

Introduction

Emperor Julian's Jewish Gambit

The history of Roman Late Antiquity rarely considers Jews. Unfortunately, material remains of Jews from this period are scant.¹ Meanwhile all that remains of Jewish writings comes from ahistorical literature of the rabbis. The other key source, the writings of the leaders of the Church, presents Jews as rhetorical figures designed to attack “heretical” Christian others.² Scholars like Judith Lieu, Miriam Taylor, James Carleton-Paget, and Christine Shepardson explain how Jews are employed in ancient Christian arguments. Andrew Jacobs uses postcolonial analysis to examine how Jews are used by Constantine, Eusebius, and other Christian Church leaders to develop and cement Christian imperial identity in Palestine. Some of these scholars attempt to elucidate the historical impact of Christian depictions of Jews.³ Rarely, if ever, do scholars explore works of Hellenes who employ Jews in their rhetorical arguments and imperial acts for their own ends.⁴ These inquiries seldom reveal much about the life of Jews in a given society and their interactions with Christians and Hellenes. Of late there are new efforts to bring Jews back into the history of Late Antiquity.⁵ Postcolonial theory has been used fruitfully to establish the Palestinian rabbis as a provincial elite and rabbinic literature as a source for Jewish subaltern voices.⁶

This book approaches the place of Jews in the Roman empire of Late Antiquity from a different vantage point. I argue that Emperor Julian (361–63) employs ethnological discourse to present Jews as the Judean *ethnos* and then uses them as tools not only to undermine Christians as commonly understood but also, surprisingly, to shape Hellenic identity along a variety of philosophical principles but especially along theurgic Neoplatonist philosophical lines.⁷

Like Porphyry of Tyre before him, Julian mines the ethnographic wisdom of the Jews, leavens it with his own observations and then uses his findings to support his Neoplatonist philosophical goals of achieving salvation of the Soul both for individuals and for the Roman *oikoumenē*.⁸ His endeavor can be traced directly to his stay in Syrian Antioch in the second half of 362 and in the first three months of 363. There, in the face of a failing program, and in the midst of renewed efforts to Hellenize the empire, Julian employs Jews *qua* Judeans (the descendants of the Hebrews), their sacrifices, priests, heroes, and institutions, to emulate orthopraxy for Hellenes, a super-*ethnos* and an “imagined community,” while displacing Christians, whom he labels “Galileans,” from his Platonist ethnic map.⁹ Julian’s Jewish gambit is an attempt to leverage the place of Jews in Antioch, where some Christians kept Jewish law and some Hellenes likely participated in Jewish festivals and believed the Jewish god to be the highest god, in order to strengthen his Hellenizing program by convincing these groups to behave and identify in certain ways.¹⁰

Scholars often discount the role of Jews in *Against the Galileans* and in Julian’s other works, cautioning not to make too much of Julian’s rather limited use of Jews.¹¹ Nevertheless, they are forced to explain why, prior to February 363, Julian had never used the term *Ioudaios* in any of his writings, and then suddenly, in the space of three months, Jews appear in five works and are present in at least an additional two letters no longer extant.¹² They appear not only in Julian’s anti-Christian polemic *Against the Galileans* but surprisingly also in his *Letter to Theodorus* and its companion, *Fragment of a Letter to a Priest*, written to his chief priest of Asia and conceived as a manual for Hellenic and priestly practice and behavior.¹³ They are the subject of his letters to the Jews, one of them, the *Letter to the Community of the Jews*,¹⁴ largely intact, and another, extant as a fragment preserved by John Lydus.¹⁵ If we set aside for the moment Julian’s largely negative depiction of Hebrews, whom Julian argues are the ancestors of the Judeans, in the first half of *Galileans*, the remainder of his comments about Hebrews and Judeans in that work and in these other works both cohere and are largely positive.¹⁶ Julian attempts to realize his ethnographic rhetoric by rebuilding the Jerusalem temple and by returning Jews to Jerusalem. His Jewish gambit responds to Eusebius of Caesarea’s attempt in *Preparation of the Gospels* and *Demonstration of the Gospels* Book 1 to “historicize” the Jews as a defunct *ethnos* whose remains could be used to authenticate and define Christianity.¹⁷ By raising the specter of the Jews, Julian resurrects the power of a living, breathing, efficacious, and compelling Jewish people and their laws for Christians, many of whom already experience Jews in Antioch in this way. The content of Julian’s response to Eusebius and his characterization of Hebrews and Judeans as engaging in theurgy not only defines correct practices for Hellenes but refutes Porphyry’s brand of Neoplatonism even as Julian employs and expands Porphyry’s Neoplatonist tactic of mining Jewish sources in the definition of Hellenic identity.¹⁸ In other words, Julian uses Jews *qua* Judeans to

flush out his largely theurgic Neoplatonist program in order to define correct practice for Hellenes.

My reading of Julian's use of Jews runs counter to the standard perception that Jews are merely tools with which the emperor attacks Christianity.¹⁹ Typically, Jews are seen to occupy the place of the straw man in *Galileans*, triangulated with Hellenes and Christians and attacked as the parent of Christians but deemed a legitimate people in the Roman empire with a god and ancestral laws.²⁰ As scholarly understanding of the relationship between Jews and Christians has shifted from a mother-daughter paradigm to one of parallel development, Daniel Boyarin suggests that we read Julian's use of Jews through the lens of heresiological discourse.²¹ In his view Jews are cast as a legitimate if an inferior pole to Hellenes. Christians, who are neither fully Jews nor fully Hellenes but mixtures of both, are cast as heretics and thus deemed illegitimate. Each of these paradigms casts Jews as an "other." At the same time, Julian's scattered claims about Judean practices both in *Galileans* and in his other works are either treated separately from the dynamic in *Galileans*²² or are not considered in light of the full body of that work.²³

The chief claim of my book is that these paradigms miss an entire dynamic within *Galileans*, which plays out over the course of Julian's scattered comments about Jews. Julian's deployment of Jews as ethnic Judeans in *Galileans* and in his other works in furtherance of his Hellenizing program cannot be explained as merely a symptom of the reflection of the "self" in the creation of the "other" that Majaistina Kahlos, Judith Lieu, and others write about.²⁴ Their thesis is that sometimes authors reflect the aspired-for qualities of the "self" in the "other." Judith Lieu's analysis of the virtue of "Germans," an enemy of Rome, functions as a fascinating case in point.²⁵ Julian's Judeans perform much more than merely reflect the Hellenic self in *Galileans* and in his other works. Nor are they always ethnic exempla in the way Aaron Johnson describes Porphyry's use of Jews.²⁶ Rather his Judeans sometimes are sources for ancient Hellenic wisdom. Their practices bear ancient wisdom and they can be interpreted and used to shape Hellenic identity and to support universalist philosophical goals. In the final section of *Galileans*, Julian uses Judeans in order to drive his argument forming Hellenic identity. Further, I engage the scholarly debate about whether *Ioudaios* should be translated as "Jew" or "Judean" before the late fourth century C.E. In Julian's works, Jews are labeled Judeans by a Roman emperor for his own purposes.²⁷ Throughout this book we will see how Julian's ethnological use of Jews as Judeans achieves this.

This book is not the first to point out that Julian aligns Jews with Hellenes in the final sections of *Galileans*. Some years ago, Jay Bregman argued that Julian saw in Jews a divine mystery and posited that he may have found his own "meaning and significance" in the Temple in Jerusalem.²⁸ Jewish traditions, he noticed, retain validity and derive from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whom Julian identifies as Chaldeans skilled in theurgy and who worship a great god.²⁹ In the *Letter to the*

Community of the Jews Julian even presents the Judean god as a solar deity, identical to Helios, Julian's patron and the Demiurge. Therefore, argued Bregman, by reinstating Jewish religion, Julian was reviving true Hellenic religion, which entailed theurgic rites and temple sacrifice. His argument does not go so far as to posit that Julian used Jews to develop Hellenic identity. However, Bregman did not examine all the evidence about Jews; nor did he set it in its Antiochene context. His thesis has been criticized by Ilinca Tanaseanu-Döbler, who argues that Bregman does not think through the meaning of "theurgy."³⁰ She correctly notes that Julian's use of theurgy stands in for mystical revealed wisdom rather than Iamblichus's theurgic ritual. Indeed, we will see that Julian's attribution of theurgy to Judean Scripture and practices largely does refer to secret wisdom rather than to the theurgic *technē* of the theurgists, who were trained in identifying and manipulating all of the *sunthēmata* (symbols or thoughts of the One) of the gods contained in the cosmos to achieve union with the One. However, Iamblichus recognized that various people's ancestral traditions carried within them theurgic elements even in the absence of a theurgist to guide them.

More recently, Giorgio Scrofanì has argued that Julian strategically develops a close parallel between Judeans and Hellenes in order to show how Christians have strayed from the idea of purity shared by the other two groups.³¹ In response to Christian claims that animal sacrifice is impure, Julian argues that Judeans are pure and that everything they eat is sacred.³² Indeed, the Eucharist, argues Julian, is not authentic atonement sacrifice, and Christians have given up their ability to purify themselves by apostatizing from their Judean ancestral traditions. Scrofanì correctly sees this argument working in fourth-century Antioch, where some Christians kept the Day of Atonement.³³ However, he warns that Judaism is of little use to Julian in proving the validity of Hellenic worship.³⁴ Scrofanì's argument that Julian strategically aligns Jewish and Hellenic traditions in order to undermine Christian notions of purity and atonement is compelling. However, he misses that Julian also is describing Iamblichean ideas of sacrificial atonement. In chapter 3 we will see that the relevant sections of *Galileans* are addressed to Hellenes as much as they address Christians. Nor does Scrofanì consider that *Galileans* forms part of a triptych of works that includes Julian's *Hymn to King Helios* and the *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods*, which are all designed to outline his Hellenizing program.³⁵ Among these works *Galileans* defines the correct worship of the gods. Specifically, Judean worship is designed not only to delegitimize Christians who fail to practice their Judean ancestral laws but also to define Hellenic orthopraxy.

Bregman's observation that Jewish practice contains theurgy opens a door to a different and new analysis of Julian's use of Jews. Scholars from Josef Vogt on have claimed that Jews and Hellenes parallel each other in the final part of *Galileans* for the purpose of denouncing Christians.³⁶ Boyarin's heresiological argument essentially argues the same thing. These analyses never consider the role of Jews in

developing Hellenic identity. Consequently, we understand only half of Julian's project in *Galileans*. This means we tend to overlook the fact that Julian was a Neoplatonist philosopher who read Porphyry and carried a tradition that Jews could be ethnic examples and sometimes even sources for Hellenic wisdom. We, therefore, miss that Jews as Judeans were a resource for Julian in his establishment of Hellenic identity. Antioch was the indispensable backdrop for Julian's arguments. As Scrofanì notices in the instance of purity, Julian frames his arguments addressing local Antiochene issues, particularly where Jews and Christians intersect and share practices.

In the following chapters I explore Julian's use of Jews as Judeans in the Antiochene context in greater depth through the prism of ethnological discourse. As Julian engages with his Hellenizing efforts of early 363, he enters a field of polemical and apologetic discourse that uses ethnographic knowledge about Jews to control subject peoples in an imperial context. Ancient historians and polemicists had a "dispositional" orientation or predisposition to use *ethnē* discursively.³⁷ This activity essentialized, assigned distinctive dispositions and practices, to each *ethnos*, and then arranged them into "cultural, social and intellectual hierarchies" that would influence how people were to understand their relations with others.³⁸ Like other ethnographers, Julian reinterprets the findings of previous authors like Celsus, Origen, Porphyry, and Eusebius to fit his particular goals and adds to them, drawing in part on his knowledge about the Jews of Antioch.³⁹ In *Against the Galileans* and in the *Letter to Theodorus* Julian employs ethnic argumentation, defined by Aaron Johnson as "the concern to strategically formulate ethnic identities as the basis for an apologetic argument," to shape Hellenic identity and undermine Christian ethnic identity.⁴⁰ Next to a Judean *ethnos* with a newly reclaimed capital and rebuilt Temple, Christians are defined as ethnic Galileans, an oxymoron as the Galilee had never been home to a single *ethnos* possessing its own cultic center. Meanwhile, Hellenes, an "imagined community," are encouraged by Julian to emulate Jewish sacrificial practice and a number of other Judean practices. The ethnological approach to studies on Julian is relatively new. Virtually all scholars have defined Julian's Hellenizing program through the lens of religion. The best example of this can be found in the work of Vasiliki Limberis.⁴¹ An exception is Florin Curta and to a limited extent Aaron Johnson as well.⁴² However, recent studies have shown the difficulties of using religion to describe phenomena in the ancient world.⁴³ Although recent efforts have been made to revive the use of religion as an analytical tool for this period,⁴⁴ nevertheless, Julian's ethnological arguments are at the core of the arguments in this book. He is an example of an anti-Christian author who engages in polemics within a discourse of ethnicity. His works share a strategy of identity formation through the use of ethnicity. To define Hellenes Julian is very occupied with defining Jews and Christians as ethnic entities. I hope this study will contribute to our understanding of local and specific dynamics of

cultural and ethnic contestation in fourth century Antioch in which Jews played an important part.

Chapter 1 explains Julian's imperial Hellenizing program. Julian marketed himself as a son of Helios who was raised by the gods, given perfect divine knowledge, and sent back to Earth to correct the errors of the Flavian Dynasty, which had mischaracterized the cosmic order and destroyed the temples and images of the gods. Now emperor, *pontifex maximus*, and prophet of Didymeian Apollo but acting as a philosopher with divine knowledge, Julian set out to define the correct hierarchy of ethnic gods who ensured the health and success of the Roman *oikoumenē* and to articulate correct worship, which would gain their beneficence. As a theurgic Neoplatonist philosopher, Julian sought salvation for every soul in his empire and, through them, for the entirety of the Roman *oikoumenē*. He was challenged by the fact that Hellenes did not self-identify as such. Julian borrowed Porphyry of Tyre's tactic of finding ethnic particular wisdom in the texts and practices of certain barbarian *ethnē*, particularly the Jews, to inform his universal and imperial Hellenic goal of salvation. This chapter explores what Julian meant by Hellenes, Judeans, and Galileans, and lays the foundation for how he presented Jews and marshaled them to shape Hellenic identity and to undermine Christian identity: all this to achieve his theurgic Neoplatonist goal of salvation for the Roman *oikoumenē*.

Chapter 2 lays out the Antiochene setting prior to Julian's arrival there in the late summer of 362 and explains how Julian's stay in the city upset the Antiochenes' lives. The chapter explores the cosmopolitan nature of Antioch and the embeddedness of Jews within the city and its territory, as well as their interactions with local Christians and Hellenes. Many Christians kept Jewish laws and worshipped in Jewish synagogues. There is also evidence that some Antiochene Hellenes celebrated Jewish holidays with Jews and Christians. Some may have considered the Jewish god to be the highest god. Julian's ethnic argumentation in *Galileans* and in his other works of early 363 map on to the Antiochene landscape. His arguments about Jews are designed to interact with Jewish sites or Jewish practices there, and this chapter offers a tableau of the landscape as it was in early 362 before Julian's arrival. It then explains the emperor's experiences in Antioch in the second half of that year.

Chapter 3 situates Julian's *Galileans* in the context of imperial ethnographic literature that shapes and positions Hebrews, and Jews, in various ways with Hellenes and Christians to define these imperial entities. After discussing the state of *Galileans* and its main source, Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*, it places Julian in dialogue with Celsus, Origen, Porphyry of Tyre, and Eusebius of Caesarea. When Julian is compared with these authors, it becomes apparent that he does not merely follow his sources about Hebrews and Jews but changes them by explicitly using the language of ethnicity to highlight their ethnographic character in a manner that seeks to alter Antiochenes' perceptions of Jews as Judeans which he then

uses to support his Hellenizing program in Antioch. This is especially apparent in the final part of that work, where he adopts Porphyry's framework that Christians are truly heretical Judeans but changes the content of his attack in order to shape Hellenic orthopraxy via his presentation of Judean practices.⁴⁵ The efficacy of Judean law is a vital piece of Julian's response to Eusebius's ethnic legitimization of Christians in *Preparation* and *Demonstration*, and is an organizing principle of the final section of *Galileans*. Its continuity with Hebrew law proves that, contrary to Eusebius, Judeans are the Hebrews of old and undermines Christian ethnic legitimacy. At the same time Julian borrows and extends a Neoplatonist tactic of using Hebrews and Jews as sources for Hellenic wisdom. In *Galileans*, Jews become Judeans, and their laws and institutions become useful tools that Julian employs to shape Hellenic identity. Meanwhile, Christians are Galileans, a non-*ethnos* from a region without a people, temple, god, or cult. Understanding this dynamic is crucial to comprehending Julian's use of Jews as Judeans, because it is repeated in every other one of Julian's works about Jews. We will see also that pieces of the *Letter to Theodorus* written at the same time as *Galileans* similarly contain a large section of ethnographic reasoning involving Hellenes, Judeans, and Galileans.

Chapter 4 explores Julian's effort to employ Judean "sacrifice" as a model for Hellenic practice and to convince Christians that the Eucharist bore no relationship to Hebrew sacrifice. The theurgic Neoplatonist philosopher Iamblichus of Chalcis claimed prayer combined with animal sacrifice was essential to the proper propitiation of the gods (*On the Mysteries* 5.25). But animal sacrifice was rare in Antioch, eschewed by many Hellenes and by Christians. In *Galileans* fragment 72 (= 305D–306A), Judean private sacrifice stands in for Hellenic sacrificial orthopraxy. Like theurgic Neoplatonic sacrifice, Judean private sacrifice contains theurgy, while Hebrew sacrifice on the Day of Atonement and Hellenic sacrifice achieve expiation. Meanwhile, Galilean sacrifice—the Eucharist—has no continuity with Hebrew sacrifice and is therefore invalid. The chapter also considers Julian's sources for Judean private sacrifice and how his presentation overlaps and contests rabbinic and Christian narratives about Jewish private sacrifice. This analysis will explain why Julian's argument might have been compelling to Antiochenes.

Chapter 5 argues that Julian draws on Judeans to model his highly innovative priestly program. Julian assigns chief priests over the provinces and allows them to choose local priests in the temples in accordance with a series of criteria that he sets out in his *Letter to Theodorus* and in its companion, the *Fragment of a Letter to a Priest*. Julian's presentation of Judean priests offers more evidence that he draws in part on theurgic Neoplatonism in thinking about Hellenic priests. In Julian's writings Judeans exemplify the priestly life, and they execute laws laden with theurgic wisdom. It is this same priestly life that the emperor seeks to instill in his priests. Judeans themselves behave like what Garth Fowden describes as "pagan holy men" in observing their dietary laws, criteria by which Julian chooses his priests.⁴⁶ Just as

Julian seeks to promote the priests to the highest levels of leadership in the empire, he offers Judeans as an example of a people who hold priests in high esteem and implicitly suggests that he will restore Judean priests to positions of leadership. Further, Judeans offer Hellenes a model for the financing of priests, whose Judean counterparts receive the right shoulder of every sacrifice (*Gal. fr. 72 = 306A*). Julian's presentation of Judean priests is compared with Christian and Jewish narratives about Jewish priests, and its potential impact on Christians and Jews is assessed.

Chapter 6 explores the place Julian assigns the Judean god in his divine order. Greek and Roman philosophers had long associated the Jewish god with the universal god, equivalent to the highest god in the cosmic order. Constantine built the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and a palace on the compound, declaring his association with Jesus, whom Eusebius characterizes as Plato's Divine Intellect. Julian's definition of the Judean god in his divine realm forms part of his attempt to correct the errors of the Flavian Dynasty (*Against Heraclius*), which mischaracterized it; but that definition also represents his attempt to restore the Judean ethnic god and realize his ethnological arguments about Judeans in *Galileans*. As Julian rethinks his Hellenizing program in early 363 and considers the cosmic order in the *Hymn to King Helios*, he also considers the place of the Judean god in this pantheon in *Galileans*, written only a month later. Julian's various and sometimes contradictory characterizations of the Judean god reveal his ambivalence over how close he ought to hold Him. To rank the Judean god too highly might collapse the boundaries between Jews and Hellenes and wreck his still-fragile Hellenizing program. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the impact on Christians of the replacement of Jesus with the Judean god and the restoration of the Temple.

Chapter 7 returns to Antioch to examine what Julian calls the "holy city" that facilitates the proper worship of the gods. Julian faces a number of challenges from Christians, which present obstacles to the proper propitiation of the gods. Chief among these problems is the Christian dead and the cult of the martyrs, which contaminates Hellenes with whom they come into contact and therefore blocks the pathways of Hellenes to their temples. To alleviate the growing threat, Julian employs a type of exegesis common in the city of Antioch, reading Scripture in its historical context, employing grammatical acumen that he learned in grammar school to alter Christians' perceptions of their martyrs. In contesting Christian interpretations of texts, Julian shows himself as an exegete superior to Church leaders. Here we find the only instance in which Judeans are offered as a negative example for Hellenes. Julian also alludes to the Christian cult of the Maccabean martyrs, which had only recently begun in Antioch. He changes the wording of Porphyry's implied praise of the Maccabean martyrs for keeping their Judean dietary laws to the words of the Apostolic Decree to remind Christians that these were Judeans who died for their laws, laws that the Apostles insisted all Christians keep.⁴⁷ By changing perceptions of the Christian cult of the martyrs, Julian hoped

to clear space for Hellenes to reach their temples in a state of purity and carry out efficacious sacrifice.

The conclusion imagines the impact of Julian's ethnological arguments on the Antiochene landscape especially as found in the writings of John Chrysostom. While Julian's rhetoric has an impact on Hellenes as evidenced by Cyril of Alexandria, it has far greater historical impact on Christian authors in Antioch and beyond. Typically, Chrysostom's vituperative anti-Jewish rhetoric is explained as a phenomenon of Christianization in which Christian leaders mercilessly attacked other Christian groups as heretics. Julian's Judean rhetoric resurrects the Jewish menace that had lain dormant in Christian thought ever since Eusebius declared Jews a defunct *ethnos* in *Demonstration* Book 1. In Antioch Jews were already seen as potent figures and authentic purveyors of a Christian past by Christian groups on the borders of the Jewish community. Julian's rhetoric turns Jews into a potentially real danger for Christians that has to be dealt with. For Chrysostom, who grew up in Antioch during Julian's stay in the city and witnessed what the emperor's rhetoric and actions evoked among some Christians, this may have been a formative experience. The particularly ugly language he uses to describe Jews in *Against the Judaizers* may, in part, be explained by his perception of Jews as a danger to Christian orthodoxy. In this sense, Chrysostom's rhetoric really is anti-Jewish rather than merely against the Judaizers. Given Chrysostom's influence, this would have negatively impacted Jewish-Christian relations for years to come.

Finally, the appendix rethinks how Julian's *Letter to the Community of the Jews* can fruitfully be read as the realization of Julian's ethnological arguments in *Galileans*. In recent years the authenticity of this letter has been impugned as containing anachronistic elements. While there can be no doubt that there is a later hand in this letter, the evidence of Neoplatonist worship suggests that there is a Julianic core here. This is important, as this letter is the only source that discusses Julian's resettlement of the Judeans in Jerusalem, a logical consequence of his ethnographic arguments and his rebuilding of the Temple.

What do Roman Studies of Late Antiquity have to tell us about Jews in Late Antiquity? Conversely, what do Jewish Studies have to tell us about the Roman empire in this period? These are questions increasingly being asked by scholars in both fields as they attempt to bridge the gulf that has stood so long between these two fields. Recent studies explore evidence of Jews in Late Antiquity as Roman evidence, asking what this evidence reveals about life in the empire.⁴⁸ This study turns the lens around, and asks how Jews are relevant to the study of what it meant to be a Hellene in Antioch. We will see how ethnological arguments about Jews *qua* Judeans are utilized by Julian to create Hellenic identity in the specific circumstances of Syrian Antioch and therefore what it means to be Roman there.

Late Antiquity is typically conceived of as moments of conflict between pagans and Christians. Jews are often written out of this history. This is a narrative drawn

largely from Christian writers who portray Jews as a defeated people superseded by Christians in *Adversus Iudaeos* literature. Even towering works in Jewish Studies sometimes come to the conclusion that Jews and Judaism shattered after the destruction of the Temple, only to be reconstituted by the development of orthodox Christianity.⁴⁹ This study strongly challenges that narrative. Julian's use of Jews *qua* Judeans to shape Hellenic identity and weaken Christian identity works in Antioch precisely because Jews were powerful symbols and influential parties there. We may be tempted to think that Julian is a unique phenomenon. Having crossed the divide from Christianity to Hellenism and being a follower of Neoplatonism, he could make particularly good use of Scripture to attack Christians but also to shape Hellenes. If anything, his uniqueness sheds light on forces already present in Antioch that we may not otherwise have been aware of. His ability to change perceptions of Hellenes and Christians using local Jewish practices and sites as his background speaks to the important presence and power of Jews in Antioch for all Antiochenes.

At the same time, this study challenges the notion of static identities in the ancient world. The binary of Jew versus Greek that dominates ancient Jewish and Christian literature cannot be sustained. What precisely does it mean to be a Hellenic in Late Antiquity when Neoplatonists like Julian use Jewish texts, practices, and ancestral laws to shape Hellenic identity? What does the need to draw these identities reveal about life in Antioch? The same criticism is often applied to the Jewish-Christian binary. How can this binary apply when we have Christians in Antioch who argue over how much "Jewish" law they are allowed to observe and yet still be Christians? Unfortunately, we have far less information about the porousness of Jewish borders. Did some Jews sacrifice in private? Did they participate in "Hellenic" festivals and attend temples and churches? We have no evidence for this. One would imagine that some Jews would have taken part in civic festivals, but by the fourth century the Hellenic content of these festivals was greatly reduced.⁵⁰

What I hope this study demonstrates is that Jews are relevant to the study of *Romanitas* (Romanness) in Late Antiquity. This is an intellectual history of Antioch. What applies to Antioch cannot necessarily be applied to the rest of the Roman empire. Inasmuch as processes of Romanization and Hellenization varied locally and were negotiated phenomena between the colonizer and the colonized, it is not surprising to find Jews implicated within these processes in Antioch.⁵¹ Ultimately, if we want to understand Romanness in Antioch we need to know something about Jews there. These processes suggest that there may be other locations in the empire where Jews are factors in the definition of Romanness in Late Antiquity, and I hope this will open new exploration into other parts of the empire where Jews played a part in the development of Romanness. It should also encourage us to return to Christian imperial literature and question the underlying dynamics between Jews, Christians, and others, as I do in the Conclusion.