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The monumentalization of public space is among the most striking phenomena of the Near East, especially for the cities of the steppe during the time of Roman domination. Awe-inspiring buildings, demonstrations of power or of greatness were everywhere in the public space, from the temple of Jerusalem, the sanctuary of Heliopolis at Baalbek, to the sanctuary of Jupiter Damascenus and the temenos of Hatra. In the new decor, statues of gods, nobles and kings were one aspect, as was the rapid development of the epigraphic habit. This was true for the western part of Syria with the use of Greek, as well as for the eastern regions on either side of the Euphrates, where various dialects of Aramaic were attested, from the end of the 1st century BCE onwards. With differences in chronology and style, the sudden rise of public culture is characteristic of both Hatra and Palmyra. Beyond the similarities and the differences in form, both cities constitute a case study for a better understanding of this complex phenomenon.

FROM PALMYRA TO HATRA, ACROSS THE STEPPE. A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE

It has often been supposed that some of the people who left inscriptions in different places in the steppe could have been part of ‘tribes’ or groups nomadizing between Hatra and Palmyra. The Arabs of the Hatrene inscriptions, the nomads of Palmyrene epigraphy could have belonged to those groups or ‘tribes’. The modern evidence for tribes (Bedouins) whose members are on both sides of the Syrian-Iraqi border is obviously a model. As we shall see, not much can sustain this view, which of course does not imply that it is untrue.

The evidence for the direct links between Palmyra and Hatra is very slight. All evidence from Hatra that is unequivocally Palmyrene was found in one of the small shrines, the so-called thirteenth temple (figure 2). Among the most original finds in this temple were one relief, with a dedication to Allat in the Palmyrene script (figure 30), and one altar which was put in connection with Palmyra, because of the relief carved on it.¹

The relief is obviously an import, as the stone does not seem to originate in the surrounding of Hatra and the style of the figures deviates from locally fabricated sculptures and tallies with Palmyrene work dated to the early first century

CE. As is well known, Allat was venerated in Palmyra, as in Hatra and elsewhere, and her cult in Hatra does not indicate a particular closeness between the two cities. More interesting is the name of the dedicant of the relief, a freedman (brhry), with a name very common at Palmyra, Obaihan (‘byhn), but not attested so far at Hatra. The name of the ex-master, Addai (‘dy), is rather common at Hatra, but not so at Palmyra. One has to look to Edessa to find several other cases (the famous Doctrine of Addai apostle of the Christ).

If the relief is an import from Palmyra, the origin of the altar that was found with it is less clear. One look at the piece itself shows that the altar is not of a type common at Palmyra. The representation of the divinity, a male god with rays of the sun in a halo around the head, is rather well attested, not only at Palmyra (sculptures from the temple of Nabu), but in the steppe as well, or at Dura (Iarhibôl from the so-called temple of the Gadde). The rather crude character of the sculpture itself does not point to Palmyra. As is shown by several altars from Hatra, the typology of those small altars shows a great variety of form. So the presence of Palmyrenes (in plural) is rather elusive at Hatra. Contrary to Dura, where Palmyrenes seemingly gathered in several places, the evidence is restricted to just one piece.

It is only natural to seek for some evidence of links between Palmyra and Hatra in the vast zone of steppe between the two cities. The most obvious place to start looking is Dura. Here, the documentation is rich and gives evidence for the presence of both Palmyrenes and of Hatrenes. Nothing, however, neither in the epigraphy, nor in the archeology, points to particular contacts between them, only to a coincidence of presence. The sanctuaries and monuments that have given evidence for Palmyrene patrons are localized in different areas of the city, and they never correspond to places where Hatrene inscriptions have been found, except for the main gate. It is clear that Hatrenes could have met Palmyrenes, for trade, for religious purposes, and indeed they surely did, at least at the main gate. But nothing more can be said on this point.

A group of Aramaic inscriptions from the wadi Hauran, in the middle Euphrates region south of Dura, has been used as evidence of the Hatrene influence on the right bank of the Euphrates. The texts published by Fuad Safar were more recently interpreted as Hatrene Aramaic. The inscriptions reveal a bilingual society, using Safaitic and Aramaic, expressing different things in each language, es-

---

3 Bounni, Seigne & Saliby (1992), fig.100 (sculptures from Nabu); Downey (1977), p.213–215, pl.XII (Iarhibôl from Dura).
5 For Palmyrenes at Dura, see Dirven (1999) with the remarks of Yon (2000); see now also Dirven (2011). Palmyrene inscriptions: Du Mesnil du Buisson (1939) = PAT 1067–1121.
6 Hatrene inscriptions at Dura: Bertolino (1997) On Semitic inscriptions at Dura, see most recently, Bertolino (2004), a book which is not easily available.
7 Safar (1964). For the reinterpretation, Segal (1986).
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especially for expressing genealogies and family or clanic ties (as at Palmyra, between Greek and Aramaic).

The question is whether some tribes or groups of people were on both sides of the border between the Palmyrene and the territory of Hatra, or more largely, between Rome and Parthia. Borders between ethnic groups do not necessarily correspond with political borders, as is known from modern examples. Even if tribes or clans are rare in the inscriptions of the region, two bilingual texts (Aramaic and Safaitic) from the wadi Hauran may prove that some individuals were members of larger groups that roamed the desert between Palmyra and Hatra.

The most interesting point is to see that only the Safaitic texts from the wadi Hauran bother to mention the group, namely here d’l n’mn. In text no. 3, the Aramaic version gives tymḥʾ br tymš and qwpʾ br šrykw yrhy (“Taihmē, son of Tai-mshā and Qūpā, son of Shoraikū Iarhai”) but the corresponding Safaitic texts has tymḥʾ wqpn dʾl nʾmn (“Tayyimha and Qupan from the tribe (or family) of Niʾman”). Both versions end with words having the same general meaning, underlining the differences between two ways of seeing the importance of genealogies: šnt zbydʾ hwml in Aramaic (“the year of Zebidā Haumal”) and šnt bn hwml (“the year of the son of Haumal”).

In Safaitic the name of the clan was preferred as a designation for an individual, whereas in Aramaic the patronym was chosen most of the time. Clanic structures, tribal or only at the family level, are more important for the nomads than for the sedentary population. But when looking at the names, the situation seems more complex, for both Shoraiku as Iarhai are frequent at Palmyra, and Iarhai, hypocoristic of Iarhibol, was even typically Palmyrene. From the onomastics, one may have concluded that he was Palmyrene, showing how adventurous it is to make such assumptions. The tribal dimension is still predominant in Safaitic, and is different according to the audience that is expected. It had always been rare in Greek, it became rarer in Aramaic, but was still there for Safaitic. The same phenomenon may explain why Zebida was bn hwml in the Safaitic version of no. 3. It proves that, in the region, the last part of the genealogy was the most important, linking Zebida with a well-known clan (?) or kin group.

TRIBES AT HATRA

At Hatra, tribal names are rather rare, and there is no evidence of links between them and the groups known in the wadi Hauran. Besides, the personal names attested in the inscriptions from the wadi Hauran, such as Taimarsu and Hagegu,

9 For the meaning of ’l in Safaitic, generally translated as ‘tribe’, note the caveat of Macdonald (1993), p.354: ‘these words could be used of almost any unit from tribe to family’.
10 In the texts published by Safar (1964), note especially no.8 (p.18) with Taimarsu and Hagegu bny tymʾ: they must have been sons of Taimē, and not of a Taimē tribe. The same could be true for the Bene Taimu of Hatra, often interpreted as tribe. For the Bene Taimu of Hatra, see H214 and H293.
are common at Palmyra, and unknown at Hatra. But a closer look at the so-called
tribal names of Hatra can reveal interesting details. H214 and H293, both dated
around the beginning of the second century, mention the Bene Bel’aqab and the
Bene Taimu, acting together. Apart from these two inscriptions, Bel’aqab is not
attested in Hatra, whereas the name is very common at Palmyra. One may add that
Taimu is not found in Hatrene epigraphy, where only composed forms (as Temal-
lat tyml) are documented. If tribal or clanic groups are rare at Hatra, they have
several characteristics in common and are all dated relatively early. In addition to
the Bene Bel’aqab and the Bene Taimu mentioned previously, the better docu-
mented are the Bene Raphshamash. The first inscription of the Bene Raphsha-
 mash (mn bny rpśmś: H107) has been published more than fifty years ago, but
they appear as well in some more recently published texts from Temple XIV. One
of them is dated, and belongs to the end of the first century. The same is true for
a group which was not previously known: the Bene Temanay (mn bny tmny in a
text dated to 412 Sel. Beyer translates as ‘von den Nachkommen des (= von dem
Clan) Mann-aus-Têmâ(n)’. The possible explanation is that the group actually
came from Teima (in Arabia), but the conclusion must be subject to debate. The
period is again the same for the ‘group’ of the ‘Asilaye (H242-243 [428 Sel.] and
H244 [415 Sel.]: syly’), which could be an ethnic group (from a place called
‘Asil) or a tribal group; likewise the ethnical origin may be only a reference to a
distant past, or may refer to the solidarity between newly settled inhabitants of
Hatra. The dates, every one of them before 428 of the Seleucids, point to some
change in the society and its organisation, at least in the way that people who
originated from so-and-so have finally lost any reference to a past origin, as some-
thing which had become meaningless.

The relief inscribed with Palmyrene script found at Hatra indicates that there
were relations between the two great cities, and that those relations were maybe
more than transitory contacts, with artistic or maybe commercial links. Despite
this, no evidence clearly shows that tribes had members on both sides of the bor-
der. If it seems a matter of common sense to surmise that some nomads were
roaming in the vast area between the two cities, no evidence can sustain this view.
Besides the numerical importance of those groups is a matter of pure speculation.

THE BUILDING OF URBAN DÉCOR

The monumentalization of public space in the case of Hatra and of Palmyra is
conceived to impress the visitor and to show the power of the gods, and one may
add, the power of the servants of the gods. Huge buildings are not only common

11 Only once: H184. At Palmyra, the name appears as tymy or tym’.
12 Bertolino (1996) = H1039 [after CE 66], H1019 [no date] [dbet Rpashmesh] and H1045 [no
date]. Raphshamash is used as a personal name as well (see H213 : bsmy’ br rpśmś).
it the number H1054. On the confusion created by multiple numeration, see Moriggi (2010).
in the landscape of these two cities, but at other well-known sites of the Near East as well. The trilithon of Baalbek and the giant podium of the temple of Jupiter, the sanctuary of Jupiter at Damascus, or the temple of Jerusalem are more cases of the phenomenon. It is obviously not particular to the Near East during the Roman era, and examples could be adduced from different cultures. But it is not a natural phenomenon either, and the difference with other cities of the region, such as Dura, is clear. Hence monumentalization is a typical phenomenon for cities of a certain importance, for capital cities with a specific social structure. It is a demonstration of power, in an implicit (maybe explicit in some cases) competition with other cities, leaving one’s mark on the surroundings.

One striking aspect is the rapid development of writing in the public sphere and on a monumental scale: even if it could be considered incidental, the monumentalization of writing deserves a treatment in its own right for its great variety of purpose and realization. At Edessa and at Palmyra, we have different ways of adopting the traditions of Greek monumental script: at Palmyra, almost all letters have the same size and only few of them have haste above the line, whereas the Edessean script is far less regular, for the Greek eye at least. Likewise at Hatra, despite some variations, the differences of script (so-called monumental or cursive) are less clear, and less marked by Greek models. Examples of Palmyrene script of the 1st century BC show that the evolution had there the same type of beginning. One good example of this is the comparison between PAT 1524 (Inv XI, 100), the oldest dated Palmyrene inscription, and some of the monumental inscriptions of the great colonnade (as PAT 0278 = IGLS XVII/1, 53). But one has to use caution in those matters, as the lack of differentiation between types of script is not unseen in Greek epigraphy itself. Once again, Dura is a good example with the great number of dedications and commemorative texts (as at Hatra) using a cursive type of script, beginning with ιμηςθη, Greek equivalent of the ubiquitous dkyr in Hatrene Aramaic. Likewise, very few honorific inscriptions have been discovered at Dura, even in Greek: in those cases, Palmyra seems to have been the mediating influence, for the type of script (curved and regular) used for more monumental inscriptions is typical of Palmyrene epigraphy since at least the beginning of the second century. No wonder so if the rare examples of honor-

14 See the Beilage 38 of Freyberger (1998).
15 On the epigraphy of Edessa and its surroundings in the Roman period: Drijvers & Healey (1999), with plates.
16 See e.g. H345, a clear example of the ‘monumental’ type of script: drawing in Aggoula (1991), p.161 and photograph pl. XXVI.
17 For illustrations, see, for the first one, As’ad & Yon (2001), p.32, no.2, and for the last one, ibid., p.66, no.18.
18 See the numerous inscriptions of this type, at the main gate of Dura: Prel. Rep. I and II. This type of proscyneme is mostly attested in the Near East (and Egypt) during the first three centuries CE, and almost everywhere in the whole Greek world during the proto-Byzantine (Christian) period; see Rehm (1941). As for the dkyr inscriptions, see an important group of this type, in North-Western Palmyrene, as represented by the corpus in Schlumberger (1951): e.g. no.2ter, 6, 18, 24, etc. Very numerous attestations of the same formula are known at Hatra: H2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and passim.
ific inscriptions at Dura are dated to the next century, that is after the arrival of Rome.  

As far as we know (except for the city wall), all the monuments at Hatra are temples and shrines, in the archeological discoveries as well as for those documented only by epigraphy. The phenomenon has strict parallels at Palmyra. It is quite clear in the sanctuary of Bel, but as well for the sanctuary of Baalshamin or for other temples. It is even provable that the colonnades were used in a religious perspective, the transversal colonnade as the great colonnade, with the so-called basilica of Arsu-Ares. There the statues were put on columns not only for the glory of human beings, but often for the glory of a deity and his temple. If what is usually considered as a civic monument, purely secular, such as a colonnade, could be used for religious purpose, it did not prevent the same families maybe to use some temples, as that of Nabu, as a way of enhancing their own glory, by way of the same kind of statues and inscriptions.

In my mind, the similarities between life-size statues at Hatra and Palmyra do not lie in the religious or secular world they belong to, but more in the impression they made on the visitors of the different sanctuaries or for the conception of the urban panorama. It is certainly not by chance that the first Palmyrene honorific inscriptions were placed in the sanctuary of Bel and that all the excavations so far in sanctuaries have revealed the presence of honorific inscriptions for nobles, grandees and priests. Contrary to Hatra, most of the statues have disappeared. The majority of inscriptions were carved on consoles, on which the statues were standing, but some of them were on the columns themselves. For the first period (early first century CE), before the adoption of consoles, statue bases were also used at Palmyra, like the ones that are numerous at Hatra. This honorific aspect was present at Hatra as well, even if local particularities and local traditions were the cause of significant changes, as the possible role of the city as a pilgrimage centre. One particularly good example is the inscription PAT 1524 (Inv XI, 100). The stone block, which may well be a statue base, has only a few lines of Aramaic, but is clearly honorific and commemorates the erection of a statue.

---

19 Prel. Rep. no.876, after 212 (inscription painted on a wall of the temple of Adonis). See as well Leriche and al-Ajji (1999), p.1322–1324 (SEG 49, 1996: honorific inscription), with a script clearly influenced by the model of what we have at Palmyra for the same period. For the script of the Greek inscriptions from Palmyra, see the plates in IGLS XVII/1.


21 Contra, see Dirven (2008), with my remarks in Yon (2009). It is true that the statues were often inside the temples in Hatra, and not in the temenos (courtyards of sanctuaries), as they were in Palmyra. But as we do not know who could enter the sanctuaries and temples, it is difficult to go further.

22 E.g. PAT 0270–0271 = IGLS XVII/1, 24 and 27.

23 In the sanctuary of Baalshamin, see Dunand & Stucky (2000), p.100–101, pl. 20 and Beilage I. Another example, Ingholt (1936), p.96, no.5.

24 'qymw kmry’ dy bl šlm’ dnh lgrymy br nbwzbd dy mn phd bny khnbw ‘The priests of Bel have erected this statue to Goraîmî son of Nabûzabad, of the tribe of Benê Kohannabû’.
Likewise, honorific texts at Hatra are simple and formulaic, making it difficult to understand why exactly the statue had been erected.\textsuperscript{25}

The almost complete disappearance of the statues in the sanctuaries of Palmyra presents us with a problem. The few examples still available date to the Roman period at a time when the art of Palmyra was deeply impressed by the sculpture of the wider empire.\textsuperscript{26} It makes every comparison a liable cause of misunderstanding, despite the probable great variety of models followed. The inscriptions on the consoles at least show common use of some stereotypes, whether for priests, traders or nobles. The same variety of influences is striking at Hatra. The corpus of the sculpture of Hatra will surely greatly improve our understanding of the phenomenon.\textsuperscript{27}

At Hatra, statues are found in the sanctuaries, the great temenos and the small shrines between the temenos and the city walls. As at Palmyra, one major sanctuary common to the population as a whole is surrounded by smaller entities, linked with tribes or smaller groups. The big difference is the lack of a civic, municipal center in Hatra, as was the agora of Palmyra, where statues of benefactors were erected. But one must stress that the agora is only a later development in the history of Palmyra, and is a consequence of the instauration of civic institutions on a Greek model.

**HONOR AND SOCIAL RELATIONS**

The vocabulary of the inscriptions is revelatory on the question of honor, and is best described in relation with the different social levels involved. In Greek epigraphy, and in that of Palmyra as well, the person who offered the statue had a lesser social level than the person whose statue was erected.\textsuperscript{28} The concept of honor is always on the forefront in Palmyrene epigraphy: \(\text{λύγρ/ τεμής χάρις}\). But one must be careful in assigning this phenomenon to the influence of Greek mind, as the formula \(\text{τεμής χάρις}\), though not unknown elsewhere, seems proper to Palmyra.\textsuperscript{29} It does not exist in other Semitic epigraphy either, as Nabatean or

\textsuperscript{25} Statue bases, with a short inscription mentioning only the name of the individual depicted, are only found in funerary context at Palmyra, whereas at Hatra, several examples come from temples and sanctuaries: H56 gives only the genealogy and the title; H105 has only \(\text{ɪɨ̃м’ dəp’}\) (‘statue of \(\text{qpr}’\)) on the base of a statue. One has to keep in mind though, that in many instances at Hatra we do not have the entire inscription and that the short one, on the base of the statue, was frequently followed by a larger text on another base or console.

\textsuperscript{26} For the time being, see Safar & Mustafa (1974).

\textsuperscript{27} See Balty (2005), p. 321–341.

\textsuperscript{28} See Dijkstra (1995), p.194–195 on H272 and the vocabulary of friendship; but note the translation by Beyer of the vexed phrase \(\text{mn dy lmry’ rhym} ‘\text{welcher den Herren liebt}’\): the participe is active, not passive as in the translation by Dijkstra, ‘whoever is dear to him’. As at Palmyra, the concept is used to mark someone as a patron and, as in Greek inscriptions, the patron is the friend. See Yon (2002), p.145–150.

Edessean. At Hatra, one possible example is H65, according to the reading of Aggoula.30

The inscriptions mentioning the erection of a statue permit a better understanding of the relations between the people involved. The task is easier at Hatra than at Palmyra, as names of functions are much more frequent in Hatra. The conclusions are even easier for the large group of inscriptions concerning the kings, the lords and their families, a category absent in Palmyrene inscriptions.31 The quantity of these inscriptions is in itself a sign of the power of the kings and their importance for the society of Hatra. One must add that obviously the prominence of kings had religious motives as well, as at least some of them were said to be priests and seemed to have important religious functions. A few examples will be enough: very often those statues are made by servants or functionaries (treasurer, eunuch, steward, ...).

The statement does not seem to lose its value when it comes to inscriptions concerning the rest of the population. For those who have official functions at least, it is clear that their social level was above that of the persons who erected the statue.32 One perplexing case is that of one *rabbeta* (‘économé?’) honouring another *rabbeta*. Aphrahat, *rabbeta* of Arab, is honoured by Aqaba, *rabbeta* of Barmaren (H223–224). Was it a functional difference of social level, or was it only contextual, due to relations otherwise unknown between the two men? The consequence is obvious if one prefers the first solution; the political function (as

---

30 Aggoula is followed by Vattioni, but not by Beyer. Aggoula has (l.5) *lqr tgry’* (‘en l’honneur des commerçants’), whereas Beyer transliterates with his ‘Hatrene’ font (*lqrtygry*’ in one word, so the same reading as Aggoula), but does not give a vocalized transcription (‘l...âyâ’). In his translation, he gives the following meaning (‘der... [= ein Funktionär des Tempels]’), without comment, note or reference. It is true that the omission of the first letter y is quite perplexing, as are the following lines, which read *dy smy’ / ‘wdw* and are translated ‘qui ont fait les enseignes’ by Aggoula and Vattioni (who reads l.6 ‘bdw, even if on the drawing –w is rather clear). The same lines are translated by Beyer as ‘der (Göttin) Semyâ. ZUFLUCHT<sup>RA</sup> (hat dieses Relief ausgemeißelt)’. Small capital letters indicate in Beyer’s system the literal translation of a personal name. His translation of l.15 is obviously induced by the meaning he gives to the following line.

31 H79 (statue of Sanatruq by two men); H112 (statue of Sanatruq, son of Sanatruq by a servant of his sister; see Safar & Mustafa (1974), p.93); H139 (statue of a grand-son of Sanatruq by a treasurer [or eunuch?] ; H193 (statue of Vologese king of ‘Arab by a man; see Safar & Mustafa (1974), p.64) ; H194 (statue of Sanatruq), H195 (statue of Sanatruq by the ‘majordomo’; see Safar & Mustafa (1974), p.63), H196 (statue of Sanatruq), H203 (statue of Abdasamai, tutor of Sanatruq by a man), H345 (statue of Sanatruq by a ‘majordomo’ of Maran), H346 (statue of Nsrû the lord by Aqabalat), H347 (statue of Sanatruq, king of ‘Arab by ‘Abdogeilû), H351 (statue of Nashrihab the lord by his son).

32 H140 (statue of a man by the chief of his guards); H144 (statue of Worod ‘majordomo’ for the life of Sanatruq the king), H223–224 (statue of Aphrahat ‘majordomo’ of ‘Arab by Aqaba ‘majordomo’ of Barmaren, for the life of the king), H286 (statue of *mym the priest by a man), H362 (statue of X ‘majordomo’ [auctile function] by X ‘majordomo’ of Maran), H363 (statue of ‘Abigud, evergetes and friend of the gods and the men, by Aqabhamsash), H364 (statue of Aphrahat ‘majordomo’ of ‘Arab by Alahayab, steward of Our Lady), H381 (statue of a ‘majordomo’ by his friend), H405 (statue of a priest by his nephew).
far as we know) is above the religious one. No evidence permits to propose any definite answer.

One more time, the predominance of religious matters, as in the iconography of the statues, is more than a possibility: the functions mentioned here belong very often to this realm. But to understand the various aspects of the society of Hatra, the honorific motives must also be taken into account.

WOMEN

Conclusions are more ambiguous for the women who received statues in the sanctuaries of Hatra. The type of denomination used, as a woman was always described in relation to a man of his family (husband or father mostly), makes it difficult to consider that women received statues for themselves, not as members of a family, or of a larger group. A quick look at the evidence may be thus useful. What appears clearly is the commemorative character of some of them; it is particularly clear for the inscription H30, which tells the story of a crime and call divine justice to avenge the victim. The inscription and the statue are an ex-voto. Several Palmyrene inscriptions, without crime and with fewer details, are proofs of a similar process, and as at Hatra, families are on the foreground, as in the case of the two daughters of Sanatruq (see above for the king’s family). As at Palmyra, as everywhere else in the Greek world, the position of those women here as king’s daughters may well explain the honor and the erection of a statue.

More religious seems to be the dedications made by gods to women, as in the case of Ate’em at Palmyra (PAT 0315, of CE 17) or, at Hatra, of Qayyāmāy daughter of Abdsemya the deity Ashurbel (H35, CE 238). For this type of dedication, studied extensively by Milik, particular to the Semitic world, it may be tempting as well to find a purely secular interpretation, putting as equivalent to divine gift a formula like ‘gift from the temple’, that is ‘made by the treasury of the temple.’ Beyer almost always marks the equivalence in his translations. Whatever the precise meaning of the formula, it seems better to keep the ambiguity, as we do not know much of the process involved. The intervention of dreams in other inscriptions could be cases of divine decision (H106b and H281). In any

33 H5 (statue of a woman by her husband, a priest; see Safar & Mustafa [1974], p.28); H30 (statue of a woman by her husband, after her death; see Safar & Mustafa [1974], p.219); H34 (statue of a woman, a priestess, by her son and her brother; see Safar & Mustafa [1974], p.252 et p.417); H35 (statue of a woman by herself; see Safar [1974], p.252); H36 (statue of a woman by ?; see Safar & Mustafa [1974], p.250) ; H37 (statue of a woman by ?; see Safar & Mustafa [1974], p.250) ; H228 (statue of a woman by Barmaren).


35 H228: *šlm’t dy ’bw btr dmwy n dy ’qym lh br mryn [’]lh* (‘Die (weibliche) Statue der (Ganz-)ihr-Vater der Tochter des ᴹἄμιων, welche ihr der Gott der Sohn unserer Herrschaften (= sein Tempel) hat aufstellen lassen.’).
case, the tradition of ‘dédicaces faites par des dieux’ was bound to disappear, as no evidence so far documents it after the first part of the second century.\textsuperscript{36}

CONCLUSION

As always the conclusion is difficult: Hatra is not a case of arrested development, or a proto-Palmyra, but what is interesting is to underline that they were for some part of their evolution and their history on common grounds. Belonging to two different political formations, they were, despite this, part of a same world were buildings as gymnasia and balaneia were less important than temples. Indeed there were gymnasia, balaneia and even a theater at Palmyra, but it is striking to realize that even in the later period (to which those monuments mostly belong) civic monuments as the colonnade were still used in a religious way. The differences between Palmyra and Hatra lie surely in a different social structure, in the role of Rome in promoting Greek institutions, in the instauration of kingship at Hatra and surely to other factors unknown to us.

\textsuperscript{36} For Palmyra as well, those ‘dédicaces’ are very rare after the end of the first century CE. Bilingual inscriptions in this category are not very many (\textit{IGLS} XVII/1, 125 = \textit{PAT} 1942 or \textit{IGLS} XVII/1, 148 = \textit{PAT} 0194) and one of the best preserved is \textit{IGLS} XVII/1, 124 (= \textit{PAT} 0312). Its date (February 64 CE) makes it also the oldest case of inscribed honorary column. In the later period, the columns were made by the city. This coincidence between the appearance of honorary columns, a tradition taken over by the civic authorities, and the disappearance of dedications made by the gods are perhaps the sign that those areas which belonged to the tribes in the years before were being taken over by the city.
Hatrap is the richest archaeological site in the Parthian Empire known to date and has great potential for a better understanding of this enigmatic empire and its relationship with Rome. After an introduction to this little known site, seventeen contributions written by leading experts in the field provide the reader with the latest insights into this important late-Parthian settlement. They touch upon three themes. The first section, “Between Parthia and Rome” contains three articles that discuss the relationship between Parthia and Rome on the one hand, and Parthia and its vassal states on the other. The seven contributions in “The City and its Remains” take the rich archaeological evidence from Hatra as a starting point and use this to reconstruct the city’s history. The third and final section “Culture and Religion on the Crossroads” contains seven articles that are related to Hatra’s position between the two great empires. Although most scholars agree that politically this city belonged to the east, this by no means holds true for all aspects of its culture and religion.