As pointed out in the Preface, the present thesis was written as one, and pari passu, with the overall study of Romanization in Syria, both the preliminary work, which now forms my M.A. thesis, and the section on Romanization the Policy, which has been deleted. It is therefore impossible to make a clearcut distinction between the bibliography proper to this section alone and that pertaining to the study as a whole. Even where a work is not specifically cited in the present thesis, some awareness of it existed in my mind at the time of writing: the whole bibliography, collectively, constitutes the body of knowledge upon which I am drawing, and confining the list to only those works actually cited in the present thesis would unfairly conceal my debt to the authors of the remainder. The following therefore represents the bibliography for the overall study of Romanization in Syria-Palestine; works actually cited wholly or principally in the other sections of the study are marked with an asterisk (*).

The relevance of most of the material and the degree of indebtedness to most of the various scholars has been made clear in the preceding text and Notes or in the M.A., or is self-evident, and so comment here has been reduced to a minimum.

As a general observation, I should like to point out that I have deliberately utilized the more readily available sources, standard reference book, handbooks, even 'popular' accounts, wherever possible when citing illustrations, particularly those cited when the application of a generality to the point at issue calls for a specific example. This has been done for two reasons, ethical and practical. In the first place, if a photograph is adequate to the purpose, there is no reason why it should not be used, regardless of the level of the concomitant text; if it is used, it should be acknowledged, and due credit given. In the second place, if cited, it is desirable that it should be readily available for inspection, and not all libraries carry some of the more obscure archaeological publications; where an adequate illustration exists in a more common publication, the citation of a more recondite, if more scholarly, one instead is gratuitous obscurantism, and counter-productive. Similarly, failing such a readily obtainable book, reference has been made to the American Journal of Archaeology (AJA), this being, to the best of my knowledge, the most widely held broad spectrum, Classically orientated, archaeological journal.
In order to clarify the relevance and relative importance of the sources, the modern bibliography has been divided into four sections, A being Syria-Palestine and adjacent areas, and B Rome, the Roman empire and comparative Greek material. Section C, General Reference, comprises books such as Boëthius - Ward-Perkins, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture*, which pertain to more than one section - in this case, for example, Ward-Perkins' Chapter 18, "The Architecture of the Roman Near East", is the only available recent coverage of the architecture of Roman Syria as a whole, while the remainder of the book is an invaluable source of comparative material. This section also includes the standard literature from other fields utilized where the nature of the study necessitated crossing inter-disciplinary lines, such as Konrad Lorenz' *On Aggression*, in reference to modern ethological and anthropological theory on racial prejudice and group behavior. Section D is the "Miscellaneous" category accommodating books and articles of which only minimal use has been made, as well as those which do not properly belong in other categories. For example, in the M.A., in connection with the reliability of Lucian as a source of factual material, it seemed instructive to draw a parallel with comparable modern satirists, and to quote specific examples in the interests of clarity; nevertheless, Robert Sheckley hardly belongs in a bibliography of Romanization in Syria.

While, as stated above, the degree of indebtedness to the various scholars is, on the whole, self-evident from the citations, this is perhaps not the case with five, whose importance to the thesis is not reflected by the number of references or comments in the text.

G.W. Bowersock's work, which has been heavily criticised in some respects, was invaluable in two different ways: his articles on Arabia and Flavian Syria provided basic information and in addition drew my attention to evidence whose significance I had previously overlooked; even more importantly, his forthright and unambiguous statement of the case against the existence of Romanization in Syria clarified the issue and allowed debate, as the insinuations and oblique statements of earlier scholars of similar persuasion did not; this in itself is a major advance, and I have endeavoured to reciprocate by stating the case for the opposite view as unequivocally as the evidence will permit.

Jean-Paul Rey-Coquais appears in the bibliography only as an editor of *IGLS* volumes VI and VII. The notes to these superb volumes of
his are in actuality miniature articles on a wide variety of topics relating to Roman Syria. (I am aware of the existence of his JRS 1978 article, which, however, arrived in Australia when the text of the original thesis had progressed to a point where it could not be taken into consideration; I therefore refrained from reading it. Since the decision was made to preserve the 1979 character of the thesis I have continued to do so to this point.)

Bibliographical circumstances also obscure the debt to Henri Seyrig, whose initial publications of material and ideas formed the basis for so many later studies in which the themes were developed further. Reference has therefore been made to the derivative studies, but a glance through the citations of these later scholars shows the extent to which our knowledge of Roman Syria depends on Seyrig's work.

Of the authors cited wholly or principally in the deleted section on Romanization the Policy, Barbara Levick, Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor, particularly her analysis of Tacitus, Agricola 21 (pp.186-7), and H.-G. Pflaum, "La romanisation de l'Afrique", Vestigia 1973, were seminal to the discussion of the Roman concept of Romanization, a key section in the overall study, and one which, obviously, was much in mind during the writing of the present thesis (cf. infra, Postface).

Citation in the text has followed the principle of full citation at first mention, and "op. cit.", "loc. cit.", etc. thereafter. This has been varied where necessary for the sake of clarity and easy recognition, where, for example, a work has been cited briefly in, say, Chapter I, then not used again until Chapter IV. Similarly, when a study is first used in a particular passage, or where there may be some confusion, the 'short title' method is employed in the case of a book, or citation by publication and year in the case of journal articles (with amplification by easily recognisable short title where, as for example in the case of the two separate articles by Reifenberg in IEJ 1950-1951, more than one article by the same scholar in the same volume have been used). The standard abbreviations have been employed in the case of journals (see AJA 1976, pp.3-8), save that once again some amplification has been made where considered necessary in the interests of easy recognition. In addition, some abbreviated titles have been used throughout, some standard, such as Denkmäler II for Watziner's Denkmäler Palästinas Vol. II, or BMC Emp. for the various volumes of the Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, others borrowed from the internal references of the author in question, such as
HistAnt. for Downey's *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, and yet others coined for the purpose where a book is used frequently throughout the thesis and no established abbreviation is known to me, for example AncJewCoins for Reifenberg's *Ancient Jewish Coins*, on analogy with HistAnt.

### ABBREVIATIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ArchPalaest.</td>
<td>W.F. Albright, <em>The Archaeology of Palestine</em>, see Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Josephus, <em>The Antiquities</em>, see Ancient Sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td><em>The American Journal of Archaeology</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJP</td>
<td><em>The American Journal of Philology</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AncJewCoins</td>
<td>A. Reifenberg, <em>Ancient Jewish Coins</em>, see Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baalbek I, II</td>
<td>See under Wiegand, Th., Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baalshamîn I, II, V</td>
<td><em>Le Sanctuaire de Baalshamîn à Palmyre</em>, see under Collart, P. and Vicari, J., and Fellmann, R., Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell. Civ.</td>
<td>Caesar, <em>De Bello Civile</em>, see under Ancient Sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G.</td>
<td>Caesar, <em>De Bello Gallico</em>, see under Ancient Sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC Emp.</td>
<td>Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, see under H. Mattingly, Section C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
<td>Josephus, The Jewish War, see under Ancient Sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Grosv. Mus.</td>
<td>See under Haverfield, F., Section B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.R.P.²</td>
<td>See under Jones, A.H.M., Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III, XI</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum Vols. III, XI, see under Sections A, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denkmäler II</td>
<td>See under Watzinger, Carl, Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenMeet.(AJA)</td>
<td>The Annual General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, published yearly in AJA: indicates the citation is to a brief precis of a paper delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerasa</td>
<td>See under Kraeling, Carl H., Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Excavations</td>
<td>The Harvard excavations at Samaria, see under Reisner, G.A., et al., Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Tacitus, The Histories, see under Ancient Sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGLS</td>
<td>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie, see under Section A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>The Israel Exploration Journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>See under Dessau, H., Section B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.d.(k.) a. I.</td>
<td>Jahrbuch des deutschen (kaiserlichen) archäologischen Instituts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>Journal of Jewish Studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JRS: Journal of Roman Studies.

Mus. Helv.: Museum Helveticum.

OCD²: The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd edition, see Section C.

P.A.E.S.: Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria, see Section A.

PEQ: Palestine Exploration Quarterly (a continuation of PEQ St., the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, which is incorporated in it).

P-W: Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie, see under Section C.

QDAP: Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine.

Race: See under Thompson, Edgar T., and Hughes, Everett C., Section C.

RIB: The Roman Inscriptions of Britain, see under Collingwood, R.G., and Wright, R.P., Section B.

Samaria-Sebaste I: See under Crowfoot, J.W., et al., Section A.

S.E.H.R.E.²: See under Rostovtzeff, M., Section A.

SHA: Scriptores Historiae Augustae, see under Ancient Sources.

Vestigia: The publication of the International Congress for Greek and Latin Epigraphy of the preceding year.

ZDPV: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
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Summary of Conclusions in regard to
Romanization the Deliberate Policy.

There are at least four Roman rationales which might, with hindsight, be termed "policies of Romanization", three which can be extrapolated from textual or other evidence and one which may reasonably be assumed from more general evidence as to the Roman mentality, preconceptions and preoccupations.

The best known is Romanization as a tool of political subjugation, a means of ensuring military quiescence, of which the premise is "civilization leads to military debilitation". It is attested explicitly in Tacitus, Agricola 21 (cf. e.g. Barbara Levick, Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor, Oxford 1967, pp.186-7), with which should be read Agricola 11. This 'policy' is entirely negative in its thrust, with no thought of encouraging positive political loyalty. There was, however, such a positive policy, implicitly attested in the same passage, Agricola 21. Not all Agricola's institutions are explained by Tacitus' rationale, for example, the adoption of the toga or prestige deriving from the personal praise of the governor - indeed, the training of the chiefs' sons and the spread of Latin were more likely to result in better led rebels more familiar with Roman military techniques, viewed from the limited perspective of the Tacitean rationale. The most obvious explanation is that these elements were supposed to do something else: acculturation was supposed to promote political loyalty, specifically, Romanization loyalty to the Romans. The basic presupposition, "cultural similarity leads to political affinity", is implicit in Tacitus, Annales XIII.34, and in a more developed form in his version of Claudius' speech on the admission of citizens from Gallia Comata to the magistracies of Rome, Ann. XI.24. This more positive policy itself has a negative corollary: non-Roman culture is conducive to loyalty to whatever non-Roman cultural group it belongs, therefore the extirpation of that culture or the particular cultural aspects which seem most likely to be the focus should extirpate this alien fealty. Ann. XIII.34 attests the existence of the premise, while the clearest detailed illustration of this policy put into practice and applied to a specific situation known to me comes from the Syrian lands themselves: Titus' destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, as this action may be interpreted if one uses the fragment of Tacitus preserved in Sulpicius Severus, Chron. ii.306, to supplement the manifestly partially expurgated account of Josephus, BJ VI.iv.3.

There is a similar, lesser form of 'negative Romanization' which can reasonably be assumed. Modern thought of various disciplines, anthropology, psychology, ethology, seems united on the role of salient physical or cultural features, particularly visible ones, in distinguishing "we" and "they", ingroup and outgroup, "racial" or otherwise, if not as to the particular mechanisms involved or ultimate causes. In the case of culture, these are basically the same criteria as are seen to act cohesively in the rationale of the second policy, but they are equally effective as divisive factors: in ethological terminology, these features which serve as recognition signals denoting an outsider become aggression stimuli in their own right; in terms of lay observation pertinent to this study, obvious
cultural differences tend to promote friction, something which would have been undesirable from the Roman point of view.

If the Romans recognised this they would undoubtedly have made some attempt to rectify the situation. It seems unlikely that they would have failed to observe what appears from modern examples to be an authentic general truth which would be as valid then as now: indeed Tacitus (Hist. V. xii) opines that the "founders" of the Temple at Jerusalem foresaw subsequent wars because the people differed from their neighbours in culture and so built it like a citadel, couching his comments in terms appropriate to the application of an axiom to a specific instance: Providerant conditores ex diversitate morum crebra bella". But even if the aphoristic tone of Tacitus does not imply recognition of a widespread phenomenon rather than a specific instance, there were many other highly conspicuous examples in Roman times, so obvious that they can hardly have escaped attention, for example the notorious Gallic bracae discussed by A.N. Sherwin-White (Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome, Cambridge, 1970, pp.57-9).

Faced with a situation where the trousers themselves produced a reaction of derision and marked the wearer as an object of ridicule, the most obvious step for the Romans to take would be to remove the apparent source of the problems by inducing the Gauls to wear something more "civilized". This is a very superficial sort of 'negative Romanization'. One can nevertheless see its potential use in some situations, for example 'tidying up' a province or town to make it 'look respectable' by rubbing off the most prominent un-Roman features, and expect it if, say, an emperor were born or acclaimed there: he would hardly wish it to appear that he stemmed from barbarians or was the choice of barbarians; one thinks of Septimius Severus and Lepcis Magna.

The earliest attestation of the first policy known to me is Tacitus, Agricola 21. All the component enabling concepts are however to be found separately in Caesar's Gallic Wars: the premise, "civilization leads to military debilitation", occurs in B.G. I.1 and recurs throughout, in B.G. IV.1-3, VI.(11-)24, and II.15, where similar ideas are attributed to the Nervii; its converse, the military superiority of those untouched by 'civilization' and influenced by more warlike neighbouring cultures, is taken up by Aulus Hirtius in B.G. VIII.25. Caesar, however, never explicitly correlates the elements into a practical policy of provincial administration. The terminus post quem for the development of the policy should therefore be the date of composition of The Gallic Wars, the terminus ante quem the date of composition of Agricola 21 (as opposed to the date of Agricola's governorship). The obvious candidate for the inventor of the second policy is Agricola himself, but the logical step before the premise "cultural similarity leads to political affinity", the presupposition that there was a positive connection of any kind between culture and political behaviour, is attested in the writings of Nicolas of Damascus, as preserved in AJ XVI.35 ff. An even more basic prerequisite is an interest in culture generally, which is again amply attested in the writings of Caesar. An indication that the other enabling concepts, the ideas belonging to another aspect of this policy, were 'in the air' in the mid first century B.C. comes in Cicero, de prov. cons. 31 (xii), "Nulla gens est, quae non aut ita sublata est, ut vix existet, aut ita domita, ut quiescat, aut ita pacata, ut victoria nostra imperioque laetetur." While there is no indication that Cicero includes cultural manipulation among the techniques leading to "gens...pacata" - this merely differs somehow from "gens...domita" - the goal is not only quiescence, as in the 'Tacitean' policy, but a more positive response; at the least it indicates contemporary thought as to the role of Roman subjects and what was required of them. The elements therefore existed severally in the first century B.C. There
are however more general considerations which suggest that they did not coalesce much earlier.

The negative corollary of this policy shares the same component postulates, but it should be pointed out that if the theory was empirically derived, it may have developed before its positive counterpart: the observed fact on which it is based, that peoples of non-Roman culture tend towards loyalty to people of similar culture, is something which can emerge in a relatively short period of observation, say ten years or so; rebellions, and so situations which might inspire the genesis of such a policy as a countermeasure, were frequent. That people who had come to share Roman culture tended to be actively loyal to the Romans, in other words that it was conceivable that the observed fact could be put to practical positive use by inducing this situation, may have required far longer, say a hundred years of colonial experience. There is no indication at all of the chronological development of the fourth conjectural policy, but the foregoing jointly suggests a likely terminus post quem for all policies of Romanization somewhere in the first century B.C., when long-term provincial experience perceptibly gave rise to interest in and general thoughts about methods of provincial administration, what was desired of subject peoples and what in practice could be achieved, though with some flexibility in regard to policies requiring a less complex progression of component concepts. Certainly, in distinguishing a terminus ante quem non of 201 B.C. for policies of Romanization in Africa, H.-G. Pflaum ("La romanisation de l'Afrique", Vestigia 17, 1973, pp.55-72, ref. pp.56-8) may well have found the ultimate terminus ante quem non for policies of Romanization anywhere, provided they were empirical and pragmatic in origin. However, this cannot preclude a purely theoretical evolution, like that of the atomic theory of Democritus, by an individual at any time.

While one similarly cannot preclude the possibility of individual Romans at any time taking steps for idiosyncratic reasons, all the policies appear to be primarily pragmatic: whether the ultimate goal in any given case was military security, prosperity and profit, or even additional land for excess population, the prerequisite was that the provinces should remain docile, and the proximate aim of all such policies was therefore to secure this docility, by a more economic method than permanent intensive military supervision. There is no evidence of a policy of 'civilization for civilization's sake', but rather of specific tools of rule with specific goals: in intent, therefore, all policies may be expected to be ones of partial Romanization, geographically or qualitatively speaking; there is no suggestion that the Romans wanted their subjects to be more Romanized than was necessary to achieve the immediate purpose, whatever that happened to be.

Clearly there was scope for the application of at least some of these tools in various parts of Syria at various times, but establishing that any were so applied is a different matter. The evidence for a policy of Romanization of some description on the part of Herod I is overwhelming, even allowing for the qualifications which must attach to the account of Josephus, and it seems to correspond to the 'affirmative' version rather than one of the negative ones, thus modifying the chronological framework of conceptual development obtained from the Roman evidence in favour of an earlier genesis, with Caesar as the prime suspect, something which in turn helps rehabilitate the highly dubious evidence of Malalas indicating the implementation of such a positive policy by Caesar himself at Antioch (cf. supra, Ch.I, pp.11-12). However, the evidence is inadequate to determine the specific nature of Herod's policy. There is little doubt that Titus was employing a policy of 'negative Romanization', or rather 'de-Judaicization'
in his destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, the physical focus of Judaism and Jewish culture generally; Vespasian's foundation of Emmaus Nicopolis and elevation of Col. Flavia Caesarensis may or may not have been intended as replacements for Jerusalem as a whole. There is probably less doubt that Hadrian took the natural complementary step to what he saw as such a policy, completing the abolition of Jerusalem and substituting the acceptable Roman replacement, Col. Aelia Capitolina, with the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus on the site of the Jewish Temple as its raison d'être. His reconstruction of the rival Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim can also be seen as provision of an acceptable substitute, but the only possible indication that he intended the effect of this measure to spread beyond the immediate vicinity is the dedication of the Gerizim temple to Zeus Hypsistos, the Greek 'translation' designating the Unnamed God, an aspect of Baalshamin, just then rising to prominence at Palmyra. If Rostovtzeff is correct in his interpretation, the selective elimination of Parthian cultural elements not shared by the Syrians at Dura Europos, by whichever emperor or emperors were responsible (supra, Ch.IV, p.237) should represent an instance of either the third or the fourth policy. Beyond the period proper there is what appears to be a striking example of the official sponsorship of the acceptable types of the Romano-Syrian milieu at the expense of those peculiar to the dissident "Palmyrene Empire" by Diocletian at Palmyra, a re-affirmation of the principle that cultural affinity was deemed to be directly related to political loyalty, and the suggestion that that Alexander Severus recognised and exploited the cultural effects of the creation of the Palmyrene limes.

But apart from these six instances, there are only hints. For example, there is no way of determining on present evidence whether these cultural effects of the limes were part of the intent of its initial Flavian or Antonine creators, whether those creators were knowingly using cultural manipulation along with other tools or whether the cultural effects were an incidental bonus to measures taken purely for short-term military reasons and/or middle distance goals of rural prosperity and profit; while it is possible that the construction of the 'Temple of Bacchus' in the colony of Baalbek, with the tutelary deities of the various cities in its decoration suggesting that it may have been intended as a kind of provincial pantheon, marks another instance of the attempted use of a religion as a cohesive force, afferent to a suitable political focus, this is speculative, due to lack of evidence as to purpose.

In fine, there is forensic rather than scientific proof of some policies of Romanization: the Romans did have ambitions as cultural puppeteers in Syria, and as such they were neither totally inept nor totally adept. However, the amount of possible deliberate Romanization on the part of the Romans is manifestly far from adequate to account for the amount of Romanization described above. This apparent discrepancy may be partially illusory, but it is also partially real, the product of the interaction of a number of factors.

The illusory element derives from the nature of the proposition in conjunction with the nature of the evidence. In investigating policies, one enters the sphere of human motivation: what is required is evidence of how these people thought. In essence this means literary evidence, preferably autobiographical, or the writings of a biographer so close to the principal that only one layer of interpretation separates us from his thoughts, a layer which with care may be cut away, as with Tacitus and Agricola; it is rare that other sorts of evidence are as unambiguous and eloquent as Hadrian's "bulldozing" of Jerusalem and replacement of it with
Col. Aelia Capitolina (cf. supra, Ch.III, pp.113-122). Even with autobiographical evidence, it is almost impossible to prove motivation conclusively, since the writer may disingenuous or afflicted with an egregious lack of self-knowledge, but literary techniques such as the analysis of the criteria for selection of evidence, the attitude of the writer to his subject - in short, not what he says but how he says it - can reveal underlying preconceptions and presuppositions and provide a firm basis for further interpretation. Such evidence can act as a limiting factor on the range of interpretations, almost invariably wide, which the other known facts allow. Without it one is in a position where almost anything may be supposed, so supposition becomes virtually meaningless. It is precisely this sort of evidence which is lacking for Syria: even the best documented Romanizer, Herod, left no Gallic Wars; if it could be ascertained what of Josephus' account derives from Niccol of Damascus and what from his own interpretation, the ground would be much firmer, but that cannot at present be done.

The discrepancy between Romanization the policy and Romanization the effect is unlikely, however, to have been entirely a function of the lack of suitable evidence regarding the former, for one of the most striking features of the policies which are attested is that they are on the whole 'negative', a matter of replacement or subtraction, deleterious in intent, whereas the Romanization which did take place in Syria was essentially a matter of fusion and addition. The former did not beget the latter.

Moreover, the discrepancy is even greater when one considers another common feature of these detectable policies, namely that where their results can be discerned, most failed. Herod's programme failed as a whole and it failed in detail. Whatever its ultimate goal, its immediate intention was to secure submission to Roman overlordship, through the Herodians, to prevent conflict with the Graeco-Roman world by assimilating the Jewish people with their gentile neighbours. Instead, it precipitated these very conflicts, as Josephus perceived, leading ultimately to the First Revolt, hardening the stance of the stricter members of the population and by its extremes alienating potential converts and driving them to alliance with the Zealots. If anything, Herod prevented the process of cultural fusion from taking its natural course, by engendering a hostile awareness of the fact of acculturation and precipitating disruptive interludes, so strengthening the proud tradition of brave resistance to foreign interference which dated back to Maccabaean times, a tradition which therefore took longer to erode in Judaea than elsewhere in the region. And the First Revolt not only interrupted the process of Romanization, but in part reversed it, destroying previous Roman superimpositions which might have served as models for later response. Much of his work had to be redone by the later Romans.

Even in his own lifetime he was forced to withdraw from Trachonitis to Batanea. There is little evidence that most of his more specific introductions such as amphitheatres met with more than bare tolerance in Judaea - only theatres were perhaps an exception, though the evidence for this comes from the predominantly non-Jewish towns of Caesarea and Scythopolis, outside Judaea proper. And if, as Avi-Yonah has suggested (IEJ I 1950-1, p.160), his foundations of Caesarea and Sebaste were intended as model cities to show the Jews the benefits of Graeco-Roman civilization, they had little apparent effect: for the former at least there is evidence that it failed to achieve its purpose, remaining essentially a gentile centre despite the attestation of a Jewish sector of the population in BJ II.xiii.7 and AJ XX.173 - Schwabe (IEJ I 1950-1, p.49 and n. 1) notes that by 1950/51
only nine Jewish inscriptions had been recovered.

His main success was in the less urgently needed stimulation of the growth of the Romano-Syrian milieu elsewhere in the region, with the two major architectural types he sponsored, the colonnaded street and the 'axial' sanctuary. Of the other signal instances of Romanization the effect outside Judaea only the transformation of Abila Lysaniae from a den of 'brigands' to a respectable little Graeco-Roman town might ultimately be accredited to Herod's programmes, and given that Herod himself was forced to pull back from this area it is doubtful whether it was he or some other representative of the Romans who initiated this transformation. As pointed out in Ch.I, the one element in his Judaean programme which did eventually lead to a profound degree of specialized Romanization the effect in that country, the introduction of the skills and expertise required for Classical architecture by the employment side by side of Jewish workmen and foreign experts, is the element least likely to have been deliberate policy on Herod's part and most likely to have been coincidental, to him merely the most efficient method of getting his buildings built. While this expertise enabled the development of Romano-Jewish architecture, and indeed some of the more specific details of Herod's architecture survived to become part of this style, it developed only after three bloody revolts, which can hardly have been part of Herod's design, after a great deal of further intervention by the Romans or their surrogates, and above all after roughly a hundred more years of Roman rule and propinquity to the ever more Romanized adjacent provinces.

As for the Romans themselves, Titus' destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as a potential focus for rebellion did not prevent further revolts - if anything, it perpetuated the train of events which was leading inevitably to revolt, specifically the Second, for on balance it seems likely that it was some part of Hadrian's follow-up measures which provoked the uprising (see above, Ch.III, pp.172-3 and Notes385-388). Vespasian's attempted replacements for Jerusalem, if such they were, met with a resounding lack of success. Hadrian's Col. Aelia Capitolina succeeded, but only as the crudest, most facile sort of Romanization of all, Romanization of a place but not its people, since the Jewish population had to be replaced, a situation similar to that apparent at Dura. His espousal of the cult of Zeus Hypsistos was at best a limited success: the cult took root and endured where it was planted, but it failed to spread throughout the region and become a binding religious force.

It seems likely that the well-documented Roman lack of interest in the area for its own sake (e.g. for Tacitus, see M.A., pp.40-42) meant that at least initially comparatively little attention was given to such policies and the programmes which marked their implementation. It was only when, for example, the First Revolt forced the area on the attention of the central government and demonstrated that all was not proceeding smoothly under the client rulers, that the Romans themselves were spurred to direct and comprehensive action, dismantling the vassal state system with the concomitant re-organization of the area as a group of Roman provinces. The paucity of such programmes by the Romans themselves gave little scope for policies of Romanization which would naturally form part of such an undertaking. Lack of attention and concern led to real lack of intent to Romanize, apparent not only in the absence of such policies but in the willingness of the Romans to compromise with local culture, their acceptance of congenial local forms such as the Palmyrene strategoi, which, under their Hellenized titles, were incorporated within their own system of administration, the notorious stair-temples, which ultimately made their appearance in one of the two premier Roman colonies, local deities who
obligingly underwent nominal syncretization and became acceptable not only to the Romans of Syria but elsewhere in the empire, even at Rome itself. It was only where a specific need arose for a specific cultural tool that they were motivated to make a serious attempt at any form of Romanization, as in Judaea, where their efforts were concentrated on a cultural aspect which had shown a detrimental causal connection with political behaviour, namely religion: they tried to nullify this specific feature as a factor for dissention, and transform it into a cohesive factor promoting loyalty to Rome.

When these rare occasions for specific, limited Romanization did occur, lack of prior attention and interest in the place for its own sake rebounded on the Romans, in that they were apt to attempt to apply policies derived from observations made elsewhere in the empire or from cursory observations in the Syrian lands; those policies were therefore apt to be misapplied, and a priori likely to be incondite failures. Failed policies leave few positive results, and in the absence of literary evidence it is only by their results that most policies can be detected at all. But detectable or otherwise, failed policies do not in any case contribute significantly to the amount of Romanization the effect. Both the illusion and the reality of the discrepancy are therefore reinforced.

Observable policies of Romanization are not a major causal factor in observed Romanization the effect; such policies are a priori likely to be rare and unsuccessful, contributing little to Romanization the effect and so impossible to detect by their results; there is in any case a dearth of evidence suitable for the investigation of such policies - if discernible, they are only so in broad outline. Given all this, Romanization the policy does not seem a potentially fruitful direction for further research in the Syrian lands. A better approach would be to examine the impersonal mechanisms of Romanization the effect, since for this it is necessary only to establish what happened, not what certain individuals intended to happen, exploring questions such as the inevitability of 'inevitable Romanization', the part played by 'economic evolution', the role of reinforcement, where analogous cultural elements contribute to the survival of both, and the mechanisms of transmission, models, the larger towns as 'centres of Romanization', the effect of prestige, and so forth.

The following additional works have been utilized in the above revised 1985 text, and should be added to the Bibliography. They comprise omissions from my previous bibliography, works recommended by my previous examiners, pertinent material which became available too late for inclusion in the previous work, and bibliography stemming therefrom.
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The results of the excavations at the Herodian sites of Jericho and Herodium II (Netzer, IEJ 1975, pp.89-100, BASOR No.228, 1977, pp.1-13, cf. also Ehud Netzer and Eric M. Meyers, "Preliminary Report on the Joint Jericho Excavation Project", BASOR No. 228, Dec. 1977, pp.15-27, Netzer, Greater Herodium, 1981; Netzer, Greater Herodium, p.103, plausibly suggests that Herodium I may be an illusion due to textual corruption - I am grateful to Dr. A.W. McNicoll for this reference) modify the picture of Herod's architecture discerned above, insofar as they significantly increase the attested purely Roman element in Herod's work, without, however, altering my conclusions as to the existence of a strong pre-Roman Hellenistic element. In particular, at Herodium II, the barrel-vaulted terrace of the northern palace (Greater Herodium pp.32-5, p.33 Ill. 59) and the stone dome with oculus over the tepidarium of the Roman bath in the mountain palaces (ibid., p.87, Ill. 119, cf. p.80 Ill. 107 and p.141 n.40), reminiscent of that in the Stabian Baths at Pompeii (e.g. Robertson, Handbook, p.244) suggest that Herod's builders utilized the latest available techniques of Roman architecture, and perhaps even assisted in the further development of those techniques. So, too, does the use of vaults (Netzer, IEJ 1975, pp.96, 100, BASOR No.228, 1977, p.3), opus reticulatum (idem IEJ 1975, p.93, BASOR No. 228 p.9) and opus sectile (IEJ 1975, pp.95, 96, BASOR No.228, p.9) and especially Roman concrete (including a possible semi-dome) (IEJ 1975, pp. 93, 97, 100, BASOR No.228, p.9) in the complex at Jericho, where, too, there was a Roman bath in the northern wing of the complex (IEJ 1975, p.96, BASOR No.228, p.10 and p.11 fig. 12) as well as a more doubtful specimen in the southern mound (IEJ 1975, p.100). Netzer (BASOR No.228, p.9) does not hesitate to surmise that Roman workmen took part in the construction of the Jericho complex, perhaps through the good offices of Agrippa.

It seems that Herod's architecture was technologically Roman 'state of the art', but stylistically either Roman or local Hellenistic.

It appears likely that the results of the excavations at Caesarea, when available, will also help clarify this situation. In the meantime, however, problems in regard to other aspects of Romanization at this site remain unanswered. Levine, Caesarea under Roman Rule, makes certain statements in respect of the ethnic composition of the population and the early form of government, which would appear to assist in these matters.
In regard to the population, he states (p.11) that the city's territory included a large area of Jewish settlement, and pp.14-17 and notes pp.154-155, on the composition of the original population of Herod's city, he infers the presence of residents of the old Strato's Tower, Herod's veterans, Romans, and a substantial Jewish element. However, his statements are predominantly based on generalities and analogies with the composition of the population of other cities, these examples themselves sometimes being independently dubious. His evidence for the extent of the territory of Caesarea comes from Josephus, and may refer to a later time; his evidence for the existence of a Jewish population at all, aside from that discussed above, p.28, dates from the second century or later (cf. Levine, op. cit., p.44), and Josephus' account of the quarrel between the 'Syrians' and the Jews in the time of Nero can hardly substantiate the statement (p.16 and n.17) that by the mid first century the Jews constituted about half the population of the city. The assertions of the protagonists, as reported by Josephus, are highly polemic: Levine might equally have laid stress on the statement of the 'Syrians', AJ XX.173 (which he cites elsewhere, p.10 and n.48), that no Jew had ever lived in Caesarea prior to Herod's rebuilding. Similarly, his implication that Caesarea may have had a Hellenistic form of government (op. cit., p.17) is again based almost entirely on analogies and evidence relating to a later period, with only the mention of a public assembly by Josephus for the time of Herod. Even for the later first century A.D., his evidence for "magistrates of Caesarea" exercising control over the adjacent territory is not conclusive, since we are not, in fact, specifically told that "οἱ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐξορκισμοί" of AJ XX.174 are also the magistrates of Caesarea. In any case, even if Caesarea were given a 'Hellenistic constitution' by Herod, the point would be irrelevant to the present thesis, since, because of the doubt about the composition of the population, we still cannot determine who was being 'Hellenized'. The actual evidence has remained the same, and it remains inadequate to determine these points.

In regard to Palmyrene, it is encouraging to note the statement of M. Gawlikowski, "Palmyre et l'Euphrate", Syria LX, 1983, pp.53-69, ref. pp.58-9) that, given the evidence of Schlumberger's villages, the Harbaka dam, and scattered evidence elsewhere in Palmyrene of ancient cultivation, "L'oasis de Palmyre, avec ses jardins, n'était donc pas isolée, mais disposait d'un arrière-pays aux resources appréciable". (It is also heartening to note, ibid., p.59, a certain scepticism regarding the Tiberian date for the incorporation of Palmyra into the province.) His suggestion (pp. 56f.) that Palmyrene did not include the area from Arak to the Euphrates (based in part on a rejection of the evidence of Ptolemy, after Dussaud, and an acceptance and retrospective projection of the boundary between Syria Phoenice and Coelesyria, as extrapolated from the Not. Dign. Oriens) does not affect my arguments regarding Palmyrene above, since the point at issue there is not the political boundary of Palmyrene in this area, but rather the area of semi-desert transformed. Three points, however, might be made. i) Dussaud is not always right. His criticisms of Ptolemy and his reconstructions of how Ptolemy worked are at times conditioned by his own identifications of the sites mentioned by Ptolemy, identifications which are not always beyond question (e.g. Auira-Howareen, cited by Gawlikowski, p.56). For example, he states (Syria 1929, pp.61-2) that the order of Ptolemy's towns in Chalybonitis is road-map order, with Chalybon removed to the centre to justify its importance. This is true only if Chalybon is his Helbūn, rather than Musil's Helbān: strict road-map order would place Chalybon perilously close to Helbān and proscriptively far from Helbūn. It is in fact unlikely, in any case that Ptolemy was working in road-map order here, since if one follows Dussaud's
identifications consistently, this would imply an improbable (but not impossible) abrupt detour to the east to Esrija, in the road in question. It is more likely that Ptolemy, the major pioneer of ancient plane-projection maps, was using a projection map. When listing places from such a map one is always faced with a conflict of the claims of latitudinal order and longitudinal order: the result is an erratic zig-zag; see, for example, the order of sites in corpora such as CIL III, or the order of regions in IGLS, where the map in question can be only a projection map, or for that matter, the list of sites above, p.365, conditioned by Map 2). If one accepts Musil's Helbän for Chalybon, as too his identifications for Thema (at-Tâmme), Akoraba ('Uzērībat) and Spelunca (al-Mrejrāt) then Ptolemy's list presents the aspect of just such an erratic zig-zag. ii) Stipulating the overall high standard of the Not. Dign. Or., the section covering this ill-known frontier area seems the reverse of reliable in regard to political boundaries, see the apparent occurrence, under slightly different variant names, of Arak in both Syria Phoenice and Coelesyria (supra, Ch.VI, p.373, cf. Ch. III Note 363 and Seeck's identification of "Adatha" with Arak, ad Segment XXXII (29)). J.B. Bury, "The Notitia Dignitatum", JRS X, 1920, pp.131-154, e.g. pp.139, 152, notes that the Not. Dign. Or. is a clean copy intended for transmission to Rome, while the Not. Dign. Occ., which was a 'working' copy, had corrections written on. This seems to imply that the Not. Dign. Or. derived from other 'working' documents, presumably lists and 'memos', which had already been correlated - or mis-correlated (cf. A.H.M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire 284-602. A Social and Economic and Administrative Study, Vol.III, Blackwells, Oxford, 1964, Appendix II, "The Notitia Dignitatum", p.347, on the inconsistencies and emendations in compilation). Segm. XXXII and XXXIII of the Not. Dign. Oriens in fact give every appearance of being the work of someone in Constantinople trying to make sense of a series of incomprehensible messages of slightly differing date regarding the wild Eastern frontier, and referring to nearly, but not quite identical place-names, none of them familiar, with military units which were often the same, or nearly the same. This hypothetical Byzantine clerk was unable to determine where it was a matter of the same place under a slightly different name being garrisoned by different units at slightly different dates, and where it was a matter of genuinely different places; operating conservatively, he listed these as separate places when he was unable to determine otherwise. Constantinople is, after all, a long way from Palmyrene; Rome is even further. iii) Ptolemy himself may have drawn some distinction between Palmyrene (and Chalybonitis) and the area immediately adjacent to the Euphrates, though he assuredly set the demarcation line further north than Arak: in the section on Palmyrene (V.15.24-25), the last three sites (#25), Alalis, Sura and Alematha, are prefixed by the words, "καὶ παρὰ τὸν Εὐφράτην πόλεις αὐτῷ"; in the section on Chalybonitis (V.15.17) the last two sites, Barbalisso and Athis are prefixed by "καὶ παρὰ τὸν Εὐφράτην"(Nobbe, pp.62-3, 64).

J.F. Matthews, "The Tax Law of Palmyra: Evidence for Economic History in a City of the Roman East", JRS (October) 1984, pp.157-180, also draws attention to the fact that Palmyra was not an island in a sandy sea, pointing to the Harbaka dam and particularly the remains excavated by Schlumberger, which he relates to the villages of the Tariff (despite the apparent discrepancy in date, see above, Ch.VI, Note 624), and to an inscription from Qa'ara, ca. 200 km. south-east of Palmyra (pp.162, 173). (I was aware of the general lines of Dr. Matthews arguments, as he was of mine, from a seminar given at Macquarie University in 1981, after the submission of my M.A. thesis. I must point out that the two studies are totally independent, and there is no indebtedness on either side. It is a matter of two different people working from two different aspects of the
same phenomenon, he from the Tariff to the remains, I from the remains to
the Tariff, and arriving at similar conclusions in regard to the economy
of Palmyra and Palmyrene, cause for encouragement. My section on
Palmyrene was first drafted in 1975 and revised in 1979; the full version
in the Ph.D. thesis submitted in 1983 (of which the above is a drastic
condensation, from approximately 37 pages to approximately 12) differed
from the 1979 version in no way relating to Dr. Matthews study; my
argument is encapsulated in the coded Map 2, submitted with my M.A.
thesis in 1981.)

My previous examiners have also recommended as relevant some
works which I have been unable to procure. J. and Ch. Balby, Guide
d'Apamée, Centre belge rech. archéol. à Apamée de Syrie & Paris, de
Boccard, 1981 (as too other publications on Apamea) is at present unavail­
able in Australia; so too, surprisingly, L. Kadman, The Coins of the Jewish
War 66-73 A.D., Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium III, Israel Numismatic
Society, 1960; and, perhaps most regrettably, M. Gawlikowski, Palmyre VI.
Le temple Palmyrène. Étude epigraphique et de topographie historique,
Editions scientifique de Pologne, Warsaw, 1973, considering the scope and
relevance of its subject matter (see the review by A. Parrot, Syria LI,
1974, p.341). (So, too, still, are H. Seyrig's book form revisions of
his "Antiquités syriennes" articles, specifically Antiquités syriennes I,
Paris, 1934, the lack of which was felt in the 1983 version of this thesis.)
I have been unable to trace Mariano Malevolta, "Interiores limites",
Ottava miscellanea greca et romana, 1982, 587-610 and I have also been
unable to obtain R. Lacqueur, Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus,
1920 and Wilhelm Wilber, Josephus und Vespasian.

Other works which seem likely to prove relevant when available
include: Anthony W. McNicoll, Robert Smith and Basil Hennessy, Pella in
Jordan I, Australian National Gallery, Canberra 1982 (reviewed by Issa
Jirjis Khalil, AJA LXXXVIII, 1984, pp.426-7); the publication of the
results of the excavation at Decapolitan Abila, where there appear to be
Roman waterworks under study (W. Harold Mare, abstract of paper, "The 1982
Abila of the Decapolis Excavation and Regional Survey", GenMeet 85, AJA
LXXXVIII, 1984, p.252); the results of the 1983 excavations at Sepphoris,
where an attempt is being made to date the theatre ("Notes and News", IEJ
34, 1984, pp.51-50, ref. pp.51-2). Also possibly relevant, but not to
hand, are M. Sartre, Trois études sur l'Arabie romaine et byzantine, Coll.
épigraphique", Rev. des ét. grecques 1983, p.178, No.455), of which the
third chapter deals with the Arab nomads, including those of the area of
Resafa, and Monde de Bible, 22, Jan.-Feb. 1982 (eodem, "Bull. Épigr.",
Rev. des ét. grecques 1982, p.425, No.464) devoted entirely to articles on
the Decapolis. The publication of Marilyn Chiat's new synagogue
chronology (see M. Chiat, abstract, "Synagogues Chronology. A New Hypo­
thesis", GenMeet 85, AJA LXXXVIII, 1984, p.240) is also eagerly awaited.
NOTE ON THE MAPS:

The following maps have no pretensions to cartographical precision. It is an unfortunate fact that no two maps of Syria agree entirely, and some of the smaller sites do not, in any case, appear on any full-sized map, the only indication of their location deriving from small-scale, and sometimes rough, maps supplied by the author of the relevant archaeological report, or even merely from a verbal intimation of their whereabouts in the text. Some maps are totally irreconcilable (see M.A. pp.85-88, Notes 301-309). Under the circumstances, Map 1 (based on the outline provided by The Oxford Atlas, Oxford, 1951, 1961 reprint) and Map 2 (based on the fold-out map in Alois Musil, Palmyrena) can be no more than approximations, an indication of where the sites mentioned are deemed to be for the purposes of the thesis, offered merely for the sake of convenience.

The scale of the maps, particularly Map 2, is regulated by the same considerations. They are as accurate as I can make them, using the available data, and at the scale used they are not, to the best of my knowledge, "wrong", in that it would be impossible to locate the sites any more precisely at that scale. If however the scale were enlarged - for example, in the case of Map 2, to employ Poidebard's map from Trace de Rome Vol. II as the basis - then I would be committed to showing a more precise interrelationship between some of the sites than it is possible to ascertain on the available evidence. Even at the present scale the omission of some minor sites mentioned in passing has been necessitated by such considerations.
MAP 2. Palmyrene and adjacent districts

KEY

- Hellenistic Occupation
- Roman Occupation
- Ruins (or in the case of a settlement, greatly reduced in size)
- Ruined dams, fields, aqueducts, agricultural structures etc.
- Villa
- Fort or watchtower

E.g. Ruined Roman fort; ruined shrine, settlement with Roman occupation

N.B. —— Guideline for putative Pirmian desert, not boundary of Palmyrene