

Siculus) as a nomadic tribe in the Arabian peninsula, via the establishment of their extensive and wealthy kingdom in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, to their incorporation into the Roman empire. Then follow four chapters on different topics, including a fairly detailed description of Petra; the Nabataean religion, neatly gathering all the available information and leading speculations about this mysterious subject; the Nabataean language and writing, a particularly well-informed and fascinating discussion, aptly subtitled 'speaking Arabic, writing Aramaic and carving inscriptions'; and Babatha, who merits a surprisingly long and detailed chapter because of the light her archive sheds on life in the region — particularly its administrative, judicial and economic aspects — and on the peaceable relations between Nabataeans and Jews. A final chapter and epilogue deal with the slow absorption of the Nabataeans into the Christian society of the later Roman empire and their traces in the Islamic world. The book is well-researched, with only occasional slips (e.g., Vitellius certainly was not 'celebrating Passover with the Jews' in 37 [p. 72], but rather had gone to Jerusalem to prevent anti-Roman agitation during the festival), and strikes a judicious balance between a detailed account of the Nabataeans and a description of the complex and dynamic historical and cultural background of the period, necessary for the general reader.

The book is a pleasure to read, although the prose occasionally becomes overexcited with superlatives and ebullient description. The word 'genius' occurs frequently, as well as 'remarkable', 'gifted' and 'brilliant'. But it is clear that these are signs not of an anxiety to form the reader's impression correctly but of the author's own enthusiastic love of her subject. Enthusiasm is well-deserved in some respects: Nabataean architecture and water installations, for example, are astonishing achievements. Yet the historical record, although sketchy, does not preserve a uniformly rosy picture of the Nabataeans, and thus in certain places Taylor feels compelled to apologize and forgive: Malichus' massacre of Herod's ambassadors was 'one of the few known acts of gratuitous brutality in the Nabataean kingdom' (p. 57); Aretas III's imitation of Seleucid coins was 'a temporary and localized act of cultural vainglory'. But this tendency is perhaps forgivable in a general book written to revive the memory of an 'unjustly forgotten' people.

Jonathan J. Price

Tel Aviv University

Clayton Miles Lehmann and Kenneth G. Holm, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima*, American Schools of Oriental Research. The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima. Excavation Reports Series No. V, Boston, MA, 2000. xx + 292 pp. + indices + 171 plates. ISBN 0 89757 028 6.

'Do you wish not to fear authority? Do good and you will receive praise from it' (Rom. 13, 3). If the inhabitants of the province Palaestina I had to visit the offices of their provincial administration in Late Antiquity, they were confronted with inscriptions quoting that and other biblical phrases. Roman rule had a new face: in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries it depended not only on the Roman army and the cooperation of the local elites with those of the empire. It also received legitimacy from Christian doctrine.

That this took place not only in sermons and theological tractates but also in the daily routine of the Roman administration is one of the many astonishing results obtained in the last decades from excavations in Caesarea Maritima, site of the famous foundation and residence of Herod, and the administrative centre of Roman rule in Judaea until its end in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Clayton Miles Lehmann and Kenneth G. Holm publish here the first crop of epigraphical findings, the 411 inscriptions found before 1992 (today we know of about 200 more). These numbers demonstrate impressively how many inscriptions could be found in a city of the Eastern part of the empire, provided that the city was not built over later and could be excavated systematically. Before

the excavations, we knew of almost no inscriptions from Caesarea: in the most renowned Corpora — the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, the *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* — there are none (apart from three Latin inscriptions from Caesarea in *CIL* III).

A short introduction of 32 pages sketches the most important aspects of the history of the city and especially those which shaped the inscriptions. The authors discuss for example the special role of the city in its province (as the administrative and political centre), the presence of the Roman army, the information which we get from inscriptions about local construction work and cults and even the ethnic composition of its population. Finally a few pages deal with epigraphical questions, such as the characteristics of the language and the grammar of these inscriptions, the chronological systems in use and the palaeography of these epigraphical testimonies.

The catalogue of the 400+ inscriptions (more than 50 of them only small fragments) constitutes the central part of the book. Half of these inscriptions have never been published before; and the other half have been published only in journals and excavation reports.

With good reason and in accord with the practice in the most recent epigraphical publications, the authors have paid much attention to the connection of the inscriptions with the archaeological monuments to which they belonged. However, it would be wrong to adopt this as a principle of organisation, as the authors claim to be (but fortunately are not) doing: ‘we arrange the texts in our collection in the first instance by monument type (e.g. “architectural inscriptions”, “slabs and blocks”)’ (pp. XI f.). Had this principle been strictly followed, it would have meant that the core of each epigraphic publication — the texts — was subordinated to an *ephemeron*, the monument to which it belonged. In this case one would have been obliged to discuss all ‘slabs and blocks’ together, and whether we find on these slabs honorific or sepulchral inscriptions or even a graffito would not matter. Fortunately, the authors do not adhere so strictly to their principle. However, instead of developing a consistent new order, they have used three different and often incompatible principles: they have organized their corpus partly according to the different types of inscriptions (e.g. ‘honorific inscriptions’, ‘milestones’, ‘funerary inscriptions’), partly according to the site of the find (e.g. ‘The High Level Aqueduct’; ‘The Byzantine Esplanade’; ‘The Synagogue’) and sometimes according to the archaeological monuments (‘The bust of Olympiodorus’; ‘Slabs and blocks’; ‘Sarcophagi’).

Each inscription entry consists of the following parts: a descriptive title; a date; very copious and precise information about the archaeological monument to which the inscription belongs; details about the site of the find; a bibliography; the text of the inscription — not in capital letters, but in a form convenient to the modern reader: words are written in small letters and are separated by spaces, and all abbreviations are expanded; a translation; an apparatus with variant readings (if any); finally a philological-historical commentary. Photographs or illustrations of all the inscriptions (sometimes reproduced from earlier publications) are found at the end of the volume. The corpus is rounded off by a bibliography, ten different indices, lists of scriptural quotations, of dated inscriptions and of metrical inscriptions, and a concordance.

Without any doubt, this corpus is extremely valuable in respect of the number of newly published inscriptions, the excellent archaeological commentaries and the opulent illustrations. But a review must also point out the weaknesses of such a central reference work.

Some of these can be attributed to the long publication process. The manuscript was apparently almost complete several years ago, and the authors have not always been successful in re-writing existing entries in the light of newly found inscriptions or recently published articles. For example, in the bibliography of the entry for the well-known inscription of Pontius Pilatus (No. 43) we find the important article of G. Alföldy, published in *SCI* 18, 1999, 85-108. But his readings are not referred to and his interpretation is only briefly mentioned. In the case of entry No. 10 we find in the commentary: ‘Aurelius Theophilus (less likely Aurelius Flavius Theophilus)’, but in the transcription of the epigraphical testimony: ‘Aur(elio) Fl(avio) Theophilo’.

Other weaknesses result from problematic decisions of the authors. Besides the above-mentioned lack of a consistent arrangement of the entries, the arrangement of the index of personal names is not convincing. Other corpora had good cause for two separate name indices: one for the Roman names, which consist — as is well known — of two or three separate parts, and one for the other names (which have only one part). Instead of this logical arrangement, we find in this corpus one index of the names written in Greek characters and another of those written in the Roman alphabet. So the truly Roman name T. Flavius Maximus is only listed in the ‘Greek’ index because the inscription in which he appears is written in Greek. Even worse, the authors do not follow a single method of integrating the Roman names in these two indexes. Sometimes they do it according to the first letter of the *nomen gentile* (as is the normal practice), sometimes according to the first letter of the *cognomen* — as for example: ‘Μάξιμος, Τ(ίτος) Φλ(άουιος)’; sometimes they cross-reference — see for example Φλάουιος or Aurelius; sometimes they do not — as for example in the case of Pontius.

For the most part the photos in the section devoted to illustrations are very well focused and easily allow for the checking of the authors’ readings. There exist, however, some unnecessary flaws. Even in the case of inscriptions of the same group, the authors have not bothered to produce the illustrations on approximately the same scale. If one judges by the photos, inscription No. 68 looks much smaller than No. 67. Actually it is quite the reverse. A print made the wrong way round has produced the same inscription under two entries (Nos. 220 and 224). In the case of inscription No. 62 the authors provide two photos — but one of these is upside down. In the case of inscription No. 132, the drawing does not reproduce the same text as the entry, but apparently that of an older reading. In the drawing, we find BOHΘHEITN, in the text βοήθησον. But the drawing also allows us to improve the reading of the authors: at the end of line 5 there is no doubt that we must read AMHNKE, meaning ἀμὴν Κ(ύρι)ε.

In other cases too the illustrations are so good that one can actually propose improvements on the authors’ readings. In the case of No. 41 the photo makes it absolutely clear that the reading τῶ[ν] ὠμοφόρω[ν] proposed by L. Robert is not possible. There is simply no space for two *nus*. One reads either τῶ(ν) ὠμοφόρω(ν) or τῶ<ν> ὠμοφόρω<ν>. In the case of inscription No. 58, one has to read in line 5 κόμ(ητος) καὶ Ἠλίου and in lines 1 and 2 Φλ(αουίου); the same kind of error is found also in line 1 of inscription No. 5 and in line 5 of inscription No. 12. In lines 2 and 3 of No. 78 one has to read εὐξάμ[ε]ν[ος].

Such unnecessary and careless mistakes will have been eliminated in a second edition. Unfortunately we find them also in the text. Freedmen of the emperor worked not in the office of the governor (pp. 7, 20) but in that of the *procurator*. The *procurator* was appointed by the emperor and was therefore not brought to the province by the governor (*pace* p. 20). A *primipilus* was a very experienced *centurio* and therefore certainly not ‘on the governor’s staff of *beneficarii*’ (pp. 7, 20), who were only privates first class. The title *gloriosus/gloriosissimus* appears not in the 4<sup>th</sup> century (p. 9), but for the first time only in the 5<sup>th</sup>. It was introduced in a systematic way by Justinian. Translating the phrase *II viral(em) col(oniae) I Fl(aviae) Aug(ustae) Caesareae oratorem* by ‘duovir, orator of Caesarea, the first colony of Flavius Augustus’, shows several errors: *col. I Fl. Aug. Caesareae* is a complement to *II viralis* and *Fl(avia) Aug(usta)* are adjectives and not *genitivi subiectivi*. The correct translation is: ‘the duovir of colonia I Flavia Augusta Caesarea, the orator’. The commentary on inscription No. 137 refers several times to line 3 but the line is numbered 4 in the text given. The commentary on No. 205 states ‘Isidoros is a very common name. Matrouna or Matrona, from the Latin, is less so, but known from Egypt’; but in the case of No. 83 one reads: ‘Theodorus and Matrona were common among Jews’.

These relatively small errors do not lessen the merit of a book which provides the scientific public with such an important, detailed and lavishly illustrated corpus of 400 inscriptions, most of them virtually unknown to a wider public until now. But they are irksome in a reference book which is normally consulted only selectively.

In view of this and with regard for the planned *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae*, some observations regarding specific inscriptions are added. For a detailed review of the Latin inscriptions Werner Eck's review of the volume under discussion in *Topoi* should be consulted. The present discussion concentrates on the Greek inscriptions.

No. 30: As the authors remark with good reason, we must search for a word to which the genitive *Fl(avii) Boethi co(η)s(ularis)* refers. But we need not think only of *mandatu* or *iussu*. One could also think of *strator* (cf. No. 7) or *b(ene)ff(iciarii)* as in an inscription recently published by H.M. Cotton and W. Eck ('Governors and their Personnel on Latin Inscriptions from Caesarea Maritima', *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* VII 7, 2001, 215-38).

No. 111: In the case of this heavily damaged inscription, only the upper centre (with the upper margin) of a marble plaque is preserved, so only the central parts of several lines remain. The first line was written in distinctly taller letters than the following lines, as headlines were often set off. In this line we find apparently a form of ἀπόφασις, a word usually meaning decision (*sententia*). In the next four lines, several Roman names follow, cited in a very formulaic manner. We find the remains of a filiation (---πλίου υἱός), fully expanded *praenomina* (Λούκιος, Κοῖντ[ος]); the names were apparently separated by shallow wedges. From the last two lines too few letters remain to make any interpretation possible.

The editors were not even able to determine the nature of this fragment. But one type of document exhibits the characteristics described: the heading ἀπόφασις and a beginning with a list of Roman citizens. These are the final verdicts, the *sententiae*, with which Roman magistrates concluded juridical hearings, normally after consulting their advisory committee, their *consilium*. These documents usually begin with the name of the judge and his title, often followed by a reference to the participating *consilarii*. A particularly good parallel is *P.Mich.* III 159 = *FIRA* neg. 64 lines 6ff; but see also *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3361 = K. Bringmann, *Klio* 81, 1999, 491ff.; *FIRA* leg. 171 a; *P.Strasb.* IV 179 = *SB* XVI 12749, cf. *BL* V 136, IX 291.

Even a final peculiarity of the inscription fits perfectly into this context. In line 3 we find, before a shallow wedge, which means the end of a name, κλασσικῆς. This Greek word derives without doubt from the Latin *classicus*. But what does it mean? The editors could not make anything of it because they were thinking primarily of a female name. But there is no such name. Thus, they concluded, 'perhaps <...> an *origo*, referring to some harbor-town'. However we sometimes do find Κλασσικῆ/*Classica* as part of the name, not of a woman, but rather of a military unit. There existed in the Roman army several *cohortes Classicae*, that is, *cohortes* drawn up from a core of soldiers originally serving in the fleet (*classis*). One of these, the *cohors II Classica*, was stationed in the region. We find them in Augustan times (*CIL* III 6687 = *ILS* 2683) and in the second century as part of the garrison of Syria (*CIL* IX 4855 a; for the dating see also Devijver, *PME* F 63). From there the *cohors* could easily have been transferred for a shorter or longer period to *Iudaea/Syria Palaestina*.

Thus, all observations point in the same direction: the inscription contained a copy of a *sententia* — [ἀντίγραφον] ἀπόφασ[εως] — given by an officer of *cohors II Classica*, most probably the *praefectus*. In *P.Dura* 126 lines 12ff. we find, for example: 'Λαρώνιος Σεκουνδιανὸς χειλιάρχος σπεί[ρης] εἰκοστῆς Παλ[μυρη]νῶν Ἀλεξανδριανῆς τῆ ἀποφάσει ὑπ' [έ]μου δεδομέ[ν]η ὑπέγραψα'.

The officer of *cohors II Classica* had pronounced his decision after discussing the legal problems involved with his *consilium*. This advisory body consisted of Roman citizens, most probably also members of the Roman army, presumably of a slightly lower rank and perhaps from the same *cohors*. What kind of dispute they had to decide on we cannot recover from the few letters left in the last lines. But there was one kind of dispute often decided by Roman officers (see for example *CIL* III 8472 = *ILS* 5948) and important enough for the winner to have documented his victory by publishing the *sententia* with all its diplomatic details: disputes about land boundaries (see for example *CIL* II 4125 = *Römische Inschriften von Tarraco* 143; *JG* VII 1, 1431).



No. 134: the letters of this Christian inscription are very regularly cut. We should therefore prefer an early dating (after 312). It is perhaps the earliest known building-inscription of a church in Iudaea. Such building activity should not cause surprise in a place where the Roman governor had his residence and where the emperors had on several occasions shown their new faith (see for example Eus. *V. Const.* II 46; *V. Porph.* 54).

No. 163: The formula is also typical of honorific inscriptions and the elaborate letters make this type of inscription more likely.

No. 202: For the name Θεότεκνος, see D. Roques, *REG* 111, 1998, 735-56.

No. 244: δούλη τῶν βασιλέων in a metrical inscription of Caesarea could mean 'female slave of kings' or 'of emperors'. But this one was born in Italy, so the latter is more likely. And we have to take into account that the Roman *procurator* resided in Caesarea and was served by personnel composed of slaves and freedmen of the emperor. So, for different reasons, a slave of the emperors is much more likely (as for example also B. Lifshitz, *ANRW* II 8, 1977, 509 and L. Robert, *BE* 1953, 221). Metrical epitaphs for such people are also known from other places in the empire; see for example *CIL* III 754 = 7436 = *ILBulg.* 145; *CIL* VI 29152 = *IGR* I 325.

Nos. 367-369 could be fragments of *cursus honorum* of Roman officials, which should have been cited in the case of honorific inscriptions.

No. 379: Read probably: ἐτέλλ[εσεν--- ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων] χρημάτων. This is apparently a fragment of a building inscription.

No. 398. One should perhaps read in line 1: [--- κ]αὶ Καίσα[ρος ---].

Rudolf Haensch

Princeton

Robert C. Gregg and Dan Urman, *Jews, Pagans and Christians in the Golan Heights. Greek and Other Inscriptions of the Roman and Byzantine Eras*, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism no. 140, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996, xxi + 360pp. + 6 maps. ISBN 0 7885 0314 6.

Dieses Buch handelt, wie der doppelte Titel andeutet, von einer bedeutsamen Thematik und präsentiert wichtiges neues Quellenmaterial. In den mehr als drei Jahrzehnten, seitdem der gesamte Golan für die israelische Forschung zugänglich ist, wurden viele antike Stätten erschlossen und durch surveys außerordentlich reiches neues Material aufgefunden. Vor allem Dan Urman hat das Verdienst, viele dieser seit damals zugänglichen Quellen gesammelt und damit dem Verlust entrissen zu haben. Denn wie in vielen Ländern läßt der Landesausbau auch auf dem Golan die Vergangenheit nicht nur ans Licht kommen, er zerstört sie häufig auch. So sind Archivierung und Publikation die entscheidenden Mittel, um die endgültige Vernichtung vielfältiger Traditionen zu verhindern.

Die beiden Autoren setzen sich ein doppeltes Ziel mit ihrem Buch: 1. 'to make the region's Greek (and other) inscriptions available for inspection, and to add epigraphical evidence to the emerging picture of late Roman and early Byzantine Golan'. 2. soll die Sammlung auch Information bieten 'about the religious groups in Golan communities', und zwar vom 3. bis 7. Jh. (S. 1f.).

Dieses doppelte Ziel, im Titel in umgekehrter Folge formuliert, ist freilich auch das Problem, das das Buch kennzeichnet. Denn um das zweite Ziel zu erreichen, müßte das gesamte, sachlich einschlägige Material eingeschlossen und präsentiert werden. Statt dessen wird vornehmlich das neue inschriftliche und, allerdings nur sehr partiell, auch das architektonische und bildliche Material, vorgelegt. Unter den 241 griechischen Inschriften, die in dem Buch in vollem Text neben 12 hebräisch-aramäischen und einer lateinischen geboten werden, sind 207 zuvor unpubliziert gewesen. Allein diese große Zahl von neuen Texten zeigt, wie verdienstvoll dieses Buch ist. Doch früher publiziertes epigraphisches Material wird nur zum Teil aufgenommen, ohne daß jedoch gezeigt wird, warum anderes, das nicht genannt wird, ausgeschlossen ist; auch viele andere materielle Überreste werden nur erwähnt, aber nicht präsentiert, ohne daß es nachvollziehbar