

ROMAN COLONIES IN JUDAEA:  
THE FOUNDATION OF AELIA CAPITOLINA

BENJAMIN ISAAC

TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY

The Foundation of Aelia Capitolina and its connection with the outbreak of the Second Jewish Revolt have been discussed by many scholars.<sup>1</sup> It is now usually accepted that the decision to found a colony of Roman Citizens at Jerusalem was taken during Hadrian's visit in the area 129/130.<sup>2</sup> The city may not have been built until after the war which lasted from 132-135.<sup>3</sup> Whether a start was made before, we do not know. There is less agreement on Hadrian's motives and intentions, since this involves a judgement of Hadrian, of the Roman Empire and of the Jewish people. Any evaluation of Hadrian's religious policy should now take into account W. Den Boer's paper on the subject.<sup>4</sup> It is instructive precisely because it does not primarily deal with Hadrian's treatment of the Jews. As regards Aelia there is yet another question to be asked, namely what were Hadrian's reasons for founding a *Colonia Civium Romanorum* rather than a Greek πόλις according to the pattern prevalent in the Eastern Roman

\* An earlier version of this paper appeared in Hebrew in *Chapters in the History of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period – Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*, edited by A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport and M. Stern (Jerusalem 1981). I am grateful for suggestions and comments by Professors S. Applebaum, J.E. Bogaers, G.W. Bowersock, Dr. J. Matthews and Dr. M.M. Roxan.

1. Dio lxix, 12, 1-2; see: Schürer i (1973), 540-2; Applebaum, 1976, 8; Smallwood, 1976, 432-34 and older literature cited in these works. See also: B. Lifshitz, *ANRW* ii, 8, 444-89, 'Jérusalem sous la Domination Romaine'.

2. Prof. Gichon will argue for a later date in his forthcoming study on the Second Revolt (in *ANRW* ii). For the foundation in 129/130, see Schürer, I (1973), 541-2; Applebaum (1976), 8.

3. See above, n. 1 and esp. Schürer i (1973), 553-54; Smallwood, 1976, 559 ff.

4. Den Boer, 1955; see also: J. Beaujeu, *La Religion Romaine à l'apogée de l'empire* i (1955), 180 ff.; A.S. Benjamin, *Hesperia* 32 (1963), 57-86. M. Guarducci, in: *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne* (1965), 209-222.

provinces.<sup>5</sup> There is no easy answer but some observations may be made.

Considering why a Roman colony instead of a Greek city was founded we should, first of all, note that, in one respect, it was a creation without precedent. I do not know of any other Roman colony, existing at this time, which also served as legionary headquarters.<sup>6</sup> In the East two or, possibly, three communities where a

5. For the establishment of colonies in the eastern provinces, see Millar, 1977, 395-410; also: Jones, 1940, 61-5; Bowersock, 1965, Chapter v; Grant, 1946; Levick, 1967, Chapter xiv; Vittinghoff, 1952; Sherwin-White, 1973, 228-29; 275ff. The present paper is concerned with the establishment of colonies up to Hadrian. The cities founded by Severus and his successors are not discussed.

6. The archaeological evidence for the legionary fortress in Jerusalem is, so far, very unsatisfactory. For the period after 70, Josephus, *BJ* vii, 1, 1 (1-2); cf.: 1, 3 (17), records that the garrison was encamped in the western part of the city. Inscriptions from this period indicate that the fortress was in the city: *ILS* 9059 (diploma of AD 93); M. Gichon and B. Isaac, *IEJ* 24 (1974), 117-23 (Flavian inscription from Jerusalem); *CIL* iii, 13587 = *ILS* 4393 (inscription of 116/7 set up by a detachment of the III *Cyr.* in Jerusalem). From the period after the Second Revolt and the foundation of Aelia we have one legionary inscription found in the city: *CIL* iii 12080a = 6641 = *AE* 1888. 50. Tombstones of veterans of the legion were found in Jerusalem, but this only shows that they settled in Aelia after their discharge, cf.: *CIL* iii, 14155, 3; M. Avi-Yonah, *QDAP* 8 (1938), 54-7 = *AE* 1939. 157; see also: Lifshitz, *ANRW* ii, 8, 470-71; E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (1953), 115 attributes this inscription to the Hadrian-Antonine period. Fragmentary but probably relating to the presence of army units in town are: *AE* 1904. 91; cf.: Thomsen, *ZDPV* 64 (1941), no. 3; *AE* 1904, 201; *CIL* iii, 6638; G.B. Sarfatti, *IEJ* 25 (1975), 151. A piped drain with stamps of the legion was excavated in the citadel, cf.: C.N. Johns, *QDAP* 14 (1950), 152-53; 156. Stamped bricks of the legion were found at this and many other sites in the city, e.g. *CIL* iii 12090; A.D. Tushingham, *PEQ* 99 (1967), 73; B. Mazar, *The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem, Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons* (1971), 5; 22. For brick-stamps of the legion, see: D. Barag, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 167 (1967), 244-67 (English) = *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), 168-82 (Hebrew). Remains of brick ovens of the legion were excavated (but never adequately published) at Giv'at Ram (Sheikh Bader), c. 1 km. from Jerusalem near the Roman Road to Emmaus, cf.: M. Avi-Yonah, *BIES* 15 (1950), 19-24, Pl. 6-7. Legionary bricks were produced primarily for military installations (see below, n. 13). Although the relationship between legion and colony is unclear at Jerusalem, it may be assumed that here too the stamps of the legion indicate a military presence. There is therefore no reason to doubt that both before and after 135 the legionary fortress was in Jerusalem. It must be emphasized, however, that no excavated site has been published, furnishing evidence of what can be described as legionary structures. Only Mazar claims to have excavated a building, w. of the Western Wall, in use as barracks of the legion from the foundation of Aelia down to the time when the legion left

legion was quartered acquired city-status before Hadrian's reign.<sup>7</sup> In the western provinces we know two sorts of civilian settlements near camps: a) civil settlements that grew up around camps and were somehow attached to them (*canabae* and *vici*); b) independent communities a little distance off.<sup>8</sup> In Pannonia civilian settlements developed into *municipia*, but these are found to be situated at some distance from the camp.<sup>9</sup> It may be noted that here too it was Hadrian who put the final touches to urban development near the legionary fortresses, begun under the Flavians. He created three *municipia* near camps on the Danube.<sup>10</sup> Military control of civilian settlements near camps (*canabae legionis* and *vici* of auxiliary units) and the physical separation of *municipia* and legionary bases are thought to have prevented conflicts between civilian and military administration in the area closest to the fortress. In several western provinces these matters have been clarified by years of digging and

Jerusalem (loc. cit.). Scholarly literature is full of plans of the *castra* and of confident statements concerning its site, all as contradictory as they are speculative, see: C.W. Wilson, *PEFQS* (1905), 138-44; L.H. Vincent and F.M. Abel, *Jérusalem nouvelle* ii, (1926), 19-21, Pl. i; M. Avi-Yonah, *Enc. Arch. Exc.* ii, 610-11; Y. Tsafrir, *Zion* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Jerusalem, 1975), 286-301. In the last mentioned work the archaeological evidence is conveniently compiled, pp. 50-78.

7. The era of Samosata dates from 71, it issued coins as Flavia Samosata from Hadrian onwards, see: *BMC, Galatia* etc., 117 ff.; for Bostra in Arabia, cf.: Bowersock, 1971, 231-2. It had already become a major city before it became the legionary headquarters, cf.: Bowersock, *JRS* 63 (1973), 139; A. Negev, *ANRW* ii, 8, 660 ff. For Melitene in Cappadocia, see: Procopius, *de Aed.* iii, 4; cf. Josephus, *BJ* vii, 1,3 (18) who still describes it as a district rather than a town. It seems not to have issued coinage; see also: Magie, 1950, 1436; 1464. For Cyrrhus and Zeugma, cities since Hellenistic times, see below, n. 12.

8. E.g.: Chr.B. Rüger, *Germania Inferior* (1968), 74 ff. for the situation in this province, see also: J.E. Bogaers and Chr.B. Rüger, *Der Niedergermanische Limes* (1974), s.v. Nijmegen and Xanten. In Britain the relevant case is York, where the *canabae* remained under military control, while the separate civil settlement (across the river) eventually was granted the status of a *colonia*, cf.: I.A. Richmond, *Eburacum* (1962), xxxiv-xxxix. See also on this subject: F. Vittinghoff in: *Legio VII Gemina* (1970), 339-352.

9. For Pannonia and Upper Moesia, see: Mócsy, 1974, 126-28; 139 ff. F. Vittinghoff in: *Festschrift H. Jankuhn* (1968), 132-42. As observed by Dobson and Mann, 1973, 196 "one effect of the so-called 'vallum' on the Hadrianic frontier of Britain (whatever its main function) was certainly to keep the early civilian settlement along its line well clear of military installations."

10. Mócsy, loc. cit.; Millar, 1977, 399-406 has argued that the title of *municipium* was not formally conferred by the emperor.

the study of numerous inscriptions.<sup>11</sup> It is clear that the practice of quartering army-units in urban centres in the eastern provinces must have created completely different patterns, but we know, in fact, nothing of their working.<sup>12</sup> As regards Aelia, it seems quite certain that the legionary base was part of the city, but we have no evidence at all about the division of authority between the colony's administration and the legionary command. We know nothing of the territorial situation. What was military territory and what belonged to the colony? Was there a division between the two or not? These are questions which cannot be answered until more evidence becomes available.<sup>13</sup> In general it must be said that we know nothing about

11. No legionary fortress has been excavated even partly in the eastern provinces. H. v. Petrikovits, *Die Innenbauten römischer Legionslager der Principatszeit* (1975), Bild 1, lists 66 permanent legionary fortresses, 15 of those are in the Near East, but not one could be discussed in this book. In Israel the only plans of a legionary establishment published (but not excavated), are those of Masada, cf.: I.A. Richmond, *JRS* 52 (1962), 141-55. Even here some thirty little buildings belonging to a civilian settlement near camp F can be seen scattered on the hillside (Pl. xviii and p. 151).

12. Archaeological evidence of military camps in cities is so far available only from Dura (third century): M.I. Rostovtzeff (ed.), *The Excavations of Dura* (1934) (report on the fifth season, 1931-2), 201 ff. A military camp excavated in Palmyra dates to the late third century: Th. Wiegand, *Palmyra* (1932), 82 ff., Pl. 9-10. Syrian cities known to have been quarters of legions are: Raphanaeae (Jones, 1971, 267 with n. 53) *IGLS* 1399; 1400; J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Arados et sa périée aux époques grecque romaine et byzantine* (1974), 167 f.; Samosata (above, n. 7; Jones, 1971, 263-64; 267); J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1949, 190; *AE* 1950, 190; Zeugma (J. Wagner, *Seleukia am Euphrat - Zeugma*, Beiträge zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B. Nr. 10, 1976; id in: *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms* ii (Beih. BoJb 38, 1977, 517-39); Cyrrhus (Tac. *Ann.* ii, 57; E. Frézouls in: *ANRW* ii, 8, 164-97, esp. 182-83). All these cannot properly be compared with Aelia, since they were existing cities in which army units were quartered, rather than bases around which a city was built. Comparable with Aelia might be Melitene (above, n. 7) and Satala in Armenia Minor (Magie, 1950, 1436; 1465; T.B. Mitford, *JRS* 64 (1974), 160 ff.). Both were fortresses around which cities developed. The site of the *castra* known to have been at Bostra has not been located as yet, cf.: A. Negev, *ANRW* ii, 8, 663.

13. For the territory of Aelia, cf.: Avi-Yonah, 1966, 155-56; 1974, 421. It must be said, however, that much of what is written there is based on unreliable sources. Apart from the incorrect use of milestones and Eusebius' *Onomasticon*, there is, e.g., no reason why a road-station ('Maledomnei') should mark the border of a territorium. The same sources were, apparently, used by Jones, 1971, 277 and *JRS* 21 (1931), Pl. vii, which therefore cannot be accepted at face value, cf.: Isaac, 1978, 57. The territorial history of Judaea needs revision. Worthless evidence should be rejected and no attempt should be made to draw a map of Roman Judaea which includes territorial borders, since this serves only

the consequences of the eastern practice of quartering the army in cities, apart from the observation of Tacitus and Fronto that it was bad for discipline.<sup>14</sup> Concerning Aelia it must be noted that not until the third century was there another colony serving as legionary headquarters.<sup>15</sup>

Returning to the question why Aelia was made a Roman colony rather than a Greek city, we must keep in mind that, at the time, it was an unusual creation which does not fit the general characteristics of Roman colonies of the period. First I shall try to clarify matters by looking at earlier citizen-colonies in the East, next by considering contemporary foundations in other provinces.

The foundation of Roman colonies in the East started with Caesar and Augustus. This period has been subject of extensive research. Jones dealt with cities in the East founded at this time. Vittinghoff devoted a monograph to the study of colonisation and citizenship under Caesar and Augustus. Barbara Levick has much to say on the period in her book on Roman colonies in Southern Asia Minor and G.W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, contains a chapter on eastern colonies. Cities which issued coinage in this period are discussed by M. Grant. Most recent is the second edition of Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* with a new discussion of the *ius Italicum*.<sup>16</sup>

to present a misleading picture of the state of our knowledge. In Germania Superior and Inferior the spread of military brick-stamps has been used as an indicator of military territory, since it has been shown that such bricks were used first of all in military installations or in civilian buildings constructed by the military (cf.: Rüger, 1968, 56 ff.). This will not get us very far in Judaea since finds of stamped bricks are rare in this country, apart from substantial finds in Jerusalem. For the subject in general (in the western provinces), see: F. Vittinghoff, *Ac. Naz. Lincei* 194 (1974), 109-124.

14. *Ann.* xiii 35; Fronto, *ad Verum imp.* ii, 1 (128 Naber). Cf.: Mommsen *Römische Geschichte* (1904), v, 448-9. Part of the tasks of the army units encamped in cities will have been to control these cities themselves and their surrounding territory. Josephus indicates that the legions stationed in Alexandria were used to suppress fighting between Jews and Greeks (*BJ* ii, 18, 8 [494]). In Jerusalem, before 67, *auxilia* were established in two permanent camps, one in the royal palace, the other in the Antonia fortress: *BJ* ii, 15, 5 (328-9); 17, 8 (439). Josephus extensively describes the way these troops were used in town.

15. It has been suggested that Bostra received the status of colony at the same time as Petra, i.e. under Elagabalus, 221/2, cf.: S. Ben Dor, *Berytus* 9 (1948-9), 430. Head, *Hist. Num.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 812 dates the grant in Severus Alexander's reign.

16. *v. supra n. 5.* For the *ius italicum* see also the discussions by F.T. Hin-

In Syria Augustus planted veteran-colonies at Berytus and possibly also at Heliopolis (Baalbek).<sup>17</sup> Jones (for Berytus only) and Bowersock (for both) pointed out that they must have served to control the territory of the Ituraeans, who were notorious brigands.<sup>18</sup> There were comparable groups of colonies elsewhere, discussed in the studies mentioned above. For the present paper it may be relevant to mention the Caesarian colonies garrisoning the s. coast of the Propontis and the Black Sea and the chain of Augustan veteran-colonies along the coast of Mauretania, protecting communications on the North African coast.<sup>19</sup> The group of colonies in Pisidia were studied by Barbara Levick. In her book she has shown that these colonies, founded at the same time, threw a cordon round the whole of Pisidia as part of a program meant to tame and civilize the entire region.<sup>20</sup> In 6 B.C., nineteen years after the foundation of these colonies an extensive road-network was constructed linking them, as shown by Dr. Levick. This, it appears, was part of the preparation for the Homanadensian war, in which a rebellious tribe which hindered communications and the development of the area was subjugated. The colonies were meant to garrison the area and to serve as base of operations. The roads made the conquest easier. Besides, as observed by Dr. Levick, "the soldiers (brought perhaps from Syria) who were to fight the war must have been those who built the roads. The building of roads is a valuable act in itself but it serves another purpose: it toughens those who take part. The Syrian legions were not always maintained at fighting pitch."<sup>21</sup>

richs, *Die Geschichte der grämatischen Institutionen* (1974), 147-57 and by J. Bleicken, *Chiron* 4 (1974), 367 ff.

17. For Berytus, see now: J. Lauffray in: *ANRW* ii, 8, 135-63; for the foundation of the colony, 145-47. Heliopolis was made a colony by Augustus according to Sherwin-White, 1973, 229; H. Seyrig, *Bull. Musée de Beyrouth* 16 (1961), 111-12 = *AE* 1964, 55; Bowersock, 1965, 66; Vittinghoff, 1952, 135. However, Jones, 1940, 72-3; 1971, 287-88 with n. 85 and Grant, 1946, 258 opt for Severus. For a somewhat different hypothesis, see: J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *JRS*, 68 (1978), 52.

18. Jones, *JRS* 21 (1931), 266-67; Bowersock, 1965, 71.

19. For Caesar's foundations in Asia, see: Levick, 1967, 4-5; Bowersock, 1965, 62-4 and literature listed there; Vittinghoff, 1952, 87-9 denies their military function. For the colonies in Mauretania, see: S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* viii (1928), 199-205; Grant, 1946, 222 ff.; Vittinghoff, 1952, 116-18; Syme, *op. cit.* (below, n. 21A), 218 f.

20. Levick, 1967, 6; 38-40; 187 ff. Recently it has been argued that Col. Archelais and Iconium were founded in the same period: D. French, *ZPE* 27 (1977), 247-49.

21. Levick, 1967, 40; see above, n. 14.

In Numidia the nomadic Musulamii were subjugated by the same method, but here the process took longer, as shown by Sir Ronald Syme.<sup>21a</sup> A start was made under Augustus but the organization was not completed until the reign of Trajan. This entailed the construction of the colony of Thamugadi by the legion III Augusta, the transference of this legion to Lambaesis, road-building, the delimitation of Musulamian territory and the establishment of *municipia* at Calama and Thubursicu.

Claudius planted one colony in the East, Ptolemais (Acco) in Phoenice, a foundation which requires our attention.<sup>22</sup> In Judea the reign of Claudius was marked by a series of popular uprisings of increasing violence and bitterness. Most dangerous were the troubles between Jews and Samaritans which were investigated on the spot by Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria and cost the prefect of Judaea his office (c. 52).<sup>23</sup> Under Felix, the next prefect, rebellion continued.<sup>24</sup> Clearly as a response to these events veterans of the four Syrian legions were settled in a new colony at Ptolemais, c. 52-54.<sup>25</sup> The decision will have been taken by Claudius in accordance with advice of Ummidius Quadratus, who remained governor of Syria from 50 till 60.<sup>26</sup> Next the coastal road from Antioch down to Ptolemais was constructed and provided with milestones, dated AD 56. The inscriptions mention Ummidius Quadratus and record the paving of the road "from Antioch to the new colony of Ptolemais".<sup>27</sup> The site of the Claudian colony was well chosen, just outside the

21A. R. Syme, 'Taçfarinas, the Musulamii, and Thubursicu', *Roman Papers I*, Chapter 16, 218-230 = *Studies in Economic and Social History in Honor of Allen Chester Johnson* (1951), 113-30.

22. For Ptolemais (Acco), see: Kadman, 1961; N. Makhoul and C.N. Johns, *Guide to Acre* (1946); H. Seyrig, *Rev. Num.* (1962); *Syria* 39 (1962), 193-207; Schürer ii (1907), 141-48; also: *Enc. Arch. Exc.* i, 14-23 (Z. Goldmann); Avi-Yonah, 1976, 89.

23. See: Schürer, i (1973), 458-60.

24. *Op. cit.*, 462 ff.

25. The date of the foundation is determined by coins of A.D. 52 which name the city without its colonial titles; Kadman, 1961, nos. 88-90. The foundation by Claudius (i.e. 54 at the latest) is recorded by Pliny, *NH* v, 19, 75: "*Colonia Claudi Caesaris Ptolemais quae quondam Acce*". Milestones of 56 mention the city as the 'new colony of Ptolemais': Thomsen, 1917, no. 9a2; R.G. Goodchild, *Berytus* 9 (1948), 112-23; 120. See also: M. Avi-Yonah, *QDAP* 12 (1946), 85-6: '*col. Ptol. Veter(anorum)*'. For the legions, see the founder's coins with *vexilla*, A.D. 66: Kadman, 1961, nos. 88-90.

26. For Ummidius Quadratus, see: Schürer i (1973), 264.

27. *V. supra*, n. 25.

province but at the 'gateway' to it. In 67 it served as Vespasian's base of operations and only after the subjugation of Galilee did he move his headquarters to Caesarea.<sup>28</sup> The veteran-colony at Ptolemais and the road to it assured the Romans of a convenient spot for their rear-headquarters and marshalling area in any action against Judaea.<sup>29</sup>

All colonies discussed so far were veteran-settlements serving as *ad hoc* garrisons. Their sites were chosen out of military considerations, a fact which detracts nothing from the reality that this was a way to dispose of a surplus of veteran-soldiers. Their siting at locations controlling communications was, in many instances, a factor contributing to eventual economic growth. As pointed out by Levick, they were both garrison-colonies and *poleis*. Their foundation and the construction of a road-network in the surroundings must be explained as an attempt "not only to pacify the country but permanently to alter its character."<sup>30</sup>

The next colony to be founded in the East was Caesarea, capital of Judaea, with the titles '*Colonia Prima Flavia Augusta Caesarea*' or '*Caesarensis*'.<sup>31</sup> The previous history of the city is well known and

28. Jos. *BJ* iii, 2, 4 (29); *ibid.* 4, 2 (64 ff.); *ibid.* 9, 1 (409). Ptolemais was a military base under the later Seleucids, cf.: *SEG* xx, 413; xix, 404; S. Applebaum in: *Essays in honour of C.E. Stevens*, ed. B. Levick (1975), 64-5, n. 48.

29. Ulpian, *Dig.* L 15, 1, 3: "*Ptolemaeensium enim colonia, quae inter Phoenicen et Palaestinam sita est, nihil praeter nomen coloniae habet*" is a good indication of the strategic siting of Ptolemais. The last part of the sentence shows that the colony did not have any additional privileges, such as *ius Italicum* or freedom from taxes. This has been misunderstood by several scholars, e.g.: Schürer ii (1907), 148; Avi-Yonah, 1974, 382 and 1976, 89. For the purpose of Claudius' colonies, see: A. Momigliano, *Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement* (1961), 65 (partly political, partly military function); see also p. 64: 'a great builder of roads', with references. For Claudian road-building, see also: E.M. Smallwood, *Documents illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (1967), 87-91.

30. Levick, 1967, 187-89. The territory of Col. Ptolemais was divided into *pagi* as appears from an inscription published by M. Avi-Yonah, *QDAP* 12 (1946), no. 3, p. 86. This is an indication of the city's organization as a Roman colony. The function of veteran colonies is described in a number of well known passages in ancient sources: Cicero, *de Lege Agraria* ii, 73; *Pro Fonteio* 5; 13; Tac. *Ann.* xi, 24; xii, 32; xiv, 31; *Hist.* i, 65; iv, 64; *Agric.* 16, 1; Appian, *BC* v, 12 ff.

31. Pliny, *NH* v, 13, 69: "*Stratonis turris, eadem Caesarea ab Herode rege condita, nunc colonia prima Flavia a Vespasiano imperatore deducta.*" See also sources quoted below, p. 00 and coins mentioned below, p. 00; *CIL* iii 12082 = *ILS* 7206 (see below, n. 39). On Caesarea there exists an extensive literature:

need not be recapitulated here.<sup>32</sup> What must be emphasized is that this was an entirely different sort of foundation. This is clear from all available evidence and can be explained by the background of, and the history leading up to, the foundation. Till the reign of Claudius there were two sorts of colonies: 1) entirely new foundations on sites where no earlier community existed at the time of colonization; 2) veteran-settlements superimposed upon existing towns, the result being a community consisting of an upper class formed by new settlers and an original population of mostly lower status.<sup>33</sup> The eastern colonies mentioned so far, including Ptolemais, belong to the second class. Claudius, apparently, was the first to create colonies of a third kind, purely native communities elevated to the rank of a Roman colony, without any *deductio* of veterans taking place. The first towns to be granted the honorary title of colony were prosperous communities in Gaul.<sup>34</sup> In the second century this honorary title became a popular and important institution as a reward for loyalty. A brief survey of the facts will show that Caesarea must have belonged to this group, the first in the East to be founded according to this pattern.

1) *Digest.* L, 15, 8: '*Divus Vespasianus Caesarienses colonos fecit*'. 'The Divine Vespasian made the Caesarienses *coloni*.' This suggests a formal change in status without settlement of veterans.<sup>35</sup>

2) Josephus, *BJ* vii, 6, 6 (217) records that Vespasian, after the

Kadman, 1957; recently, J. Ringel, 1975; L.I. Levine, *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (1975); *id.* *Roman Caesarea, an archaeological-topographical Study* (1975). Bibliographies of older literature can be found in these works. See also G. Foerster in: R.J. Bull (ed.), *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, I (*BASOR*, Supp. No. 19, 1975), pp. 9 ff.; Schürer II (1979), 115-8.

32. For a convenient survey: Ringel, 1975, 81 ff. The archaeological remains are described on pp. 28-78. See also: Schürer ii (1907), 134-38; Avi-Yonah, 1976, 44; *Enc. Arch. Exc.* i, 270 ff.; B. Lifshitz in: *ANRW* ii, 8, 490-518. It must be said that, in this paper, the late Prof. Lifshitz again failed to acknowledge sources of information (cf.: p. 505 and Y. Kaplan, *JQR* 54 (1963), 111-113) or even previous publication of inscriptions (cf.: p. 499, n. 54; p. 517 and J. Olami and J. Ringel, *IEJ* 25 (1975), 148-50, esp. n. 44; *id.* *Qadmoniot* 7 (1974), 44-46, 3 figs. (Hebrew); *id.* *RB* 81 (1974), 597-600, pl. xiii).

33. To this group belong Antioch in Pisidia and her sister-colonies, cf.: Levick, 1967, 189-90. See also: Vittinghoff, 1952, 23-27.

34. See: Sherwin-White, 1973, 244; 350-52. For a different opinion: Vittinghoff, 1952, 27 ff.

35. Paulus, *Dig.* L, 15, 8, 6: "*Divus Antoninus Antiochenses colonos fecit salvis tributis.*" Antioch obviously was an honorary colony, cf.: G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (1961), 243 ff.; Sherwin-White, 1973, 276 and Millar, 1977, 409.

fall of Machaerus, allotted land property in Emmaus near Jerusalem to some eight hundred veterans. From this passage it may be understood that there were no other settlements of veterans in the province.<sup>36</sup>

3) Veteran-colonies invariably issued coinage marking the military origins of the settlers and the units from which they were dis-

36. Jos. *BJ* vii, 6, 6 (216-17):

Περὶ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἐπέστειλε Καῖσαρ Βάσσων καὶ Λαβερίω Μαξίμω, οὗτος δὲ ἦν ἐπίτροπος, κελεύων πᾶσαν γῆν ἀποδόσθαι τῶν Ἰουδαίων. οὐ γὰρ κατώκισεν ἐκεῖ πόλιν ιδίαν αὐτῷ τὴν χώραν φυλάττων, ὅτακοσίοις δὲ μόνοις ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς διαφεύγεντος χωρίον ἔδωκεν εἰς κατοίκησην, δὲ καλεῖται μὲν Ἀμμαοῦς, ἀπέχει δὲ τῶν Ἱερουσαλύμων σταδίους τριάκοντα.

Schürer i (1901), 640 already pointed out that, according to Josephus, Jewish land was leased and not sold. Momigliano, 1934, 85-6 concluded that the passage must refer to Jewish land everywhere in the province of Judaea and not only to land of the Jews in Judaea in its narrower and proper sense (thus e.g. Schürer i (1973), 520; Jones, 1971, 276-77). There would be no reason to treat Jews in the area around Jerusalem differently from those in Galilee or Peraea. The Emmaus mentioned here did not have city-status – it was much too small for that with only 800 veterans. It was certainly no citizen-colony. Our sources, particularly the *Digest*, would say something about it. (For the site, see: Schürer i (1973), 512, n. 142.) A regular veteran-colony received at least 3000 settlers (Levick, 1967, 92-3 with statistics down to the Augustan age). Emmaus must have been one of the many similar communities of veterans called *κολωνίαι* but lacking city-status (Jones, 1940, 64). Josephus, in this passage, wants to emphasize that Vespasian did not give away Jewish land and, especially, that no settlements of foreigners were planted on territory taken from the Jews, apart from the minor *κατοίκησις* at Emmaus, which is the exception confirming the rule. Caesarea is not mentioned, precisely because no foreign settlers were planted there. Similarly, Joppa and Neapolis are ignored. Both appear from coins to have received city-status from one of the Flavians (for Flavia Joppa, *BMC, Palestine*, 44 nos. 1-2, cf.: xxiv-xxv; for Flavia Neapolis, see: *ibid.* 45-7, nos. 1-19, cf.: xxvi-xxvii. See Schürer i (1973), 520-21 for further evidence). Both were previously existing communities which were ravaged in the war (Joppa: Jos. *BJ* ii, 18, 10 (507-09); iii, 9, 2-4 (414-31); Neapolis, formerly Ma'abartha, at the foot of Mount Gerizim, for which see: iii, 8, 32 (307-15)). There is good evidence implying that in neither of these two towns the original community of respectively Jews and Samaritans was disenfranchised. These may have formed joint municipalities together with pagans living in the two cities (for Joppa, see S. Klein, *Sepher Hayishuv* i<sup>2</sup> 1977), 79 ff. (Hebrew); Frei, *CII* ii, nos. 892-960; stamps of a Jewish *agoranomos* have been found by Y. Kaplan, *JQR* 54 (1964), 111-13 (Trajan). Neapolis issued coinage under Domitian which avoided pagan types). Josephus' statement can therefore serve as indirect confirmation that no veterans were settled in Caesarea and no foreign communities planted in Joppa, Neapolis or elsewhere in the province.

charged.<sup>37</sup> The coins of Caesarea never refer to a military origin of the colony.<sup>38</sup>

4) No inscriptions referring to veteran-colonists are known, although we have a considerable number of inscriptions mentioning inhabitants of the town and army-units stationed there.<sup>39</sup>

5) Veterans used to be sent to colonies where they could fulfil a military task as *ad-hoc* garrison. Caesarea, as provincial capital and residence of the governor, had a detachment both before and after the first Jewish Revolt.<sup>40</sup> As noted above, the foundation of veteran-colonies with a military purpose usually was accompanied by the construction of a Roman road-system in the area. I have shown elsewhere that the reorganization of Judaea after the First Revolt did not involve road-building.<sup>41</sup>

6) The *Digest*, as quoted above, adds: '*non adiecto, ut et iuris Italici essent, sed tributum his remisit capitum: sed divus Titus etiam solum immune factum interpretatus est.*' 'without adding the *ius Italicum*, but remitting the poll-tax: but the divine Titus decided that

37. For example: Berytus, *BMC, Phoenicia*, nos. 55 ff. and above, n. 17; Lugdunum, Grant, 1946, 209; Caesaraugusta (Saldusia), *op. cit.* 217 no. 10; Patricia (Corduba), *op. cit.* 220; Pisidian Antioch and sister-colonies, Levick, 1967, 35-6; Grant, 1946, 250-51; Tyrus, *BMC, Phoenicia*, pp. cxxvi; cxxix; Jones, 1971, 287 and n. 85. As observed by Sherwin-White, 1973, 228: to trace the settlement of veterans is a comparatively easy matter, since they usually left abundant traces of themselves in their personal inscriptions or in the titles of their colonies (and in their coinage). The *vexilla* with legionary numbers usually kept appearing on successive issues long after the foundation.

38. A coin of Trebonianus Gallus mentions the legion III *Gall.*: Kadman, 1957, no. 213, but this, of course, has nothing to do with the first century colonization. Not only are the *vexilla* with legionary numbers missing on Caesarea's coinage, Kadman, p. 69 also noticed that the military reverse types, so important at Aelia, are almost insignificant in the coinage of Caesarea. This must reflect a lasting difference in the character of the two communities and not a mere technicality relating to the foundation of the two colonies. Caesarea did not strike colonial coinage until Domitian. This can be explained by the fact that Caesarea after the First Revolt minted coins of the ΙΩΤΔΑΙΑ ΕΑΛΩΚΤΙΑ series. It has no bearing on her status at the time. For the coins, see H. Hamburger, *IEJ* 20 (1970), 87.

39. For a bibliography of inscriptions from Caesarea, see: Ringel, 1975, 179-83. Compare the inscriptions of *X Fret.* at Jerusalem (above, n. 6).

40. Cf. Schürer i, 1973, 363 ff. For the governor's military staff, see: A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des Römischen Heeres* (ed. Dobson, 1966), 29 ff.; D. Breeze, *Bo Jb.* 174 (1974), 245-92; for the *officium consulare* in Arabia, see: M.P. Speidel, *ANRW* ii, 8, 695-97; in Pannonia: A. Dobó, *Die Verwaltung der römischen Provinz Pannonien* (1968), 155-68.

41. Isaac, 1978, 47-9.

the soil had been made immune also.' The nature of the *ius Italicum* recently was analyzed anew by Sherwin-White, by F.T. Hinrichs and by Bleicken.<sup>42</sup> Its practical significance – and the reason why it was rarely granted – was that it meant freedom from poll – and land-tax. This raises the question what prevented Titus from granting the *ius Italicum* to Caesarea, since he gave it the substance of this status.<sup>43</sup> The explanation must be that, at that time, it was considered undesirable to recognize as 'Italians' the first eastern community which enjoyed the status of 'Colony of Roman Citizens' without a nucleus of ex-legionaries. Sherwin-White suggested that *ius Italicum* was granted to the eastern foundations of Caesar and Augustus, such as Berytus and Antioch in Pisidia precisely in order to emphasize the non-Greek character of these communities.<sup>44</sup>

It may therefore be concluded that the citizens of Caesarea were granted the honorary title of a Roman colony without accompanying settlement of veterans, as a reward for past services towards the empire.<sup>44a</sup> These services are extensively described by Josephus. Until 67 troops stationed in Judaea consisted mostly of Caesareans and Sebastenes. In AD 67 Vespasian enlisted in his army 5 cohorts and one ala from Caesarea.<sup>45</sup> These troops took active part in the suppression of the Revolt.<sup>46</sup> The citizens of Caesarea enthusiastically supported the Romans at the same time and, among other things, provided the troops with winter-quarters. "The inhabitants received

42. Sherwin-White, 1973, 276-77; 316-22; Hinrichs and Bleicken (*supra*, n. 16).

43. Cf. *op. cit.*, 276, n. 4. Millar, 1977, 409 observes that "we can be reasonably sure that when Titus 'interpreted' Vespasian's conferment in a wider sense, this was either a response to a request from the city, or a decision in a dispute about tribute." A. Kindler, *Museum Haaretz, Bulletin* 10 (1968), 9-11 attributes to Caesarea a founder's coin of 81/2 on which a 'Gamma' is clearly visible. According to Kindler this would refer to Caesarea's era, counting from the year of Titus' ruling, which would then be 78/9.

44. Sherwin-White, 1973, 276. Hinrichs (*supra*, n. 16) has argued that the concept did not exist before the end of the Flavian period. See also Bleicken (*supra*, n. 16), pp. 375-6.

44a. Pliny's phrase on Caesarea (above, n. 31) shows that to him the '*deductio*' of a colony had lost its original meaning and represented merely a formal measure relating to the charter of a town. Pliny obviously does not mean to say that Caesarea was "founded by king Herod and now 'led forth' or 'conducted' by Vespasian as a colony."

45. Jos. *BJ* iii, 4, 2 (66).

46. For these units, see: Schürer i (1973), 360-63. Prof. Applebaum pointed out to me that during the second revolt the coh. I *Vindelicorum* recruited local inhabitants of Caesarea (*CIL* vi, no. 107).

the army and its general with blessings and congratulations of every description, prompted partly by goodwill towards the Romans, but mainly by hatred of the vanquished."<sup>47</sup> Furthermore Josephus records that Vespasian was first proclaimed Empéror by his own troops at Caesarea.<sup>48</sup> This almost certainly explains the *cognomen Prima'*, indicating that Vespasian founded the first Flavian colony where he had been first proclaimed Emperor.<sup>49</sup>

We may therefore assume that Caesarea was made an honorary colony because of its good behaviour in the first Revolt.<sup>50</sup> There may have been an additional reason, discussed below. Other measures in the province, apart from the quartering of the *X Fret.* at Jerusalem and the planting of veterans at Emmaus, included the grant of city-status and the name 'Flavia' to Neapolis and Joppa.<sup>51</sup> As mentioned above, there is no evidence of road-building.<sup>52</sup> No other indications of activities resulting from government-initiative can be traced as yet, until Hadrian's reign.

In other eastern provinces I can find no colony-foundation during the reigns of Titus through Trajan.<sup>53</sup> Trajan's reign, on the other

47. *BJ* iii, 9, 1 (409-13) transl. Thackeray, Loeb; iv, 2, 1 (88).

48. *BJ* iv, 10, 4 (601 ff.), but cf. Suetonius, *Vesp.* 6; Tac. *Hist.* ii, 79.

49. B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Epigraphische Studien* 9 (1972), 74, agrees that there could be a connection with the proclamation of Vespasian as emperor but denies that 'Prima' could signify that Caesarea was the first Flavian colony as there was no 'Col. Secunda Flavia', 'Tertia Flavia' etc. This seems somewhat formalistic. The only parallel is Col. Comama which, long after its foundation, was styled 'Prima Fida' (from Caracalla onwards; see *ILS*, 7203). B. Levick, *Numismatic Chronicle* 7 (1967), 34-5 prefers to see this as an unconvincing claim for primacy and precedence in the region. The case of Caesarea, a century and a half before Comama, is different. She received the title "Prima" from the emperor at the time of her elevation to the rank of a colony (cf. Pliny, above n. 31).

50. For a similar conclusion, see: Kadman, 1957, 64; Ringel, 1975, 145. *Deductio* of veterans a.o. according to F. Hampl, *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 3 (1950), 39; *Rheinisches Museum* 95 (1952), 60; 70 f.; L. Haefeli, *Caesarea am Meer* (1923), 31; 74. L.I. Levine, *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (1975), 55.

51. Above p. 00, and no. 36.

52. *V. supra*, n. 41. The road from Caesarea to Scythopolis and probably onwards to Gerasa was constructed in 69, during the war; see: B. Isaac and I. Roll, *JRS* 66 (1976), 15-9. There is no further evidence of building activity on this road until 129. The coastal road in Syria, from Antioch to Ptolemais, constructed in 56, has milestones of 72, Domitian and Trajan (before 116); see: R.G. Goodchild, *Berytus* 9 (1948-49), 120; 124-125 and nos. 234 A (ii); 235 (ii).

53. Col. *Ninica Claudiopolis* in Cilicia began to coin under Trajan, cf.: Jones,

hand, was marked first by the annexation of Arabia as a province in 106 and the subsequent construction of a road from Bostra, legionary fortress and new capital to the Red Sea.<sup>54</sup> Both this and the Parthian War of 114-7 must have changed the position of Judea drastically.<sup>55</sup> When Hadrian became emperor he had to organize the withdrawal from Mesopotamia and the reorganization of the eastern frontier. Judaea was no longer a territory on the fringes of the empire but an interior province which controlled vital lines of communication.<sup>55a</sup> The damage Jews could cause by an insurrection became clear in 117.<sup>56</sup>

The nature of Hadrian's activities in Judaea, as in other provinces, is gradually being clarified by excavation, numismatics and epigraphy.<sup>57</sup> The general characteristics of his reign, marked by centralization, unification and an increasing absolutism have been studied from various points of view.<sup>58</sup> We now know that in Judaea a second

1971, 209 and n. 32. According to Vittinghoff, 1952, 132, however, her titles '*Iulia Augusta*' would point to an earlier foundation. Levick, 1967, Appendix ii, tends to accept Ninica as a foundation of Trajan.

54. Cf. Bowersock, 1971, 228 ff.; see also, below n. 65.

55. For the Parthian expedition, see F.A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War* (1949). A. Maricq, *Syria* 36 (1959), 254-263 = *Classica et Orientalia* (1965), 103-112.

55a. Cf. Applebaum, 1976, 3-4.

56. For the Jewish Revolt of 115-17, see: Schurer i (1973), 529-34; Smallwood, 1976, 421-27 and bibliographies there; see now M. Pucci, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 4 (1978), 63-76.

57. The best survey of Hadrian's work in the provinces is still W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (1907); see also: De Ruggiero, *Diz. Epigr.* iii, 640 ff. (De Vagliari). Two evaluating chapters: Rossovitzeff, *SEHRE*, 362-71; R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), chapter xx. See also: R. Syme, 'Hadrian the Intellectual' in *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne*, Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Madrid-Italica 1964 (1965), 243-54. For Judaea in the early years of Hadrian's reign, see Isaac and Roll, 1979a.

58. For Hadrian as an administrator, see: J. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (1955), 56 ff. Of great interest is a recent study of the changes in the witnesses to military *diplomata*: J. Morris and M. Roxan, *Arheolski Vestnik* 28 (1977), 299-333. The authors have shown that Hadrian introduced changes in administrative practice which must have concerned the whole of the administration. See also: W. Williams, 'Individuality in the Imperial Constitutions', *JRS* 66 (1976), 69-74; P.J. Alexander, 'Letters and Speeches of the Emperor Hadrian', *HSCPh* 49 (1938), 141-77. Den Boer, in his study of Hadrian's religious policy, 1955, concludes that Hadrian had "the one purpose to put everything in the melting pot and so to produce one official religion presenting all the various elements." (p. 130) He further emphasizes the importance of the ruler-cult,

legion was quartered before the Second Revolt, probably immediately after the withdrawal from Mesopotamia.<sup>59</sup> Jones argued that Hadrian transferred the local government in Sepphoris, Tiberias and Neapolis to pagans.<sup>60</sup> This happened in Tiberias before 120, i.e. soon after the accession.<sup>61</sup> Hadrian was an active road-builder in many provinces.<sup>62</sup> The road-network in Syria had been developed since Nero and, especially, under Vespasian by his legate, the elder Trajan.<sup>63</sup> In Arabia roads were constructed by the emperor Trajan, shortly after the annexation. This left a gap in Judaea, to be filled by Hadrian. The significance of Hadrian's road-building in Judaea was noted in two previous publications.<sup>64</sup> Starting from 120 roads were constructed connecting key-sites in the province both with each other and with neighbouring provinces. The roads were built first of all to serve the military. The army is likely to have been involved and this, as noted above, was one of the customary methods of toughening soldiers in the Roman army.<sup>65</sup> It is of some interest for the history

leading to extreme forms of divine honour equalled only under Caracalla (p. 140).

59. B. Isaac and I. Roll, 1979a and b. The legion was the II *Traiana*, according to a milestone published in 1979b. J.P. Rea, *ZPE* 38 (1980), 220 f. does not accept our reading of this milestone. Our reply in *ZPE* is forthcoming. Note that this does not affect the other indications that there was a second legion in Judaea by 120. A vexillation of *II Traiana* in Judaea is also attested on a Hadrianic inscription from Caesarea (A. Negev, *IEJ* 14 (1964), 245).

60. Jones, 1971, 278.

61. A. Kindler, *The Coins of Tiberias* (1961), no. 7b and pp. 48-9; Hill, *BMC, Palestine*, p. xv; cf. Isaac and Roll, 1979a, 62 ff.

62. Weber, 1907, passim; Ruggiero, 621 ff.

63. For the Elder Trajan as governor of Syria, see: G.W. Bowersock, *JRS* 63 (1973), 133 ff. For roads of Vespasian in Syria, see also above, n. 52 and two milestones of 72, recently discovered: *AE* 1974, 652; 653. For milestones of 109 from the region of Palmyra, see: Smallwood, 1966, 136, no. 421 and A. Bouanni, *Annales Archéologiques de la Syrie* 10 (1960), 159-60.

64. Isaac, 1978, 49 and above, n. 59. Meanwhile an additional milestone of Hadrian, AD 129, came to my notice, published in 1962, but unidentified for what it was because of its fragmentary state: N. Zori, 'An Archaeological Survey of the Beth Shean Valley' in: *The Beth Shean Valley, The 17th Archaeological Convention* (1962), 182, no. 120, now lost. It marked the road from Scythopolis to Sussita (Hippos) and thence to Damascus. Dr. I. Roll has now informed me of the discovery of a Hadrianic milestone on the road from Lydda and Antipatris to Gophna and thence to Aelia Capitolina. So far eight major routes in Judea appear to have been marked first by Hadrianic milestones.

65. A Soldier's letter home of 107 shows that units of the legion in Arabia were working in quarries, apparently for the construction of the *via Traiana* (*P. Mich.* viii, 465; cf.: 466 = Smallwood, 1966, 307a; b; cf.: C. Préaux, *Phoibos*

of the Second Revolt that, shortly before it broke out, the army (i.e. the legions, which were responsible for engineering projects, rather than auxiliary units)<sup>66</sup> had constructed roads all over the province.<sup>67</sup>

Jerusalem too was linked with other towns by new roads, one of them certainly, another probably dated to 130.<sup>68</sup> This was the year of Hadrian's visit and, apparently, of the decision to found *Colonia Aelia Capitolina*. As indicated above, the combination of road-building and foundation of colonies was a familiar pattern in Roman history.<sup>69</sup> Programs such as these, in the words of Barbara Levick, were meant, not only to pacify a country but permanently to alter it. Whether these observations apply to Judaea also, depends, to a certain extent, on the nature of the new colony in Jerusalem. The veteran-colonies of Caesar and Augustus were planted in order to serve as garrison-towns. *Aelia Capitolina* was founded a century and a half later on the ruins of a city, where a legionary fortress already existed. The colony itself can not have been intended to serve as a fort. Moreover, it was founded at a time when the systematic establishment of colonies by settlement — as opposed to honorary ones — had already come to an end.<sup>70</sup> For the identity of the first colonists we have two indications. Late Christian sources inform us that they were "Ελληνες which need not signify more than that they were Gentiles."<sup>71</sup> Second there are founder's coins with *vexilla* of the X

5 (1950-1), 123 ff.; M.P. Speidel, *ANRW* ii, 8, 691 ff.). From this we can learn that the construction of the road started immediately after the annexation of the province in 106. The setting up of milestones in 111 and 114 must have formed the last stage.

66. For legionary road-building, see also: Thomsen, 1917, no. 5; *CIL*, viii, 10335; Jos. *BJ* iii, 7, 3 (141-42); 6, 2 (118); v, 2, 1 (47); Isaac and Roll, 1976, 17, 1979b.

67. When Hadrian inspected the army in Africa in 128, practice field-works formed part of the manoeuvres, see: *ILS* 2487 = Smallwood, 1966, 328.

68. Thomsen, 1917, nos. 282; 296; *supra* n. 64.

69. See above, p. 00 and, for the numerous cities founded by Hadrian during his travels: Weber, 1907. We may note Rostovtzeff's comment on Hadrian's urbanizing: "His activity was devoted chiefly to the lands which by their position were destined to be the bases on which the most important military frontiers rested." (*SEHRE*, 366). It has been suggested that the roads were constructed for the emperor's travels, i.e. to facilitate his passage (e.g. Avi-Yonah, 1974, 400; *IEJ* 1 (1950-1), 56-8). This might be true for the third century when, at such occasions, series of milestone-inscriptions would be set up on existing roads. It is not plausible that the whole road-network in a province was first constructed for the convenience of Hadrian and his *familia*.

70. See Sherwin-White, 1973, 253; see also Vittinghoff, 1952, 29.

71. Zonaras, *Ann.* xi, 23c; Malalas, *Chron.*, 279 (Dindorf).

*Fret.*<sup>72</sup> These have been taken to indicate the close relationship between colony and legion. This, however, is never the purpose of such coins. They invariably indicate the units from which colonists in a new colony were discharged.<sup>73</sup> And this should be their meaning in Aelia as well. As noted above, when Aelia was founded, no other colony attached to a legionary fortress was known. We may perhaps accept Jones' suggestion that the *canabae legionis* (or whatever was left of them after 135) formed the nucleus of Aelia Capitolina.<sup>74</sup> If this is true, then the citizens of the colony would be veterans of *X Fret.*, settling in the colony and inhabitants of the former *canabae* and *prata legionis*. This would make sense in terms of the history of Roman colonization, which furnishes no parallel for the settlement of a group of nondescript "Syrians and Arabs", as has been suggested.<sup>75</sup>

The title of a colony would enhance the status of the city, since only this rank carried more prestige than that of a *polis*.<sup>76</sup> It would

72. Kadman, 1956, nos. 53; 54; cf.: 55-60.

73. See above, n. 37.

74. 1940, 64. The suggestion is not repeated in 1971, 277, where he speaks only of 'foreign colonists'. Note the tombstones of legionaries found in Jerusalem (above, p. 00). Since we know nothing of the topography and organization of the legionary base at the time, it is not clear whether we should speak, in principle, of *canabae* or whether civil settlement would be the correct term or if there was no such distinction. *V. supra*, p. 00.

75. Avi-Yonah, 1974, 404: "Syrer und Araber wurden in der Stadt und ihrem Gebiet angesiedelt." See also: Smallwood, 1976, 459; Lifshitz, *ANRW* ii, 8, 484. There is, in fact, no parallel for the *deductio* of civilian non-veterans, let alone non-citizens, after Caesar and Augustus, cf.: Jones, 1940, 61-3; Bowersock, 1965, 67-8; Sherwin-White, 1971, 228-29. J. Meyshan, *PEQ* 90 (1958), 19-26 published a founder's coin of Aelia with vexillum on the reverse on which, according to the author, 'LE V' can be read. Meyshan therefore attributes to the Leg. V *Macedonica* the recapture of Jerusalem in the Second Revolt and her subsequent colonization. As noted by Prof. Applebaum, 1976, n. 243, it seems altogether probable that we are faced with an error for 'LEX'. The reading 'LE V' was supported by Kadman, 1956, 2, but it must be said that the photograph in the article is too vague to show any lettering. Dr. A. Kindler of the Museum Ha'aretz, Tel-Aviv, informed me that he could not identify any lettering on the original either. For the population of Jerusalem between 70 and 130, see: Smallwood, 1976, 433; Alon, vol. i, 35; Lifshitz, *ANRW* ii, 8, 471-73.

76. This appears from the fact that Greek *poleis* requested the rank of *colonia* from emperors; however, it has been emphasized in literature on the subject that the *Colonia Civium Romanorum* was, in the East, a marginal phenomenon as compared with the status of *polis*. It was local status and the relative prestige of communities which mattered, i.e., that of *polis*, *mētropolis*

save the inhabitants taxes.<sup>77</sup> These privileges would make Aelia an attractive place to live in, at the cost of the imperial treasury. But the question why Hadrian decided to make his new city a colony remains to be answered. His religious policy could have been realized just as well in a *polis* without colonial status.<sup>78</sup> Moreover the foundation of a colony involved extra investments. A recent study has shown that the grant of colonial status to a city usually was accompanied by the building of a city-wall.<sup>79</sup> A second-century wall is not yet clearly attested in Jerusalem,<sup>80</sup> but evidence from other colonies leads one to suppose that Aelia was furnished with walls at the time of the foundation (similarly we should expect Flavian building-activity in Caesarea).<sup>81</sup>

A possible explanation for the grant of colonial status may be found by comparison with contemporary patterns in other pro-

and additional titles, cf.: B. Levick, *Numismatic Chronicle* 7 (1967), 34-5; Millar, 1977, 407-09; also: Jones, 1940, 64-5.

77. According to Paulus, *Dig. L*, 15, 8, 7 Aelia had the same rights as Caesarea, i.e. freedom from land and poll-tax.

78. Jewish resistance against the foundation of Aelia may not have been directed against the establishment of a colony as such. Jews were willing to live as citizens in *poleis* and there may be evidence that the status of a colony was, in their eyes, desirable. Agrippa I is on record as having claimed that he might have dared to ask on behalf of his native city, if not for the Roman citizenship (*πολιτεία*) then at least freedom or relief from taxes. (Philo, *Leg.* 36, 287). Millar, 1977, 407 pointed out that *πολιτεία* must refer to the status of a colony, since there was no other way of granting Roman citizenship *en bloc*. We can be reasonably sure that Agrippa I would not have considered involving Jerusalem in anything abhorrent to the Jews. Again, almost two hundred years later, R. Jehuda Hanassi is represented as asking the emperor for colonial status on behalf of Tiberias (b. Abodah zarah 10a). The information itself is untrustworthy, because it is part of a series of stories on the close relationship between R. Jehuda and an emperor Antoninus. However, it shows that colonial status was considered desirable among Jews. (I am indebted to Dr. I. Ben Shalom and Dr. A. Oppenheimer for clarification on this point.) It is therefore quite possible that not the organization of Jerusalem as a colony provoked Jewish resistance, but the decision to make it a pagan city and the plans for the site of the temple.

79. See the papers by P.-A. Février in: *Omaggio à Fernand Benoit* iii (1972) = *Rivista di Studi Liguri* 35 (1969), 277-86 and H.-G. Pflaum, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 260-62.

80. See Smallwood, 1976, 461; R.W. Hamilton, *QDAP* 10 (1944), 26; 35; 52 and above, n. 6.

81. There is no reference to the possibility of Flavian building in Caesarea in archaeological literature e.g. *Enc. Arch. Exc.* i, 273; L.I. Levine, *Roman Caesarea* (1975), 9-11; Ringel, 1975, chapters ii-iv.

vinces.<sup>82</sup> If it is accepted that the nucleus of Aelia Capitolina was formed by the legionary *canabae* and that many of the settlers were former legionaries this will have made Aelia, in a sense, one of the last real veteran colonies. In any event it is evident that the foundation of Aelia entailed the settlement of Roman citizens in a newly established town. In this respect it was fundamentally different from the honorary colonies which were existing communities elevated to the rank of a colony. Caesarea was one of the first colonies of this type, while Aelia was one of the last colonies established by settlement. As noted by Dobson and Mann, there were two main reasons for the discontinuance of veteran-colonies: new sites ceased to become available as the expansion of the empire came to an end and as legions ceased to move forward, but more important, they argue, was the fact that the veterans themselves did not like being moved away from what had become their real homes.<sup>82a</sup> Jerusalem was not a vacated legionary site, it was a military base in a ruined city. Both the site and the veterans for a colony were available. At Aelia they could settle in a new colony without being moved away from their real homes. Many of the settlers may have been veterans of the legion who had been discharged years ago and had not left Jerusalem. Aelia has, therefore, much in common with western veteran colonies. What sets it apart from these are the geographic proximity of, and close ties with the legionary headquarters. This was normal in the East but not, in this period, in the West.

Another consideration may also have played a role when the decision was taken to found Aelia. Mócsy has observed that under Trajan the number of *coloniae* corresponds to the number of legions in some of the European frontier provinces.<sup>83</sup> He concluded that new colonies were created as new recruitment areas for the provincial armies.<sup>84</sup> Many legionaries in these provinces came indeed from the colonies.<sup>85</sup> Dobson and Mann agree that the veteran colonies pro-

82. See also: Isaac and Roll, 1979a, 65-6.

82a. Dobson and Mann, 1973, 196.

83. Mócsy, 1974, 94. I have found no discussion of this phenomenon in literature on other provinces. It happens to be true for Syria as well, if Heliopolis was a foundation of Augustus. However, the third colony in the province was founded by Claudius before the correspondence in numbers had any significance.

84. Mócsy, 1974, 118. On recruitment, see Dobson and Mann, 1973; P.A. Brunt, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 1 (1974), 90 ff.

85. Cf. A. Mócsy, *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der Römischen Provinz Moesia Superior* (1970), 168; 170. For Britain, see Dobson and Mann, 1973, 202 f.

duced many recruits, but they deny that this was the reason for their foundation, for otherwise, they say, many more would have been founded. As a general statement this may be true, but, in the absence of any evidence, it is hard to distinguish between function and effect. Since emperors must have been aware of the effects of founding colonies some of them may have been founded to serve, among other things, as centres for the recruitment of legionaries.

Little is known about the origins of legionary recruits in Judaea. There are, however, facts which seem to indicate that in this province, too, the colonies played an important role. F. Millar has pointed out that an invariable consequence of acquiring the rank of *colonia* in the imperial period was that all the citizens of the town became Roman citizens. "In the established empire it was the principal means by which the emperor gave the citizenship to communities, and as regards Greek cities it seems to have been the only means."<sup>85</sup> For Judaea this means that the citizens of Caesarea in the seventies and those of Aelia Capitolina in the thirties of the next century became Roman citizens.

Two Roman soldiers who came from Caesarea may be mentioned here as a matter of interest. First L. Cornelius Simon, who appears as a witness on diploma CIL XVI, 15 of A.D. 71. He must have been a Caesarean Jew who fought in the Roman army during the First Jewish Revolt. Presumably he came to the West with the troops in 69. The other is the recipient of diploma CIL XVI 106 of A.D. 157: Barsimso Callisthenis f. He was recruited when the Second Jewish Revolt broke out in 132. He must have been one of the few Jews who helped to suppress that revolt. As noted above, the garrison of Judaea was, until 70, drawn mainly from Caesareans and Sebastenes.<sup>86</sup> These, being non-citizens, could serve in the auxilia only. These units, having behaved in an irresponsible manner before the outbreak of the First Revolt were, after the revolt, transferred to other provinces.<sup>87</sup> There is, however, no reason to assume that recruits for these units were drawn from Judaea for a long time afterwards. In Judaea, from 70 onwards, there was one legion along with units of auxilia.<sup>88</sup> The promotion of Caesarea to colonial status made Roman citizens of the Caesareans and consequently they could serve

85a. Millar, 1977, 407.

86. Schürer i (1973), 362-65.

87. Jos. Ant. xix, 9, 2 (366).

88. For *X Fret.* in Judaea, v. supra n. 6; for the auxilia, see the diploma of 86, CIL xvi, 33.

in the legions. Hadrian added a legion and a colony. The second legion was based at Caparcotna which did not see rapid urban development.<sup>89</sup> As a result of the foundation of *Colonia Aelia Capitolina* all male citizens of the city could serve in the legions. This, as in the case of Caesarea, would include inhabitants of the colonial territory.<sup>90</sup>

In summary, two points may be stressed: the nucleus of Aelia Capitolina seems to have been formed by veterans of the *X Fretensis* and by its *canabae*. One of the important consequences of the foundation of the colony was that its population received the Roman citizenship and thus could serve in the legions based in the province. The relationship between Aelia and *X Fret.*, however, is unclear and will remain so until more evidence is forthcoming on legionary establishments in the eastern provinces.<sup>91</sup> If the Bar Kokhba revolt was caused partly or mainly by the foundation of Aelia, it is helpful to realize what kind of pagan city superseded Jerusalem. Hadrian decided in 130 to organize Aelia as a garrison town, dominated by the legionary headquarters and the veterans of the *X Fretensis*.

Roman administration in Judaea was marked by a combination of improvisation and traditional policy, both with unfortunate results. Reluctance to get involved more than necessary may account for the fact that Judaea was the first Roman province with an equestrian prefect, rather than a senator as governor.<sup>92</sup> The same may be true for the years after 70, when Judaea was the first province with an ex-praetor serving both as governor and as commander of the legion.<sup>93</sup> As argued above, Caesarea seems to have been the

89. It did not acquire city-status until the reign of Diocletian (Maximianopolis): Hieronymus, *PL* 25, 1589; Hierocles, *Synecdemus*, 398, 25 (Niebuhr); *It. Burdigalense* (Geyer), 19:19; see also Jones, 1971, 279-80.

90. See above, n. 13.

91. At present we can only point to two observations of a general nature, namely that Hadrian gradually introduced the system of local recruiting and thus created an army familiar with the needs of the provinces in which it was stationed (Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, 363; for recruitment policy, *v. supra*). Secondly, it has been observed that Hadrian's consistent policy of fostering town life in the provinces was, among other things, motivated by his desire to base the army on those elements regarded by Rome as civilized (Rostovtzeff, 365-66). This again was a tradition from earlier times. In Pseudo-Sallust, *Ad Caes.* ii, 5, 8 Caesar is advised to found colonies in order to enrich the army.

92. H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Procurateurs Équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain* (1950), 22-4. Egypt, of course, was also governed by an equestrian prefect.

93. The second province was Arabia in 106. See B.E. Thomasson, 'The One-

first honorary colony in the eastern provinces.<sup>94</sup> This will certainly have been a reward for past loyalty, but recruitment for the legion is likely to have been a factor as well. As formulated by Rostovtzeff: "The first duty of the newly constituted (Flavian) cities was to send their youth to the legions."<sup>95</sup> We are ill informed on the history of Judaea between the first and the second Revolt, but it is clear that, apart from these measures and those mentioned above things were left rather as they were. Of Hadrian's measures only an outline can be detected, but it is clear that he instituted drastic reforms in many fields. And it can no longer be doubted that a start was made in the first years of the reign. When more evidence becomes available we may be able to trace the development and extent of Hadrian's policy in Judaea, just as Den Boer has sketched succeeding phases in the development of Hadrian's religious policy.<sup>96</sup> In this connection it is worth noting that the year 130 clearly showed a progress towards absolutism.<sup>97</sup> By this time Hadrian's plans for Judaea had assumed a definite shape. Part was traditional, such as the combination of road-building and colonization as a prelude to the pacification of an area inhabited by an unwieldy people. Part was new, such as the nature of the new colony which formed part of a Legionary establishment rather than constituting a garrison-city by itself. Added to this there was Hadrian's religious policy, a peculiarity of this Emperor, which had its consequences for the colony and is reflected by its names.<sup>98</sup>

It can, perhaps, be said that the first revolt was the result of neglect by the central government, the second of over-interference.

Legion Provinces of the Roman Empire during the Principate', *Opuscula Romana* 9 (1973), 63 f. Thomasson argues that these one-legion provinces are, in fact, each a legionary command removed from the jurisdiction of the senior legate of Syria.

94. *V. supra*, p. 00.

95. *SEHRE*, 107.

96. *V. supra*, 00.

97. *Op. cit.*, 139.

98. It may be noted that both elements of the name *Aelia Capitolina* refer to Hadrian himself. The latter is the Latin equivalent of *Olympios*, Hadrian's favourite epithet, Latin because a Roman colony ought to have a Roman name. In naming Jerusalem *Aelia Capitolina* he dedicated the city to himself as identified with the Capitoline Jupiter.

LIST OF WORKS TO WHICH ABBREVIATED REFERENCE  
HAS BEEN MADE

- Alon, vol. I Along, G., *The History of the Jews in the period of the Mishna and the Talmud* (1952-). (Hebrew).
- ANRW ii, 8 *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase), ii, Band 8 (1977).
- Applebaum, 1976 Applebaum, Sh., *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt*.
- Avi-Yonah, 1966 Avi-Yonah, M., *The Holy Land* (<sup>2</sup> 1977 has an extensive toponymic index).
- Avi-Yonah, 1974 Avi-Yonah, M., P.-W., *Sup. xiii*, s.v. 'Palaestina' cols. 11-454.
- Avi-Yonah, 1976 Avi-Yonah, M., *Gazetteer of Roman Palestine*.
- BMC, Galatia etc. Wroth, W., *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum: Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria* (1899).
- BMC, Palestine Hill, G.F., *id.: Palestine* (1914).
- BMC, Phoenicia Hill, G.F., *id.: Phoenicia* (1910).
- Bowersock, 1965 Bowersock, G.W., *Augustus and the Greek World*.
- Bowersock, 1971 Bowersock, G.W., *JRS* 61, 219-42.
- Den Boer, 1955 Den Boer, W., 'Religion and Literature in Hadrian's Policy', *Mnemosyne* 8, 123-44.
- Dobson and Mann, 1973 Dobson, B. and Mann, J.C., *Britannia* 4, 191-205.
- Enc. Arch. Exc. *Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. M. Avi-Yonah), vols. i (1975); ii (1976); iii-iv (1977-8, with E. Stern).
- Grant, 1946 Grant, M., *From Imperium to Auctoritas*.
- Head, Hist. Num. Head, B.V., *Historia Numorum* (<sup>2</sup> 1911).
- Isaac, 1978 Isaac, B., *PEQ* 110, 47-60.
- Isaac and Roll, 1979a Isaac, B. and Roll, I., *Latomus* 38, 54-66.
- Isaac and Roll, 1979b Isaac, B. and Roll, I., *ZPE* 33, 149-56.
- Jones, 1940 Jones, A.H.M., *The Greek City*.
- Jones, 1971 Jones, A.H.M., *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Second Edition).
- Kadman, 1956 Kadman, L., *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina*.
- Kadman, 1957 Kadman, L., *The Coins of Caesarea Maritima*.
- Kadman, 1961 Kadman, L., *The Coins of Akko-Ptolemais*.
- Kraft, 1951 Kraft, K., *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Koherten an Rhein und Donau*.
- Levick, 1967 Levick, B., *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*.
- Magie, 1950 Magie, D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*.
- Millar, 1977 Millar, F., *The Emperor and the Roman World*.
- Mócsy, 1974 Mócsy, A., *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*.
- Momigliano, 1934 Momigliano, A., *Ricerche sull'Organizzazione della Giudea sotto il Dominio Romano*.

- Ringel, 1975
- Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*
- Rüger, 1968
- Schürer i (1901)
- Schürer ii
- Schürer i (1973) and  
ii (1979)
- Sherwin-White, 1973
- Smallwood, 1966
- Smallwood, 1976
- Thomsen, 1917
- Vittinghoff, 1952
- Weber, 1907
- Ringel, J., *Césaree de Palestine, Étude Historique et Archéologique.*
- Rostovtzeff, M., *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Second Edition, revised by P.M. Fraser, 1957).
- Rüger, C., *Germania Inferior.*
- Schürer, E., *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Vol. i.
- Op. cit., vol. ii (1907).
- id.*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar).
- Sherwin-White, A.N., *The Roman Citizenship* (Second Edition).
- Smallwood, E.M., *Documents illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian.*
- Smallwood, E.M., *The Jews in the Roman Empire.*
- Thomsen, P., *ZDPV* 40, 1 ff.
- Vittinghoff, F., *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechts Politik.*
- Weber, W., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus.*