Hannah M. Cotton

Some Aspects of the Roman Administration of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina*

This paper falls into two parts: in the first part I discuss the provincialization of the territory that came to be called the province of Judaea, and later Syria-Palaestina¹; in the second part I look at the administration of the so-called 'Jewish region' of Judaea in the light of the recently published documents from the Judaean Desert.

I

Judaea came under direct Roman rule only in 6 CE with the exile of Herod's son, the Tetrarch Archelaus. From the conquest of Judaea by Pompey in 63 BCE until 6 CE, Judaea was ruled first by descendants of the Hasmonaeen house without royal title and later by the Herodian dynasty. Pompey reduced the extent of Jewish territory by annexing all the coastal cities and those of the Decapolis to the new province of Syria². Judaea included then Judaea proper, Idumaea, Samaria, the Peraea and the Galilee. Under Herod the districts of Batanea, the Trachonitis and Auranitis were added to his kingdom³. After Herod's death the kingdom was divided between his three sons. Archelaus had Judaea proper, Idumaea, and Samaria including the cities of Caesarea, Samaria-Sebaste, Jerusalem and Joppa – this part came under direct Roman rule upon his exile in 6 CE. Philip received Batanea, the Trachonitis and Auranitis – districts with mixed population where the non-Jewish element prevailed. It is little wonder that after his death they were attached to the province of Syria. Herod Antipas received the Galilee and the Peraea. He was deposed in 37 CE and his territory was granted to Agrippa I who

* The citation of bibliographical references in the notes has been deliberately reduced to a minimum, both to preserve the form of a lecture, and because of exigencies of space.

¹ This is part of the prolegmena to the projected *Fasti of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina* by *H. M. Cotton, W. Eck and Sh. Naeh*.

² See *E. Schürer, G. Vermes, F. Millar*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* I (Edinburgh 1973–87) 240.

³ *Ibid.* I, 291.

later received from Claudius the whole of Herod the Great's earlier kingdom together with a royal title. Agrippa's reign lasted only three years, from 41 to 44. After his death Judaea was once more under direct Roman rule. In the 50s the territory that had been subject to Philip (Batanea, the Trachonitis and Auranitis), with parts of the Peraea and the Galilee was bestowed on Agrippa II. The non-Jewish parts were incorporated once more into the province of Syria upon his death in 93/4, whereas the Jewish were joined to the rest of the Jewish territory⁵.

I have deliberately used the expression 'came under direct Roman rule' for Archelaus' ethnarchy and for Agrippa's kingdom and refrained from saying, it became the province of Judaea, since this seems to me a moot point, one which needs to be discussed once more.

Josephus' statement in BJ 2.117 about the fate of Judaea after Archelaus' deposition – τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης ἐπίτροπος τῆς ἱππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως Κωπώνιος πέμπεται – which implies that Archelaus' former kingdom was reduced to a province, does not decide the issue, for this is in stark contradiction to what he himself says in AJ 17.355 – τῆς δ' Ἀρχελάου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσεμεθεῖσης τῇ Σύρων – and in AJ 18.2 – παρὴν δὲ καὶ Κυρίνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκη τῆς Κυρίας – namely that Judaea was annexed to the province of Syria⁶.

There is no doubt at all that a part of the Herodian kingdom was provincialized in 6 CE, but was it from the beginning the *provincia Iudaea*? Was it from the beginning an independent province with its independent provincial governor? We may not use the fact that it later became an independent province as proof that it was so from the very beginning.

The current consensus is that from the beginning there existed an independent Roman province of Judaea⁷, first ruled by a governor with the title of *praefectus*⁸, who later on was designated *procurator*⁹, and that the difference was merely sem-

⁴ Ibid. I, 442–53.

⁵ Ibid. I, 330–57.

⁶ A. Shalit, who believes that Judaea was annexed to Syria from 6 till 66 CE (Roman Administration in Palestine [Jerusalem 1937] 11) explains away the contradiction by maintaining that Judaea constituted an independent administrative unit within the province of Syria, *ibid.* 89 and n. 97 on p. 149.

⁷ Cf. M. Goodman, in: CAH X² (1996) 750 ff.; see the admirably cautious exposition of M. Stern, The Province of Judaea, in: S. Safrai, M. Stern (eds.), The Jewish People in the First Century I (Assen 1974) 308 ff. Stern's final judgement, however, is that Judaea was an independent province from 6 CE. There are some dissenting voices, e.g. M. Ghiretti, Lo 'status' della Giudea dall'età Augustea all'età Claudia, in: Latomus 44 (1985) 751–66, some of whose arguments agree with those presented here.

⁸ This is established by the inscription of Pontius Pilatus from Caesarea, in: AE (1963) 104; see G. Labbé, Ponce Pilate et la munificence de Tibère. L'inscription de Césarée, in: REA 93 (1991) 277–97 and L. Boffo, Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia (Brescia 1994) no. 25, 217–33.

⁹ For this designation there is no epigraphical evidence in Judaea.

antic; the difference between *praefectus* and *procurator* in imperial provinces was one in name only¹⁰.

It is quite possible that this became true later, but were early *praefecti* distinguished from the later *procuratores* in only name? Perhaps. Nonetheless, it seems more likely that the change of name coincided with a change in the status of the former *praefecti*. This assumption may account for the fact that no praesidial procurators are attested in the provinces before Claudius. Furthermore, were all early *praefecti* of the same status? It is tacitly assumed that the presence of a *praefectus* in Judaea means that Augustus restructured the province of Judaea on the Egyptian model¹¹. I believe that Egypt in any case should not be taken as a model since this province was created in the special circumstances prevailing after Actium. A special law was passed in the *comitia* to regulate the unusual appointment of an equestrian¹². Egypt remained unusual to the extent that three and later two legions were stationed there under the command of an equestrian. This happened in no other province: nowhere else were legions under the command of an equestrian governor. Later, when a legion was stationed in Judaea, the status of its governor changed to that of a senator¹³.

There are good reasons to equate the *praefectus* of Judaea with prefects of 'civitates' and 'gentes', about whom we know that they were dependent on provincial governors; in their case the evidence is based solely on inscriptions¹⁴. These *praefecti* did not govern autonomous provinces, but parts of provinces where special circumstances called for the presence of a special functionary. I assume that unlike independent governors these prefects would normally not be vested with full authority to judge provincials in capital cases¹⁵. It is in the light of this assumption that we should understand Josephus' explicit statement in the case of the first prefect of Judaea, Coponius: Κωπώνιος τε αὐτῷ (Κυρινίῳ) συνκαταπέμπεται

¹⁰ Schürer, Vermes, Millar, I (n. 2) 359.

¹¹ See A. Bowman, in: CAH X² (1996) 346.

¹² Dig. I.17.1 (Ulpian): 'praefectus Aegypti non prius deponit praefecturam et imperium, quod ad similitudinem proconsulis lege sub Augusto ei datum est, quam Alexandriam ingressus sit successor eius ...'.

¹³ Cf. Cappadocia: it was governed by procurators with auxiliary forces under their command until Vespasian, when it was united with Galatia under a consular *legatus Augusti pro praetore* with two legions under him; see W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian*. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluß der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter (Vestigia 13, München 1970) 2–3.

¹⁴ E.g. the *praefecti* in Spain: CIL II 4616 = ILS 6948: praefectus Asturiae, tribunus militum legionis secundae; CIL II 3271: praef. Gallaeciae; in Numidia: CIL V 5267 = ILS 2721: praefectus coh. VII Lusitanorum et nationum Gaetulicarum sex quae sunt in Numidia; in Sardinia: CIL XIV 2954 = ILS 2684: praef. coh. Corsorum et civitatum Barbariae; on the Danube and the Alps: CIL V 1838/9 = ILS 1349: primopilus leg. V Macedonic., praef. civitatum Treballiae, praef. civitatum in Alpibus Maritimis; CIL IX 3044 = ILS 2689: praef[ectus] Raetis Vindolicis valli[s] Pjoeninae et levis armatur(ae). On these early prefects see H. Zwicky, *Zur Verwendung des Militärs in der Verwaltung der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1944) 11 ff.

¹⁵ See Ghiretti, (n. 7) 765.

τάγματος τῶν ἱππέων ἡγεσόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ (AJ 18.2)¹⁶. And indeed we find both in Josephus as well as in the New Testament the prefects making full use of their absolute penal jurisdiction¹⁷. However, there would have been no need to specify the grant of such competence had Coponius been an independent governor.

Considerations of size may well have contributed to the decision not to turn a territory into an independent province. ‚Archelaus’ ethnarchy was too small to demand the creation of an independent province¹⁸. The smallest province, Cyprus with its 8,500 square km was bigger than the combined size of what had earlier been Archelaus’ ethnarchy. The simplest way, on the face of it, was to annex the ethnarchy to the neighboring province of Syria¹⁹. The appointment of a prefect subordinate to the governor of Syria fits in well with the size of territories put elsewhere under the command of a *praefectus*.

The census of 6 CE in Judaea is taken as a proof for the inauguration of Judaea as a new independent province. The notion that a provincial census followed immediately upon the annexation of a territory to the Roman empire is not, however, well founded²⁰. That a census took place in Judaea at the time of its provincialization was a mere coincidence: at the time, as we know both from Josephus and from ILS 2683²¹, a census was conducted in Syria by the governor P. Sulpicius Quirinius; naturally the census spread into the newly *annexed* territory. Josephus explicitly combines the fact of annexation with the administration of the census: Κυρίνιος δὲ ... ἐπὶ Κυρίας παρῆν ὑπὸ Καίσαρος δικαιოდότης τοῦ ἔθνους ἀπεστελαμένος καὶ τιμητὴς τῶν οὐσιῶν γενησόμενος. Κωπώνιος τε αὐτῷ συγκαταπέμπεται τάγματος τῶν ἱππέων ἡγεσόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ. παρῆν δὲ καὶ Κυρίνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκην τῆς Κυρίας γενομένην ἀποτιμησόμενος τε αὐτῶν τὰς οὐσίας καὶ ἀποδωσόμενος τὰ Ἀρχελαίου χρήματα (AJ 18.1-2)²². The Judaea-centred view of the census as the inauguration of a new province distorts the true picture.

On the other hand the assumption that the prefect of Judaea, although appointed by the emperor²³, was a subordinate of the governors of Syria would

¹⁶ Cf. BJ 2, 117: Κωπώνιος πέμπεται, μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν. I do not accept Stern’s explanation for Josephus’ statement (n. 7), 337.

¹⁷ *Schürer, Vermes, Millar*, I (n. 2) 367 ff.

¹⁸ *Stern*, (n. 7) 309.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ See in detail *H. M. Cotton*, ‘Η νέα ἐπαρχία Ἀραβία: The New Province of Arabia in the Papyri from the Judaean Desert, in: *ZPE* 116 (1997) 204–208.

²¹ Q. Aemilius Q. f. Pal. Secundus [in] castris divi Aug. s[ub] P. Sulpi[c]io Quirinio le[gato] C[a]esaris Syriae honoribus decoratus, pr[a]efect. cohort. Aug. I, pr[a]efect. cohort. II classicae; idem iussu Quirini censum egi Aramena civitatis millium homin. civium CXVII. See *Boffo*, (n. 8) no. 23, 182–203.

²² Cf. AJ 17.355: τῆς δ’ Ἀρχελαίου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνεμηθείσης τῇ Σύρων, πέμπται Κυρίνιος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός, ἀποτιμησόμενος τὰ ἐν Κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῦ Ἀρχελαίου ἀποδωσόμενος οἶκον.

²³ *Stern*, (n. 7) 319.

explain the constant interventions of the latter in Judaea in matters which were not purely military²⁴ – an intervention that cannot always be explained by special authorization²⁵.

All this seems to me to justify a reconsideration of what Josephus says – namely that Judaea was subordinate to the province of Syria – before we conclude that Judaea became an independent province in 6 CE. Josephus says so in so many words in AJ 18.2 (τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκην τῆς Κυρίας γενομένην), and in AJ 17.355 (τῆς δ' Ἀρχελαίου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσσημειώσεως τῇ Σύρων)²⁶.

When did Judaea become an independent province?

There are reasons to believe that this happened in 44 with the death of Agrippa I, and the provincialization of his kingdom. This time the territory in question was much larger than in 6 CE. Furthermore, under Claudius the equestrian procurator as a praesidial governor makes his appearance elsewhere in the Empire²⁷. Two of the governors of Judaea, unlike the earlier prefects, are known to have served in other procuratorial posts before and after their governorship of Judaea. Ti. Iulius Alexander had served as *epistrategus* of the Thebaid in Egypt²⁸ before becoming governor of Judaea in 46–8, and in 66 was appointed prefect of Egypt²⁹. Luceius Albinus proceeded directly from Judaea, where he was governor in 62–64, to the governorship of Mauretania Caesarensis to which Tingitana was added later³⁰. All these facts would suggest that by now Judaea had become an independent procuratorial province. This, however, cannot be easily reconciled with what Tacitus says about the status of Judaea in 49 CE (ann. 12.23.1): *Ituraeique et Iudaei defunctis regibus Sohaemo atque Agrippa provinciae Syriae additi*³¹. This he could not have invented, but must have found in his sources, for in his own time Judaea was an independent praetorian (or already consular) province (see below).

During the Great Revolt of 66–70 the Roman field commanders ruled Judaea, and Antonius Iulianus, the procurator mentioned in Josephus (BJ 6.238) as taking

²⁴ E.g. the vestments of the High Priest.

²⁵ As pointed out by Stern, (n. 7) 313, and see the whole discussion there.

²⁶ Tac., ann. 2.42.5: *et provinciae Syria atque Iudaea fessae oneribus deminutionem tributi orabant*, for 18 CE, seems at first sight to imply that Judaea, like Syria, was an independent province. However, the term *provinciae* could have been added by Tacitus himself, in view of Judaea's status in his own time. Thus there is all the more reason to give credence to what he says in ann. 12.23.1 cited later.

²⁷ For Raetia, see H. Wolff, in: CAH X² (1996) 541 f.; for Noricum see J. J. Wilkes, *ibid.* 568; for Thrace *idem*, *ibid.* 567; for Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana see C. R. Whittaker, *ibid.* 598–9.

²⁸ Pflaum, Carrières 1165.

²⁹ PIR² J 139; E. G. Turner, 'Tiberius Iulius Alexander', in: JRS 44 (1954) 54–64.

³⁰ Tac., hist. 2.58; PIR² L 354.

³¹ Note, though, that ann. 12.23.1 echoes hist. 5.9: *Claudius defunctis regibus aut ad modicum redactis, Iudaeam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permisit*, which seems to imply that Claudius reduced Judaea to a province, unless the renewal of provincialization after Agrippa's death is all that is implied here.

part in Titus' war council, must now have been in charge of finance only. After the revolt Judaea became a one-legion praetorian province ruled by a *legatus Augusti pro praetore* in charge of the province as well as of the legion – the *Legio Decima Fretensis*. In fact it was the first province to have a *legatus Augusti pro praetore* of praetorian rank in charge of a legion³². Before the Bar Kokhba revolt the status of the governor of Judaea changed once more – thus not as a result of the revolt. At an unknown date a second legion, first the *Legio II Traiana*, later permanently replaced by the *Legio Sexta Ferrata*, was stationed in Judaea and a consular governor was put in charge. The exact date of the change is unknown. If we accept the argument of Isaac and Roll that the second legion is already attested in 120 CE, then this must be the date *ante quem* Judaea became a consular province³³. It has been suggested that the change could have come about already under Pompeius Falco³⁴, and that a likely date for the transfer of the *Legio II Traiana* to Judaea was after the second Dacian War, i.e. 107–108. It seems prudent though, in the absence of compelling evidence, to suspend our final dating of the change from praetorian to consular status.

After the Bar Kokhba revolt, if not already before its conclusion, the name of the province was changed from Judaea to Syria-Palaestina – thus suppressing the Jewish identity of the province. The province remained under a senator of consular rank since he was in charge of two legions at least until the reign of Probus (276–82): two governors of senatorial rank from this reign are now attested on two columns from Caesarea Maritima³⁵. At the latest by 293–305 the governor became an equestrian as twice attested on the same columns for Aufidius Priscus *v(ir) p(erfectissimus) pr(aeses) prov(inciae) Pal(estinae)*³⁶. This brings us down to the end of the third century.

³² B. E. Thomasson, The One-Legion Provinces of the Roman Empire during the Principate, in: *Opuscula Romana* IX:7 (1973) 63. The other one-legion provinces (Hispania Citerior and Dalmatia) were consular; a *legatus legionis* of praetorian rank was in charge of the one legion. In Hispania Citerior the second legion was removed at the latest in 63, see Alföldy, in: *CAH* X² (1996) 454; in Dalmatia, the second legion was removed in 58 or 59, see Ritterling, *RE* XII.1, s.v. *legio* (1255).

³³ *Legio II Traiana* in Judaea, in: *ZPE* 33 (1979) 149–56; contra, J. Rea, in: *ZPE* 38 (1980) 220–1; B. Isaac, I. Roll, in: *ZPE* 47 (1982) 131–2.

³⁴ W. Eck, Zum konsularen Status von Iudaea im frühen 2. Jahrhundert, in: *BASP* 21 (1984) 55–67. His conjecture is based on this governor's two career inscriptions: *CIL* X 6321 = *ILS* 1035 (prope Tarracinam) and *CIL* III 12117 = *ILS* 1036 = *JHS* 11 (1896) 253 (Hierapolis Castabala); note the *consularis* in the second inscription: leg. Aug. leg. X Fret. et leg. pr. pr. [pr]ovinciae Iudaeae consularis.

³⁵ B. Burrell, Two inscribed columns from Caesarea Maritima, in: *ZPE* 99 (1993) 288–9, column I, insc. 2 = AE 1993, 1620, ll. 5–6: *(v)ir c(larissimus) praes(es) prov(inciae) Syr(iae) Pal(estinae)*; for the senatorial status of Acilius Cleobulus (Burrell, 292–3, column II, insc. 2 = AE 1993, 1623) see W. Eck, Zu lateinischen Inschriften aus Caesarea, in: *ZPE* 113 (1996) 141 ff.

³⁶ Burrell, *ibid.* 290–1, column I, insc. 3 = AE 1993, 1621; 293–4, column II, insc. 3 = AE 1993, 1624.

In conclusion of this part I should like to re-emphasize two facts. First, from 63 BCE to the end of the first century CE, the area of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina was subject to fluctuation between direct Roman and dynastic rule. Secondly, even after the introduction of direct Roman rule the history of the province of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina is characterized by violent political, administrative, and military changes reflected in the changing ranks of its officials.

The unique sources at our disposal, as well as other factors – not to be admitted by the impartial historian – have conspired to create the notion of the special and unique status of the province of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina within the Roman empire³⁷. Was it so regarded by the Romans? To a certain extent the answer is that it was – at least in practice; we cannot explain otherwise the violent changes in the status of the territory in the period described above. Its provincialization began in 6 CE, when it is likely to have been annexed to the Roman province of Syria; it may have become an independent procuratorial province between 44 and 67; it was promoted to a praetorian province in 70 CE; finally, at an unknown date in the early second century it became a consular province, with two legions as well as three cavalry *alae* and twelve cohorts at the disposal of the governor³⁸ – and all that in what was after all an exceedingly small province. The Romans must have felt themselves faced with special problems calling for special administrative and military measures³⁹.

II

Having discussed the more external aspect of Roman rule in Judaea/Syria-Palaestina, I devote the second part of this presentation to the local organization of the area with special emphasis on the papyrological evidence now coming to light. Following Emil Schürer I distinguish the so-called 'Hellenistic cities' from the Jewish region⁴⁰. Assuming that these cities functioned in a similar way to other cities in the Roman Empire, i.e. in their relations to the sovereign power and the

³⁷ There is a striking similarity to the fate of Roman Egypt: the 'Sonderstellung Ägyptens' is the direct corollary of the availability of the papyrological material; but see now the corrective views of *N. Lewis*, *Greco-Roman Egypt: Fact or Fiction?*, in: *Proceedings of the XIIth Int. Congr. Papyrology 1968 (1970)* 3–14; *J. Keenan*, *Papyrology and Roman History: 1956–1980*, in: *The Classical World* 76 (1982–3) 30–31; *N. Lewis*, *The Romanity of Roman Egypt: A Growing Consensus*, in: *Atti del XVII Con. Int. di Papirologia* (1984) 1077–84; *A. K. Bowman*, *D. Rathbone*, *Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt*, in: *JRS* 82 (1992) 107–27; *D. Rathbone*, *Egypt, Augustus and Roman Taxation*, in: *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz* 41 (1993) 81–112.

³⁸ *CIL* XVI 87, 139 CE.

³⁹ However, the Romans could not, and did not, realize the special problems facing them in Judaea from the beginning, as those who postulate the creation of an independent province with an independent governor already in 6 CE seem to suggest; see e.g. *Stern* cited above ad nn. 18 and 19.

⁴⁰ *Schürer, Vermes, Millar*, II, (n. 2) 85–198.

villages within their boundaries, I have decided to concentrate on the Jewish region only. I can foresee many objections: their history was often entwined; some cities had mixed populations of Jews and non-Jews; the populations of a few cities were preponderantly Jewish. Although to the extent that they are *poleis* they could be seen as Hellenistic foundations, the history of many of these cities goes back far beyond the Hellenistic age, whereas other cities were recent Herodian and Roman foundations. Nor is it quite accurate to speak of the Hellenistic cities as cities of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina, since, as we have seen, one of the first acts of Roman rule was to free the cities from Jewish rule and attach them to the province of Syria. At different times many of the Hellenistic cities belonged to Syria and to Arabia. Altogether the artificiality of the provincial borders is apparent in the fluctuations between native dynastic rule and direct Roman rule, and in the parcelling and reparcelling of the territories. The expression of Jewish nationality and the Hellenic pretensions of the cities paid little attention to provincial borders. The Great Revolt involved Jews across the borders and I suspect that the Jews of Arabia were involved in some way in the Bar Kokhba revolt, and, that this is the reason why their archives were found in Naḥal Ḥever in Judaea⁴¹. A good example of the Hellenic pretensions of the Greek cities is the formula, 'a Greek city of Koile Syria' on coins and inscriptions of six cities of the Decapolis incorporated into the 'Barbaric' provinces of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina and Arabia by the mid-second century CE. 'Koile Syria' was neither an administrative entity nor a *koinon*, nor even a geographical reference, but merely an attempt at showing off the 'Hellenic credentials' of these cities, as a recent study describes it⁴². While I admit that the objections enumerated above are valid, I have nevertheless decided to exclude a treatment of the Hellenistic cities here.

The Jewish region

We are talking here of Judaea proper, Samaria, the Galilee and the Peraea. There are very few cities in these areas and of these the majority are on the fringes, and in any case are not likely to have controlled the entire Jewish region as their city-territories. Many settlements referred to as cities in the Jewish sources would not pass the criteria of a *polis*. The Jewish region was composed then of villages of different sizes. The Jewish sources speak of 'a large city' (כָּרֶךְ), 'a town' (עִיר) and 'a village' (חֲצֵר אוֹ כֶּפֶר).

⁴¹ I refer to the Babatha archive and the archive of Salome Komaïse daughter of Levi. The Greek part of the former was published by N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (Jerusalem 1989) (P. Yadin); for the latter see H. M. Cotton, *A. Yardeni*, Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites. The Seiyāl Collection II (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXVII, Oxford 1997) (XḤev/Se ar. and XḤev/Se gr.); see now W. Eck, *The Bar Kokhba Revolt: The Roman Point of view*, in: JRS 89 (1999, forthcoming).

⁴² A. Stein, *Studies in Greek and Latin Inscriptions on Palestinian Coinage under the Principate* (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to Tel-Aviv University 1990) 260–91.

It is generally assumed, as far as I can tell, that there was a relationship of subordination between the settlements of different size in the Jewish region. The new Schürer for example assumes that the subordination of villages to a 'town', indicated already in the Old Testament, where it is reflected in such locutions as 'the cities and their villages' (הערים וחצריהן) or 'the city and its daughters' (העיר ובנותיה), must have continued into our period⁴³. It has been suggested that one can trace at least economic dependence of smaller villages on larger ones both in the rabbinic sources and in aerial surveys of patterns of settlement and communication in the Jewish region⁴⁴.

A parallel is often drawn between the so-called 'towns' of the Jewish region and the 'mother villages' *μητροκωμῖαι* in the Trachonitis – a territory which like the Jewish region lacked cities⁴⁵. It is argued that the 'mother villages' were administrative and judicial centres like cities in other parts of the Roman world. A letter of Iulius Saturninus, the governor of Syria in 185–87, to Phaena, in which the city is described as the *metrokomia* of the Trachon' (*μητροκωμία τοῦ Τράχωνος*)⁴⁶, illustrates, to cite Fergus Millar, 'the city-like function of the major villages of this region'⁴⁷. This may well be so, but the letter, which addresses the inhabitants of Phaena only (Ἰούλιος Κατουρνῖνος Φαινησίοις *μητροκωμία τοῦ Τράχωνος* χαίρειν), does not give us any information about the range and nature of Phaena's responsibilities vis-à-vis its lesser neighbours. Moreover, as MacAdam points out: 'Apart from the paucity of inscriptions which testify to *metrocomiai*, not a single community is yet attested twice as a *metrocomia*'⁴⁸. It seems to me idle, therefore, to talk, as MacAdam does, about the 'extent of [their] territories' and '[their] duties and responsibilities ... regarding the *komai*'⁴⁹, since we do not really know whether they possessed either or both attributes. After all the title of *metropolis* which *metrocomia* closely resembles is merely honorific. There is abundant epigraphic evidence for village officials, village assemblies and public building undertaken by the villages in the Trachonitis, the Auranitis and Batanea. This evidence argues for a large measure of independence of the single village. Harper is right to point out that: 'Had the villages become dependent parts of city territories, it is not probable that they would have retained such an elaborate organization of their own'⁵⁰; the same could be said about putative dependence on the *metrocomiai*. I think that Jones was right to suggest that 'the village was the normal social and

⁴³ Schürer, Vermes, Millar, II, (n. 2) 189.

⁴⁴ Z. Safrai, 'The Village in the Time of the Mishnah and the Talmud', in: M. Stern (ed.), *Nation and History: Studies in the History of the Jewish People* (Jerusalem 1983) 173–95 (Hebrew); I. W. J. Hopkins, 'The city region in Roman Palestine', in: *PEQ* 112 (1980) 19–32.

⁴⁵ Schürer, Vermes, Millar, II, (n. 2) 189f.

⁴⁶ IGR III 1119 = OGIS 609.

⁴⁷ F. Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 BC – AD 337* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993) 426.

⁴⁸ H. I. MacAdam, 'Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Arabia', in: *BAR* 295 (1986) 82.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ G. M. Harper, 'Village administration in the Roman province of Syria', in: *YCIS* 1 (1928) 141, cf. 145.

administrative unit in this area⁵¹. The village then must have been in direct contact with the Roman governor. Whether this was done through an official appointed by the governor of Syria we do not know. The one and only piece of evidence for such a link are the centurions who figure in nine or eleven inscriptions from the area. But since they all fall between the years 169–189, this may be no more than a temporary measure⁵².

It seems to me that we may be on safer ground in understanding the administration of the Jewish region if we examine the evidence for the existence of administrative divisions in Judaea in Roman times. Gabinius' division of the country into five regions ruled by *synhedria* was an episode (57 BCE) – we do not hear of it later⁵³. A much older division of Judaea proper into *toparchiai* survived into the Roman period. The origin of some of the toparchies seems to have been Ptolemaic; the Seleucids maintained them, the Hasmoneans increased their number and they continued into Herod's time⁵⁴. Josephus (BJ 3.55) and Pliny (NH 5.70) as well as the documents from the Judean Desert confirm the survival of *toparchiai* into the Roman period, both before and after the Great Revolt of 66–70.

With the exception of Idumaea – which is an ethnic name – the *toparchia* was named after one of its villages, presumably the most important or central village in the *toparchia*. Adora and Beth Govrin have each been proposed as the central village for Idumaea.

Josephus gives the following list of κληρουχίαι or τοπαρχίαι for Judaea proper: (1) Jerusalem (2) Gophna (3) Acrabeta (4) Idumaea (5) Thamna (6) Lydda (7) Emmaus (8) Pella i.e. Betholeptephene (9) Ein Gedi (10) Herodion (11) Jericho (BJ 3.55). Pliny names ten toparchies: (1) Jericho (2) Emmaus (3) Lydda (4) Jopica (5) Acrabeta (6) Gophna (7) Thamna (8) Betholeptephene (9) Orine (10) Herodion (NH 5.70). There are two significant discrepancies between Josephus' and Pliny's lists: 1) Ein-Gedi and Idumaea are absent from Pliny's list; 2) Jamnia and Joppa are not included in Josephus' list, but added as an appendix⁵⁵, whereas Pliny includes Joppa in his list, but omits Jamnia.

The omission of Ein Gedi and Idumaea from Pliny's list led people to the conclusion that he used a source which goes back to Herod's time when Idumaea and Ein Gedi had not yet been made part of Judaea⁵⁶. However, all this was before the recent publication of the archives from the Judean Desert. It now seems certain that Pliny's list reflects the situation after the revolt. The village of Ein Gedi, sacked by the *sicarii* of Masada and possibly also by the Romans in the battles over

⁵¹ A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, rev. M. Avi-Yonah (Oxford 1971) 285.

⁵² Jones, (n. 51) 465, n. 79; MacAdam, (n. 48) 54 f., 91 ff.

⁵³ Schürer, *Vermes, Millar*, I, (n. 2) 268–9; II, 190.

⁵⁴ A. Shalit, *King Herod. Portrait of a Ruler* (Jerusalem 1960) 101 ff. (Hebrew).

⁵⁵ μεθ' ἧς Ἰάμνια καὶ Ἰόππη τῶν περιόκων ἀφηγοῦνται, *Jos.*, BJ 3.56.

⁵⁶ M. Stern, *Pliny the Elder's description of Eretz Israel and the administrative division of Judaea at the end of the Second Temple period*, in: *Tarbiz* 37 (1978) 215–229, reprinted in: M. Amit, I. Gafni, M. D. Herr (eds.), *Studies in Jewish History. The Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem 1991) 255 f. (Hebrew).

the balsam groves⁵⁷, became like Jerusalem 'a heap of ashes' (*nunc alterum bustum*, Pliny, NH 5.73), and, as we now know from the papyri, ceased to be the central village of a toparchy, and was itself subsumed in the toparchy of Jericho. In P. Yadin 16 from 127 CE, Babatha's second husband Judah son of Eleazar is said to come from 'the village of Ein Gedi in the district of Jericho in Judaea' (Ἰουδαίου Ἐλαζάρου κώμης Αἰνγαδδῶν περὶ Ἱερειχοῦντα τῆς Ἰουδαίας, lines 14–15). Perhaps Ein Gedi lost its status as a capital village of a toparchy as it became 'a village of our Lord the Caesar', as attested in the opening lines of P. Yadin 11 of 124 CE: ἐπὶ ὑ[πάτ]ων Μανείου Ἀκειλίου Γλαβρίωνος καὶ Τορκουά[του Θ]ηβριανοῦ[ῦ] πρὸς μιᾶς νωγῶν Μαίω[ν] ἐν Ἐνγαδοῖς κώμῃ κυρίου Καίσαρος; cf. XHēv/Se gr. 67, line 2: [Ἐν]γαδῶν κυρίου Κ[αίσαρος]⁵⁸.

As for Idumaea, it could be suggested that it too suffered such devastation that it disappeared as an independent toparchy⁵⁹. At some point though between the late 70s and 130 a new toparchy was created at least in part of what had previously been the toparchy of Idumaea: the toparchy of Zif or Zephine. This is biblical Zif situated south-east of Hebron. The new toparchy is attested for the first time in a marriage contract from the Judean Desert from 130 CE. The marriage was contracted ἐν Ἀριστοβουλιάδι τῆς Ζειφηνῆς, and the groom is Ἀκαβας Μηριω τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Ἰακείμων τ[ῆς Ζειφηνῆς], XHēv/Se gr. 69 (=XHēv/Se gr. 2), lines 3–5⁶⁰. The two villages, Aristoboulias and Yaqim (or Yakum)⁶¹, belonged to the new toparchy of Zif. It is true that the term *toparchia* does not appear in this papyrus⁶² but the expression ἐν Ἀριστοβουλιάδι τῆς Ζειφηνῆς describes the relationship between a central village and another village, typical of the toparchy structure.

Another marriage contract from the Judean Desert, DJD II, no. 115, from 124 CE, was concluded 'at Bethbassi in the toparchy of Herodium' – ἐν Βαιτοβαίσσαις ... τοπαρχείας Ἡρωδείου[ς]; the groom, Eleaios son of Simon, came from the village of Galoda of Akrabatta, but [was] an inhabitant of Batharda of Gorphna: τῶν ἀπὸ κ(ώμης) Γαλωδῶν τῆς περὶ Ἀκραβαττῶν οἰκῶν ἐν κώμῃ Βαιτοαρδοῖς τῆς περὶ Γοφνοῖς. It thus attests the survival of three of the old toparchies into the period after the Great Revolt. Finally Orine (Ὀρεινή), the toparchy which replaced Jerusalem according to Pliny (*Orinen in qua fuere Hierosolyma*), is attested in DJD II, no. 114 (an acknowledgement of debt), line 6.

⁵⁷ H. M. Cotton, W. Eck, Ein Staatsmonopol und seine Folgen: Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 12,123 und der Preis für Balsam, in: RhMus. NF 140 (1997) 153–161.

⁵⁸ H. M. Cotton, Ein Gedi between the two revolts in the light of the documents from the Judean Desert, in: R. Katzoff (ed.), Proceedings of the Judean Desert Documents Workshop held in Bar Ilan University, 3–5 June 1998 (forthcoming).

⁵⁹ BJ 4.231–5.

⁶⁰ See preliminary publication in H. M. Cotton, A Cancelled Marriage Contract from the Judean Desert (XHēv/Se gr. 2), in: JRS 84 (1994) 64–86.

⁶¹ Yakim or Yakum is mentioned also in the Aramaic XHēv/Se ar. 9.

⁶² In fact the term appears but once in the papyri from the Judean Desert to describe Herodion: τοπαρχείας Ἡρωδείου[ς], DJD II, no. 115, line 2.

In conclusion, the papyri and the 'rehabilitated' Pliny prove that the system of toparchies, i.e. the division of Judaea proper into districts, which took their names from their capital villages, remained virtually unchanged after the First Revolt.

*What about the rest of the Jewish region, namely Samaria,
Galilee and the Peraea?*

Stern, as well as others, believed that the system of *toparchiai* was not restricted to Judaea proper: it is maintained that although we have full lists only for Judaea proper, nevertheless there is enough evidence to prove that *toparchiai* were to be found elsewhere in Judaea/Syria-Palaestina as well. This belief is based on Josephus' use of the term *toparchia* to describe administrative units outside Judaea proper⁶³. Moreover, the term *toparchia* is used by Josephus to describe what at first sight at least seems a totally different regional division⁶⁴. Josephus attaches the name of toparchy not only to a cluster of villages, of which the most important or central one gives its name to the toparchy, but also to cities with their territories. Joppa and Jamnia, as we have seen, are added as an appendix to Josephus' list of toparchies in Judaea proper⁶⁵. Joppa is included in Pliny's list of toparchies, and is mentioned in the same breath with Lydda and Emmaus, two of the toparchies of Judaea proper, as centres to which commanders were assigned by the war council in Jerusalem on the eve of the Great Revolt⁶⁶. In AJ 18.31 we are told that Salome, Herod's sister, bequeathed to Livia, Augustus' wife, Jamnia and its *toparchia*: Ἰάμνείαν τε ... καὶ τὴν τοπαρχίαν πᾶσαν. Even more revealing is the evidence of BJ 2. 252, where we are told that Nero annexed to Agrippa II's kingdom, four cities with their *toparchiai* (πόλεις ... σὺν ταῖς τοπαρχίαις). The cities were Abila and Julias (that is Livias) in the Peraea and Trachinae and Tiberias in the lower Galilee. The parallel passage in AJ explains to us the meaning of the expression 'a city with its toparchy': 'he (Nero) gave him also Livias (Julias), a *polis* of the Peraea, with its fourteen villages' (δίδωσι δὲ [Nero] καὶ Ἰουλιάδα πόλιν τῆς Περαιᾶς καὶ κώμας τὰς περὶ αὐτὴν δεκατέσσαρας, 20.159). In other words the fourteen villages constituted Livias' toparchy.

The expression καὶ κώμας τὰς περὶ αὐτὴν to describe the relationship between a city and the villages within its territory is attested now in a document from the Judean Desert, XHev/Se gr. 65 (olim P. Yadin 37), which belongs to the archive of Salome Komaïse daughter of Levi. This is a marriage contract concluded between Salome Komaïse and Yesu'a son of Menahem from the village of Soffathe[.] in

⁶³ E.g. Nabata in Samaria is called *toparchia* in *Jos.*, BJ 2.509. Nabata, like the *toparchiai* in Judaea, was named after its central village, Nabata, see Stern, *Studies in Jewish History* (n. 56) 256.

⁶⁴ The same conclusions have been reached independently by Y. Shahar, *Josephus' Geography of Eretz Israel and its Relation to Talmudic Traditions and Roman Literature* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tel Aviv 1996) 181 f.

⁶⁵ Above n. 55.

⁶⁶ BJ 2.567.

the district of the city of Livias of the administrative region of P[eraia], – Ἰησοῦς Μαναήμου τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης ...] Σοφάθε[...]. περὶ πόλιν Λιουιάδος τῆς Π[εραίας] (lines 3–4).

Furthermore, like Josephus, the documents too describe the dependence of a village on the central village of the toparchy in terms identical to those which describe that of a village on the city to whose territory it belongs: the dependence of the village of Soffathe[...] on the city of Livias just quoted is expressed in the same terms as that of the village of Ein Gedi vis-à-vis Jericho (also a village) in P. Yadin 16 line 16: Ἰουδάνου Ἐλαζάρου κώμης Αἰνγαδδὼν περὶ Ἰερειχοῦντα τῆς Ἰουδαίας⁶⁷; that of Bethbassi vis-à-vis Herodion – ἐν Βαιτοβαίσσαιας ... τοπαρχείας Ἡρωδείου; Galoda vis-à-vis Akrabatta – ἀπὸ κ(ώμης) Γαλωδῶν τῆς περὶ Ἀκραβᾶτων, and Batharda vis-à-vis Gorphna ἐν κώμῃ Βαιτοαρδούς τῆς περὶ Γοφνοῖς – all in Mur 115 lines 2–3; and finally that of Aristoboulas and Yaqim (or Yaqum) vis-à-vis Zif in No. 69 lines 3–5 cited above⁶⁸.

Does the identity of language imply an identity of function: would it be legitimate to maintain that the central village performed the same functions fulfilled by cities both in respect of their subordinate village and in respect of the Roman authorities?

It is tempting to draw parallels between the administrative arrangement in Egypt, so richly documented, and that of the Jewish region of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina, where the documentation is so scarce and lacunose, when it exists at all. Such an approach gains force from the assumption that the toparchy is an inheritance from Ptolemaic times (note though that the Egyptian *toparchia* is a subdivision of the *nomos* which is the real equivalent of the Jewish *toparchia*). Thus the central or capital village which gives its name to the toparchy could be assimilated to the *metropoleis* of the Egyptian *nomoi*. A recent study of the Egyptian *metropoleis* by Alan Bowman and Dominic Rathbone convincingly demonstrates that already in the Julio-Cludian period, the *metropoleis* were to a significant degree functioning and behaving like the Greek *poleis* of other eastern provinces⁶⁹. Were the central villages of the *toparchiai* in Judaea the equivalent to these *metropoleis*? The enslavement of Gorphna, Emmaus, Lydda and Thamna – all of them capital villages of toparchies – by Cassius (Caesar's murderer) in 43 BCE for failing to raise the amount of money imposed on them is often adduced as evidence that taxes were imposed and collected at the level of the toparchy, and that the central village (or rather its officials or council) was therefore responsible for their collection. What we lack in Judaea/Syria-Palaestina altogether is the centrally appointed *strategoi*. Shalit believes that the *strategoi* stood at the head of the toparchies under Herod⁷⁰. Furthermore two passages from the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds have been interpreted as if there were *strategoi* in charge of the *toparchiai*, but I ac-

⁶⁷ Judaea here means Judaea proper, not the province.

⁶⁸ Above ad n. 60.

⁶⁹ A. Bowman, D. Rathbone, Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt, in: JRS 82 (1992) 125.

⁷⁰ Shalit, (n. 54) 116 f.

cept Alon's argument that the *estrategi* (אסטרטגי) mentioned there are the *duoviri* of a *colonia*⁷¹.

The circumstantial evidence for the role of the capital village of the toparchy is strong; and yet one must not lose sight of the fact that there is evidence for a large measure of independence and administrative autonomy of the individual village – not unlike our evidence for the village in southern Syria mentioned above. Josephus mentions for the late Herodian period *κωμογραμματεῖς* in AJ 16.203 and *κωμῶν γραμματεῖς* in the parallel passage in BJ 1.479. We also hear in the New Testament of *πρεσβύτεροι*, *βουλαί* and *συνεδρία* – located in villages. Needless to say, the Jewish sources abound in manifestations of self-rule, and administrative, religious and judicial autonomy. The people of a town were competent to control their synagogue, their market prices, the wages of their workers, to impose fines, check roads, dig public cisterns, mark boundaries of cemeteries etc. The sources speak of assemblies where decisions were taken and of local village courts, to handle civil and criminal cases; in particular these courts were responsible for appointment of guardians for orphans and widows. The sources attest the existence of *agoranomoi* in charge of market prices, weights and measures. *Parnasim* (פרנסים) and *gabbaim* (גבאים) are mentioned in the sources as the village magistrates, handling moneys and building projects. *Parnasim* are also attested in the Bar Kokhba documents as being in charge of leasing and sub-leasing public land in Ein Gedi. Taxes seem to have been collected by local people. This is evident in Josephus, in the New Testament⁷², as well as in the documents from the Judean desert⁷³. The *mochsin* (מוכסין) of the Jewish sources stand for collectors of taxes. We cannot determine whether the job of the collector of taxes was a liturgy, as in Egypt, or handled by *publicani* (τελώναι)⁷⁴.

In conclusion, Josephus, Pliny and the papyri prove that the Jewish region was divided into administrative units with central villages or cities at their head. Only about Judaea proper can we be sure that these units were called *toparchiai*. There is no evidence for local officials at the head of these capital villages, nor for cen-

⁷¹ G. Alon, The Strategoi in the cities of Eretz Israel in the Roman period, Studies in Jewish History II (Tel Aviv 1958) 74–87 (Hebrew).

⁷² H. C. Youtie, Publicans and sinners, in: ZPE 1 (1967) 1–20 (originally, 1937).

⁷³ Two receipts from Maḥoza, XHev/Se gr. 60 (125 CE, see H. M. Cotton, Rent or Tax Receipt from Maḥoza', in: ZPE 100 [1994] 547–57) and the Aramaic XHev/Se 12 (131 CE), both from the archive of Salome Komaïse daughter of Levi, demonstrate that local people, fellow-villagers, collected the taxes; see B. Isaac, Tax collection in Roman Arabia: new evidence from the Babatha Archive, in: Mediterranean Historical Review 9 (1994) 256–66. Susan Weingarten rightly suggests, 'presumably the use of local middlemen who knew the properties ... concerned meant that the central authorities had a built-in mechanism for verifying the census declaration' (apud Isaac, *ibid.* 266, n. 26). Evidently the display of the land declarations in the basilica of Rabbath Moab (P. Yadin 16 lines 1–2 = lines 3–4; XHev/Se gr. 62 frg. a lines 1–2 = lines 3–4) also served as a deterrent to false declarations.

⁷⁴ It is hard to interpret the scene described in BJ 2, 405 of tax collection by the *ἄρχοντες καὶ βουλευταί* of Jerusalem in 66 CE: εἰς δὲ τὰς κώμας οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ βουλευταὶ μερισθέντες τοὺς φόρους συνέλγεον. Was it an emergency measure? To what extent were they personally involved in the collection of taxes?

trally appointed officials in charge of the *toparchiai* – but the existence of one kind or another of local officials must be assumed. There are some hints that the *toparchiai* were in charge of taxation. Above all it is hard to believe that nothing beyond a merely geographical relationship is intended by the description of the dependence of a village on a central village, especially since the dependence of the single village on the central village is described both in the papyri and in Josephus in terms identical to those describing the dependence of the *chora* on its *polis*. Furthermore, we know that under the Severi some of these central villages received the status of a *polis*: thus Lydda became Diospolis in 199/200, and Emmaus became Nicopolis in 219 or 220. In 199/200 Beth-Govrin – about which we do not know that it was a capital village – received the status of a *polis* and was renamed Eleutheropolis⁷⁵. The accelerating urbanization of Judaea (now called Syria-Palaestina) resulted in the eventual disappearance of the toparchies and their replacement by *poleis* with their territories. This is the picture conveyed by the fourth century Onomasticon of Eusebius⁷⁶. But if we are right to think that the capital villages achieved a degree of local autonomy and administrative responsibilities already in the first and second centuries, then this urbanization was but a logical development. On the other hand, one must also take into account the social and demographic changes, or rather upheavals, consequent upon the failure of the Bar Kokhba revolt: the heavy losses suffered by the Jewish population and its severe dislocation. The change of name from Judaea to Syria-Palaestina which reflects the suppression of the Jewish element symbolizes a new reality. The urbanization of Palestine in the centuries following the Revolt is concurrent with the strengthening of the non-Jewish element in the province, first the pagan and later on the Christian.

⁷⁵ See A. H. M. Jones, The Urbanization of Palestine, in: JRS 21 (1931) 82 ff.

⁷⁶ A. Oppenheimer, Urbanization and city territories in Roman Palestine, The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern (Jerusalem 1996) 220 ff. For example the village of Zif which was the capital of its toparchy to which both Aristoboulas and Ya'qim belonged (Xῆβ/ῤε gr. 69 lines 3–5) is now described as ,α κώμη in the Daromas in the territory of Eleutheropolis, near Hebron, eight miles to the south', Eusebius, Onomasticon p. 92, line 15 (Klostermann).

Appendix: Administrative divisions in Arabia:

The hierarchical relationship between Maḥoza and Zo'ar has been known to us from the Babatha archive, where it takes the following variants: ἐν Μαω[ζοις] τῶν περὶ Ζ[οα]ρα⁷⁷; ἐν Μαωζα περὶ Ζοαραν⁷⁸; ἐν Μαωζα περὶ Ζοορων⁷⁹; ἐν Μαωζας τῆς περὶ Ζοα]ρα⁸⁰; ἐν Μαωζα περιμέτρῳ Ζοορων⁸¹. It is attested also in the archive of Salome Komaisē daughter of Levi: ἐν Μαωζας τῆς περὶ Ζ[ο]αρων (XHev/Se gr. 64 line 3). The phrasing in all its different variations strongly resembles the locations describing the hierarchical relationship between central villages and subordinate ones in Judaea: ἐν Βαιτοβαυσαιας ... τοπαρχείας Ἡρωδεῖο[υ] ... ἀπὸ κ(ώμης) Γαλωδὼν τῆς περὶ Ἀκραβατῶν οἰκῶν ἐν κώμῃ Βαιτοαρδοις τῆς περὶ Γοφνοῖς (Mur 115 lines 2–3); κώμης Αἰνγαδδῶν περὶ Ἱερειχοῦντα (P. Yadin 16 line 16); ἐν Ἀριστοβουλιάδι τῆς Ζειφηνῆς ... τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Ἱακεῖμων τ[ῆς Ζειφηνῆς] (XHev/Se gr. 69 lines 3–5). The similarity suggests that Maḥoza was subordinate to Zo'ar in much the same way as a village in Judaea was subordinate to the central village which gave its name to the toparchy to which it belonged – even if the term *toparchia* never appears in the archives from the province of Arabia⁸².

Yet, as we now know, Arabia was organized differently. In the section on Judaea it was demonstrated that the province was divided into toparchies the centre of which could be either a city (*polis*) or a village. In Arabia, on the other hand, there was double subordination: both Maḥoza and Zo'ar were subsumed in the territory of of Petra, which possessed the legal status of a *polis*⁸³. This is attested in Babatha's land declaration, P. Yadin 16: Βαβθα ... Μαωζηνή τῆς Ζοαρηνῆς περιμέτρου Πέτρας (lines 13–14), as well as in that of Sammouos son of Shim'on, Salome Komaisē's first husband, XHev/Se gr. 62 (olim XHev/Se gr. 7)⁸⁴: Σαμμουος Σιμων[ο]ς Μαωζηνὸς τῆς Ζοαρηνῆς περιμέτρου Πέτρας (frg. a line 12). It also occurs in Salome Komaisē's contract of marriage to her second husband mentioned above: [ἐν Μαωζα τῆς Ζο]αρηνῆς [...]..... Πέτραν μητρόπολιν τῆς Ἀραβίας] (XHev/Se gr. 65 lines 2–3). The fact that the double subordination is recorded in land declarations (XHev/Se gr. 62 and P. Yadin 16) lends the subordination an official status. That this was – or came to be – the administrative struc-

⁷⁷ P. Yadin 5a col. i lines 4–5.

⁷⁸ P. Yadin 14 line 20; 15 line 3 = lines 16–17; 17 lines 2–3 = lines 19–20; 18 line 3 = line 32.

⁷⁹ P. Yadin 25 line 28 = line 64.

⁸⁰ P. Yadin 19 lines 10–11.

⁸¹ P. Yadin 20 line 4 = lines 22–23; 21 lines 5–6; 22 line 5–6; 26 line 18; 27 lines 3–4.

⁸² As N. Lewis reminds us in 'The Babatha archive: A response', in: IEJ 44 (1994) 244; however, one notes that it is also absent in XHev/Se gr. 69 quoted above as well as in two out of three dependencies described in DJD II 115 quoted above.

⁸³ The evidence for its status as a *polis* is P. Yadin 12 lines 1–2 (= lines 4–5, 114 CE): ἐγγεγραμμένον καὶ ἀντιβεβλημένον κεφαλαίου ἐνὸς ἀπὸ ἄκτων βουλῆς Πετραίων τῆς μητροπόλεως.

⁸⁴ Frg. a of XHev/Se gr. 62 was published by N. Lewis, A Jewish Landowner from the Province of Arabia, in: SCI 8–9 (1985–8) 132–7.

ture in the whole province of Arabia is now proved by the unpublished P.Bostra 185. The Bostra papyrus dates to 260 CE. It is a petition addressed to a *beneficiarius* by a woman called Aurelia Thopheise, daughter of Azeizos, from the village Azzeira, which belongs to Aianitis in the territory of Bostra, Augusta Colonia and Metropolis: παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Θοφεισης Ἀζειζου κώμης Ἀζζειρων τῆς Αἰανείτιδος ὁρίου Αὐγουστοκολ(ωνίας) μητροπόλεως Βόστρων (lines 2–4). The three concentric circles familiar to us from the southern part of the province are reproduced in its northern part⁸⁶. As in the case of Petra, the vastness of Bostra's territory should be seen to account for the inclusion of villages in a subdivision of the city's territory⁸⁷.

⁸⁵ I am much obliged to J. Gascou for allowing me to see the text and the commentary on it in advance of publication. See above p. 71 ff.

⁸⁶ The editors regard Aianatis as a name of a district rather than that of a village. In that case the district of Aianatis, unlike that of Zo'ar, is not called after its capital village.

⁸⁷ I am grateful to Werner Eck and David Wasserstein for helpful criticism of earlier versions. The research for this article was supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.