

ACTS OF DISPLAY:  
IDENTITY AND ROME IN HERODIAN PALESTINE

Brian A. Coussens

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Religious Studies in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Chapel Hill  
2014

Approved by:

Jodi Magness

Zlatko Plese

James Rives

© 2014  
Brian A. Coussens  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

Brian A. Coussens: ACTS OF DISPLAY: IDENTITY AND ROME IN HERODIAN  
PALESTINE  
(Under the direction of Jodi Magness)

Scholars have been divided over how to interpret the relationship between Palestinian Jews and the Roman Empire during the Herodian period (40 BCE – 70 CE). This thesis attempts to understand this relationship through a model of Romanization based on theories of identity negotiation. It uses the unit of the household and its objects to examine the range of identity displays in which the Jews of Herodian Palestine participated, and it examines this display vernacular to see how it compares to that of other sites and how it changes over time. For its sample, this thesis examines the sites of Jerusalem (the Upper City) and Qumran. It finds that, although these sites show a range of identities and experiences under Empire, the context of the Roman Empire affected both by changing the discourse of identity expression.

Dedicated to the memory of Colleen Gunter Cavin,  
my beloved and much missed grandmother.  
You did not see the end, but you always believed in me.  
And, yep, I'm still digging.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who made this thesis possible. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Jodi Magness, without whom this thesis would not be. Because of her close readings and her helpful comments, it is more readable than it would have been and is characterized by more rigorous scholarship, even though we do not always agree. I would also like to thank my committee for their time, patience, and comments. For a number of reasons, the process of completing this thesis took longer than I anticipated, and they were all too kind in accommodating my personal needs.

Second, I would like to thank my family, especially Mom and Dad. Without your support, I am not sure how I would have gotten through the past several years. Thank you, Mom, for the countless number of phone calls and for listening to me talk (and complain) endlessly about the same things over and over again. Thank you, Dad, both for getting me through some rough spots and for reading large sections of this thesis, even if it was outside of your field. Thank you both for investing in my education and believing in my capabilities, even when I fail to believe in them myself.

Third, I would like to thank all of those colleagues and friends who helped me both with the content of this thesis and with overcoming hurdles along the way. I would like to give a special thanks to Shaily S. Patel, who, having the unfortunate luck of being my neighbor, had to listen to me rattle off about this thesis way too often. She is a rock in the storm and, to appropriate for her another religion, a saint. She is always willing to walk the critter if I decide to stay on campus for a twelve-hour work session and thoughtful enough to send me encouraging

texts and emails. Thanks to my other stalwart companion, Stephanie Gaskill, who, knowing how I hate to share my work, through her patient persistence and, perhaps, a bit of stubbornness, managed to get me to present part of this thesis at the Religious Studies' Writing Group. I would also like to give a special shout out to Shannon Schorey, Daniel Schindler, Lenny Lowe, and anyone else who got to play counselor to my particular brand of crazy when I let the process overwhelm me. Thanks to the members of the UNC Religious Studies Writing Group for reading and commenting on Chapter 2 and the members of the Judaism and the Levant in Antiquity Reading Group for slogging their way through the original version of Chapter 4. Thanks to all of you who have helped me think through some of these issues over the past couple of years, including Travis Proctor, Matt Grey, Brad Erickson, Jocelyn K. Burney, and David Culclasure.

Finally, thanks to Lady Eowyn Kiyō, because my dog puts up with way too much from me. She patiently waits for me to get home from extremely long days, generally lets me sleep in after pushing myself too hard for several days, and gives the best doggy snuggles. And, let's face it: when you are writing on a topic such as Romanization, you get through the hairier parts with a lot of puppy breaks.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	X
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 2: HOW TO READ “ROMAN”: THE SHIFTING PARADIGM OF ROMANIZATION .....	7
2.1. From Romanization to...? A Century of Reading “Roman” .....	8
2.1.1. Roman-izing: Haverfield and the Acculturation Model (1890s-early 1900s) .....	8
2.1.2. Resisting “Roman”: The Post-Colonial Resistance Model (1970s-1980s) .....	14
2.1.3. Resurrecting Roman: Neo-Romanization Model (1990) .....	15
2.1.4. Breaking Roman: The “Post”-Romanization Era (1990-Present) .....	19
2.2. Can the East Be Won? Romanizing the “Roman” East .....	26
2.3. Romanizing Palestine: Changing Perspectives on the East .....	30
2.3.1. Roma Philohellene: Rome as Hellenizer .....	31
2.3.2. Herodes Philorhomaïos, a Roman Exception? .....	35
2.3.3. Emerging Romanization Paradigms .....	38
2.3.3.1. Defining Boundaries in the Galilee (Berlin) .....	39
2.3.3.2. Roman in Politics, Not in Culture (Lee) .....	40
2.3.3.3. A Roman Cultural Revolution (Altshul) .....	42
2.4. Conclusions .....	42
CHAPTER 3: RE-READING ROMANIZATION: IDENTITY NEGOTIATION, DISPLAY, AND THE HOUSEHOLD .....	44
3.1. <i>Romanization</i> , a Champion of the “Post”-Romanization Critique .....	45

3.2. Power Plays: Negotiating Identities and Acts of Display .....	49
3.3. Archaeological Dyslexia and Interpreting Changing Display Acts .....	53
3.4. Locating Identity: The Household as a Locus of Romanization.....	55
3.5. Conclusions.....	57
<b>CHAPTER 4: IDENTITY DISCOURSE AND DISPLAY: ROMANIZATION AND THE HOUSES OF JERUSALEM’S UPPER CITY.....</b>	<b>58</b>
4.1. A Multi-vocal Romanization? Limits and Survival Bias.....	59
4.2. The Vernacular of Elite Display: A Summary.....	60
4.2.1. Frescoes.....	61
4.2.2. Stucco.....	65
4.2.3. Mosaics .....	68
4.2.4. Opus Sectile .....	71
4.2.5. Pottery: Imported Finewares.....	72
4.2.7. Glasswares .....	74
4.2.8. Chalk Vessels.....	76
4.2.9. Miqva’ot.....	79
4.3. Negotiated Identities: Material Displays and the Identity(ies) of the Jerusalem Elite.....	80
4.3.1. A Shifting Vernacular: Changes in Display Practices .....	80
4.3.2. Multiple Identities: the Multivalency of Displays .....	81
4.3.3. Imperial Identities: Rome and the Jerusalem Elite .....	84
4.4. Conclusions.....	88
<b>CHAPTER 5: ANTI...: IDENTITY AND DISPLAY AT QUMRAN .....</b>	<b>89</b>
5.1. A Villa or Sectarian Community? Methodology .....	90
5.2. The Display Vernacular of Qumran.....	92
5.2.1. Architecture.....	92



5.2.2. Decorative Techniques.....	97
5.2.3. Glass.....	99
5.2.4. Pottery.....	100
5.2.5. Chalk Vessels.....	101
5.2.6. Miqva'ot.....	103
5.3. A Difference of Identities?.....	104
5.4. Anti...: An Oppositional Identity at Qumran?.....	107
5.5. Conclusions.....	109
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS .....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	115

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Periods of Ancient Palestine .....	6
--	---

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

For scholars who study ancient Palestine, few periods loom larger than the time of Herod the Great and his successors.<sup>1</sup> From the beginning of Herod's reign in 40 BCE to the destruction of the Second Jewish Temple in 70 CE, the land was transformed physically, politically, culturally, and religiously. One of the changes associated with this period was the transformation of Judea from a small independent kingdom to a subject territory of the Roman Empire.<sup>2</sup> This change has prompted much debate over Rome's cultural and material impact on the Jews of Palestine. Over the years, the theories have ranged widely. For some scholars, Rome's influence was only political, eliciting no complementary cultural changes.<sup>3</sup> For others, its influence was so profound that it should properly be categorized as a "cultural revolution."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> While the geographical terminology for this region is somewhat problematic because of modern political discourse, this thesis will primarily use the terms *ancient Palestine*, *Roman Palestine*, and *Palestine* to refer to the region over which Herod the Great ruled and the states which surrounded that territory. This geographical description includes lands in the modern state of Israel, the Palestinian territories, and the Kingdom of Jordan. This terminology is anachronistic as it was not applied to the region until the 130s C.E., but it avoids the problems of the term *Judea*, which changes meanings during the period of interest. I have generally eschewed the use of *Judea* in this thesis, using it primarily to refer to the administrative region around Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup> As noted below, Rome gained control of Palestine in 63 BCE. The nature of the relationship and control changes in 40 BCE when Herod the Great was appointed as client king of Judea, as, unlike his predecessor, he had no hereditary claim to throne. As noted by Roller, Herod's architectural habits, including its euergetic tendencies and some of its style and techniques, can partially be linked to an imitation of his predecessors. For example, Josephus cites Gabinius' role in rebuilding parts of the region. Some of the material practices noted in the course of this thesis may also have had their beginnings in this early period of Roman rule. Duane W. Roller, *The Building Program of Herod the Great* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 81–83, 85; Joseph. *BJ* 1.8.4 § 165–166.

<sup>3</sup> Francis Haverfield, *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915), 12–13; Reuben Lee, *Romanization in Palestine: A Study of Urban Development from Herod the Great to Ad 70* (Oxford, England: Archaeopress, 2003), 82.

<sup>4</sup> Asher Y. Altshul, "Was There a Herodian 'Revolution'? Changes in the Social and Material Culture of the Late Second Temple Period Jerusalem" (MA Thesis, Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2012), 51.

For most, the change probably falls somewhere between these extremes. Other scholars debate the nature of Rome's influence, deliberating over whether its impact was primarily Romanizing or Hellenizing.<sup>5</sup> Still others have begun to ask what, if any, connection exists between new local "Jewish" practices and Rome.<sup>6</sup> The discussion is diverse, and no consensus has been reached on how living under Empire affected the Jews of Herodian Palestine and what the material changes of the period mean. This thesis attempts to address the problem of Jewish-Roman relations by examining the material culture and re-assessing it in light of identity theory. It contends that the new situational reality of the Herodian period – living under Empire – required the Jews of Palestine to engage in a process of Romanization, a discourse of identity negotiation which had material expressions.

From the beginning of Hasmonean rule, Jewish leaders in Palestine had maintained a relationship with Rome. This began as a political alliance, renewed on occasion by the various Hasmonean rulers.<sup>7</sup> In 63 BCE, the nature of the Jewish-Roman relationship changed fundamentally. The Roman general Pompey interceded in the civil war between Hyrcanus II and

---

<sup>5</sup> This debate is evident in the discussions over the origins and influence behind particular types of architecture, and especially, in discussions of Herod's construction projects. See, for example, R. Förtsch, "Residences of King Herod and Their Relations to Roman Villa Architecture," in *Judaea and the Greco-Roman World in the Time of Herod in Light of the Archaeological Evidence*, ed. Klaus Fittschen and Gideon Foerster (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 74–119; Karl Galinsky, "The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod," in *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009), 29–42; Gideon Foerster, "Hellenistic and Roman Trends in the Herodian Architecture of Masada," in *Judaea and the Greco-Roman World in the Time of Herod in Light of the Archaeological Evidence*, ed. Klaus Fittschen and Gideon Foerster (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 55–72; Achim Lichtenberger, "Herod and Rome: Was Romanisation a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod," in *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009), 43–64.

<sup>6</sup> Andrea Berlin, "Romanization and Anti-Romanization in Pre-Revolt Galilee," in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology*, ed. Andrea Berlin and J. Andrew Overman (London: Routledge, 2002), 57–73; Andrea Berlin, "Jewish Life before the Revolt: The Archaeological Evidence," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36, no. 4 (2005): 417–470.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Macc 8:1-32; 12:1-4; 14:16-24; Joseph. *AJ* 12.10.6 §415-419; 13.5.8 §163-166; 13.9.2 §259-263; 14.8.5 §145-148.

Aristobulus II and conquered Jerusalem.<sup>8</sup> Rome seized control. With this coup, Rome was transformed from a notable (if stronger) ally to the region's ruler. This move altered the manner in which the two parties interacted and required a redefinition of their co-dependent identities. One became ruler, and the other subject. Whereas their previous bonds had been based upon verbal terms of friendship and did not require sustained contact, they now entered into a relationship of governance.<sup>9</sup> It guaranteed and necessitated some form of direct contact between Rome and its subject peoples, though the nature and manner of that contact varied throughout the Herodian period.

This political change precipitated a material change. Although Rome never instituted an imperial policy of acculturation, in the case of ancient Palestine, the political redefinition of Jewish-Roman relations correlates with visibly different patterns of material consumption in the archaeological record. On the state scale, this change was visible in the monumentalization of the region by Herod the Great and his successors. On a smaller scale, in the households of Palestine's Jewish residents, it appears in a range of patterns from the rejection of previously forms of acceptable consumption habits to the adoption of new Greco-Roman practices. Materially, the context of Empire provided the setting for a "cultural revolution," but it was not solely "Roman."<sup>10</sup> It was characterized by a diversity of changes, both local and Greco-Roman. The lingering question is "What can explain this diversity of material change?" This thesis

---

<sup>8</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 14.1.1 §1 – 14.4.5 §79; *BJ* 1.6.1 §120 - 1.7.7 §158.

<sup>9</sup> The extent to which the two groups were in contact prior to 63 BCE is debatable. They may have maintained minimal economic contact, but according to historical sources, official contact was restricted to the renewal of the Rome-Jerusalem friendship. E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 5–11; Sara R. Mandell, "Did the Maccabees Believe That They Had a Valid Treaty with Rome?," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1991): 202–220.

<sup>10</sup> Altshul, "Herodian Revolution," 51.

suggests that the answer may lie in a Romanization based upon a linguistic interpretation of identity negotiation.

To address the issue of change in Herodian Palestine, this thesis begins in Chapter Two with a historiographical discussion of the term *Romanization*. It traces the theoretical development of the term in the regions of the Western Empire, from its popularization under Francis Haverfield in the early 1900s until its rejection by the “post”-Romanization movement from the 1990s to the present. This chapter also addresses the peculiar issue of “Romanizing” in the Eastern Empire and ancient Palestine. There, despite parallel evidence of changes in material practice, the process of Romanization in the East has been seen as categorically different from that in the Western Empire. This chapter places the current work within this discourse of Romanization, and many of the solutions presented in the course of this thesis should be seen as developing in response to this theoretical conversation.

In light of the discussion of Romanization from Chapter Two, Chapter Three proposes a somewhat different model for approaching Romanization. Instead of equating objects with identity, it argues for an understanding of Romanization that integrates identity practice by looking at how people construct identity through material objects. Using Andrew Wallace-Hadrill’s discussion of such material praxis, it suggests that Romanization is best described as a discourse of identity negotiation involving the manipulation of a range of material objects in acts of display.<sup>11</sup> As exhibited by the discussions in the succeeding chapters, this definition of Romanization best explains the range of material change characteristic of Herodian Palestine. This chapter contends that, if the material from Palestinian sites is viewed as the range of

---

<sup>11</sup> Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome’s Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

material symbols used in a discourse of identity, one can then use this range to analyze how the discourse of identity changes over time and how it differs from site to site within a period.

Chapters Four and Five apply this Romanization model to two sites in ancient Palestine, Jerusalem and Qumran. Both chapters catalog the range of material symbols present at each site and, taking into account the range of these symbols' meanings, discusses what they may suggest about the types of identities constructed at these sites. In Jerusalem, the catalog shows that the language of identity display among the city's elite changed drastically from the Hasmonean to the Herodian period. As the Jerusalem elite coped with changing political realities, they increasingly became familiar with and co-opted new forms of identity expression in their discourse of identity negotiation with Rome. At Qumran, however, the inhabitants rejected many of the identity displays appropriated by the Jerusalem elite. Instead, in the course of identity negotiation, they focused on forms associated with Jewish ritual practices, engaging in a discourse of othering that separated them from the Jerusalem elite. Yet, despite their different responses and motivations in this identity negotiation, in both examples, the context of Empire shaped the tenor of their discourse such that they both can be said to have "Romanized."

TABLE 1: Periods of Ancient Palestine

<b>PERIODS</b>	<b>JERUSALEM, Additional Sub-Periods</b>	<b>QUMRAN, Magness Periodization<sup>12</sup></b>
<b>Hellenistic Period</b> (332 BCE – 63 BCE)		
<i>Early Hellenistic</i> (332-167 BCE)		
<i>Hasmonean</i> (167-63 BCE)		
		----- <i>Period Ib – Pre-Earthquake</i> (100/50 BCE – 31 BCE)
<b>Roman Period</b> (63 BCE – 312 CE)		
<i>Roman-Hasmonean</i> (63BCE-40BCE)		
<i>Herodian</i> (40BCE-70CE)		
	Early Herodian <sup>13</sup> (37 BCE – 15/12 BCE)	----- <i>Period Ib – Post-Earthquake</i> (31 BCE – 9 BCE)
	Late Herodian (15/12 BCE – 70 CE)	----- <i>Period II</i> (4/1 BCE – 68 CE)
		----- <i>Period III</i> (68 CE – 73/74 CE)
<i>Late Roman</i> (70CE-312CE)		-----

<sup>12</sup> Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 68.

<sup>13</sup> The beginning of this period is based upon Herod's retaking of the city in 37 BCE. The end is based upon the *terminus post quem* provided for the laying of Pavement 800 on the Western Hill. For the date of the early Herodian residences on the Western Hill, see Renate Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "Late Hellenistic and Early Roman Lamps and Fine Ware," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 159; Donald T. Ariel, "Coins," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 195; Hillel Geva, "Stratigraphy and Architecture," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 32–33.



**CHAPTER 2:**  
HOW TO READ “ROMAN”:  
THE SHIFTING PARADIGM OF ROMANIZATION

This thesis engages with a century-long discussion of the consequences of Roman imperial expansion across the Mediterranean. Scholars have struggled to define the relationship between Rome and its subjects. They have examined classical literature for imperial discourse and consulted the archaeological record for evidence of material change.<sup>1</sup> In the past, scholars interpreted the existing data as attesting to an empire-initiated cultural modification, a transformation they termed *Romanization*. With Roman power came the adoption of literary and material praxis that did not accord with the previous cultural systems of the local peoples. Thus, according to earlier generations of Classicists, the Romans adopted a policy of assimilation.<sup>2</sup> With the collapse of the modernist paradigm and the adoption of post-modernist ideas, this model of Romanization has come under increasing scrutiny, as scholars have attempted either to revise the term or to abandon it altogether. To many, it does not correspond with emerging theoretical models that engage with ideas of power dynamics, identity, culture, and practice.

---

<sup>1</sup> By imperial discourse, I mean the ancient image of empire constructed by Rome and its subjects. This discourse need not be restricted only to literature. As Zanker and others show, imperial discourse can be applied through imagery and architecture. Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 101.

<sup>2</sup> Here, an issue of terminology exists as the authors do not typically refer to their models as an assimilation or acculturation model and the critique of such models fluctuates between the usage of these terms. While *assimilation* and *acculturation* are not synonyms, in Romanization scholarship, they are used interchangeably. Hanson notes this issue in his definition of Romanization, where he states that “assimilation...may be used as a convenient and specific short-hand for what is, in effect, a potential extreme of acculturation.” With this in mind, in the following discussion, I have opted to use the term *assimilation* to describe nineteenth century and early twentieth century models but apply *acculturation* to later models that have moved away from the Haverfieldian model. Where appropriate, both terms are used. W. S. Hanson, “Dealing with Barbarians: The Romanization of Britain,” in

Although the post-modern critique and deconstruction of the concept of Romanization has proven to be beneficial and necessary, the word, while debated, remains useful in understanding the identity negotiations that occurred when Rome annexed a people.

The following chapter discusses the complex history of *Romanization* from its first rendition to the modern critique. It provides a critical examination of past studies and adds to the discussion by considering some of the issues that have emerged from the current formulations (or anti-formulations) of Romanization. It also addresses the approach to Romanization in the East, where Roman interests have traditionally been minimalized before a Hellenizing paradigm. This chapter contends that, despite developments in theoretical models, studies of the Eastern Empire have continued to suffer under biases originating in nineteenth-century traditions. Whereas the West has served as the testing grounds for theory in Romanization, the East has generally rehashed older traditions, only recently adopting new modes of Roman-native interaction and incorporating new models of Romanization.<sup>3</sup>

## **2.1. From Romanization to...? A Century of Reading “Roman”**

### **2.1.1. *Roman-izing: Haverfield and the Acculturation Model (1890s-early 1900s)***

*Romanization*, as a technical term in classical studies, dates to at least the time of Theodor Mommsen, but a discussion of the term in Western scholarship (particularly in Britain and America) necessarily begins with Francis Haverfield.<sup>4</sup> Haverfield was the first to popularize

---

*Building on the Past: Papers Celebrating 150 Years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*, ed. Blaise Vynier (London: Royal Archaeological Institute, 1994), 150.

<sup>3</sup> On the contention that the West tends to serve as the testing ground for Romanization theory, see, for example, the Gaul-focused study of Woolf, the Italy-focused study of Wallace-Hadrill, and the Britain-focused studies of Millett and others. Greg Woolf, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*; Martin Millett, *The Romanization of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> Freeman traces it to the Renaissance, and Mattingly notes its earliest occurrence in 1607. However, the formulation provided by Haverfield is the primary form that entered into the mythology of classical studies. Philip Freeman, “Mommsen through to Haverfield: The Origins of Romanization Studies in Late Nineteenth-Century

it among English-speaking scholars during the early 1900s.<sup>5</sup> His articulation became determinative for the understanding of the word, and the critiques which followed address the short-comings of *his* interpretation.<sup>6</sup> Haverfield defined *Romanization* as an act of civilizing mankind, wherein the Romans “extinguished the difference between Roman and provincial through all parts of the Empire but the east, alike in speech, in material culture, in political feeling and religion.”<sup>7</sup> He envisioned, “native elements succumb[ing] almost wholesale to the conquering influences” of the Romans.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the earliest understanding of Romanization was an assimilation model, in which one group exchanged (forcibly or not) its own traditions and culture for that of another. The result of this exchange was a complete identity re-alignment. For Haverfield, the natives *became* Romans.

Haverfield’s formulation of the Roman-native interaction dominated the field for the first half of the twentieth century, despite the occasional critique.<sup>9</sup> However, with the rise of native

---

Britain,” in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, ed. David J. Mattingly (Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997), 45; David J. Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011), 38.

<sup>5</sup> One should caution here against over exaggerating the influence of Haverfield’s ideas. Mattingly notes similar traditions in France and Italy; however, the ideas entered into the English-speaking world through Haverfield. Also see Hingley’s comment on the wider influence of Mommsen over Haverfield. Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, xix; Richard Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire* (London: Routledge, 2005), 35.

<sup>6</sup> One need only read Webster, Mattingly, and others to ascertain the extent of Haverfield’s influence. See, for example, Richard Hingley, “The ‘Legacy’ of Rome: The Rise, Decline, and Fall of the Theory of Romanization,” in *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, ed. Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper (Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996), 35–39; Jane Webster, “Creolizing the Roman Provinces,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 105, no. 2 (2001): 211; Richard Hingley, *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 2000), 111–155; Freeman, “Mommsen to Haverfield.”

<sup>7</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization* (3rd Ed.), 22.

<sup>8</sup> Francis Haverfield, *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 30.

<sup>9</sup> For example, Webster sees Collingwood’s major study as a challenge to Haverfieldian Romanization, though the extent to which the two follow different scholarly genealogies is debatable. The main difference is Collingwood’s declaration that “the Britons became Romans” but “they did not cease to be Britons.” This statement was a significant deviation from Haverfield; however, Hingley demonstrates that their views stem from similar traditions. Webster, “Creolizing,” 211–212; Robin G. Collingwood, *Roman Britain*, New rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press,

archaeologies and post-colonial theory, Haverfield's thesis became the main target of anti-assimilation, anti-Romanization critiques.<sup>10</sup> As he originally framed the concept, Haverfield's modernist model no longer seemed pertinent in a post-colonial, post-modern world. Although scholars have deemed his work insufficient for a number of reasons, the major critiques fall into one of three categories: assimilation, Romano-centrism, and anachronism.

The central component of Haverfield's Romanization model was a theory of assimilation, a diffusionist model that explains change in the archaeological record through the adoption of one culture's traits by another culture.<sup>11</sup> In its traditional formulation, the model is progressive, with the cultural exchange occurring from the more "advanced" culture to the less-"advanced."<sup>12</sup> Thus, Haverfield's formulation of Romanization posits that, whether by Roman encouragement or by elective adoption by the natives, subject peoples took on Roman traits and eventually identified as Roman.<sup>13</sup> As demonstrated by Haverfield's own research, archaeological evidence does not support such a thesis. He pointed to several "survivals of Celtic traditions" that remained in Britain after the Roman conquest, including the habit of depicting animals according to Celtic tradition on Castor pottery.<sup>14</sup> Such theories fail to depict the complexity of cultural

---

1953), 12; Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 131–134.

<sup>10</sup> At times, Haverfield's critics seem to forget that he lived in a different time and place.

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of "diffusion" models and their historical development, see Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 217–223.

<sup>12</sup> Trigger argues that diffusionism replaced evolutionary progressive models and that progressivism fell out of fashion by the end of the nineteenth century as scholars become disillusioned with the Industrial Revolution. In a sense, he is right, as scholars exchanged certain theories for others, but in the case of diffusionism, they only have replaced one model of progressivism with another. See Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 217–218.

<sup>13</sup> Note that, despite critiques indicating otherwise, Haverfield does indicate in places native participation in Romanization. Where this agency appears, though, it is prompted by the desirability of Roman culture. In others, such agency seems to fade before a Roman-ization machine. A careful reading should not dismiss the agency present in Haverfield. Instead, it should recognize that the ongoing problem with agency seems to be the motivation behind or cause of that agency. Haverfield, *Romanization* (3rd Ed.), 14, 16.

<sup>14</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization* (2nd Ed.), 39–42.

exchange, as they assume such exchange is one-sided, done willingly, and adopted equally by all social classes in all places.<sup>15</sup> As a result, Haverfield had to turn to the concept of Tylorian survivals to explain deviations from his Romanization model.<sup>16</sup>

The Haverfieldian version of Romanization is also Romano-centric. His model assumes that the natural progression in history is from native to Roman, without explaining this connection beyond the “definite and coherent culture of Rome.”<sup>17</sup> It presumes the superiority of the Roman culture and universalizes the standards of desirability.<sup>18</sup> The model obscures the multiplicity of responses to the Roman presence, opting for an optimistic interpretation of Roman interaction with local cultures.<sup>19</sup> And, it subsumes a process of complex, ideological identity negotiation under a unidirectional adoption of Roman culture, with all cultural exchange moving from the imperial center outward.<sup>20</sup> The Eternal City and its people remained unaffected by this cultural interchange. This aspect of Haverfield’s theory, in particular, has led to a call among post-modernists for the exorcising of the “Roman” from *Romanization*.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Examples addressing one-sidedness, willingness/resistance, and universalism include, among others, Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 6–7; Richard Hingley, “Resistance and Domination: Social Change in Roman Britain,” in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, ed. David J. Mattingly (Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997), 85–86; Hingley, “Legacy of Rome,” 42–44; Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 29.

<sup>16</sup> Edward B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*, vol. I (London: John Murray, 1871), 16–17, 63–144. For Haverfield’s discussion of survivals, see the following: Haverfield, *Romanization (2nd Ed.)*, 15, 39, 54; Haverfield, *Romanization (3rd Ed.)*, 11, 18, 48, 52–53, 66.

<sup>17</sup> The meaning of this phrase is not entirely clear, but it seems to establish an opposing dichotomy between the order of “civilization” and the chaos of “barbarism” (or, at least, local, non-“civilized” cultures). Haverfield, *Romanization (3rd Ed.)*, 14.

<sup>18</sup> Hingley, “Legacy of Rome,” 45.

<sup>19</sup> Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 13–14; Hingley, “Legacy of Rome,” 40.

<sup>20</sup> Webster, “Creolizing,” 205.

<sup>21</sup> In Gardner, this extraction of “Roman” from *Romanization* has already occurred. He views the term as stripped of its previous meanings and only minimally useful in very specific applications. Andrew Gardner, *An Archaeology of Identity: Soldiers and Society in Late Roman Britain* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007), 33.

A handful of scholars have cited the inappropriateness of this model due to its anachronism. They contend that, instead of reflecting life in Roman Britain, Haverfield's Romanization expresses a late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century utopian conception of the world.<sup>22</sup> The "civilizing" process in which Haverfield imagined Rome engaging mirrored the British moral defense of their own empire, such that the two ideas of empire became mutually reinforcing.<sup>23</sup> In other words, the colonial project reproduced its own image in the past, creating a mythical basis for the continuation of imperial praxis in the present.

Haverfield's scholarship reflects his own time, but two points of caution are needed here. One cannot assume, as some have, that Haverfield's interpretation of the data developed for the sinister reasons of sustaining British imperial repression. It is true that the interpretation justified the British Empire and its goals and that many classically trained students became administrators of the empire, learning from the "Romans" how to manage their imperial present.<sup>24</sup> However, the conclusion does not follow that Haverfield formulated his interpretation with the goal of maintaining British colonial power. He likely read his past in light of his present experience of Empire, without consciously molding it to support his own system.<sup>25</sup> Such an act is reflective of

---

<sup>22</sup> Especially Hingley: see Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 30–40; Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 111–155.

<sup>23</sup> Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 1.

<sup>24</sup> Philip Freeman, "British Imperialism and the Roman Empire," in *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, ed. Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper (Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996), 26–27; Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 38–60.

<sup>25</sup> Although Hingley at times allows that Haverfield may not have been aware of such a connection, he (somewhat contradictorily) continues to insist that the comparison between Roman and British empires in public lectures demonstrates both awareness and intentionality on his part. However, Hingley seems to dismiss the circumstances of Haverfield's lectures, which are of overriding importance, given that scholars' public justifications of their works do not always correspond with their scholarly or personal understandings of their work; instead, such justifications are more about establishing significance in the public's eyes and securing funding. In that respect, they do and should reflect the contemporary culture, as they must play on the perceived values of the audience. This conclusion does not mean, however, that Haverfield consciously carried such sentiments over into his own work, for as Freeman points out, overt connections to British imperialism are generally not present in his scholarly corpus. Freeman, "British Imperialism," 30; Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 3, 121–129.

Bourdieu's self-sustaining *habitus*, which does not require that actions be of "genuine strategic intentions."<sup>26</sup>

Along these lines, a theory should not be rejected simply because it reflects the author's own time. While I find John Boardman's sometimes vitriolic descriptions of modern theoretical trends off-putting, his point that all archaeological theories are situational is pertinent here.<sup>27</sup> As the following discussion of the responses to Haverfield's theories will show, all of the succeeding theoretical discourses reflect the historical moment in which they developed. Haverfield's social context may have given form to his model, but this connection does not, in itself, invalidate the theory and only serves to provide background for the origins of the theory. Since all theoretical models necessarily reflect the contexts of their authors, they can only be invalidated by the application of data, not by the service to which they are employed. The use of Haverfield's model in bolstering British imperial practice only serves as an example and admonition of how history can engender theories that may support current systems of power and modes of thinking.<sup>28</sup> As demonstrated above, it happens that Haverfield's rendition of Romanization does not fully explain the available data and, on those grounds alone, must be revised – not simply because it is "anachronistic."

---

<sup>26</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 73.

<sup>27</sup> Boardman's rhetoric against modern theoretical movements seems to increase across his work. I do not approach modern theoretical ideas with the same hostility he seemingly does (in fact, I embrace many of their principles); however, the anachronistic argument seems to be blindsided by the fact that its own ideas are situational and, therefore, according to their argument, irrelevant to interpreting the past. For examples of Boardman's response to modern theory, see the following, especially his 2002 critique: John Boardman, "Al Mina and History," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 9 (1990): 170; John Boardman, "Aspects of Colonization," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322 (2001): 33; John Boardman, "Greeks and Syria: Pots and People," in *Greek Settlements in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea*, ed. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze and Anthony M. Snodgrass (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002), 13.

<sup>28</sup> On this point, I agree with Hingley. In particular, Hingley's engagement with literary works, like Kipling, demonstrates a conflation of Roman and British in popular opinion, but this should not then be constructed into an intentional, empire-building model on the part of scholars. Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 43.

To represent Haverfield fairly, one must acknowledge that many of his claims are also attenuated by asides and that, despite his shortcomings, no one has yet completely abandoned his model.<sup>29</sup> While scholars call for the jettisoning of *Romanization* as a term, object to the assimilation model, and generally set Haverfield up as a straw man, they do not completely dismiss his work, and even his harshest critics acknowledge his contributions.<sup>30</sup> Rather than rejecting Haverfield's work, many scholars state that it is too simplistic in its universality and unidirectionality, and the responses which followed in Haverfield's wake can be seen as complicating his theory by opening it up to multivocality and eliminating its moral progressive directionality.

### **2.1.2. Resisting "Roman": The Post-Colonial Resistance Model (1970s-1980s)**

In the aftermath of the breakdown of European imperial control of the Mediterranean littoral, Roman archaeologists, following similar trends in anthropology and other fields, reassessed the traditional Romanization model. One of the earliest responses to Romanization was the Resistance Model of the 1970s and 1980s. This model developed in the wake of native archaeologies of the Mediterranean and the rise of British and Irish archaeologists' interests in their own non-Roman (Gallic) roots.<sup>31</sup> Examples of works emerging out of this milieu include *Black Athena* and *L'histoire du Maghreb*.<sup>32</sup> Many of these studies constructed scenarios in which the occupied populations of the Mediterranean re-acted negatively towards their Roman

---

<sup>29</sup> For example, Haverfield provided examples of British cultural continuity, though bracketed as "latent persistence"; acknowledged that Romanization was not consistent or concurrent across the Empire; and noted that the reasons for Romanizing are sometimes complex (e.g., political and economic incentives for acculturating). In many ways, he foreshadowed the critiques that modern scholars use against him. Haverfield, *Romanization* (2nd Ed.), 13, 18.

<sup>30</sup> Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 14.

<sup>31</sup> Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 40; Webster, "Creolizing," 212.

<sup>32</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (London: Free Association Books, 1987); Abdullah Laroui, *L'histoire du Maghreb, un essai de synthese* (Paris: Francois Maspero, 1970).



colonizers. At the same time that the modern African and Near Eastern peoples were shrugging off years of their own colonial experiences, these emerging theoretical interpretations envisioned Roman subjects as resisting imperial power and the imposition of imperial culture.<sup>33</sup> While this theoretical shift proved important for re-introducing some vocality to the subject person, Webster and others have critiqued the move because the resistance model remains firmly within the framework of the acculturation school.<sup>34</sup> Faced with the imposition of Roman control, native subjects only had two possible responses: they could become Roman or they could resist. While they included new reactions to the political situation of imperial expansion, these models retained their Romano-centrism and a conception of the subject's passive receipt of Roman culture evident in Haverfield's Romanization.<sup>35</sup>

### **2.1.3. Resurrecting Roman: Neo-Romanization Model (1990)**

In 1990, Martin Millett introduced an updated model of Romanization, bringing Haverfield's theory into the twentieth century.<sup>36</sup> Some scholars now view *The Romanization of Britain* as the new "standard" formulation of Romanization.<sup>37</sup> In it, Millett suggested that Romanization was a dialectical process in which native elites chose to adopt Roman praxis.<sup>38</sup> It

---

<sup>33</sup> Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 59–63.

<sup>34</sup> Some scholars seem to imply that such models re-introduce the subject peoples as actors in this process. As pointed out above, Haverfield's model already clearly envisions subject peoples as agents. The change is not from recipient to agent, but from one cause of agency to another. Webster, "Creolizing," 212.

<sup>35</sup> Note that, for Haverfield, resistance does not seem to be an option. He terms the existence of earlier traditions during the Roman period as Tylorian "survivals." See above.

<sup>36</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*. According to Hingley, this work belongs to the "nativist" school of thought. In part, he is correct, but this work is transitional, framing the gap between the "nativist" traditions and post-modernism. For this reason, I elected to separate the "nativist" school as Resistance from Millett's Romanization model, which sees a different goal in native participation. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 40–42.

<sup>37</sup> In particular, Hingley seems to view it as a new orthodoxy. The fact that the post-modern, deconstructionist critique arose directly after his work (and possibly from it) makes any claims about the dominance of Millett's views suspect. Hingley, "Legacy of Rome," 41–42.

<sup>38</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 1.

was native-initiated and developed in the context of political discourse. As such, it no longer occurred either at the behest of the Romans or as the result of some moral teleology.<sup>39</sup> The native elites emulated their Roman masters, not because Roman culture was better or forced upon them, but because of a dialog of power. They sought to retain control by adopting cultural practices that aligned them with those who could guarantee their positions of power.<sup>40</sup> From such Romanized elites, Roman culture trickled down to the lower classes as they emulated their acculturated rulers and other agents of Roman control.<sup>41</sup>

Millett's proposal addressed several of the issues that had emerged in the earlier models. Whereas previous models had largely envisioned Roman subjects as passive recipients of Roman culture, Millett sought other ways of reading the evidence of imperial change. As he wrote in his introduction, his work reflects a post-imperial generation "unwilling to accept the paternalistic view that 'the Britons did what they were told by the Romans because it represented progress.'"<sup>42</sup> As such, his theory recognized not only that local peoples could resist Roman culture but also that they could be active participants and agents in the adoption of it.<sup>43</sup> Likewise, whereas Haverfield's version of Romanization has been criticized for its *sui generis* exposition of cultural change and its evolutionary progress, Millett's explanation provides clear political motivations for elite acculturation under the rubric of political discourse.<sup>44</sup> Cultural

---

<sup>39</sup> Despite Hingley's claims that Millett's model is simply progressive. See below.

<sup>40</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 2, 7, 68-69.

<sup>41</sup> Martin Millett, "Romanization: Historical Issues and Archaeological Interpretations," in *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, ed. Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990), 38.

<sup>42</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, xv.

<sup>43</sup> This point is the major distinction between Millett and those nativists of the Resistance Movement: not only can locals be active in their resistance to Rome, but they can also play a major role in the adoption and spread of "Roman" culture.

<sup>44</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 7.

change no longer flowed from greater to lesser cultures but moved according to political needs in a system of power discrepancies. Despite these necessary improvements to the Romanization theory, Millett's definition prompted further critique of the Romanization paradigm and precipitated the field's fascination with "post"-Romanization models.<sup>45</sup>

As with Haverfield, this critique of Millett originated out of discontent with its inherent Romano-centrism and its inability to account for cultural change across all classes. While Millett had altered the nature of elite agency, the local elites were still largely "Romanizing," making themselves into Romans.<sup>46</sup> This act engenders a new cultural identity (or *synthesis*), but that identity remained *Roman*, such that his fourth-century Britain was "utterly Roman."<sup>47</sup> This interpretation does not stray far from Haverfield, who imagined a similar hybridization, an "amalgamation" that he termed "Roman."<sup>48</sup> It preserves the unidirectionality of Haverfield's model, with ideas flowing from the center of the Empire outward. Because the end result is "Romanness," Hingley contends that Millett's model is merely a dressed-up acculturation model with a progressive teleology.<sup>49</sup> It imagines a unified "Roman" cultural package.<sup>50</sup> While such an

---

<sup>45</sup> This is a view Millett shares in his self-assessment of the work 15 years later. He adopted the term *post-Romanization* to describe the theoretical developments which followed his own work. I find the term applicable, though, I intentionally relocate the quotation marks around *post*, as I find the claim to be beyond Romanization suspect, especially since, as Millett demonstrates, many of the "post"-Romanization critics' definitions fit comfortably within his own work. Also see Hill. Martin Millett, "The Romanization of Britain: Changing Perspectives," *Kodai: Journal of Ancient History* 13/14 (2004): 169–173; J. D. Hill, "Romanisation, Gender, and Class: Recent Approaches to Identity in Britain and Their Possible Consequences," in *Britons and Romans: Advancing an Archaeological Agenda*, ed. Simon James and Martin Millett (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2001), 12.

<sup>46</sup> For Millett, the origin of the change is much clearer. Later renditions of the Romanization model, like Woolf's "becoming Roman," make the direction of change ambiguous (intentionally so).

<sup>47</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 212. In some respects, his *synthesis* is akin to Collingwood's *fusion*, though Collingwood carefully notes that such a fusion is not "consistent and homogenous" blend. Rather, he speaks of a scale of Romanization, which he correlates with class. Collingwood, *Roman Britain*, 92.

<sup>48</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization (3rd Ed.)*, 17, 20, 37, 71.

<sup>49</sup> Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 44.

<sup>50</sup> Hingley, "Legacy of Rome," 42.

analysis exaggerates the direction of Millett's work, it does isolate its inherent weaknesses.<sup>51</sup>

Millett's model falters in its universality, subsuming multivocality and multiple identities under a single response.

Following from Millett's tendency towards universal explanations, Mattingly, Webster, and others find his discussion of the non-elite response to Romanization limiting.<sup>52</sup> Millett's model explains cultural change as an emulation of the local elite. In this exposition, many of the post-modern critics see shades of Haverfield. The native non-elites became recipients of the elite Roman culture, and Millett provides little explanation of this change beyond a concept of trickle-down culture.<sup>53</sup> In some respects, the critique expressed by other scholars is gratuitous since Millett's theory actually contains the answer. Power negotiation becomes the explanation for all changes in the system. It is "self-generating" because each class within society must interact with the one above it, and members of each class adopt or emulate the practices above them in a process of power negotiation.<sup>54</sup> Such a system does not require, as Webster assumes, that the one adopting Roman culture have the potential for mobility to a "Roman" elite position; rather, such a model requires only that the classes be able to converse in a system of symbols.<sup>55</sup> It does, however, fail to consider the non-elites' role in the discourse of power and the compelling suggestion by Webster that other forms of social capital may exist.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> While Hingley prefers to see Millett's model as progressive, his study actually works to eliminate such characteristics. In particular, the reason given for the change, even if acculturation, seems to weaken any claim that Millett's work is progressive, as the process of change is not read as improvement/civilizing but as discourse.

<sup>52</sup> Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 18, 26; Webster, "Creolizing," 209–210, 214–215.

<sup>53</sup> Webster, "Creolizing," 214–215, 219.

<sup>54</sup> Millett, "Romanization," 38. Of course, other factors become involved such as resistance and the limitation of certain symbols to certain classes.

<sup>55</sup> Webster, "Creolizing," 216.

<sup>56</sup> Webster, "Creolizing," 216.

As with Haverfield's theory, Millett's has not been rejected by most scholars. While his model does not completely explain the effects of Roman imperial expansion, many scholars accept his interpretation of elite culture exchange as valid in some Roman-local interactions.<sup>57</sup> Yet, the inability of the model to account for variations has prompted classical scholars to search for other means of explaining what happens with sustained colonizer-colonized relationships.

#### **2.1.4. *Breaking Roman: The "Post"-Romanization Era (1990-Present)***

In the 1990s and 2000s, many scholars in the humanities attempted to divest their fields of the trappings of modernism. They took terms central to their fields under the modernist paradigm, investigated how they paralleled the new theoretical paradigms, and deconstructed them. For example, anthropologists problematized the concept of *culture* while religious studies scholars debated the existence of *religion* as a category and field.<sup>58</sup> Classicists also incorporated such approaches into their own work, examining their field through the lenses of postmodern and postcolonial theories.<sup>59</sup> In particular, they found that models of cultural change, such as Romanization and Hellenization, lacked explanatory power. They failed to encompass the entirety of the empire-subject relationship and, according to some, they were burdened with the baggage of the British imperial climate in which they had developed. Because of this dissatisfaction with such models, some scholars have sought a clean break from Romanization.

---

<sup>57</sup> Given that most of this thesis focuses on elite households, Millett's use of power as a motivation for social exchange has been influential on this work.

<sup>58</sup> Russell T. McCutcheon, *Manufacturing Religion: The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

<sup>59</sup> Of course, the break with the modernist paradigm was not sudden. The roots of this process can be traced back to the Nativist movement, and works like Millett's are transitional between the paradigms.

The attempt to replace Romanization has produced a profusion of alternative models which attempt to describe a relationship once encompassed by the term *Romanization*.<sup>60</sup>

Such models have been grouped here as “post”-Romanization theories because they reject the Romanization paradigm as unsatisfactory and often attempt to replace it with some other term or phrase, usually one borrowed from theoretical models originating in other fields or specializations.<sup>61</sup> For example, scholars have substituted such terms as “discrepant identities,” “globalization,” “creolization,” “negotiated syncretism,” and “becoming Roman” for *Romanization*.<sup>62</sup> Although each of these new models differs in its specifics, they share some commonalities that reflect the tenor of this theoretical turn.<sup>63</sup> The following list outlines the primary characteristics of the post-Romanization movement.<sup>64</sup>

### 1. A Rejection of Romano-Centrism.

---

<sup>60</sup> In an overview of the field’s developments, Mattingly lists ten alternatives to Romanization. However, one should be cognizant of the fact that not everyone involved in the field adopted these ideas, and traditionalist theories and revisionist theories of Romanization remain alongside the theories that are discussed here. See, for an example of the latter, de la Bedoyere. David J. Mattingly, “Vulgar and Weak ‘Romanization’ or Time for a Paradigm Shift,” *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 15 (2002): 537–538; Guy De la Bédoyère, “Romanization,” *British Archaeology* 92 (2007): 22.

<sup>61</sup> In other words, these scholars are *anti*-Romanization in the sense that they avoid the term. Of course, some, like Hingley and Mattingly, are *ANTI*-Romanization. They depict the term as a dangerous idea and a tool of repression. Other scholars such as Woolf and Wallace-Hadrill demonstrate much less animosity towards the term.

<sup>62</sup> Discrepant identities: Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 213–215; globalization: Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*; Martin Pitts, “Globalizing the Local in Roman Britain: An Anthropological Approach to Social Change,” *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27 (2008): 493–506; creolization: Webster, “Creolizing”; negotiated syncretism: Jane Webster, “A Negotiated Syncretism: Readings on the Development of Romano-Celtic Religion,” in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, ed. David J. Mattingly (Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997), 165–184; and becoming Roman: Woolf, *Becoming Roman*.

<sup>63</sup> Because of the number of theories, they are best treated here as a group, as our interest here is not what each individual theory states (I address some specifics elsewhere) but in defining their collective approach to Romanization.

<sup>64</sup> Similar attempts to distill the characteristics of this movement have been made by Chancey, Hill, and Millett. Mark A. Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 15–16; Hill, “Romanisation, Gender, and Class,” 14–15; Millett, “Changing Perspectives,” 170–172.

The classical definition of *Romanization* was Rome-centered: objects and ideas moved from the center and the subjects of the Empire eventually became Roman. As seen above, this was one of the major critiques against Haverfield, the Nativists, and Millett.<sup>65</sup> Such models either do not account for the contributions of the periphery to the center, or they render the actions of the periphery as reactionary and solely dependent upon those of the center.<sup>66</sup> To correct this traditionalist point of view, the new models continue to examine peripheral regions but attempt to swap perspectives, expounding upon Millett's local-initiated Romanization by examining ways locals interact with the ruling culture.<sup>67</sup> Some, in an attempt to be particularly thorough in their rejection of previous models, maintain an anti-imperial, anti-Roman perspective for the sake of argument.<sup>68</sup>

## 2. *Framing of identity/interaction as discourse.*

As part of this attempt to provide the periphery with greater participation in "Romanization," many of these theories have rejected traditional assimilation and acculturation models and opted to define the adoption and use of culture in terms of communication. Reframing the question in such a manner ensures that the periphery is neither written over nor reactionary: native populations are active participants in a

---

<sup>65</sup> Webster argues that one should examine Romanization through a colonial view because imperialism is focused on centralism. Colonialism, in turn, pushes the focus outwards towards the periphery. Jane Webster, "Roman Imperialism and the 'Post Imperial Age,'" in *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, ed. Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper (Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996), 4; Webster, "Creolizing," 216; Pitts, "Globalizing the Local," 494.

<sup>66</sup> This is particularly evident in Haverfield. Though Mattingly does allow at times that the center can be more dominant, the stress of new methodologies, as is exhibited by points #2 and #4 below, is giving voices to a wider group of people, such as the natives on the periphery. Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 40.

<sup>67</sup> Simon James, "Roman Archaeology: Crisis and Revolution," *Antiquity* 77 (2003): 182.

cultural conversation, wherein objects are symbols that can be displayed, manipulated, and altered in the course of that cultural conversation.<sup>69</sup> This continues the work of Millett, who framed the adoption of Roman culture as a discourse of power.<sup>70</sup>

3. *Allowance for variations in practice/meaning of the same materialia.*

The “post”-Romanization critics also recognize the multivalent meanings and uses of objects. The meaning of objects manipulated in such cultural discourses need not always be constant, and it may depend upon one’s conversation partner. For example, Hingley discusses *terra sigillata* found along the northern border of the Empire.<sup>71</sup> Traditionally, archaeologists have assumed that the presence of such pottery has a universal meaning, namely that local populations adopted a particularly Roman way of eating and, therefore, had become Romanized.<sup>72</sup> However, evidence suggests that native peoples did not always use such pottery in a Roman manner, such that the same pottery may have different meanings, depending on its context.<sup>73</sup> In particular, scholars of the post-Romanization school of thought are particularly concerned with the rejection of the concept of a “Roman cultural package.” The locals on the periphery had no *Guide to Being Roman* and could not purchase the

---

<sup>68</sup> In particular, Mattingly adopts a negative approach to Rome that tends to denigrate previous works as lauding the glory of an empire built on blood and violence. Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 4, 13, 22–26.

<sup>69</sup> See Wallace-Hadrill’s understanding of code-switching: Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 63–64, 96–103, 452.

<sup>70</sup> Millett uses the phrase “dialectical change.” Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 1.

<sup>71</sup> Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 109–114.

<sup>72</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 62.

<sup>73</sup> Pitts, “Globalizing the Local,” 500; Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 109–114.



latest extension pack for downloading all the necessary accoutrements for being Roman. Rather, each community worked out what it was to be Roman on their own so that what was “Roman” varied from place to place, even within small geographic confines.<sup>74</sup>

4. *Allowance for a multiplicity of identities/experiences.*

Working from developments in identity theory, several of these models emphasize two points about identity and experience. First, they correct the univocality of earlier models by recognizing multiple responses to Empire, both individually and at the group level. For example, Webster finds Millett’s model pertinent for the elite of the periphery but seeks other ways to explain non-elite responses to Roman power.<sup>75</sup>

Second, identity studies free scholars from the burden of making the subject “simply Roman”: people have multiple identities and group associations that can be manipulated and brought to the forefront depending upon their circumstance.<sup>76</sup> Both of these characteristics introduce multivocality to “Romanization.”

5. *Incorporation of the non-elite.*

Accompanying this multiplicity of experiences, many of these models attempt to address the non-elite, non-male members of society, including women, children, and slaves. This portion of the discussion of *Romanization* has only just begun, as it is

---

<sup>74</sup> Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 241–246.

<sup>75</sup> Webster, “Creolizing,” 209.

<sup>76</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 5.

hampered by the availability of evidence and the archaeological invisibility of such populations.<sup>77</sup>

6. *Rejection/Avoidance of the term Romanization.*

Finally, a vociferous group of scholars has called for the elimination of the term *Romanization* altogether, suggesting a wide variety of various alternatives. Thus, Hingley writes, “it is time that we abandoned the term and the intellectual baggage that it carries...,” and Mattingly describes the use of the term, tongue-in-cheek, as grooming a dead horse or selling dead parrots.<sup>78</sup> Since such appeals rarely prevail (e.g., the failure of the processual call for the end of *biblical archaeology*), Romanization likely will continue to be used to describe cultural change in the Roman period.<sup>79</sup> However, this movement has partially succeeded by firmly imprisoning the term behind hyperbolic air quotes. Scholars must now expound upon what they mean by *Romanization* (see Chapter 3) and, when the term comes up in introductory courses, explain to their students that the subject is more complicated than can be covered in the scope of an introductory class.

---

<sup>77</sup> As Millett points out, the elite focus of his own work and others resulted from an artifactual bias, not a personal bias. Millett, “Changing Perspectives,” 170–171.

<sup>78</sup> In another article, Hingley (or the article publisher) uses the asterisk in the manner through which reporters indicate curse words in a publicly “acceptable” manner. While tongue-in-cheek, Mattingly’s imagery is particularly disturbing because it implies either that his colleagues do not realize that “Romanization is dead” or that they recognize the passing of the paradigm and are being intentionally deceptive. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 2; Mattingly, “Vulgar and Weak Romanization,” 537; Richard Hingley, “R\*\*\*\*ization,” *British Archaeology* 95 (2007): 20.

<sup>79</sup> For the debate over what to call to call biblical archaeology, see the discussion between Dever and Shanks in *Biblical Archaeology Review*. Hershel Shanks, “Should the Term ‘Biblical Archaeology’ Be Abandoned,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 7, no. 3 (June 1981): 54–57; Hershel Shanks, “Is This Man a Biblical Archaeologist? BAR Interviews William Dever - Part One,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22, no. 4 (August 1996): 30–39, 62–63; William G. Dever, “What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 7, no. 5 (October 1981): 40–41.

Assessing the “Post”-Romanization movement is difficult, as it is currently in its heyday. Some of the major works that belong to this school of thought are less than a decade old, with the result that their authors continue to develop their theoretical models and their students have only begun to apply these works to case studies. Much of the viability of such models has yet to be tested. In addition, although I object to the strong anti-Romanization sentiment expressed by some of these scholars, I find my work aligned with many of the goals of the “post”-Romanization movement, making any critique harder.

Like all of the theories examined thus far, the content of these models reflects the period in which they developed. In particular, the multivocality of the past seems to be a reflection of the multivocality of the present. As I pointed out with Haverfield, this interaction of past and present does not necessarily reflect poorly on the theoretical model. Rather, the model must be applied to see if such claims are sustainable. In the present case, while perhaps exaggerated at times, the multivocality of the past solves many of the shortcomings of previous models and reflects human reality. It runs little risk of being labeled *anachronistic*, except perhaps by its exaggeration.<sup>80</sup> The problem with multivocality is that no suitable inclusive alternative has been proposed to replace *Romanization*: a plethora of methodologies exists but their applicability is limited. All of the proposed theories work in certain cases but not in others because they focus on specific features of society. This fact becomes particularly evident with Webster. In discussing two different topics (the non-elite and religion), she must turn to two different

---

<sup>80</sup> One of the dangers that arises with multivocality is the danger of imagining that the ancients had unlimited freedom of choice. We must always remember that choice is restricted by such things as power, economic, and social structures, such that the choices in discussion of multivocality can become limited, and that the present freedom of the present (enjoyed or imagined) should not be retrojected onto the past. See a similar note on freedom expression in Insoll. Timothy Insoll, “Introduction: Configuring Identities in Archaeology,” in *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, ed. Timothy Insoll (London: Routledge, 2007), 4.

American historical archaeology models to explain cultural change.<sup>81</sup> This new paradigm has led to fracturing explanations of cultural change and lacks a holistic model.<sup>82</sup> The version of Romanization presented below addresses some of this challenge, but this issue largely lies beyond the scope of this thesis. In addition, with the new freedom of multivocality and multivalency provided in the “post”-Romanization era, some of these models have sacrificed historical specificity for comparative power. For example, Pitts and Hingley apply an economic model that has its basis in twentieth century connectivity in an attempt to explain the system of the Roman Empire.<sup>83</sup> Despite its weaknesses, the “post”-Romanization movement has expanded the discussion of cultural change and corrected a number of the issues that appeared under the previous models.

## **2.2. Can the East Be Won? Romanizing the “Roman” East**

Traditionally, the debate over Romanization has centered upon the Western Empire, largely ignoring the issue of cultural discourse between the Romans and their Eastern subjects. Although recent studies have begun to shift to regions such as Greece and Palestine, the discussion remains overwhelmingly Western.<sup>84</sup> This orientation is apparent in many of the works discussed thus far, as the case studies on which they depend are overwhelmingly

---

<sup>81</sup> Webster, “Creolizing”; Webster, “Negotiated Syncretism.”

<sup>82</sup> Millett, “Changing Perspectives,” 172; Martin Pitts, “The Emperor’s New Clothes? The Utility of Identity in Roman Archaeology,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (2007): 696.

<sup>83</sup> While perhaps I run the risk here of falling into my own critique against anachronism, of all the models applied to the Roman-period Mediterranean, perhaps ironically, globalization is the most fitting for the label. Globalization is a twentieth-century term used to describe an economic and global system that did not come into existence until the twentieth century due to the greater global connectivity caused by technological advances. On the other hand, see Webster’s arguments for such comparisons, which illustrate differences between past and present. Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*; Pitts, “Globalizing the Local”; Webster, “Roman Imperialism and the ‘Post Imperial Age,’” 8–9.

<sup>84</sup> Alcock provides a list of approximately twenty or so works concerning Romanization in the East written as of 1997, though some of them connect only indirectly to the topic. Susan E. Alcock, “Preface: East Is East,” in *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, ed. Susan E. Alcock (Oxford, England: Oxbow Books, 1997), v–vi.

Western.<sup>85</sup> As a result, most of the theoretical discussion of what it meant to be “Roman” depends exclusively upon the evidence from the Western Empire.

The reasons for the Western focus of *Romanization* can be traced back to its beginnings. Of course, interest in the West depends partly upon the location of scholars and their own interests: for the most part, the scholars engaging in a discussion of the Romanization of the West are Westerners telling the story of their own perceived past (or present). However, beyond simple interest in the subject lie two questions that are determinative for the Western bias of the field. Can a people who already possess “civilization” be Romanized? And, how do we define cultural change — by origins or by power? The answers to these questions constitute the central assumptions in the discussion of Romanization, and the manner in which they have been traditionally answered pushed the discussion of Romanization westward.

With respect to the first question, the answer has always been a resounding, “No.” This answer can be traced back to Haverfield’s original framing of the term *Romanization*. With respect to the East, Haverfield argued that “The Romanization of these lands was political. They ultimately learnt (sic) to call and to consider themselves Romans. But they did not adopt the Roman language or the civilization.”<sup>86</sup> He equated Romanization with bringing “civilization” to the native peoples, or as Hingley and his colleagues would have it, his Romanization was framed by a moral prerogative of civilization that reflected the British Empire’s own belief in their civilizing mission.<sup>87</sup> In civilizing the natives, Rome introduced them to the cultural achievements that historians have long associated with Western culture. However, Greece and many of the states of the Eastern Empire not only possessed, but also had developed many of

---

<sup>85</sup> See examples above.

<sup>86</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization (2nd Ed.)*, 11.

<sup>87</sup> Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 33.

these central ideas of “civilization.”<sup>88</sup> These peoples, therefore, could not be Romanized. The assimilation model provided no effective explanation for cultural exchange between one “civilization” and another “civilization.” In theory, modern scholarship has escaped the limits of assimilation and Rome-centric acculturation models by reframing the relationship between ruler and subject. Despite these apparent changes in the “post”-Romanization period, though, the topic of Romanization has largely remained the prerogative of the West.<sup>89</sup>

While this tendency preserves a scholarly tradition, it may also be explained by the answer to the second question. For decades, the dominant opinion in classics has deemed *origins* as the most important (and, at times, the most interesting) factor in cultural change. For example, it appears in debates over the inspiration behind Herodian architecture and appears in nativist works such as Bernal’s and Ball’s under the guise of we-did-it-first.<sup>90</sup> For the present purposes, this assumption has traditionally led scholars of the Eastern Empire to approach cultural change in the Roman East differently from the West. The peoples of the East do not Romanize: they Hellenize. While *Hellenization* has also faced many of the same criticisms as Romanization, the term seems to be applied more readily to the East than *Romanization*.<sup>91</sup> This trend stems from the idea that much of the cultural change taking place in the East during the Roman period originated from places like Greece and Alexandria, reflecting the intensification and spread of the hybrid culture developed in the aftermath of Alexander the Great’s conquest. This fascination with origins, though, is problematic. It relies upon the same paradigm which

---

<sup>88</sup> Greg Woolf, “Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40 (1994): 119.

<sup>89</sup> Millett suggests that modern imperial settings may explain this tendency. Martin Millett, “A View from the West,” in *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, ed. Susan E. Alcock (Oxford, England: Oxbow Books, 1997), 201.

<sup>90</sup> Bernal, *Black Athena*; Warwick Ball, *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire* (London: Routledge, 2000).

states that the East cannot be “civilized.” Although Haverfield’s reasons for arguing against Romanization in the East are unpalatable to most modern scholars, the origins theory depends on the same reasoning: the East already had a culture which was connected to that other “cradle of Western civilization” – Greece. Therefore, the Romans do not “Romanize” here; they only expand the existing Hellenistic culture.<sup>92</sup>

Beyond the fact that such models often possess latent assimilation and acculturation tendencies, they also maintain Haverfield’s idea of a Western veneer, assuming that Rome could contribute nothing to the Greeks and the East. Yet, archaeological and literary evidence suggests that Rome completely changed Greek culture. The Romans transformed the landscape, reshaping places like Athens in accordance with Roman ideals and beliefs; and, figuratively, they changed “Greekness,” which acquired a new meaning under Roman rule.<sup>93</sup> In fact, it acquired this meaning *because of* Roman rule, with it being defined on criteria such as being “not Roman” or “older than Rome.”<sup>94</sup> Thus, although the East was already “civilized” and much of its material culture may rightfully be termed “Hellenistic,” it too was “Romanized.”

The absence of Romanization in the East, then, emerges from scholarship that still clings to a Western-centric acculturation model.<sup>95</sup> Although the “post”-Romanization theories have deconstructed the Romanization model, their concentration on the Western Empire, to the almost

---

<sup>91</sup> This distinction is expressed by Alcock and Millett. Alcock, “Preface: East Is East”; Millett, “View.”

<sup>92</sup> Among others, for the equation of Romanization with Hellenization, see Lee Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 16; Martin Hengel, *The “Hellenization” of Judaea in the First Century After Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1989), 1; Mark A. Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 17.

<sup>93</sup> For example, the addition of “itinerant temples” to the Athenian agora. See Susan E. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 51–73; Susan E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 180–199.

<sup>94</sup> Woolf, “Becoming Roman, Staying Greek,” 126.

total neglect of the East, betrays the lingering specter of Romanization. However, the “post”-Romanization movement has also provided the tools to allow scholars, like Susan Alcock and Andrea Berlin, to ask what Romanization would look like if it occurred in the East.<sup>96</sup> Changing views of what an empire is and how it impacts the lives of its subjects has allowed scholars to expand what it means to “Romanize.” Concepts such as discourse, which are the foundation of the “post”-Romanization models, avoid the origins trap and engage in a discussion of use and perception. In so doing, these tools allow us to examine a new data set and approach cultural exchange across the Empire from a different perspective.

### **2.3. Romanizing Palestine: Changing Perspectives on the East**

Since the geographical subject of this thesis lies in the Eastern Empire, the story of its “Romanization” has been told differently than those works on which the theoretical discussions hinge. In general, the scholarly understanding of the Jewish relationship with their neighbors in ancient Palestine reflects the broader field’s approach to the East. Despite the significant influence of scholarship in other fields such as biblical and early Christian studies, works on ancient Palestine share classical studies’ Eastern bias: Hellenism was the dominant force in Palestine in the post-Alexandrian world.<sup>97</sup> For some scholars, Hellenism was an “instrument of three successive empires,” including Rome.<sup>98</sup> Only recently has a “Roman” Romanization become an increasingly important factor in the field.

---

<sup>95</sup> Whether or not the authors of the models are cognizant of the fact.

<sup>96</sup> Alcock, *Graecia Capta*; Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization.”

<sup>97</sup> By *Hellenism*, I mean Levine’s definition: it is the “cultural milieu” produced by the process of *Hellenization*, “the process of adoption and adaptation of this culture on a local level.” Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 16–17.

<sup>98</sup> Tessa Rajak, “Greeks and Barbarians in Josephus,” in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, ed. John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001), 247. Levine makes a similar point in describing the cultural milieu. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 17.



### 2.3.1. Roma Philhellene: Rome as Hellenizer

According to traditional scholarship, if “Romanization” existed in ancient Palestine, whether enforced by the Romans themselves or adopted independently by the locals, it was expressed as Hellenization.<sup>99</sup> As demonstrated by Tessa Rajak’s quote above, these scholars imagine the symbolic and uniting language of Rome in Palestine to be Hellenism.<sup>100</sup> Lee Levine has suggested that the origins of this tradition can be traced back to Elias Bickerman’s and Saul Lieberman’s works of the 1930s and the 1940s, as they began to examine the influence of Hellenizing trends on Jews within Palestine itself.<sup>101</sup> However, the bellwether for the field was Hengel’s publication of his doctoral thesis, *Judaism and Hellenism*.<sup>102</sup> He addressed a historical-theological question in early Christian studies that had severed a diaspora-centric Hellenistic Judaism from Palestinian Judaism. Rendering moot all arguments about the development of Hellenistic Christianity outside of the Jewish homeland, he demonstrated that the Jews of ancient Palestine were Hellenized in their language, education, and philosophy.<sup>103</sup> Although this volume concerned the period prior to the coming of the Romans, its arguments came to be applied

---

<sup>99</sup> A particularly clear statement of the Eastern approach to cultural change appears in Chancey. He writes, “Furthermore, in the eastern half of the Mediterranean region, the Romans encouraged Hellenistic culture, already present to varying degrees, as a unifying force. Thus, ‘Romanization’ there often included ‘Hellenization’...” However, in reading the typical discourse on archaeology or Judaism in Palestine in this period, the “Roman” contribution may be excised completely, such as in Hengel’s *Hellenistic Judaism*. Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture*, 18; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

<sup>100</sup> Rajak, “Greeks and Barbarians,” 17.

<sup>101</sup> Levine also provides an extensive review of the literature on Hellenism in Judea. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 6–15; Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942); Elias Bickerman, *Der Gott der Makkabaer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabaischen Erhebung* (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1937).

<sup>102</sup> It was originally published in German in 1969 and later translated to English by Bowden in 1974. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*.

<sup>103</sup> Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 311-312.

throughout the Roman period, even up to the Arab conquest, and Hengel's interpretation became the dominant reading of Roman Palestine.<sup>104</sup>

This reading of Roman Palestine, though, raises a number of issues. The interpretation largely arises from a literary context, as Bickerman's, Lieberman's, and Hengel's works predated or were roughly contemporary with the major Roman-era archaeological excavations of the past century.<sup>105</sup> Although these later archaeological discoveries show continuities between the Hellenistic and Roman periods in Palestine, they also demonstrate that significant cultural, social, and political changes occurred under Roman rule. As such, the appellation "Hellenistic" is not always satisfactory. In fact, the continued description of the change under the Romans as primarily "Hellenizing" requires the downplaying or omission of Rome's contributions to the East. For example, although Hengel was not an archaeologist, he engages with the archaeological record to demonstrate the continued presence of Hellenization in Palestine through the first century CE.<sup>106</sup> However, intentionally or not, his work lacks references to "Roman" additions to the cultural milieu such that the seeming continuities between the periods overwhelm any differences.<sup>107</sup> Likewise, though I hold perception and use to be more important than origins, archaeologists who participate in such discussions and adopt a Hellenization model inexplicably describe structures with traditionally "Roman" features but label them as

---

<sup>104</sup> In his introduction to his thesis, Hengel ended his "Hellenistic" period with the disappearance of the last "Hellenistic" kingdom under Trajan, but in his later work, he expanded this image to the Arab conquest. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 3; Martin Hengel, "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, ed. John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001), 29.

<sup>105</sup> For example, although many sites had undergone partial excavations in previous decades, the ground breaking and large-scale excavations of the major sites of the Roman period did not occur until the latter half of the twentieth century: Caesarea Maritima's major excavations began in the 1950s, Masada's were in the 1960s, Netzer's excavations of the major Herodian palaces were from the 1960s onward, and Jerusalem's (especially those of the Western Hill and Ophel) occurred from 1968 onward.

<sup>106</sup> Hengel, "*Hellenization*" of *Judaea*.

“Hellenistic” or “Greek” in origins.<sup>108</sup> Many scholars who follow the Hellenization model recognize this flaw and tend to designate the post-63 BCE Palestinian culture as “Greco-Roman.”<sup>109</sup> This term is preferable in that it acknowledges part of the threefold identity negotiation (Roman-Hellenistic-Jewish) that occurred in Judea in this period, but, often, the term is not applied consistently across a work or the verbal act of Hellenizing continues to dominate such constructions.<sup>110</sup>

In addition to de-emphasizing the material difference between the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the Hellenization model minimizes the impact of Roman culture on identity.<sup>111</sup> It misses the fact that the nature of Hellenization itself changes in the self-reflective mirror of empire. The emerging cultural milieu and connections of empire necessitates that Hellenization become something new. A “Hellenized” West in control of a “Greek” East calls for new boundaries and new definitions, which appear in such cases as a redefinition of Greekness.<sup>112</sup> The Hellenization model also ignores the fact that the presence of Rome requires a re-working of personal and group identities, perhaps as in the re-definition of Jewishness in the north of Palestine by Berlin’s

---

<sup>107</sup> Hengel acknowledged that the study was much briefer than he originally had planned, and this fact may have been partially determinative in the omission. Hengel, “*Hellenization*” of *Judaea*, 5-6.

<sup>108</sup> For example, Levine with reference to the Second Temple. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 68–69.

<sup>109</sup> Defined by Chancey, Meyers, and others as being “the added influence of the Roman culture” (on top of Hellenistic culture). Chancey, *Myth*, 7; Eric Meyers, “Sanders’s ‘Common Judaism’ and the ‘Common Judaism’ of Material Culture,” in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 166.

<sup>110</sup> Chancey’s definition, though, at times seems more flexible, as he seems to use it interchangeably with Hellenistic/Hellenism. Chancey, *Myth*.

<sup>111</sup> An impact, which, admittedly, will likely also have material correlates.

<sup>112</sup> For example, Whitmarsh shows how the spectacle of empire shifts Greek definitions literarily. Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 181–246.

“anti-Romanization.”<sup>113</sup> Instead, although “Hellenized Judaism” existed before the coming of the Romans, such models may extend a single undifferentiated process over the course of a millennium, as in Hengel’s final definition of the process.<sup>114</sup> Finally, behind the claim that Rome pursued a policy of Hellenization in Palestine lies the assumption that this undifferentiated Hellenization was unproblematic for the Romans. However, as Woolf demonstrates, while the Romans adopted aspects of Hellenization into their own culture, they were never comfortable with their heritage from the Greek East because the incorporation of such features challenged the basis of their own self-identity.<sup>115</sup>

In addressing these shortcomings of characterizing Roman Palestine as being primarily Hellenistic, I do not intend to question Hengel’s primary thesis. His work was transformative for the fields of Jewish and Christian studies, and his primary point stands. The Greek conquest of the East prompted ongoing dialogical negotiations between the natives and their Hellenistic rulers. These negotiations resulted in changes in Jewish culture, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. Rather, my point is that Romanization does not simply equate with Hellenization in Roman Palestine. While perhaps this process of Hellenization continued under the Romans because they themselves had “Hellenized” and continued to use political structures left in place by their predecessors, the term *Hellenization* fails to describe adequately the cultural image of Roman Palestine and even obscures our understanding of the period. The Romans interjected new ways of identity negotiation and intensified old ones. Viewing Hellenization as the dominant factor of the period effaces the significant impact of the new identity situation brought about by the Romans and fails to explain major events prompted by these changes.

---

<sup>113</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 69.

<sup>114</sup> Hengel, “Revisited,” 29.

<sup>115</sup> Woolf, “Becoming Roman, Staying Greek,” 130.

### 2.3.2. Herodes Philorhomaïos, a Roman Exception?

Aside from the deficiencies listed above, the Hellenization model gives rise to a particular difficulty: the question of how to handle Herod the Great. Any model that privileges one culture over another falls apart when considering Herod. He moves easily through the landscapes of all the major cultures in the region so that labels such as “Hellenistic” cling only tenuously to his figure.<sup>116</sup> Turned the wrong way, his robe will slip to reveal another identity. Although this thesis will not focus on Herod in particular, he is the clearest example of how people in Roman Palestine could easily navigate the Roman-Hellenistic-Jewish trialectic through identity negotiation.<sup>117</sup>

Herod’s roots were in the Hellenistic world. He likely received a “Greek” education; in his early years, he learned governance under Hellenistic rulers such as his father and Hyrcanus II; and he performed the duties of a Hellenistic king.<sup>118</sup> However, besides Hadrian’s re-foundation of Jerusalem and re-organization of the province after the Bar Kokhba Revolt, no one did more to Romanize Judea than Herod the Great.<sup>119</sup> He so aligned himself with Rome and adopted Roman material culture that he became recognized in imperial contexts as

---

<sup>116</sup> Although I am focusing on the difficulty that arises from the focus on the Hellenistic aspect of Herod’s reign, over emphasis of its Roman-ness can also result in problematic conclusions. For the east, the “Roman” aspect has been less of an issue, but see Roller’s tendency to attribute almost every feature in Herod’s reign and architecture to a close relationship with and multiple trips to Rome. The definition of *Romanization* used in this thesis attempts to avoid such shortcomings by engaging in a discussion of identity negotiation and display. Roller, *Building Program*.

<sup>117</sup> My 2012 ASOR paper addressed the manner in which Herod’s architecture creates a dialog of identity. This model should be opened further beyond this trialectic, as Herod ruled over other *ethnoi*, including his own family’s territory of Idumaea and his wife Malthace’s district of Samaria. Brian A. Coussens, “anOther’s Image: Self-Representation and Kingship on the Periphery of the Roman Empire” (presented at the ASOR, Chicago, IL, 2012).

<sup>118</sup> Peter Richardson, *Herod, King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1996), 108–128; Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, trans. Brian Pearce (London: Penguin, 1990), 102–103.

<sup>119</sup> Although Hadrian is typically portrayed as Hadrian “Philohellene,” one must remember that the new organization he gave to the region was largely Roman, and he accelerated the Romanization of the province by stationing the Tenth Legion in Judea. As Wallace-Hadrill notes, “For all this easy and playful intimacy with Greek culture...there is no mistaking Augustus, or for that matter Hadrian, for a Greek.” Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 39.

*Philorhomaïos*.<sup>120</sup> Herod adopted “Roman” architectural techniques, dedicated cities, temples, and other buildings to Roman leaders, helped construct Augustus’ victory city of Nicopolis, sent several of his sons to Rome to be educated, and actively engaged with Rome in other ways.<sup>121</sup> He transformed Palestine’s landscape with visible and lasting monuments to Rome.

The dissonance that the Hellenization model generates is best exhibited by Steven Purtell’s recent thesis for the University of Georgia, entitled *The Hellenization of Judea under Herod the Great*.<sup>122</sup> Despite the title of the thesis, approximately one-third of it deals with Roman influence on Herod, discussing at length some of the “Romanized” attributes of his reign.<sup>123</sup> However, the framework of Purtell’s thesis is Hellenization, and he never addresses why something presented as being Romanized should also be defined primarily as Hellenized.<sup>124</sup> Instead, he lists a partial definition from Chancey that expands the Hellenization process throughout the Roman period and concludes that “Herod believed in Hellenism...[standing] for a policy of melding the best of the West with the East.”<sup>125</sup> In other words, like many following the traditional model, although Purtell would give a significant role to the transformative Roman

---

<sup>120</sup> I disagree with Geiger’s claims that the Athenians likely followed Herod’s own self-identification in this. Just as no evidence exists that Herod ever commissioned or approved any of the statues dedicated in his honor, there is no evidence that he played a part in approving the inscriptions that were associated with them. Joseph Geiger, “Language, Culture, and Identity in Ancient Palestine,” in *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks*, ed. Erik Nis Ostenfeld, Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity III (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002), 238. *OGIS* 414; *IG* 2.2.3440.

<sup>121</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 1.14.3 §281, 1.20.4 §400, 1.23.3 §452-454; *AJ* 14.14.3 §379, 15.10.3 §361, 16.1.2 §6-7, 16.4.1 §91 – 16.4.5 §129.

<sup>122</sup> Steven M. Purtell, “The Hellenization of Judea under Herod the Great” (MA Thesis, Athens: University of Georgia, 2012).

<sup>123</sup> Purtell, “Hellenization of Judea,” 43-72.

<sup>124</sup> Purtell, “Hellenization of Judea,” 13-16.

<sup>125</sup> Purtell, “Hellenization of Judea,” 16, 102; Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture*, 14.

period under Herod the Great, he subsumes it under the category of Hellenization. He stresses continuity between periods without adequately accounting for change.

I use Purtell's thesis as an obvious and recent example of this tendency, but this trend is evident among established scholars as well. For example, Ehud Netzer pointed to Roman features and principles in Herodian architecture but concluded that it was primarily Hellenizing.<sup>126</sup> Likewise, in their recent book on Jerusalem, Katharina Galor and Hanswulf Bloedhorn place the entire Herodian era within their chapter entitled "The Hellenistic Period."<sup>127</sup> For them, Jerusalem only becomes defined as "Roman" with the re-foundation of the city under Hadrian.<sup>128</sup>

To maintain this image of "Roman" Herod nesting easily inside a "Greek" one, such Hellenizing models must opt for one of several approaches. They can, as with Purtell and Netzer, acknowledge a significant Roman change but insist upon its Greekness; they can, as with Lee, divorce Rome from its cultural contributions by insisting that Romanization is purely political; or, as with Hengel, they can omit Herod altogether. Admittedly, part of the difficulty arises from the fact that no single Roman or Greek identity package exists.<sup>129</sup> This situation

---

<sup>126</sup> Ehud Netzer, *The Architecture of Herod the Great Builder* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 292. Lichtenberger sees Herod's adoption of Roman techniques as not Roman but a Hellenistic expression of kingship. Lichtenberger, "Herod and Rome," 43.

<sup>127</sup> Katharina Galor and Hanswulf Bloedhorn, *The Archaeology of Jerusalem: From the Origins to the Ottomans* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 63–112.

<sup>128</sup> To some degree, their organization appears to be determined by archaeological considerations. However, while for the first time the entire city appears to be re-organized on a Roman plan as Aelia Capitolina, to place the Herodian reformulation of the city under the Hellenistic period is problematic, as the city, while not a "new" foundation, had changed greatly from the days of Hyrcanus II. Beyond the addition of major monuments, the city added a quarter and expanded old ones. In addition, major planning and re-organization occurred, including the laying of at least one major street (Pavement 800) in the Upper City. Admittedly, as Geva noted, sometimes the finds between the later Hellenistic period and early Herodian period are difficult to differentiate, but the periods are driven by different forces and, while some of the desires of the rulers overlap, their architectural agenda is motivated by different sources. Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 32, 64–69; Galor and Bloedhorn, *Archaeology of Jerusalem*, 113–126.

<sup>129</sup> Though, perhaps, we can speak of a *koine*.

allows for a flexibility in definition of identities such that scholars can approach Hellenism from a maximalist or minimalist position. However, with respect to Herod, the insistence that he is primarily a Hellenizer overlooks the Roman correlates in his works and disregards contemporary recognition of one aspect of his identity. For both Herod and his land, a new model is needed that does not sacrifice a burgeoning Roman identity to its Hellenistic past, while permitting Roman-Hellenistic-Jewish identities to exist side-by-side and to play off one another.

### ***2.3.3. Emerging Romanization Paradigms***

Although 1990 should not be conceived of as a hard divide, the past twenty-five years have seen an increasing number of studies willing to describe post-63 BCE Palestine as *Romanizing*, with little reservation.<sup>130</sup> This burgeoning interest is odd as this period coincides with the West's deconstruction of the terminology. The reasons behind this development are not immediately clear. While Millett's study serves as a convenient corresponding temporal marker, the East lacks a single catalyst for this transition. Instead, the term began to appear more frequently in the 1990s, followed by its proliferation in the first decade of the present century. Part of the interest in this term may be due to the deconstruction of traditionalist views that would restrict Romanization to the West. It may also originate in the growing evidence from post-1968 excavations of a significant change in the material habits of local inhabitants in the aftermath of the Roman annexation. At other times, such as in Lee's thesis, the term's use stems from an attempt to tie a study to the larger theoretical discussion of Empire and cultural

---

<sup>130</sup> As per my qualification, this does not mean that the term did not appear in the East before 1990s but that there is a renewed interest in its application and, in many cases, a change in what is meant by Romanization. For a few examples of the growing application of this term after 1990, see Altshul, Berlin, Chancey, Lee, Regev, and the session on Hellenization and Romanization in Israel at the XVII International Congress of Classical Archaeology. Altshul, "Herodian 'Revolution'"; Berlin, "Romanization and Anti-Romanization"; Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture*; Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*; Regev, "Herod's Jewish Ideology"; *Bolletino di archeologica on line*. Edizione speciale: Congresso di Archeologia AIAC, no. G8: Meetings of East and West: Hellenization and



change.<sup>131</sup> The following discussion engages with works that are representative of this “Romanizing” turn to demonstrate some of its theoretical groundings and interests.

### 2.3.3.1. *Defining Boundaries in the Galilee (Berlin)*

Of the works covered here, Berlin’s “Romanization and Anti-Romanization in pre-Revolt Galilee” has been the most influential.<sup>132</sup> Her premise, based on the archaeological record, is that Galilean Jews began to reject certain categories of artifacts because they had become representative of Roman control.<sup>133</sup> Berlin draws conclusions that require her to step away from the traditional Roman “Hellenization” model. She recognizes that the archaeological remains indicate a temporal shift: throughout the Hellenistic period, households in the Galilee and Golan produced a fairly consistent repertoire of artifacts across both Jewish and Gentile sites. Only in the aftermath of Roman control, does this change, such that it “might suggest their cultural association should be in fact read as ‘Roman’ rather than ‘Hellenistic.’”<sup>134</sup> In other words, even if the cultural objects seem to be “Hellenistic” or “Greek” in origin and even if we may still term this adoption as *Hellenization*, the noticeable physical cultural change only occurred during the Roman period. Therefore, we may have a new cultural milieu which, though having similarities to the old one, should not be equated with it. While Berlin ties this response to Rome through a political lens, she also demonstrates that Roman control produced more than a simple Roman veneer: it had a physical impact on material adoption and use. She also frames the discussion in terms of identity and personal choice, a decision which breaks with the tendency to equate

---

Romanization of the Land of Israel (2008), [http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=73](http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=73) (accessed October 14, 2013).

<sup>131</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 1, 7–10. See below.

<sup>132</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization.”

<sup>133</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 69.

<sup>134</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 63.

origins with identity.<sup>135</sup> She later applies this model more broadly to Palestine in discussing what she terms “Household Judaism.”<sup>136</sup> Although both of these articles have been cited widely in scholarship, the references usually concern recognizing “Jewishness” in the archaeological record and for this significant shift in the traditions of understanding Romanization and Hellenization in the east.

#### 2.3.3.2. *Roman in Politics, Not in Culture (Lee)*

Unlike Berlin, Lee’s thesis engages heavily in the theoretical discussions of Romanization from the West, applying the ideas of Millett, Barrett, Hingley, Freeman, and others.<sup>137</sup> As such, his thesis was an important addition to the scholarly corpus as the theoretical discussion has been missing in the East. However, Lee’s argument, that Palestine never Romanized, reflects a response to a Western question, as the only geographically relevant work he can truly bring to bear on this question is Berlin’s.<sup>138</sup> Although Lee engages in discussions of Hellenization, the “corrective” that he attempts to apply to the field is about a concern which had not figured prominently in Palestinian archaeology to that point. Instead, his thesis appears to adduce the lack of Roman cultural change in an Eastern province as evidence for a Western question. In addition, Lee’s conclusions derive primarily from four assumptions. He defines *Romanization* according to Haverfield’s (or, possibly, Millett’s) definition, that those who *Romanize* become Roman.<sup>139</sup> This position necessitates a negative answer to the question of whether or not natives of Palestine Romanized, and most scholars who still use the term do not

---

<sup>135</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 68.

<sup>136</sup> Berlin, “Jewish Life.”

<sup>137</sup> This fact is not particularly surprising, given that one of his advisors was Freeman, one of the British scholars engaged in the “post”-Romanization debate. See his “Acknowledgements.” Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*.

<sup>138</sup> The others listed fall under the rubric of the Hellenization tradition. Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 7.

<sup>139</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, i.

understand it as such. Because of this antiquated definition, Lee concludes that no Jew Romanized because their Jewish-ness was still apparent.<sup>140</sup> He also adopts Ball's understanding of cultural continuity.<sup>141</sup> By stressing the "eastern" origins of certain architectural elements, Lee claims that the particular element is not "Romanizing," despite the facts that he can neither establish a cultural connection to the architectural origins nor demonstrate that the natives understood such architecture as expressly "not Roman."<sup>142</sup> Finally, in his most problematic move, he attempts to sever the political realm from the cultural, ethnic, and religious.<sup>143</sup> As demonstrated in the discussion of Berlin above, even if we were to treat these as separate categories, the political can have a direct effect on the cultural. What these positions produce is a theory that ends in a familiar space, describing a non-Romanized Palestine with a political Roman veneer.<sup>144</sup> Although his thesis begins to address the theories needed for understanding Romanization in the East, Lee's assumptions prevent the theory from being applied usefully to Roman Palestine.

---

<sup>140</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 57.

<sup>141</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 36-38, 50-53.

<sup>142</sup> In Lee's "origins" argument, he envisions a hybrid culture that may have some "Roman" elements. The main problem with his argument is that, though having Roman elements, the architecture can never communicate or express "Romanness." We both agree that the locals may not have had the ability to distinguish the "origins" of architecture, but he prefers to see local incorporation. Such architecture engenders both local and imperial identities, despite its origins. Although I do not have space to discuss it here, monumental structures or those expressed in a non-local symbolic language likely brought forward connotations imperial power dynamics and, in part, enforced a role as Roman subject. Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 36, 53-55.

<sup>143</sup> By ethnic, here, as elsewhere, I mean "concerning an *ethnos*." Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 67, 82.

<sup>144</sup> In other words, despite Lee's engagement of a critique of Haverfield's definition of Romanization, with respect to Romanization in the East, he ends up exactly where Haverfield started a century ago.

### 2.3.3.3. *A Roman Cultural Revolution (Altshul)*

In his 2012 thesis, Altshul applied theories of Romanization to Herodian Jerusalem.<sup>145</sup> He implements part of Wallace-Hadrill's model for Augustan Rome in his consideration of first-century Jerusalem and finds that Herod followed the example of Augustus, achieving both a political and "cultural revolution." The majority of Altshul's thesis concurs with the material evidence and, in some ways, continues the work which Berlin started a decade before. However, his Romanization of Jerusalem (or, more appropriately, Jerusalem's "becoming Roman") is too strong, supposing clear cultural delineations where few are evident.<sup>146</sup>

Although Roman-period features seemingly dominate the archaeological landscape of Roman Palestine, the concept of "Romanization" in the region has only begun to reach maturity. The tendency to equate origins with identities meant that Hellenization received prime place in the history of Palestine. Only in the past two decades has Romanization become a serious subject for the region's specialists. Yet, even at this early stage in its development, its theoretical scope is wide-ranging, stretching from denial of cultural Romanization to the declaration of a Roman cultural revolution. Despite their differences, these studies demonstrate the growing sentiment in the field that this period should be distinguished from the preceding period and that the effect of Roman control on material culture should be more clearly formulated.

## 2.4. Conclusions

The study of *Romanization* has been in transition over the past twenty-five years. In the region of the Western Empire, where Romanization was the standard interpretation of cultural change in the Roman Empire for most of the twentieth century, scholars have generally discarded the paradigm. They have abandoned the traditional explanations of assimilation and

---

<sup>145</sup> Altshul, "Herodian 'Revolution.'"

acculturation for post-modern theories. These theories, while dismantling Romanization, have not provided a satisfactory substitute for it. Beyond a general concern for principles central to post-modern thought (such as multivocality), the field remains fragmented. At the same time, scholars working in the East have become increasingly interested in the possibility of “Roman” cultural change, deviating from the norm of the Hellenization model. In Palestine in particular, this newfound interest in “Romanization” has corrected a number of problems which emerge from equating cultural change with Hellenization by addressing the noticeable cultural divergences between the Roman and Hellenistic periods. This thesis engages in both of these traditions. On the one hand, it turns to the Western Empire for theoretical correlates, much as Lee and Altshul have done, because the scholars of the East have introduced little to the theoretical discussions. On the other hand, this thesis continues to focus on the significance of cultural change in Roman period Palestine. The following chapter will attempt to outline a model for understanding first-century cultural change that combines both of these concerns.

---

<sup>146</sup> Altshul, “Herodian Revolution,” 54-57.

**CHAPTER 3:**  
RE-READING ROMANIZATION:  
IDENTITY NEGOTIATION, DISPLAY, AND THE HOUSEHOLD

The previous chapter discussed the history of scholarship on *Romanization*, both in its theoretical development and in its particular manifestations in Palestine. It showed that, following a period of deconstruction, the term has become contested and the field remains divided on how to define the interaction between imperial Rome and her subjects. This historiographical discussion raises three methodological questions which must be resolved before proceeding to the analysis of Romanization in ancient Palestine. The first concerns the term itself. The debate, as it has been framed over the past two decades, requires that discussions of “cultural change” in the Roman period justify use of the term *Romanization* and define it.<sup>1</sup> The second is one of interpretation, as studies of this nature must also outline the rubric for gauging “change.” The third question is one of scale. Romanization may occur on several levels, from state-wide, ruler-sponsored activities to the actions of individuals. As Lee’s distinction between cultural and political Romanizations demonstrates, such decisions can be determinative for one’s analysis.<sup>2</sup> This chapter answers these questions, defining Romanization primarily as identity negotiation, restricting the criterion for “change” to alterations in display habits, and limiting the present study’s examination to the household and its goods.

---

<sup>1</sup> An opinion shared by Keay. Simon Keay, “Romanization and the Hispaniae,” in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, ed. Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), 123.

<sup>2</sup> Lee’s choice to focus solely on public architectural projects is part of the reason he reaches the conclusion that Romanization, if it occurred in Herodian Palestine, was political. Unsurprisingly, examining monuments that are largely public and political in nature produces a Romanization that seems public and political in nature. See further discussion below. Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 11–55, 67, 82.

### 3.1. *Romanization*, a Champion of the “Post”-Romanization Critique

Despite the dissenting opinions that Romanization is a problematic term, this thesis continues to use it to describe the discourse between the Roman Empire and ancient Palestine. As Woolf, Keay and Terrenato, and Chancey have stated, although the term carries cultural baggage, it remains a useful “shorthand” for describing this relationship.<sup>3</sup> Beyond its utility, I maintain the term because the arguments for dismissing it lack force. They rest upon the inability of the field to produce a unified definition for *Romanization* and an understanding of language as static.<sup>4</sup>

Due to the subjectivity of the field and the nature of the evidence, the definition of Romanization has varied greatly. A number of factors influence the definition, including research interests, theoretical models, conversation partners, and the nature of the evidence. For example, as noted in the previous chapter, what constituted Romanization in the Western Empire has traditionally diverged from that of the Eastern Empire.<sup>5</sup> As in the case of Haverfield, Romanization may even differ for individual scholars, depending on the portions of the Empire they are analyzing.<sup>6</sup> Besides their connections with tradition and locality, definitional variations also derive from the diversity of the archaeological record. A town could deviate from its neighbor in how its inhabitants chose to respond materially to the Empire.<sup>7</sup> The heterogeneity of

---

<sup>3</sup> Woolf, “Becoming Roman, Staying Greek,” 7; Chancey, *Greco-Roman Culture*, 16; Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, “Preface,” in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, ed. Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), ix–x.

<sup>4</sup> On the latter, see Millett’s comments on “post”-Romanization critics’ tendency to ignore how language develops. Millett, “Changing Perspectives,” 170.

<sup>5</sup> See Section 2.2, “Can the East Be Won? Romanizing the “Roman” East.”

<sup>6</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization (2nd Ed.)*, 11.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Terrenato’s comparison of cities on the Etrurian coast and Woolf’s comparison of Autun and Bibracte. Nicola Terrenato, “A Tale of Three Cities: The Romanization of Northern Coastal Etruria,” in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, ed. Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), 54–67; Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 10.

this evidence constitutes the central point of Woolf's model: across the Empire, people "become Roman" in different ways.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, in discussing Romanization, one should really speak of Romanizations, and the variation in definitions, rather than being a hindrance to scholarly debate, should now be expected and welcomed as incorporating both the "post"-Romanization critique and the full extent of the data.

If the lack of unity in the definition reflects the nature of the field, the argument tying the use of the word to a corresponding adoption of nineteenth century ideas does not. Hingley dismisses the term on the basis of a problematic genealogy and contends that scholars should maintain it only as a means of deconstructing previous paradigms.<sup>9</sup> His view develops from assuming a temporal consistency in the term's connotations (acknowledged or unacknowledged by the user) and scholars' inability to reform a paradigm without jettisoning the terminology along with its less palatable ideas. He imagines a scenario in which the continued use of the term necessitates the duration of base assumptions, particularly that of a progressive teleology.<sup>10</sup> However, as pointed out above, Hingley's opposition to Romanization is suspect.<sup>11</sup> He ignores the structures which Millett adopted to prevent such a teleology.<sup>12</sup> In addition, while anti-Romanization scholars' contention about the effects of terminology has some veracity, the effects of terminology are no more influential on research than any other number of factors

---

<sup>8</sup> Woolf states that "there were so many kinds of Roman to become that becoming Roman did not mean assimilating to an ideal type." Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 245.

<sup>9</sup> Contra Webster who recognizes the problems but argues for the maintenance of the term *Romanization* for the same reasons Hingley would reject it: she recognizes the problems with the terms, but she argues that use of it allows a "reflexive critique" of the field. Hingley, *Roman Officers*, 112; Webster, "Roman Imperialism and the 'Post Imperial Age,'" 11–13.

<sup>10</sup> Richard Hingley, "Recreating Coherence without Reinventing Romanization," in "*Romanization*?", ed. Andrew Merryweather and Jonathan Prag, *Digressus Suppl. 1* (Digressus, 2003), 113, accessed August 15, 2013, <http://www.digressus.org/articles/romanization.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> See pp. 18-19, n51.



involved in these projects.<sup>13</sup> Thus, awareness of the inherent issues with these factors – such as the Romano-centrism of *Romanization* – permits the scholar to correct for these biases.

The fact that some of the critiques of the traditional definition are legitimate does not necessitate the elimination of the term or the limitation of it to historiographical discussions. In fact, the traditional terminology accommodates a number of changes that solve the issues broached by the “post”-Romanization movement. While some scholars continue to depict Romanization as a complete identity re-alignment, this assertion is a rhetorical foil.<sup>14</sup> Few (if any) scholars maintain a Haverfieldian Romanization, and most would concur with the statement that becoming Roman does not involve losing one’s identity.<sup>15</sup> This shift settles many of the issues with *Romanization* and opens the term to new modes of conception. Despite persistent claims of survivals from the older phases of Romanization’s genealogy, a re-definition of the word has already occurred and is ongoing. Current portrayals of Romanization are neither “weak” nor “vulgar,” descriptors often used by those who see the term as preserving old

---

<sup>12</sup> Millett, “Romanization,” 38.

<sup>13</sup> On the terminology determining the end result, Josephine Crawley Quinn argues “...the very structure of the word, however ingeniously defined, forces Mediterranean cultural and economic history to be about Rome...The problem is that it *dictates* a field of research.” Other examples of factors that can be determinative include the questions asked by the researcher, their adopted theoretical frameworks, or their collection methods. Josephine C. Quinn, “Roman Africa,” in “*Romanization*”?, ed. Andrew Merryweather and Jonathan Prag, *Digressus Suppl. 1* (Digressus, 2003), 29, accessed August 15, 2013, <http://www.digressus.org/articles/romanization.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, i.

<sup>15</sup> Altshul expresses a similar opinion in his thesis concerning the identity of the Jerusalemites of the Herodian period. Although many scholars may concur with this statement, the identity persistence they imagine is in the form of hybridity or bricolage, the creation of a new cultural identity out of native and Roman traditions. They often do not allow for the maintenance of two competing identities (e.g., Woolf). Altshul, “Herodian ‘Revolution,’” 53; Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 143; Greg Woolf, “Beyond Romans and Natives,” *World Archaeology* 28, no. 3 (1997): 341, 347.

presuppositions.<sup>16</sup> Rather, *Romanization* has acquired a new meaning, which was molded in the forge of the “post”-Romanization critique, and, therefore, appropriates solutions to its criticisms.

As noted above, the theoretical discourse of the past quarter century has failed to propose a suitable suggestion with which to replace the term.<sup>17</sup> Those which have been suggested by Hingley, Webster, and others also carry their own baggage. For example, Wallace-Hadrill has critiqued Webster’s creolization and hybridity models, and Lee has questioned Woolf’s “becoming Roman” model.<sup>18</sup> Thus, whereas Romanization and its successors each possess shortcomings, Romanization offers an advantage over other terms, as it captures the political reality of Empire. One of the critiques of the term *Romanization* has been that it conveys a unidirectional change. As with the theory of complete identity re-alignment, most scholars do not understand the term as denoting a solely Roman-to-native cultural exchange. Rather, the term conveys a power differential — the power disparity between Roman ruler and native subject.<sup>19</sup> Admittedly, Rome was only one in a number of factors affecting such spheres as politics, economics, and culture, and decisions concerning these spheres may have been made for

---

<sup>16</sup> As a term applied to Romanization, *vulgar* was originally used by Syme in a derogatory sense, as he described Romanization as an “ugly and vulgar” term. The phrase “vulgar Romanization” may have another meaning (e.g., Alcock), but it tends to be used in Syme’s sense. “Weak Romanization” is a designation from Keay and Terrenato to distinguish their continued use of the term from assimilative Romanizations; however, the phrase has become appropriated by Mattingly and others as a means of critique. The choice of terminology was unfortunate and fails to reflect the reality that *Romanization*, as it is used today, has been transformed. Ronald Syme, “Rome and the Nations,” in *Roman Papers IV*, ed. Ronald Syme (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 64; Keay and Terrenato, “Preface,” i; Susan E. Alcock, “Vulgar Romanization and the Domination of the Elites,” in *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, ed. Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), 230; Mattingly, “Vulgar and Weak Romanization”; Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 204.

<sup>17</sup> See pp. 26-27 above.

<sup>18</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 10–14; Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 7, 82.

<sup>19</sup> The power asymmetry conveyed by this term tends to be a topic of “post”-Romanization works influenced by post-colonial theory. Although they cite the problems with the Romano-centrism of the term, they often acknowledge that the reality of empire is power asymmetry, a fact which should make the inclusion of some Romano-centrism reasonable. For example, Mattingly, *Imperialism, Power, and Identity*, 32–34; Webster, “Creolizing,” 217.

local reasons. However, choices under Empire relate to the center through a series of nested power relationships.<sup>20</sup> Although the choice to buy particular tablewares may be determined by economic necessities, in this system of nested power, the choice also becomes a reflection of one's position in the Empire. Thus, not only does Romanization have the ability to incorporate many of the changes suggested by the "post"-Romanization movement, but also it expresses the reality of living under the Roman Empire in the first century.

### **3.2. Power Plays: Negotiating Identities and Acts of Display**

Romanization, then, as this project understands it, incorporates many of the concerns of the recent critiques. It is not the Romanization of Haverfield, in which one culture or identity replaces another. Rather, Romanization is a living process of identity negotiation that occurs within the context of Empire. It takes the form of a material and verbal dialog between people within and outside of one's own culture and is directly affected by certain social and situational realities, such as power dynamics, economic disparities, and spatiality.

Identity negotiation is the process by which an individual, household, or community forges connections (negative or positive) with groups, including cultures, ethnicities, genders, and age groups.<sup>21</sup> Such connections are manipulated through different types of communication, like verbalization, ritualization, and spatial movements. The primary expression of identity negotiation which concerns this thesis is the material speech act, which is perhaps best imagined as an act of display.<sup>22</sup> If material culture is meaningfully constituted and symbolic, as Hodder

---

<sup>20</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 2; Keay, "Romanization and the Hispaniae," 123.

<sup>21</sup> The actors performing the identity negotiation may be part of these groups or not. The types of groups listed here are only examples. The point is that identity negotiation is a wide and on-going process that involves the participation in a range of identities by the actor(s).

<sup>22</sup> John Searle described the speech act as the "basic unit of linguistic communication." Since objects convey something about the user, the basic unit of this materially based discourse is the material speech act or act of display.

has argued, then it can be manipulated in a dialog of material culture.<sup>23</sup> This dialog does not consist of simple one-to-one correlations between object and identity because, like words, the meanings of objects are multiple.<sup>24</sup> Their given interpretation at any one time is determined by such factors as context, connecting symbols, and conversation partners, and as they are manipulated in this dialog of identity, they come to mean very different things. For example, Wallace-Hadrill, using the illustration of the *toga*, shows how certain dress became at once a symbol of Roman identity and difference while being of little import to the Greeks.<sup>25</sup> Identity negotiation uses these material displays and manipulations to reinforce group connections and distinctions.

Not only are the meanings of objects multiple, but each person has multiple identities.<sup>26</sup> Wallace-Hadrill's discussion of multi-lingual code-switchers is useful here.<sup>27</sup> He suggests that material culture can be manipulated in the manner that bilingual and trilingual people manipulate language. Depending on the context, the cunning linguist may easily switch between tongues, bringing a different identity to the forefront. This linguistic morphing allows individuals to

---

John Searle, "What Is a Speech Act," in *Language and Social Context*, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli (Harmoundsworth, UK: Penguin, 1972), 136.

<sup>23</sup> Ian Hodder, *Theory and Practice in Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 1995), 12–15, 109–111.

<sup>24</sup> One of the critiques that has have emerged in a period increasingly interested in an archaeology of identity is that the material record cannot be equated with identity. As Jones states, "There is no straightforward relationship between particular types of material culture and particular identities." Thus, although current scholarship and the culture-history school both examine identity, the form of identity discussed here does not fit comfortably within the culture-history school's "archaeological cultures," which depended upon such direct object-identity correlations. In permitting multiple meanings of objects and multiple identities, the discreet boundaries of the culture-history school fade away, leaving a morass of overlapping identities. Siân Jones, "Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity," in *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*, ed. Siân Jones and Sarah Pearce (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 31; Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 299, 310.

<sup>25</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 41–57.

<sup>26</sup> As Wallace-Hadrill states, they often "survive in plurality alongside each other." Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 13.

<sup>27</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Cultural Revolution*, 13, 63–64, 76.

move easily between situational identities and to express ideas in multiple ways, choosing forms which either best express their ideas or which best suit their situations. For example, during the fall, I encountered a woman on the bus as she accompanied her three daughters home from school. One of the girls, asked her mother for something in Spanish and ended the exchange with the phrase, “Please, please, please.” This girl, being at least bilingual, formulated the request in her mother’s native tongue but, when appropriate, turned to a linguistic expression that best captured the tenor of her request. Likewise, a person acquainted with the multiple meanings of material display can use material culture to express multiple identities and bring different identities and material expressions to the forefront, depending on their situation.<sup>28</sup>

Identifying Romanization as negotiated identity performed through acts of display escapes many of the traps of the assimilative and acculturative Romanizations. This negotiated Romanization is not invested in presenting a progressive teleology, wherein the end result is specifically Roman as opposed to something else.<sup>29</sup> As negotiated identity, it allows multiple responses to Rome, multiple and conflicting identities for individuals and groups, and multiple meanings of objects.<sup>30</sup> It even encompasses identity negotiations that occur beyond the Roman-subject dialectic, as any such negotiations must happen within and are influenced by the context of Empire and its power asymmetries. To a degree, it remains somewhat Romano-centric;

---

<sup>28</sup> A similar idea is discussed by both Insoll and Alcock. Alcock describes the move as a shifting of identities “contingent upon need and social context.” Timothy Insoll, “Changing Identities in the Arabian Gulf: Archaeology, Religion, and Ethnicity in Context,” in *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, ed. Timothy Insoll (London: Routledge, 2007), 311–313; Alcock, “Vulgar Romanization,” 229.

<sup>29</sup> Such a model may produce something that looks “Roman” and/or one of the identities may be “Roman,” but living under the Empire need not necessitate a specifically “Roman” identity in the Herodian period.

<sup>30</sup> In other words, as a dialogical, multiple-identity, and multiple-meaning model, it accounts for the central points of the “post”-Romanization movements. See the list in Section 2.1.4 above.

however, this center-focus is dictated by power dynamics, recognizing that local political, economic, and social realities connect back to an imperial context.<sup>31</sup>

Likewise, this form of Romanization addresses issues which have emerged from previous models. For example, in his discussion of Romanization, part of Lee's justification of the division of cultural and political Romanization was his contention that Jews did not attach Greco-Roman meanings to Greco-Roman architecture, instead investing these structures with "Jewish" interpretations.<sup>32</sup> Re-examining these objects within the context of negotiated identity, though, allows local populations to maintain both Jewish and Greco-Roman meanings, such that, even if one seems dominant, others may be brought forward at different times. In Lee's example of the Temple, the centrality of this structure to Jewish identity is hard to deny; however, it also maintains Greco-Roman meanings, which come to the foreground each time the observer looks up to see the Antonia standing over the Temple, remembers the *euergetic* activities of re-building and re-dedication that resulted in the current Temple, or witnesses the sacrifice for the emperor.<sup>33</sup> Thus, although this thesis maintains the traditional terminology of *Romanization*, its definition deviates greatly from that of Haverfield by incorporating the modern critique. Romanization is not just about "becoming Roman" per se, but about the effects of Empire on one's identity.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Despite issues with Romano-centrism, any attempts to completely eliminate Rome and the center from the picture ignore the situational reality of Empire.

<sup>32</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 63.

<sup>33</sup> Lee, *Romanization in Palestine*, 56. Identity negotiation goes a long way to explaining the significance of the cessation of the Temple sacrifice in honor of the Emperor (Joseph. *BJ* 2.17.2-4 §409-419). The Jewish rebels intentionally erase a symbol of their identity as Roman subjects to foreground their identity as an independent Jewish kingdom in continuing other sacrifices. According to Josephus, part of the defense provided by the elders argues that accepting such foreign sacrifice was part of Jewish identity and tradition.

<sup>34</sup> While I concur with much of what Wolff argues, including the influence of Roman power on native cultures, I find the "becoming Roman" terminology much more problematic and much more reflective of a progressive

### 3.3. Archaeological Dyslexia and Interpreting Changing Display Acts

This definition of Romanization as identity negotiation under Empire requires a methodological clarification on how this project understands the “effects of Empire” archaeologically. The early proponents of Romanization theorized that the effects of Empire could be assessed by a growing prevalence of Roman cultural objects in the archaeological record, Haverfield’s wholesale succumbing of native elements.<sup>35</sup> Although living under the Empire undoubtedly occasioned the adoption of new and even Roman materials — as in Herod’s adoption of *opus reticulatum* — the “post”-Romanization critique has demonstrated the fallacy behind this methodology.<sup>36</sup> As in the case of *terra sigillata* found along the frontier, objects predicted as evidence of “Roman-ness” need not be “Roman” at all.<sup>37</sup>

Under a rubric of identity negotiation, the effects of Empire cannot be measured simply by equating artifacts with an *ethnos*. Artifacts are the remnants of a discourse of symbols that convey and reinforce identity. The nature of the field is such that we rarely discover such a conversation intact. More often than not, we uncover the scattered pieces of a long-ceased dialog, the broken and refracted echoes of a dissipating discourse on identity. Selecting a single component of this broken dialog and connecting it with “Roman-ness” is akin to my nephew’s early habits when learning to deal with dyslexia. For students with dyslexia, educators often teach key sight words, and in the initial stages of learning, students, recognizing individual words, will often complete the sentences with what they expect the word to be. Likewise, a focus on single components of the archaeological record with single meanings skews its

---

teleology than *Romanization* itself. The distinction I make here is one that allows that locals to maintain traditional identities while still being affected by Empire. Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 241–246.

<sup>35</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization (2nd Ed.)*, 30.

<sup>36</sup> On the use of *opus reticulatum* by Herod, see Netzer, *Architecture*, 57.

interpretation. Instead of accounting for all the components of the conversation, it ignores the contexts of the word/object and constructs a discourse that privileges certain recognized meanings/objects over others. The result is a distorted identity discourse where the presence of certain “key” objects/words obscures the possibility of a completely different discourse.

If the particular conversations of identity discourse are difficult to reproduce archaeologically, we can at least reconstruct the symbolic repertoire out of which they stemmed by examining the vernacular of identity display, the sum of the possible material display acts and their range of meanings. Shifts in the material habits of display should correlate with a shift in conceptions of identity. Such changes may be accompanied by a reconceptualization of identity under new circumstances, the changing importance of certain display acts for a particular group, and/or the adoption of a new identity (usually alongside old identities). For example, in her article on anti-Romanization, Berlin recognized such a change in Galilee during the Roman period.<sup>38</sup> Despite the use of Greco-Roman materials under the Hellenistic kingdoms and their proximity to these goods in local markets during the Roman period, Jewish villages in Galilee avoided consuming certain imported wares under the Herodians.<sup>39</sup> Since the cause does not seem to be economic (i.e., availability), Berlin has suggested that this change in Jewish dining habits was a means of thumbing their proverbial nose at the government.<sup>40</sup> The new experience of Empire prompted new display acts and, possibly, new identities.<sup>41</sup> I posit that similar changes

---

<sup>37</sup> Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture*, 109–114.

<sup>38</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization.”

<sup>39</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 63–65.

<sup>40</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 69.

<sup>41</sup> The new identities would be those of Roman subjects, even if they are expressing themselves in what Berlin terms “anti-Romanization.” Jodi Magness has suggested another interpretation, arguing that the rejection of this pottery is not politically motivated but originated in a concern over purity. For my present point, the veracity of their



in patterns of display in the archaeological record may be due to ongoing identity negotiations, as communities and individuals wrestled with their own identities under the pressures of Empire.

### **3.4. Locating Identity: The Household as a Locus of Romanization**

Changes in the symbolic repertoire of identity display may occur at a number of levels, from the grand statements of state-sponsored monuments to the houses of the state's lowliest members. At each level, they function to express, to reinforce, and to constrain identity, creating landscapes of negotiated identity. At the same time, different voices dominate these levels of construction. With state-sponsored monuments, the architecture often projects the "official" or "ideal" view of the community. These spaces constitute the "conceived" landscapes constructed by the government or others in power.<sup>42</sup> Archaeologically, the "conceived" spaces often obscure the "lived" spaces of those who experienced these monuments on a daily basis.<sup>43</sup> With the exception of the fleeting glimpses caught in our textual sources, "lived" experiences of these spaces are masked by the public façade. Although understanding the "conceived" landscape is important, especially in a consideration of both the *euergetists* who sponsored them and the public images they engender, they tell us little about which displays individuals and households were appropriating in negotiating their own identities.

---

arguments is not particularly relevant: either interpretation demonstrates an identity shift, either as a Roman subject or as a particular type of Jew. Jodi Magness, *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 61–62.

<sup>42</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1991), 38–40.

<sup>43</sup> Although Lefebvre writes that "conceived" spaces are usually verbal and literary constructs, they also become inscribed on the "perceived" space in the forms of such monuments such that they structure the experience of space. They are meant to dominate and suppress other means of conceiving these spaces. They dominate those space, and the "lived" experiences disappear before them. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 38-40.

Instead of focusing on such monuments, this thesis examines the house as the seat of identity.<sup>44</sup> Although such spaces are constructed, they more readily reflect the “lived” spaces of individuals and the types of identities they wished to convey.<sup>45</sup> As Hales has pointed out, the Roman house functioned as the public face of the family.<sup>46</sup> Traditionally, this descriptor has been preserved for the Romans, while the dwellings of the Greek East have been viewed as everything the Roman’s was not.<sup>47</sup> However, although certain distinctions differentiate the functionality of the Eastern house from the Western, this depiction arises largely from textual evidence and may be reflective of elite utopian conceptions of how Greek households functioned.<sup>48</sup> As recent studies have demonstrated, archaeologically, houses of the East do not often correspond with those belonging to the literary imagination.<sup>49</sup> Despite the supposed private nature of the Eastern dwellings, their objects and decorations indicate an interest and investment in acts of display, whether for private consumption or a more public audience. Such displays constitute the *koine* of identity discourse, and the changes within this symbolic vernacular of

---

<sup>44</sup> Ideally, a thorough study of Romanization in Palestine should incorporate an analysis of all spheres of identity display, including state-sponsored projects, elite households, and non-elite households. Unfortunately, due to the limits of this project and the nature of the data, I can only consider one of these in any depth here.

<sup>45</sup> As Berlin states, “Houses provide the physical context for day-to-day living: their arrangements and material furnishings reflect peoples’ actual choices and behaviors.” Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 437.

<sup>46</sup> Shelley Hales, *The Roman House and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1.

<sup>47</sup> Hales, *Roman House*, 207.

<sup>48</sup> Hales demonstrates that Vitruvian renderings of the household are likely expressions of a fantastical ideal and not the way houses were laid out or functioned in reality. As Goldberg points out, not only are such accounts likely fiction, but also they are a gendered, andro-centric fiction. Marilyn Y. Goldberg, “Spatial and Behavioural Negotiation in Classical Athenian City Houses,” in *The Archaeology of Household Activities*, ed. Penelope Allison (London: Routledge, 1999), 143; Hales, *Roman House*, 5, 207–208.

<sup>49</sup> The prime illustration of this contention is the traditional separation of the house into male and female space and the archaeological demonstration that no such separation is identifiable archaeologically. See, for example, Eric Meyers, “Roman-Period Houses from the Galilee: Domestic Architecture and Gendered Spaces,” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 497; Goldberg, “Spatial and Behavioural Negotiation,” 157–158.

individuals and households serves as a better measure of the effects Empire on native identity discourse.

### **3.5. Conclusions**

As the historiographical overview of Chapter 2 indicated, the term *Romanization* has been thoroughly dissected by “post”-Romanization scholars. They have found its traditional model to be lacking, and some of them have petitioned for its relegation to the past, as an unfortunate academic detour. However, this thesis maintains the term to describe the Roman imperial power and native populations engaging in an ongoing process of identity negotiation. The effects of this discursive relationship will be examined through display acts performed at the level of the house and through changes in the symbolic vernacular of display. In the following chapter, I apply this model of identity negotiation to the elite houses of Herodian Jerusalem.

**CHAPTER 4:**  
**IDENTITY DISCOURSE AND DISPLAY:**  
**ROMANIZATION AND THE HOUSES OF JERUSALEM'S UPPER CITY**

The purpose of this thesis is to re-assess how living under Roman rule affected the Jewish inhabitants of Herodian Palestine because previous models used to analyze these data have proven unsatisfactory.<sup>1</sup> In Chapter 3, I proposed that rather than reading *Romanization* as simply the adoption of “Roman” culture, it should be understood as a process of identity negotiation which can be seen enacted materially through various forms of identity display. In this chapter, I apply this model of Romanization to Herodian Jerusalem. Historical sources record clashes between the Roman rulers and Jewish subjects in the city, suggesting currents of contested identities, power, and control.<sup>2</sup> As a locus of interaction between Rome and the Jewish people, Jerusalem provides an ideal place to study the effects of living under Empire.<sup>3</sup> To examine these effects, this chapter reconstructs the display vernacular of the Jerusalem elite, analyzes what these display habits say about the types of identities they were constructing, and places these identities in the context of Empire. It concludes that, during the Herodian period, how the Jerusalem elite materially identified themselves changed and that, in part, this change emerged from their new reality as subjects of the Roman Empire.

---

<sup>1</sup> See discussion in 2.2-2.3.

<sup>2</sup> For example, the issue with the standards (Joseph. *BJ* 2.9.2-3 §169-174; *AJ* 18.3.1 §55-59).

<sup>3</sup> In the Empire-subject dialog, points of contact between empire and subject occur at different levels. In the case of Palestine, Caesarea Maritima is the highest point of contact, serving as the central node of power and control since it was both the capital after Archelaus and the major port city. Beyond the central node are other regional loci of power and control exist. One example is Jerusalem, as indicated by the concentration of local power there, the presence of a Roman military force (Joseph. *BJ* 2.17.7 §430), and a number of confrontations characterized by displays of Roman power. The selection of Jerusalem as the subject of this chapter is based on its dual roles as a

#### 4.1. A Multi-vocal Romanization? Limits and Survival Bias

Although Jerusalem's status as a regional center is ideal for studying negotiated identities between the Empire and its subjects, a survival bias in the archaeological data limits this study. One of the goals of "post"-Romanization models is to escape the elite-focus of previous models.<sup>4</sup> However, Herodian Jerusalem has afforded few opportunities to investigate underrepresented, non-elite bodies such as its poorer residents, women, children, and slaves.<sup>5</sup> While this project ideally would investigate a broader range of Roman-subject identity negotiations, modern historical circumstances have determined the nature of the data and inhibit the incorporation of non-elites into this study.<sup>6</sup> The reconstruction of the Jewish Quarter after the Six Day War gave Nahman Avigad the opportunity to excavate portions of the Western.<sup>7</sup> This accident of history produced the main information on household identity displays for Herodian Jerusalem, but it originates in a section of the city which was home to its wealthiest residents. This area was the location of Herod's palace, a Hasmonean palace, the homes of priestly families, and the homes of other wealthy members of the city.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the analysis of displays which follows only applies

---

locus of Roman control and native power, as the city permits a study of the effects of Empire on the local power base at a site of control.

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Webster, "Creolizing," 215–216.

<sup>5</sup> The exceptions to elite structures in Jerusalem include Greenhut's analysis of a rescue excavation in the Tyropoeon valley and, perhaps, a few salvage excavations and the Western Wall excavations, though the latter have suffered from publication lag. Zvi Greenhut, "A Domestic Quarter from the Second Temple Period on the Lower Slopes of the Central Valley (Tyropoeon)," in *Unearthing Jerusalem: 150 Years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City*, ed. Katharina Galor and Gideon Avni (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 257–293.

<sup>6</sup> A similar restriction characterized Millett's work. Millett, "Changing Perspectives," 170–171.

<sup>7</sup> The excavations were conducted between 1969 and 1982. For the history of the excavations, see Hillel Geva, "Introduction," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume I: Architecture and Strigraphy: Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 10–12.

<sup>8</sup> All mentioned by Josephus: Joseph. *BJ* 1.21.1 §402, 2.16.3 §344, 2.17.6 §425-427. Of these, according to Avigad, only Herod's palace can be securely located, though the Burnt House appears to have been related to one of the high priestly families. Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville: Nelson, 1983), 82–83; Joshua Schwartz, "Bar Qatros and the Priestly Families of Jerusalem," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume*

to one sector of society – the local elite. As demonstrated by Berlin’s work and the analysis of Qumran in the next chapter, the conclusions reached here cannot be applied universally to all Jews living in Herodian Palestine.<sup>9</sup>

#### **4.2. The Vernacular of Elite Display: A Summary**

One of the main goals of this chapter is to outline the display vernacular of the Jerusalem elite. As I argued in the previous chapter, if Romanization is a process of identity negotiation and material displays serve as a means of identity expression, the study of the use of and change in these displays should reveal something about how the context of Empire affected local identity. However, in this dialog of identity negotiation often all that remains archaeologically is an interrupted conversation, the shattered remains of a long-ceased discourse on identity. While this state of survival hampers reconstruction of exactly how material display acts functioned in practice, the symbolic constituents of this discourse – the material components of these display acts – endure. These may be collected together to constitute the vernacular of display, which, when analyzed, can provide a range of possible display acts and suggest scenarios of practice. This section provides a brief overview of the display vernacular of the Jerusalem elite, focusing primarily on the content of each category of artifact and feature and how it changes over the course of time. This analysis is based largely upon the published data of the Jewish Quarter Excavations.<sup>10</sup>

---

*IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010), 308–319.

<sup>9</sup> Berlin notes a difference between the Jerusalem elite, the Qumranites, and most other Jews in terms of “the surroundings of their day-to-day lives.” Of course, we know little about much of the Jewish population (e.g., urban populations). Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 470.

<sup>10</sup> Although Hillel Geva and his team have published five comprehensive volumes on the Jewish Quarter Excavations, this study is limited by the fact that many of the Second Temple residences of the Western Hill remain unpublished. The current Jewish Quarter volumes only cover Areas A, B, D, E, T, W, and X. According to the list in Volume I and what we know from Avigad’s preliminary reports, relevant household structures and finds remain unpublished for Areas J, F, M, O, and P. For its data, this study depends largely of the reports on the Burnt House

#### 4.2.1. Frescoes

In Palestine, the walls of houses were treated in different ways, both for functional and decorative purposes. One of the oldest and most constant forms of wall treatment was wall plaster.<sup>11</sup> This method continued into the modern period in both the homes of the poor and wealthy alike.<sup>12</sup> Sometime during the Hellenistic period, some of the wealthier inhabitants of Palestine adopted the practice of painting on plaster, particularly in a fashion known as the Eastern Masonry Style. This style divided the wall into several architectural zones, each with its own architectonic component. It was particularly characterized by raised panels, which were rendered from stucco and paint to imitate stone.<sup>13</sup> According to Silvia Rozenberg, this practice's adoption occurred amid "the increased luxury and higher standard of living of the Hellenistic period."<sup>14</sup> By the end of the Herodian Period, Jerusalem's inhabitants had become so well-

---

(Area B) and Building 721 (Area E) and some preliminary reports from Avigad. In addition, as noted by Geva, the Jewish Quarter Excavation was ultimately a salvage project, suffering from the problems that come with such a project (see, for example, the problems encountered while trying to excavate the Burnt House). The fact that the excavations were conducted forty years ago also means that the research questions were different. For example Liora Kolska Horwitz and Omri Lernau note that "animal remains were rarely collected, as was common practice at that time." This means that the available data are incomplete. When relevant, I have tried to note these restrictions below. Hillel Geva, ed., *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem*, 4 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000); Oren Gutfeld, ed., *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume V: The Cardo (Area X) and the Nea Church (Areas D and T)* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2012); Geva, "Introduction," 13–15, 28; Hillel Geva, "Stratigraphy and Architecture," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010), 3–4; Liora Kolska Horwitz and Omri Lernau, "Faunal Remains from the Cardo and the Nea Church," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume V: The Cardo (Area X) and the Nea Church (Areas D and T)*, ed. Oren Gutfeld (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2012), 472.

<sup>11</sup> The coating of walls with simple white plaster dates at least to the Iron Age. Silvia Rozenberg, "Hellenistic and Roman Wall Paintings in the Land of Israel and Their Parallels," in *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod's Third Palace at Jericho*, ed. Silvia Rozenberg (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008), 283.

<sup>12</sup> Yizhar Hirschfeld, *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1995), 226.

<sup>13</sup> The Masonry Style was more complex than described here and varied geographically and temporally. Rozenberg provides a detailed discussion of the origins and variations of the style. Rozenberg, "Hellenistic and Roman Paintings," 283-298.

acquainted with the technique that “fresco decoration was a common practice in the Jewish Quarter.”<sup>15</sup> The evidence indicates that, sometime between the introduction of this method of decoration and the end of the Herodian period, a drastic change in practice occurred. This change is apparent both by the frequency of the technique and by its content.

The adoption of this technique seems to increase in Jerusalem during the Herodian period.<sup>16</sup> Although fresco painting had begun in Palestine during the Hellenistic period, archaeologically, the evidence of frescoes in Hellenistic Jerusalem is paltry. Frescoes have been found at Hellenistic sites like Tel Anafa and Maresha, but similar evidence has not been forthcoming from Jerusalem.<sup>17</sup> Whereas the Jerusalem excavations have produced no Hellenistic-era frescoes, a number of Herodian examples have been found on the Western Hill, including the Area A fragments, the in-situ frescoes of the “Palatial Mansion,” the “House of Caiaphas” fragments, and the fragments found between the mosaics in Area F.<sup>18</sup> In part, this

---

<sup>14</sup> Although frescoes may have emerged in such a climate, this climate in itself does not explain why locals began to adopt these elements. While this is a topic for another study, as in the current study, the explanation may be located in discourses of identity and power. Under such theory, the reason for the change can be located in the forces which order social relationship (e.g., the effects of power relations). Silvia Rozenberg, “Wall Paintings of the Hellenistic and Herodian Period in the Land of Israel,” in *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009), 250.

<sup>15</sup> Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 374.

<sup>16</sup> Because Jerusalem lacks evidence of this technique before the Herodian period, the technique may have first appeared in Jerusalem during this period. However, see the discussion on the Hasmoneans below.

<sup>17</sup> Other sites with Hellenistic frescoes are listed in Rozenberg. While the Tel Anafa material was analyzed by Robert Gordon in his dissertation, Marisa’s are only preliminary reviewed by Rozenberg and are in preparation by the excavators. Robert Gordon, “Late Hellenistic Wall Decoration of Tel Anafa” (PhD diss, Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1979); Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 301–309, n. 98–99.

<sup>18</sup> Fragments are harder to date, as their original context is lost and their archaeological location can only provide the excavator with a *terminus ante quem*. As recent excavations outside the First Wall (Zelinger’s Area L) have shown, fragments of frescoes were sometimes dumped outside the walls with other refuse. The fills containing these pieces may have originated from such a context and may date as early as the Hasmonean or Roman-Hasmonean periods. However, the fragments from Area A are very similar to those found in the Herodian palaces. Combined with a corresponding Herodian *terminus post quem* for the previous phases (e.g., coins from beneath the fragments of Area A date to the reigns of Herod the Great and Archelaus [Coin 314]), which suggests that the remains *could be* Herodian, most of the Area A fragments should probably be assigned to this period. Silvia Rozenberg, “Wall Painting Fragments from Area A,” in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The*



difference may be ascribed to a survival bias.<sup>19</sup> Presumably, some homes of the Western Hill were richly adorned during the Hellenistic period. For example, Josephus noted the presence of a Hasmonean palace on the Western Hill.<sup>20</sup> From the excavation of the winter palaces at Jericho, archaeologists have a pretty good idea of the Hasmoneans' decorative habits. It included, among other things, the use of frescoes.<sup>21</sup> The Hasmonean royalty likely did not reserve such decorative techniques for their winter residences, and one may imagine their Jerusalem palace adorned in a similar manner. Yet, this survival bias cannot account for all the evidence. Securely dated early Herodian homes of the Western Hill show that some of the relatively wealthy inhabitants chose not to invest in such ornamentation, preferring the plain plaster tradition.<sup>22</sup> The lack of evidence

---

*Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003), 99–104; Magen Broshi, "Excavations in the House of Caiaphas, Mount Zion," in *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968-1974*, ed. Yigael Yadin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 84–85; Hillel Geva, "Jerusalem, the Jewish Quarter in the Old City, The Herodian Quarter," *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 119 (2007), accessed January 6, 2014, [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=539&mag\\_id=112](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=539&mag_id=112); Yehiel Zelinger, "Jerusalem, the Slopes of Mount Zion," *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 122 (2010), accessed January 6, 2014, [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=1530&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=1530&mag_id=117); Haim Gitler, "The Coins," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003), 464, 476–478.

<sup>19</sup> Besides the absence of paintings from the Hellenistic period, this bias is further suggested by the nature of the remains. According to Rozenberg, a greater number of the Roman-era frescoes across Palestine remain intact. The corollary to this statement indicates that a greater number of the Hellenistic fragments have deteriorated and are fragmentary. The destruction which characterizes the end of the Herodian period verses the lack of such an interruption between the Herodian and Hellenistic periods may explain these different states of survival. Rozenberg, "Wall Paintings," 251.

<sup>20</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.16.3 §344.

<sup>21</sup> Rozenberg, "Hellenistic and Roman Paintings," 298-301.

<sup>22</sup> The dismantling of the buildings in Areas E and J of the Jewish Quarter Excavations has been securely dated to the Early Herodian period based on pottery and coins sealed beneath Pavement 800. For Building 721 (Area E), Geva describes some rooms covered in their "original light plaster." Elsewhere, he describes multiple layers of plaster (e.g., L711). Although Area J is not yet published, Reich indicates that the structures in Area J share a similar a wall treatment. Concerning the wealth of the inhabitants, the quality of the construction and the scale of household are not that of the Palatial Mansion, but the finds, which Geva notes are likely left over from the family's relocation, suggests that the family was relatively well-to-do, as does the investment in a large personal *miqveh*. Avigad reached a similar conclusion in his original analysis of the structure. Ronny Reich, "Area A - Stratigraphy and Architecture: Hellenistic to Medieval Strata 6-1," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume I: Architecture and Strigraphy: Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 99; Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 29, 51, 61; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 86. For the date of the Early Herodian structures, see Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Wares - JQE III," 159; Ariel, "Coins - JQE III," 195; Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 32–33.

from the Hellenistic period in combination with the evidence of the early Herodian structures may suggest a growing adoption of this form of decoration over time in Jerusalem, particularly in the Late Herodian Period.

Whether or not the frequency changed, the style of fresco painting changed over time. As indicated by non-Jerusalem examples, the Hellenistic phase of fresco decoration in Palestine was dominated by the Eastern Masonry Style.<sup>23</sup> During the Herodian period, painting styles became more eclectic, juxtaposing traditional Hellenistic subjects, such as marbled paneling, with elements from the Second and Third Pompeian Styles.<sup>24</sup> In Room 5 of the Palatial Mansion, the excavators discovered an architectonic painting of the Third Pompeian style, depicting Ionic columns and a Doric frieze.<sup>25</sup> Likewise, the plain paneled stucco used to cover some of the paintings of the Palatial Mansion evinces a mixture of styles, imitating Roman traditions in its string course and high socle but returning to an older Hellenistic tradition in its molded paneling.<sup>26</sup> In her analysis of the Area A fragments, Rozenberg identified a similar

---

<sup>23</sup> Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 298.

<sup>24</sup> The Second Style, dispensing with the relief work of the Masonry Style, was characterized by illusionistic paintings that included architecture, landscapes, and figures. The Third Style was characterized by an abandonment of the illusionary techniques of the Second Style and a focus on ornamental and fanciful architecture. For a discussion of the styles, see Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 310-332. On the connection of marble paneling to the Eastern Masonry Style, see Rozenberg, “Painting - Area A,” 303-306.

<sup>25</sup> Room 3 also has an example described by Rozenberg as Third Style. The Room 5 example was described as “Second Style” by Avigad. The correct attribution of style does not matter for the current argument: both show the incorporation of Roman techniques into the local repertoire. Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 370-373, Ill. 438, 445; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 103.

<sup>26</sup> Rozenberg proposes that the change in decoration from the rich and colorful Pompeian style to a plain Hellenistic masonry style is symptomatic of “a nostalgia for the ancient and more restricted traditional Hellenistic style of decoration, as against the opulent decorative trend of the Roman world.” While I concede this is a possibility, this explanation does not account for the fact that, according to the currently accessible material, the fresco in Room 3 appears not to have been covered with the plain masonry molding found in the rest of the house. While not absolutely necessary (see, for example, the issue of Herod and the placement of images), it seems that someone suddenly concerned with a rubric of conservatism would apply it consistently across the house. In addition, the other material found in the house does not suggest this same conservatism. Foerster, noting the elements in the paneled stucco which belong to the Western tradition, prefers to compare it to the First Pompeian style, a legitimate observation given that the First Style was also characterized by molded panels. Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman

trend. She notes that the frescoes are characterized by “a combination of Hellenistic traditions and motifs... alongside Western motifs.”<sup>27</sup>

Besides indicating change over time, the style of frescoes also indicates the limits of its subjects. While mingling “Hellenistic” and “Roman” styles, the frescoes show the householders’ preference for certain subjects. The paintings tended to be architectonic, geometric, and floral.<sup>28</sup> Although the catalog of animals and humans depicted in art has expanded over the past decade, particularly with the Herodium excavations, the only known example of figural imagery in frescoes from the Western Hill is the birds from the “House of Caiaphas.”<sup>29</sup> In general, scholars have read this omission as an expression of the Second-Temple Jewish sensibility towards the depiction of images.<sup>30</sup> For the purpose of describing the display habits of the Jerusalem elite, it is sufficient to note that this form of decoration exhibits a range of traditions (and meanings/identities), including those which may be characterized as Hellenistic, Roman, and Jewish.

#### 4.2.2. *Stucco*

Like frescoes, stucco work had a long tradition in Palestine. Stucco consists of three-dimensional molded plaster applied to different architectural zones and features, often in

---

Paintings,” 291–298, 371–372; Gideon Foerster, *Masada V: Art and Archaeology* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1995), 10.

<sup>27</sup> Rozenberg, “Painting - Area A,” 313.

<sup>28</sup> Rozenberg, “Painting – Area A,” 303.

<sup>29</sup> The recent Herodium figural images include a scene with a faun, a Nilotic scene with an alligator, a rural scene with a bovine, a naval battle, and a depiction of two men with victory crowns. An additional figural image of water birds is known from the Upper Herodium. Broshi, “House of Caiaphas,” 84–85, Pl. 18.A–B; Silvia Rozenberg, “Interior Decoration in Herod’s Palace,” in *Herod the Great: The King’s Final Journey*, ed. Silvia Rozenberg and David Mevorah (Jerusalem: The Israel Museum, 2013), 174–189; Virgilio C. Corbo, *Herodium, Gli edifici della reggia-fortezza* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1989), Pl. V.

<sup>30</sup> On images in Jewish art, see Silvia Rozenberg, “The Absence of Figurative Motifs in Herodian Wall Painting,” in *I temi figurativi nella pittura parietale antica (IV Sec. a.C. - IV Sec. d.C)*, *Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale sulla Pittura Parietale Antica*, (Bologna 2-23.9.1995) (Imola: University Press Bologna, 1997), 283–285, 415–416.

imitation of stone.<sup>31</sup> The history of this tradition of decoration is not clear. The archaeological record indicates that it appeared in Palestine at least by the time of the Eastern Masonry Style, as this technique was characterized by molded ashlar in its lower registers and egg-and-dart stucco work in its upper zones.<sup>32</sup> In addition to the difficulties of determining the technique's history in Palestine, the evidence from Jerusalem does not permit a study of its changing frequency over time. In the Jewish Quarter Excavations, only two houses – the Peristyle Building and the Palatial Mansion – show evidence of this technique. Together, the small sample and problem of differentiating between residential and non-residential architecture hampers attempts to analyze changes in frequency.

However, the stucco elements from the Jewish Quarter Excavation do provide evidence of a range of decorative practice. Of the five types of stucco delineated by Orit Peleg and Rozenberg, three occur among the houses of the Herodian elite.<sup>33</sup> As discussed under frescoes, some of the wall decorations exhibit molded paneling. Likewise, the columns of the Peristyle House had stuccoed fluting in what Avigad termed “the classical style.”<sup>34</sup> Both of these techniques had precedents from the Hellenistic period in Palestine and, thus, maintain an older architectonic tradition. The third example constitutes a new tradition in Palestine. Most houses of this time seem to have treated ceilings according to local custom, either leaving the ceiling

---

<sup>31</sup> Orit Peleg and Silvia Rozenberg, “Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces,” in *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod's Third Palace at Jericho*, ed. Silvia Rozenberg (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008), 475.

<sup>32</sup> Rozenberg, “Hellenistic and Roman Paintings,” 283–291, 298–308.

<sup>33</sup> A fourth category may be indicated by Figure 156 in Avigad (a possible stucco cornice). Because Avigad did not provide a temporal context for the piece, it has been excluded from this discussion as the current data do not permit a determination of whether it belonged to the Herodian or Hellenistic periods and was residential or non-residential. Peleg and Rozenberg, “Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces,” 475; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 149, Fig. 156.

<sup>34</sup> Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 32-33.

exposed or covering it with plaster.<sup>35</sup> Sometime during the Herodian period, the elite of Palestine adopted a new technique that involved adorning the ceiling with stucco coffers. Although some Hellenistic Masonry-style walls bore similar stuccoed designs in their upper registers and some Hellenistic ceilings had similar painted designs, decorating the ceiling with stucco relief work seems to have appeared for the first time in Palestine during the Herodian period, possibly originating from Rome.<sup>36</sup> Examples of the technique have been found throughout Herodian Palestine, including in Herod's palaces at Jericho and Masada.<sup>37</sup> The only examples currently noted in the Jewish Quarter Excavations are fragments from the "Reception Hall" (Room 4) of the Palatial mansion.<sup>38</sup> These consisted of two types: coffers surrounded by a raised egg-and-dart motif and a flat design with beveled coffers.<sup>39</sup> Although the Jewish Quarter may have other unpublished examples of this type, outside of wall reliefs, stucco work seems to have been a fairly limited form of decoration in the residences of Herodian Jerusalem.<sup>40</sup> The designs derive from a range of Hellenistic and Roman traditions, but as with frescoes, besides a figural frieze found near the Temple Mount, the local repertoire shows a preference for

---

<sup>35</sup> Both examples may be represented within the Jewish Quarter Excavations, though Geva's analysis suggests that plastering the ceiling was the more common practice of the Jerusalem elite. Geva, "S&A - JQE IV," 65-66.

<sup>36</sup> For an example of similar raised egg-and-dart designs used in a lozenge design on the wall, see Tel Anafa. Rozenberg notes that the Hellenistic tradition in Palestine was almost exclusively painted ceilings (some of which mimicked coffers). While she does not dismiss the possibility of the stuccoed ceiling during the Hellenistic period, she states that the technique would have been "truly rare." In her later work ("Interior Decorations"), Rozenberg suggests that the coffers imitated and replaced the illusionary ceiling paintings of the Hellenistic period. Both Rozenberg and Foerster have suggested a Roman origin of the technique, with the latter suggesting that, at least at the palaces of Masada, the work of a Roman master. Saul S. Weinberg, "Excavations at Tel Anafa," *Qadmoniyot* 3, no. 12 (1970): Pl. D; Peleg and Rozenberg, "Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces," 497, 500; Foerster, *Masada V*, 69; Rozenberg, "Interior Decoration," 217.

<sup>37</sup> Peleg and Rozenberg, "Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces," 500-501; Foerster, *Masada V*, 68-69.

<sup>38</sup> Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 102.

<sup>39</sup> For the reconstructions, see Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 102-103, Fig. 90-91. For a color image of the fragments, see Rozenberg, "Hellenistic and Roman Paintings," 371, Ill. 441.

<sup>40</sup>

geometric and architectonic designs, perhaps reflecting the Second-Temple Jewish sensitivity towards the depiction of images.<sup>41</sup>

### 4.2.3. *Mosaics*

As with the ceilings and walls of the Upper City, the Jerusalem elite treated their floors using a variety of techniques, including tamped earth, plaster, mosaics, and *opus sectile*. The two former methods had a long tradition in Palestine and continued in use into the modern period.<sup>42</sup> They are found alongside the latter methods in the homes of Jerusalem's elite.<sup>43</sup> Mosaics were introduced to Palestine sometime during the Hellenistic period.<sup>44</sup> Less clear is when they arrived in Jerusalem. Like frescoes, the seeming absence of mosaics from Hellenistic Jerusalem and the large number of intact examples discovered during the Jewish Quarter Excavations renders the impression of a change in elite display practices between the Hellenistic and Herodian periods. While the silence of the archaeological record should be treated with caution, the rise of the technique's popularity during the Herodian period is suggested by an apparent preference for earthen or plastered floors in early Herodian structures in Jerusalem.<sup>45</sup> In

---

<sup>41</sup> Although no floral examples are noted in the Jewish Quarter material, the Herodian palaces have stucco work with floral designs, including rosettes, vines, leaves, and grape clusters. On floral designs, see, for example, Peleg and Rozenberg, "Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces," 505–508; Rozenberg, "Interior Decoration," 217–222; Foerster, *Masada V*, 72–75. A single example of a frieze depicting a lion, lioness, antelope, rabbit, and pig was discovered during the course of Benjamin Mazar's excavation. For examples of the Roman figural tradition, see Peleg and Rozenberg, "Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces," 501 Ill. 680, 503 Ill. 687. For the Jerusalem example, see, Meir Ben-Dov, *In the Shadow of the Temple: The Discovery of Ancient Jerusalem* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985), 150-151.

<sup>42</sup> Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 270.

<sup>43</sup> Floor choice seems to be based partially on the area of the house, with more expensive floors reflecting a combination of factors, including display and function. An example of a structure with multiple types of floors is Herod's Third Palace at Jericho, which has three of the four techniques listed here. Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 30; Geva, "S&A - JQE IV," 36; Silvia Rozenberg, "Floor Decoration in Herod's Third Palace at Jericho," in *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod's Third Palace at Jericho*, ed. Silvia Rozenberg (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008), 523–544.

<sup>44</sup> Katherine Dunbabin, *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 187.

<sup>45</sup> For flooring used techniques in the early Herodian structures, see Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 30.

addition, while dates cannot be ascertained for all of the known mosaics, dated examples point to the technique gaining popularity among the Jerusalem elite sometime at the end of the first century BCE, during the reign of Herod the Great.<sup>46</sup> Avigad observed this change and suggested that this method of decoration became widespread shortly after its introduction.<sup>47</sup>

The mosaics of the Jewish Quarter Excavations seem to belong to a very cohesive artistic tradition. From the preliminary reports, it appears that the excavators discovered at least ten mosaics with geometric designs.<sup>48</sup> Although the details of the designs vary from house to house, they follow a similar pattern. All had a square or rectangular design placed within the center of a white mosaic carpet, with the image typically rendered in red, white, and black tesserae.<sup>49</sup> The central composition consisted of a series of nested borders, usually surrounding a circle containing a rosette design (7x).<sup>50</sup> The borders included simple monochrome bands, wave

---

<sup>46</sup> So far, only two of the mosaics are dated. Pottery from the fill beneath a mosaic from Geva's salvage excavation at the Wohl museum provides a late first century BCE *terminus post quem* (Geva cites a *terminus post quem* of 30 CE for the mosaic above it based on a coin found between them, and Avigad noted a "Year Two" coin on the upper mosaic's surface, indicating the later mosaic dates between 30 CE and 67 CE). The only other dated mosaic is the *unguentaria*-palmette mosaic of Area F-3. Avigad suggested dating this mosaic on the basis of the form of the *unguentaria*; however, the temporal resolution provided by *unguentaria* is not sufficient to be useful here. Geva, "Herodian Quarter"; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 144.

<sup>47</sup> Avigad states that "mosaic pavements became widespread in this upper class quarter soon after they were introduced into Jerusalem." The fast track adoption of this type of display is unlikely. Like frescoes, despite the evidentiary lacuna, this type of display was probably adopted by a few (perhaps just the Hasmonean rulers) and then increasingly adopted throughout the Herodian period until it appears to be ubiquitous among the Jerusalem elite at the end of the period. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 144.

<sup>48</sup> The descriptions of the mosaics below depend largely upon the images provided by Avigad in his preliminary reports. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 111, 117, 154-156, Figs. 100, 109, 160-165; Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 49; Geva, "Herodian Quarter."

<sup>49</sup> From the images, at least three of the mosaics also had a yellow-mustard color in addition to the typical colors noted above. These include the mosaics from F-3 and O-2 and one of the Middle Block mosaics from the Wohl Museum. In discussing Herodian mosaics, Ovadia divided the group into five types. For the present purposes, though, the dominant themes of the technique are more important than a division into types. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 154-155, Fig. 161, 164; Nahman Avigad, *The Herodian Quarter in Jerusalem* (Keter Publishing House, 1989), 49; Asher Ovadia, "Mosaic Pavements of the Herodian Period in Israel," in *Fifth International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics: Held at Bath, England, on September 5-12, 1987*, ed. Peter Johnson, Roger Ling, and David J. Smith, vol. 1 (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1994), 68-70.

<sup>50</sup> None of the rosettes is exactly the same, although three have similar patterns in different colors (six petals divided by six triangular sections, capped by ovoid lozenges which form the border of the central circle – see Avigad,

patterns, saw tooth patterns, and a guilloche, all of which have parallels among the mosaics at Masada.<sup>51</sup>

These mosaic patterns could have worked well within a range of display acts representing very different traditions and identities. Most of the Jerusalem mosaics reflect a Hellenistic style, with clear precedents in the East, but as illustrated by Foerster, many of these patterns had correlates in the Western Empire.<sup>52</sup> The content of the compositions is also notable for the absence of images.<sup>53</sup> All but two of the Upper City mosaics demonstrate a preference for geometric designs, reflecting the restraint in the depiction of figures similar to that observed above.<sup>54</sup> Thus, the range of identities which could be represented by this type of material display

---

*Discovering Jerusalem*, 155, Figs. 162, 164; Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 49). Of the three mosaics which lack the rosettes, one has a blank center, another a checkerboard, and the third a swastika pattern. Of the seven with a rosette, the one recently uncovered by Geva in his salvage excavation is less clearly a rosette. On the basis of a parallel at Masada which Foerster termed rosette, I have included it in the same category. The Jerusalem example consists of a black monochrome circle divided into eight sections by black lines. The circle is divided into at least eight concentric circles alternating in white, black, and red, with the circles cutting through each of the eight sections. The outermost band (below the black outline) consists of a white band broken in each section by two half-circles of red, with the rounded edge of the circles facing outward to form the outer edge of eight heart-shaped petals. Because of the location of the concentric bands and choice of colors, the shape is less obvious than that of the Masada example. The latter was placed within in white circle on a black field. The black surrounds the rosette and separates the petals so that the heart-shaped petals stand out and form clear units against the background. Although it also has eight concentric circles, they are more central to the rosette, creating a more realistic flower with a clear eye (e.g., a sunflower). The Jerusalem example, on the other hand, is less technical and demonstrates a more unnatural and confusing use of color. These two rosettes follow the same complex pattern, and their similarity suggests that the mosaicists likely used a pattern book but that the selection of colors and their placement in the pattern was determined by either the mosaicist or the patron. See Geva, "Herodian Quarter," Fig. 1; Foerster, *Masada V*, 143-144, Figs. 256-258, Pl. XIV.

<sup>51</sup> For comparison's sake, the terminology used to describe the borders is based on Foerster's analysis of the Masada mosaics. Although some of the terms overlap, Avigad's descriptions of the techniques differ from Foerster's. Foerster, *Masada V*, 140-161.

<sup>52</sup> Although both Foerster and Rozenberg give Roman examples for the Masada and Jericho mosaics, they see the style of the mosaics as being primarily Hellenistic. Foerster, *Masada V*, 145; Rozenberg, "Floor Decoration," 523-560.

<sup>53</sup> Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 146.

<sup>54</sup> Ovadia also observes this connection between a lack of images and a preference for certain patterns. Two of the mosaics in the Upper City depict objects filling the corners between the boxes and the central rosette. The one in the entrance vestibule of the Palatial Mansion depicts pomegranates on a branch while the larger panel in the "bath complex" of Area F-3 depicts two poorly rendered palmettes and two *unguentaria*. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 115, 144, 154, Figs. 108-109, 160-161; Ovadia, "Mosaic Pavements," 67.



is, again, multiple, characterized by designs that may fit well within Hellenistic, Roman, or Jewish traditions.

#### 4.2.4. *Opus Sectile*

The other “non-traditional” flooring technique employed by the residents of the Upper City is *opus sectile*, the laying of large stone tiles, usually in a geometric pattern. As with the discussion of stucco work, the data from Jerusalem are limited. The technique seems to have been fairly rare among the Jerusalem elite.<sup>55</sup> The only examples from the Upper City are the tiles and bedding from Area M (the Peristyle Building) and four or five stray tiles found in the Burnt House (Area B).<sup>56</sup> The pattern in Area M is made of white hexagonal tiles surrounded by alternating black square and red triangular tiles forming dodecagons.<sup>57</sup> Although the technique was used at other sites, such as Masada and Jericho, there is no evidence yet of a parallel pattern based on hexagons in Herodian Palestine.<sup>58</sup> The context of the Burnt House tiles does not allow

---

<sup>55</sup> The reasons for the rarity of *opus sectile* in the Herodian period are not clear. Perhaps the rarity may be attributed to its expense or novelty. If such floors were constructed of marble, a type of stone not found locally, perhaps the cost would have been prohibitive. In Palestine, though, the cost in the Herodian period was often off-set by the use of local materials. Unfortunately, the sources do not indicate the nature of the stones used in the Peristyle House, and although Geva describes in detail the nature of the stones from the Burnt House (most were limestone breccia of various colors), no information on possible origins was included in his analysis. Rozenberg suggests that this form of decoration was “more prestigious” on the basis of its usual occurrence in “important spaces.” However, a preference for such locations does not explain why they occur there, and the location of the only *in situ* Herodian example in Jerusalem seems to defy this characterization, as it was tucked away in an oddly shaped room in the corner of the Peristyle Building. Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 32–37; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 146; Rozenberg, “Floor Decoration,” 526; Hillel Geva, “Stone Artifacts,” in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010), 182–183.

<sup>56</sup> An additional tile was noted from a salvage excavation by Billing, but it was from unsealed contexts and, therefore, could date to any era. Other tiles may exist from the Jewish Quarter Excavations but may not have been published yet. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 146; Geva, “Stone - JQE IV,” 182–183, Pl. 5.19; Ya’akov Billing, “Jerusalem, the Jewish Quarter,” *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 123 (2011), accessed January 6, 2014, [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=1919&mag\\_id=118](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=1919&mag_id=118).

<sup>57</sup> See reconstruction in Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 146, Fig. 152. For a photograph of the floor as found, see Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 34 (lower image).

<sup>58</sup> Foerster, *Masada V*, 158–159; Rozenberg, “Floor Decoration,” 526–533.

for the reconstruction of a pattern and they may derive from more than one floor.<sup>59</sup> In terms of range of meaning, one should not simply associate the use of this technique with its origins. Though imperial connections facilitated the adoption of this technique, its geometric patterns fit well within the general design ethic seen among the other techniques discussed above. On the basis of this similarity, *opus sectile* could be appropriated for a display ethic wholly different from that of its Roman origins, with its meaning dependent upon context.

#### **4.2.5. Pottery: Imported Fine Wares**

Reports on imported fine wares have appeared in several of the final volumes for the Jewish Quarter Excavations.<sup>60</sup> These reports do not present a cohesive picture of the Jerusalem elite's habits of consumption. This inconsistency can be attributed largely to the assemblage from the Burnt House. Just as the Burnt House lacked any of the types of interior decoration discussed above, it also had few imported fine wares, with only a handful of non-diagnostic Eastern Terra Sigillata and Pompeiian Red sherds, perhaps due to the function of the surviving parts of the house as a workshop or servant's wing.<sup>61</sup> Had the excavators been able to uncover the other portions of the structure, they might have found more imported wares.

---

<sup>59</sup> Geva suggests that the tiles were brought here “for their colorful beauty, perhaps for their use as grinding or mixing plaques.” While his proposal is plausible, the presence of mortar suggests that some (1-3) were used in a local floor; one (5) is questionably even a tile; and only one (3) is recorded with possible wear marks from secondary use. Unless these tiles can be connected to the known *opus sectile* floor in Area M (which they cannot because the squared tiles do not correspond to the color schema of that floor), they provide direct evidence of another *opus sectile* floor in the vicinity. Although their variations in size (only 2 and 3 have equivalent measurements) may indicate they were not part of the same pattern, the easiest explanation for their location is that the floor was close to its find spot (either the Burnt House or a nearby structure). The tiles, then, ended up in the Burnt House as a result of looting and destruction. Geva, “Stone - JQE IV,” 182–183, Pl. 5.19; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 145, Fig. 152.

<sup>60</sup> Renate Rosenthal-Heginbottom, “Hellenistic and Early Roman Fine Ware and Lamps from Area A,” in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003), 192–223; Rosenthal-Heginbottom, “ER Fine Wares - JQE III”; Hillel Geva, “Early Roman Pottery,” in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010), 118–153.

<sup>61</sup> Based on the practice of initial sorting in the field, the final report depends on “impressions” of the number of sherds. For the Area B analysis, the available information indicates that the Burnt House had a “few” non-

The other areas analyzed in the final reports possessed a sizeable and varied collection of fine wares from around the Mediterranean. The descriptions of Areas A's and E's collections are considered as typical of the neighborhood's corpus, though only a fraction of the Upper City's pottery has been published.<sup>62</sup> If such vessels are typical, according to Renate Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "the imported pottery...is clear evidence of substantial changes in lifestyle, culinary taste, trade connections, and marketing strategies which took place during the reign of Herod the Great."<sup>63</sup> While the Jerusalemites of the previous period used imported fine wares (though fewer in quantity and variety), the Herodian period witnessed the adoption of several new types in Jerusalem, including Eastern Sigillata A, Eastern Sigillata D, and Western Terra Sigillata.<sup>64</sup> As discussed in the previous chapter, the presence of foreign wares need not indicate their use in its traditional manner; however, the reproduction of these forms in local wares expresses a local interest in those particular forms and, perhaps, implies an accompanying change in the customs of consumption.<sup>65</sup>

---

diagnostic fine ware sherds. Geva, "ER Pottery - JQE IV," 120; Hillel Geva and Malka HersHKovitz, "Local Pottery of the Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 99.

<sup>62</sup> This generalization appears to be due partially to the order of the appearance of publications. Berlin's article, which has influenced many of the succeeding discussions (e.g., Altshul) was published prior to *JQE III* and *JQE IV*, meaning it depends solely upon preliminary reports and Rosenthal-Heginbottom's analysis of the pottery from Area A, an area which the excavator has interpreted as either non-residential or seasonally/temporarily residential in nature during the Herodian period. Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Ware - JQE II"; Reich, "A: Strata 6-1 - JQE I," 101; Berlin, "Jewish Life," 446; Altshul, "Herodian 'Revolution,'" 42-45.

<sup>63</sup> In her discussion of the pottery of Building 721 and Area E, Rosenthal-Heginbottom observes that, for this part of the Jewish Quarter, her analysis from Area A holds true here: "Overall the finds do not change the picture of the import pattern already drawn from the Area A finds." Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Ware - JQE II," 122; Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Wares - JQE III," 159.

<sup>64</sup> Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Ware - JQE II," 202-204, 214, 219-220.

<sup>65</sup> Although both Berlin and Rosenthal-Heginbottom associate these forms with the adoption of new culinary habits, Rosenthal-Heginbottom also notes that in some cases, when the expression of these forms in the local repertoire is limited, it may indicate a preference for the technological superiority of a local type rather than a widespread adoption of the cooking technique (see Pompeian Red). Berlin, "Jewish Life," 440-442, 447-448; Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Ware - JQE II," 216-217.

#### 4.2.7. Glass

Another type of material that appears frequently among the remains of the Upper City is glass. The refuse from a workshop in the Jewish Quarter testifies to a thriving glass industry in Jerusalem during the Herodian period.<sup>66</sup> Cast bowls dominated the workshop refuse, but its assemblage shows experimentation with the earliest known examples of glass blowing.<sup>67</sup> During the early Herodian period, glass ware consumption was characterized by a preference for cast forms, as illustrated by Area E, where roughly seventy-five percent of the glass fragments belonged to cast bowls.<sup>68</sup> However, the remains from the Burnt House suggest that by the end of the period, the picture had drastically changed, with new forms and blown glass dominating the corpus.<sup>69</sup> In addition, although further quantitative investigation is needed, the Herodian period seems to have witnessed an increasing interest in imports, both from the Levantine coast and the broader Mediterranean.

---

<sup>66</sup> Yael Israeli and Natalya Katsnelson date the refuse from the workshop based on coins of Alexander Jannaeus found with the collection and the absence of Herodian Quarters. However, their analysis of the date is not compelling. The coins of Alexander Jannaeus only provide a *terminus post quem*, and the *terminus ante quem*, is based on the covering of the *miqveh* by Pavement 800, which is dated either to 20-12 BCE (Ariel and Geva) or to ca. 15 BCE (Rosenthal-Heginbottom). This provides a date range for the deposition of the collection of 80/79 BCE to 12 BCE. Given no compelling reason is given for not connecting the deposition with the sealing of the *miqveh* by Pavement 800, a later Herodian date is preferable. This date is further supported by the fact that the coins of Alexander Jannaeus remain in circulation even under Herod. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 85. On Israeli and Katsnelson's conclusions on dates, see Yael Israeli and Natalya Katsnelson, "Refuse of a Glass Workshop of the Second Temple Period from Area J," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 411–412. On the dating of the Early Herodian material, see Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Wares – JQE III," 159; Ariel, "Coins – JQE III," 195; Geva, "S&A – JQE III," 32-33.

<sup>67</sup> Israeli and Katsnelson, "Refuse of a Glass Workshop," 430.

<sup>68</sup> By seventy-five percent, I mean seventy-five percent of the published forms. Gorin-Rosen notes that the published material only presents 76 of 316 shards discovered in Area E. The reasons for only partial publication are not clear. This approach to the glass appears to be common across all the volumes. Given that she defines it as a "representative sample" (239), I assume that the percentages were consistent across the assemblage, although this may not have been the case. Yael Gorin-Rosen, "Glass Vessels," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 239–265.

Much work also needs to be done on the study of display and use of glass in ancient Palestine. As discussed by Dennis Mizzi, the field has been characterized by an assumption which considers all glassware expensive and symptomatic of conspicuous consumption.<sup>70</sup> Not all glass was created equal. Mizzi contends that the most common types, such as the cast bowls and blown glass from the Area J workshop, should be considered relatively cheap wares, accessible to all but the poorest of people.<sup>71</sup> Although Area E yielded a number of these cheaper forms of glass, Yael Gorin-Rosen notes that the Area's residents could "afford luxurious glass vessels of local manufacture as well as imported objects," demonstrating the households' considerable expenditure on glass.<sup>72</sup> Similar patterns occur elsewhere in the Jewish Quarter, as evidenced by objects like the mold-made blown wares of Ennion.<sup>73</sup>

Apart from the investment in some forms of glass, determining how the use of these vessels changed over time is difficult. The dispersion of objects in Building 721 and in the Burnt House is very different and may suggest different storage-use patterns. For example, Building 721's glass was concentrated in L719, the same room with the highest concentrations of fine

---

<sup>69</sup> That said, Israeli also suggests that this appearance of change could be a circumstance of the particular residence. Yael Israeli, "Glass Vessels," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010), 229.

<sup>70</sup> Dennis Mizzi, "The Glass from Khirbet Qumran: What Does It Tell Us about the Qumran Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 99–100.

<sup>71</sup> Of course, other factors beyond production method affected the cost, such as the color of the glass and whether or not it was imported. Mizzi, "Glass," 104–105.

<sup>72</sup> This statement was made more broadly about the area. Stratum 3 in Building 721, as defined according to Geva (Avigad's definition was much larger), yielded only fourteen published pieces of glass (18% of the Area's total), two of which are listed among Gorin-Rosen's fine quality examples. According to Mizzi's definition, only one of these (G58) would be considered fine glass. Gorin-Rosen, "Glass - JQE III," 257; Mizzi, "Glass," 101–108; Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 83–88, Fig. 64; Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 24–26, Fig. 1.2.

<sup>73</sup> Avigad noted three to four pieces made by Ennion within the Palatial Mansion. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 107–108, 117.

ware and coarse ware pottery.<sup>74</sup> This concentration may indicate that these forms were used and stored together. However, the Burnt House, which lacked significant amounts of ceramic fine wares, still possessed a large assemblage of glass.<sup>75</sup> The discrepancy between these two assemblages may indicate changes in the storage-use pattern of glass and/or the de-valuation of certain types of glass.<sup>76</sup> However, the differences between these assemblages could also be attributed to depositional processes.<sup>77</sup> At the very least, the differences between them suggest that, over the course of the Herodian period, glass became an increasingly important part of the local assemblage, as indicated by the variation in the sizes of the assemblages.<sup>78</sup>

#### 4.2.8. Chalk Vessels

Sites around Jerusalem have produced large number of chalk vessels.<sup>79</sup> This local industry began sometime during the Herodian period, and it quickly gained popularity across all

---

<sup>74</sup> See rough distribution map in Geva. According to the catalogs, 10 of the 14 glass shards were found in Room L719, while 47 of 74 pottery pieces (37 local, 10 fine ware) were found in the room. Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 33, Fig. 1.3; Gorin-Rosen, "Glass - JQE III," 240–256; Rosenthal-Heginbottom, "ER Fine Wares - JQE III," 144–158; Geva and Hershkovitz, "ER Local - JQE III," 103–114.

<sup>75</sup> Israeli, "Glass - JQE IV," 221.

<sup>76</sup> Mizzi suggests that blown glass made the material cheaper and therefore more disposable, causing the use of glass to change over time. The evidence from the Burnt House may support this proposal, as the concentration of glass away from ceramic finds in other parts of the house may suggest a difference in their statuses. However, as in Building 721, roughly 7% of this assemblage could be classified as "fine" or "imported" wares. Mizzi, "Glass," 106.

<sup>77</sup> Both houses ended in conditions that may not preserve use patterns from the life of the structure, as one was abandoned and the other looted. In addition, as Geva and Hershkovitz note that they were unable to differentiate between pottery found on the floor and in the fill above the floor in Building 721. I assume that this problem holds for the glass and other find types. Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 24; Geva, "S&A - JQE IV," 37; Geva and Hershkovitz, "ER Local - JQE III," 99, 102.

<sup>78</sup> The disparity between the assemblages is fourteen shards verses approximately one hundred. This temporal discrepancy could be a function of the growing popularity of blown forms (supported by the almost total absence of cast forms in the Burnt House) correlated with a declining cost of glass because of the new methodologies. Israeli, "Glass - JQE IV," 121.

<sup>79</sup> For other Jerusalem sites, see the slightly dated list in Cahill: Jane Cahill, "The Chalk Assemblages of the Persian/Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods," in *Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985. Vol. III: Stratigraphical, Environmental, and Other Reports*, ed. Alon De Groot and Donald T. Ariel, Qedem 33 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Institute of Archaeology, 1992), 227–228. Important publications on the Jerusalem chalk vessel assemblage include the following: Ronny Reich, "Stone Vessels, Weights, and Architectural Fragments," in *Jewish*

of Palestine's Jewish regions.<sup>80</sup> The use of these vessels became so widespread that archaeologists now expect to find them at most late Second-Temple Jewish sites. For the most part, these vessels were considered easily-made, cheap, and accessible.<sup>81</sup> This availability suggests that, although the elite may have had greater access to more expensive forms, investment in this ware had little to do with status. Rather, the general consensus has been that the proliferation of chalk vessels stems from the observance of ritual purity, "a prerequisite for encountering the sacred."<sup>82</sup> According to rabbinic halakah, stone could not contract impurity and, therefore, presents an ideal medium for conveying those things (e.g., water, food) which could.<sup>83</sup> Berlin connects the use of these vessels with "ethnic pride" and "religious solidarity,"

---

*Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003), 263–291; Hillel Geva, "Stone Artifacts," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006), 218–238; Geva, "Stone - JQE IV"; Yitzhak Magen, *The Stone Vessel Industry in the Second Temple Period: Excavations at Hizma and the Jerusalem Temple Mount* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002); David Amit, Jon Seligman, and Irina Zilberbod, "Stone Vessel Production Caves on the Eastern Slope of Mount Scopus, Jerusalem," in *New Approaches to Old Stones: Recent Studies of Ground Stone Artifacts*, ed. Yorke M. Rowan and Jennie R. Ebeling (London: Equinox, 2008), 320–342; Shimon Gibson, "The Stone Vessel Industry at Hizma," *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983): 176–188.

<sup>80</sup> The chalk vessel industry appears to have developed early in the Herodian period, but if Reich is correct, it developed out of a nascent stone industry of the Hasmonean period (Area A, Stratum 6). Geva prefers Cahill's interpretation of this early *mizzi* stone industry developing from the forms of imported stone objects, but the disappearance of the *mizzi* industry at approximately the same time as the appearance of chalk vessels suggests Reich's explanation is better. This fact does not mean, however, that they did not emulate imports. In addition, it does not mean that Reich's view should be accepted wholesale: his interpretation of the stone vessel industry developing in the context of "religious regulations" does not adequately explain the wide-spread adoption of these vessels. Berlin's description of household Judaism occurring in the absence of "halakhic or priestly concerns" may be a bit strong for the Jerusalem material (after all, many of the Upper City residents were priests) but conveys the sense that the adoption of such material was likely at the popular level and not at the hand of some regulator. Who would have had the power to induce so many to adopt such material practices? Reich, "Stone - JQE II," 265; Cahill, "Chalk Assemblages," 193; Geva, "Stone - JQE III," 219–220; Berlin, "Jewish Life," 467.

<sup>81</sup> The exception is the large *qalals*. Magen observed a tendency to avoid decoration in cheaper forms. He explains the latter as an attempt to avoid adding extra costs. Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 65.

<sup>82</sup> Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 171.

<sup>83</sup> For discussion of rabbinic halakah and stone, see Magen. While a desire to adhere to this halakah helps explain the widespread use of such objects, not all sects viewed stone as impervious to impurity. For example, among the Essenes, stone was susceptible to impurity via contact with oil. Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 138–147; Hanan Eshel, "CD 12:15-17 and the Stone Vessels Found at Qumran," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated*

suggesting that such objects can act as a display of Jewish-ness.<sup>84</sup> However, as Gibson has pointed out, chalk vessels need not always be connected to Jewish ritual practice.<sup>85</sup>

The assemblage from the Jewish Quarter Excavations has provided a rich addition to the repertoire of chalk vessels from Jerusalem. As Geva has argued, it may even provide the temporal resolution necessary to trace the technological development of stone vessels throughout the Herodian period.<sup>86</sup> What the current evidence has not done so far is allow a similar mapping of changes in use patterns over time. For example, the early Herodian assemblage from Building 721 is characterized by two interesting concentrations. Overall, it lacks those vessels concerned with food service, perhaps suggesting that chalk vessels were originally used among the households of the Jerusalem elite in the context of ritual washing and the storage of liquids.<sup>87</sup> On a smaller scale, the concentration of mug pieces in the dinging room (L711), the dining room, points the setting of dining and hand washing commonly associated with this type of vessel.<sup>88</sup> However, the archaeological context of these finds renders any claims about changing patterns over time tenuous. Without the corresponding data from Area J, any of these patterns may be

---

*Literature*, 4-8 February 1998, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther C. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 45–52.

<sup>84</sup> Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 433.

<sup>85</sup> Shimon Gibson, “Stone Vessels in the Early Roman Period from Jerusalem and Palestine: A Reassessment,” in *One Land - Many Cultures: Archaeological Studies in Honor of Stanislaw Loffreda OFM*, ed. G. Claudio Bottini, Leah Di Segni, and L. Daniel Chrupcala (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2003), 300.

<sup>86</sup> Geva, “Stone - JQE IV,” 156.

<sup>87</sup> On the use of the vessels and typology of the vessels, see Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 430–431. For evidence of liquids in the *qalal*, see Reich, “Stone – JQE II,” 266.

<sup>88</sup> For a discussion of ritual hand washing and dining see, Magness, *Stone and Dung*, 17–23; Chaim Milikowsky, “Reflections on Hand-Washing, Hand-Purity, and Holy Scripture in Rabbinic Literature,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 149–62.



attributed to survival bias or depositional processes.<sup>89</sup> The only conclusion that the current data allow on changing use patterns is that, by the end of the Herodian period, the elite of Jerusalem had adopted a rich and varied corpus of chalk vessels not attested at the beginning of the period.

#### 4.2.9. *Miqva'ot*

One of the most frequent architectural features in the Upper City is the Jewish ritual bath or *miqveh*. In Second-Temple Judaism, immersion in living water was the usual means of ritual purification.<sup>90</sup> In places where naturally occurring bodies of water were not readily accessible for immersion, *miqva'ot* were constructed to serve this purpose. They were generally dug into fill or bedrock, reinforced with stone walls (if necessary), and plastered. In addition, in the Jewish Quarter, some of the *miqva'ot* were capped by well-constructed vaulted roofs. For individual households, their construction required a significant investment of labor and money, an expenditure which demonstrates the importance of these features in the lives of the householders.<sup>91</sup> The practice of constructing such pools began around the end of the second century BCE and first appeared in the Upper City during the early first century BCE.<sup>92</sup> By the end of the Herodian period, *miqva'ot* had become a standard feature of the houses on the Western Hill. As Avigad notes, every home had at least one ritual bath, and some, like the

---

<sup>89</sup> Since the missing forms do occur elsewhere in the city at the same time, this absence from the archaeological record may be attributed to a chance of history. While it would not prove that this pattern was not due to depositional processes, a repeated pattern in Area J's structures would make the case more compelling for Building 721. In terms of depositional processes, the Stratum 3 data from Area E is problematic because of the difficulty of differentiating between finds from the floor and those from the fill, as noted above. Geva and Hershkovitz, "ER Local - JQE III," 99, 102.

<sup>90</sup> For a discussion of ritual immersion during the Second Temple period, see Jonathan David Lawrence, *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 46–70.

<sup>91</sup> On the expense of *miqva'ot*, see, for example, Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 58.

<sup>92</sup> Reich states that Pool 65 in Area "is one of the earliest such installations found in Jerusalem thus far." Reich, "A: Strata 6-1 - JQE I," 89; Boaz Zissu and David Amit, "Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean *Miqva'ot* (Ritual Immersion Baths)," in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 49.

Palatial Mansion, had several.<sup>93</sup> While associated with ritual immersion, a growing number of studies have focused on the “everyday” uses of *miqva’ot* outside of ritual activities.<sup>94</sup>

### **4.3. Negotiated Identities: Material Displays and the Identity(ies) of the Jerusalem Elite**

The previous section broadly outlined the Jerusalem elite’s display vernacular during the Herodian period. As established above, all objects have meanings and can be manipulated in a discourse of identity negotiation. The range of display acts and their material expressions constitute the display vernacular. As such, the display vernacular defines the limits of identity discourse, providing a range of meanings for these acts and suggesting scenarios of practice. This section continues to examine how living under Empire affected the Jewish elite by analyzing this display vernacular.

#### ***4.3.1. A Shifting Vernacular: Changes in Display Practices***

Although a number of continuities are evident between the Hellenistic and Herodian periods in Jerusalem, one of the most salient characteristics of this display vernacular is how it changed from the end of the Hellenistic period to the end of the Herodian period. This changing vernacular is characterized by two developments. On the one hand, some material expressions of display acts which originated in the Hellenistic period now became nearly ubiquitous among the Jerusalem elite. *Miqva’ot*, frescoes, and mosaics appeared in almost every house uncovered by the Jewish Quarter Excavations. On the other hand, the period witnessed the increasing adoption of material expressions with no precedent in Palestine. These new practices involved both

---

<sup>93</sup> Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*, 139.

<sup>94</sup> Katharina Galor, “The Stepped Water Installations of the Sepphoris Acropolis,” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity. Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 202; Stuart S. Miller, “Stepped Pools and the Non-Existent Monolithic ‘Miqveh,’” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity. Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 225–226.

appropriating foreign means of display for local use, such as *opus sectile*, and adopting new local traditions, such as chalk vessels.

At first glance, this change does not seem altogether surprising. After all, for a long time, archaeologists observed change in the archaeological record and interpreted it as the adoption of foreign material culture and ways. For the Herodian period, in the Eastern Empire, this sort of change has been described as Hellenization. However, the changes noted in the display vernacular should not be conflated with this traditional acculturative model. Instead of focusing on the particular cultural associations of newly adopted materials, observation of changes in the display vernacular focuses on the practice of identity expression. In other words, dispensing momentarily with the cultural baggage and origins of these objects, it asks, “Did this group previously use this form of expression in the discourse of identity negotiation?” In focusing on this aspect of practice, the question no longer concerns how Greco-Roman traditions were adopted into local customs; instead, it incorporates all changes into the discourse of identity, including those which originated in the local milieu. Thus, for the Jerusalem elite, both local and appropriated foreign traditions attest to a change in the manner in which they expressed their identity during the Herodian period.

#### ***4.3.2. Multiple Identities: the Multivalency of Displays***

The other conspicuous point from this survey of the Jerusalem elite’s display vernacular is its multivalency. Most (if not all) of the material expressions of identity discussed above could have multiple meanings that may be brought to the foreground in the discourse of identity negotiation. This is, again, an important distinction for understanding this model. As observed in Chapter 2, the traditional acculturative model assumes the “Roman-ness” of Roman objects. Likewise, although many scholars have abandoned the acculturative model, in the archaeology of Palestine, objects traditionally associated with Jewish ritual practice are often assumed to

indicate a Jewish identity.<sup>95</sup> However, objects' meanings are dependent on how they are used. As used in acts of displays, many of the objects discussed above could point to a participation in a larger Mediterranean *koine* but, in a different context, might also join the actor to local representative traditions.

A good example of this discursive multivalency is the four decorative techniques discussed above. For the most part, these techniques originated in a Greco-Roman context and may attest to familiarity with elite material practices in other parts of the Empire. At the same time, the Jerusalem elite generally eschewed designs (the depiction of images) which might be construed as problematic at a local level. In terms of identity, these decorative techniques were ambiguous, as they were neither fully Greco-Roman nor fully Jewish. This ambiguity led Altshul to suggest that the Jerusalem elite created their own local culture.<sup>96</sup> To a degree, his assertion is correct: they seem to be embracing a new and unique display ethic. However, when examining these techniques as symbols of a discourse of identity negotiation, framing them in such terms suppresses the options of identity expression to that of a single group, the Jerusalem elite. In the ambiguity of these forms, though, their meanings may cross the multiple identities with which the Jerusalem elite intersect. Depending on factors such as the combination of these decoration techniques with other material expressions of identity and the composition of their audience, their ambiguity allows the householder to emphasize a Greco-Roman, Jewish, or some other identity and, in the ongoing process of identity negotiation, enables that person to form links with different and even opposing identity groups.

---

<sup>95</sup> Mark A. Chancey, "Archaeology, Ethnicity, and First-Century C.E. Galilee: The Limits of the Evidence," in *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 215; Jones, "Identities in Practice," 33, 37–42.

<sup>96</sup> Altshul, "Herodian 'Revolution,'" 28–29.

Another example of the multivalency of the objects which constitute this display vernacular is the case of certain types of stone vessels. In her analysis of Jewish villages in the Galilee, Berlin argues that the choice to use such dishes communicates “ethnic pride and attentiveness to Judaism,” demonstrating “conspicuous religious solidarity.”<sup>97</sup> Since these same forms also appeared in table settings of the Jerusalem elite alongside imported pottery from all over the Mediterranean, should they be connected to this same display of “religious solidarity” in this different setting? Perhaps. However, at the same time, this context can also privilege other meanings. When paired with the imports and fine wares of the Jerusalem elite’s table setting, their connections to Second-Temple practice may not be the primary identity being performed. In such a setting, their ware still suggests the local origins of the vessels, but many of their forms imitate those seen in the imports with which they share the table, perhaps linking these objects more closely to a larger imperial context.<sup>98</sup> As Gibson has argued, chalk vessels derive their meanings from context and audience, despite their traditional connections to Judaism.<sup>99</sup> While chalk vessels likely retained meanings connected to Jewish identity and practice, it is hard to accept that this wholly different context would not have added to or changed the meanings of these vessels. Both of these examples suggest that the elite Jerusalem householders may have deployed a combination of objects to construct and stress certain parts of their identities, depending on their needs and audience.

If space permitted, a discussion of each of the categories listed in the Jerusalem elite’s vernacular would exhibit this same ambiguity. In fact, one of the vernacular’s defining

---

<sup>97</sup> Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 433.

<sup>98</sup> On the forms imitating imports, see Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 431-432; Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 66-68; Cahill, “Chalk Assemblages,” 209.

<sup>99</sup> Gibson, “Stone Vessels,” 300.

characteristics seems to be ambiguity. While all materials used in identity displays possess some ambiguity outside of context, Berlin has shown that, when considered together, a display vernacular may express certain trends in the display habits of a group. For her sample, in the first century CE, Galilean villagers exhibited an “ethic of austerity” characterized by the avoidance of imports.<sup>100</sup> For Jerusalem, the elite residences were characterized by a level of conspicuous consumption, but unlike the villagers, they adopted identity expressions that connected them strongly to both the Jewish and Greco-Roman identities. This ambiguity could serve them well in the different roles they played in governance. In the ambiguity of their material expressions of identity, they could, as needed, perform acts of display which linked their identities with their imperial occupiers, their fellow Jerusalem elites, and/or their fellow natives who practiced certain forms of Judaism.

#### ***4.3.3. Imperial Identities: Rome and the Jerusalem Elite***

In this analysis of the Jerusalem elite’s display vernacular, the evidence indicates that the manner of identity expression changed during the Herodian period and that the character of the resultant vernacular was multivalent. This change cannot be easily explained away with a single causal solution. This is why the field has so many models for understanding the process of empire-local interaction. However, one factor that stands out is the new context of Herodian Palestine. As Berlin has pointed out, although much of the cultural change that occurred during this period may be described as “Hellenistic,” changes in the habits of Jewish villagers did not occur until the Roman period.<sup>101</sup> As we have seen above, the same is true of the Jerusalem elite.

---

<sup>100</sup> Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 436.

<sup>101</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 63.

In part, this change is explainable by their new context within the Roman Empire and the inhabitants' new identities as subjects of Empire.

The context of Empire provided access. Through imperial connections, the Jerusalem elite were introduced to new means of identity expression, such as *opus sectile* and stucco work. With the advantages of imperial peace and trade networks, they also had unprecedented access to Mediterranean markets, allowing the increase in and variety of imports which characterized their assemblages.

Not only did the context of Empire provide access, but it also provided motive. The basis of Empire is a series of nested power relationships, and much of elite display can be understood as a response to the resultant power inequities. As Millett suggested, native emulations of Roman practice function to retain local elite power under a new situational reality.<sup>102</sup> Herod's display and euergetic habits (e.g., naming structures after the imperial family) indicate that he believed a relational advantage could be gained through such practices. The Jerusalem elite sought similar social capital. Display acts which connected them with broader imperial practices showed a certain cultural sophistication and evinced a willingness to collaborate in a wider imperial culture, perhaps enabling them to curry favor with their local imperial representatives.

Altshul, working from the same body of evidence, reached a similar conclusion, arguing that Herodian Jerusalem experienced a cultural revolution characterized by the adoption of cultural trends originating in Rome.<sup>103</sup> However, his model, though allowing for the development of a local hybrid culture, forgets the other side of the power differential – the elite's local power base. As a result, he overemphasizes the connection to and emulation of Rome. For

---

<sup>102</sup> Millett, *Romanization of Britain*, 2, 7, 68-69.

<sup>103</sup> Altshul, "Herodian 'Revolution,'" 50-51.

example, he envisions chalk vessels as luxury goods with primarily Roman connections and barely mentions the growing popularity of *miqva'ot* that develops alongside all the “Roman” cultural trends that he observed.<sup>104</sup> An explanation of changing practice in Herodian Palestine cannot rely primarily on *imitatio romae*. If it does, it runs the risk of omitting the concurrent Jewish changes and obscuring the multivalency of the “Roman” practices. When *Romanization* is read as a discourse of negotiated identity, though, it can incorporate both Roman and local identities and the changes to them.

The context of Empire may also provide part of the motive for the adoption of locally-oriented displays by the Jerusalem elite. Berlin has already suggested this point by arguing that the spread of some “Jewish” practices may be explained by a form anti-Romanization.<sup>105</sup> Her explanation is somewhat problematic for the Jerusalem elite, as some of the material practices observed above show they were attempting to maintain identities which connected them to imperial representatives.<sup>106</sup> However, something must explain the sudden interest in new Jewish practices during the Herodian period and their spread. Given the rapid wide-spread acceptance of these practices, even among those not aligned with the Temple (e.g., Qumran), it is hard to see these practices as a top-down imposition.<sup>107</sup> Likewise, theories which attempt to explain the

---

<sup>104</sup> Although Altshul allows for a ritual meaning of stone vessels, he emphasizes their imperial connection even further, describing them as luxury goods “introduced as a local version of new styles from Augustan Rome” and making this role their primary function in display. As for his discussion of ritual baths, it is largely restricted to other scholars’ use of the term (e.g., Berlin – 29, Geva – 30, Amit – 41). While many of the arguments he makes are compelling, in this case, his Romano-centric focus makes the incorporation of local practice difficult. Altshul, “Herodian ‘Revolution,’” 40-41, 51.

<sup>105</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization,” 69.

<sup>106</sup> Since people can maintain self-contradictory identities, perhaps there is an argument for maintaining a part of this interpretation for the Jerusalem elite.

<sup>107</sup> Berlin, “Jewish Life,” 467.



appearance and spread of these concerns with the concept of purity generally do not work.<sup>108</sup>

Such an explanation depends upon a *sui generis* and circular argument that seeks an explanation of the appearance and spread of a ritual object in the ritual itself, without really attempting to explain its origins or spread. In general, identifying the initial appearance of these objects and practices is not possible as none of the theories can actually be proven.<sup>109</sup> However, the spread of the objects can be explained through social relationships and structures. In the case of the Jerusalem elite, the spread of these practices among the elite can be attributed to local expectations of who a Jewish leader was and what he should (or should not) do. For whatever reason, the expectations for ritual purity changed during this period, and at least among the Jerusalem elite, the acceptance of these new practices can be seen, in part, as an attempt to maintain their local power base by adopting these practices.<sup>110</sup>

Therefore, the change in the display vernacular of the Jerusalem elite may be seen as the result of a balancing act. The elite of Jerusalem, under the context of Empire, had multiple identities. They were both Roman subjects and local elites. As a result, their display ethics can be seen as an attempt to navigate the complexities of maintaining these competing identities as they tried to hold onto their local power.

---

<sup>108</sup> For example, while I can see the cause of some of the new standards originating from a concern to maintain a state of purity, as Regev posits, the explanation does not explain the new concern or how this concern spread for non-priestly purity spread among the population. Eyal Regev, "Pure Individualism: The Idea of Non-Priestly Purity in Ancient Judaism," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000): 188.

<sup>109</sup> For example, I believe that the temporal proximity between the Roman assumption of power and the appearance of the chalk vessel industry is not coincidental, but a causal relationship cannot be established.

<sup>110</sup> The spread among non-elites can either be seen, as per Berlin, a form of anti-Romanization or, similarly, prompted by a degree of social pressure. While I do not think the present solution explains everything involved in this process of change, it does take into account the idea that these were not top-down, Temple-initiated practices, and it incorporates Webster's call for more bottom-up approaches. Berlin, "Jewish Life," 467; Webster, "Creolizing," 209.

#### **4.4. Conclusions**

In this chapter, an examination of the display habits of the Jerusalem elite showed that, during the Herodian period, the manner in which they materially expressed their identity changed. These changes in the display vernacular of the Jerusalem elite should be seen as the product of their negotiating their new situational realities as subjects of Empire. Under this model of *Romanization*, which is defined here as a process of identity negotiation, the power disparities of empire explains the adoption of local and Greco-Roman displays as the local elite balanced their identities as both Roman subjects and Jewish leaders.

**CHAPTER 5:**  
ANTI...:  
IDENTITY AND DISPLAY AT QUMRAN

The previous chapter showed that the Jerusalem elite, in their ongoing discourse of negotiated identity with Rome (*Romanization*), increasingly adopted new forms of identity expression during the Herodian period. These changes helped them navigate their new identities and cope with the power asymmetries of Empire. However, telling a single narrative is dangerous. Purposely or not, it has the habit of eliding all experience into that single account.<sup>1</sup> As the “post”-Romanization movement has stressed, living under Empire does not affect all communities, classes, genders, or individuals equally.<sup>2</sup> For Herodian Palestine, past interpretative frameworks, like Hengel’s Hellenization model, have over-emphasized the commonality of experience.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this chapter is to present a different narrative on the “effects of Empire” in Herodian Palestine by examining the display vernacular of the community at Qumran.<sup>4</sup> As this chapter will show, despite the theories arguing that Qumran was a villa, the site does not reflect the same display ethic as that of the Jerusalem elite. Instead, its display vernacular evinces a preference for identity displays connected primarily to Jewish ritual

---

<sup>1</sup> Chimamanda Adichie, “The Danger of a Single Story” (presented at the TEDGlobal, Oxford, UK, 2009), accessed April 10, 2014, [http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda\\_adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story#t-504835](http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story#t-504835).

<sup>2</sup> See discussion on “post”-Romanization in Section 2.1.4. above. This is one of the points of Woolf’s “becoming Roman” model, as he stresses the different experiences of different communities under Roman power (“There were so many Romans to become...”). Woolf, *Becoming Roman*, 245.

<sup>3</sup> See discussion on Hengel in Section 2.3.1. above. To be fair to Hengel, his purpose was to correct a particular problem of the field and the solution to that problem (showing the similarities between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism) lent itself to the elision of different experiences of change.

observance, and when read against the vernacular of the Jerusalem elite, the resultant disparity suggests that the community was constructing identities oppositional to those of Jerusalem's leaders.

### 5.1. A Villa or Sectarian Community? Methodology

From its discovery, Qumran, a site near the northwestern edge of the Dead Sea, has generally been interpreted as a Jewish sectarian center.<sup>5</sup> However, since the 1990s, a number of scholars have proposed alternative interpretations of the site.<sup>6</sup> One of these theories posits that the site was a wealthy country villa.<sup>7</sup> This theory depends upon several points. First, like the other alternative theories, it requires the divorce of the Dead Sea Scrolls from the site.<sup>8</sup> Second, according to the proponents of the villa theory, Qumran shared commonalities with other elite

---

<sup>4</sup> Others have begun to address this problem by studying patterns regionally. For example, Chancey and Berlin have done much to reform the idea that Galilee was primarily "Hellenistic." Chancey, *Myth*; Berlin, "Romanization and Anti-Romanization"; Berlin, "Jewish Life."

<sup>5</sup> For the traditional interpretation, see Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 91–138; Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 73–103.

<sup>6</sup> Other interpretations of the site include a pottery workshop (e.g., Magen and Peleg), a fort (e.g., Magen and Peleg, Hirschfeld, Cargill), or a country villa (see below). Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, *The Qumran Excavations, 1993-2004: Preliminary Report* (Jerusalem: IAA, 2007), 49–65; Robert R. Cargill, *Qumran through [Real] Time* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2009), 210–212; Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 229–230.

<sup>7</sup> The major proponents of this idea have been Donceel and Donceel-Voûte and Hirschfeld. Humbert suggests that earlier phases of the site (Hasmonean) included a residence, but for most of the Herodian period, he argues for a small sectarian settlement. Since this chapter largely concerns the Herodian period, his theory of a Hasmonian residence is of less interest here, though a few relevant points are brought up below. Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "Les ruines de Qumrân reinterprétées," *Archaeologia* 298 (1994): 24–35; Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site, Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. Michael Wise et al. (New York: New York Academy of Science, 1994), 1–38; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 49–166; Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "Arguments en faveur d'une résidence pré-Essénienne," in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshka II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 467–482; Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "The Chronology during the First Century B.C., de Vaux and His Methods: A Debate.," in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshka II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 425–444; Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "L'espace sacré à Qumrân: Propositions pour l'archéologie," *Revue biblique* 101 (1994): 161–214.

<sup>8</sup> For example, Hirschfeld embraced the theory that the scrolls originated from a library in Jerusalem. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 45–48.

residences from the Herodian period, which indicate it was a villa.<sup>9</sup> Third, because some scholars have characterized the site as poor and isolated, advocates of the villa theory cite proof of its wealth and “openness” as evidence that it was not sectarian and, therefore, most likely a villa.<sup>10</sup> Although Eshel and Magness have demonstrated the fallacy of arguments which dismiss the connection between the scrolls and the site, this chapter temporarily brackets the first criterion.<sup>11</sup> Instead, for the sake of argument, it takes seriously the claim that the site may have been a villa. As a villa, a home of one of the wealthy Jewish elite, one should expect to find displays similar to those found at other elite residential sites like those in Jerusalem. Not only should they have similar displays, but also the display vernacular as a whole should reflect similar identity concerns as those seen among the Jerusalem elite in the previous chapter. Thus, this chapter discusses the types of identity displays at Qumran and the evidence for them and compares the resultant identity vernacular to that of the Jerusalem elite.<sup>12</sup> It begins by outlining Qumran’s display vernacular, parts of which proponents of the villa theory have adduced as evidence of the site’s affluence and externality.

---

<sup>9</sup> Donceel-Voûte, “Les ruines de Qumrân reinterprétées,” 34–35; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 211–230.

<sup>10</sup> Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, “The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran,” 9, 12; Donceel-Voûte, “Les ruines de Qumrân reinterprétées,” 32, 35; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 142–152.

<sup>11</sup> Using both archaeology and local geography, Magness and Eshel have shown the relationship between the site and the caves. De Vaux recognized this connection and described the caves as being “organically connected” with the site’s history. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 73–104; Hanan Eshel, “Qumran Archaeology. Review of *Qumran in Context* by Yizhar Hirschfeld,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125, no. 3 (2005): 390–391; de Vaux, *Archaeology*, 54.

<sup>12</sup> Magness has already engaged in some of this assessment in her works. This chapter adds to her discussion and furthers it by putting the discussion in the context of identity display and practice. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 90–100; Jodi Magness, “Review: *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence*,” *Review of Biblical Literature* (2005); Jodi Magness, “A Villa at Khirbet Qumran?,” in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 17–39.

## 5.2. The Display Vernacular of Qumran

### 5.2.1. Architecture

The previous chapter did not consider the category of architecture for the Jerusalem residences because many of the major architectural features of the Upper City have not been published.<sup>13</sup> However, this category is important for a number of reasons, including its ability to reflect people's conceptions of space and the durability of such acts. For the proponents of the villa theory, the importance of these features rests primarily in their function as a sign of affluence. The structures of Qumran were constructed largely of field stone or mudbrick walls, with cut stones at doors, windows, and corners.<sup>14</sup> However, scattered throughout the site were a number of carved elements. Chambon's catalog contains 27 architectural fragments, including 2 capitals, 5 bases, 13 column drums, 1 cornice, and 6 elements related to the construction of doorways.<sup>15</sup> Hirschfeld interpreted these elements as a "degree of grandeur" and a "sign of luxury."<sup>16</sup> Likewise, Humbert and Chambon describe them as indicative of "aristocratic architecture" and reconstruct a triclinium from them.<sup>17</sup> All of these scholars see in these features practices parallel to those in Jerusalem, which they connect directly to elite identities.

At first glance, these explanations seem compelling. During the Herodian period, such architectural elements typically were associated with elite residences or non-residential public buildings. However, a difficulty arises in the interpretation of these elements at Qumran, as they

---

<sup>13</sup> E.g., the Peristyle Building. See Avigad, *Herodian Quarter*, 32–37.

<sup>14</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 47–48.

<sup>15</sup> The catalog also includes eight *opus sectile* tiles, which are discussed in the next section. Some of the items included in the catalog did not appear in de Vaux's notes. Alain Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs d'architecture localisés ou erratique," in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Aïn Feshka II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 46–48.

<sup>16</sup> Yizhar Hirschfeld, "Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57, no. 3 (1998): 164; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 93.

all were found either in secondary use or in a context of abandonment in the later phases of the site.<sup>18</sup> No archaeological evidence of their original contexts has been identified. As a result, scholars are left to speculate about their original locations. For example, De Vaux argued that a colonnade stood between L35 and L49, and Humbert contended that the architectural remains originated around the location of pools L56 and L58.<sup>19</sup> Four points suggest that these features were not associated with an elite presence at Qumran.

First, although some of the architectural features were relatively rare at other sites (e.g., columns), one should not conflate all cut stones with these rare forms.<sup>20</sup> A common building technique in Palestine until the modern period was strengthening points of ingress and egress with cut stones, even when the rest of the structure was constructed out of field stones.<sup>21</sup> The significance of certain architectural features at Qumran has been overstated.<sup>22</sup> Had these same fragments been found at other sites, they would not have warranted the attention that they have received at Qumran; therefore, they should not necessarily be treated as signs of affluence.

Second, these architectural features need not be indicative of an elite residence. In Herodian Palestine, columns appeared in two primary contexts: in elite residences and in non-residential public structures. According to the traditional interpretation of Qumran, the latter is

---

<sup>17</sup> Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs," 447; Humbert, "Arguments," 480–481.

<sup>18</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 69.

<sup>19</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân, Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne," *Revue biblique* 61 (1954): 209–210; Humbert, "Arguments," 480.

<sup>20</sup> Dennis Mizzi has proposed a similar point. Dennis Mizzi, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran: A Comparative Approach" (PhD diss, Oxford: Oxford University, 2009), 39.

<sup>21</sup> Hirschfeld, *Palestinian Dwelling*, 249–258.

<sup>22</sup> Chambon includes some items in his catalog and architectural discussions (e.g., door jambs) which would not have warranted this extent of discussion at other sites. While I appreciate the inclusion of these features in his catalog because of the lack of published data for the site, the publication of the data in these contexts over emphasizes their importance and "unique" status. Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs," 445, 447–448.

more in line with Qumran's character. As Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel's excavations have shown, the main living spaces of the community would have been outside of the site's walls, with the site functioning as a center for community activities.<sup>23</sup> This point connects back to the multiple meanings of displays. Those who argue for the villa theory seem to connect the use of certain architectural features solely with the construction of certain identities without considering other possibilities. Thus, the simple equation between these features and an elite presence is fallacious as their presence could be connected to the communal nature of the site.

Third, a diachronic view shows something odd. If these architectural features stood at Qumran, Period I was the only period in the history of the site with a significant investment in these types of features. In other words, concerning architecture, the Qumranite's practice of display changed. For some reason, they abandoned their previous traditions. Scholars who claim that the latter periods of the site are characterized by an elite villa encounter a problem: at the same time that the elite of Jerusalem were adopting display practices which linked them to the broader Mediterranean world, the Qumranites appear to have rejected those same practices. Elite practice at Qumran suddenly appears divergent from elite practice elsewhere in Palestine. In addition, if these architectural pieces went out of use in later periods, they should no longer be considered a reflection of the site's affluence.<sup>24</sup> Although Humbert and Chambon's

---

<sup>23</sup> Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Residential Caves at Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6, no. 3 (1999): 328–348; de Vaux, *Archaeology*, 48. For a counter argument to Broshi and Eshel, see Joseph Patrich, "Khirbet Qumran in Light of New Archaeological Exploration in the Qumran Caves," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site, Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. Michael Wise et al. (New York: New York Academy of Science, 1994), 93–94; Joseph Patrich, "Did Extra-Mural Dwelling Quarters Exist at Qumran?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence W. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1997), 720–727.

<sup>24</sup> This is a salient point which Hirschfeld seems to miss. He allocates the architectural features to his Stratum III, which he dates from Herod to the site's destruction in 68 CE. The problem is that, during this period, these features already appear in secondary use. In this state, they can no longer be symbolic of the "degree of luxury" he perceives at the site. Instead, they are essentially rubbish applied to new purposes. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 87, 93.



reconstruction of the history of the site is still problematic, their division of the site's history into that of a villa followed by a sectarian center originates from an attempt to account for this perceived difference in architectural practice.<sup>25</sup>

Fourth, as pointed out above, archaeologically none of these features was found in a primary context. Not only has this circumstance led to much disagreement over their original contexts, but also it has permitted a handful of scholars to suggest that the majority of the architectural fragments did not originate at the site at all.<sup>26</sup> Some of the argument is based upon the absence of evidence, including the missing stylobate, the small number of capitals (vis-à-vis the number of bases), and the single piece of a cornice.<sup>27</sup> While the absence of evidence is not compelling by itself, it is more compelling when stylistic concerns are considered. As Mizzi points out, the styles of the capitals are different, architectural elements are in various states of completion, and the bases vary in size.<sup>28</sup> In terms of the bases, Mizzi was a bit generous in limiting his assessment to dimensions. A consideration of the images provided by Chambon shows that their profiles are also different.<sup>29</sup> Together, they appear to represent three different styles, and although three of the bases share a common style, not a single profile matches. Possible explanations for these variations are limited. The Qumranites may have had multiple colonnades; they may have hired poor quality artisans; they may have randomly mixed styles

---

<sup>25</sup> The detailed discussion and description of how they interpret the stones appears in Humbert, "Arguments," 476-480.

<sup>26</sup> Humbert also suggests (and dismisses) the possibility that the stones resulted from spoliation. Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 36-39; Ehud Netzer, "Did Any Perfume Industry Exist at 'Ein Feshka?," *Israel Exploration Journal* 55 (2005): 97-98; David Stacey, "Some Notes on the Archaeological Context of Qumran in Light of Recent Publications," *The Bible and Interpretation*, June 2004, accessed April 12, 2014, [http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Stacey\\_Qumran\\_Light\\_of\\_Recent\\_Publications.shtml](http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Stacey_Qumran_Light_of_Recent_Publications.shtml); Humbert, "Arguments," 480.

<sup>27</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 36-37.

<sup>28</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 37.

<sup>29</sup> Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs," 451-453, 456, Figs. 14, 15, 20.

without a care; or they may have taken the pieces from other sites. The first possibility is unlikely given the number of colonnades it would require, and the second possibility is unlikely given that the quality of at least a couple of the pieces (KhQ 2981, 2982) is comparable to those found at Herodian sites.<sup>30</sup> The easiest and most reasonable solution to the wide variation of styles in the architectural features at such a small site appears to be spoliation. This solution does pose its own problem as the likely sites of origin are not nearby.<sup>31</sup> In addition, it only explains the variation of the architectural pieces on the site: it does not explain how or if they were used on the site prior to their relocation to their final contexts.<sup>32</sup> However, the solution of spoliation suggests that, though architectural features paralleling elite practices were present at Qumran, they may not actually be evidence of wealth or a display of elite identity and conspicuous consumption.

Altogether these arguments suggest that, during the Herodian period, the architecture of Qumran most likely was not a sign of affluence and even if it were, the use of these elements may have had other implications than a connection to elite residential practices. If anything,

---

<sup>30</sup> The possibility of multiple colonnades is extremely unlikely. If the Qumranites matched the colonnades by style, based on the differences in the bases, there would have to be at least three different colonnades (two, if based upon the differences in the capitals). If they actually wanted matching bases, they would require five different colonnades.

<sup>31</sup> Mizzi provides a list of possible origin points including Jericho, Rujm el-Bahr, Khirbet Mazin, Machaerus, and 'Ein ez-Zara. None of these locations solves the issue of distance and transport. Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 37–38.

<sup>32</sup> If the material was spoliated, the evidence only allows the firm conclusion that the material was at the site after the earthquake of 31 BCE. The location of some of the pieces in places abandoned after the earthquake strongly suggests that they were used on the site in period IB (see Magness), but the spoliation explanation permits other (if, in my opinion, less likely) scenarios. Based on the dating of some of the material, Mizzi suggests that there are problems with these pieces being in use at the site prior to the earthquake, but his solution is problematic. It does not provide an adequate explanation for the pieces abandoned in L49 (i.e., the implication of his position is that these pieces would never have been used at the site). Even if the architectural material was on the site prior to the earthquake, the spoliation theory only shows that the material was used on the site. It cannot determine how it was used. The pieces could have already been used in manners contrary to the purposes for which they were made. For example, on account of the bases, Magness suggests that there were at least four standing columns on the site prior to the earthquake. However, this need not be the case if the material was spoliated. If the spoliation theory is correct, it proposes an alternative history for the site, and the second and third point of the discussion on architecture above may be irrelevant. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 69; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 34–36.

architectural praxis at Qumran may be described as fundamentally practical, being less concerned with elite displays of conspicuous consumption than providing for the needs of the community. For example, if the columns ever stood in situ, they stood in relation to an eclectic mix of second-story supports, including palm trunks and piers.<sup>33</sup> They used a diversity of local materials (for functional or practical reasons) to achieve the same purpose. Likewise, in Period Ib (post-earthquake) and Period II, the use of the architectural remains, spoliated or not, and the closing of heavily damaged spaces, provided a practical and inexpensive solution to repairing the settlement. These practical approaches to architectural problems suggest that affluent displays were not a primary concern for the inhabitants of the site.

### **5.2.2. Decorative Techniques**

In terms of decorative techniques, as Magness has pointed out, the site shows no evidence of stucco, painting, or mosaics, all of which were a large part of the Jerusalem elite's display vernacular.<sup>34</sup> During the excavation, de Vaux did discover *opus sectile* tiles at Qumran. Consequently, they have been used by all of the villa proponents as evidence of elite practice.<sup>35</sup> However, several pieces of evidence suggest that, while Qumran's assemblage contained tiles, the site likely never had an *opus sectile* floor. As Mizzi points out, no primary site of installation such as a floor bedding was ever found.<sup>36</sup> Although this point depends upon the absence of evidence, several factors support it. Almost half of the tiles were found in secondary contexts,

---

<sup>33</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 52, 57.

<sup>34</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 99-100.

<sup>35</sup> Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 12; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 195; Humbert, "Arguments," 478-479.

<sup>36</sup> Hirschfeld attempts to account for this missing bedding by suggesting that the *opus sectile* floor was located in the upper story rooms. Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 36; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 195.

and their condition suggests secondary use.<sup>37</sup> For example, in their reconstruction of the *opus sectile* floor, Humbert and Chambon arranged the floor around a central roundel.<sup>38</sup> Although they imagine the floor arranged around this single tile, the tile's shape was most likely determined by its secondary life. De Vaux's notes indicate that it was found within a wooden cylinder in L101.<sup>39</sup> Thus, the site's inhabitants likely altered it to function in conjunction with this cylinder. While its original shape cannot now be determined, the tile's modification suggests that at least some of these tiles functioned as something apart from floor tiles. Likewise, the tiles at Qumran appear significantly more worn than those from 'Ain Feshka. Their state suggests that the Qumran tiles may have experienced a longer and harder secondary life than those at 'Ain Feshka.<sup>40</sup> Finally, none of the tiles depicted in the catalog shows evidence of mortar. As seen with the comparable loose tiles from the Burnt House in Jerusalem, the presence of mortar would provide some indication of their use in a primary context as a floor.<sup>41</sup> Tiles are easily portable and could have been brought from another site to be used for various

---

<sup>37</sup> Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Alain Chambon, eds., *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and 'Ain Feshka IB: Synthesis of Roland de Vaux's Field Notes*, trans. Stephen J. Pfann (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 12, 45–46.

<sup>38</sup> Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs," 463, Fig. 27.

<sup>39</sup> I am not sure what the feature is that de Vaux is describing here. According to Pfann's translation, he describes "a wooden cylinder, reduced to dust, which initially had been coated with plaster." For the present purposes, the function of the object does not matter; rather, the relevant information for the present discussion is that two limestone tiles were found in secondary-use: one was found at the bottom, acting as the base of the so-called cylinder, and the rounded tile was in the cylinder, possibly having functioned as some sort of lid. Humbert and Chambon, *De Vaux's Field Notes*, 45–46.

<sup>40</sup> The stones from Qumran appear more battered and cracked than those from 'Ain Feshka. Admittedly, the images do not represent all of the tiles, so the impression may be the result of the process of selection and publication. Chambon, "Catalogue des blocs," 460–462, Figs. 24–26.

<sup>41</sup> Geva, "Stone - JQE IV," 182–183, Pl. 5.19.

purposes at Qumran.<sup>42</sup> An *opus sectile* floor likely never existed at Qumran, and in general, the site lacks any indication of the decorative techniques associated with the Jerusalem elite.

### 5.2.3. Glass

In their 1994 article, Donceel and Donceel-Voûte linked Qumran's glass assemblage with the affluence and the openness of the site.<sup>43</sup> They contend that the site's mold-blown glass was of the highest quality and that Qumran was a center of glass production.<sup>44</sup> A number of scholars dismiss the latter claim on the grounds that the supposed raw glass could be from the melting of glass vessels at the time of the site's destruction.<sup>45</sup> Despite its lingering influence, this idea that the site's glass shows affluence should also be dispelled as the glass assemblage at Qumran is not out of the ordinary.

As noted in Chapter Four, not all glass is a sign of luxury.<sup>46</sup> For the most part, Qumran's assemblage parallels other sites in the Dead Sea region. It lacks the finest wares and consists of mostly free-blown glass.<sup>47</sup> In fact, of the finer glass wares found at the site, only one piece could be dated securely to the Herodian period.<sup>48</sup> Mizzi notes that Qumran fared better than some sites

---

<sup>42</sup> De Vaux similarly suggested that the collection of tiles found at 'Ain Feshka originated from elsewhere, were piled up for construction, and never used in an *opus sectile* floor. Humbert and Chambon, *De Vaux's Field Notes*, 91.

<sup>43</sup> Glass is a portion of the Donceels' trinity of evidence (glass, stone ware, *opus sectile*) which caused them to remark that the collection "is astounding considering what has been said about the 'monastic simplicity' of the site." Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 12.

<sup>44</sup> Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 7-9.

<sup>45</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 185-187; Mizzi, "Glass," 120; Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993-2004," in *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002*, ed. Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jurgen Zangenberg (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 71.

<sup>46</sup> Mizzi, "Glass," 104.

<sup>47</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 182, 187.

<sup>48</sup> In his dissertation, Mizzi discusses the rarity of some glass found at Qumran, noting five "rare finds" and the four sagged pieces of glass. However, only a single piece from these groups can be firmly dated to the sectarian period at Qumran. Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 173, 175, 177-181.

in the region which lack any glass at all.<sup>49</sup> However, one should be cautious in over stating this difference as the absence of glass (or certain types of glass) can be explained by archaeological collection methods and historical factors such as the manner in which the site was abandoned.<sup>50</sup> In general, the glass of Qumran cannot compare to the diversity and quantity of glass in the homes of the Jerusalem elite.<sup>51</sup> As Magness points out, it cannot even compare to the assemblage of a smaller site such as Shu'afat.<sup>52</sup> In Mizzi's words, "the evidence is really at odds with the idea that the glass from Qumran betrays the existence of a very wealthy community who lived a life of luxury."<sup>53</sup> Although the site has examples of fine glass wares, including imports, their importance has been over exaggerated as they are few and most are not associated contextually with the sectarian occupation of the site.

#### **5.2.4. Pottery**

Imported pottery has also been cited as evidence of Qumran's wealth and openness.<sup>54</sup> These claims depend upon the overestimation of the available evidence and a failure to enumerate and contextualize that data.<sup>55</sup> In general, as with glass, Qumran appears to have followed consumption patterns of non-palatial sites in the Dead Sea region.<sup>56</sup> As Magness notes,

---

<sup>49</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 188.

<sup>50</sup> Mizzi, "Glass," 105, 114; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 188n137.

<sup>51</sup> See discussion in Section 4.2.7. For the primary reports on the Jerusalem glass from the Upper City, see Israeli and Katsnelson, "Glass Workshop"; Gorin-Rosen, "Glass - JQE III"; Israeli, "Glass - JQE IV."

<sup>52</sup> Magness, *Stone and Dung*, 68–69.

<sup>53</sup> Mizzi, "Glass," 107.

<sup>54</sup> Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 93.

<sup>55</sup> Magness, "Qumran in Context Review," 10; Jodi Magness, "Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review Article," *Revue de Qumran* 88 (2007): 651.

<sup>56</sup> Jodi Magness, "The Community at Qumran in Light of Its Pottery," in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 13; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 119.

the assemblage is characterized by the near absence of fine wares and imported amphora.<sup>57</sup> She contends that this pattern may be attributable to a “deliberate rejection of these products by the inhabitants” but that the regional pattern suggests that they could not afford a large collection of imports if they had wanted them.<sup>58</sup> Because Qumran’s assemblage fits well within the local patterns of consumption, connecting the pottery directly to an elite identity is difficult. It does not parallel consumption at sites of extreme wealth like the palaces at Jericho; and the pattern of consumption seen at Qumran is present at a wide range of smaller sites, including villa and non-villa sites.<sup>59</sup>

### **5.2.5. Chalk Vessels**

The final category which proponents of the villa theory have pointed to as evidence of Qumran’s affluence and openness is chalk vessels. Although this category does show affluence and a peculiar interest in a particular type of ware, the evidence of chalk vessels at Qumran has been consistently misstated. In their 1994 article, Donceel and Donceel-Voûte defined their category of stone ware in a manner which implies they are only discussing the chalk vessel industry; however, later in the article, they provide an estimate of the assemblage’s size at almost two hundred pieces, in which they included all of the stone objects, not just the chalk vessels.<sup>60</sup> This misrepresentation (intentional or not) has caused confusion in the field, and the size of the assemblage continues to be overestimated both by those who support the villa theory and those

---

<sup>57</sup> Magness, “Qumran Pottery,” 13.

<sup>58</sup> Magness, “Qumran Pottery,” 15.

<sup>59</sup> Mizzi, “Khirbet Qumran,” 117; Magness, “Qumran Pottery,” 8.

<sup>60</sup> This is an error that Mizzi was able to clear up due to his access to the archaeological material. The Donceels clarify their meaning in Note 36; however, the manner in which the discussion develops in the article is confusing. Mizzi, “Khirbet Qumran,” 201; Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, “The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran,” 10–11.

who do not.<sup>61</sup> According to Mizzi, the assemblage of stone vessels at Qumran consists of 59 pieces, with other pieces possible among the material examined by the Donceels and Magen and Peleg.<sup>62</sup>

The Donceels' article also misrepresented the content of the assemblage. Whereas they describe "a good number of pieces belonging to chip-cut vessels," only six vessels from sectarian occupation contexts fit this description.<sup>63</sup> In general, the sectarian assemblage lacks the types of vessels which Berlin has associated with food service (only three bowls), and there were hand-carved mugs were few (4).<sup>64</sup> The small number of the food service vessels could be due to a lack of incentive to invest in them, as the site produced its own pottery and sectarian halakah indicates that they believed stone could contract impurity through contact with oil.<sup>65</sup> Instead of an interest in dining habits and ritual hand washing, the collection reflects two other concerns: storage of liquids (9 sectarian-period *qalals*) and covering vessels (25 sectarian-period lids, stoppers, and discs).<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> For example, following the Donceels, Hirschfeld, Regev and, most recently, Magness cite the "almost two hundred" estimate. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 145; Eyal Regev, "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 275; Magness, *Stone and Dung*, 225n128.

<sup>62</sup> I was able to locate the majority of the 59 cited examples in de Vaux's notes (ca 55). The missed examples may be the result of a difference in qualification or miscalculation on my part. Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 201; Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 10–11; Magen and Peleg, *Qumran*.

<sup>63</sup> By "chip-cut" the Donceels meant hand-carved, as opposed to lathe-made vessels. Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 11.

<sup>64</sup> Two of the bowls were hand-carved (or, in the Donceels' language, chip cut). For hand-carved mugs, I am using the typological description provided by Magen: "mugs and spouted mugs characterized by one or two rectangular handles, a flat base and roughly dressed external walls." Berlin, "Jewish Life," 430–431; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 202; Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 40.

<sup>65</sup> In other words, if part of the motivation for the use of these vessels was replacing imported vessels, as Berlin postulated concerning the Galilean villages, the need is lessened if the site is producing its own pottery vessels. Eshel, "CD 12:15-17"; Berlin, "Jewish Life," 433.

<sup>66</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 202.



If the Donceel's quantitative analysis of the stone ware at Qumran has proven problematic, their qualitative assessment is less so. The bulk of the vessels in the assemblage were large lathe-turned kraters or *qalals* used for storing liquids. Most were decorated and some bore fluted friezes.<sup>67</sup> As Magen notes, these were the most expensive products of the stone vessel industry because of their size and additional decorations.<sup>68</sup> The Donceels note that they "find parallels only with the best specimens from...Jerusalem."<sup>69</sup> In terms of comparison, as Mizzi's analysis shows, the large collection of *qalals* is unusual for the Dead Sea region.<sup>70</sup> In fact this level of consumption is unusual even among urban elites. For example, the Burnt House, which Geva describes as having a higher concentration of stone vessels than any other Upper City residence, only had ten *qalals*, many of them plain.<sup>71</sup> Thus, although the number of stone vessels has been exaggerated, with respect to this one category, the Qumranites appear to have invested a significant amount of their resources.

### 5.2.6. *Miqva'ot*

Thus far, *miqva'ot* have not played a particularly important role in the arguments presented by the proponents of the villa theory. Their silence on this topic may arise from the fact that the number of ritual baths at the site poses a problem for the theory. Thus, Hirschfeld dismisses the quantity of ritual baths at Qumran as "large but not exceptional."<sup>72</sup> As Magness

---

<sup>67</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân, Rapport préliminaire," *Revue biblique* 60 (1953): 3:12; Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 11, Fig. 2; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 202.

<sup>68</sup> Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 65.

<sup>69</sup> Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 11.

<sup>70</sup> Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 203–206.

<sup>71</sup> Israeli, "Glass - JQE IV," 154, 167–170.

<sup>72</sup> Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 128.

has demonstrated, the number of installations for a site of this size is out of the ordinary.<sup>73</sup> To dismiss this distinction as insignificant is to distort the evidence. Despite its lack of prominence in the villa theory, though, the quantity of *miqva'ot* may be another indicator of affluence at the site. As pointed out above, the construction of a personal *miqveh* was a costly venture.<sup>74</sup> The number of *miqva'ot* at Qumran suggests that community invested a significant amount of time, energy, space, and, perhaps, capital in the construction of this system of purity.<sup>75</sup> Comparable systems of ritual purity are only seen among the homes of the wealthiest Jewish elite, such as in the homes of the Upper City residents.<sup>76</sup> Thus, although the number of *miqva'ot* indicate the site likely was not a villa, its quantity represents a significant investment on the part of the community.

### 5.3. A Difference of Identities?

The previous section broadly outlined the display vernacular of Qumran, describing the range of material displays available in a discourse of identity negotiation. Proponents of the villa theory have read the categories which constitute this vernacular as attesting to an elite identity. For them, displays of conspicuous consumption, affluence, and openness contradict the site's identification with sectarians and align its inhabitants with elite practice. However, as noted above, some of their claims have been exaggerated and are not supported by the physical

---

<sup>73</sup> Magness, "Qumran in Context Review," 11–12.

<sup>74</sup> See section 4.2.9. Geva, "S&A - JQE III," 58.

<sup>75</sup> While the community could have built the system itself, the complexity of the hydraulic system at the site probably required a specialist.

<sup>76</sup> Per Reich, the pools at Qumran follow a similar pool to total space ratio as that seen in the Upper City's houses. This statement should not be conflated with an equality in the number of pools, as in Hirschfeld. None of the Upper City residences has nearly as many separate pools as the settlement at Qumran. Also, in general, the pools at Qumran are larger than those in the Jerusalem houses. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 128; Ronny Reich, "Miqwa'ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence W. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov,

evidence. For example, there like never was an *opus sectile* floor at Qumran. Beyond enabling an evaluation of each of these categories individually, the description of the display vernacular also permits an assessment of the types of identities constructed at Qumran and allows a comparison with identities constructed at other sites. As proposed above, if this site were an elite villa, it should reflect an identity discourse similar to that of the Jerusalem elite.<sup>77</sup> Instead, the display vernacular at Qumran shows an interest in constructing identities different from those which seem to have been the concern of the Jerusalem elite.

To be fair to those who support the villa theory, if the primary standards for linking elite identity to a site were displays of conspicuous consumption and affluence, they have a point. After all, although some of the categories adduced as evidence do not work, others do. If, as in the minds of the Donceels, those who support a sectarian interpretation portray the inhabitants' practice as defined by "monastic simplicity," even these few categories of affluence would suggest a non-sectarian identity.<sup>78</sup> However, two corrections to the logic behind this argument are needed. First, while signs of affluence may correlate with elite display practice, they should not automatically be associated with elite identity. As observed above with respect to the architectural features at Qumran, investment in certain "affluent" forms of display may also be connected with communal practices. Second, signs of moderate wealth and interaction with the

---

and James C. Vanderkam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 730; Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 153.

<sup>77</sup> Although Hirschfeld objects to Magness' use of certain kinds of elite sites like Jerusalem for comparison with Qumran, he uses Jerusalem as a comparative site to argue in favor of its identification as a villa. In general, while factors such as economics and scale may have limited access to certain types of displays, the display vernacular as a whole should indicate a general interest in the same sort of identities. Thus, in Magness' example, while Ein ez-Zara lacked certain types of pottery, its inhabitants invested in other display forms similar to the elite in Jerusalem. Hirschfeld, "Manor Houses," 162; Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 96; Magness, "Qumran Pottery," 14-15.

<sup>78</sup> Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," 12

outside world need not negate a sectarian connection.<sup>79</sup> As de Vaux notes, “[our ancient sources] do not exclude the possibility that the community may have possessed goods. On the contrary, they presuppose it.”<sup>80</sup> Mizzi has also shown that the sectarian community “could have been relatively wealthy,” as illustrated by their habit of pooling resources and providing for the poor.<sup>81</sup> Thus, signs of affluence and conspicuous consumption may not indicate an elite presence at Qumran at all. Determining elite presence at the site depends upon showing that the inhabitants at Qumran were participating in the same sort of identity discourses as the Jewish elite elsewhere in Herodian Palestine.

Here, the villa argument completely breaks down. Although Qumran is characterized by some affluent displays, the choice of displays does not reflect the same identity concerns as those of the Jerusalem elite. As discussed in Chapter Four, in Herodian Jerusalem, the elite display vernacular was characterized by the increasing adoption of new types of displays, both Greco-Roman and Jewish in origin. The adoption of these displays seems to have been tied to the power disparities of Empire. The Jerusalem elite embraced a number of new identity displays as they attempted to maintain the balance between their identities as Roman subjects and leaders of the Jewish people. At Qumran, however, the finances of the community appear to be allocated primarily towards one type of display: those which concerned Jewish identity. Thus, their primary points of conspicuous consumption were purchasing the large *qalal* and building the complex water system with its ten *miqva'ot*.<sup>82</sup> In this singular focus, the inhabitants of Qumran

---

<sup>79</sup> Mizzi provides a particularly thorough discussion of this point, using evidence from the literary record of the community. See Mizzi, “Khirbet Qumran,” 290-294.

<sup>80</sup> De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 129.

<sup>81</sup> Mizzi, “Khirbet Qumran,” 290.

<sup>82</sup> While one could make an argument here for the expense of the system being tied to the need for water in the desert, such an argument cannot account for the fact that, as pointed out by Galor, over 90% of the community’s

differed from the display habits of the Jerusalem elite. As noted above, they showed little interest in displays which originated in the Greco-Roman world.<sup>83</sup> During the Herodian period, Qumran lacks major architectural fragments, Greco-Roman decorative techniques, and significant amounts of imported pottery or glass. In the case of architecture, if the architectural fragments ever stood in a structure on the site, the Qumranites abandoned this form of display at the very same time the Jerusalem elite began to adopt it. This contrast with the Jerusalem elite suggests that the identity discourse in which the people of Qumran were engaged was different from that of the Jerusalem elite.

#### **5.4. Anti...: An Oppositional Identity at Qumran?**

At the very least, the types of displays at Qumran suggest that the site's inhabitants were interested in constructing primarily Jewish identities centered upon the concepts of purity and community. However, this display vernacular may say something further about the types of identities constructed at Qumran. The absence of Greco-Roman displays may indicate that the community was constructing an identity oppositional to other identities that depended on such displays. Although Magness notes that such claims should be moderated because of the community's possible lack of resources, both the textual evidence (as cited by Mizzi) and the artifactual evidence discussed above suggest that the community had some wealth.<sup>84</sup> The Qumranites chose how and where to spend this wealth. According to the material evidence, they

---

water would have been contained in *miqva'ot*. Katharina Galor, "Plastered Pools, a New Perspective," in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshka II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 310.

<sup>83</sup> As noted by Magness, some of their pottery forms may have imitated Greco-Roman examples (e.g., Eastern Sigillata A). Magness, "Qumran Pottery," 9.

<sup>84</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 205; Mizzi, "Khirbet Qumran," 290–294.

chose to invest primarily in types of material displays connected to Jewish identity.<sup>85</sup> This consistent choice suggests a framework of avoidance that segregates the community from those who participated in Greco-Roman forms of identity display.

The natural inclination of the field has been to view such acts of othering as a form of anti-Romanization or anti-Hellenization. The Qumranites, after all, generally avoided those display acts which would have linked them more broadly to the Mediterranean world. While I would not dispense wholly with the possibility of anti-Hellenizing and anti-Romanizing motives, the main motivation behind the avoidance of such displays does not seem to be their “foreignness” or “non-Jewishness.” Rather, the literary record indicates that the avoidance of such displays may originate in the oppositional relationship the community had with the Jerusalem leadership. The community’s foundation myth pits its founder against the leadership of the Jerusalem Temple (i.e., the Jerusalem elite).<sup>86</sup> While the historicity of these myths is debated, the fact that these stories were told in the community and became part of its interpretative traditions suggests that they continued to express the community’s relationship with Jerusalem.<sup>87</sup> Identity theory shows that part of group formation depends on a discourse of difference, and the community’s literary tradition indicates that its primary concern was differentiating itself from the Jerusalem elite.<sup>88</sup> Thus, although the scholarly tendency is to

---

<sup>85</sup> As noted above, Magness predicted that if they had been able to acquire some of these displays, it would be unlikely they would have done so. The artifactual evidence now available through Mizzi’s dissertation seems to indicate that her prediction holds true. Magness, “Qumran Pottery,” 15.

<sup>86</sup> See, in particular, *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab).

<sup>87</sup> For this discussion, the historicity of the accounts does not matter; rather, the telling of the accounts relates something about what the community thought, whether or not the stories were actually true. On the debate over the historicity of the accounts found in the *pesharim*, see, for example, George J. Brooke, “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 158–159.

<sup>88</sup> On identity and difference, see, for example, Jones’ discussion of the formation of ethnicity. The same sort of othering applies to the formation of sectarian identities. Siân Jones, “Discourses of Identity in the Interpretation of

associate Greco-Roman material culture with Greco-Roman meanings and the eschewal of them with anti-Romanizing and anti-Hellenizing sentiments, the meanings of such displays are multiple and varied. Arguably, for the community at Qumran, the primary connection of Greco-Roman displays was not Greco-Roman but Jerusalemite. Their main experience of these types of displays would have been in the homes of the Jewish elite, and for some, not all of these types of displays may have had distinctly Greco-Roman meanings. Instead, avoidance of them distinguishes the community from the Jerusalem elite, the heirs of the ancient persecutors of the community.

Probably, as Magness argues, these displays retained both a Hellenistic and Jerusalemite meaning for the inhabitants of Qumran, and avoidance of them was their way of defying a corrupt Hellenizing priesthood.<sup>89</sup> However, for the purposes of this thesis, establishing the primary motivator is important. Being primarily anti-Romanizing or anti-Hellenizing is a wholly different scenario than being primarily anti-Jerusalemite. The first is an act of resistance against the Empire as in Berlin's first-century Galilee, while the second is a sectarian act about proper practice and Temple control.<sup>90</sup> Because this discourse of identity negotiation occurs in the context of Empire, both would look the same archaeologically. In the case of Qumran, textual evidence suggests that the community's identity antithesis was the Jerusalem elite.

## 5.5. Conclusions

Qumran provides an alternative narrative for how living under Empire affected the lives of the Jewish population of Herodian Palestine. Although the community was aware of the

---

the Past," in *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, ed. Timothy Insoll (London: Routledge, 2007), 51; Jones, "Identities in Practice," 43.

<sup>89</sup> Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 202–206.

<sup>90</sup> Berlin, "Romanization and Anti-Romanization," 69.

Romans and appropriated them into their origin myths and eschatological expectations, Rome was not the primary concern of the community. Instead, they were concerned with issues such as how to maintain ritual purity and were caught up in a sectarian discourse over proper Temple practice. In this local discourse, they defined their identity against those who controlled Temple practice – the Jerusalem elite – and rejected forms of identity display associated with them. In many ways, the community at Qumran was engaging in an old, local discourse; living under Empire only provided a new symbolic language for an old oppositional relationship.



## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS**

This thesis began with a problem. During the Herodian period, shortly after Rome gained political control over Palestine, the Jewish inhabitants of the region developed new material habits. Some abandoned previous consumption habits, although the archaeological evidence showed the goods remained economically and physically available; many adopted new local traditions such as the use of chalk vessels; and some embraced new Greco-Roman practice and/or increasingly invested in older Hellenistic forms. The underlying question of the field concerns how to understand these changes. As observed in Chapter Two, the field has been divided over these changes, their causes, and their meanings. Many of the debates can be attributed to the difficulty of the subject. The processes of change are complex, involving intersections of economy, power, socio-cultural relations, and religion. Others can be attributed to problematic ideas of what culture change entails. This thesis has proposed another method of understanding the change going on Herodian Palestine, and while it should not be considered a final solution to the problem, it may suggest a way forward.

The basic argument advanced here is that the material correlates to the political changes of ancient Palestine can be explained, in part, by understanding Romanization as identity negotiation. Although identity negotiation involves several forms of communication, this thesis has focused on its material expressions. Instead of equating material objects with identity, it has proposed that these objects be studied for how they function in the practice of identity discourse. They are symbolic, with multiple meanings, and can be manipulated to mean different things in

different contexts. While the particular conversations in which they were used are often lost to archaeologists, this thesis has suggested that the display vernacular of a community — the range of display acts and their possible meanings — can be reconstructed. Through such an analysis, one should be able to say something about the types of identities constructed at a site.

This methodology has offered several advantages over those discussed in the course of this thesis. It escapes the acculturation trap of object-identity correlation by moving the discussion from one of origins to one of use (or, in terms of the display vernacular, potential ranges of use). This focus on use allows each object to have a multiplicity of meanings. Because these objects have multiple meanings, their use also permits for the construction of a multiplicity of identities. It can easily accommodate a Romanizing Jewish Hellenistic Idumaean king like Herod the Great. A discussion of identity negotiation also accommodates non-elite voices, even though the evidence used in the course of this thesis did not lend itself to such an analysis. In its multiplicity, the model solves some of the debates between scholars, as it can incorporate a range of different views. Likewise, such a model can accommodate the whole range of changes which occurred during the Herodian period. Finally, it solves the larger problem of Herodian Palestine by suggesting legitimate and compelling reasons for material cultural change. Most of the solutions stem from the social dynamics of identity theory, including the need to gain social capital through association with power and the pressure to conform to the habitus of one's own group.

As seen in the examples of Jerusalem and Qumran, the model, when applied to ancient Palestine, reveals a varied landscape of identity discourse during the Herodian period. On the one hand, the elite of Jerusalem experienced a shift in their display vernacular. In their discourse of identity negotiation, they adopted a wide range of displays that could have both a Greco-

Roman and Jewish meaning. Much of their growing interests in these types of display can be accounted for by their position in the imperial power structure and their attempts to maintain the status quo of their own positions. On the other hand, the community of Qumran showed a different range of interests. They avoided most non-Jewish displays. In combination with their literary tradition, their range of material expression demonstrated an interest in differentiating themselves from the Jerusalem elite and evinced little concern for imperial identities. If other communities had been examined, their identity concerns would also have diverged, depending on their own local contexts and concerns.

These examples may also suggest a broader conclusion about the relationship of Palestinian Jews to Rome. The evidence of identity negotiation from Qumran indicates that identity discourses not oriented towards Rome occurred in post-63 Palestine. As the “post”-Romanization movement has suggested, everything under Empire need not be about Empire. However, the evidence also suggests that identity discourses during this period may have been affected by the context of Empire, even if they were not directly about Rome. Identity discourse at Qumran was primarily about separating the community from the Jerusalem elite, but the discourse’s symbolic language had largely been determined by their imperial context. The community’s inhabitants were constructing their identities in opposition to a group which defined itself in relationship to Rome and had adopted displays which oriented it towards the Empire. In this manner, such identity negotiation appears as a form of Romanization. Even though the community’s concern was not primarily Rome, such identity negotiation places them in a relationship to it via the nested power relations of its Empire. The presence of Empire in ancient Palestine requires anyone living within its reaches to deal with the reality of Empire

because, even when it does not affect the primary concerns of an identity discourse, it seems to have changed the very language of that discourse.

So, should what the Jews were doing in ancient Palestine be called Romanization? It depends. According to the older models of acculturation, they did not Romanize. Not everyone in (or even most of) the Jewish population adopted Roman material practice. Identifiably “Greco-Roman” objects only appeared with regularity among the elite of the region, and even then, they did not always maintain “Greco-Roman” meanings. However, according to the model suggested here, when Romanization incorporates identity negotiation, the picture changes. As both Berlin’s study and the discussion of Qumran above show, the context of Empire changed the discourse of identity.<sup>1</sup> Whether an individual was pro-Roman, anti-Roman, or somewhat apathetic, the new reality of Empire not only called for a change in political identities, but also for a shift in how identities were defined materially.

---

<sup>1</sup> Berlin, “Romanization and Anti-Romanization.”

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adichie, Chimamanda. "The Danger of a Single Story". Oxford, UK, 2009. Accessed April 10, 2014. [http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda\\_adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story#t-504835](http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story#t-504835).
- Alcock, Susan E. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Preface: East Is East." In *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, edited by Susan E. Alcock, v–viii. Oxford, England: Oxbow Books, 1997.
- . "Vulgar Romanization and the Domination of the Elites." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Altshul, Asher Y. "Was There a Herodian 'Revolution'? Changes in the Social and Material Culture of the Late Second Temple Period Jerusalem". MA Thesis, Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2012.
- Amit, David, Jon Seligman, and Irina Zilberbod. "Stone Vessel Production Caves on the Eastern Slope of Mount Scopus, Jerusalem." In *New Approaches to Old Stones: Recent Studies of Ground Stone Artifacts*, edited by Yorke M. Rowan and Jennie R. Ebeling, 320–342. London: Equinox, 2008.
- Ariel, Donald T. "Coins." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 192–217. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- Avigad, Nahman. *Discovering Jerusalem*. Nashville: Nelson, 1983.
- . *The Herodian Quarter in Jerusalem*. Keter Publishing House, 1989.
- Ball, Warwick. *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- De la Bédoyère, Guy. "Romanization." *British Archaeology* 92 (2007): 22.
- Ben-Dov, Meir. *In the Shadow of the Temple: The Discovery of Ancient Jerusalem*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Berlin, Andrea. "Jewish Life before the Revolt: The Archaeological Evidence." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36, no. 4 (2005): 417–470.

- . “Romanization and Anti-Romanization in Pre-Revolt Galilee.” In *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology*, edited by Andrea Berlin and J. Andrew Overman, 57–73. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. London: Free Association Books, 1987.
- Bickerman, Elias. *Der Gott der Makkabaer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabaischen Erhebung*. Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1937.
- Billing, Ya’akov. “Jerusalem, the Jewish Quarter.” *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 123 (2011). Accessed January 6, 2014. [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=1919&mag\\_id=118](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=1919&mag_id=118).
- Boardman, John. “Al Mina and History.” *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 9 (1990): 169–190.
- . “Aspects of Colonization.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322 (2001): 33–42.
- . “Greeks and Syria: Pots and People.” In *Greek Settlements in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea*, edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze and Anthony M. Snodgrass, 1–16. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002.
- Bolletino di archeologica on line*. Edizione speciale: Congresso di Archeologia AIAC, no. G8: Meetings of East and West: Hellenization and Romanization of the Land of Israel (2008). Accessed October 14, 2013. [http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=73](http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=73).
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Brooke, George J. “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim.” In *Images of Empire*, edited by Loveday Alexander, 135–159. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Broshi, Magen. “Excavations in the House of Caiaphas, Mount Zion.” In *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968-1974*, edited by Yigael Yadin, 57–60. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Broshi, Magen, and Hanan Eshel. “Residential Caves at Qumran.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6, no. 3 (1999): 328–348.
- Cahill, Jane. “The Chalk Assemblages of the Persian/Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods.” In *Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985. Vol. III: Stratigraphical, Environmental, and Other Reports*, edited by Alon De Groot and Donald T. Ariel, 190–274. Quedem 33. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Institute of Archaeology, 1992.
- Cargill, Robert R. *Qumran through [Real] Time*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 2009.

- Chambon, Alain. "Catalogue des blocs d'architecture localisés ou erratique." In *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshka II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, 445–465. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- Chancey, Mark A. "Archaeology, Ethnicity, and First-Century C.E. Galilee: The Limits of the Evidence." In *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*, edited by Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, 205–218. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Collingwood, Robin G. *Roman Britain*. New rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Corbo, Virgilio C. *Herodion, Gli edifici della reggia-fortezza*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1989.
- Coussens, Brian A. "anOther's Image: Self-Representation and Kingship on the Periphery of the Roman Empire". Chicago, IL, 2012.
- De Vaux, Roland. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- . "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân, Rapport préliminaire." *Revue biblique* 60 (1953): 83–106.
- . "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân, Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne." *Revue biblique* 61 (1954): 206–236.
- Dever, William G. "What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 7, no. 5 (October 1981): 40–41.
- Donceel, Robert, and Pauline Donceel-Voûte. "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran." In *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site, Present Realities and Future Prospects*, edited by Michael Wise, Norman Golb, John J. Collins, and Dennis Pardee, 1–38. New York: New York Academy of Science, 1994.
- Donceel-Voûte, Pauline. "Les ruines de Qumrân réinterprétées." *Archaeologia* 298 (1994): 24–35.
- Dunbabin, Katherine. *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Eshel, Hanan. "CD 12:15-17 and the Stone Vessels Found at Qumran." In *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998*,

- edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther C. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, 45–52. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Qumran Archaeology. Review of Qumran in Context by Yizhar Hirschfeld.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125, no. 3 (2005): 389–394.
- Foerster, Gideon. “Hellenistic and Roman Trends in the Herodian Architecture of Masada.” In *Judaea and the Greco-Roman World in the Time of Herod in Light of the Archaeological Evidence*, edited by Klaus Fittschen and Gideon Foerster, 55–72. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- . *Masada V: Art and Archaeology*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1995.
- Förtsch, R. “Residences of King Herod and Their Relations to Roman Villa Architecture.” In *Judaea and the Greco-Roman World in the Time of Herod in Light of the Archaeological Evidence*, edited by Klaus Fittschen and Gideon Foerster, 74–119. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Freeman, Philip. “British Imperialism and the Roman Empire.” In *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, edited by Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper, 19–34. Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996.
- . “Mommsen through to Haverfield: The Origins of Romanization Studies in Late Nineteenth-Century Britain.” In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by David J. Mattingly, 27–50. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997.
- Galinsky, Karl. “The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod.” In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, edited by David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 29–42. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009.
- Galor, Katharina. “Plastered Pools, a New Perspective.” In *Khirbet Qumrân et ‘Ain Feshka II: Études d’anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, 291–320. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- . “The Stepped Water Installations of the Sepphoris Acropolis.” In *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity. Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, edited by Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough, 201–214. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007.
- Galor, Katharina, and Hanswulf Bloedhorn. *The Archaeology of Jerusalem: From the Origins to the Ottomans*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Gardner, Andrew. *An Archaeology of Identity: Soldiers and Society in Late Roman Britain*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007.



- Geiger, Joseph. "Language, Culture, and Identity in Ancient Palestine." In *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks*, edited by Erik Nis Ostenfeld, 233–246. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity III. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002.
- Geva, Hillel. "Early Roman Pottery." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 118–153. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010.
- . "Introduction." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume I: Architecture and Strigraphy: Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 1–35. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . "Jerusalem, the Jewish Quarter in the Old City, The Herodian Quarter." *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 119 (2007). Accessed January 6, 2014. [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=539&mag\\_id=112](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=539&mag_id=112).
- , ed. *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem*. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . "Stone Artifacts." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 218–238. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- . "Stone Artifacts." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 154–212. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010.
- . "Stratigraphy and Architecture." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 1–79. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- . "Stratigraphy and Architecture." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 1–90. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010.
- Geva, Hillel, and Malka HersHKovitz. "Local Pottery of the Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 94–143. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- Gibson, Shimon. "Stone Vessels in the Early Roman Period from Jerusalem and Palestine: A Reassessment." In *One Land - Many Cultures: Archaeological Studies in Honor of Stanislaw Loffreda OFM*, edited by G. Claudio Bottini, Leah Di Segni, and L. Daniel Chrupcala, 287–308. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2003.
- . "The Stone Vessel Industry at Hizma." *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983): 176–188.

- Gitler, Haim. "The Coins." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 453–492. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003.
- Goldberg, Marilyn Y. "Spatial and Behavioural Negotiation in Classical Athenian City Houses." In *The Archaeology of Household Activities*, edited by Penelope Allison, 142–161. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Gordon, Robert. "Late Hellenistic Wall Decoration of Tel Anafa". PhD diss, Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1979.
- Gorin-Rosen, Yael. "Glass Vessels." In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 239–265. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- Greenhut, Zvi. "A Domestic Quarter from the Second Temple Period on the Lower Slopes of the Central Valley (Tyropoeon)." In *Unearthing Jerusalem: 150 Years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City*, edited by Katharina Galor and Gideon Avni, 257–293. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Gutfeld, Oren, ed. *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume V: The Cardo (Area X) and the Nea Church (Areas D and T)*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2012.
- Hales, Shelley. *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hanson, W. S. "Dealing with Barbarians: The Romanization of Britain." In *Building on the Past: Papers Celebrating 150 Years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*, edited by Blaise Vyner, 149–163. London: Royal Archaeological Institute, 1994.
- Haverfield, Francis. *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- . *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.
- Hengel, Martin. "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited." In *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, 6–37. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- . *The "Hellenization" of Judaea in the First Century After Christ*. London: SCM Press, 1989.
- Hill, J. D. "Romanisation, Gender, and Class: Recent Approaches to Identity in Britain and Their Possible Consequences." In *Britons and Romans: Advancing an Archaeological Agenda*,

- edited by Simon James and Martin Millett, 12–19. York: Council for British Archaeology, 2001.
- Hingley, Richard. *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- . “Romanization.” *British Archaeology* 95 (2007): 20.
- . “Recreating Coherence without Reinventing Romanization.” In “Romanization”?, edited by Andrew Merryweather and Jonathan Prag, 111–119. Digressus Suppl. 1. Digressus, 2003. Accessed August 15, 2013. <http://www.digressus.org/articles/romanization.pdf>.
- . “Resistance and Domination: Social Change in Roman Britain.” In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by David J. Mattingly, 81–100. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997.
- . *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- . “The ‘Legacy’ of Rome: The Rise, Decline, and Fall of the Theory of Romanization.” In *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, edited by Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper, 35–48. Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996.
- Hirschfeld, Yizhar. “Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57, no. 3 (1998): 161–189.
- . *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.
- . *The Palestinian Dwelling in the Roman-Byzantine Period*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1995.
- Hodder, Ian. *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Horwitz, Liora Kolska, and Omri Lernau. “Faunal Remains from the Cardo and the Nea Church.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume V: The Cardo (Area X) and the Nea Church (Areas D and T)*, edited by Oren Gutfeld, 472–474. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2012.
- Humbert, Jean-Baptiste. “Arguments en faveur d’une résidence pré-Essénienne.” In *Khirbet Qumrân et ‘Aïn Feshka II: Études d’anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, 467–482. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- . “L’espace sacré à Qumrân: Propositions pour l’archéologie.” *Revue biblique* 101 (1994): 161–214.

- . “The Chronology during the First Century B.C., de Vaux and His Methods: A Debate.” In *Khirbet Qumrân et ‘Ain Feshka II: Études d’anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, 425–444. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- Humbert, Jean-Baptiste, and Alain Chambon, eds. *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshka IB: Synthesis of Roland de Vaux’s Field Notes*. Translated by Stephen J. Pfann. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- Insoll, Timothy. “Changing Identities in the Arabian Gulf: Archaeology, Religion, and Ethnicity in Context.” In *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, edited by Timothy Insoll, 308–325. London: Routledge, 2007.
- . “Introduction: Configuring Identities in Archaeology.” In *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, edited by Timothy Insoll, 1–18. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Israeli, Yael. “Glass Vessels.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 221–235. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010.
- Israeli, Yael, and Natalya Katsnelson. “Refuse of a Glass Workshop of the Second Temple Period from Area J.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 411–460. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- James, Simon. “Roman Archaeology: Crisis and Revolution.” *Antiquity* 77 (2003): 178–184.
- Jones, Siân. “Discourses of Identity in the Interpretation of the Past.” In *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*, edited by Timothy Insoll, 44–58. London: Routledge, 2007.
- . “Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity.” In *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*, edited by Siân Jones and Sarah Pearce, 29–49. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Keay, Simon. “Romanization and the Hispaniae.” In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 117–144. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Keay, Simon, and Nicola Terrenato. “Preface.” In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, ix–xii. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Laroui, Abdullah. *L’histoire du Maghreb, un essai de synthèse*. Paris: Francois Maspero, 1970.

- Lawrence, Jonathan David. *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lee, Reuben. *Romanization in Palestine: A Study of Urban Development from Herod the Great to Ad 70*. Oxford, England: Archaeopress, 2003.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1991.
- Levine, Lee. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.
- Lichtenberger, Achim. "Herod and Rome: Was Romanisation a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod." In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, edited by David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 43–64. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942.
- Magen, Yitzhak. *The Stone Vessel Industry in the Second Temple Period: Excavations at Hizma and the Jerusalem Temple Mount*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002.
- Magen, Yitzhak, and Yuval Peleg. "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993-2004." In *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002*, edited by Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jurgen Zangenberg, 55–113. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . *The Qumran Excavations, 1993-2004: Preliminary Report*. Jerusalem: IAA, 2007.
- Magness, Jodi. "A Villa at Khirbet Qumran?" In *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology*, 17–39. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- . "Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review Article." *Revue de Qumran* 88 (2007): 641–664.
- . "Review: Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence." *Review of Biblical Literature* (2005).
- . *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- . *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- . "The Community at Qumran in Light of Its Pottery." In *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology*, 1–15. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

- Mandell, Sara R. "Did the Maccabees Believe That They Had a Valid Treaty with Rome?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1991): 202–220.
- Mattingly, David J. *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- . "Vulgar and Weak 'Romanization' or Time for a Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 15 (2002): 536–540.
- McCutcheon, Russell T. *Manufacturing Religion: The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Meyers, Eric. "Roman-Period Houses from the Galilee: Domestic Architecture and Gendered Spaces." In *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina, 487–501*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . "Sanders's 'Common Judaism' and the 'Common Judaism' of Material Culture." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, edited by Fabian E. Udoh, 153–174. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- Milikowsky, Chaim. "Reflections on Hand-Washing, Hand-Purity, and Holy Scripture in Rabbinic Literature." In *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz, 149–62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Miller, Stuart S. "Stepped Pools and the Non-Existent Monolithic 'Miqveh.'" In *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the "Other" in Antiquity. Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, edited by Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough, 215–234. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007.
- Millett, Martin. "A View from the West." In *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, edited by Susan E. Alcock, 200–202. Oxford, England: Oxbow Books, 1997.
- . "Romanization: Historical Issues and Archaeological Interpretations." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett, 35–41. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1990.
- . *The Romanization of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . "The Romanization of Britain: Changing Perspectives." *Kodai: Journal of Ancient History* 13/14 (2004): 169–173.
- Mizzi, Dennis. "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran: A Comparative Approach". PhD diss, Oxford: Oxford University, 2009.

- . “The Glass from Khirbet Qumran: What Does It Tell Us about the Qumran Community.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context*, edited by Charlotte Hempel, 99–198. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Netzer, Ehud. “Did Any Perfume Industry Exist at 'Ein Feshka?” *Israel Exploration Journal* 55 (2005): 97–100.
- . *The Architecture of Herod the Great Builder*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Ovadiah, Asher. “Mosaic Pavements of the Herodian Period in Israel.” In *Fifth International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics: Held at Bath, England, on September 5-12, 1987*, edited by Peter Johnson, Roger Ling, and David J. Smith, 1:67–76. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1994.
- Patrich, Joseph. “Did Extra-Mural Dwelling Quarters Exist at Qumran?” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, edited by Lawrence W. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam, 720–727. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1997.
- . “Khirbet Qumran in Light of New Archaeological Exploration in the Qumran Caves.” In *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site, Present Realities and Future Prospects*, edited by Michael Wise, Norman Golb, John J. Collins, and Dennis Pardee, 73–95. New York: New York Academy of Science, 1994.
- Peleg, Orit, and Silvia Rozenberg. “Stuccowork in the Herodian Palaces.” In *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod's Third Palace at Jericho*, edited by Silvia Rozenberg, 475–522. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008.
- Pitts, Martin. “Globalizing the Local in Roman Britain: An Anthropological Approach to Social Change.” *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27 (2008): 493–506.
- . “The Emperor's New Clothes? The Utility of Identity in Roman Archaeology.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (2007): 693–713.
- Purtell, Steven M. “The Hellenization of Judea under Herod the Great”. MA Thesis, Athens: University of Georgia, 2012.
- Quinn, Josephine C. “Roman Africa.” In “*Romanization*”?, edited by Andrew Merryweather and Jonathan Prag, 7–34. Digressus Suppl. 1. Digressus, 2003. Accessed August 15, 2013. <http://www.digressus.org/articles/romanization.pdf>.
- Rajak, Tessa. “Greeks and Barbarians in Josephus.” In *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, 246–264. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001.
- Regev, Eyal. “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 243–278.

- . “Herod’s Jewish Ideology Facing Romanization: On Intermarriage, Ritual Baths, and Speeches.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 100, no. 2 (2010): 197–222.
- . “Pure Individualism: The Idea of Non-Priestly Purity in Ancient Judaism.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000): 176-202.
- Reich, Ronny. “Area A - Stratigraphy and Architecture: Hellenistic to Medieval Strata 6-1.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume I: Architecture and Strigraphy: Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 83–110. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . “Miqwa’ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, edited by Lawrence W. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. Vanderkam, 728–731. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . “Stone Vessels, Weights, and Architectural Fragments.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 263–291. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003.
- Richardson, Peter. *Herod, King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1996.
- Roller, Duane W. *The Building Program of Herod the Great*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Rosenthal-Heginbottom, Renate. “Hellenistic and Early Roman Fine Ware and Lamps from Area A.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 192–223. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003.
- . “Late Hellenistic and Early Roman Lamps and Fine Ware.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume III: Area E and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 144–167. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006.
- Rozenberg, Silvia. “Floor Decoration in Herod’s Third Palace at Jericho.” In *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod’s Third Palace at Jericho*, edited by Silvia Rozenberg, 523–544. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008.
- . “Hellenistic and Roman Wall Paintings in the Land of Israel and Their Parallels.” In *Hasmoean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume IV: The Decoration of Herod’s Third Palace at Jericho*, edited by Silvia Rozenberg, 283–424. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008.
- . “Interior Decoration in Herod’s Palace.” In *Herod the Great: The King’s Final Journey*, edited by Silvia Rozenberg and David Mevorah, 166–223. Jerusalem: The Israel Museum, 2013.



- . “The Absence of Figurative Motifs in Herodian Wall Painting.” In *I temi figurativi nella pittura parietale antica (IV Sec. a.C. - IV Sec. d.C)*, Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale sulla Pittura Parietale Antica, (Bologna 2-23.9.1995), 283–285, 415–416. Imola: University Press Bologna, 1997.
- . “Wall Painting Fragments from Area A.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume II: The Finds from Areas A, W, and X-2*, edited by Hillel Geva, 302–328. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003.
- . “Wall Paintings of the Hellenistic and Herodian Period in the Land of Israel.” In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, edited by David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 249–265, 469–479. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009.
- Schwartz, Joshua. “Bar Qatros and the Priestly Families of Jerusalem.” In *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Volume IV: The Burnt House of Area B and Other Studies*, edited by Hillel Geva, 308–319. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2010.
- Searle, John. “What Is a Speech Act.” In *Language and Social Context*, edited by Pier Paolo Giglioli, 136–154. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1972.
- Shanks, Hershel. “Is This Man a Biblical Archaeologist? BAR Interviews William Dever - Part One.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22, no. 4 (August 1996): 30–39, 62–63.
- . “Should the Term ‘Biblical Archaeology’ Be Abandoned.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 7, no. 3 (June 1981): 54–57.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Stacey, David. “Some Notes on the Archaeological Context of Qumran in Light of Recent Publications.” *The Bible and Interpretation*, June 2004. Accessed April 12, 2014. [http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Stacey\\_Qumran\\_Light\\_of\\_Recent\\_Publications.shtml](http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Stacey_Qumran_Light_of_Recent_Publications.shtml).
- Syme, Ronald. “Rome and the Nations.” In *Roman Papers IV*, edited by Ronald Syme, 62–93. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Terrenato, Nicola. “A Tale of Three Cities: The Romanization of Northern Coastal Etruria.” In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 54–67. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.
- Trigger, Bruce G. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Tylor, Edward B. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. Vol. I. London: John Murray, 1871.

- Veyne, Paul. *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Translated by Brian Pearce. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Webster, Jane. "A Negotiated Syncretism: Readings on the Development of Romano-Celtic Religion." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by David J. Mattingly, 165–184. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1997.
- . "Creolizing the Roman Provinces." *American Journal of Archaeology* 105, no. 2 (2001): 209–225.
- . "Roman Imperialism and the 'Post Imperial Age.'" In *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leicester University in November 1994*, edited by Jane Webster and Nicholas J Cooper, 1–18. Leicester: School of Archaeological Studies, University of Leicester, 1996.
- Weinberg, Saul S. "Excavations at Tel Anafa." *Qadmoniyot* 3, no. 12 (1970): 135–138.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Woolf, Greg. "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40 (1994): 116–43.
- . *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "Beyond Romans and Natives." *World Archaeology* 28, no. 3 (1997): 339–350.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Zelinger, Yehiel. "Jerusalem, the Slopes of Mount Zion." *Hadashot Arkheologiyot-ESI* 122 (2010). Accessed January 6, 2014. [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.aspx?id=1530&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.aspx?id=1530&mag_id=117).
- Zissu, Boaz, and David Amit. "Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean Miawa'ot (Ritual Immersion Baths)." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 47–62. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.