

Latin in Cities of the Roman Near East

Four languages are appropriately used in the world. And these are: Greek for song, Latin for war, Syriac (Aramaic) for mourning, Hebrew for speaking.¹

Rabbi Jonathan of Eleutheropolis (third century) is the author of this famous statement regarding the respective qualities of the four languages: Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Hebrew. According to his view, Greek is most suitable for 'zemer', which in this instance means song in the broader sense of the word – poetry.² The other qualifications do not require comment.

In the Roman Near East, various languages were used for written and oral communication. The relative importance of these languages is a topic frequently studied and discussed. Two of the languages were imported by conquerors from the West. Of these, it is clear that Latin, unlike Greek, was never used widely, but it is also obvious that the first language of the Empire played a role in communications. In the present chapter I shall attempt to consider the question of the extent to which Latin may have been more than the language of government and military organization in the cities of the Near East from Pompey to the third century. This is only one aspect – but an important one – of the impact of Western, Roman influence on the cities of the Near East.³

The region to be considered for present purposes is more narrowly that of Syria, Judaea/Palaestina, and Arabia, excluding the numerous cities of

An early version of this paper was delivered at a conference 'Epigraphy and Beyond', Institute for Advanced Studies, Jerusalem, 30 June–2 July 2003. An expanded version was originally intended for a volume in honour of Fergus Millar, the publication of which was cancelled. The chapter as published owes much to the diligent and careful editorial work of Richard Alston. It was then published in H. M. Cotton *et al.* (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (Cambridge, 2009), 43–72. Here it has been revised slightly to take account of recent publications.

¹ Y. Megilla I 71b, col. 748.

² S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York and Jerusalem, 1994), 21.

³ Clearly, there are other aspects, not to be discussed here, such as the presence of amphitheatres in eastern cities. These are found not just in Roman colonies like Caesarea, but in regular *poleis* such as Scythopolis, Neapolis, Eleutheropolis, and Gerasa.

Asia Minor. This is appropriate because the cultural and linguistic differences between these regions are such that a comparison might well result in misleading conclusions. Any attempt to lump them together would ignore essential aspects of linguistic culture and I therefore follow the precedent of major recent works of synthesis which exclude Anatolia in their treatment of the Roman Near East.⁴ For the present study, this is appropriate all the more because the process of Hellenization is so markedly different between the various regions. Ephesus on the coast of the Aegean was an important Greek *polis* from the archaic period onwards. Its language always was Greek and the introduction of Latin as the language of government under the Principate was due to its status as a *conventus* centre, seat of the governor and chief centre for the Roman ruler cult. Perge in Pamphylia may have had its origins as a Hittite city, but its claims to Hellenic status go back centuries before the arrival of Roman rule. The latter is true also for a city like Side. Greek was the norm in those cities. Latin could never achieve predominance, except in communities of Latin-speaking settlers such those in southern Asia Minor.⁵ The situation in the area of the Eastern Levant, here to be considered, was different. The city populations and those of the surrounding territories were always linguistically mixed. The local languages were Semitic, and Greek arrived only with the establishment of Seleucid and Ptolemaic rule. While some cities, such as Apamea, Gadara, and Ascalon, produced highly respectable Greek intellectuals at some stage and while others certainly wished to be regarded in the Greek heartland as genuinely Greek, there is good evidence to show that this was a vain hope.⁶ The degree of Hellenization varied and is today often difficult to trace. Whatever the relationship between the local Semitic languages and Greek, Greek was the second language introduced by imperial rulers in this region and Latin was the third. It seems therefore questionable whether the use of Latin can be profitably compared in these two different regions and I will restrict myself to Syria, Judaea-Palaestina, and Arabia.⁷

⁴ F. Millar, *The Roman Near East: 31 BC–AD 337* (Cambridge, 1993); W. Ball, *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire* (London, 2000); M. Sartre, *D'Alexandre à Zénobie, Histoire du Levant antique iv^e siècle avant J.-C. iii^e siècle après J.-C.* (Paris, 2003). It will be obvious that the present chapter focuses on a relatively small part of the Empire. Much can be said – and has been said – about other regions, such as, for instance, North Africa. See e.g. F. Millar, 'Local Cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa', *JRS* 58 (1968): 126–34; M. Benabou, *La résistance africaine à la Romanisation* (Paris, 1976) with C. R. Whittaker's review in *JRS* 68 (1978): 190–2.

⁵ B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1967).

⁶ See the conclusions to this chapter and above, Chapter 7: 'Attitudes towards Provincial Intellectuals in the Roman Empire'.

⁷ It will be clear that these assumptions are not shared by my colleague Werner Eck, whose paper in the volume in which the present article was originally published discusses Anatolian cities for

The ancient literature is not very informative on the use of Latin in non-Latin-speaking provinces. In this respect, the situation resembles a related and even larger topic, which is popularly called ‘Romanization’, an only apparently transparent term for political, economic, and cultural acculturation or the assimilation of subject peoples to Roman imperial society. For the present, far more modest subject, the obvious material to study is the epigraphic record and this immediately raises the question of the extent to which this is reliable evidence for social and cultural issues beyond that of epigraphic practices themselves. Can we take language use in epigraphic contexts as representative of issues of non-epigraphic language use or cultural identity, for instance?

Language use is determined by many factors, as will be obvious if we think of more recent parallels. In India, Hindi was declared the official language after independence alongside some eighteen officially recognized languages. English, however, in many ways a remnant of British colonial rule, continued to be a widely used *lingua franca*, especially by educated Indians in business, government, and academic life, and even more than half a century after independence, the English press remains influential. At another level, English serves as the means of communication between central government and the non-Hindi-speaking states. Yet it remains the first language of only a small percentage of the population. By comparison, in Indonesia, formerly a Dutch colony, Bahasa Indonesia, originally a Malay dialect, was declared the official language and functions as such, though a multitude of other languages are in common use; Dutch has disappeared altogether, apart from a few loanwords. Again, in Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia, formerly French Indochina, the French language did not penetrate deeply. In countries under German occupation during the Second World War, German was the language of communication between the occupying powers and the local authorities, but the language did not otherwise penetrate the society of the occupied. It is clear that these differences have been caused by combinations of factors, to be sought in the policies and practices of the rulers, in the social and linguistic situation of the ruled, in the length of time during which the foreign language was officially dominant, and, not least, in the circumstances surrounding the ousting of the occupying power. Whatever the reasons, their complexity

similar purposes: W. Eck, ‘The Language of Power: Latin in the Roman Near East’, in Cotton *et al.* (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam*, 15–42. It is clear also that we disagree about the nature of society in Caesarea-on-the-Sea from the Flavian period onwards, and I hope that the contrasting arguments produced in these two papers will eventually contribute to scholarly clarity – if not agreement – in these complex matters.

and the variety of post-occupation linguistic reactions show how cautious we must be in drawing conclusions regarding language use in societies for which the extant evidence is scarce, or in drawing, consciously or unconsciously, on modern parallels in considering the ancient situation.⁸

In assessing the impact of Latin in the Roman Near East, we must keep in mind that there are several mechanisms at work.⁹ First, there are the Roman authorities who used Latin for themselves and sometimes, but not always, Greek in their communications with the locals. Second, there is the Roman army, which functioned mostly in Latin and continued doing so for centuries even when recruitment was overwhelmingly local. Third, there was the settlement of speakers of Latin in a few parts of the region. Such settlers were in part drawn from retired soldiers. Finally, it is conceivable that in centres with a substantial Latin-speaking population this language was adopted to some extent by people with Greek or a Semitic language in order to interact with the speakers of Latin. This leads us to another large and related topic, that of bilingualism. In the Near East and

⁸ There are several extensive older publications on the use of Latin and Greek in the Roman Empire: L. Hahn, *Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache* (Leipzig, 1906), 110–18, 208–23; ‘Zum Sprachenkampf im römischen Reich bis auf die Zeit Justinians’, *Philologus*, suppl. 10 (1907), 675–718; A. Buturas, *Ein Kapitel der historischen Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: Über die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der griechischen und der fremden Sprachen, besonders über die fremden Einflüsse auf das Griechische seit der nachklassischen Periode bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1910), 55–8. For the Eastern Roman Empire, see H. Zilliagus, *Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im oströmischen Reich* (Helsingfors, 1935; repr. Amsterdam, 1965). Note the more recent paper by M. Dubuisson, ‘Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?’, *Ktéma* 7 (1982): 187–210, where it is argued that there was no Roman policy attempting to stimulate, let alone impose, the use of Latin in the provinces.

⁹ B. Rochette, *Le Latin dans le monde grec: Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l’Empire Romain* (Brussels, 1997); W. Eck, ‘Latein als Sprache politischer Kommunikation in Städten der östlichen Provinzen’, *Chiron* 3 (2000): 641–60, discusses several inscriptions from Perge; W. Eck, ‘Ein Spiegel der Macht: Lateinische Inschriften römischer Zeit in Iudaea/Syria Palaestina’, *ZPAV* 117 (2001): 47–63; Eck, ‘The Language of Power: Latin in the Inscriptions of Iudaea/Syria Palaestina’, in L. H. Schiffman (ed.), *Semitic Papyrology in Context* (Leiden, 2003), 123–44; R. Schmitt, ‘Die Sprachverhältnisse in den östlichen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches’, *ANRW* 2.29.2 (1983): 554–86, esp. 561–3. S. Schwartz, ‘Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine’, *P&P* 148 (1995): 3–47, is, in spite of its title, concerned only with the use of Hebrew and Aramaic by Jews. For local languages in the Roman Empire see R. MacMullen, ‘Provincial Languages in the Roman Empire’, *AJA* 87 (1966): 1–17, with discussion of the use of Syriac, Coptic, Punic, and Celtic in the Empire. For the (local) languages in Palestine, from 200 BC till AD 200 see J. C. Greenfield, ‘The Languages of Palestine, 200 BCE–200 CE’, in H. H. Paper (ed.), *Jewish Languages: Theme and Variations* (Cambridge, 1978), 143–54, with responses by H. C. Youtie, ‘Response to Greenfield’, 155–7, and F. E. Peters, ‘Response to Greenfield’, 159–64. H. B. Rosén, ‘Die Sprachsituation im römischen Palästina’, in G. Neumann and J. Untermann (eds.), *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium vom 8. bis 10. April 1974* (Cologne and Bonn, 1980), 215–39, at 219, claims that Latin had only administrative significance in Roman Palestine. R. Schmitt, ‘Die Sprachverhältnisse in den östlichen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches’, *ANRW* 2.29.2 (1983): 554–86, states that in Syria Latin was used only in the army and in Berytus.

in many or most of the provinces of the Roman Empire, bilingualism was a widespread phenomenon. Adams' recent study of the role of Latin and bilingualism in Egypt has demonstrated the need to reassess the available source material for all provinces.¹⁰ In this chapter I am concerned with the role of Latin in cities, notably the Roman citizen colonies.¹¹ However, my discussion here is heavily dependent on our understanding of the role of Latin in the army and among the authorities. Concerning language use in the army, Adams concludes:

A persistent misconception is that Latin was the 'official' language of the army ... While it is true that service in the army gave recruits, if they were not Latin speakers, the opportunity to acquire the language and although there might have been pressure on them to do so, in that training in the skills of Latin literacy seems to have been provided, some excessively sweeping generalisations have been made about the role of Latin as the official language of the army.¹²

Adams cites military documents from Egypt with the aim of showing that Greek was acceptable for official purposes.¹³ Latin, however, was, as formulated by Adams, 'a sort of supreme or super-high language in the army, which was bound to be used in certain circumstances, e.g. correspondence with the Emperor'.¹⁴ Or, as formulated by Valerius Maximus in a frequently cited passage:

How carefully the magistrates of old regulated their conduct to keep intact the majesty of the Roman people and their own can be seen from the fact

¹⁰ J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text* (Oxford, 2002); J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

¹¹ Rochette, *Le Latin dans le monde grec*, does not seriously discuss the subject at hand.

¹² Adams, *Bilingualism*, 599.

¹³ J. N. Adams, 'Language Use in the Army in Egypt', in Adams *et al.*, *Bilingualism*, 599–623: 'There was no rigid adherence to a policy of using Latin for public documents in the army; on the contrary, there were occasions when a decision was taken to use Greek instead' (602). 'Greek was acceptable for record keeping even if there was a scribe to hand who could have used Latin' (607). '... matters of an official kind were regularly handled in Greek, both in dealings with outsiders to the unit and in internal record keeping' (608).

¹⁴ Adams, 'Language Use in the Army in Egypt', 608–17. The *dux Aegypti* did not respond in Latin when he received a petition in Greek. Latin would be used when a superior wished to assert his power over a subordinate, or when a subordinate wished to make a potent appeal to a higher authority. It was used for the transmission of orders, receipts and promissory notes, *diplomata*, dedications to emperors. The incidents often cited in this respect may be more significant as exceptions than as a true reflection of the rule of behaviour. These are described by Suetonius, *Tiberius* 71: describing Tiberius' reluctance to use Greek loanwords in the Senate, he also relates that the Emperor prohibited a soldier from giving testimony in Greek. Suetonius, *Claudius* 16.2, reports that Claudius removed a Greek dignitary from the list of jurors and also took away his Roman citizenship because he did not know Latin. Dio 60.17.4 says he was a Lycian.

that among other indications of their duty to preserve dignity they steadfastly kept to the rule never to make replies to Greeks except in Latin. Indeed they obliged the Greeks themselves to discard the volubility, which is their greatest asset, and speak through an interpreter, not only in Rome but in Greece and Asia also, intending no doubt that the dignity of Latin speech be the more widely venerated throughout all nations ... (Thinking) it unmeet that the weight and authority of empire be sacrificed to the seductive charm of letters.¹⁵

All this may have been true for the 'old magistrates' but it follows that it was no longer the reality of the first century AD when Valerius Maximus wrote these lines.¹⁶ The same is true for a rather similar pronouncement by John the Lydian.¹⁷

Since the cities of the East have not produced the abundance of papyri available for Egypt, we must have recourse to the inscriptions on stone of which many have been found.¹⁸ Clearly, however, the usual type of public inscriptions encountered in the inscriptions of the Roman East do not require any serious knowledge of the language and are not evidence of the language commonly spoken or written by those who set them up. Nevertheless, the languages used for public declarations of political, cultural, and social identity in the various cities of the Roman East are important in themselves.

In the present chapter, therefore, I shall consider the various categories of inscriptions in Latin that are found in a number of cities of the Roman East and attempt to formulate conclusions about the use of this language in documents meant to be read by or displayed to the public. The analysis depends very much on the availability of published material. Preservation and publication are very uneven for the various cities of the region, and this, of course, raises methodological issues when considering the relative

¹⁵ Valerius Maximus 2.2.2 (trans. Shackleton-Bailey): *Magistratus uero prisci quantopere suam populiue Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint hinc cognosci potest, quod inter cetera obtinendae grauitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseuerantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi latine responsa darent. quin etiam ipsos linguae uolubilitate, qua plurimum ualent, excussa per interpretem loqui cogebant non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae uocis honos per omnes gentes uenerabilior diffunderetur. nec illis deerant studia doctrinae, sed nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur, indignum esse existimantes inlecebris et suauitati litterarum imperii pondus et auctoritatem donari.*

¹⁶ As observed by Dubuisson, 'Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?', 195.

¹⁷ Joannes Laurentius Lydus, *De magistratibus populi Romani*, 2.12 and 3.42; cf. Dubuisson, 'Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?', 196; M. Maas, *John Lydus and the Roman Past* (London and New York, 1992), 25, 32, 87.

¹⁸ Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 617: 'An epitaph might be seen as the ultimate definition of a person's identity.'

incidence of Latin inscriptions at the various sites. In spite of the paucity of evidence, one category excluded from the analysis is inscribed milestones. Since these were formal texts set up by the army on instructions from the provincial authorities, they were obviously in Latin. By the end of the second century, in the reign of Severus, we find the first milestones which use Greek, in particular for distances.¹⁹ The reason for this is that the responsibility for the maintenance of the road-system and, with it, the erection of milestones, fell increasingly upon the local authorities and has more to do with the development of provincial administration than with the topic at hand. In the remaining categories of Latin inscriptions from the Eastern cities and their territories, my analysis attempts to determine whether their erection and the choice of language in the inscriptions were the responsibility of the Roman authorities, such as the governor and procurator and their staffs; the Roman army, either active-duty soldiers or officers; veterans, either of local origin or settled after service in the area; local civilian speakers of Latin who may have been descendants of veterans settled in Roman citizen colonies or local citizens who served in the army and their relatives; or other civilians.

The use of Latin is more expected if army personnel and provincial authorities are involved, and it is thus of particular interest to attempt to assess the use of the language outside those circles. We know that Latin was used to some extent in Eastern cities with colonial status, as is clear from their coin inscriptions as well as from the fairly numerous inscriptions on stone so far published. The point of interest is whether and why local civilians from these cities set up inscriptions in Latin, and whether we can establish any kind of social context for those epigraphic Latinists.

The Roman colonies in the East were, like those in the West, either genuine veteran colonies such as Berytus (which presumably at first included Heliopolis and vicinity), Acco-Ptolemais, and Aelia Capitolina, or titular colonies, the most important of which for our purposes are Caesarea-on-the-Sea, Bostra, and Gerasa. Veteran colonies were reorganized at the time of the foundation, and veterans from the Roman legions were settled there and received land. They formed a local elite imposed upon the existing communities. By contrast, the titular colonies were established through political reorganization and a change in status, unaccompanied by the settlement of veterans or other foreigners. There is therefore an essential

¹⁹ Cf. B. Isaac, 'Milestones in Judaea', in B. Isaac, *The Near East under Roman Rule: Selected Papers* (Leiden, 1998), 48–75, at 62–5. Tetrarchic milestones and those of Constantine and his colleagues are usually in Latin.

difference: the establishment of a veteran colony represented a serious disruption of social and economic life in a community and the imposition of a foreign upper class.²⁰

Heliopolis-Baalbek

The fullest, most accessible, and therefore instructive collection is that of Heliopolis-Baalbek. The legal status of Heliopolis in the first and second centuries AD should not concern us here. It was either founded as a separate colony by Augustus or was part of the territory of Berytus, founded by Augustus no later than 14 BC. In the reign of Severus, it is on record as a separate colony.²¹ Whatever the case, the city was occupied by veterans of the legions *V Macedonica* and *VIII Augusta* in the time of Augustus. In spite of this early occupation by veterans, the earliest imperial texts from the region are relatively late: two rock-cut inscriptions along the Heliopolis–Damascus road which mention Nero.²² In the town the earliest dated inscription mentions Vespasian on a dedication.²³

There are 306 inscriptions in Greek and Latin from the town, the sanctuary, and the vicinity, of which 131 are in Latin.²⁴ The exceptional nature of the Latin epigraphic record becomes obvious if we compare this corpus of inscriptions with that from the major city of Emesa, which has not produced a single Latin inscription, apart from milestones and boundary stones.²⁵ Yet one might have expected Emesa to produce some Latin texts

²⁰ It will suffice to refer to the establishment of the veteran colony at Camulodunum (Colchester). Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.32, states that a strong body of veterans was installed on expropriated land and describes vividly the procedure: the veterans ejected Britons from their homes, confiscated their land, and treated them as slaves. The town was ‘the seat of servitude’ in the eyes of the Britons and we are told of their fierce hatred of the veterans. Elsewhere, in a speech which Tacitus puts in the mouth of Arminius, the leader of the Germanic revolt, the essence of Roman provincial rule is expressed by the phrase *dominos et colonias novas*: *Ann.* 1.59.8. Appian, *BC* 5.12–14, describes problems caused by the settlement of veterans in Italy. The walls of Colonia Agrippinensis (Cologne) are referred to as *munimenta servitii* (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.64).

²¹ References and discussion by J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie (IGLS)*, VI, *Baalbek et Beqa* (Paris, 1967), 34, n. 9 (for references to earlier discussion) and Rey-Coquais, ‘Syrie romaine de Pompée à Dioclétien’, *JRS* 68 (1978): 51–73; F. Millar, ‘The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: A Study of Cultural Relations’, in H. Solin and F. M. Kajave (eds.), *Roman Policy in the East and Other Studies in Roman History, Proceedings of a Colloquium at Tvärmine, 1987* (Helsinki, 1990), 7–57, at 10–23, 31–4; B. Isaac, *The Limits of Empire: The Roman Army in the East*, revised edn (Oxford, 1992), 318–21, 342–4; Millar, *Roman Near East*.

²² *IGLS* VI, 2968.

²³ *IGLS* VI, 2762.

²⁴ All numbers derive from the collection in *IGLS* VI.

²⁵ *IGLS* 5 (Émésène). Latin boundary stones: nos. 2549, 2552. Milestones: 2672, 2674–6; see also 2704, 2708. Cf. Millar, *Roman Near East*, 300–9.

since its citizens served in units named after the city and at least one of those was a *cohors milliaria c(ivium) R(omanorum)*.²⁶ The first group of inscriptions from Heliopolis to be mentioned is dedications to Jupiter Optimus Maximus Heliopolitanus. There are nineteen of those, two of them erected by military men²⁷ and two by freedmen.²⁸ Then there are fourteen inscriptions on statue bases for emperors; on four of these the donors are private individuals. Two inscriptions record dedications to kings: Sohaemus of Emesa and Agrippa (either I or II), who apparently had a close relationship with the colony.²⁹ There are also five inscriptions in honour of provincial governors. For three of these it is not clear who dedicated them. Of the inscriptions with known dedicators, one was set up by the governor's *equites singulares*, the other (2779) by a centurion of the *legio VII Gemina*. Such dedications could have come from any urban centre which the governor regularly visited. Finally, there are forty-five inscriptions in Latin which mention people of local origin (as distinct from military personnel or officials who were not citizens of the colony, but present temporarily on duty). Two of these were members of senatorial families.³⁰ One remarkable equestrian career is recorded on a statue base, 2796, for C. Velius Rufus, clearly from Heliopolis, who was active in the second half of the first century. Several of his descendants were senators. There are two other equestrian careers: 2781 recording the career of L. Antonius Naso, who became a tribune of the Praetorian Guard and procurator.³¹ The second is recorded

²⁶ J. Fitz, *Les Syriens à Intercisa* (Brussels, 1972).

²⁷ *IGLS VI*, 2711, dated AD 212–17, by Aurelius Antonius Longinus, a *speculator* of the *legio III Gal.*, stationed at Raphanaeae. The name is characteristic for a recent grant of citizenship and it is therefore not clear what connection the dedicant had with Heliopolis. There is no such doubt in the case of L. Antonius Silo (no. 2714, AD 128–38), *eques* of the *III Aug.*, *Heliopolitanus*, by his heirs, all four of the *tribus Fabia*, and therefore also Heliopolitans.

²⁸ *IGLS VI*, 2713, origin not certain, and 2719.

²⁹ *IGLS VI*, 2760 for Sohaemus, '*Patronus Coloniae* ... set up by L Vitellius L f Fab Sossianus'. *IGLS VI*, 2759 for Agrippa, *patronus coloniae*.

³⁰ *IGLS VI*, 2795: T. Statilius Maximus, for whose senatorial career see comments *ad loc.* A relative of his, Titus Statilius Maximus Bromiacus, is attested at Berytus (see below). *IGLS VI*, 2797: a senatorial descendant of the equestrian officer C. Velius Rufus, honoured in *IGLS VI*, 2796. *IGLS VI*, 2795 refers to a member of a senatorial family which produced three consuls in the second century and is also mentioned at Berytus (2796, 2798). Cf. G. W. Bowersock, 'Roman Senators from the Near East: Syria, Judaea, Arabia, Mesopotamia', in *Atti del colloquio internazionale AIEQL su epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Roma 1981* (Rome, 1982), II, 651–68, esp. 665–6, nos. 16–18. Note also *IGLS VI* 2785 honouring Sex. Attius Suburanus, twice consul under Trajan. The inscription dates to the end of the first century, while he was still an *eques*. There is no evidence of a personal connection with Heliopolis apart from this dedication by the brothers of his *cornicularius*.

³¹ Cf. *IGLS VI*, no. 2761, where it is suggested that Antonius Taurus, mentioned on the base of a statue of Vespasian, is the tribune of the praetorians mentioned by Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.20, together with Antonius Naso. In that case, we would have another Heliopolitan *eques*.

on two statue bases (2793, 2794): P. Statilius Justus Sentianus, who was *praefectus fabrum* and tribune of the legion *II Traiana* as well as *decurio coloniae*. Nine inscriptions refer to military careers of local men below the equestrian level.³² Five other Latin inscriptions mention locally significant men with Roman names who did not, apparently, have imperial careers outside the city.³³ Twenty-one fragmentary Latin inscriptions are too far gone to be instructive for the present topic.

No less significant is the number of Latin inscriptions from the vicinity of Heliopolis, which shows that there were Latin speakers, clearly descendants of the original colonists and locals, who were integrated with their families in the territory of the colony. I count twenty-three private individuals, twelve of them identified by their *tria nomina*.³⁴ Remarkable is a dedication on an altar for 'Jupiter Optimus Belesdedes' by three men, named Viveius Cand(idus?), Septimius Sator(ninus), and Adrus (2925). We may note also a boundary stone of a village from the territory.³⁵ Eleven additional Latin inscriptions are too fragmentary for profitable interpretation.

Of special interest is the material from Niha, in the Beqa valley, where a series of inscriptions in Latin records the existence of a sanctuary of the Syrian Goddess of Niha', Hadaranes, or Atargatis.³⁶ One of those mentions the *Pagus Augustus*, presumably an association of Latin-speaking Roman citizens which will have been settled there at the time of the foundation of the Roman colony. At this sanctuary some evidence of social integration

³² *IGLS VI*, 2782: a *primus pilus*; 12783: a centurion; 2786 and 2787: L. Gerellanus who became *primus pilus* of the legion X Fretensis and *praefectus castrorum* of the legion XII Fulminata fulfilled functions in the colony. The statues were set up by respectively a centurion of legion X Fretensis and M. Antonius Sosipatrus, a friend. 2789: a statue of a *bastatus* of the XIII Gemina set up by his son, a centurion of the I Adiutrix. Their connection with Heliopolis is not clear. 2798: a fragmentary inscription on a statue base for a *primus pilus* who was honoured by the city, perhaps because he was of local origin. *IGLS VI*, 2844 is the epitaph of a *protector*, by his brother, also a *protector* (late third century). It is not unlikely that they were local citizens. 2788 is too fragmentary to tell us anything, apart from the rank of the honorand.

³³ *IGLS VI*, 2780, 2784, 2790–2.

³⁴ *IGLS VI*, 2898: M. Rufus Valens Honoratus; 2904: C. Antonius Abimmes. For this Aramaic name, see the comments on *IGLS VI*, 2898. pp. 181–2; *IGLS VI*, 2911: M. Cl. Cornelianus; 2921: M. Sentius Valens and his son; 2922: L. Licinius Felix; 2923: Q. Baebius Rufus; 2949: L. Sevius Rufinus; 2953: C. Iulius Magnus, son of Rufus (dated by the consuls of AD 96); 2955: epitaph of Cn. Iulius Rufus, *primus pilus*, probably father of the previous; 2956: L. Iulius Li(g)us; 2966: C. Aetrius Cresces Mundus and his family; 2976: M. Longinus Falcidianus.

³⁵ *IGLS VI*, 2894: *Oblig(atum)* or *Oblig(ata) Caphargmi*.

³⁶ *IGLS VI*, 2936. The inscriptions from Niha are *IGLS VI*, 2928–45. For *pagi*, country districts or communities attached to cities and *vici*, rural settlements, *RE* 18.2318–39. For *pagi* at Ptolemais see below.

has been detected.³⁷ The sanctuary preserved its indigenous character, and the gods did not receive Graeco-Roman names. In contrast to the sanctuary at Heliopolis itself, the priests and prophetesses were *peregrini*, but the inscriptions also mention at least six Roman citizens and their relatives.³⁸ A sanctuary nearby is identified by a dedication in Latin to the god Mifsenus.³⁹

Finally we ought to notice a number of relevant inscriptions from other regions of the Empire.⁴⁰ They record citizens from Heliopolis as serving soldiers and officers in various regions.⁴¹

The figures are not in themselves statistically significant but they do show that some Roman citizens of local origin in Heliopolis used Latin on public monuments. These Romans belong to various social classes, from senatorial and equestrian families to families who use a mixture of Semitic, Greek, and Roman personal names, but all preferred to use Latin for their public declarations. We encounter some military careers at lower and middle levels, again of people of proven local origin, both in Heliopolis and its vicinity, and in other parts of the Empire. Particularly in the surrounding territory, we also encounter some evidence of integration and mixed culture. All this is what one would expect of an Eastern citizen colony where a substantial group of veterans settled in close proximity with Greek- and Semitic-speaking others. The situation resulted in a tendency in individuals to use of Latin on private monuments even if they were not of the original group of veteran settlers or their direct descendants.

³⁷ Cf. J.-P. Rey-Coquais, 'Des montagnes au désert: Baetocécé, le *Pagus Augustus* de Niha, la Ghouta à l'Est de Damas', in E. Frézouls (ed.), *Sociétés urbaines, sociétés rurales dans l'Asie Mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines, Actes du colloque organisé à Strasbourg (novembre 1985)* (Strasbourg, 1987), 191–216, esp. 198–207, pls. II–IV, 1.

³⁸ *IGLS* VI, 2928; 2929 (bilingual), set up by a veteran, Sex. Allius Iullus. Note also *IGLS* VI, 2933; L. Iulius Apollinaris; also 2937 (fragmentary); 2938(?); 2940 (Greek), mentioning the sons of C. Clodius Marcellus (who have Semitic names); 2942: Q. Vesius Petilianus, *flamen aug(ustalis)* and *decurio Berytensis, quaestor col.*; 2943: Q. Vesius M[agnus]; 2944: L. Vesius Verecundus.

³⁹ 2946, cf. Rey-Coquais, 'Des montagnes au désert', 203. In charge are five persons with Aramaic names and four with Roman names (*praenomina* only).

⁴⁰ Cited in *IGLS* VI, p. 40.

⁴¹ Trebonius Sossianus appears in Rome as *centurio frumentarius* of the *legio III Fl(aviae) Gordianae* (*ILS* 4287) and later as *primus pilus* in Philippopolis (*ILS* 9005). *CIL* VIII 18084, ll. 75, 92: M. Domitius Valens and M. Atilius Saturninus are soldiers of the *Legio III Augusta* in Lambaesis. Since these date to the early second century and are described as 'Heliopolitanus' it has been suggested that this might be evidence of the existence of the city as a separate colony by that time (*IGLS* VI, p. 35). G. Ch. Picard, *Castellum Dimmidi* (Paris, 1945), 198, 22B, left column, l. 11: [S]aturnin[us] in (colonia) Helub (Heliopoli), as read by H.-G. Pflaum. *CIL* VI 2385.5, l. 14: [Hel]iopo[li] on a list of praetorians in Rome. Interesting is also *CIL* X 1579; *ILS* 4291 indicating the existence of a *corpus Heliopolitanorum* at Puteoli.

Berytus

A city most charming that has law schools which assure the stability of all of the Roman legal system. Thence learned men come who assist judges all over the world and protect the provinces with their knowledge of the laws ...⁴²

Although there is far less published material from Berytus than from Heliopolis, the pattern of what there is resembles that of Heliopolis. Gregorius Thaumaturgus describes Berytus as being a 'city rather Roman in character and credited with being a school for legal studies'.⁴³ The planned corpus of inscriptions from the city is not yet available. Veterans were settled at Berytus at the same time as at Heliopolis, in 14 BC by Agrippa.⁴⁴ The existence of a distinguished school, or schools, of Roman law at Berytus has always been seen as an indication of the Latin character of this town from the third century until the end of the fourth century.⁴⁵ A famous inscription, originally set up at Berytus, honours an equestrian officer who, in the course of his career, was dispatched by the governor of Syria at the beginning of the first century to destroy a fortress of the Ituraeans in the mountains of the Lebanon.⁴⁶ The inscription is relevant for our topic because the officer later became *quaestor*, *aedilis*, *duumvir*, and *pontifex* of the colony.

There is evidence of at least two senators from Berytus, which shows that it produced members of the imperial upper class.⁴⁷ Four (or possibly

⁴² *Expositio Totius Mundi et Gentium* (ed. Jean Rougé) 25: <Post istam> Berytus, civitas valde deliciosa et auditoria legum habens per quam omnia iudicia Romanorum <stare videntur>. Inde enim viri docti in omnem orbem terrarum adsident iudicibus et scientes leges custodiunt provincias ...

⁴³ Gregorius Thaumaturgus, *Orat. Panegyri ad Origenem* 5. PG 10. 1066: πόλις Ῥωμαϊκότερα πῶς, καὶ τῶν νόμων τούτων εἶναι πιστευθεῖσα παιδευτήριον

⁴⁴ Some veterans were established there at an earlier date, after Actium and before 27: *CIL* III 14165.6. For Berytus, J. Lauffray, 'Beyrouth : Archéologie et histoire, époques gréco-romaines. I Période hellénique et Haut Empire romain', *ANRW* 2.8.135–63; Millar, 'The Roman *Coloniae*', 10–18.

⁴⁵ P. Collinet, *Histoire de l'école de droit de Beyrouth* (Paris, 1925), is merely the last of a venerable series of works published since the seventeenth century, listed by Collinet, 6–9; Millar, 'The Roman *Coloniae*', 16–17; Rochette, *Le Latin dans le monde grec*, 167–74. Other centres were Alexandria and Antioch: Rochette, *Le Latin dans le monde grec*, 174–7. For the substitution of Greek for Latin as the language of legal instruction, see Collinet, *Histoire*, 211–18. The school functioned till the mid-sixth century. Most of the literary sources which shed light on the institution are later than the period considered in the present chapter. There are a few from the third century (Collinet, *Histoire*, 26–30) and more from the fourth (at 30–42). For a recent treatment: L. J. Hall, *Roman Berytus: Beirut in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004).

⁴⁶ *CIL* III 6687; *ILS* 2683; L. Boffo (ed.), *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della bibbia* (Brescia, 1994), 182–203, no. 23; Cf. Isaac, *Limits of Empire*, 60–2.

⁴⁷ Bowersock, 'Roman Senators from the Near East', nos. 11 and 12; M. and S. Sentius Proculus, possibly brothers. Cf. J.-P. Rey-Coquais, 'Un légat d'Afrique', in A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana: Atti*

five) equestrian officers are attested as originating from Berytus.⁴⁸ Two (or possibly three) of these refer to the only attested first-century equestrian officers from Syria. The number of attested equestrian officers of this town was surpassed only by Palmyra in the second century.⁴⁹

I am aware of twenty-three inscriptions representing private individuals, setting up dedications to gods in Latin on their own behalf.⁵⁰ We find only purely Latin personal names on thirteen of these, but on eight the names are a combination of Latin and Greek or Semitic. The former reflect a tradition of Roman nomenclature which goes back to the settlement of veterans in the city while the latter could either mean that local families received the citizenship or that descendants of the group of citizens intermarried with local families. Both must have happened regularly, but it is interesting to see it reflected in the personal names. Next there are nine epitaphs or statue dedications with inscriptions in Latin.⁵¹ Four of these represent private persons with fully Latin names, one of them recording those of freedmen and one a soldier. One inscription has a mixture of Latin and Greek names.

There are a few relevant inscriptions from other parts of the Empire: the worshippers of Jupiter Heliopolitanus from Berytus who lived in Puteoli (*CIL* III 6680; *ILS* 300) and a dedication from Nîmes to this god and to the god Nemausus by a *primipilaris* from Berytus (*ILS* 4288).

For Berytus the limited epigraphic material confirms the impression derived from the literary sources that this was a substantial Roman veteran colony where the Latin tradition was maintained for centuries after the foundation. The city produced some members of the higher classes and

del IX Convegno di Studio su 'L'Africa Romana' Nuoro, 13–15 dicembre 1991 (Sassari, 1992), 345–52 = *AE* 1992. 1689.

⁴⁸ H. Devijver, 'Equestrian Officers from the East', in P. Freeman and D. Kennedy (eds.), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East: Proceedings of a Colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986* (Oxford, 1986), 109–225, at 183.

⁴⁹ Devijver, 'Equestrian Officers', 183. For military inscriptions see further *CIL* III 14165/6; *AE* 1998. 1435: career inscription of a centurion, probably a local man (*tribus Fabia*), mentioned also in *IGLS* VI, no. 2955; 2956, first half of the second century.

⁵⁰ H. Seyrig, *Antiquités Syriennes*, 1st ser. (Paris, 1934), 5; *Antiquités Syriennes*, 3rd ser. (Paris, 1946), 46–7, no. 18; 48, no. 19; *CIL* III 14165/5; 9; *AE* 1900.191; 1903.361, for which see also 1905, p. 7: the dedicator, Q. Antonius Eutyches, appears also on another dedication: 1924.138; 1905.29; 1906.188 and p. 41; 1906.189 and 190; 1922.60; 1924.137; 1926.56; 1939.69; 1950.231; 1950.233: a dedication to 'Fortunae Geni coloniae' by M(arcus) Iulius Avidius Minervinus from Emesa; 1955.85: one slave made a vow and another placed the dedication; 1957.118; 1958.164; 1998.1436: a private dedication in Latin to *I.O.M.H.* by Q. Longinus, a freedman. 1437: another freedman.

⁵¹ *AE* 1898.20; 1906.189; 1907.191; 1926.61; 1939.68; 1947.143; 1950.230; 1958.162. 1928.62 = 1954, p. 77 s.n. 258; 1947, p. 49 s.n. 135 is the famous text: *Regina Berenice regis magni Agrippae filia) et rex Agrippa templum?] / [qu]od rex Herodes proavos(!) eorum fecerat ve[tustate] conlapsum a solo restituerunt] / marmoribusque et columnis [se]x [exornaverunt].*

some of its citizens expressed themselves in Latin on public monuments and had proper Roman names.

Ptolemais (Acco)

The next veteran colony established in the region was Ptolemais.⁵² Veterans of the four Syrian legions were settled in a new colony at Ptolemais between 51/2 and 54, and a new road was constructed from Antioch in Syria to the colony.⁵³ Ulpian describes Ptolemais as lying between Palaestina and Syria.⁵⁴ The foundation of the colony involved the usual thorough reorganization of the territory and land grants to veterans. The land, whether bought or confiscated, was taken from its original possessors and the infusion of veterans entailed the imposition of a new local leadership. The site of the ancient town has been occupied continuously since antiquity. As in Jerusalem, there are therefore very few inscriptions, but the few that have been discovered do not contradict the pattern one might expect to see if there had been more evidence.⁵⁵ As noted above, the imposition of

⁵² See L. Kadman, *The Coins of Akko-Ptolemais* (Tel Aviv, 1961); N. Makhoul and C. N. Johns, *Guide to Acre*, rev. edn (Jerusalem, 1946); H. Seyrig, 'Le monnayage de Ptolemais en Phénicie', *RN* 4 (1962): 25–50; 'Divinités de Ptolemais', *Syria* 39 (1962): 192–207; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC–AD 138)*, 3 vols., ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman (Edinburgh, 1973–9), 121–5; see also E. Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, I (Jerusalem, 1993), 16–31; V (2008), 1554–61; Tsafirir et al., *Tábula Imperii Romani-Iudaea-Palaestina* (Jerusalem, 1994), 204–5; B. Isaac, 'Roman Colonies in Judaea: The Foundation of Aelia Capitolina', *Talanta* 12–13 (1980–1): 31–53, at 37–9 = Isaac, *Near East under Roman Rule*, 92–4; Millar, 'The Roman *Coloniae*', 23–6.

⁵³ The last pre-colonial coin-issue of Ptolemais dates from AD 51/2: Kadman, *Coins of Akko-Ptolemais*, 108, nos. 86–90; Seyrig, 'Le monnayage de Ptolemais en Phénicie', 39. For further bibliography see A. Kindler and A. Stein, *A Bibliography of the City Coinage of Palestine* (Oxford, 1987), 5–18. The foundation by Claudius (died 54) is mentioned by Pliny, *NH* 5.17.75: *Colonia Claudii Caesaris Ptolemais, quae quondam Acco* ... Milestones of 56 record the construction of a road *ab Antiochea ad novam coloniam Ptolemaidam*. See R. G. Goodchild, 'The Coast Road of Phoenicia and its Roman Milestones', *Berytus* 9 (1948–9), 91–127, esp. 120. For the legions, see the founder's coins with *vexilla*, AD 66, see Kadman, *Coins of Akko-Ptolemais*, no. 92.

⁵⁴ Ulpian, *Dig.* L 15, 1, 3: *Ptolemaensium enim colonia, quae inter Phoenicem et Palaestinam sita est, nihil praeter nomen coloniae habet*. That is, the colony had no additional financial privileges, such as the *ius Italicum*, or the exemptions from taxation enjoyed by Caesarea and Aelia Capitolina. Perhaps it received *ius Italicum* in the reign of Elagabalus, for city coins of his reign show Marsyas (Kadman, *Coins of Akko-Ptolemais*, no. 163).

⁵⁵ See M. Avi-Yonah, 'Newly Discovered Greek and Latin Inscriptions', *QDAP* 12 (1946): 84–102, at 85, n. 2: *Imp. Ner. Caesari Col. Ptol. Veter. Vici Nea Com. et Gedru*; 86, n. 3: *Pago Vicinal(i)*, which shows that the territory, like that of Heliopolis, was organized in *pagi*. See also Y. Soreq, 'Rabbinical Evidences about the Pagi Vicinales in Israel', *JQR* 65 (1975): 221–4. A centurial *cippus* was found a kilometre and a half south of the first inscription, see J. Meyer, 'A Centurial Stone from Shavei Tziyyon', *SCI* 7 (1983–4): 119–25, with S. Applebaum, 'A Centurial Stone from Shavei Tziyyon: Appendix', *SCI* 7 (1983–4): 125–8. A fragment of another Latin inscription was found not far from this spot, see Meyer, 'A Centurial Stone', 117.

the veteran colony was a measure that had a drastic impact on the existing community and cannot have been welcome. There is one hint that families of distinction may have lived in the city. It produced at least one distinguished person: the consular Flavius Boethus, governor of Palestine, AD 162–6, known from the works of Galen as a scholar and philosopher with an interest in medicine.⁵⁶

Caesaraea on the Sea

The case of Caesaraea is difficult as the nature of and reason for the grant of colonial status to the city are not clearly established. It became a colony in the reign of Vespasian but it is a matter of debate whether this change in status was accompanied by the settlement of legionary veterans.⁵⁷ There is good evidence for the existence of several honorary or titular colonies from the reign of Claudius at the latest, so Caesaraea would definitely not have been the first case of a grant of colonial status without settlement of veterans and the literary and archaeological evidence, though capable of a different interpretation, cumulatively points to Caesaraea not receiving a veteran settlement.⁵⁸ Most explicitly, *Digest*. L 15 8 states that *Divus*

⁵⁶ See references in E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1981), 552.

⁵⁷ I have argued that Caesaraea received colonial status without receiving a contingent of veteran settlers in my article 'Roman Colonies in Judaea'; reprinted in *The Near East under Roman Rule*, 87–111. A different scenario has been proposed by H. M. Cotton and W. Eck, 'A New Inscription from Caesaraea Maritima and the Local Elite of Caesaraea Maritima', in L. V. Rutgers (ed.), *What Athens has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster* (Leuven, 2002), 375–91, who argue that the epigraphic evidence indicates the presence of a group of veteran settlers in the city, planted there at the time of the change in status. See also Eck, 'Language of Power', and my own forthcoming paper: 'Caesaraea-on-the-Sea and Aelia Capitolina: Two Ambiguous Roman Colonies', in C. Brélaz (ed.), *L'héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient*: Proceedings of a Conference, 8–9 November 2013, in Strasbourg. This paper evaluates the evidence from the inscriptions collected in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae*, I, part I, Jerusalem (2010), and II, Caesaraea and the Middle Coast (2011), nos. 1128–2107, historical introduction on pp. 17–38.

⁵⁸ F. Vittinghoff, 'Die "Titularkolonie"', in W. Eck (ed.), *Civitas Romana: Stadt und politisch-soziale Integration im Imperium Romanum der Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart, 1994), 34–40, notes that 'die "Titularkolonie"' is rare before the end of the first century, but perhaps was granted already under Caesar to especially meritorious peregrine communities. Dio 43.39.5, referring to Spain, in 45 BC states: 'to those who had displayed any good-will toward him he granted lands and exemption from taxation, to some also citizenship, and to others the status of Roman colonists' (ἔδωκε ... πολιτεῖαν τέ τισι, καὶ ἄλλοις ἀποίκους τῶν Ῥωμαίων νομίζεσθαι). This could refer, according to Vittinghoff, 35, n. 44, to Nova Carthago, Ucubi, and Tarraco, unless Dio is anachronistic here. Caesaraea in Mauretania was possibly also a Claudian titular colony; cf. Pliny, *NH* 5.20: *oppidum ... Caesaraea Iubae regiae a divo Claudio coloniae iure donata – eiusdem iussu deductis veteranis Oppidum Novum*. There can be no doubt regarding the case of Vienna in Gaul (Vittinghoff, 36 with n. 48). Vienna was promoted from a colony with the *ius Latii* to a titular *Colonia Civium Romanorum*. The date is uncertain, but the Latin status was probably granted by Caesar, following Vittinghoff, and the status

Vespasianus Caesarienses colonos fecit (the divine Vespasian made the people of Caesarea *coloni*), suggesting that the existing Caesareans became citizens of the new Roman colony. Given that this is a legal source, the phrasing may be significant, though it is possible that the source is confused, conflating generally later practice in creating ‘honorary’ colonies with generally earlier practice in establishing veteran settlements. Yet the best informed contemporary source, Josephus, explicitly denies that Vespasian founded any city of his own in Judaea: ‘For he founded there no city of his own while keeping their territory [i.e. the land of the Jews], but only to eight hundred veterans did he assign a place for settlement called Emmaus.’⁵⁹ This would seem clearly to exclude the establishment of a veteran settlement at Caesarea.

The absence of clear archaeological or iconographic evidence of a military settlement is also persuasive. Founder’s coins with legionary *vexilla* and symbols are invariably found on coins of the Eastern veteran colonies. Accordingly, they are frequent on the coins of Berytus, Acco, and Aelia Capitolina, but are absent on those of Caesarea.⁶⁰ There is also no evidence in the vicinity of Caesarea of centuriation, such as is found at Acco (see below). The absence of centuriation suggests that there was no reorganization or redistribution of land in the territory of the city consonant with the arrival of new settlers.

The grant of colonial status could result from two vastly different historical scenarios. Briefly, the granting of ‘honorary’ colonial status can be seen as a reward for political loyalty while the implanting of veterans on a community, with the economic and political disruption this entailed, should be seen as a punishment. The introduction of a foreign elite over and above

of a full citizen colony was no later than AD 41. This is clear from Claudius’ speech in Lyon: *CIL* XIII 1668; *ILS* 212; *FIRA* I 43: *Ante in domum consulatum intulit quam colonia sua solidum civitatis Romanae beneficium consecuta est*. Vienna is known as *Colonia Romana* to Pliny, *NH* 3.36, but not to Strabo 4.186. Puteoli received colonial status from Nero: Tac. *Ann.* 14.27: *vetus oppidum Puteoli ius coloniae et cognomentum a Nerone apiscuntur*; cf. Vittinghoff, ‘Die “Titularkolonie”’, 35, n. 44. See also A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1973), 244.

⁵⁹ Jos. *BJ* 7.6.6 (216): οὐ γὰρ κατώκισεν ἐκεῖ πόλιν ἴδιαν αὐτῶ τὴν χώραν φυλάττων, ὀκτακοσίοις δὲ μόνοις ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς διαφειμένοις χωρίον ἔδωκεν εἰς κατοίκησιν, ὃ καλεῖται μὲν Ἀμμαοῦς, Cf. B. Isaac, ‘Judaea after A.D. 70’, in Isaac, *Near East under Roman Rule*, 112–21, at 114. Pliny, *NH* 5.13.69: *Stratonis turris, eadem Caesarea ab Herode rege condita, nunc colonia prima Flavia a Vespasiano imperatore deducta* might (but need not) be construed as implying veteran settlement, but his passage should clearly be regarded as less significant than the two sources cited above.

⁶⁰ Werner Eck regards the absence of such coinage in the case of Caesarea as insignificant, arguing that they are to be expected only from the mints of colonies established during the period of large-scale discharges following the civil wars: Eck, ‘Language of Power’, 34. However, both Claudian Acco and Hadrianic Aelia Capitolina produced such coins, and I therefore conclude that the failure to do so by the mint of Caesarea after AD 70 is indeed indicative.

the existing non-Jewish population definitely would have been punishment, even if landed property from Jews had become available for distribution after the suppression of the Jewish revolt. There was indeed every reason not to punish the citizens of Caesarea, but to reward them. They had supported the Roman army, killed many Jews, and it was the place where Vespasian had been proclaimed emperor (hence the name *prima Flavia*). Such a reward would parallel the lesser honours granted to smaller towns in the aftermath of 70. Ma'abartha at the foot of Mt. Gerizim was founded as the city of Flavia Neapolis (Nablus).⁶¹ Jaffa received the name of Flavia Joppa.⁶² Both towns had been ravaged during the war. It is worth observing that, elsewhere in the wider region, Samosata, the old royal capital of Commagene, annexed by Vespasian, became 'Flavia Samosata', but did not receive colonial status.⁶³ Additionally, it is difficult to find advantages for Vespasian in establishing a veteran colony at Caesarea. Such colonies had no useful military function; on the contrary, in wartime they had to be protected by the regular troops.⁶⁴ A group of elderly veterans had nothing to contribute to the security of the province of Judaea. In fact, the presence of veteran colonists would have had an adverse effect: forming an irritant among people who had formed a bulwark of support for Rome among the Jewish insurgents. Furthermore, Caesarea was a prosperous urban centre that did not need reinforcement, unlike Jerusalem, sacked and not rebuilt, and seen by Hadrian, sixty years afterwards, as ripe for development.

Even the presence in fair numbers of veterans and soldiers at Caesarea cannot be taken as conclusive evidence for the planting of a veteran colony. As is stated by Josephus, Caesarea (and Sebaste) supplied numerous recruits for special units of the provincial army before AD 70 – another reason to reward the city. There is every reason to assume that the same population continued to do so after 70, when they could do so as Roman citizens. In fact, they could serve in the provincial legions and would have increasingly done so as local recruitment became the norm, at least in the

⁶¹ Jos. *BJ* 3.8.32 (307–15); for the (re)foundation, see G. F. Hill, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine* (London, 1914), 45–7, nos. 1–19, and pp. xxvi–xxvii. The civic area began in 72/3. Cf. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, I, 520–1.

⁶² Jos. *BJ* 2.18.10 (507–9); 3.9.2–4 (414–31); Hill, *British Museum Catalogue*, 44, nos. 1–2, cf. pp. xxiv–xxv. For the city in general, see now *CIIP* III, 19–146.

⁶³ W. Wroth, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria* (London, 1899), 117–23.

⁶⁴ Isaac, *Limits of Empire*, ch. 7, and see now the discussion for Asia Minor by C. Brélaz, 'Les colonies romaines et la sécurité publique en Asie Mineure', in G. Salmeri, A. Raggi, and A. Baroni (eds.), *Colonia romana nel mondo greco, Minima epigraphica et papyrologica Supplementa*, III (Rome, 2004), 187–209.

second century. These recruits would have tended to use Latin like other members of the military and this can serve as sufficient explanation for any use of Latin by private persons on inscriptions in Caesarea. How little we know of linguistic usage in first-century Judaea will be clear also from the fact that we do not know what would have been the first language of such military men: did they speak Greek at home? Or Aramaic? Did they speak Greek or Latin in daily life in the army?

The literary sources, few as they are, the coins, and the historical circumstances all strongly suggest that Caesarea received colonial status as a reward and was spared the establishment of a contingent of veteran legionaries in the city. The argument in support of the claim that it was a genuine veteran colony could only be based on the Latin inscriptions discovered in the city.⁶⁵ The systematic excavations carried out in Caesarea have uncovered a large number of those, brought together in vol. II of the *CIIP*.⁶⁶ The inscriptions of Caesarea are numbers 1128–2079 on pp. 37–798 of *CIIP*, vol. II, with inscriptions from the vicinity, nos. 2080–2107, on pp. 799–820. Even with all the inscriptions published, there still is a problem of method. Caesarea was not only a Roman colony; it was also the provincial capital, the seat of both the governor and the financial procurator. Moreover, it was not far from the legionary base of the *VI Ferrata* at Legio. We must therefore assume that a substantial number of Latin inscriptions was to be expected there anyway from those circles, as in Bostra and Gerasa (see below), where no planting of veteran settlers occurred.

For the purposes of analysis, the inscriptions must therefore be divided into the following categories:

- (1) Inscriptions related to the imperial or provincial authorities and their officials. These normally have nothing to do with the city or local society as such.
- (2) Military monuments, related to the provincial garrison and military personnel attached to the governor's office. Again, such inscriptions are frequently unconnected with the city and its permanent inhabitants.
- (3) Public inscriptions, related to or set up by the city authorities. These, like the city coinage, ought to be in Latin because of the colonial status

⁶⁵ Gregorius Thaumaturgus travelled to Caesarea to study Roman law there, rather than in Berytus as he had wanted originally: *Panegy. ad Origenem* 5. *PG* 10. 1067–8. The fact that one could study Roman law in Caesarea in the third century is certainly significant, but it is no indication that there was a presence of Roman veterans in the first century.

⁶⁶ An attempt at evaluation of the material now available will come out in the already cited forthcoming work in C. Brélaz, *L'héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient*. This evaluation has not led to different conclusions on my part.

of the city. Such a use of Latin does not prove that the language had roots in the local population.

- (4) Public building inscriptions.
- (5) Inscriptions set up by and for private individuals.

Only texts belonging to category 5 might be taken as unambiguously reflecting Latinity among the citizens of Caesarea. From an analysis of all the available material I conclude that the discussion about the nature of the colony of Caesarea cannot be decided on the basis of the epigraphic material. What we do recognize, however, in a vivid manner, is its colonial status as such and the fact that it was the capital of a province with a substantial military presence. Even so Greek dominates at least in numbers of texts. This in itself need not surprise us, for over time the legions and *auxilia* in the Near East were recruited in the region among people whose mother tongue was not Latin. Caesarea was and remained a major Hellenized city in the Near East. My point is that the inscriptions known so far do not provide evidence to contradict the conclusion, based on other indications, that Vespasian gave Caesarea the rank of a colony as a reward for good behaviour without imposing a group of veteran settlers on the city.

Aelia Capitolina

The refoundation of Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina⁶⁷ represented the last establishment of a genuine veteran colony in the region, as opposed to the grant of colonial status to an existing community.⁶⁸ It was an exceptional foundation, first, because it replaced the city of Jerusalem and, second, in Roman terms, because it was situated side by side with a functioning legionary base. As in the case of Caesarea, but for different reasons, this means that it is not easy to interpret the epigraphic evidence, since it must be determined whether Latin inscriptions derive from the legionary base or from the colony. Unlike Caesarea, however, Jerusalem has produced very few Latin texts for the period under consideration.⁶⁹ Aelia Capitolina, at the time of its foundation as a Roman colony, was a small and rather isolated settlement. It became a major city only in the fourth century. The

⁶⁷ For the inscriptions from Aelia Capitolina, see now *CIIP*, I/ii, historical introduction in I/i. For an evaluation, see again my forthcoming paper.

⁶⁸ Isaac, 'Roman Colonies in Judaea', esp. 101–6 = Isaac, *Near East under Roman Rule*, 99–107; Millar, 'The Roman *Coloniae*', 28–30.

⁶⁹ As already noted, the inscriptions from Jerusalem and vicinity are now available in *CIIP* I/i and ii. For a related topic, see now P. Arnould, *Les arcs romains de Jérusalem: Architecture, décor et urbanisme* (Göttingen, 1997).

epigraphical evidence for this period is correspondingly meagre. It mostly reflects the presence of a legion, soldiers, and a city administration. Just to give an impression: funerary inscriptions of serving military people are small in number (three, excluding one from Abu Ghosh).⁷⁰ Of particular interest is no. 732, perhaps for an *optio* of the legion *X Fretensis*, set up by a relative. If indeed this was the case we may possibly face a case of local recruitment, one example of what must have been very common at the time. Other funerary inscriptions of the period under consideration are again not large in number. Five are in Greek,⁷¹ eight in Latin, two of them military, and one of those antedating the foundation of Aelia Capitolina. One (no. 740) is interesting: the Latin funerary inscription for Glaucus son of Artemidorus from Zeugma. It gives no clue how the man came to Aelia.

The evidence from the two Near Eastern cities considered provides a lively impression of the significant impact of Roman administrative presence and army there. Yet this influence remains limited. Greek dominates, at least in the numbers of texts. This completes our little survey of evidence from the Roman colonies in the region. For comparison, it will now be useful briefly to discuss the Latin inscriptions from several towns in the Near East that were not veteran colonies.

Palmyra

A recent inventory of the Latin inscriptions of Palmyra⁷² divides them into two main groups:

- (1) Six trilingual grave inscriptions (Latin, Greek, and Palmyrene), most of which concern people occupying prominent positions in the city, dated to the first and second centuries (from AD 52 to 176). The Latin is always brief, the Greek longer, and the Palmyrene longest. The presence of Latin here is no indication that the language was spoken locally, but must be seen as a gesture or a declaration of loyalty towards the Roman Empire. Interestingly, Latin is not used locally after Palmyra received colonial rank, probably under Severus.⁷³
- (2) Military inscriptions which are divided into three sub-groups: inscriptions linked with the imperial family, inscriptions concerning officers,

⁷⁰ No. 732; 733 may have been part of 732; 734 (perhaps pre-colonial); 735 (from Abu Ghosh); 736.

⁷¹ Nos. 737, 738, 746, 749, 750. Note the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek graffito, no. 752.

⁷² K. As'ad and C. Delplace, 'Inscriptions latines de Palmyre', *REA* 104 (2002): 363–400.

⁷³ Millar, *Roman Near East*, 326–7.

and funerary inscriptions. These reflect the presence of a military garrison at Palmyra.

Bostra

The town of Bostra in Arabia served as a legionary base and seat of the provincial governor.⁷⁴ It received colonial status in the third century, a grant that had no impact on the social composition of the city. The inscriptions have been published very well in one accessible volume. Numerous inscriptions were set up by serving military men,⁷⁵ by governors,⁷⁶ or members of the governor's entourage.⁷⁷ These need not detain us here.⁷⁸

Generally speaking, there is a separation between city and army in the sense that there are no careers of men who served both as officers in the army and as city magistrates, such as we have encountered in Heliopolis⁷⁹ and Berytus,⁸⁰ but not, so far, at Caesarea. The city made dedications in Latin to such officials but private inscriptions in Latin are rarer.⁸¹ Nevertheless, we have some epitaphs set up by civilians for their military relatives or by military for civilians.⁸² Of particular interest are inscriptions by civilians for civilians in Latin.⁸³ These presumably represent the relatives of military people who settled in Bostra. These cases provide evidence of some local use of Latin even though there is no question that there ever was a veteran settlement. The Latin must be ascribed to families somehow related to the

⁷⁴ For the inscriptions from Bostra: *IGLS XIII/1* (ed. M. Sartre). For the city, see M. Sartre, *Bostra, des origines à l'Islam* (Paris, 1985). For the coinage see A. Spijkerman, *The Coins of the Decapolis and Arabia* (Jerusalem, 1978) and A. Kindler, *The Coinage of Bostra* (Warminster, 1983).

⁷⁵ *IGLS XIII/1*, e.g. nos. 9050, 9051, 9064, 9065(?), 9067, 9069, 9070, 9072, 9078, 9079, 9081, 9082, 9085, 9086, 9087, 9098; note also 9169.

⁷⁶ *IGLS XIII*, nos. 9060, 9062.

⁷⁷ *IGLS XIII*, nos. 9071, 9077.

⁷⁸ Note also the more recently published inscriptions: *AE* 2000. 1527a–b: emperors; 1528: military; 1529–32; 1536: governors; 1540: military building inscriptions.

⁷⁹ *IGLS VI*, nos. 2786–7, 2793–4, 2796.

⁸⁰ *CIL III* 6687 = *ILS* 2683, discussed above.

⁸¹ *IGLS XIII/1*, no. 9029. One inscription in honour of Iulia Domna represents a dedication by an individual who came from Parthiopolis in Thrace (9053). He may have been the relative of a soldier or government official. Iulia Domna, born in Emesa, appears frequently on inscriptions in the region: on milestones (*CIL III* 13689), on honorary inscriptions in the Galilee (*JGR III* 1106) and in Berytus (*AE* 1950. 0230).

⁸² 9170: by a freedman and heir named Ianuarinius Florinus for a centurion. 9172: Mercurius, freedman of a *beneficiarius tribuni*. See also 9179 (234–5): the mother and sister of an *optio hastati* of the *VI Ferr.* from Philadelphia; 9181: a centurion for his adopted son.

⁸³ 9171: Antonius Eutices for his spouse; 9177 (232); 9184 (240); 9189 (245); 9190 (246); 9195: the father was perhaps a former soldier, the son, 9 years old, an *eques* (250); 9197 (251).

provincial government or the army who preferred to use this language for public consumption.

Gerasa

This city was apparently the seat of the provincial procurator of Roman Arabia,⁸⁴ and there was a local garrison. It received colonial status in the third century. We rule out of our discussion Latin inscriptions set up by people or military units temporarily present in the city, such as the *equites singulares* of Hadrian who made a dedication when the emperor was in the region,⁸⁵ anonymous dedications to emperors, or inscriptions set up in the city by high provincial officials, legates, and procurators (105, 160), their subordinates, notably the procurator's staff (165, 208) and their relatives (207), and serving soldiers and officers (171, 178).

Of the remaining, the most remarkable is no. 175, a Latin inscription in honour of Maecius Laetus, procurator, set up by the heirs of Allius Vestinus, *advocatus fisci, ex testamento eius*. This strongly suggests that the heirs were local people. The funerary inscriptions of serving soldiers are in Latin, as expected, and mark the presence of a garrison in town, but give no indication of Latinity among the permanent population (200, 201, 211), nor does the tombstone of a procurator set up by his widow and son (207). Some, however, may possibly indicate that there was at least *some* local Latin culture. For instance, no. 199, the epitaph of an *optio* of the *Ala I Thracum*, perhaps locally based, was set up in both languages by his brother, who is not listed as a soldier himself. Other epitaphs, in Latin only, were set up for imperial freedmen who fulfilled various functions in the procurator's office by their spouses, children, and relatives (202, 203, 204, 210; also 215, 216). The procurator's staff would seem to have formed a milieu in the city which preferred at least to have their tombs marked in Latin, but little can be said about the origins of those staff members.⁸⁶

Furthermore, there are a number of interesting but ambivalent cases. No. 177 is engraved upon a cylindrical stele, in honour of Marcus Aurelius Faustus, an imperial freedman, and lists various equestrian functions, all in Latin. One might suggest that the dedicants were citizens of Gerasa

⁸⁴ R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum: Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Mainz, 1997), 244.

⁸⁵ C. Kraeling, *Gerasa: City of the Decapolis* (New Haven, 1938), no. 30.

⁸⁶ No. 204 gives the origin of one *tabularius*, an imperial freedman, as Puteoli. His mother and sister have Greek names.

who wrote Latin because of their social basis in the army. No. 179 refers to Gerasa as a Roman colony and is thus of the third century. The dedicants, an Aurelius Longinianus ... and his son, may have written Latin because of a military career, but this cannot be simply assumed.

The least that can be said for Gerasa is that there are sufficient inscriptions in Latin to demonstrate that there was a habit of using that language in formal texts. Mostly, these texts can be connected to people and their relatives who were associated with the army and provincial government. Yet many of the inscriptions are epitaphs and therefore should be regarded as belonging to the personal sphere, independent of a formal or administrative framework where the use of Latin was obligatory.

Petra

Whatever the status of the old Nabataean capital after the annexation of the Province of Arabia,⁸⁷ it is certain that the governors regularly visited it.⁸⁸ It received colonial status under Elagabalus, probably in 221–2.⁸⁹ The Latin inscriptions reflect the presence of the governor and of military personnel.⁹⁰

Caesarea Philippi

The excavations at the Pan sanctuary of Caesarea Philippi (Banias) have uncovered a substantial number of inscriptions (twenty-nine texts).⁹¹ There is an obvious preponderance of Roman personal names (fifteen Roman, five Greek, five Semitic). A special case is inscription no. 5 of AD 222, which mentions eight members of a family, five of them with names that are connected with 'Agrippa'. This presumably reflects a local tradition of more than a century of loyalty to the Herodian house. There are few regular

⁸⁷ M. Sartre, *IGLS XXI: Inscriptions de la Jordanie*, 4 (Paris, 1993).

⁸⁸ G. W. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia* (Cambridge, 1983), 86; M. Sartre, *Bostra*, 68–70; *IGLS XXI*, II, 30.

⁸⁹ S. Ben-Dor, 'Petra colonia', *Berytus* 9 (1948): 41–3; Millar, 'The Roman *Coloniae*', 51.

⁹⁰ *IGLS XXI*, nos. 1–8: dedications by the governor Q. Aiadius Modestus, AD 205–7; nos. 40–1: to Diocletian (fragment); 44: soldiers of a legionary cohort, unnamed emperor; 45: for Claudius Severus, governor, AD 107–15; 47: in honour of a governor, *opt(iones) [legio]nis*; 51: tomb of T. Annius Sextius Florentinus, governor, AD 127; 52: C. Antonius Valens, *equus* of the *legio III Cyr.*, epitaph; 53: fragmentary epitaph.

⁹¹ The excavations were carried out by Dr Zvi Maoz, formerly of the Antiquities Authority, and I have prepared the inscriptions for publication in the periodical *'Atiqot*. I mention them here to provide preliminary information and hope that the full publication will appear in print before long, after a quite considerable delay.

Greek names, and only four Semitic ones, including two patronymics. Seven inscriptions are in Latin, not including boundary markers and milestones. This is remarkable for material from an essentially rural sanctuary in this region, demanding a particular explanation. There is no information about any settlement of Roman veterans in the locale and there is no reason to assume that there was one. It is very likely that the first- and second-century inscriptions in Latin should be assigned to men from the region who also served in the Roman army and had undergone a measure of Latinization.⁹² It is quite likely that these were men serving in the units of Ituraeans, recruited in part from the territory of Caesarea Philippi.⁹³

Arados

This was the most important northern Phoenician city, located on an island off the coast. A few Latin inscriptions have been found here.⁹⁴ The city and council dedicated a statue to an equestrian officer, who may have been either commander of a local garrison or a native Aradian serving in the army.⁹⁵ The latter situation is almost certainly the case attested in the bilingual inscription of L. Septimius Marcellus for his brother M. Septimius Magnus, centurion in various legions.⁹⁶ There is some further evidence of men from Arados serving in the army.⁹⁷

Military Presence

To end this limited survey, it may be useful to note that a number of cities have produced Latin texts that are limited strictly to the military sphere

⁹² Two inscriptions are directly related to the military, but do not prove this hypothesis. A Greek inscription mentions ‘Taia the son of Silas, *signifer*’. Another is set up by a centurion in honour of a commander of the *Cohors Milliaria Thracum* in the reign of Trajan, which shows that this unit must have been in the region in this period.

⁹³ J. C., Mann, *Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement during the Principate* (London, 1983).

⁹⁴ J.-P., Rey-Coquais, *Arados et sa Pérée aux époques grecque, romaine et byzantine* (Paris, 1974); Rey-Coquais, *IGLS VII, Arados et régions voisines* (1970). For Dio Chrysostom’s disparaging remarks about the city, see above, pp. 159–60.

⁹⁵ *IGLS VII*, no. 4009 (= *CIL III 14165/10*): *Civitas et Bule Aradia / L Domitio Cf Fab Catullo [p]raef* ... There is no explicit evidence of a garrison in the city, but note coins of the city countermarked ‘L XV’: Hill, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia*, p. xxxvii.

⁹⁶ No. 4016. Compare 4015: The boule and demos set up a statue with dedication in Greek for M. Septimius Magnus.

⁹⁷ *IGLS VII*, 90, no. 40; *CIL VIII 18084*, l. 1: *-ius Severus Arado*; 24: *[C]lemens Gabal(a)*. Note, finally, *IGLS 4028* from Hosn Soleiman in the Alawite Mountains, the great sanctuary of Arados at Baetocece. It is bilingual and records five documents affirming the privileges bestowed upon the sanctuary by various Seleucid rulers and reconfirmed in an imperial rescript of the mid-third century (Gallienus *et al.* AD 253–60).

and reflect the presence of a military garrison at some stage. The most remarkable case is that of Apamea in Syria.⁹⁸ Other towns to be mentioned are Neapolis (Nablus),⁹⁹ Samaria-Sebaste,¹⁰⁰ Emmaus-Nicopolis,¹⁰¹ Tiberias,¹⁰² and, finally, Dura Europos.¹⁰³

Conclusions

All empires are necessarily multilingual. The Roman Empire in the East had two languages of government of unequal status, Latin and Greek. Greek could be used for some official functions in the Roman army, but, as formulated by Adams, Latin 'had super-high status which made it suitable for various symbolic purposes, whether in legalistic documents, or to highlight the Roman identity of a soldier, or to mark or acknowledge overriding authority'.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁸ J. Balty and W. van Rengen, *Apamea in Syria: The Winter Quarters of Legio II Parthica* (Brussels, 1993); cf. *AE* 1993. 1571–97.

⁹⁹ (a) A fragmentary inscription mentions a *tribunus* and a *primus pilus* or *praepositus*: Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine* (London, 1896), II, 318–19. (b) Countermarks of the legion *XII Fulminata* on coins struck up to AD 86/7: C. J. Howgego, 'The XII Fulminata: Countermarks, Emblems and Movements under Trajan or Hadrian', in S. Mitchell (ed.), *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia* (Oxford, 1983), 41–6. The coins were countermarked after AD 86/7 and probably before 156/7. This almost certainly shows that the legion (or part of it) was based at Neapolis in 115–17 or 132–5. (c) The tombstone of M. Ulpius Magnus, centurion of the legion *V Macedonica*, presumably from the years of the revolt of Bar Kokhba: F.-M. Abel, 'Nouvelle inscription de la Ve légion Macedonique', *RBI* 35 (1926): 421–4: figs. 1 and 2. (d) A city coin: *obv.* Tribonianus Gallus (251–3); *rev.* *COL NE[A]POLI* and emblems of the legion *X Fretensis*: S. Ben Dor, 'Quelques remarques à propos d'une monnaie de Néapolis', *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952): pl. 9.1. (e) City coin: *obv.* Volusianus Augustus (251–3); *rev.* *COL NEAPOLIS* and emblems of the legion *III Cyrenaica*: A. Kindler, 'Was there a Detachment of the Third Legion Cyrenaica at Neapolis in A.D. 251–253', *Israel Numismatic Journal* 4 (1980): 56–8.

¹⁰⁰ G. Reisner, C. S. Fisher, and D. Gordon Lyon, *Harvard Excavations at Samaria*, I (Cambridge, 1924), 251, no. 1, recording a *vexillatio* of the *legio VI Ferrata*. *AE* 1938.13: *mil(it)es v(e)xi(lationis) coh(ortium) Pa(nnoniae) Sup(erioris), cives Sisci(ani) (et) Varcian(i) et Latobici*. *AE* 1948. 150, 151.

¹⁰¹ Josephus says that the legion *V Macedonica* stayed there in the Jewish War before the siege of Jerusalem: *Jos. BJ* 4.8.1 (445); see also: 5.1.6 (42); 2.3 (67). Five inscriptions referring to this legion have been found there: *CIL* III 6647; 14155.11; 14155.12; J. H. Landau, 'Two Inscribed Tombstones', *Atiqot* 2 (1976): 98–102. At least two of these are epitaphs of serving soldiers who died at Emmaus some time in the later first century AD: cf. M. Fischer, B. Isaac, and I. Roll, *Roman Roads in Judaea*, II, *The Jaffa–Jerusalem Roads* (Oxford, 1996), 14–15, 152, 174. This shows that they stayed there long enough for a stone-mason's workshop to be set up. Another inscription mentions the *coh(ors) VI Ulpi(a) Petr(aeorum)*: *AE* 1924. 132. A fragmentary inscription mentions an unknown cohort: *CIL* III 13588. It is therefore quite possible, although not certain, that army units were permanently based here.

¹⁰² *AE* 1948. 146: the epitaph of a centurion of the legion *VI Ferrata*. Cf. 1988. 1053: a stamped brick of the same legion, found on Har Hazon, NW of Tiberias.

¹⁰³ Millar, *Roman Near East*, 467–71; N. Pollard, *Soldiers, Cities, and Civilians in Roman Syria* (Ann Arbor, 2000).

¹⁰⁴ Adams, *Bilingualism* (2003), ch. 5, part IV: 'Latin as a Language of Power'. Certain types of legalistic documents concerning Roman citizens had to be in Latin, even if the citizens did not know

The question asked in this chapter is what we can deduce from the surviving texts, invariably inscriptions on stone, about the use of Latin in cities of the Roman East. Such use of Latin may, but need not, have been a very deliberate expression of some form of identity (political, cultural, or ideological) rather than reflecting intensive and 'everyday' use and knowledge of Latin among the authors of the texts. We have no way of knowing whether Latin was a first, second, or third language for most of the individuals involved in the Latin dedications, but whether Latin was imposed or preferred by these users, it represents an ideological expression. The Latinity of those who used Latin on epitaphs may have been superficial, but its use implies a declaration of social and political loyalty. Latin was a minority language in the epigraphic culture of the East, and certainly in the oral culture of the cities. Its use, therefore, is necessarily a conscious attempt to differentiate its users from the surrounding Greek or Semitic populations. We can compare this to the use of Hebrew in funerary inscriptions. Traditionally, the tombstones of Jews in the diaspora are in Hebrew or in both Hebrew and the local language. This does not mean that the deceased or their relatives have any serious knowledge of Hebrew. Another example of the investment of significance in language-choice is a famous graffito, scratched in the rocks of the Wadi Mukatteb in Sinai: *Cessent Syri ante Latinos Romanos* (The Syrians will cease before [? yield to] the Latin Romans). The words of the traveller are not exactly Ciceronian Latin, but his meaning is more or less clear.¹⁰⁵

Inscriptions represent, first of all, a public declaration of political and social identity. Nevertheless, a switch of language clearly did not have the same meaning in every context. The significance ascribed to the choice of language probably depended on the particular epigraphic culture of the city. These cultures appear not to have been straightforwardly related to accepted or plausible claims of Greek origin. Thus, Dio Chrysostom in his thirty-third discourse, where he harangues the citizens of Tarsus: 'And would any one call you colonists from Argos, as you claim to be, or more likely colonists rather of those abominable Aradians? Would he call you Greeks, or the most licentious of Phoenicians?'¹⁰⁶ Yet the self-perception of the citizens may have been very different. Dio himself was well aware that the Hellenic credentials of Tarsus were more impressive than those of his

Latin. Birth certificates and wills of Roman citizens had to be in Latin and so were building inscriptions.

¹⁰⁵ *CIL* III 86.

¹⁰⁶ D. Chr. 33.41; cf. 42 and on this B. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, 2004), 345–6, 395. Cf. p. 159, above. For Latin in Arados, see above.

native Prusa. We do not know what the citizens of Tarsus thought of Dio's harangue, but we can be quite certain that the Hellenized inhabitants of Aradus would not have been pleased if they had heard him speaking. An inscription from Trachonitis is dedicated by 'The Hellenes in Danaba'.¹⁰⁷ Even the Hellenized Syrian and Palestinian cities might claim to be genuinely Hellenic, as shown by an inscription from Scythopolis-Beth Shean, which refers to the city of Nysa-Scythopolis as 'one of the Hellenic cities in Coele-Syria'.¹⁰⁸ The continued Latin tradition in Roman colonies such as Berytus and Aelia Capitolina may be due in part to active involvement on the part of the inhabitants of the Eastern colonies in the Roman army. In Greek-speaking Roman colonies in the West, epitaphs of the early imperial period are found written in Greek, but influenced by Latin formulae, probably reflecting the particular cultural status of the two languages in those cities.¹⁰⁹

The least problematic cases we have surveyed are those of Berytus and Heliopolis, known to have been populated by veteran settlers. Heliopolis in particular has produced a good quantity of inscriptions which show that private citizens used Latin on their public monuments, as did distinguished citizens who served in senior imperial positions and as city magistrates. These types of inscriptions show that Latin was to some extent integrated into civilian life. There is some evidence that the same was the case in Aelia Capitolina where veterans certainly took root in a depopulated city. There is no such published evidence from Caesarea, which, I have argued, was a titular colony. Bostra, legionary base and seat of the governor of Arabia, has also provided copious epigraphic evidence. Significantly, there is no evidence of senior military men or imperial magistrates serving also as city magistrates, an indication of social separation. It is not surprising that we encounter epitaphs set up by civilians for their military relatives or by military for civilians in Bostra. Noteworthy, however, are a limited number

¹⁰⁷ M. Sartre, 'Communautés villageoises et structures sociales d'après l'épigraphie de la Syrie du sud', in A. Calbi, A. Donati, and G. Poma (eds.), *L'epigrafia del villaggio, Actes du VIIe colloque international Borghesi à l'occasion du cinquantenaire d'Epigraphica (Forlì, 27-30 septembre 1990)* (Faenza, 1993), 117-35; *AE* 1993, 1636 from Dhunaybeh (Danaba) οἱ ἐν Δαναβοῖς Ἕλληνες Μητροφίλω εὐνοίας ἔνεκεν. It is suggested that this might be connected with the Herodian settlers in Trachonitis. See also above, p. 132 and p. 153.

¹⁰⁸ G. Foerster and Y. Tsafir, 'Nysa-Scythopolis: A New Inscription and the Titles of the City on its Coins', *Israel Numismatic Journal* 9 (1986-7): 53-8: τῶν κατὰ Κοίλην Συρίαν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων. See the comments by P.-L. Gatiér, *Syria* 67 (1990): 204-6, and A. Stein, 'Studies in Greek and Latin Inscriptions on the Palestinian Coinage under the Principate' (PhD thesis, Tel Aviv University, 1991). See also above, pp. 120, 131, and 153.

¹⁰⁹ K. Korhonen, 'Three Cases of Greek/Latin Imbalance in Roman Syracuse', in E. N. Ostenfeld (ed.), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks* (Aarhus, 2002), 70-8, at 73.

of inscriptions by civilians for civilians which presumably represent the relatives of military people who settled in Bostra and, as such, are evidence of some local use of Latin even though there is no question that there ever was a planned veteran settlement at Bostra. A similar pattern is found at Gerasa, where the financial procurator had his headquarters and various units appear to have been based. Finally, we must note rare and surprising pockets of Latin culture attested in minor provincial centres such as Caesarea Philippi.

The use of Latin on inscriptions in a few, but not many, cities of the Roman East represents a variety of social situations, which, given the scarcity of sources, are not always easy to determine. It may not tell us much about the language actually spoken in daily life. It is, however, a clear indication of a direct Roman impact on the life of a city: settlement of Roman army veterans is but one such phenomenon, the presence of a garrison or provincial offices is another constituting factor, but there are more possibilities such as the settlement of retired soldiers and officers from a local or regional garrison. These might be either retired locals who had served in the army or immigrants who had served and then retired locally. Although the use of Latin on, for instance, epitaphs does not necessarily mean that Latin was the first language spoken by the dead or the dedicants, the choice of Latin was a significant decision. It broke with the linguistic practices of the surrounding communities and thus set apart those who used the language. The association with the Roman rulers means that the most obvious understanding of the choice of language is as a reflection of political loyalty and of association with the imperial power. Latin does not simply represent one of the languages spoken locally, but had a particular social and political resonance, and the study of the epigraphic material opens up these resonances to historical analysis.