galleries with wooden staircases, but this seems highly speculative, and the lack of stairs and columns must be taken as a very serious hindrance to the reconstruction of a gallery.

Further, it is not at all clear that these fragments of architecture had to come from a gallery. Perhaps the smaller columns, capitals and bases belonged to other installations, such as an aedicula or a porch. The diameter of columns often varied considerably within a single synagogue¹¹³ and it is purely a matter of definition to assign one column to the lower story and another to the gallery. The diameter of the columns in one portion of the synagogue can also vary from that of another portion, as, for example, between the main prayer hall and the courtyard at Capharnaum. For these reasons, the architectural fragments in question can no longer simply be treated as clearly having come from a gallery.

In summary, then, there are at least five synagogues (if the three first-century structures are synagogues) which clearly had no gallery, and there are five synagogues where a gallery could plausibly be reconstructed, although the evidence is by no means conclusive. In addition to these, there are a considerable number of synagogues where no one has reconstructed a gallery, as well as over a dozen where some archaeologists have reconstructed a gallery, but where a closer examination shows that the evidence is insufficient for supporting such a hypothesis. In other

words, the vast majority of the ancient synagogues in Israel do not seem to have possessed a gallery.

Brief mention of side rooms for women must also be made here. The reader will notice that most of the synagogues whose floor plans are included here do not have a side room. Several, however, do, and it has been suggested that they served as women's sections. The general rule seems to have been that if one did not reconstruct a gallery, one took such a room to be a schoolroom or other type of room. A good example of this is *Ḥammāt Gader*, where Asher Hiram¹¹⁴ and Erwin Goodenough¹¹⁵ suggest that the side room with the bench along one wall could have been the women's section, while Eliezer Sukenik,¹¹⁶ who assumes the existence of a gallery, takes it to be a schoolroom. *Ḥammāt Teverya* (south of the hot springs) is a further example. In the Severus Synagogue, where a gallery is not assumed, one has taken the aisle to the extreme east to be a women's section,¹¹⁷ whereas in the later basilica synagogue built on the same spot a gallery is assumed and the side room to the west of the prayer hall is considered a schoolroom.¹¹⁸ One cannot exclude the possibility that the side rooms found in some Palestinian synagogues did serve as women's sections, but there is no archaeological or, as we shall see, literary reason to do so. The real analogy has been the use of a separate room as a women's section in modern synagogues. This is an anachronistic analogy and therefore methodologically questionable.

2. Synagogues in the Diaspora in the Roman and Byzantine Periods

A number of synagogue remains have also been found in the Jewish Diaspora. A brief survey of the evidence for a women's gallery or women's section will complete the collection of Palestinian evidence considered thus far.

The most ancient synagogue (1st C. B.C.E.)--if it is indeed a synagogue--found to date is the synagogue on the island of *Delos*¹¹⁹ in the Southern Aegean. The building consists of three oblong rooms side by side. The wall separating Room A from Room B is later than the structure itself and is pierced by three doors. Benches lining the northern and western walls of Room A are broken by a highly decorated stone chair. In Room B benches run along the western wall and part of the southern one. It has been suggested, presumably because of the stone chair, that Room A served the men and that Room B was for the women.¹²⁰

Erwin Goodenough, however, who is very interested in establishing the mystery nature of ancient synagogue worship, writes:

Those who have discussed the synagogue as such have thought that the two rooms were respectively for men and women, but this I should doubt. As in the early structure at Dura, I should think the women stood in the outer chambers of C, or did not attend at all, but not that benches were provided for them in Room B. The inner chamber, A, seems to me to be the adyton which in Capernaum, for example, lay behind the screen.¹²¹

This discussion demonstrates the arbitrariness of assigning a particular room to the women. While some scholars would relegate the women to Room B, where they could at least sit and hear, though not see very much, Goodenough sends them off to Room C, where they could neither see nor hear, nor even have a bench to sit upon. There is no archaeological reason for any of these room assignments; they are, rather, the result of the presupposition that there must have been a separation of the sexes in the ancient synagogue. Room B could as easily have been a classroom as a women's section and Room C could have served as a hostel or some other purpose.

On the island of Aegina,¹²² just across from Piraeus, which is in Attica, were found the remains of a synagogue which the excavator Belle Mazur dates to the fourth century,¹²³ while noting that the foundations of an older building, possibly also a synagogue, lie under the present structure. Due to abutting houses, the entire complex could not be excavated. What was excavated is a single hall exactly enclosing a mosaic floor which measures 13.5 by 7.6 meters. An apse on the east side extends beyond the mosaic. On the level of the older building and running parallel to its northern wall were found two chambers. Mazur suggests that the younger synagogue made use of these older chambers as women's quarters or as levitical chambers.¹²⁴ One must note that it is not even clear that these older rooms had anything to do with the prayer hall at all.

The largest ancient synagogue found to date is the basilica synagogue in Sardis¹²⁵ in Asia Minor. (The main hall alone is 54 by 18 meters in size.) The building went through a number of building stages, with the present interior of the structure dating from the fourth century,¹²⁶ although some portions of it are older. One entered through an atrium with a colonnaded portico and proceeded into the prayer hall; an internal apse was situated at the west end and the famous "eagle table" in the nave. There were two rows of piers, one along the northern and

one along the southern wall. In his 1963 report, David Gordon Mitten notes, "It is still uncertain whether these features were bases for roof-supports or for piers on which galleries, similar to those familiar from synagogues in Palestine, rested."¹²⁷

Andrew R. Seager also shows a second story for the main prayer hall in his 1968 reconstruction of the Sardis synagogue.¹²⁸ By 1972, however, probably after more careful study of the matter, Seager writes, "Two rows of piers within the hall may have supported side galleries as well as the roof, but no cogent evidence for galleries has been found."¹²⁹ This development is worth noting. At first one assumed a gallery on the basis of the supposed Galilean parallels, but further study revealed that the site itself produced no cogent evidence for such an assumption.

The German excavators Theodor Wiegand and Hans Schrader discovered the ruins of what they took to be a house church in 1895-1898 in Priene¹³⁰ in Ionia. Subsequently discovered Jewish symbols in the building are evidence that the building, which measures 10 x 14 meters, was actually a synagogue.¹³¹ One entered through a small forecourt into the prayer hall, which, as stylobates attest, was divided into a nave and two side aisles. A stone bench ran along the northern wall, and a small square niche in the eastern wall probably served as a Torah niche. No suggestion has been made of a women's gallery or women's section, and there is nothing in the ruins to indicate such a thing.

In Miletus¹³² in western Asia Minor are the remains of a building which could be a synagogue, although no Jewish evidence has been found. I believe that there is insufficient evidence to identify this as a synagogue, but cite it here to illustrate the way in which A. von Gerkan deals with the issue of the women's gallery. The date of the building is uncertain, but a late, i.e., Byzantine, date seems likely. Located in a complex of buildings, the room in question is oblong (18.5 by 11.6 m) and is divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns. One proceeded from a forecourt with a peristyle through one of three doors (at an earlier stage) into the large room; at the present stage the two outer doors are blocked by two piers. Gerkan is of the opinion that the columns must have borne a gallery because they are so close together; he does not suggest that this would have been a women's gallery, nor does he mention any fragments that might have belonged to it or stairs leading to it.¹³³

Recent excavations in Stobi¹³⁴ in Macedonia (Yugoslavia) have brought to light the remains of two synagogues underneath

Christian basilica ruins. The older synagogue (possible 1st C. C.E.), which measures ca. 7.9 x 13.3 meters, contains donative inscriptions mentioning the name Polycharmos, thus tying it in with the dedicatory inscription mentioning Claudius Tiberius Polycharmos found on a column in the atrium of the basilica. This latter inscription (CII 694)¹³⁵ speaks of "upper chambers" (hyperōa) of which the donor and his descendants were to maintain disposal, perhaps for living purposes. In other words, far from being a women's gallery, these "upper chambers" were for the private use of the donor. A women's section or women's gallery has not been suggested for the younger synagogue.

The ancient synagogue excavated in Ostia,¹³⁶ the port of ancient Rome, dates from the fourth century. The prayer hall, which measures 24.9 by 12.5 meters, is part of a complex of rooms including one with an oven for baking. One approached through an area with a mosaic floor, then proceeded through an inner gateway with four columns and finally entered the innermost section, an oblong room with a bema at the western end and an aedicula, or Torah shrine, at the southeastern end. Two fallen marble columns were found in the main prayer hall. The excavators have not suggested the existence of a gallery or separate women's section. Beneath this synagogue were found the remains of a first-century C.E. building, which may also have been a synagogue. Here, too, the excavators do not assume the existence of a separate section for women.

The third-century synagogue found in Dura Europos¹³⁷ has been one of the most spectacular synagogue discoveries to date, due to the excellent condition of the building and especially of the frescoes decorating its walls. The main prayer hall, measuring 13.65 by 7.8 meters, is located in a complex. No one has suggested the existence of a gallery, which would be impossible given the architecture. A separate women's room has, however, been suggested. Beneath the third-century synagogue were found the remains of an earlier synagogue, and in this earlier synagogue, Room 7, a small room to the east of the prayer hall has been taken to be a possible women's section.¹³⁸ Erwin Goodenough, however, sees this as impossible due to the wear on the threshold between Room 7 and the main prayer hall, Room 2. Goodenough writes:

First, the well-worn threshold of the little door that joined Room 7 with Room 2 indicates a frequency of going back and forth unthinkable if the room was used for women, but quite intelligible if processions from one room to the other were a

regular part of the ritual. A glance at the plans of oriental synagogues strengthens this feeling. Kohl and Watzinger give a number of such plans, from which it is at once clear that if women were accommodated in the synagogues at all, they did not stroll in with the men and sit in full view of them. Rather they had a separate entrance from the outside to a room entirely screened off from the room where the men worshipped. The heavy wear of the sill shows that Room 7 in the early synagogue could not thus have been blocked off.¹³⁹

The oriental synagogues referred to by Goodenough, several floor plans of which are given by Kohl and Watzinger,¹⁴⁰ are none other than modern oriental synagogues. With this it becomes clear that the true analogy for the women's section and the starting point for the search thereof is the contemporary Orthodox synagogue. Given the absolutely strict separation implied by the modern concept of the women's section, Goodenough seems to me quite right in insisting that a worn threshold could not have served as the barrier between women and men. Presumably, Goodenough assumes that, in the absence of a women's section, women did not go to the synagogue at all.

The later synagogue did not have this separate room, for the whole area was taken up by the forecourt. Carl Kraeling therefore suggests that the women prayed with the men in the main prayer hall, but that they sat on the south side of the room. Kraeling writes:

What we know about the nature of the wall decorations in this area, and what we can infer from the existence of the smaller door, makes it clear that the benches in question were those normally used by the women and that here the raised footrests were omitted lest modesty and propriety be offended. Along the south wall in the benches used by the women two additional provisions were made to safeguard modesty and simultaneously to provide easier access. One was a rectangular recess in the lower bench where it abutted on the reveal floor of the smaller door, the other a rectangular platform set into the southwest corner of the chamber floor below the lower bench.¹⁴¹

By the "nature of the wall decorations," Kraeling means that the west wall bears the fresco with Elijah raising the widow's son. He suggests that this scene is especially appropriate vis-à-vis the women's entrance.¹⁴²

While it must be emphasized again that Kraeling is doing what archaeologists should do, namely reconstructing, one must nevertheless note how shaky the evidence is upon which he builds his theory. The fact that a woman appears in a certain fresco can hardly be taken as evidence that it was women who sat beneath

it, and there are many reasons why one door is smaller than another. The special features of the benches (steps, etc.) could be taken as safeguards for feminine modesty, but they could also mean no more than that a different person built the benches on that side of the room, adding some features (steps) and omitting others (footrests). In spite of all this, Kraeling's suggestion that the women sat together on one side of the room in the later synagogue at Dura fits in better with the archaeological evidence than other possible suggestions, such as a gallery or a women's room. It may well be that if there was any separation of the sexes at Dura, then it was of the informal type proposed here. In any case, the later synagogue at Dura did not have a women's gallery or a separate room for women.¹⁴³ Most likely, neither did the earlier synagogue.

In 1883 a Captain Ernest de Proudhomme who was stationed at Hamman Lif (Naro),¹⁴⁴ not far from Tunis in North Africa, performed an amateur excavation of a synagogue mosaic and of the building complex in which it was located. What seems to have been the main prayer hall can be approached from two directions, with many small rooms on either side of the approach ways. In the prayer hall was a magnificent mosaic (much of it now lost) with a large inscription in the middle:

Sancta sinagoga Naron pro salutem suam ancilla tua Iuliana p(ateressa?) de suo proprium teselavit. Menorah¹⁴⁵

L. 1: read sanctam synagogam.

Your servant Juliana, "fatheress" (?), paved with mosaic, from her own funds, the holy synagogue of Naro for her salvation.

A woman donated the entire mosaic for the prayer hall; given the high costs of mosaics, this must have been a very substantial donation. Does it seem reasonable that the wealthy woman who donated the mosaic should also have had the right to tread upon it? Not so to Erwin Goodenough, who writes:

She herself could presumably not have attended the services in this sancta synagoga; but as with all daughters in Israel, her hope was in the maintenance of Jewish worship and life.¹⁴⁶

Goodenough places the women worshipers in the room to the left of the prayer hall, for it has a separate entrance and no access to the prayer hall at all; indeed, one could neither see nor hear anything from this room. Goodenough notes, "This room might have

been used for a guest hostel, but seems to me more likely, from its total isolation, to have been designed for the women."¹⁴⁷

Methodologically it is important to keep open the possibility that the ancient Jewish men in Ḥammam Lif were of the mentality described by Goodenough, that they desired to isolate totally the women in a room from which they could not see into the prayer hall nor hear the Torah being read or the sermon being given. It is also important not to exclude the possibility that the ancient Jewish women in Ḥammam Lif accepted this, that the benefactor Juliana did not take offense at never being allowed to pray in the room in which lay the mosaic she had donated. All of this is possible, but where is the literary or archaeological evidence for it? There being no Jewish literary sources from Ḥammam Lif, we are dependent on the monumental remains. Archaeologically, there is no reason to assume that the room in question is a women's section rather than a hostel, a meeting room or a schoolroom.

This survey has shown that there is no Diaspora synagogue in which a strong archaeological case can be made for a women's gallery or a separate women's section. At Priene and Ostia a gallery or room for the women has not even been suggested. In the later synagogue at Dura there is also no separate room or gallery for women. Although there was some speculation in the earlier phases of excavation as to whether the Sardis synagogue might have had a gallery, it has now been recognized that there is "no cogent evidence" for such a gallery. The Stobi inscription does speak of "upper chambers" but these were not for women but rather for the use of the donor, Claudius Tiberius Polycharmos, and of his heirs. At Aegina, the earlier synagogue at Dura, Ḥammam Lif and Delos, a side room (or rooms) has been suggested as a possible women's section. At Aegina it is not even clear that the rooms suggested had any connection with the synagogue. At Dura the worn threshold between the hypothetical women's room and the main prayer hall speaks against the use of Room 7 as a strictly separate women's section. At Ḥammam Lif there are many side rooms, and we do not know the exact use of any of them. There is no archaeological reason for assigning any one of them to women. At Delos we have seen that, while Plassart supposed that the division between Rooms A and B represents the division between the men and the women, Goodenough assigns the women to Room C and makes Room A into an inner chamber for the men, Room B being the men's outer chamber. It is time to recognize that we can only guess at the function of the many

adjoining side rooms in the Diaspora synagogues. It is arbitrary to assign one or the other to women.

B. Is there Literary Evidence for a Women's Gallery or a Separate Women's Section?

No scholar is of the opinion that ancient Jewish literature attests to a general regulation that the sexes be separate in synagogue worship. All admit that this regulation cannot be found in ancient Jewish sources. Eliezer Sukenik, for example, writes:

The ancient literature nowhere mentions a specific regulation to the effect that men and women must be kept separate at public worship; still less is it prescribed that the women's section shall be built in the form of a gallery.¹⁴⁸

In spite of this consensus, scholars have argued that even without a regulation, it was in fact the case that the sexes were kept separate in the synagogue worship. What is the literary evidence for a factual separation?

In the Second Temple there existed a women's forecourt (ʿezrat hannāšim; gynaikōnitis),¹⁴⁹ which contrasted with the forecourt of Israel. This meant that women were normally only allowed into the women's forecourt, but not beyond that;¹⁵⁰ only the men were allowed into the inner forecourt of Israel. What is often overlooked, however, is that the women's forecourt was not reserved for women. It was the large outer court where both sexes mingled together freely. It was not an area where women could pray quietly by themselves, undisturbed by men, for the men had to pass through this area in order to enter the forecourt of Israel. Therefore it can hardly be taken as an example of the separation of the sexes. "Women's" here does not mean reserved for women, but rather restrictively that women could not pass beyond this outer court. Thus, the men had a court reserved for them, but the women did not. This is a totally different model from the one presupposed by those archaeologists who reconstruct a women's gallery with a separate entrance in the Galilean synagogues.

Once a year, however, an actual separation of the sexes was ordained. This was during the water-drawing celebration on the night following the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles.

B. Sukk. 51b-52a reads:

"במוצאי יום טוב כו". מאי תיקון גדול?
 -אמר רבי אלעזר, כאוחה ששנינו,
 חלקה יתה בראשונה והקיפנה גזוזטרא,
 והחקינה שיהיו נשים יושבות מלמעלה ואנשים מלמטה.
 חנו רבנן: בראשונה היו נשים מכפנים ואנשים מבחוץ,
 והיו באים לידי קלות ראש, החקינה שיהיו נשים יושבות מבחוץ
 ואנשים מבפנים. ועדיין היו באין לידי קלות ראש.
 החקינה שיהיו נשים יושבות מלמעלה ואנשים מלמטה.
 היכי עביד הכי? והכתיב "הכל בכחב מיד ה' עלי השכיל!"
 -אמר רב, קרא אשכחו ודרוש, "וספדה הארץ משפחות משפחות לבד
 משפחה בית דוד לבד ונשיהם לבד".
 אמרו, והלא דברים קל וחומר:
 ומה לעתיד לבא שעוסקינן בהספד ואין יצר הרע שולט בהם
 אמרה תורה אנשים לבד ונשים לבד,
 עכשיו שעוסקינן בשמחה ויצר הרע שולט בהם
 על אחת כמה וכמה.

"At the conclusion of the first festival day, etc." (m. Sukk. 5:2). What was the Great Enactment? -- R. El'azar replied, As that of which we have learned. Originally [the walls of the women's forecourt] were smooth, but [later the court] was surrounded by a gallery, and it was enacted that the women should sit above and the men below.

Our Rabbis have taught, Originally the women used to sit within [the women's forecourt] while the men were without, but as this caused levity, it was instituted that the women should sit without and the men within. As this, however, still led to levity, it was instituted that the women should sit above and the men below.

But how could they do so? Is it not written, "All this [do I give you] in writing as the Lord has made me wise by his hand upon me"? (1 Chr 28:19)-- Rav answered, They found a scriptural verse and expounded it: "And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart" (Zech 12:12). Is it not, they said, an *a fortiori* argument? If in the future when they will be engaged in mourning and the evil inclination will have no power over them, the Torah nevertheless says, "men separately and women separately," how much more so now when they are engaged in rejoicing and the evil inclination has sway over them.¹⁵¹

The text describes a temporary (wooden) gallery which was erected for the annual all-night celebration of the water-drawing ceremony on Sukkot. It would have surrounded the women's forecourt, so that the men were on the floor of the women's forecourt of the temple and the women in a gallery surrounding it. R. El'azar's words are a nearly exact quotation of m. Mid. 2:5.¹⁵² They are followed by a baraita (i.e., Tannaitic saying), and the two sayings serve to explain each other, that is, the reader is meant to take the *gēzūztārā'* (Greek: *exōstra*) as the architectural concretization of the women sitting above. The gemara raises the question as to how this innovation in the temple architecture could be allowed, quoting 1 Chr 28:19 as proof that the (First) Temple should not be changed. The third century Babylonian Amora Rav answers that Zech 12:12 can serve as a proof text for the

validity of this innovation. The explanation is that the text refers to a future period of mourning and requires a separation of the sexes even when mourning, that is, when one would not expect the evil inclination to arouse their sexual desires. How much more is it necessary to separate the sexes when they are engaged in celebrating this special festival--a time when one would expect sexual desire to arise.

Here we have the precise model that scholars have assumed for the synagogues. Is this not sufficient evidence for assuming a similar arrangement in the synagogue? Aside from the fact that a rather uneven development is described here, a development based on anything but a stable notion of how the sexes should be arranged, it is of special note that the Babylonian Talmud brings this gallery into connection with a special holiday, i.e., a night when many people would be present and dancing and wine would be an integral part of the festival. One can hardly draw generalizations from this special arrangement--not for the regular temple service and even less for synagogue worship.¹⁵³

A further possible reference is found in v. Sukk. 55b.14-23 according to which the famous Diplostoon (Hebrew: dippéle 'istéba'; Greek: diple stoa)¹⁵⁴ in Alexandria was destroyed by the Emperor Trajan. After he had killed the men, Trajan offered the women mercy if they would surrender, to which the women answered, "Do to those above ('ilyé') as you have done to those below ('ar'áyé')." This seems to be a very clear case of the separation of the sexes. What is often overlooked, however, is that the parallels in Lam. Rab. 1:45 (on 1:16) and 4.22 (on 4.19)¹⁵⁵ have the terms reversed: "Do to those below (i.e., the women) as you have done to those above." Sukenik dismisses this reversal:

Right or wrong, the Palestinian narrator cannot conceive of the Community Centre in Alexandria otherwise than with a gallery, and that reserved for the women.

Accordingly it would seem that the reading of the parallels in the ordinary edition of Lamentations Rabba, 58b and 68d, where the terms are reversed, is due to a misapprehension. In Buber's edition, p.83, they are simply replaced by 'men' and 'women.'

It is even possible that in Palestinian Aramaic the male and female halves of any congregation were designated colloquially as ארעיא, literally 'those of the ground (floor)' and עיליא, 'those of the upper (floor)' respectively.¹⁵⁶

At the historical level, it is not clear that this account is based on historical fact. Sukenik and those who follow him,

however, are less interested in the early second-century Alexandrian Diplostoon than in the third- and fourth-century Palestinian synagogues. But if this is the case, then how can one so rapidly dismiss the parallels, where "those above" and "those below" are reversed, making the women "those below"? If the interest is in ancient Israel rather than Alexandria, then this discrepancy must be taken very seriously. Further, it is not even clear that 'ilayé' and 'ar'ayé' are spatial terms at all. Marcus Jastrow, for example, takes them to mean "inferior" (i.e., the women) and "superior" (i.e., the men) respectively, and lists y. Sukk. 55b as an "incorrect version"!¹⁵⁷ A further possibility is that the image behind this haggadah is that of a castle or a fortress, where the men fought up above and only when they were killed did the Roman soldiers reach the women below.¹⁵⁸ In light of the ambiguity of the terminology and the lack of agreement in the sources, this passage and its parallels cannot be taken as evidence either for a gallery in the Alexandrian Diplostoon or for galleries in ancient synagogues in Israel.

A further passage of interest is found in Philo of Alexandria. In describing the life of the Therapeutrides and Therapeutai, Philo writes (De vita contempl. 32-33; cf. also 69):

Τὸ δὲ κοινὸν τοῦτο σεμνεῖον, εἰς ὃ ταῖς ἑβδομαῖς συνέρχονται, διπλοῦς ἐστὶ περιβόλος, ὃ μὲν εἰς ἀνδρῶνα, ὃ δὲ εἰς γυναικωνῆτιν ἀποκριθεῖς· καὶ γὰρ καὶ γυναῖκες ἐξ ἔθους συνακροῶνται τὸν αὐτὸν ζῆλον καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν προαίρεσιν ἔχουσαι. ὃ δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν οἰκῶν τοῦχος τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἑδάφους ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἢ τέσσαρας πῆχεις εἰς τὸ ἄνω συνφυκοδόμηται θωρακίου τρόπον, τὸ δὲ ἄχρι τέγους ἀνάγειον ἀχανές ἀνεῖται, δυοῖν ἕνεκα, τοῦ τε τὴν πρέπουσαν αἰδῶ τῇ γυναικείᾳ φύσει διατηρεῖσθαι καὶ τοῦ τὴν ἀντίληψιν ἔχειν εὐμαρῆ καθεζομένης ἐν ἐπηκόῳ, μηδενὸς τὴν τοῦ διαλεγομένου φωνὴν ἐμποδίζοντος.

This common sanctuary in which they meet every seventh day is a double enclosure, one portion set apart for the use of the men, the other for the women. For women too regularly make part of the audience with the same ardour and the same sense of their calling. The wall between the two chambers rises up from the ground to three or four cubits built in the form of a breast work, while the space above is left open. This arrangement serves two purposes; the modesty becoming to the female sex is preserved, while the women sitting within ear-shot can easily follow what is said since there is nothing to obstruct the voice of the speaker.

Should we take this as a first-century example of a separation of the sexes? Yes, by all means, but that gives us no license to generalize that all or even most first-century Jews followed the example of the Therapeutai and Therapeutrides. The group which Philo is describing is a sect, a sect which follows

such unusual life customs as celibacy and the pursuit of the purely contemplative life, as the context of this passage clearly demonstrates. Scholars would not think of using this sect as proof that celibacy or the contemplative life were widespread in Judaism. Why should one view their separation of the sexes during worship in a different way? It may well be that their celibacy and the desire to preserve it were what gave rise to this custom. Further, the divider described does not fit in with any synagogue remains known to us. One cannot use a room divider of about 4.5 to 6 meters in height as proof for a women's gallery or separate room for women. Finally, the very tenor of Philo's description of this group of people suggests that he was telling his readers something they did not already know. Whether written for Jewish or for non-Jewish readers, the report on this exotic sect is an introduction to customs not widely practiced. Philo's detailed description arouses the impression that we have before us a rare custom rather than one so widespread that describing it is unnecessary.¹⁵⁹

A further text worth noting here reflects a fourth-century Babylonian practice (*b. Qidd. 81a [mid.]*):¹⁶⁰ אבוי דייר גופלי. "Abaye placed jugs around (them); Rava placed reed around (them). Avin stated, The sorest spot of the year is the festival season." The context of this passage is a discussion of women and men mixing with each other. The jugs and reed were two means of separating the men from the women, i.e., they could be placed on the floor forming a sort of boundary between the two groups. Rashi says that the jugs were pottery shards and that these or reeds were placed in rows between men and women at such gatherings as a sermon or a wedding. The statement, "The sorest spot of the year is the festival season," is a reference to the type of frivolity discussed above in the context of the water-drawing ceremony.

Note that this text makes no reference to the synagogue. If Rashi is right, the gatherings were not necessarily synagogue services, but rather large public gatherings of various sorts. Given all the discussion by archaeologists of permanent architectural features designed to separate women from men, it is especially noteworthy how temporary a jug or reed divider looks to us. This text, therefore, rather than providing support for the thesis of a women's gallery or section in the ancient synagogue, lends credence to the thesis that the separation of the sexes was occasionally practiced at certain large public

gatherings and was facilitated by means of temporary dividers, as for example, reed or jug dividers.

This survey of the literary evidence adduced by scholars in support of a women's gallery or women's section has shown that none of this evidence is convincing. The women's forecourt in the temple was not just for women. The gallery erected in the women's forecourt was just for women but was rarely used. The story concerning Trajan and the women is ambiguous in its terminology and contradictory in its versions. The separation practiced by the Therapeutrides and the Therapeutai cannot be used as evidence for general Jewish practice. The passage concerning the separation of women from men by means of jugs or reeds is not related to the synagogue and actually underscores the temporary nature of the divider. There is, therefore, no convincing literary support for the existence of a women's gallery or women's section.

C. Further Considerations

In order to set the study of the synagogues in its proper context, it is necessary to compare them briefly with churches and temples. As to Christian practice, there was some variety and a certain development. The vast majority of the Byzantine churches in Palestine do not seem to have had a gallery.¹⁶¹ Outside of Palestine some churches seem to have had one (e.g., the Church of St. John Studios in Constantinople [463],¹⁶² the Church of the Acheiropoietos in Salonika [470],¹⁶³ the Umm-es-Surab in the Hauran, Syria [489],¹⁶⁴ and the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople [537]¹⁶⁵), while others seem not to have (e.g., St. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna [490],¹⁶⁶ Maria Maggiore in Rome [432-440]¹⁶⁷). Galleries in churches, of course, could serve a number of purposes, and should therefore not be identified as "women's galleries."¹⁶⁸ There is, however, some evidence that some Christian communities did institute a separation of the sexes.¹⁶⁹ These varied in form and sometimes applied only to the laity.¹⁷⁰ There is no reason to assume that this practice was ancient or universal or that the earliest Christians adopted it from the Jews.¹⁷¹ The evidence points to its being an independent Christian development which occurred in an uneven and regionally varied way.

It is impossible to give any kind of a survey of temples here, and it also does not seem necessary since ancient synagogues do not bear a great deal of resemblance to ancient Graeco-Roman temples. One type is worth mentioning, however, and

that is the temple with a staircase. Robert Amy made a very thorough survey of temples with staircases, especially of those in Syria, Lebanon and Trans-Jordan.¹⁷² What is significant for our question is that staircases do not disappear in the course of time. Where they are present in the ruins, they have as good a chance of surviving raids by builders in search of material as do columns, piers, or courses of ashlar stones. This fact should be particularly significant for those archaeologists who would reconstruct galleries in Palestinian synagogues even when no staircase is to be found.

If the evidence points so heavily against the reconstruction of a gallery and against the assumption that women and men were strictly separated in the ancient synagogue, why is the opposite the prevailing view? The most likely reason is that modern scholars are still using the contemporary Orthodox synagogue as their *tertium comparationis* rather than allowing for the possibility that in antiquity certain customs were different from today's customs. Further, archaeologists have looked to certain Galilean synagogues for their point of departure, assuming that the reconstructed women's gallery was based on firm evidence.

Has no one called all of this into question? As a matter of fact, five prominent scholars, over a period of the last eighty-one years, have offered their reasons for calling into question the existence of a separate gallery or women's section in the ancient synagogue.

The first was Leopold Löw,¹⁷³ who pointed out that the Talmud makes no mention of it, and that a number of stories make mention of women participating in the synagogue services. He also discusses a number of the passages dealt with above and comes to the conclusion that there was no women's section in the ancient synagogue.

Löw was followed by Ismar Elbogen,¹⁷⁴ who referred to several of the same texts and concluded that women and men probably sat separately, but that the rows for women and for men were side by side. Elbogen does assume, however, that the galleries in the Galilean synagogues were probably for women, although he adds that this is not certain.

Richard Krautheimer¹⁷⁵ also believed that the ancient synagogue did not have a strict separation of the sexes, suggesting that this probably came in gradually.

Asher Hiram¹⁷⁶ argued on various grounds that the ancient synagogue in Israel did not have a gallery, whether for women or not. As a technical argument, Hiram points out that the

Palestinian synagogues were built of ashlar stones with no cement of any sort and that such buildings could not have supported the lateral pressure which would have been exerted by a gallery. As an archaeological argument against the gallery, Hiram cites the ancient coins which bear the images of synagogues, noting that no gallery is visible on them. He further proposes the economic argument that a gallery is rather expensive and the architectural argument that a gallery would have been aesthetically displeasing. If there was a gallery, Hiram concludes, then it must have been over the transverse aisle and have functioned as a classroom. If there was a pseudo-gallery, it could have been used for storage purposes. By rejecting the theory of the gallery, Hiram does not totally exclude the possibility that the women sat in a side room, as he believes they did at Hammat Gader.

Finally, and in the greatest depth, Shmuel Safrai¹⁷⁷ has called the existence of the women's gallery into question. Safrai accepts the existence of galleries, but argues that these were not for women and that, in fact, no reference to a general separation of the sexes in synagogue worship can be found in ancient Jewish literature. Safrai also discusses a significant number of texts which show that women went to the synagogue and participated in the services.

It is time that scholars of Judaica and archaeologists take these arguments seriously.

Conclusions

The archaeological survey has demonstrated that the ancient synagogue ruins in Palestine yield little evidence for galleries. The ancient Diaspora synagogues yield none. While there are side rooms, especially in Diaspora synagogues, there is no archaeological reason to assume that these were for women. It should be stated here that it is not my thesis that one can prove that all ancient synagogues were built without galleries. Rather, it is my thesis that at nearly all sites the evidence is totally insufficient to reconstruct a gallery. Even if these galleries were for women, the architectural and cultural picture emerging would still be vastly different from the one current in modern scholarship. As for the side rooms, it is not my thesis that one can prove that these were not for women, but rather that all evidence is lacking to support the hypothesis that they were for women. Even if the one or the other were a women's section, the cultural picture emerging would still be vastly different from the one current in modern scholarship.

Ancient Jewish literature yields no hint of a strict separation of the sexes in the synagogue. Thus, even if a gallery were to have existed in a particular synagogue, this would not prove that it was a women's gallery. By the same token, ancient literature should caution us from identifying unidentified side rooms as women's sections.

The parallel of Christian churches shows that they do not give us reason to reconstruct a gallery in the ancient synagogues in Israel. The development of the arrangement of the sexes was uneven and regionally influenced. Earliest Christianity does not seem to have had a separation of the sexes.

Ancient pagan temples with stairs show that stairs do not disappear more quickly than other architectural elements.

This has not been the first attempt to call the existence of the women's gallery and the women's section in the ancient synagogue into question. Rather than simply relying on the consensus of scholarship, it is time to rethink the prevailing view, to produce evidence where it exists and to alter one's hypothesis where it does not. It is therefore inappropriate to reject the possibility of women leaders in the ancient synagogue on the grounds that women were not even admitted into the main prayer hall.

CHAPTER VII

FURTHER BACKGROUND ISSUES RELATING TO WOMEN

LEADERS IN THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE

A. Women's Participation in Synagogue Worship Services

The lack of an adequate understanding of women's participation in the life of the ancient synagogue has hindered research on the Jewish inscriptions in which women bear titles. Even the following, very cursory survey of several salient points should shed light on the context from which they arose. The basis for all other participation is attendance at the synagogue services. Women's attendance at synagogue worship services is taken for granted in the ancient sources.¹ The New Testament gives several of the earliest attestations of this. In Luke 13:10-17, Jesus heals a woman who had been bent over for eighteen years. According to the evangelist, the framework of the miracle is a sabbath service: "Now he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath" (Luke 13:10).

The Acts of the Apostles also attest to women's presence at worship services. When Paul and Silas traveled to Philippi, they followed their usual custom of searching out the local synagogue (Acts 16:12b-14):

Ἔμην δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς. τῇ τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμὸν οὗ ἐνομιζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλάλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναῖξιν. καὶ τις γυνὴ ὀνόματι Λυδία, πορφυροπώλις πόλεως θυατείρων σεβομένη τὸν θεόν, ἤκουεν, ἧς ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου.

We remained in this city for some days; and on the sabbath day we went outside the gate to the riverside, where we supposed there was a synagogue (proseuchē); and we sat down and spoke to the women who had come together. One who heard us was a woman named Lydia, from the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple goods, who was a worshiper of God. The Lord opened her heart to give heed to what was said by Paul.

There is a general tendency among scholars to assume that it is not an actual synagogue service which is meant, but rather some sort of outdoor prayer meeting. The reasons for the hesitancy to translate proseuchē as "synagogue" are: 1) the "we supposed" (hou enomizomen) of v. 13; 2) the use of proseuchē instead of

synagōgē, which is the usual term in Acts (Acts 6:9; 9:2; etc.); and 3) the fact that the congregants are women.² As to the first reason, it does not seem unusual that the missionaries would not know the site of the synagogue in a strange town. Secondly, the term proseuchē perhaps goes back to the sources of the author of Acts (the same term occurs immediately following in 16:16) or is perhaps a simple variant in the author's usage. It is in any case well-attested as meaning "synagogue."³ I believe that the real reason for the hesitancy is that the only congregants mentioned are women. One can see that this is a circular argument: on the assumption that women did not attend or only rarely attended synagogue services, a text which speaks of women attending services is taken as not referring to genuine synagogue worship. None of the three reasons is convincing, and this text is therefore a further attestation of women's presence at Jewish worship services. Another example is found in Acts 17:4, in which "not a few of the leading women" were persuaded by Paul's sermon in the synagogue of Thessalonica. Finally, Acts 18:26, "He [Apollos] began to speak boldly in the synagogue; but when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they took him and expounded to him the way of God more accurately," is an example of a Jewish woman not only attending the service, but also teaching in a synagogue context.

Rabbinic sources also speak of women participating in synagogue services. B. 'Abod. Zar. 38a-38b reads:

אשה קדירה על גבי כירה ובאה עובדה כוכבים
ומניסה עד שתבא מביית המרחץ או מביית הכנסת
ואינה חוששת.

[An Israelite] woman may set a pot on a stove and let a gentile woman then come and stir it pending her return from the bathhouse or the synagogue, and she need take no notice of it.

This saying is a *baraita* (i.e., Tannaitic). Just preceding these words, the text speaks of a male Israelite leaving a gentile man to watch his meat while he is in the synagogue or house of learning. Thus it is assumed that just as men ordinarily go to synagogue, so too do women ordinarily go to synagogue. A further relevant text is y. Ber. 9d.6-8 (cf. b. Soṭa 38a):

עיר שכולה כהנים נושאים אה כפיהן. למי הן מברכין?
לאחיהן שבצפון לאחיהם שבדרום לאחיהם שבמזרח
לאחיהם שבמערב. ומי עונה אחריהן אמר? הנשים והטף.

In a town where all are priests they raise up their hands [to give the blessing]. Whom do they bless? Their brothers in the north, in the south, in the east and in the west. And who answers, "Amen," after them? The women and the children.

Again, the women's presence in the service is simply pre-supposed.⁴ Note that this text presupposes that only male priests give the priestly blessing. A story told of a woman who used to go each week to hear R. Me'ir (ca. 150) preach would be one more example of the way in which also the rabbinic sources take women's attendance at worship services to be an ordinary phenomenon (y. Sotā 16d.38-52; Lev. Rab. 9.9; cf. Deut. Rab. 5.15). Another story about a woman's regular attendance at synagogue services is also relevant here (b. Sotā 22a):

דההיא אלמנה דהואי בי כנישחא בשיבכותה,
 כל יומא הוא אחיא ומצלה בי מדרשיה דרבי יוחנן,
 אמר לה, בחי! לא בית הכנסת בשיבכותך.
 אמרה ליה, רבבי! ולא שכר פסיעות יש לי.

A certain widow had a synagogue in her neighborhood; yet she used to come daily to the school of R. Johanan and pray there. He said to her, "My daughter, is there not a synagogue in your neighborhood?" She answered him, "Rabbi, but have I not the reward for the steps!"

The issue here is not that the woman goes to the synagogue regularly, but rather that she walks quite a distance to attend services in a synagogue far from her home and merits reward for her extra steps. That she attends is not cause for surprise. The background of these sources is that, according to Tannaitic halakhah, women are obliged to pray (m. Ber. 3:3); prayer in the synagogue is one of the ways of fulfilling that obligation.

In the light of such sources, one can say with certainty that Jewish women attended synagogue services in the period of the Second Temple and of the Mishnah and the Talmud. It is difficult to understand how Goodenough could write with reference to the Juliana who had donated the mosaic in the synagogue at Naro in North Africa:

She herself could presumably not have attended the services in this sancta synagoga; but as with all daughters in Israel, her hope was in the maintenance of Jewish worship and life.⁵

B. Women as Donors to and of Synagogues

Anyone familiar with the workings of private institutions is acutely aware of the connection between the ability to give money and the capability of wielding influence. The boards of

trustees of the private institutions of this country provide ample attestation of this phenomenon. In the ancient world, philanthropy and power were also intimately connected with each other, perhaps even more so than today, whereby it is not always clear whether philanthropy was the prerequisite to holding office or vice versa. In an article entitled "Feminism in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum," S. L. Mohler writes:

It follows as a natural corollary to the importance of games and *epula* in the life of the ancient communities that social leadership was determined to a considerable extent by the ability of individuals to supply the demand for these forms of entertainment.⁶

After outlining the concrete relationship between certain official titles held by women and philanthropy, Mohler notes:

Having once received this formal recognition as public functionaries--which meant as much or as little as election to a magistracy--, these women were in a position to enter upon the prescribed career of philanthropy.⁷

Without simplistically transferring the situation of the non-Jewish world onto Judaism, it does seem reasonable to ask whether there might have been a relationship between donations to and of synagogues and influence in the Jewish community. This is not to ask whether synagogue functionaries attained their titles through engaging in donative activity or whether maintaining the synagogue building was one of their functions. Throughout the discussion of the various titles, we have seen that while persons who bear titles often appear in donative inscriptions, so too do those who bear none. The purpose of pointing out the women in Jewish donative inscriptions is not, therefore, to suggest that all of these held leadership positions or were synagogue functionaries. The point, rather, is to view the women title-bearers against the backdrop of women donors, that is, to consider the implications of the existence of women donors for the interpretation of the nineteen inscriptions in question.

For an overview of women donating alone and together with their husbands, as well as of others donating on behalf of women, see the forty-three inscriptions given in the appendix. The most important aspect of this corpus is not any one detail, but rather the very fact of the existence of such inscriptions. They belie the current, often unstated, view of Jewish women in antiquity as very much in the background, as not in any way involved in the public sphere, but rather as absolutely restricted to domestic

activities. They show that at least some women controlled their own property and possessed sufficient sums of money to be able to donate from it. One might ask whether the system of guardianship would not have been a severe restriction on women's control of their property, as the approval of the guardian (tutor, kyrios) was necessary before disposing of one's property. Guardians are not mentioned in the donative inscriptions, probably because donative inscriptions are not legal documents. If the guardian's approval was necessary, which, especially with the smaller donations, may not have been the case, all of these women succeeded in obtaining it. Since the system of guardianship had broken down considerably by the late Roman period,⁸ the question may even be irrelevant for most of the inscriptions.

One synagogue where women were particularly active as donors was that in Apamea in Syria, which contained a mosaic floor with nineteen dedicatory inscriptions (Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 38-56; Inscr. Syrie 1319-1337; CII 803-818). One of the inscriptions is dated to 391 (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38; CII 803⁹). Of the nineteen inscriptions, nine were ordered by women (Appendix nos. 7-15), and another five were ordered by a man (or men) and a woman (or women) together, in two cases with their children (Appendix nos. 30-34). Two further inscriptions contain donations on behalf of women (Appendix nos. 39-40). There are only three inscriptions (Lifshitz, Donateurs nos. 38, 47, 49; Inscr. Syrie 1319, 1328, 1330; CII 803, 812, 814) which mention only male donors (in contrast to nine which mention only women), although one of these (Lifshitz, Donateurs no. 38) refers not to one, but rather to several male donors. A caveat concerning the relationship between being a donor and holding an official position is in order here. In spite of the preponderance of women donors, the only office-holders mentioned by name are men.¹⁰ Thus, the case of Apamea does not demonstrate that where women donate money, they receive official titles. It simply shows that they were active members of the synagogue and in control of a certain amount of money.

An inscription which shows a closer connection between donative activity and official honor is the Tation inscription from Phocaea, Ionia (Appendix no. 3; perhaps 3rd C.).¹¹ Tation donated an entire synagogue and was honored with a golden crown and prohedria, that is, the right to sit in front in the seat of honor. Perhaps this refers to the type of special chair or throne found in the synagogues at Delos, 'En-Gedi and Korazim.¹² One is reminded also of Jesus' indictment of the scribes and

Pharisees who "sit on the seat of Moses" and who "love the best seats (prōtokathedriai) in the synagogues" (Matt 23:2, 6). The prohedria granted to Tation does not fit in with the hypothesis of a women's gallery. One could imagine that this inscription is unambivalent with respect to the honor bestowed upon a woman. Not so to Salomon Reinach, who writes:

The inscription of Phocaea shows us that this distinction [i.e., prohedria] was accorded not only to the wealthy and the learned, but that the community conferred it, by special decision, even upon women.¹³

It would seem that a woman who donates an entire building is, by definition, wealthy, and how Mr. Reinach can know that Tation was not a learned person is unclear to this author.

Another woman who donated an entire synagogue was Julia Severa (Appendix no. 6; probably 1st C.), probably a non-Jewish woman¹⁴ who was a high priestess, agōnothetis and eponymous magistrate (MAMA VI 153, 263, 265).¹⁵ Her name continued to be associated with the synagogue for some time, for the extant inscription does not commemorate the erection of the building, but rather its repair at a later date.

The one woman title-bearer who was also a donor is Theopempte (Appendix no. 4), head of the synagogue. The contribution of her and her son Eusebios was a chancel screen post, possibly also the chancel screen attached to it.

In summary, the references to women in Jewish donative inscriptions do not prove that women were synagogue functionaries in antiquity, but they do show that some women controlled considerable sums of money and were active in supporting the synagogue. This is an important piece of information when considering the question of whether women could have been members of boards of elders or whether mothers of the synagogue might have served on governing boards. One of the functions of such boards might have been to make budgetary decisions. Those in society who are appointed or elected to make budgetary decisions are often those who possess property or money themselves. These inscriptions show that some women in antiquity controlled money and would, therefore, have been good candidates for board membership.

C. Women as Proselytes to Judaism

Scholars have recognized for some time that women proselytes are mentioned relatively frequently in ancient sources.

Josephus, in speaking of the Jewish War, writes that the men of Damascus wanted to carry out a massacre against the Jews of Damascus, and that "their only fear was of their own wives, who, with few exceptions, had all become converts to the Jewish religion (πλὴν ὀλίγων ὑπηγμέναις τῇ Ἰουδαϊκῇ θρησκείᾳ), and so their efforts were mainly directed to keeping the secret from them" (J.W. 2.20.2 § 560). Because this report seems exaggerated to modern scholars, they often assume that these women, or at least the majority of them, had not become full Jews, but rather "God-fearers."¹⁶ It is not at all clear why this should be the case. Josephus further reports that the Jewish merchant Ananias converted King Izates of Adiabene in the following way (Ant. 20.2.3. §§ 34-35):

...πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας εἰσιὼν τοῦ βασιλέως
 ἐδίδασκεν αὐτάς τὸν θεὸν σέβειν, ὡς
 Ἰουδαίοις πατριὸν ἦν, καὶ δὴ δι' αὐτῶν
 εἰς γνῶσιν ἀφικόμενος τῷ Ἰζάτη κάμεινον
 ὁμοίως συνανέπεισεν...

. . . [Ananias] visited the king's wives and taught them to worship God after the manner of the Jewish tradition. It was through their agency that he was brought to the notice of Izates, whom he similarly won over with the co-operation of the women . . .

Izates' mother, Helena, independently of her son, also converted to Judaism. Helena was well-known for her help to the people of Jerusalem in a time of famine and was buried in Jerusalem.¹⁷ The Mishnah (m. Yoma 3:10) mentions Helena's gifts to the Jerusalem temple, and the Babylonian Talmud says that she was very careful to observe all of the commandments (b. Sukk. 2b). Josephus also reports on a Roman woman of high rank, Fulvia by name, who had become a Jewish proselyte and was tricked by three Jewish men into giving them purple and gold, which they promised to deliver to the temple in Jerusalem, but which they actually kept for themselves (Ant. 18.3.5 §§ 81-84). In contrast to all of these references to female proselytes, Josephus mentions only one male proselyte in the Diaspora, Izates.

Some have argued that Poppaea Sabina, the wife of Nero, was perhaps a proselyte or at least favorably inclined to Judaism (Josephus, Ant. 20.8.11 § 195), but this is rather uncertain.¹⁸

The ancient Jewish inscriptions also support the theory that it was especially women who were attracted to Judaism. Of the seven or eight inscriptions from Italy which mention Jewish proselytes, five refer to women (CII 21, 202, 222, 462, 523), and only two or three to men (CII 68, 256, possibly 576). As for the

"God-fearers," Kuhn and Stegemann¹⁹ count four inscriptions referring to women (CII 285, 524, 529, 642), and three referring to men (CII 5, 500, 642). According to their use of the term "God-fearer," CII 683a and 731e should be added to the list; the first refers to a man and the second to a woman. A. Thomas Kraabel, however, has recently called into question the existence of a clearly defined group of persons called by the technical term "God-fearers,"²⁰ and therefore caution is called for in the use of these materials.

Rabbinic literature also makes mention of female proselytes (e.g., m. Ketub. 4:3; b. Ber. 8b; b. Roš. Haš. 17b; b. B. Qam. 109b; b. Hor. 13a; b. Yebam. 46a, 78a, 84b; b. Ketub. 37a; Ger. 2.1, 4). In fact, as the following law from the Theodosian Code makes clear, women continued to become proselytes to Judaism even well into the Christian era (Cod. Theod. 16.8.6; August 13, 339):

Imp. Constantius A. ad Evagrium.

(Post alia:) Quod ad mulieres pertinet, quas Iudaei in turpitudinis suae duxere consortium in gynaeceo nostro ante versatas, placet easdem restitui gynaeceo idque in reliquum observari, ne Christianas mulieres suis iungant flagitiis vel, si hoc fecerint, capitali periculo subiugentur.

Dat. id. aug. Constantio A. ii cons.²¹

Emperor Constantius Augustus to Evagrius.

(After other matters.) In so far as pertains to the women who were formerly employed in Our imperial weaving establishment and who have been led by the Jews into the association of their turpitude, it is Our pleasure that they shall be restored to the weaving establishment. It shall be observed that Jews shall not hereafter unite Christian women to their villainy; if they should do so, however, they shall be subject to the peril of capital punishment.

Given on the ides of August in the year of the second consulship of Constantius Augustus.²²

The only explanation for this law is that large numbers of Christian women had converted to Judaism. Had there only been isolated instances, such a law would be inexplicable. Placing Jewish missionary activity among Christian women under the death penalty must certainly have placed a damper on such activity; that the Roman lawgiver considered such a penalty necessary must indicate that the Jewish mission to women had been enjoying considerable success.

John Chrysostom attests, not to the conversion of women to Judaism, but to Christian women attending the Jewish New Year service in the Antioch of his time, as well as other synagogue services. Not surprisingly, Chrysostom condemns this practice with the sharpest of words, emphasizing that a Christian man is

the head of his wife and that he should keep his wife and his slave at home, not allowing them to go to the synagogue or the theater (Adv. Jud. 2.4-6; 4.3).²³

All of this evidence for women being attracted by and converting to Judaism sheds a new light, not only on ancient Judaism in general, but also on the question of the make-up of new communities of the Diaspora. If large numbers of women in the ancient world converted to Judaism, then it could have been the case that in some communities women formed the majority. Further, if large numbers of women became proselytes, then why should we imagine that men were the only proselytizers? In the imperial weaving establishment, for example, one could visualize women workers, Jewish by birth or by conversion, discussing religious questions with their fellow weavers, inviting them to religious services or festivals and finally arranging for their conversion.

Further, women's attraction to Judaism may have had something to do with the nature of the Judaism to which they were attracted. Is it possible that these forms of Judaism were less restrictive regarding women than some of its forms known to us through history? This does not mean that women could not or have not converted to religions oppressive of women, which is simply a fact in the history of religions. If Judaism was especially appealing to women in the Roman world, however, scholarship must face the question why this was so and re-evaluate our understanding of ancient Judaism accordingly. The attractiveness of Judaism to women cannot be explained as a result of the presence of Jewish women title-bearers, but it is plausible to imagine that active, leading Jewish women were influential in attracting non-Jewish women to join the Jewish community. One clear point of connection between proselytes and women title-bearers is CII 523, in which Veturia Paulla, who had converted to Judaism sixteen years before her death, is called the mother of two synagogues. It is not surprising that a convert, who would have been an especially active member of the synagogue, should also have been involved in the leadership of it.

CONCLUSION

The view that the titles in question were honorific is based less on evidence from the inscriptions themselves or from other ancient sources than on current presuppositions concerning the nature of ancient Judaism. Seen in the larger context of women's participation in the life of the ancient synagogue, there is no reason not to take the titles as functional, nor to assume that women heads or elders of synagogues had radically different functions than men heads or elders of synagogues. Of the functions outlined for each title, there are none which women could not have carried out. If women donated money, and even large sums of it, surely they were capable of collecting and administering synagogue funds. Nor is it impossible to imagine Jewish women sitting on councils of elders or teaching or arranging for the religious service. Even women carrying out judicial functions is not impossible in a tradition which reveres one of its women prophets (Deborah) as a judge. This is not to say that the women of these inscriptions might not have been exceptions. Indeed, they probably were. It is an exception today for women to hold positions of religious leadership. The point is not whether these women were exceptions or not, nor even whether they faced opposition or not--today's women rabbis, ministers and priests certainly do--but whether their titles were merely titles or whether they implied actual functions, just as for the men. It is my view that they were functional, and that if the women bearing these titles had been members of another Graeco-Roman religion, scholars would not have doubted that the women were actual functionaries. This collection of inscriptions should challenge historians of religion to question the prevailing view of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman period as a religion all forms of which a priori excluded women from leadership roles.

Further steps in research would be to consider these Jewish women leaders in the larger context of the history of religions, comparing their functions with those of women leaders in other communities and religions, such as the Isis, Demeter or Dionysus religions. It would also be especially useful to study possible connections between Judaism and Jewish Christianity. For example, it is striking that several early Christian women leaders were Jewish: the apostle Junia (Rom 16:7), the teacher and missionary Prisca (Acts 18:2, 18, 26; Rom 16:3-4; 1 Cor