

§ 21 FROM THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE DOWNFALL  
OF BAR KOKHBA

I. Conditions in Palestine from Vespasian to Hadrian

Whereas Judaea prior to the war had been ruled by governors of equestrian rank (procurators), it was now allotted governors of senatorial standing. The earlier subordination to the governors of Syria (manifest in certain circumstances at least) was thereby abolished. The official name of the province was now as before, 'Judaea'.<sup>1</sup> Since it had as a garrison only one legion, the *legio X Fretensis* (see above, p. 509), and apart from this only auxiliaries (see above, p. 367), the legion's commander was at the same time governor of the province. These governors were at first of praetorian rank. It was only at a later period—at some point in the 120's when the *legio VI Ferrata* also was stationed in Judaea, and the legate was not simultaneously governor—that the province was administered by men of consular rank.<sup>2</sup>

Of the series of governors only isolated names are known.<sup>3</sup> The

1. The name 'Judaea' is widely attested, e.g., in the diploma of A.D. 86, CIL XVI 33; an inscription of Pompeius Falco (cf. below, p. 517); an inscription of Iulius Severus (CIL III 2830=ILS 1056); cf. also CIL III 5776=ILS 1369, VIII 7079=ILS 5549; and on coins (e.g. a coin attesting and celebrating Hadrian's presence in Judaea, 'adventui Aug. Iudaeae', *BMC Roman Empire*, nos. 493-4). Compare now the Egyptian diploma of A.D. 105 mentioning two cohorts transferred 'in Iudaeam', H.-G. Pflaum, *Syria 44* (1967), pp. 339-62. The designation 'Syria Palaestina', found already in Herodotus, later becomes the rule. An early attestation of the official use of this term is given by a diploma of A.D. 139 found in Palestine, CIL XVI 87 (see above, p. 367). But even so, the old name 'Judaea' did not entirely disappear. The geographer Ptolemy (v 16, 1) uses both terms.

2. See P. von Rohden, *De Palaestina et Arabia provinciis Romanis*, pp. 30 ff.; and for the change in the status of the province, now known to have taken place before the war of A.D. 132-5, see S. Safrai, 'The Status of Provincia Judaea after the Destruction of the Second Temple' *Zion 27* (1962) pp. 216-22 (in Hebrew); H.-G. Pflaum, 'Remarques sur le changement de statut administratif de la province de Judée', *IEJ 19* (1969), pp. 225-33. For the later period, see S. Krauss, 'Les gouverneurs romains en Palestine de 135 à 640', *REJ 80* (1925), pp. 113-30; cf. M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud* (1962), pp. 41-3. In an inscription found in Jerusalem, and coming from the time of Severus and Caracalla, there is mention of one M. Iunius Maximus 'leg(atus) Augg. (i.e. duorum Augustorum) leg(ionis) X Fr(etensis)' (CIL III 6641). If this man were concurrently governor as well as commander of the legion, the designation 'pro praetore' should not be missing.

3. Compare the now out-dated lists in E. Kuhn, *Die städtische u. bürgerliche Verfassung des röm. Reiches* (1864-1865) II, pp. 184 ff.; Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung I* (1884), pp. 419 ff.; P. von Rohden, *De Palaestina et Arabia* . . . pp. 36-42; *RE XII*, cols. 1675-6. But note the recent lists in Pflaum, *op. cit.* and W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1970), p. 243.

earlier ones in office during the war of A.D. 70-74 have already been briefly mentioned, namely:

1. Sex. Vettulenus Cerialis,<sup>4</sup> who commanded the 5th legion at the siege of Jerusalem (cf. above, pp. 501-2). He remained after Titus's departure as commander of the garrison troops, i.e. of the 10th legion and the detachments associated with it, and handed them over to Lucilius Bassus.

2. Lucilius Bassus, who captured the fortresses of Herodium and Machaerus.<sup>5</sup> He died as governor.<sup>6</sup> He is to be identified with a Sex. Lucilius Bassus who appears several times during the same period.<sup>7</sup> The procurator who served under him, L. Laberius (not *Λαβέριος*) Maximus,<sup>8</sup> is also mentioned in the Acts of the Arval priesthood (CIL VI 2059=ILS 5049), and in the diploma of A.D. 83. (CIL XVI 29=ILS 1996). According to the latter he was then prefect of Egypt.<sup>9</sup>

3. L. Flavius Silva, between A.D. 73/4 and 81; the conqueror of Masada.<sup>10</sup> He became consul in A.D. 81. The *Acta Arvalium* give his full name, L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus (CIL VI 2059). Two new inscriptions show clearly that he cannot have become *legatus* of Judaea before A.D. 73, and consequently that the fall of Masada must belong in spring A.D. 74, at the earliest.<sup>11</sup>

4. Cn. Pompeius Longinus, A.D. 86. On a diploma of Domitian from A.D. 86, the veterans of two *alae* and four cohorts are mentioned 'qui . . . sunt in Iudaea sub Cn. Pompeio Longino' (CIL XVI 33). Henzen thought it necessary to conclude from certain statements in the diploma that military operations had taken place in Judaea at that time. The inference, however, is not imperative.<sup>12</sup> This Cn. Pompeius

4. *B.J.* vii 6, 1 (163-4). See *PIR*<sup>1</sup> V 351, but note R. Syme, *Athenaeum* 35 (1957), pp. 312-3.

5. *B.J.* vii 6, 1-6 (163-218).

6. *B.J.* vii 8, 1 (252).

7. See *PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 379.

8. *B.J.* vii 6, 6 (216).

9. See *PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 8.

10. *B.J.* vii 8, 9 (252-406).

11. See Eck, *op. cit.* (in n. 3 above), pp. 93-111. Before being *legatus*, he was given praetorian rank by Vespasian and Titus in their censorship, which began in spring 73. Earlier evidence in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 368.

12. Cf. W. Henzen, *Jahrbuch d. Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande* 13 (1848), pp. 34-7. Henzen's grounds were: (a) The *coh. I Augusta Lusitanorum* mentioned in the diploma was shortly before this stationed in Pannonia. It must therefore have been sent there just then to reinforce the garrison of Judaea. (b) According to the diploma the veterans were indeed granted *civitas*, but not their discharge (*honesta missio*); they were therefore still needed. The latter argument is not convincing, and the *coh. I Augusta Lusitanorum* mentioned in the diploma is a different one from the *coh. I Lusitanorum* traceable in Pannonia in A.D. 85.

Longinus should be identified with the *cons. suff.* of the same name from A.D. 90, and with the Cn. Aemilius Pinarius Cicatricula Pompeius Longinus, who was governor of Moesia Superior in A.D. 93, and of Pannonia in A.D. 98.<sup>13</sup>

5. Sex. Hermetidius Campanus, A.D. 93. The wooden diptych from Egypt,<sup>14</sup> which contains an edict of Domitian granting favours to veterans, also mentions soldiers 'qui militaverunt Hierosolymnis in leg. X Fretense (see above, p. 509) honesta missione stipendis emeritis per Sex. Hermetidium Campanum, legatum Aug. pro praetore', and the date, A.D. 93. He was possibly consul in A.D. 97.<sup>15</sup>

6. Atticus, ? A.D. 99/100-?102/3. In two fragments of Hegesippus cited by Eusebius, it is reported that Simeon son of Cleopas, a cousin of Jesus of Nazareth and alleged to have been the second bishop of the Jerusalem church, died as a martyr 'under the Emperor Trajan and the governor Atticus' (*HE* iii 32, 3 ἐπὶ Τραϊανῶν Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ . . .; *ibid.*, iii 32, 6 ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ τοῦ ὑπατικοῦ . . .). In Eusebius's *Chronicle*, this event is placed in Trajan's tenth year (A.D. 107),<sup>16</sup> in the *Chronicon paschale*,<sup>17</sup> during the consulate of Candidus and Quadratus (A.D. 105). Neither statement has any independent value, least of all that in the *Chronicon paschale*, which is based solely on Eusebius. These dates seem to be excluded by documentary evidence for other *legati* of Judaea in this period (see below). It has been suggested, in view of Simeon's possible age, that the martyrdom is more likely to have taken place in the first, rather than the second half of Trajan's reign. The period A.D. 99-103 is therefore a reasonable possibility. Atticus may be identical with Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes, the father of the famous orator, Herodes Atticus.<sup>18</sup>

7. C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus, c. A.D. 102/3-104/5, whose career is known from a long inscription found at his native Pergamum (AE 1933, 268; 1934, 176), is to be identified with the suffect consul of A.D. 105. His governorship of Judaea, attested on the inscription, will have fallen immediately before his consulship.<sup>19</sup>

8. Q. Roscius Coelius Pompeius Falco, c. A.D. 105-7. The *cursus*

13. Cf. E. Ritterling, *Archäol.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn* 20 (1897), p. 13; and on the governorship of A.D. 93, see E. Bormann, *JOAI* 1 (1898), pp. 171, 174; see RE s.v. 'Pompeius' (90); R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), p. 647.

14. ILS 9059=Cavenaille, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, no. 104=CIL XVI, App. no. 12.

15. See PIR<sup>2</sup> H 143; cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), p. 641.

16. *Chron.*, ed. Schoenè II, pp. 162-3.

17. Ed. Dindorf I, p. 471.

18. See E. M. Smallwood, 'Atticus, Legate of Judaea under Trajan', *JRS* 52 (1962), pp. 131-3.

19. See Smallwood, *op. cit.*, and PIR<sup>2</sup> I 508.

*honorum* of this man, a correspondent of the younger Pliny, is known from inscriptions.<sup>20</sup> He has the title 'leg(atus) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) provinc(iae) [Judaeae e]t leg(ionis) X Fret(ensis)'; in ILS 1036 (Hierapolis Castabala), 'leg. Aug. leg. X Fret. et leg. pr. pr. provinciae Judaeae consularis' (a mistake of the stone-cutter for 'cos.'—he was suffect consul in A.D. 108). From Pliny, *Ep.* vii 22, the governorship of Judaea should probably be dated to A.D. 107, for in the letter written at or about that time, Pliny recommends a friend to Falco for the post of a tribune. But this, according to the other details of his *cursus honorum*, can only have taken place during the period of his governorship of Judaea. The letters addressed by Pliny to Falco are *Ep.* i 23; iv 27; vii 22; ix 15.<sup>21</sup>

9. A recently published inscription from Side in Pamphylia reveals a senator whose fragmentary name may have been C. Avidius Ceionius Commodus, and who governed Judaea under Trajan at some time subsequent to A.D. 102. He has the title *πρεσβευτήν [ἀντιστράτη]γον λε[γε]ῶνος ἰ καὶ ἐπαρχ[είας] Ἰουδαίας . . .*. See Pflaum, *op. cit.* in n. 2. above.

10. ?Tiberianus, c. A.D. 114. Joannes Malalas (ed. Dindorf, p. 273) gives the text of a communication which Tiberianus, governor of 'Palaestina Prima', addressed to Trajan during the latter's stay in Antioch in A.D. 114 (ἐν τῷ διατρίβειν τὸν αὐτὸν Τραϊανὸν βασιλέα ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας βουλευόμενον τὰ περὶ τοῦ πολέμου ἐμήνησεν αὐτὸν Τιβεριανός, ἡγεμῶν τοῦ πρώτου Παλαιστινῶν ἔθνους, ταῦτα). Tiberianus brings to the emperor's notice the fact that the Christians are foolishly competing with each other to achieve martyrdom, and asks for appropriate instructions. At this, Trajan orders him and all other magistrates in the entire empire to suspend the persecutions. The same story in somewhat different form is also reported by John of Antioch (in Müller, *FHG* iv, pp. 580-1, F 111). The latter's account is reproduced word for word in the *Suda*, s.v. *Τραϊανός*). Both reports, which agree in essentials, are highly suspicious due to their contents. Further, the partition of Palestine into 'Palaestina Prima' and 'Secunda' did not take place before the middle of the fourth century. The reports of John of Antioch and Malalas support one another so strongly here and in many other places that one, in any case, has borrowed from the other. Malalas wrote in the late sixth, and John of Antioch in the first half of the seventh century; his version is in fact patently a summary of that

20. ILS 1035-6.

21. See R. Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), pp. 243, 245; *idem*, *Historia* 9 (1960), p. 344; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (1966), pp. 115, 138-40, 306, 429, 497, 499-500; cf. Smallwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-2.

of Malalas.<sup>22</sup> Neither version can be accepted as positive evidence for the existence of a governor of Judaea called Tiberianus.

11. Lusius Quietus, c. A.D. 117. This distinguished general was appointed governor of Judaea after suppressing the Jewish rebellion in Mesopotamia (Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 5 Ἰουδαίας ἡγεμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ αυτοκράτορος ἀνεδείχθη . . .; *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, p. 164, in the 18th year of Trajan (2131 Abr.); Greek in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 657 ἡγεμῶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦτο καθίσταται). Dio merely says that he was governor of Palestine after his consulship (A.D. 115), Dio lxviii 32, 15 ὑπατεῦσαι τῆς τε Παλαιστίνης ἀρξαι (Boissovain III, p. 206). That Trajan sent to Palestine a legate of consular, and not merely of praetorian rank, was justified by the special circumstances of the time. Lusius Quietus was deposed by Hadrian (HA, *vita Hadr.*, 5, 8 'Lusium Quietum . . . exarmavit'), and soon afterwards executed (*ibid.*, 7, 12; Dio, lxix 2, 15).<sup>23</sup>

12. Q. Tineius Rufus, A.D. 132.<sup>24</sup> At the time of Bar Kokhba's rebellion a 'Rufus' was governor of Judaea, Euseb. *HE* iv 6, Ρούφος ἐπάρχων τῆς Ἰουδαίας. In the Chronicle of Eusebius, he is called Tinnius Rufus (ed. Schoene II, 166-7), Greek in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 660, ἡγεῖτο δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Τίνιος Ρούφος. Latin in Jerome, 'tenente provinciam Tinnio Rufo', *Chronik.* ed. R. Helm, p. 200. The correct form is Q. Tineius Rufus, as is shown by the *Fasti Ostienses* for A.D. 127 (*Ins. Italiae* XIII, 1, p. 205). This document reveals the important fact that Rufus held the suffect consulship in that year. In consequence, the change in the status of Judaea to that of a consular province (with two legions) must already have occurred, at what date is not clear. But there are indications that the status of the equestrian *procurator* of the province had risen by A.D. 123; see Pflaum, *IEJ* 19 (1969), pp. 232-3. One Q. Tineius Rufus, who was consul under Commodus, is attested by a number of inscriptions. He may have been the son or grandson of our Rufus.<sup>25</sup>

13. C. Quinctius Certus Publicius Marcellus, formerly governor of Syria, was also sent to Judaea to put down the revolt (IGR III 174 ἡνίκα

22. John Malalas, *Chronicle* (Χρονογραφία), ed. L. Dindorf (CSHB, 1831); Migne, PG xviii, 9-790. Critical text: (Bks. 9-12), A. Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg, *Die röm. Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas* (1931). See W. Weber, 'Studien zur Chronik des Malalas', in *Festgabe für A. Deissmann* (1927), pp. 20-66. Cf. B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (1966), p. 234 [E.T. (1960) pp. 282-3]. Books 1-17 in their present form reach only to A.D. 563 (though originally to 574). On John of Antioch see K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (1897), pp. 334-7.

23. See PIR<sup>2</sup> L 439; cf. E. M. Smallwood, 'Palestine c. A.D. 115-118', *Historia* 11 (1962), pp. 500-10.

24. See PIR<sup>1</sup> T 168; R. Syme, *JRS* 52 (1962), p. 90.

25. CIL VI 1978; PIR<sup>1</sup> T 169.

Πουβλίκιους Μάρκελλος διὰ τὴν κίνησιν τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν μεταβεβήκε[ι] ἀπὸ Συρίας: cf. IGR III 175). This reinforcement of Judaea's fighting strength is also mentioned by Eusebius (*HE* iv 6, 1 στρατιωτικῆς αὐτῶ. συμμαχίας ὑπὸ βασιλείως πεμφθείσης. Cf. *Chron.*, ad ann. Abr. 2148).<sup>26</sup>

14. (Cn. Minicius Faustinus) Sex. Iulius Severus, A.D. 135. The suppression of the Jewish revolt was achieved by Iulius Severus, who was sent to Judaea from Britain where he had been governor (Dio lxix 13, 2). His *cursus honorum* is given in an inscription (CIL III 2830=ILS 1056), where the higher offices are listed in the following order: [I]eg(ato) pr(o) pr(aetore) imp(eratoris) Traiani Hadria[n]i Aug(usti) p[r]ovinciae Dacia[e], cos., leg. pr. p[r]. provinciae Moesia[e] inferioris, leg. pr. pr. provinciae Britanniae, leg. pr. pr. [pr]ovinciae Iudaeae, [I]eg. pr. pr. [provi]nciae Suriae. This confirms Dio's statement that he came to Judaea from Britain.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, his assertion, or rather that of his epitomizer, Xiphilinus, that after the end of the Jewish revolt Severus became governor of Bithynia (Dio lxix 14, 4), rests on a confusion with another Severus. The name of our Iulius Severus, who was consul in A.D. 127, was Sextus Iulius Severus; that of the governor of Bithynia was C. Iulius Severus (see PIR<sup>2</sup> I 573).

Another name probably belonging to the list of governors of Judaea is that of Cl(audius) Pater(nus) Clement(ianus) who, according to an inscription (CIL III 5776=ILS 1369) was 'proc(urator) Aug(usti) provincia(e) Iud(aeae) v(ices) a(gens) legati', (i.e. procurator and representative of the (dead or recalled) governor. But his date is not certain. For it may not be inferred, as Rohden would have it, that because the province is named 'Judaea' and not 'Syria Palaestina', the inscription is certainly pre-Hadrianic.<sup>28</sup> Just as little information emerges from rabbinical legends concerning a Roman ἡγεμῶν said to have put trick questions to Yohanan b. Zakkai towards the end of the first century A.D., for the poor condition of the text makes it impossible even to establish his name.<sup>29</sup> He seems to be identical with 'Hegemon Agnitus' (אגניטוס הגמון) who according to *Sifre Dt.* § 351 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 408), is supposed to have addressed a similar question to Gamaliel II at the beginning of the second century A.D.<sup>30</sup>

26. See RE s.v. 'Publicius' (36).

27. For details of his career see RE s.v. 'Minicius' (11) and PIR<sup>2</sup> I 576.

28. RE s.v. 'Claudius' (262); PIR<sup>2</sup> C 953; Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 150 bis.

29. In ySanh. 19b (top), he is called אגניטוס (Agnitus, ? Ignatius); ySanh. 19c (bottom), 'Antoninus'; *ib.*, 19d (top) 'Antigonus'. In other places still further forms are to be found; cf. J. Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai* (1970), p. 218, n. 3.

30. On the whole matter, see J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 316 ff.; W. Bacher, *Agada d. Tannaiten* I (1903), pp. 36 ff.; J. Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai ca. 1-80 C.E.* (1970), pp. 218-23; *Development of a Legend* (1970), pp. 139-41.

The residence of the governor was, as in the time of the procurators, not in Jerusalem but Caesarea, the important port built by Herod the Great.<sup>31</sup> It was transformed into a Roman colony by Vespasian and bore the official name 'col(onia) prima Fl(avia) Aug(usta) Caesarensis', or Caesarea.<sup>32</sup> Jerusalem had been so completely razed to the ground 'that those who visited it could not believe it had ever been inhabited.'<sup>33</sup> It was primarily only a Roman camp, the headquarters of the major part of the 10th legion and its baggage and camp-followers.<sup>34</sup>

Only scattered items of information are available concerning other changes in the organization of the Palestinian communities. It cannot be determined with any certainty from Josephus's vague statements to what extent Vespasian held the land as his private possession (see above, p. 512). It seems to have been a matter not only of the actual area of Jerusalem but of all Judaea—in its narrower and proper sense—(πᾶσαν γῆν τῶν Ἰουδαίων). The only new settlement which Vespasian founded here was the military colony of Emmaus (see above, p. 512). In Samaria the rapidly flourishing town of Flavia Neapolis was founded at that time, a fact attested not only by its name and a mention by Pliny, but also by the city's era, which begins in A.D. 72/3.<sup>35</sup> Its site was now on that of a place formerly called Mabortha or Mamortha in the immediate vicinity of Shechem, for which reason it quickly came to be identified with Shechem.<sup>36</sup> In the later imperial period it was

31. After Flavius Silva had conquered Masada, he returned to Caesarea, *B. J.* vii 10, 1 (407). Tacitus also terms Caesarea 'Iudaeae caput', *Hist.* ii 78.

32. For details, see vol. II, § 23, i.

33. *B. J.* vii 1, 1 (3) τὸν δ' ἄλλον ἅπαντα τῆς πόλεως περίβολον οὕτως ἐξωμάλισαν οἱ κατασκάπτοντες ὡς μηδὲ πώποτε' οἰκηθῆναι πίστιν ἂν ἐπι παρασχέιν τοῖς προσελθοῦσι.

34. In A.D. 116, a detachment of the 3rd legion (vexillatio leg. III Cyr.) was also stationed in Jerusalem (ILS 4393).

35. The full name is found in Justin, 1 *Apol.* 1 1 ἀπὸ Φλαουίας Νέας πόλεως τῆς Συρίας Παλαιστίνης (ed. G. Krüger (41915), p. 1); cf. Euseb. *HE* iv 12. And also on coins. Cf. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* III, 433-8; de Saulcy, *Num. de la Terre Sainte*, 244-74, pl. xii-xiv; *BMC Palestine*, pp. xxvi-vii.

36. *B. J.* iv 8, 1 (449) παρὰ τὴν Νεάπολιν καλουμένην, Μαβαρθὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων. Pliny, *NH* v 14/69: 'Neapolis quod antea Mamortha dicebatur'. Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, GCS II, 1 (1904), p. 150: Συχέμ· ἢ καὶ Σίκμα ἢ καὶ Σαλήμ· πόλις Ἰακώβ νῦν ἔρημος· δείκνυται δὲ ὁ τόπος ἐν προαστείῳ Νέας Πόλεως. *Ibid.*, p. 120 s.v. Λουζὰ ἑτέρα. Παρακεμένη Συχέμ ἀπὸ θ' σημείου Νέας Πόλεως (the text of Jerome *ibid.*, is in fact more correct: 'in tertio lapide Νέας πόλεως'). The Bordeaux Pilgrim writes: 'Civitas Neapoli. Ibi est mons Agazaren (i.e. Gerizim) . . . inde ad pedem montis ipsius locus est, cui nomen est Sechim'. (*Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. P. Geyer, CSEL xxxix (1889), pp. 19-20=CCL clxxv, p. 13. Also, on the mosaic map of Madaba, *Neapolis* and *Συχεμ ἢ καὶ Σίκμα Σαλήμ* are shown as two different places, as also on the so-called 'map of Jerome' (A. Schulten, 'Die Mosaikkarte von Madaba und ihr Verhältnis zu den ältesten Karten u. Beschreibungen des heiligen Landes', AAG, phil-hist. Kl. N.F., 4, 2 (1900), esp. pp. 8-11, 83-87. Cf. also M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), Pl. 6.

one of the most important towns of Palestine.<sup>37</sup> Its citizens were predominantly Gentile, if not wholly so, as the cults attested by the coins prove. Mt. Gerizim is depicted on not a few of them (from Hadrian onwards) and on its summit a temple dedicated, according to Damascius, to Ζεὺς ὑψίστος.<sup>38</sup> In the second century, and later also, the games of Neapolis were among the most celebrated in Palestine.<sup>39</sup> The founding of Capitolias in the Decapolis took place in the time of Nerva or Trajan; its era begins in A.D. 97 or 98.<sup>40</sup> Hadrian founded Aelia on the site of Jerusalem; more will be heard of it below, in the history of the war. The founding of other new Palestinian cities belongs to a period later than that treated here, e.g. that of Diocaesarea=Sepphoris (known under the new name since Antoninus Pius; see vol. II, § 23, 1), Diospolis=Lydda, Eleutheropolis (both under Septimus Severus),<sup>41</sup> Nicopolis=Emmaus (under Elagabal).

The destruction of Jerusalem resulted in a violent upheaval in the inner life of the Jewish people. The disappearance of the Sanhedrin and the suspension of the sacrificial cult were two great factors which profoundly affected Jewish life. It must first, of course, be established that the sacrificial service really did cease.<sup>42</sup> Not only the Letter to the Hebrews, the date of which is not certain, but also Clement of Rome and the author of the *Letter to Diognetus*, who certainly wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, speak as though in their time the sacrificial cult was still practised.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, even Josephus expresses himself similarly. He uses the present tense not only when describing

37. According to HA, *Vita Sept. Sev.* 9, 5, the *ius civitatis* was withdrawn by Septimius Severus, although he later restored it (*ib.*, 14, 6, 'Palaestinis poenam remisit, quam ob causam Nigri meruerant'. Under Philip the Arabian, it became a Roman colony, see *BMC Palestine*, pp. xxvii-viii. Ammianus Marcellinus describes it as one of the largest cities of Palestine, xiv 8, 11.

38. Serapis, Apollo, Diana and other deities appear on the numerous extant coins ranging in date from Domitian to the middle of the third century A.D. On the temple at Mt. Gerizim see Damascius in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 242., ed. Bekker, p. 345b, ἐν ᾧ Διὸς ὑψίστου ἀγιάταρον ἱερόν. For the archaeological evidence see R. J. Bull, G. E. Wright, 'Newly Discovered Temples on Mt. Gerizim in Jordan', *HTHR* 58 (1965), pp. 234-7; R. J. Bull, 'The Excavation of Tell er-Ras on Mt. Gerizim', *BA* 31, 2 (1968), pp. 58-72.

39. Cf. the inscription from the time of Marcus Aurelius, in L. Moretti, *Inscrizioni agonistiche greche* (1953), no. 72.

40. The era of Capitolias can be determined from its coins. See A. Strobel, art. 'Capitolias', in *LThK* II, col. 927, and the literature given there, especially F.-M. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 295. It appears to have been located between Gadara and Adraha (Der'a), and presumably corresponds to Bet-Räs in 'Ajlun.

41. On Lydda (=Diospolis), see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 370. On Eleutheropolis, *RE* V, cols. 2353 ff.; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 272.

42. Compare A. Guttman, 'The End of the Jewish Sacrificial Cult', *HUCA* 38 (1967), pp. 137-48.

43. 1 *Clem.* 41:2-3; *Diogn.* 3.

the biblical sacrificial cult,<sup>44</sup> but also when apparently speaking of customs and institutions of his own day.<sup>45</sup> He employs it even when referring to sacrifice for the Roman people and the Roman emperor, although this was a later custom and not prescribed by the Bible.<sup>46</sup> There is also a rabbinic text which some interpret as alluding to sacrificial worship after A.D. 70.<sup>47</sup> In itself, this could well have been possible. In an interesting passage in the Mishnah, R. Joshua testifies:<sup>48</sup> 'I have heard that one may offer sacrifice even though no Temple is there; that one may eat the Most Holy Things even though no curtains (around the outer court) are there; that one may eat less holy things and the second tithe even though there is no wall; for the first consecration (of the Temple) sanctified for the future as well as for its own time'. Accordingly, it would not have been a positive contradiction of the views of certain rabbis if, after the destruction of the Temple, sacrifice had continued to be offered. But in fact this did not occur. In an enumeration of Israel's black days it is stated simply that 17 Tammuz saw the end of the daily sacrifice;<sup>49</sup> there is nowhere any mention of its being subsequently restored. In the description of the Passover festival in the Mishnah, an account of the dishes to be laid on the table closes with the comment, 'In the Temple they used to bring before him the body of the Passover victim'.<sup>50</sup> It was in other words no longer offered, since the Temple was destroyed. In the legal rulings for the determination of the New Moon it is said: 'While the Temple existed, the Sabbath was permitted to be profaned because of any one of the New Moons, to determine aright the time of the offerings.'<sup>51</sup> The unanimous testimony of these passages from the Mishnah is confirmed by others even more direct from the Babylonian Talmud, which take for granted that the whole sacrificial cult had ended by the time of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, R. Gamaliel II, and R. Ishmael, i.e. the first decade after the destruc-

44. *Ant.* iii 9-10 (224-57).

45. *C. Ap.* ii 23 (193-8).

46. *C. Ap.* ii 6 (77) 'facimus autem pro eis continua sacrificia et non solum cotidianis diebus ex impensa communi omnium Iudaeorum talia celebramus verum . . . solis imperatoribus hunc honorem praecipuum pariter exhibemus . . .'

47. Cf. *mPes.* 7:2, where the question is discussed whether the Passover (lamb) may be roasted on a grill: 'Rabban Gamaliel once said to his slave Tabi, 'Go and roast the Passover-offering for us on the grill'. The validity of the argument hinges on the identification of the Gamaliel who had a slave named Tabi. See also *mBer.* 2:7; *Suk.* 2:1. If he was Gamaliel II (floruit c. A.D. 90-110), a survival of the Passover sacrifice is alluded to, but not so if Rabban Gamaliel I is meant, for he lived before the destruction of the Temple. On the whole, the latter alternative is more likely. See also n. 55 below.

48. *mEduy.* 8:6.

49. *mTaan.* 4:6.

50. *mPes.* 10:3.

51. *mR.Sh.* 1:4.

tion of the Temple.<sup>52</sup> Finally, there is Justin's evidence. He says to his opponent, Tryphon: 'God permits the Passover Lamb to be sacrificed nowhere except in the place where His name is called on, knowing that after Christ's passion the days will come when the place of Jerusalem shall be given over to your enemies, and all the offerings shall cease. . . .'<sup>53</sup> Elsewhere, Tryphon himself, replying to Justin's question whether it was still possible to observe all the Mosaic commandments, answers: 'No. For we know that, as you have said, it is not possible anywhere (except in Jerusalem) to sacrifice the Passover Lamb, or to offer the goats ordered for the fast, or, in a word, to present all the other offerings.'<sup>54</sup> Thus, when Christian writers and Josephus, long after the destruction of the Temple, speak in the present tense of the offerings of sacrifice, they are merely describing what was lawful, not what was actually practised. Precisely the same happens in the Mishnah, from the first page to the last, in that all legally valid statutes are presented as current usage, even when as a result of prevailing circumstances their performance was impossible.<sup>55</sup>

Two facts of the greatest consequence are therefore established: the dissolution of the Sanhedrin and the suspension of sacrificial worship.<sup>56</sup> The Sanhedrin embodied the last vestige of Jewish political independence, and with it the last remains of the power of the Sadducean nobility. The latter's influence had already been reduced since the time of Alexandra by the growing power of Pharisaism. Nevertheless, as long as the Sanhedrin existed, it still had a role to play. For the competence of this aristocratic senate of Judaea was, during the time of the procurators, quite far-reaching; and at its head were the Sadducean High Priests. Now, with the downfall of Jerusalem, this Jewish administrative authority was abolished: there no longer existed any city of Jerusalem. And with it, Sadducean power vanished from history. Another consequence was the suspension of the sacrificial cult and the gradual withdrawal of the priesthood from public life. It was, however, a long time before the situation was accepted as definitive.

52. *bR.Sh.* 31b, *bPes.* 72b, *bZeb.* 60b.

53. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 40, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, ὅτε καὶ ὁ τόπος τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑμῶν παραδοθήσεται καὶ παύσονται ἅπασαι ἀπλῶς προσφοραὶ γινόμεναι.

54. *Ibid.*, 46, οὐ γινώσκωμεν γὰρ ὅτι, ὡς ἔφης, οὔτε πρόβατον τοῦ πάσχα ἀλλάξαι θύειν δυνατὸν οὔτε τοὺς τῇ νηστείᾳ κελευσθέντας προσφέρεισθαι χιμάρους οὔτε τὰς ἄλλας ἀπλῶς ἅπασας προσφορὰς.

55. In the paragraph on Gamaliel and his slave Tabi (cf. n. 47 above), Gamaliel I is probably meant, and Tabi, the servant of his grandson, has slipped in by mistake. But it is also possible that as a young man Tabi served the grandfather, and when old, the grandson, or that the name Tabi was passed down in the slave's family just as that of Gamaliel in the master's.

56. Cf. *mSot.* 9:11.



It seemed probable that the priests would soon be able to resume their duties. Needless to say, all the taxes were paid to them as before. Only those directly intended for the support of the Temple and public sacrifice were declared by the rabbis to be suspended. Dues appointed for the personal maintenance of the priests remained a legal duty.<sup>57</sup> But in spite of all this, now that priesthood was unable to carry out its functions, it lost its significance as well. It became a relic of bygone days which, as time passed, fell more and more into dissolution and decay.

The Pharisees and the rabbis entered into the heritage of the Sadducees and the priests. They were excellently prepared for this role, for they had been pressing for leadership during the last two centuries. Now, at one stroke, they acquired sole supremacy, as the factors which had stood in their way sank into insignificance.

After the catastrophe, Jamnia (Yavneh) became a special centre of scholarly activity. During the first decade after the destruction of the Temple, Yoḥanan ben Zakkai worked there, and at the end of the first century and beginning of the second, Gamaliel II, around whom gathered a whole circle of scholars. The most famous of his contemporaries were Joshua ben Ḥananiah, and Eliezer ben Hyrcanus from Lydda. Younger contemporaries and pupils of these men were R. Ishmael, R. Akiba and R. Tarphon.

Work on the Torah was resumed by them and their numerous colleagues and students with greater zeal than ever. It was as though, after the political collapse, the whole of the nation's energy was concentrated on its true and supreme task. Everything pertaining to the Torah, criminal law, civil law and the various religious statutes, was examined with most painstaking thoroughness and impressed on the students by their teachers. It was of no consequence whatever whether circumstances permitted these statutes to be performed, or not. All the subtleties of Temple worship, the entire ritual of the sacrificial cult, were discussed with as much industry and seriousness as the laws of purity, of the Sabbath, and of other religious duties the practice of which was in fact possible. Nothing gives a more vivid

57. mShek. 8:8, '(The laws concerning) the Shekel dues and First-fruits apply only to such time as the Temple stands; but (the laws concerning) the Tithe of Corn and the Tithe of Cattle and Firstlings apply to such time as the Temple stands and to such time as it does not stand.' These three imposts are named here only by way of example, as being the most important. For instance, the laws relating to the Terumah (mBik. 2:3) also remained in force, as well as the contribution of the three pieces of a slaughtered animal, namely, the right foreleg, the cheeks and the stomach (mḤul. 10:1; cf. also vol. II, § 24, ii). The tax of the right foreleg is attested by the emperor Julian as a custom of his own time, in Cyril of Alexandria, *adv. Iulian*, 306A καὶ τὸν δεξιὸν ἔμρον διδάσασθαι ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν (PG lxxvi, col. 964).

idea of the people's faith in its future than the conscientiousness with which even the rules concerning Temple and sacrificial worship were treated by the guardians of the Law. Whether the time of desolation was long or short, the day of renewal must surely dawn. Hence, the written codification of Jewish law in the second century A.D. into a *corpus iuris* (the Mishnah) included a topography of the Temple (Middoth) and a description of the daily duties of the priests (Tamid). Posterity, to whom would be granted the privilege of the restoration of the cult, must know how it had been conducted in the time of their fathers.

These scholars who in such fashion cultivated Israel's greatest good, now constituted, more exclusively and unrestrictedly than ever before, the nation's supreme authority. The priests, who had otherwise been the most important mediators in performing their religious duties, were doomed to inactivity. The zeal of the pious was subjected to the guidance of the rabbis. No external compulsion was needed. Whatever was laid down by the distinguished teachers was accepted as valid by the devout without further ado. In fact, they were not only recognized as legislators in spiritual and worldly affairs; they were appealed to as judges in disputes, even in questions relating to property. There is nothing unusual during this period in, for example, R. Akiba, simply by virtue of his spiritual authority, sentencing a man to pay 400 zuz in damages because he had uncovered a woman's head in the street.<sup>58</sup>

The highest esteem towards the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D. was enjoyed by the academy of Jamnia (Yavneh), a college of scholars with scarcely any proper authorization from the Roman administration, but in fact occupying the role of the old Sanhedrin of Jerusalem as the supreme law-court of Israel. The decrees enacted by R. Yoḥanan ben Zakkai in Jamnia after the destruction of the Temple to adapt certain legal ordinances to the changed conditions of the times, were looked upon as binding.<sup>59</sup> R. Gamaliel II and his academy supervised the correct operation of the calendar; even the older R. Joshua accepted his decisions, though he regarded them as incorrect.<sup>60</sup> Generally speaking, legal decisions made in Yavneh were held as normative.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, Yavneh's full

58. mB.K. 8:6. On the whole question, see J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain* II (1914), esp. pp. 19-23, 95-106, 108-9, 149-52, etc.

59. mSuk. 3:12, mR.Sh. 4:1, 3, 4; mMen. 10:5. Cf. J. Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan b. Zakkai* (1970), pp. 196-215. On the establishment of the Yavneh academy, see pp. 164-9. Cf. also *Pharisees* II (1971), p. 4 and *passim*.

60. mR.Sh. 2: 8-9. According to mEduy. 7:7, on one occasion, during Rabban Gamaliel's absence, a year was declared a leap-year on condition that he should approve the decision on his return. Cf. H. Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (1961), p. 21.

61. mKel. 5:4, mPar. 7:6. Cf. also mBekh. 4:5, 6:8.

succession to the rights of Jerusalem was considered the rule; a lack of it was diagnosed as an exception.<sup>62</sup> The Sanhedrin seems to have been imitated even in regard to the size of its membership. There is mention at least once of the '72 elders' who appointed R. Eleazar ben Azariah president.<sup>63</sup> In matters of civil law the tribunal of Yavneh may, in accordance with circumstances of general legislation, have been positively authorized by the Romans. For as far as can be discovered, Roman legislation in general accorded to Jewish communities in the Diaspora the power to administer justice in civil disputes provided the contending parties themselves brought the matter before the community's law-court.<sup>64</sup> But in criminal cases, this seems to have been a usurped power rather than a jurisdiction granted by the emperor. Origen describes this state of affairs very clearly and authentically. In his defence of the story of Susanna and Daniel he seeks to show that even in the Babylonian exile the Jews may very well have had their own jurisdiction. As proof he refers to conditions in Palestine in his own day, known to him from his own observation. The power of the Jewish ethnarch (Origen's own term) was so great as to be similar to that of a king (*ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρειν βασιλεύοντος τοῦ ἔθνους*), 'Secret legal processes also took place according to the Law, and some are sentenced to death, with no general authorization for it, but not without the knowledge of the emperor.'<sup>65</sup> This was the situation in the first half of the third century. In the decades following the destruction of Jerusalem, matters would not yet have gone so far. Nevertheless, movement in that direction had begun. To this Jewish central authority in Palestine, the president of which later bore the title of Patriarch (*Nasi*), flowed contributions from the Diaspora too, so far as these continued to be exacted after the destruction of the Temple. This is certainly attested

62. mSanh. 11:4; mR.Sh. 4:2.

63. mZeb. 1:3, mYad. 3:5, 4:2. Cf. vol. II, § 25, iv.

64. Jos. *Ant.* xiv 10, 17 (235). *Codex Theodosianus* II 1, 10 'ex consensu partium in civili dumtaxat negotio'. According to mEduy. 7: 7, Rabban Gamaliel II once travelled to the governor of Syria 'to obtain authority' (*לְיָטוּל רִשׁוּת*). This may have had to do with the bestowal, extension or exercise of juridical powers. Cf. J. Juster, *op. cit.* II, pp. 95-101, 110 ff.; H. Mantel, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-2. On the theory that Yohanan b. Zakkai's move to Yavneh resulted from a Roman war measure directing loyalist Jews to the coastal region, and that the 'academy' was originally an unofficial body of scholars, see G. Alon, *Studies in Jewish History I* (1967), pp. 219-52 (in Hebrew). Cf. a critical evaluation of the thesis by J. Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai* (1970), pp. 243-5.

65. Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, 14. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Strafrecht* (1899), p. 120. Mommsen saw in this 'the most remarkable proof of the toleration under the imperial rule, of institutions running counter to the Roman ordinances themselves'. On the power of the ethnarch in this period see M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud* (1962), pp. 52-63.

for at least the later imperial period. On this point, also, the rabbis replaced the priests. For until then the taxes were paid into the priestly central treasury in Jerusalem. Now, it was a rabbinical body that collected them by means of its 'apostoli' and supervised their proper use.<sup>66</sup>

Zeal for the Torah during this later time, among the great majority of the devout anyway, found its mainspring in a belief in the nation's glorious future. This was so already before the great disaster; and it continued to be so, to an even greater degree, after it. If people now strove more keenly than ever towards a meticulous observance of God's commandments, their strongest impulse was simply the desire that they might thereby become worthy of the future glory in which they believed so confidently. The Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra, which originated at this time, provide a vivid and authentic explanation of the religious mood prevailing in the first decades after the destruction of the Holy City.<sup>67</sup> The immediate sequel to the terrible blow was, indeed, profound shock. How could God permit such a misfortune to strike his people? But this great riddle was really no more than a particular example of the universal riddle: how, in general, is the wretchedness of the just and the good fortune of the unjust to be explained? Israel's piety had long since found a way through the obscurity of these questions. Now, too, it soon discovered the solution. It is a chastisement inflicted by God on the people because of their sin. It has its appointed time. If the people allow themselves to be instructed by it, the promised day of salvation will soon dawn. Such is the basic idea of both apocalypses. Their purpose was to comfort the people in their distress, to revive their courage and zeal with a prospect of sure and imminent redemption. Their confident faith was thus only strengthened and established by the heavy blows of the time. From their mourning for the ruin of the sanctuary, the messianic hope drew new nourishment, new strength. This was also important and fateful in regard to the political situation. For the messianic hope was a remarkable mixture of political and religious ideals. The former were never renounced; and the dangerous element consisted precisely in their association with religious motives. The political freedom of the nation which they longed for was viewed as the goal of God's ways. The more firmly this was believed, the more easily was a cool consideration of the humanly possible brushed aside, the bolder grew the resolve

66. Cf. Juster, *op. cit.*, I, p. 405; Mantel, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-5; on the title *שליח*, see *ibid.*, p. 191, n. 112.

67. Cf. P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde* (1934), pp. 35-48, etc.; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (1966), pp. 35 ff.; M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (1964), pp. 25-7. Cf. vol. III, § 32, v.

to attempt the impossible. It was this outlook which had led to a revolt already in Nero's time. It now contained the seeds of further catastrophes.

Under the Flavian emperors (up to A.D. 96), there seem to have been no serious conflicts, though there would have been sufficient occasion for them. For the command to send the former Temple tax to Rome for Jupiter Capitolinus was an insult to Jewish religious sentiment which must have been exasperated afresh every year when the tax was levied. Under Domitian this tax was exacted with great severity in line with this emperor's general behaviour as the determined opponent of the Jews. Conversion to Judaism was punished with heavy penalties.<sup>68</sup>

Eusebius, on the authority of Hegesippus, speaks of a real persecution of the Jews after the destruction of the Temple, still during the reign of Vespasian. According to Hegesippus, Vespasian, Domitian and Trajan hunted down all Jews of Davidic descent and executed them in order to extirpate the royal line on which the Jews had set their hopes.<sup>69</sup> Under Vespasian, this order led to a great persecution of the Jews.<sup>70</sup> There is no way of checking the historical truth of this story. Since a Messiah of the house of David was beyond doubt expected, men claiming Davidic descent may really have been viewed as a political danger. But this 'persecution' of certain Palestinian Church leaders (reputed to have been blood relations of the Christ) may well represent an apologetical legend intended to emphasize the Davidic-Messianic status of Jesus. If at all historical, the repression cannot have been of any great extent or significance, for no other writer seems to know anything about it. It is equally uncertain whether political disturbances occurred under Domitian. Certain indications in the diploma of A.D. 86 led to a belief that such disturbances must have taken place. But these conclusions do not amount to certainty (see above p. 515). By contrast, the revolts which broke out under Trajan and Hadrian, first outside Judaea and then in the country itself, were of terrible violence and extent.<sup>71</sup>

68. On the exaction of taxes: Suet. *Dom.* 12; the prosecutions for conversion, Dio lxxvii 14, 2; see in general E. M. Smallwood, 'Domitian's Attitude towards the Jews and Judaism', *Classical Philology* 51 (1956), pp. 1-13.

69. Euseb. *HE* iii 12 (Vespasian); *ibid.*, iii 19-20 (Domitian); *ibid.*, iii 32, 3-4 (Trajan); all derived from Hegesippus.

70. Euseb. *HE* iii 12 Οδσπασσανόν μετὰ τὴν τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄλωσιν πάντας τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους Δαβὶδ . . . ἀναζητεῖσθαι προστάξει, μέγιστόν τε Ἰουδαίους ἀθθῖς ἐκ ταύτης διωγμῶν ἐπαρτηθῆναι τῆς αἰτίας. Cf. Mantel, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-7, 164, 169. See also J. Liver, *The House of David* (1959) (Hebrew) and Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (1973), p. 157.

71. For a discussion of the social history of Judaea in this period, see A. Büchler, *The Economic Conditions of Judaea after the Destruction of the Second Temple* (1912).

## II. The Wars under Trajan A.D. 115-117

### Sources

- Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II 90/380; *Historia Romana* Fr. 19 (ed. Viereck, Roos, pp. 534-5).  
 Dio lxxviii 32, 1-3.  
 Eusebius, *H.E.* IV 2; *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, pp. 164-5.  
 Orosius vii 12, 6-7.  
 Papyri: Tcherikover, V., and Fuks, A., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* II (1960), nos. 435-50.  
 Świderek, A., *ΙΟΥΔΑΙΚΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ*, *Journ. Jur. Pap.* 16/17 (1971), pp. 45-60.  
 Inscriptions (Cyrene): Applebaum, S., *Greeks and Jews in Ancient Cyrene* (1969), pp. 308-10 (in Hebrew).

### Bibliography

- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 402-12.  
 Mommsen, Th., *Römische Geschichte* V (1885), pp. 542-4 (E.T. (1886) II, pp. 221-3).  
 Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* IV (1908), pp. 113-21.  
 Büchler, A., *The Economic Conditions of Judaea after the Destruction of the Second Temple* (1912).  
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* II (1952), pp. 60-3.  
 Fuks, A., 'Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115-117', *JRS* 51 (1961), pp. 98-104.  
 Smallwood, E. M., 'Palestine c. A.D. 115-118', *Historia* 11 (1962), pp. 500-10.  
 Alon, G., *History of the Jews in Palestine in the Period of the Mishnah and the Talmud I* (1967), pp. 202-89 (in Hebrew).  
 Applebaum, S., *Greeks and Jews in Ancient Cyrene* (1969) (in Hebrew).

In the last years of his life (A.D. 113-117), Trajan was continually taken up with extensive campaigns in the far east of the Empire.<sup>71a</sup> It was while he was occupied with the conquest of Mesopotamia in A.D. 115 that the Jews in Egypt and Cyrene, taking advantage of his absence, began 'to rise against their non-Jewish fellow-countrymen, as if possessed by a wild spirit of mutiny'.<sup>72</sup> By the following year (A.D. 116)

71a. On Trajan's wars in the East, see especially Mommsen, *History of Rome V*, pp. 387 ff., CAH XI, pp. 236 ff., 889 ff.; F. A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War* (1948).

72. Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 2 ἐν τε γὰρ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ προσέτι κατὰ Κυρήνην ὡσπερ ὑπὸ πνεύματος δεινοῦ τιῶς καὶ στασιαῶδους ἀναρριπισθέντες ἄρμητο πρὸς τοὺς συνοίκους Ἕλληνας στασιάζω. The earliest literary evidence on the war in Egypt is unfortunately very brief: it is provided by two passages of Appian. (1) *BC* ii 90/380. This reports that Caesar dedicated a shrine at Alexandria as a memorial to Pompey, and then continues: ὅπερ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ κατὰ Ῥωμαίων αυτοκράτορα Τραϊανόν, ἐξολλύντα τὸ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ἰουδαίων γένος, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐς τὰς τοῦ πολέμου χρείας κατηρέφθη. (2) Fr. 19 of Appian tells how, at the time of the war, he had to flee from Egypt to escape the Jews and crossed into the Province of Arabia.



the revolt reached such proportions that it took on the character of a formal war.<sup>73</sup> The Roman Prefect of Egypt, M. Rutilius Lupus, appears to have been no match for the Jews, who defeated the 'Hellenes' in an engagement and forced them to flee to Alexandria. But in the capital the Greeks obtained the upper hand, and Jews living there were seized and put to death.<sup>74</sup>

A number of papyri now provide isolated but vivid glimpses of the course of the war. For instance, CPJ 435 is almost certainly an edict of the Prefect M. Rutilius Lupus dating to October 13, A.D. 115, and refers to a battle (*μάχη*) between the Romans and the Jews; 438, dating to the second half of A.D. 116, refers to a Jewish victory in the Hermoupolite district and to the arrival of 'another legion of Rutilius'

73. According to Eusebius, *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 164-5, the revolt seems to have begun in the 17th year of Trajan, *ann. Abrah.* 2130. (So also Jerome.) This would be A.D. 114. In *HE* iv 2, 1, he says ἡδὴ γούν τοῦ αυτοκράτορος εἰς ἐναυτὸν δεκάκαιδέκατον ἐλαύνοντος αὐθις Ἰουδαίων κίνησις ἐπαναστάσα. He thus places the start of the revolt towards the end of the 17th year of Trajan or near the beginning of the 18th. If this rests on accurate information, we would be led to the end of A.D. 114 or beginning of 115; for the 18th year of Trajan corresponds essentially to A.D. 115, whether the year is counted from the date of his accession (27 January), or from the Tribunician New Year (10 December), as was the official custom from the time of Trajan. In the following year, i.e. the 19th of Trajan = A.D. 116, while Lupus was governor of Egypt, the revolt assumed greater proportions: ἀδελφάντες τε εἰς μέγα τὴν στάσιν τῶ ἐπιόντι ἐναυτῶ πόλεμόν οὐ συμκρόν συνῆσαν, ἡγουμένον τῆνικαδρα Λούπου τῆς ἀπάσης Αἰγύπτου, *HE* iv 2, 2. To check the later literary evidence we may use contemporary documentary sources relating to the Prefects of Egypt and the events of their governorships; see A. Stein, *Die Präfekten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1950), pp. 55-63; corrections in O. W. Reinmuth, 'A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt 30 B.C. to A.D. 299', *Bull. Am. Soc. Pap.* 4 (1967), pp. 76-128, on pp. 92-3. For the disproof of the notion that Q. Marcius Turbo was Prefect in A.D. 117; see R. Syme, 'The Wrong Marcius Turbo', *JRS* 52 (1962), pp. 87-96.

(1) M. Rutilius Lupus was certainly governor of Egypt prior to the summer of A.D. 115 (SB 4383, dated to 28 January 113). That he was still in office in January A.D. 117 is shown by a rescript of his dated L κ' θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ Τῶβι δεκάτη = 5 January A.D. 117, BGU 114, col. 1,5. He must be taken as the author of the edict probably dating to October 13 A.D. 115 (see above) which refers to a battle between Romans and Jews.

(2) It is known that Q. Rammius Martialis was Prefect in the first Egyptian regnal year of Hadrian, so A. Fuks, *JRS* 52 (1962), p. 101; he is attested between 11-28 August A.D. 117, P.Oxy. 1023. He is certainly the addressee of the petition for leave from the *strategos* Apollonios (CPJ 443) which dates to November 28 A.D. 117, and indicates that by that time fighting had ceased.

On the chronology of the revolt, see the excellent article by A. Fuks, 'The Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115-117', *JRS* 52 (1962), pp. 98-104, along with the literature cited there.

74. Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 3; *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, pp. 164 ff. (*ad ann. Abrah.* 2130, following Jerome; or 2131, following the Armenian). Oros. vii, 12: 'In Alexandria autem commisso proelio victi et adtriti sunt'. See A. Fuks, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

at Memphis; 443 is an application to the Prefect (Rammius Martialis) from the *strategos* of Apollinopolis-Heptakomias, dated November 28, A.D. 117, and asking for leave on the grounds that 'because of the attack of the impious Jews, practically everything I possess in the villages of the Hermoupolite nome and in the metropolis needs my attention'. 445 and 448 (and two papyri published by Świderek, *op. cit.*, above) are concerned with the confiscation of Jewish property after the revolt, and 447 and 449 with property damaged during it. Most striking of all, 450, dating to A.D. 199/200, reveals that an annual festival was still celebrated in Oxyrhynchus to commemorate the victory over the Jews.

Even more furious was the rage of the Jews in Cyrene. Dio paints a gruesome picture of atrocities perpetrated there against their non-Jewish fellow-citizens: they are said to have eaten their flesh, painted themselves with their blood, sawed them through from end to end, or fed them to the wild animals. The toll of those massacred apparently reached 220,000.<sup>75</sup> But however certain we may be of the unbridled fantasy of this account, it nevertheless discloses the scope and importance of the rebellion. The ringleader of Cyrenaican Jewry—whom they hailed as their king—is named Lucuas by Eusebius, Andreas by Dio.<sup>76</sup>

Here too there is now considerable documentary, and also archaeological, evidence to confirm the accounts of the literary sources. For instance, a number of temples in the city of Cyrene—including those of Apollo, Zeus, Demeter, Artemis, and Isis—were destroyed or damaged; milestones refer to roads near the city destroyed 'tumultu Iudaico'; an inscription mentions the sending by Trajan of 3,000 veterans to settle in Cyrenaica, evidently to assist repopulation.<sup>77</sup>

Trajan sent one of his best generals, Marcius Turbo, to put down the revolt,<sup>78</sup> and by means of protracted and stubborn fighting (*πολλαῖς*

75. Dio lxviii 32, 1-3. Cf. Oros. vii 12, 6-7. 'Incredibili deinde motu sub uno tempore Iudaei, quasi rabie efferati, per diversas terrarum partes exarserunt. nam et per totam Libyam adversas incolas atrocissima bella gesserunt: quae adeo tunc interfectis cultoribus desolata est, ut nisi postea Hadrianus imperator collectas illuc aliunde colonias deduxisset, vacua penitus terra, abraso habitatore, mansisset. Aegyptum vero totam et Cyrenen et Thebaidam cruentis seditionibus turbaverunt'.

76. Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 4; Dio lxviii 32. Cf. P. M. Fraser, 'Hadrian and Cyrene', *JRS* 40 (1950), pp. 77-90, esp. 83-4.

77. For surveys of the extensive evidence for destruction and restoration, see P. M. Fraser, *JRS* 40 (1950), pp. 77-90; S. Applebaum, 'The Jewish Revolt in Cyrene in 115-117, and the subsequent Recolonisation', *JJS* 2 (1951), pp. 177-86; A. Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-9; and now the general work by S. Applebaum, *Greeks and Jews in Cyrene* (1969) (in Hebrew).

78. Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 3-4, ἐφ' οὗς ὁ αυτοκράτωρ ἐπεμψεν Μάρκιον Τούρβωνα σὺν δυνάμει πλείῃ τε καὶ ναυτικῇ, ἐπι δὲ καὶ ἰππικῇ. ὁ δὲ πολλὰς μάχαις οὐκ ὀλίγω τε χρόνω τὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαπονήσας πῆλον, πολλὰς μυριάδας Ἰουδαίων, οὐ μόνον τῶν ἀπὸ Κυρήνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ

μάχαις οὐκ ὀλίγω τε χρόνῳ). Turbo brought the war to an end, putting to death many thousands of Jews, not only from Cyrene but also from Egypt, who had attached themselves to their 'king', Lucius.<sup>79</sup>

The revolt had also spread to the island of Cyprus. Under the leadership of a certain Artemion, the Jews here followed the example of their Cyrenaican co-religionists and murdered some 240,000 non-Jewish islanders.<sup>80</sup> Even the capital, Salamis, was devastated by them.<sup>81</sup> No information is extant regarding the suppression of the revolt, but from then on, no Jew was allowed to set foot on the island; if any were driven onto its coasts by bad weather, they were put to death.<sup>82</sup>

Finally, when Trajan had advanced as far as Ctesiphon, the capital of the Parthian empire, the Jews in his rear in Mesopotamia also became restive. Such a disturbance on the empire's frontier was most serious. Trajan commanded the Moorish prince Lucius Quietus, who was at the same time a Roman general, to sweep the insurrectionists out of the province (ἐκκαθάραι τῆς ἐπαρχίας αὐτοῦς). Quietus followed his directions with barbaric ferocity, and thousands of Jews lost their lives. Peace was thus restored and Quietus was rewarded with the governorship of Palestine.<sup>83</sup>

The Jewish rebellion seems not to have ended completely until the beginning of the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117). Eusebius in any case refers to disturbances in Alexandria which the emperor was obliged to

τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου συναϊρομένων Λουκούα τῷ βασιλεὶ αὐτῶν ἀναρεῖ. Cf. HA, vii. *Hadri.* 5, 8, 'Marcio Turbone Iudaeis congressis ad deprimentum tumultum Mauretaniae destinato'. For a solution of the complicated problems relating to the career and identity of this man, see R. Syme, 'The Wrong Marcus Turbo', JRS 52 (1962), pp. 87-96.

79. Euseb. *HE* iv 2, 4. According to Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 164 ff., and Oros. vii 12, 6-7, the rising spread even beyond Thebes.

80. Dio lxxviii 32. See also ILS 9491.

81. Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 164 (the 19th year of Trajan, *ann. Abrah.* 2132) following the Armenian: 'Salaminam Cipri insulae urbem Iudaei adorti sunt et Graecos, quos ibi nacti sunt, trucidarunt, urbemque a fundamentis subverterunt.' Greek in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 657: τοὺς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τῆς Κύπρου Ἕλληνας Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελόντες τὴν πόλιν κατέσκαψαν. Orosius vii 12, 8 'Sane Salaminam, urbem Cypri, interfectis omnibus accolis deleverunt.'

82. Dio lxxviii 32. Cf. also A. Fuks, *loc. cit.*, p. 99.

83. Euseb., *HE* iv 2, 5; *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 164-5 (in the 18th year of Trajan, *ann. Abrah.* 2131); Oros. vii 12, 7; Dio lxxviii 32, 4-5 (here also for personal details concerning Quietus). On his activity in Mesopotamia and Palestine, see E. Groag, RE s.v. 'Lusius Quietus'; cf. PIR<sup>2</sup> L 439. It appears from CIL III 13587=ILS 4393, dated to about A.D. 116-117, that part of the force at his disposal was a detachment of the *legio III Cyrenaica*.

quell.<sup>84</sup> Hadrian's biographer, Spartianus, reports that Palestine also showed signs of rebellion.<sup>85</sup> But order seems to have been completely restored within the first year of the reign. This, or the following year provides the probable dramatic setting for the scene from the 'Act of the Pagan Martyrs', called the Acta Pauli et Antonini,<sup>86</sup> representing a hearing before an emperor, most probably Hadrian, of accusation and counter-accusations by Jewish and Greek ambassadors from Alexandria in connexion with their mutual conflicts there.

Palestine does not seem to have been involved to any great extent in the revolt, but there is scattered evidence to suggest that real upheavals took place there and had to be repressed.<sup>87</sup> Rabbinical tradition is aware of a 'War of Quietus' (פּוֹלְמוֹס שֶׁל קִיטוּס),<sup>88</sup> though this may simply refer to the war of Quietus in Mesopotamia. In the vulgar text of Meg. Taan. §29, 12 Adar is described as the 'Day of Trajan' (יְמֵי טוֹרְיָנוֹס),<sup>89</sup> intended to commemorate the following event.<sup>90</sup> Two brothers, Julianus and Pappus, were seized by Trajan in Laodicea whereupon he mockingly said to them: 'If you belong to the people of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, may your God come and deliver you from my hand as he saved them from the hand of Nebuchadnezzar. The two brothers replied that neither he nor they were worthy of such a miracle, but God would require their blood from him if he killed them. And Trajan had not yet left that place before a command came from Rome in consequence of which he was executed. This fable (which merits no attention because Trajan is depicted as a subordinate official was once advanced as principal evidence of Trajan's Judaeae War. Clearly, there is no question here either of war, or of Judaea (but expressly of Laodicea).<sup>91</sup> The only point in favour of this view is th

84. Euseb. *Chron.* II, pp. 164-5 (in Hadrian's first year=*ann. Abrah.* 2133 using the Armenian version: 'Adrianus Iudaeos subegit ter (tertio) contra Romano rebellantes'; according to Jerome: 'Hadrianus Iudaeos capit secundo contra Romanos rebellantes; following Syncellus: 'Ἀδριανὸς Ἰουδαίους κατὰ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν στασιάζοντας ἐκόλασεν.

85. HA, *vita Hadri.* 5, 2: 'Lybia [Lycia] denique ac Palaestina rebelles animo efferebant'.

86. H. A. Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs (Acta Alexandrinorum)* (1954), no. ix.

87. See E. M. Smallwood, 'Palestine c. A.D. 115-118', *Historia* 11 (1962), pp. 500-10.

88. mSot. 9:14; S. Olam, ed. Neubauer, p. 66.

89. Ed. Lichenstein, HUCA 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 321 and 272-3; J. Derenbourg pp. 443, 446. The form טוֹרְיָנוֹס is given also by A. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles* II (1895), p. 19 and yTaan. 18b. But the MSS. of Meg. Taan. and yMe. 70c, yTaan. 66a read טוֹרְיָנוֹס.

90. Lichenstein, p. 346; J. Derenbourg, pp. 406 f.; A. Neubauer, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

91. The tale possibly goes back to a hazy recollection of the fact that Lusius Quietus, the oppressor of the Jews, was recalled by Hadrian and later executed (HA, *vita Hadri.* 5, 8; 7, 2).

statement by Spartianus quoted earlier, according to which Palestine, at the outset of Hadrian's rule, *rebelles animos efferebat*. But it can hardly have come to a real war. Otherwise our sources would say something about it.<sup>92</sup>

### III. The Great Revolt under Hadrian A.D. 132-135

#### Literary sources:

- Appian, *Syriaca* 50/252.  
 Justin, 1 *Apol.* 31, 6.  
 Fronto, *Epistulae* ed. Naber, p. 218; ed. Van den Hout, p. 206.  
 Dio lxix 12-14.  
 Eusebius, *HE* iv 5, 2; 6. (On Ariston of Pella, see pp. 37-9 above.)  
 Eusebius, *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, pp. 166-9.

#### Documents and archaeological finds

- Benoit, P., Milik, J. T., de Vaux, R., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert II: Les grottes de Murabba'at* (1961), esp. nos. 22-46.  
 Avigad, N. & al., 'The Expedition to the Judean Desert, 1960', *IEJ* 11 (1961), pp. 3-72, esp. pp. 21-30, 36-62.  
 Avigad, N. & al., 'The Expedition to the Judean Desert, 1961', *IEJ* 12 (1962), pp. 167-262, esp. 190-214, 227-62.  
 Lifshitz, B., 'Papyrus grecs du désert de Juda', *Aegyptus* 42 (1962), pp. 240-56.  
 Yadin, Y., *Findings from the Bar-Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (1963).  
 Meshorer, Y., *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 92-101, 159-69.  
 Yadin, Y., *Bar Kokhba* (1971).  
 Kanael, B., 'Notes on Dates Used During the Bar Kokhba Revolt', *IEJ* 21 (1971), pp. 39-46.

#### Bibliography

- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 412-38.  
 Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* IV (1908), pp. 125-67.  
 Weber, W., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (1907), pp. 240-5; 275-6.  
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* II (1952), pp. 83-102.  
 Yeivin, S., *Milhemet Bar Kokhba (The War of Bar Kokhba)* (1952).

92. The chronology of the last Jewish wars is given in *Seder 'Olam* (ed. Neubauer, p. 66) as follows: 'From the war of Asverus (Varus? cf. p. 332 above) to the war of Vespasian: 80 years whilst the Temple existed. From the war of Vespasian to the war of Quietus: fifty-two years. And from the war of Quietus to the war of Ben Koziba: 16 years. And the war of Ben Koziba: three and a half years. מפולמוס של אספסיוס עד פולמוס של אספסיוס פ' שנים. אלו בפני הבית. מפולמוס של אספסיוס עד פולמוס של קיסוס המשים ושנים שנה. ומפולמוס של קיסוס עד מלחמת בן כוזיבא י"ו שנה. ומלחמת בן כוזיבא שלש שנים ומחצה.

- Smallwood, E. M., 'The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision', *Latomus* 18 (1959), pp. 334-47.  
 Smallwood, E. M., 'Addendum', *ibid.* 20 (1961), pp. 93-6.  
 Abramsky, S., *Bar Kokhba nesi' Yisra'el (Bar Kokhba Prince of Israel)* (1961).  
 Alon, G., *Tol'dot ha-Yehudim be-'Eretz Yisra'el bi-tshufat ha-Mishnah v'ha-Talmud (History of the Jews in Palestine in the Period of Mishnah and the Talmud)* I (1967), pp. 290-354, II (1961), pp. 1-47.  
 Applebaum, S., 'The Agrarian Question and the Revolt of Bar Kokhba', *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), pp. 283-7 (in Hebrew).  
 Mantel, H., 'The Causes of the Bar Kokhba Revolt', *JQR* 58 (1967-8), pp. 224-42, 274-96. 'Postscript', *ibid.* 59 (1968-9), pp. 341-2.  
 Prigent, P., *La fin de Jérusalem* (1969), pp. 92-146.

A late Jewish legend relates that in the days of R. Joshua ben Hananiah (i.e. during Hadrian's time), the Gentile government directed that the Temple should be rebuilt. The Samaritans, however, raised objections. As a result, the emperor, while not actually withdrawing the permit, decreed that the new building should not be erected on the precise site of the old Temple, which was equivalent to an actual prohibition. At this, the Jews gathered in crowds in the valley of Beth-Rimmon: To pacify them, R. Joshua told them the fable of the lion and the stork: as the stork was happy to have extracted its head uninjured from the jaws of the lion, so they should be happy to be able to live in peace under Gentile rule.<sup>93</sup> The historical value of the legend is nil, and yet it forms the main basis of the view put forward by some scholars that Hadrian consented to the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple and that his withdrawal of this permission was the true cause of the great Jewish revolt.<sup>94</sup> To support this theory, appeal is also made to Christian accounts. But they too are little suited for the part. Chrysostom, Cedrenus and Nicephorus Callistus say merely that the Jews in Hadrian's time revolted and tried to rebuild the Temple, and that Hadrian thwarted this enterprise; the *Chronicon paschale* speaks of the destruction by Hadrian of a Temple that had actually been rebuilt.<sup>95</sup> There is thus no question of a permit originally given by Hadrian and subsequently withdrawn; the attempted reconstruction of the Temple was itself an act of rebellion. The one apparent confirmation of this hypothesis appears in a passage from the *Letter of Barnabas*, the interpretation of which is however debatable. Barnabas wishes to show that Jewish observance of the Law does not conform to God's will. Their Sabbath is not the true one. 'And they have worshipped God in a temple almost like the heathen.' To prove the heathen character of the Jewish Temple, Barnabas quotes the prophecy of Isaiah (Is.

93. Gen. R. 64:8. For an English translation, see the Soncino *Midrash Rabbah*, *in loc.*

94. E.g. Graetz, *op. cit.*, pp. 125 ff., Derenbourg, *Histoire*, pp. 412 ff.

95. See n. 146 below.

49:17) 'See, those who have destroyed this temple will themselves rebuild it'; and he then continues: γίνεται διὰ τὸ γὰρ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ] οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν (16:4). It is only if the bracketed καὶ is retained, that this passage expresses the expectation that Jews and pagans together will rebuild the Temple. If the καὶ is omitted, the meaning is that the pagans themselves will build the Temple, for pagan purposes. But on external grounds as well, the latter reading is to be preferred. Barnabas thus seems to be alluding to Hadrian's intended pagan edifice.<sup>96</sup> The alleged permission given by Hadrian to rebuild the Jewish Temple must therefore be disregarded as a cause of the revolt. Such a consent, especially one accompanied by active encouragement, is also inherently unlikely. For whereas Hadrian did indeed promote the Graeco-Roman cults with enthusiasm, he despised alien religions.<sup>97</sup>

Only two reports on the causes of the great revolt should be considered with any seriousness. The *Historia Augusta* says,<sup>98</sup> 'moverunt ea tempestate et Iudaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia'.

96. A careful discussion of the passage is to be found in H. Windisch, HNT, Ergänzungsband, *Die apostolischen Väter III: Der Barnabasbrief* (1920), pp. 387, 388-90. Windisch (as also J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (1907), p. 261) accepts the omission of the καὶ, and refers the verse to the building of the temple of Jupiter. The words οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται best suit the construction of a pagan temple. Cf. also A. von Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Literatur bis Euseb.* II, 1 (1897), pp. 423-7. The wording of the passage implies that the rebuilding of the actual temple is involved. According to Barnabas, this temple was no better than a heathen one; the proof is that it has now been rebuilt by the pagans. In support of this, note the ἀνὸν at the end.

97. HA, *vita Hadr.* 22, 10, 'sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit'. According to A. Schlatter, *Die Tage Trajan's und Hadrian's*, p. 67 n., this remark has absolutely nothing to do with the matter. He himself construed the causes of the revolt as follows (*op. cit.*, pp. 59-67): The letter of Barnabas tells us that Hadrian authorised the construction of the Jewish temple. We also know that it was under construction and that it was so nearly finished that the Day of Atonement could again be celebrated. Everything seemed to be going as well as possible. Then suddenly conflict broke out because the Jews refused to offer the sacrifice for the emperor. The latter is attested by the story of a certain Bar Kamza (b. Git. 55b-56a and Lam. R. to Lam. 4:2). This man felt insulted by the rabbis because of the treatment he had experienced at a banquet, and maligned the Jews to the emperor by saying that a sacrificial victim donated by him would not be accepted. The emperor thereupon sent a fat calf. But the trouble makers secretly injured the animal, thus rendering it unsuitable for sacrifice. When, as a result, the Jews did in fact reject it, the emperor despatched Nero, and shortly after, Vespasian, and the Temple was destroyed. Despite the anecdotal character of the story, Schlatter treats it as historical and places it in Hadrian's time. He makes of a sacrifice sent by the emperor, the sacrifice for the emperor, and so obtains the interpretation set out above. In doing so, he clashes with the real sources, Dio and the *Historia Augusta*.

98. HA, *vita Hadr.* 14, 2.

Dio, on the other hand, observes,<sup>99</sup> 'When Hadrian founded a city of his own at Jerusalem on the site of the ruined one, calling it Aelia Capitolina, and erected on the site of the Temple another (temple) to Zeus, a great and protracted war resulted. For the Jews regarded it as an abomination for foreigners to settle in their city and for alien sanctuaries to be built in it.' As the *Historia Augusta* names only the one cause, and Dio only the other, it seems debatable whether the two can be combined without further ado. Gregorovius rejected the statement in the *Historia Augusta* and gave credence exclusively to that of Dio. In fact, a ban placed on circumcision for no special reason seems to accord little with Hadrian's mild disposition, however comprehensible its use as a method of exterminating the Jews after the suppression of the revolt.<sup>100</sup> But in spite of this, the *Historia Augusta's* reference may be accepted.

To evaluate it correctly, it must be remembered that circumcision was not peculiar to the Jews.<sup>101</sup> Herodotus lists as nations among whom it was customary from time immemorial, the Colchians, the Egyptians and the Ethiopians; from the Egyptians it passed also to the Phoenicians and the 'Syrians in Palestine' (i.e. the Jews). From the Phoenicians he excludes 'those in contact with Hellas'.<sup>102</sup> Other writers also mention the fact that the Egyptians practised circum-

99. Dio lxix 12, 1-2. But H. Windisch, *Barnabasbrief*, p. 389, stresses that this passage cannot rightly mean that the completed Aelia and temple of Jupiter were the cause of the revolt.

100. F. Gregorovius, *Der Kaiser Hadrian*, pp. 188 ff. Both Dio and the *Historia Augusta* partially depend on Hadrian's autobiography (cf. Dio lxix 11, 2, ὡς Ἀδριανὸς γράφει. HA, *vita Hadr.* 1, 1, 'in libris vitae suae Hadrianus ipse commemoret'; 7, 2, 'ut ipse in vita sua dicit', cf. also 3, 3; 3, 5). In Dio, moreover, the account of the Jewish War follows almost immediately on a quotation from the autobiography and may very well have been drawn from it; for Dio's sources on Hadrian see F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (1964), pp. 60-72. In the case of the *Historia Augusta*, on the other hand, circumstances are not so favourable. Even if it cannot be proved that the actual comment on the Jewish war does not stem from a good source, examination of the *Scriptores historiae Augustae* has shown that as presently extant they are a later work in which the underlying original source has been considerably retouched and combined with dubious material. Cf. e.g. E. Hohl, 'Über die Glaubwürdigkeit der *Historia Augusta*', SBA, Klasse für Gesellschaftswissenschaften, 1953, Nr. 2; and R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (1967).

101. For a valuable discussion of this whole question, see E. M. Smallwood, 'The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision', *Latomus* 18 (1959), pp. 334-47, and 'The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision: Addendum', *Latomus*, 20 (1961), pp. 93-6. H. Mantel's attempt at refuting this thesis (*JQR* 58 (1967-8), pp. 231-6) is unconvincing.

102. Herodotus ii 104, 2-4. Josephus twice quotes this passage, *Ant.* viii 10, 3 (262); c. *Ap.* i 22 (169-71), remarking on both occasions that by the term 'the Syrians in Palestine' only the Jews can be meant.



cision.<sup>103</sup> As a generalization, this statement is probably incorrect, for Jer. 9:24-5, according to the correct interpretation of the passage, indicates that the Egyptians were uncircumcised. Circumcision seems therefore to have been practised only in the narrower circles of the more highly placed. In Roman times, at any rate, only the priests in Egypt were regularly circumcised.<sup>104</sup> On the other hand, circumcision was general among the Arabs,<sup>105</sup> whereas the Ituraeans and the Idumaeans (i.e. the Jews' nearest neighbours to the north and south) did not accept circumcision until their forced conversion to Judaism by the Hasmonaean princes John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus I.<sup>106</sup>

Accordingly, if the Jews were not the only people in the Roman empire to practise circumcision, it is unlikely that the ban applied to them alone. In point of fact, it is plain from the factors which led to the prohibition that it was a general one. Hadrian first of all intensified the ban on castration already decreed by Domitian; it was to be punished 'in accordance with the *lex Cornelia*', i.e. as murder.<sup>107</sup> But circumcision was placed on a par with castration, as may be seen from

103. Also, Herodotus ii 36, 3, *Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ περιτέμνονται*. Agatharchides: *Geographi graeci minores*, ed. C. Müller I, p. 154, 'the Troglodytes καθάπερ Αἰγυπτίους πάντας'. Diodorus i 28, 'The Egyptians, and after them the Colchians and the Jews'; iii 32, 4, 'the Troglodytes as the Egyptians'. Diodorus in this section is reproducing Agatharchides almost verbatim. Strabo xvii 2, 5 (824). Philo, *de spec. leg.* i 1 (2). Celsus, in Origen, *Contra Celsum* v 41, 'the Egyptians and the Colchians practised circumcision before the Jews did'; cf. i 22; v 48. Further references in E. M. Smallwood, *Latomus* 18 (1959), pp. 334 ff.

104. Artapanus, in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* ix 27, 10=FGrH 726 F3 (Artapanus wrote before Alexander Polyhistor and probably in the second century B.C.). Jos. c. *Ap.* ii 13 (141), *ἐκείνοι* (the Egyptian priests) *ἀπαντες καὶ περιτέμνονται καὶ χειρῶν ἀπέχονται βρωμάτων*. Horapollon, ed. Leemans, I 14, p. 23. Origen, *Com. in ep. ad Rom.* ii 13 (ed. Lommatsch VI, 138 ff., PG xiv, cols. 910-11) 'Apud Aegyptios . . . nullus aut geometriae studebat aut astronomiae . . . nullus certe astrologiae et geneseos . . . secreta rimabatur, nisi circumcissione suscepta. sacerdos apud eos, aruspex aut quorumlibet sacrorum minister, vel, ut illi appellant, propheta omnis, circumciscus est. Litteras quoque sacerdotales veterum Aegyptiorum, quas hieroglyphicas appellant, nemo discere nisi circumciscus.' *Id., in Jerem. hom.* v 14 (GCS Origenes III, pp. 43-4). Jerome, *Comm. ad Gal.* 5: 1 (PL xxvi, col. 394). Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30, 33. The story of Apion also shows that circumcision was not general in Egypt: Cf. Jos. c. *Ap.* ii 13 (171-2); note however, W. Otto, *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten I* (1905), pp. 214-15.

105. Gen. 17:23-7 (circumcision of Ishmael at the age of thirteen). Jos. *Ant.* i 12, 2 (214) *Ἀραβες δὲ μετὰ ἔτος τρισκαίδεκατον . . .*. *Barn.* 9: 6, *περιτέμνηται . . . καὶ πᾶς Σῦρος καὶ Ἀραβὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν εἰδώλων* (only partially correct). Origen, *Com. in Gen.* iii 10 (ed. Lommatsch VIII, 33) quoted by Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* vi 11, 69 (GCS Eusebius VIII, pp. 357-8) *τῶν δὲ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀραβίαν, τοῖσδε ὡς πάντας περιτέμνεσθαι τρισκαίδεκαετείς· τοῦτο γὰρ ἰσθόρηται περὶ αὐτῶν*. Cf. preceding note.

106. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 9, 1 (257-8); 11, 3 (318-19).

107. *Digest* xlviii 8, 4, 2 (from Ulpian), 'Divus Hadrianus rescripsit: constitutum quidem est, ne spadones fierent, eos autem, qui hoc crimine arguerentur, Corneliae legis poena teneri'. By this is meant the *Lex Cornelia de*

a later decree of Antoninus Pius permitting Jews to practise circumcision once again.<sup>108</sup> Hadrian thus forbade circumcision in general as a barbaric custom. He did not simply apply the ban to the Jews on religious grounds. Hence under Antoninus Pius, the general ban remained in force, but circumcision was permitted to the Jews as a special case for the sake of their religion.<sup>109</sup> There is direct evidence for the universality of the ban in regard to the Arabs, Samaritans and Egyptians. (1) In Nabataean Arabia, circumcision prevalent until then was abolished by the Romans.<sup>110</sup> (2) Among the Samaritans in the time of Origen it was forbidden on pain of death.<sup>111</sup> In Egypt, priests in the second half of the second century A.D. required, in each individual case, a special official permit to perform circumcision. Permission to circumcise a boy was only granted once his priestly descent and absence of

*sicariis et veneficis*. Domitian and Nerva had already banned castration (Dio lxxvii 2, 3; Suet. *Dom.* vii 1), but there does not seem to be any indication that prior to Hadrian circumcision was assimilated to it. Further, his rescript goes on to impose the death penalty on both the circumcised and the circumciser. On the whole matter, see E. M. Smallwood, 'The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision', *Latomus* 18 (1959), pp. 334 ff.

108. Modestinus, *Digest* xlviii 8, 11, 'Circumcidere Iudaeis filios suos tantum rescripto divi Pii permittitur: in non eiusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis poena irrogatur'. Cf. J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain I*, pp. 263-71; E. M. Smallwood, *art. cit.*, p. 334. Note that this rescript exempts Jewish families from the ban, but apparently does not extend exemption to adult converts. This implies the universality of the ban hitherto, as affecting all races, not merely the Jews.

109. Modestinus, *Digest* xlviii 8, 11 (as in previous note). See also Paulus, *Sent.* V 22, 3-4, listing the penalties for Gentiles submitting to circumcision: 'Cives Romani, qui se Iudaico ritu vel servos suos circumcidi patiuntur, bonis adeptis in insulam perpetuo relegantur; medici capite puniuntur. Iudaei si alienae nationis comparatos servos circumciderint, aut deportantur aut capite puniuntur'. According to Smallwood, *art. cit.*, p. 345, this concerns the period after the issue of Antoninus's rescript.

110. In the Syriac dialogue on Fate, ascribed to Bardesanes, the fact that when kings have conquered foreign lands they have often, without hindrance from the stars, annulled existing laws and introduced their own, is illustrated principally by the Roman annulment, shortly after the conquest of Arabia, of local laws, and in particular that relating to circumcision. Cf. W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum* (1855), pp. 29-30; H. J. W. Drijvers, *The Book of the Laws of Countries* (1965), pp. 56-7. In the somewhat abridged version (in Greek) in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* vi 10, 41, the prohibition of circumcision is not mentioned. The same author speaks immediately afterwards of the circumcision of Jews as an existing custom.

111. Origen, *c. Cels.* ii 13, notes that Christians alone would be persecuted for their faith, and then continues: *ἀλλὰ φήσκει τις, ὅτι καὶ Σαμαρεῖς διὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν θεοσέβειαν διώκονται. πρὸς ὃν τοιαῦτα ἐροῦμεν οἱ σικάριοι διὰ τὴν περιτομήν, ὡς ἀκρωτηριάζοντες παρὰ τοὺς καθεστῶτας νόμους καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίους συγκεχωρημένα μόνους, ἀναιροῦνται*. So it is not on account of their religion that they will be punished as 'murderers' (in accordance with the *Lex Cornelia*), but because of circumcision, permitted only to Jews.

physical defect had been proved, i.e., his fitness to assume priestly office.<sup>112</sup> In general, therefore, it was forbidden.

The ban on circumcision promulgated by Hadrian was in consequence not directed specifically at Judaism; but obviously the Jews felt that it dealt them a mortal blow. To this was now added the other vexation, namely that Hadrian intended to build a new pagan city on the ruins of Jerusalem. Here again, the motive was not enmity towards Judaism: splendid architecture and the founding of cities characterized Hadrian's life work as a whole. But the proposal must have given the Jews profound offence. While Jerusalem lay in ruins they could look for its restoration. The establishment of a pagan city, the erection of a pagan temple on the holy place, put an end to these hopes. It was an outrage similar to that once perpetrated by Antiochus Epiphanes, and the reaction to it was, as before, a general uprising of the people. Thus neither cause is in itself unlikely. A combination of the two is therefore quite conceivable, if Hadrian's two directives were not too widely separated from one another in time.

Various statements appear in the sources in regard to the date at which the construction of Aelia Capitolina started. Epiphanius claims that Hadrian, on a visit to Jerusalem, commanded that the city (not the Temple) should be rebuilt, and entrusted the task to Aquila, forty-seven years after its destruction.<sup>113</sup> This would point to A.D. 117, immediately after Hadrian's accession. He was in any case in the east at that time; but Epiphanius is apparently thinking of one of his later long journeys from Rome, and his information consequently loses all its value. The *Chronicon paschale* places the founding of Aelia in the year A.D. 119, but only because it dates the great Jewish rebellion to the same year, the foundation of Aelia taking place just after the revolt was suppressed.<sup>114</sup> With the date given for the Jewish rebellion,

112. This interesting point is shown by several papyri e.g., BGU I, 82, and 347=L. Mitteis, U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge u. Chrestomathie* I, no. 76. One of these contains two contemporary documents from A.D. 171, the other, a similar document from A.D. 185. A similar text, edited by R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen* (1901), pp. 1-46, includes two documents from the time of Antoninus Pius (=Mitteis, Wilcken, *op. cit.*; no. 77). The legal process according to all four texts is the same. A priest wishing to submit his son to circumcision has first to present a petition to the officer in charge of his home district, who then certifies the boy's priestly origin on the basis of the roll of inhabitants. Armed with this certificate, father and son go to Memphis, to the Roman Chief Priest of all Egypt. This man now has the boy examined by his priestly officials (to see if he is free from physical defect—*εἰ σημεῖόν τι ἔχει ὁ παῖς*. . .). Only when he is certified to be 'free' (*ἀσῆμος*) and thus eligible for the priesthood, does the Chief Priest issue the written authorization for the circumcision. It may be mentioned as a parallel that the Prefect of Egypt was able also in exceptional cases to permit castration, Justin, *I Apol.* 29.

113. *De mensuris et ponderibus*, 14.

114. *Chron. pasch.*, ed. Dindorf, I, p. 474.

which is demonstrably false, collapses that for the foundation of Aelia.<sup>115</sup> Eusebius, too, views the work on the new city as subsequent to the revolt.<sup>116</sup> This is right inasmuch as the plan was not carried out until then. But according to Dio, building was unquestionably started prior to the uprising, though not very long before. For he says that the Jews, who were scandalized over it, nevertheless remained calm while Hadrian stayed in Egypt and Syria, but that they flared up as soon as he had left those regions.<sup>117</sup> It may therefore be assumed that the foundation of Aelia occurred during Hadrian's sojourn in Syria in A.D. 130.<sup>118</sup>

Hadrian went to Syria at that time from Greece: it was his last great journey to the east. From there he travelled to Egypt, and then back again to Syria.<sup>119</sup> Coins, papyri and inscriptions attest that he was in Syria in A.D. 129/30, in Egypt by August 130, and in Syria again in 131.<sup>120</sup> Everywhere he went, he furthered works of civilization. Buildings were erected, ornamental and utilitarian, and games were

115. Cf. CAH XI, pp. 313-14.

116. *HE* iv 6, 4.

117. Dio lxxix 12, 2.

118. Compare L. Kadman, *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina: Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium* I (1956), pp. 17-18; note also the observation of Y. Meshorer, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-3, that a coin of Aelia was found with a hoard from the Judaean Desert which included denarii of Bar Kokhba. The probable inference is that it was minted before the war and buried with them during it.

119. Dio lxxix 11-12. Cf. W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (1907), pp. 231-40; W. F. Stinespring, 'Hadrian in Palestine 129/30 A.D.', *JAOs* 59 (1939), pp. 360-5.

120. Eckhel demonstrated in *Doctr. Num.* VI, pp. 489-91 that Hadrian was in Egypt in A.D. 130. Cf. W. Weber, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 198-263, 265 ff. In favour of such a view are the following points:

(1) An inscription at Palmyra in the temple of Zeus (Ba'alsamin), dated to Nisan 442 *aer. Sel.* (=130-131), indicates that Hadrian had stayed there before (IGR III 1054). The inscription is bilingual, in Aramaic and Greek.

(2) The coins of Gaza from Hadrian's time have an era dating from A.D. 130, the occasion of which was almost certainly his presence in the city and the benevolence shown by him then (*BMC Palestine*, p. 146, n. 14).

(3) Coins were minted in Alexandria to celebrate Hadrian's presence. Most are dated to the 15th year, but one is to the 14th (*BMC Alexandria*, p. 101, n. 867). Since according to the reckoning commonly used in Egypt, the 15th year of Hadrian began on 29 August A.D. 130, his arrival in Alexandria is to be dated to August 130.

(4) The inscription on the statue of Memnon at Thebes, indicates that Hadrian was there precisely in the month of Athyr, in the 15th year of his reign: *κοιρανω[ι] Ἀδριανῶ πέμπτῳ δεκάτῳ δ' ἑναδέτῳ, (φῶτ)α δ' ἔχουσιν* Ἄθου εἰκοσι καὶ πέσυρα. εἰκόστῳ πέμπτῳ δ' ἅματι μήνος Ἄθου (Nov. 21, A.D. 130). Cf. A. and E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon* (1960), no. 31.

(5) The inscription on the triumphal arch at Gerasa, in the Decapolis, dated to A.D. 130, i.e. 192 of the city's own era, commencing in autumn 63 B.C. Cf. C. H. Kraeling, *Gerasa* (1938), pp. 401-2 (n. 58).

celebrated: to all the provinces he became a 'restitutor'.<sup>121</sup> Signs of his presence appear in the cities of Palestine also. Caesarea and Tiberias had an 'Αδριάνειον, Gaza a παρήγγυρις 'Αδριανή, Petra named itself 'Αδριανή Πέτρα in appreciation of the emperor's benefactions.<sup>122</sup> His presence in Judaea is commemorated by coins bearing the superscription 'adventui Aug(usti) Iudaeae'.<sup>123</sup>

The founding of Aelia was without doubt associated with these endeavours. Further, Pliny calls Jerusalem 'longe clarissima urbium orientis, non Iudaeae modo'.<sup>124</sup> This famous city now lay in ruins, or was no more than a Roman camp. What greater temptation than to raise it again in new magnificence? But needless to say, it would be a pagan magnificence. A temple to Jupiter Capitolinus should stand in place of the former Temple to the God of the Jews. This was the fatal proposal. The Jews were already extremely angry on account of the ban on circumcision promulgated perhaps not long before, if we accept the evidence of the *Historia Augusta*.<sup>125</sup> Now came this new outrage bringing matters to a head. The people remained quiet while the emperor stayed in Egypt and, for the second time, Syria. But once he was no longer in the neighbourhood—in A.D. 131/2 therefore—the revolt broke out:<sup>126</sup> an uprising that in scope, dynamic power and

121. On many city-inscriptions Hadrian is styled σωτήρ, οἰκιστής, εὐεργέτης, κτίστης. He is also described on his coins as 'restitutor' of Achaia, Africa, Arabia, Asia, Bithynia, Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Lybia, Macedonia, Nicomedia, orbis terrarum, Phrygia, Sicilia. Cf. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* VI, pp. 486–500; Cohen, *Médailles impériales* II (1882), pp. 209–14; *BMC Roman Empire* III, pp. 628–9.

122. A 'Αδριάνειον in Caesarea is mentioned in an inscription from the Christian period, RB 4 (1895), pp. 75 ff.; PEFQS (1896), p. 87. The coins of Petra have 'Αδριανή Πέτρα (*BMC Arabia*, p. 35, no. 8).

123. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* VI, pp. 495 ff. Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), p. 231. Cohen, *Médailles*,<sup>2</sup> II, pp. 110 ff.; *BMC Roman Empire* III, nos. 493–4. Analogous coins exist for practically all the other provinces. Cf. Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* VI, pp. 486–501; Cohen, *op. cit.* II, pp. 107–12; *BMC Roman Empire* III, p. 607, listing—in addition to Judaea—Africa, Alexandria, Arabia, Asia, Bithynia, Britannia, Cilicia, Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Macedonia, Mauretania, Moesia, Noricum, Parthia, Phrygia, Sicilia, and Thracia.

124. *NH* v. 14, 70.

125. Cf. E. M. Smallwood, *Latomus* 18 (1959), p. 336.

126. It is clear from Dio lxix 12, 1–2, that the foundation of Aelia occurred during Hadrian's first stay in Syria (129/30), but the outbreak of the revolt after his second visit (131), thus in A.D. 131/2. In point of fact, Eusebius's *Chronicle* dates it to the 16th year of Hadrian, or *ann. Abrah.* 2148 = A.D. 132, *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 166 ff. Note that the new date, A.D. 131, proposed for the beginning of the war by J. T. Milik in DJD II, p. 125, is rejected in favour of A.D. 132 by M. R. Lehmann, 'Studies in the Murabba'at and Nahal Hever Documents', RQ 4 (1963/4), pp. 53–81, on p. 56. The discussion concerns a contract taken up in the Second Year of the Liberation, for five harvests, up to but not including, the next Sabbatical year (A.D. 138/9). The first year will

destructive consequences was at least as violent as that of the time of Vespasian. It is only due to the relative poverty of the sources that it has seemed less important.

With the various discoveries in the Judaeian desert (Murabba'at, 1951; Nahal Hever and Nahal Ze'elim, 1960–1) of literary and archaeological material, first-hand Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek information relative to the second Jewish war has increased beyond all expectation. In addition to contracts, the documents include correspondence between the leader of the revolt, district governors and local chiefs. Apart from the Murabba'at texts, all the other sources are as yet unpublished and known only from preliminary studies.<sup>127</sup>

Until the recent finds, there was some uncertainty concerning the name of the leader of the rebellion. Christian sources designate him as Kokheba or Bar Kokheba. The latter form is known also in rabbinic writings, but there he is usually referred to as Ben (or Bar) Koziba.<sup>128</sup> The spelling displayed in the new documents is כוסבה or כסבה, pronounced no doubt as Kosiba, as its Greek transliteration (Χωσιβα) indicates.<sup>129</sup> From this it would follow that both Christian and rabbinic forms represent puns. The former—Bar Kokhba, Son of the Star—was coined by R. Akiba and alluded to the leader's messianic dignity;<sup>130</sup> the latter—Bar Koziba, Son of the Lie=Liar—was probably invented by his opponents, and those of Akiba, and was regularly used by later

therefore be A.D. 132/3. The most recent dated text was written 'on 21 Tishri in the fourth year of the Liberation of Israel', i.e. October 134 or 135 (*Mur.* 30, 8, see DJD II, p. 145). Cf. Lehmann, *ibid.* For the view that the period A.D. 132–134/5 corresponds to the duration of Bar Kokhba's 'kingdom' founded at the end of several years of hostilities, see H. Mantel, *op. cit.*, JQR 58 (1967/8), pp. 237–42.

127. See the bibliography at the head of this section.

128. He is called Χοχέβας and 'Chochebas' in Eusebius's *Chronicle* and Jerome *ad. ann. Abr.* 2149 (ed. Schoene II, pp. 168 ff.; the Greek form in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 660). Similarly, in Oros. vii 13. Βαρχωχέβας in Justin, 1 *Apol.* 31, 6, and Eusebius, *HE* iv 8, 4. In the rabbinical sources on the other hand, he is always either Bar Koziba' or Ben Koziba'. In the passage from the *Seder 'Olam*, only the Munich MS. reads בר כסבה.

129. See IEJ 11 (1961), pp. 41–50. For the Greek Συμῶν Χωσιβα, cf. *ibid.*, p. 44.

130. yTaan. 68d. 'R. Simeon ben Yoḥai said, R. Akiba my teacher used to explain the passage, "A star shall go forth from Jacob" (Num. 24:17) thus. "Koziba (read, Kokhba) goes forth from Jacob." Again, when R. Akiba saw Bar Koziba (Kokhba), he cried out, "This is King Messiah". Thereupon R. Yoḥanan b. Torta said to him: "Akiba, grass will grow out of your cheek-bones and the Son of David will still not have come". The correct explanation of Kokhba = σωτήρ also appears in Eusebius, *HE* iv 6, 2 and Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 660. According to Eusebius, *loc. cit.*, even Bar Kokhba himself had claimed to be an ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φωστῆρ. On the messianic application of Num. 24:17 in the Qumran texts, see CDC 7:19; 4Q Testimonia 9–13 (esp. 12); 1QM 11:6–7. Cf. G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, pp. 165–6; ALUOS 6 (1969), pp. 92, 94–5. See also *Jesus the Jew*, pp. 133–4.

writers only too aware of his failure and its disastrous consequences.<sup>131</sup>

Coins minted by the revolutionaries,<sup>132</sup> as well as the new texts, attest that his first name was Simon and his official title 'Prince (נשיא or נסיא) of Israel'.<sup>133</sup> A few coins bear the image of a star above the figure of a temple.<sup>134</sup> Others dating to the first and second year mention, together with Simon or singly, Eleazar the Priest (אלעזר הכהן), possibly a joint head of the rebellion. Since in the rabbinic sources R. Eleazar of Modiim is described as the uncle of Bar Koziba,<sup>135</sup> it has been suggested that he was identical with the 'Priest Eleazar' named on the coins.<sup>136</sup> The priestly descent of Eleazar of Modiim is admittedly never asserted, but neither is it denied. In consequence, he remains the least unlikely of several weak candidates for the office of Bar Kokhba's deputy.<sup>137</sup>

The association of Simon ben Kosiba with 'the Star' rising from Jacob (Num. 24:17) indicates that he was regarded as the Messiah. As has been noted, R. Akiba definitely announced him as such.<sup>138</sup> And though not all his colleagues agreed with him, the people did. As in Vespasian's time, so now, also, it was believed that the days had come when the ancient prophecies would be fulfilled and Israel would cast off the Gentile yoke.<sup>139</sup> Christian legends declare that Bar Kokhba

131. E.g. Lam. R. 2:2, 'Do not read Kokhab (Star) but Kozeb (Liar)'. See also the preceding note.

132. They are referred to in rabbinic writings as מטעות כוזביות, Coins of Koziba. See tM.Sh. 1:6; bB.K. 97b.

133. A. Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, nos. 190, 192-3, 199, in addition to the many coins inscribed 'Simon'. See also Y. Meshorer, *op. cit.*, nos. 167, 169-72, 181-2, 186-7, 192-3, 195, 199, 201, 204, 206, 209B, 210-12, 215. For literary evidence, see DJD II, pp. 124-33; IEJ II (1961), p. 41; 12 (1962), pp. 249-50, 255.

134. Cf. Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-7 and nos. 167-8; Meshorer, *op. cit.*, nos. 165, 178-81, 199-201.

135. See bGit. 57a; Lam.R. 2:5. Cf. W. Bacher, *Tannaiten* I, pp. 187-211.

136. Cf. Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, nos. 169-70, 189, 189a, 196, 203; Meshorer, *op. cit.*, nos. 166, 173-4, 197, 213.

137. See G. Alon, *op. cit.* II, p. 37. According to this author, R. Eleazar ben Azariah, suggested for the role by Reifenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 34 (cf. also Abel, *op. cit.* II, p. 87), was dead by that time.

138. See n. 131 above; Bacher, *Tannaiten*, I, p. 284.

139. Sundry references in the Murabba'at and Nahal Hever documents reveal a strong emphasis laid by the leadership of the revolt on the observance of traditional religion. For instance, Eleazar bar Hitta was to travel before the sabbath (IEJ II (1961), p. 44; Yadin, *Bar Kokhba*, p. 128); Bar Kosiba's envoys were to rest on the sabbath (DJD II, p. 162); order was issued to provide palm branches, citrons, myrtles and willows required for the celebration of the feast of Tabernacles (IEJ II (1961), p. 48; Yadin, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-9); taxes were to be paid with tithed corn (DJD II, pp. 125 ff.). The otherwise unknown Batniah bar Mesah is mentioned with the title *Rabbenu* (our Master = the Aramaic *Rabban*), a designation reserved in rabbinic terminology for teachers of outstanding authority (IEJ II (1961), p. 46). For reference to the sabbatical year, see Mur. 24 (DJD II, pp. 125, 129, 131).

deluded the people with fraudulent miracles.<sup>140</sup> It was precisely because of the Messianic nature of the movement that Christians were unable to participate in it without denying their Messiah. They are said by Justin and Eusebius to have been severely persecuted for this reason by Bar Kokhba.<sup>141</sup>

The revolt extended speedily to the whole land; wherever strongholds, forts, caves and underground galleries offered a hiding-place, there collected the fighters for Palestine's indigenous customs and freedom. They avoided open conflict, but ravaged the country from their places of concealment and fought all who did not join their cause.<sup>142</sup> Jerusalem, too, was certainly occupied by them. The doubt on this point which many have expressed derives from the absence of any reference in the more reliable accounts (Dio, and Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*) of a battle for Jerusalem. It is inherently probable, however, that the initially successful rebels would have taken Jerusalem, which was at that time not a heavily fortified city but only a Roman camp. This probability is confirmed by evidence of two kinds. First, the coins.<sup>143</sup> Those which can be dated to this period with the greatest confidence bear on one side Simon's name (שמעון) and on the other the inscription: 'For the freedom of Jerusalem' (לחרות ירושלים). Thus, the liberation of Jerusalem was extolled by Simon on coins. But there are others from the same time which, besides the date 'Year I of the Liberation of Israel', or 'Year II of the Freedom of Israel', bear only the name of the city of Jerusalem. These, therefore, were minted by the city in its own name, from which it is clear that it was held by the rebels during the first and second year. To the evidence of the coins is to be added that of a contemporary, Appian, who, as will be mentioned later, attests the re-conquest of Jerusalem by the Romans.<sup>144</sup> Whether in these troubled

140. Jerome, *ad Rufin.* iii 31 (PL xxiii, col. 480). Jerome tells his opponent Rufinus that he spits fire 'ut ille Barchochabas, auctor seditionis Iudaicae, stipulam in ore succensam anhelitu ventilabat, ut flammam evomere putaretur'.

141. Justin, 1 *Apol.* 31, 6 και γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ Βαρχαχέβας, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγέτης, Χριστιανὸς μόνους εἰς τιμωρίας δεινὰς, εἰ μὴ ἀρνούμενος Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῦν, ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγεσθαι. Eusebius, *Chron.* (ed. Schoene II, pp. 168 ff.) *ad ann. Abrah.* 2149 (in the Armenian version) 'Qui dux rebellionis Iudaeorum erat Chochebas, multos e Christianis diversis suppliciis affecit, quia nolabant procedere cum illo ad pugnam contra Romanos'. Cf. also Oros. vii 13, 4.

142. Dio lxix 12, 3. Cf. Jerome, *Chron. ad ann. Abr.* 2148 (Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 167; Jerome, *Chron.*, ed. Helm, p. 200), 'Iudaei in arma versi Palestinam depopulati sunt'. The Armenian version of Eusebius has: 'Iudaei rebellant et Palestinensium terram invaserunt'.

143. See Meshorer, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-6.

144. See below, n. 161. Note, however, that only one of the contemporary documents discovered in Judaea mentions Jerusalem with the formula לחרות ירושלים; see Mur. 25, 1 (DJD II, p. 135).



years, the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple was also begun straight away remains to be decided. Later Christian sources speak of it, and the intention to do so must certainly have existed.<sup>145</sup>

The data offered by the Bar Kokhba documents are too scanty, and at present, owing to our limited information, too vague to allow a proper history of the war to be written. They provide, however, valuable insight into the system of administration adopted by the rebels, the discipline imposed on his forces by Bar Kosiba and to some degree the extent of the territory under his control.

The beginning of the uprising was taken as the start of a new era and all the legal documents are dated according to the year of 'the Liberation of Israel'. See for 'first year' Mur. 22 (DJD II, p. 118); for 'second year' Mur. 24B (*ibid.*, p. 124); for 'third year' Mur. 25 (*ibid.*, p. 135) and for 'fourth year' Mur. 30 (*ibid.*, p. 145).

The various districts are described as being under military government. Several of them are named in the letters. Jonathan bar Ba'ayan and Masabala bar Simon commanded the region of En-gedi (IEJ 11 (1961), pp. 43-7), Judah bar Manasse that of Kiryath Arabaya (*ibid.*, pp. 48-9); Joshua ben Galgula was in charge of the area in which was situated the otherwise unknown Beth Mashku (Mur. 42, DJD II, p. 155).

Localities in the districts were administered by פרוסין, or community leaders (Mur. 42, DJD II, p. 156; IEJ 12 (1962), pp. 249-50). Their duties included, in addition to normal communal activity, acting as liaison officers with the district commander (Mur. 42, DJD II, p. 156), and in particular the leasing out of land belonging to the head of state (Mur. 24, DJD II, pp. 122-32; IEJ 12 (1962), pp. 249-55) and the collection of the yearly rent, a tenth of which was apparently to be paid directly into the state treasury (Mur. 24, *ibid.*).

Central government was strong and authoritarian. The commanders of En-gedi were to assist the leader's envoy, Elisha, in every way (IEJ 11 (1961), p. 43). The governor of a district was threatened with imprisonment for disobeying directives (Mur. 43, DJD II, 160). Lack of enthusiasm in the war effort provoked immediate rebuke ('You sit and eat and drink from the property of the House of Israel, and care nothing for your brothers', IEJ 11 (1961), p. 47). The inhabitants of Tekoa were threatened with severe punishment for repairing their houses (*ibid.*, p. 42) and refusing to fight (*ibid.*, p. 48). Orders were issued for the disarming and arrest of a certain Joshua bar Tadmoraya (*ibid.*, p. 42).

Little new is learnt about the conduct of hostilities. The Romans

145. Cf. Chrysostom, *Orat. adv. Iudaeos*, v 10; Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, I, p. 437; Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecl. hist.* iii 24 (PG clxv); *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf I, p. 474. Cf. p. 535 above.

are rarely mentioned (IEJ 11 (1961), p. 46); in Mur. 42 (DJD II, p. 157) a visit by local leaders to the district commander was rendered impossible because of the proximity of the Gentiles (הגויים קרבים אלנו). The regular title given to the rebels in Greek documents is that of ἀδελφός (brother) (IEJ 11 (1961), pp. 44, 59-61). All the identifiable places held by Bar Kokhba which appear in the texts lie in the Judaeian desert: Herodium,<sup>146</sup> Tekoa, En-gedi, etc.<sup>147</sup> The Galileans whose ill-treatment by Joshua ben Galgula was strongly condemned by Bar Kosiba (Mur. 43, DJD II, pp. 159-60) were probably refugees from the northern province under Roman occupation rather than either rival Galilean troops or Judeo-Christians.

Neither the new sources, nor the classical and rabbinic texts report much about the actual course of the war. At the time of its outbreak, Tineius Rufus was governor of Judaea.<sup>148</sup> As he and his troops were no match for the rebels, the uprising not only swept victoriously through Palestine, but spread beyond its frontiers as well. Indeed, unruly elements of another kind allied themselves to the Jewish revolt so that ultimately 'the whole world, as it were, was in turmoil'.<sup>149</sup> An enormous effort was necessary to control the disturbance. Large numbers of troops were brought in from other provinces as reinforcements; 'the best generals' were assigned to Palestine.<sup>150</sup> Even the governor of Syria, Publicius Marcellus, hastened to the aid of his

[Text continues on page 549]

146. Against the view that Herodium was Bar Kokhba's headquarters (cf. J. T. Milik, DJD II, pp. 123 ff.), see Y. Yadin, IEJ 11 (1961), p. 51. But cf. E.-M. Laperrousaz, 'L'Héródium, quartier général de Bar Kokhba?', Syria 41 (1964), pp. 347-58.

147. The identification of מצד פרוסין (Fortress of the Pious) in Mur. 45 with Qumran, advanced by Milik, (DJD II, pp. 163-4), is based on the problematic derivation of 'Essene' from *Hasid*. See G. Vermes, RQ 2 (1960), pp. 429-30; 3 (1962), pp. 501-2.

148. See above, p. 518.

149. Dio lxix 13, 2, πάσης ὡς εἰπεῖν κινουμένης ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης.

150. Reinforcements: Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 1; *Chron. ad ann. Abrah.* 2148. Generals: Dio lxix 13, 2, τοὺς κρατίστους τῶν στρατηγῶν ὁ Ἀδριανὸς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐπέμψεν. The inscriptions establish that the following troops took part in the war (cf. RE XII, cols. 1291-2):

(1) The *legio III Cyrenaica*, which had been stationed in Egypt from the time of Augustus to that of Hadrian, and from the latter's time was to form the garrison of the newly established province of Arabia (see G. W. Bowersock, 'The Annexation and Initial Garrison of Arabia', *Zeit. Pap. u. Epig.* 5 (1970), pp. 37-47); a *vexillatio leg. III Cyr.* was already in Jerusalem in A.D. 116 (CIL III 13587= ILS 4393). A tribune of this legion was presented 'donis militaribus a divo Hadriano ob Iudaicam expeditionem' (CIL XIV 3610= ILS 1071); one of its centurions likewise 'ab imp. Hadriano corona aurea torquibus armillis phaleris ob bellum Iudeicum (*sic*)' (CIL X 3733= ILS 2083).

(2) The *leg. III Gallica*, which had probably belonged to the garrison of Syria since Augustus. One of its *emeriti* was 'ex voluntate imp. Hadriani Aug. torquibus

et armillis aureis suffragio legionis honorat(us)', doubtless as a result of the Jewish war (CIL XII 2230=ILS 2313). Cf. also CIL VI 1523=ILS 1092.

(3) Needless to say, the *leg. X Fretensis* as garrison of Judaea (see above, p. 509) also participated in the war.

(4) The *leg. VI Ferrata* will also have been involved, for it had previously belonged to the garrison of Syria, and from Hadrian's time formed the garrison of Judaea with the *leg. X Fretensis*. Add now N. Tzori, 'An Inscription of the Legio VI Ferrata from the Northern Jordan Valley', IEJ 21 (1971), pp. 53-4. The transfer of VI Ferrata probably took place before the war, see B. Lifschitz, 'Sur la date du transfert de la legio VI Ferrata en Palestine', Latomus 19 (1960), pp. 109-11.

(5) Concerning auxiliary cohorts, a considerable number of which doubtless took part, the *coh. IV Lingonum* is mentioned in the inscriptions. Its commander was presented 'vexillo mi[. d]onato a divo Hadriano in expeditione Iudaica[a]' (CIL VI 1523=ILS 1092). From a diploma of A.D. 139 three *alae* and twelve cohorts are known to have been at that moment stationed in Syria Palaestina (CIL XVI 87). Some of them, though not all, will have taken part in the war (e.g., the *coh. I Damasc.* was still in Egypt in A.D. 135).

(6) A legionary detachment involved in the Jewish war is mentioned in CIL VI 3505, 'Sex. Attius Senecio praef. *alae* [I] Fl. Gaetulorum, trib. *leg. X Geminae* missus a divo Hadriano in expeditione Iudaica ad vexilla[tiones] deducendas in . . . Note also CIL VIII 6706=ILS 1065 which describes Q. Lollius Urbicus (PIR<sup>2</sup> L 327) as 'legato imp. Hadriani in expeditione Iudaica . . . *leg. X Geminae*' (reverse chronological order, possibly but not certainly indicating that he was in Judaea as *legatus* of the legion).

An inscription at Bittir (Beth-ther) refers to detachments of the *leg. V Macedonica* and the *leg. XI Claudia*; Clermont-Ganneau, CRAI 1894, pp. 13 f.; the attribution of the inscription to this war is made more probable by a foundation-coin of Aelia Capitolina with the legend 'L.E. V'. See J. Meyshan, 'The Legion which reconquered Jerusalem in the War of Bar Kochba (A.D. 132-5)', PEQ 90 (1958), pp. 19-26.

The Gerasa inscription of 128-138, C. H. Kraeling, *Gerasa* (1938), p. 390, n. 30, shows the emperor's *equites singulares* wintering there possibly during the war, but more probably in A.D. 129/30.

An inscription from Campania, CIL X 3733=ILS 2083, mentions a man decorated by Hadrian, 'corona aurea torquibus armillis phaleris ob bellum Iudaicum'. He was successively centurion of III *Cyrenaica* and VII *Claudia* and *primus pilus* of II *Traiana*. It was probably in the latter post that he took part in the war, for an inscription from Caesarea shows a *vexillatio* of II *Traiana* there, A. Negev, IEJ 14 (1964), pp. 245-8.

The presence of part of the praetorian cohorts with the emperor at the war may be reflected in CIL XI 5646=ILS 2081, referring to military honours awarded by Hadrian to a *trecentarius* of that cohort.

If the disappearance of the *legio XXII Deiotariana* was due to its total destruction in the Jewish war, it might be the subject of Fronto's remark (p. 218 Naber; p. 206 Van den Hout), 'Hadriano imperium optinente quantum militum a Iudaeis . . . caesum?' This legion disappears from the Roman army-list sometime between A.D. 119, when it is attested in Egypt (BGU I. 140) and c. A.D. 145, when it is missing from an inscription from Rome listing the legions in geographical order (CIL VI 3492=ILS 2288). But the fact that it ceases to be mentioned in Egypt in the late 120s weakens the theory (RE XII, col. 1795).

(7) The Syrian fleet (*classis Syriaca*) may also have taken part, for its commander was presented 'donis militaribus a divo Hadriano ob bellum Iudaicum'

harassed colleague.<sup>151</sup> But it seems that Rufus remained in control for some time yet, for Eusebius names no other Roman commander, and speaks as though the rebellion was suppressed by him.<sup>152</sup> In rabbinical sources, too, 'Turranius Rufus' (טורניוס רופוס) is presented as the arch-enemy of the Jews at that time.<sup>153</sup> From Cassius Dio, however, whose statements are corroborated by an inscription, it appears that Iulius Severus, one of Hadrian's most outstanding generals, was in supreme command during the later period, and that it was he who effected the suppression of the revolt. He was recalled from Britain to direct the campaign and took a considerable time in crushing the rebellion. Nothing could be accomplished by open battle. He had to hunt out the rebels one by one, and where they remained hidden in caves, wear them down by cutting off their supplies. The burial niches in the 'Cave of Letters' and the 'Cave of Horror' in Naḥal Hever provide a gruesome archaeological illustration.<sup>154</sup> It was only after long and costly individual battles that it was finally possible to 'annihilate, exterminate and eradicate' them from the land (κατατρίψαι καὶ ἐκτριχῶσαι καὶ ἐκκόψαι).<sup>155</sup>

It is not entirely sure where Hadrian stayed during the war. He was probably at the scene of action during the critical years. When the revolt broke out, he had left Syria. The bad news then seems to have led him to return to Judaea, for his presence there is not only

either in this post or his previous one, *praefectus alae I Augustae geminae colonorum* (CIL VIII 8934=ILS 1400; see PIR<sup>2</sup> G 1344). On the Syrian fleet in general, see RE III, cols. 2642 ff.; C. G. Starr, *The Roman Imperial Navy* (1960), pp. 114-15. A fragmentary inscription, CIL VI 1565, also mentions the activity of the fleet in a 'bellum Iudaicum'. In this case also, the Hadrianic war should be understood (so Th. Mommsen, *Ephem. Epigr.* III, 331).

151. IGR III 174-5. See p. 518 above. The two inscriptions, which are all but identical in text, mention that Severus was commander of the *leg. IV Scythica* and governed Syria as praetorian *legatus* after Publicius Marcellus had left Syria on account of the Jewish war. Publicius Marcellus thus brought to Judaea a section of the Syrian garrison consisting of three or four legions, while Severus took over the administration of Syria, retaining meanwhile command of his legion. The *leg. IV Scythica* therefore remained behind in Syria with its commander.

152. HE iv. 6, 1 πολέμου τε νόμῳ τὰς χώρας αὐτῶν ἐξανδραποδίζόμενος.

153. bTaan 29a. Cf. J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 422; J. Levy, *NhWb* II, p. 149; M. Jastrow, *Dictionary* I, p. 527 s.v. טורניוס; W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten* I, 287-93. Although the name Turranius does appear in PIR<sup>2</sup> III, 344; and cf. Ἀπόλωντος Τυράνιος 'Ροῦφος in Phrygia, Mittheil. d. deutsch. archäol. Inst. Athens, 25 (1900), p. 607, the form Tineius is now assured (cf. p. 518 above). The rabbinic טורניוס may reflect the title 'Tyrannus'.

154. Cf. Y. Yadin, 'Expedition D', IEJ 11 (1961), pp. 37-8; Y. Aharoni, 'Expedition B—The Cave of Horror', IEJ 12 (1962), pp. 186-99; Yadin, *Bar Kokhba*, pp. 60-65.

155. Dio lxix 13, 3. The summoning of Iulius Severus to Judaea from Britain is also attested by CIL III 2830=ILS 1056, see PIR<sup>2</sup> I 576 and p. 519 above.

presumed in rabbinic tradition<sup>156</sup> but is also suggested by inscriptions<sup>157</sup> and by a letter from Hadrian to his architect Apollodorus enquiring about siege-engines to be used against tribes holding out in mountainous areas.<sup>158</sup> There is no reference to his being in Rome again until 5 May, A.D. 134.<sup>159</sup> He will have returned immediately success was assured, without waiting for the complete cessation of operations.

Both Dio and Eusebius are silent concerning the fate of Jerusalem, but it is unlikely to have been a centre of battle as in the war under Vespasian. Its fortifications were inadequate. Even if the rebels had managed to drive out the Roman garrison, recapture would have presented little difficulty to a sufficiently strong Roman force. That violence did occur there is nevertheless plain from the evidence of a contemporary, Appian.<sup>160</sup> When Appian speaks of 'destruction' (*κατασκάπτειν*), this is surely correct, in so far as a violent conquest is inconceivable without it. But, of course, after Titus's thoroughness, its object was but a limited one. On the other hand, once they were in control of the city again, the Romans will not have taken destruction any further than was necessary for founding the new city of Aelia. Eusebius also assumes that the city was besieged.<sup>161</sup> Certain Church fathers (e.g. Chrysostom, Jerome and others) maintain that Hadrian completely destroyed the vestiges of the old city left standing after the devastation by Titus. By this they merely mean that Hadrian completely demolished the old Jewish city and erected a new pagan one in its place.<sup>162</sup> It is stated in the Mishnah that on 9 Ab a plough was

156. bGit. 57a. Cf. J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 433-4.

157. Cf. CIL VIII 6706=ILS 1065, which describes Q. Lollius Urbicus as 'legatus imp. in expeditione Iudaica . . .', thus suggesting that Lollius was a personal adjutant to the emperor; also, possibly, CIL VI 974, probably A.D. 134 or 135, Hadrian '[lab]oribus max[imis] rempublicam ab ho[is]te liberaverit . . .'

158. Cf. Ernest Lacoste, 'Les poliorcétiques d' Apollodore', REG 3 (1890), pp. 234-81, revised by R. Schneider, Gött. Abh. hist.-phil. Kl. N.F. 10 (1908), pp. 1 ff. Cf. F. Millar, *Cassius Dio* (1964), pp. 65-6.

159. CIG 5906=IG XIV 1054=IGR I 149=Moretti, IGUR I 235. Cf. W. Weber, *Untersuchungen*, p. 276.

160. *Syn.* 50/252 τὴν μεγίστην πόλιν Ἱεροσόλυμα —, ἣν δὴ καὶ Ἰπτολεμαῖος ὁ πρῶτος Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς, καὶ Οὐεσπασιανὸς αὐτῆς οἰκισθεῖσαν κατέσκαψε, καὶ Ἀδριανὸς αὐτῆς ἐπ' ἐμοῦ.

161. Euseb. *Demonstr. evang.* vi 18, 10 notes that the prophecy of Zech. 14:2 ἐξελεύσεται τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς πόλεως ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ was fulfilled in Vespasian's time; the other half of the city, i.e. of the inhabitants, was then besieged in the time of Hadrian and expelled, τὸ λείπον τῆς πόλεως μέρος ἥμισυ πολιορκηθὲν αὐτῆς ἐξελεύσεται, ὡς ἐξ' ἐκεῖνόν καὶ εἰς δευρὸ πάμπαν ἄβατον αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι τὸν τόπον. Thus Eusebius does not speak of a destruction of the city, but only of an expulsion of its Jewish inhabitants after a preceding siege. He mentions the siege also in *HE* iv 5, 2.

162. Chrysostom, *adv. Iudaeos* v 11; Cedrenus ed. Bekker I, p. 437; Nicephorus Callistus, *Eccl. hist.* iii 24; Jerome, *Comm. in Ies.* I 1:6 (CCL lxxiii, p. 10), 'post

driven over Jerusalem. As the context shows, the time alluded to is that of Hadrian. The Babylonian Talmud and Jerome ascribe the deed to Rufus; but these two authorities speak of ploughing up the Temple area, not the city.<sup>163</sup> At most, the brief comment in the Mishnah is worth noting. But the rite would have signified, not the destruction, but the new foundation; it would consequently have taken place prior to the outbreak of the revolt.<sup>164</sup>

The last refuge of Bar Kokhba and his supporters was the strong mountain fort of Bether, not very far from Jerusalem according to Eusebius,<sup>165</sup> and in all probability on the site of present-day Bettir, 10 km south-west of Jerusalem.<sup>166</sup> An inscription found in Bettir, in which reference is made to detachments (*vexillationes*) of the *legio V Macedonica et XI Claudia*, may well date to this period and be regarded as a confirmation that this was the scene of the last great battle between Romans and Jews.<sup>167</sup> After long and stubborn resistance, this

Titum et Vespasianum et ultimam eversionem Ierusalem sub Aelio Hadriano usque ad praesens tempus nullum remedium est'. Cf. in *Ezech.* vii 24 (CCL lxxv, p. 326), 'post quinquaginta annos, sub Hadriano civitas aeterno igne consummata est'.

163. mTaan. 4:6 lists five disasters on 9 Ab. 'On 9 Ab it was decreed against our fathers that they should not enter into the Land (of Israel), and the Temple was destroyed the first and the second time, Beth-Tor(=Bethar, Bittir) was conquered and the City was ploughed up' (בית־טור וְהַעִיר). Further, bTaan. 20a relates that it was 'Turnus Rufus' who ordered the Temple site (ההיכל) to be ploughed up. The whole passage is reproduced almost word for word by Jerome, who expressly acknowledges the Jewish tradition ('cogimur igitur ad Hebraeos recurrere'), in *Zachariam* 8: 19 (CCL lxxvi A, p. 820), 'In hoc mense et a Nabuchodonosor et multa post saecula a Tito et Vespasiano templum Ierosolymis incensum est atque destructum; capta urbs Bether, ad quam multa millia confugerant Iudaeorum; aratum templum in ignominiam gentis oppressae a T. Annio (leg. Tinnio) Rufo'.

164. That a plough was driven over Jerusalem as a sign of devastation is not improbable, because the establishment of a new city was in fact envisaged, but it may well have been done as an act of inauguration. The rite was the same in both cases. See Servius *ad Virgil. Aeneid.* iv 212 'cum conderetur nova civitas, aratrum adhibitum, ut eodem ritu quo condita subvertatur'. The passage from Vairo, cited by Servius, *Virgil. Aeneid.* v 755, provides a precise description of the rite.

165. Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 13. Cf. yTaan. 68d-69a; mTann. 4:6. The name of the locality is variously spelt, בית־טור or בית־טור in Hebrew, Βίθηρη, Βέθηρη or Βήθηρη in Euseb. *HE*, and Bethar in Rufinus.

166. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 271. For a survey see E. Zuckermann, 'Chirbet el-jehud (bettir)', ZDPV 29 (1906), pp. 51-72. The unexcavated site reveals traces of a Roman wall of circumvallation, see A. Schulten in ZDPV 56 (1933), pp. 180-4, and remains of what might have been a mint of Bar Kokhba have been found, see B. Kirschner, 'A Mint of Bar-Kokhba?', Bull. J. Pal. Explor. Soc. 13, (1946), pp. 153-60 (Hebrew; English summary, p. xi). Cf. Yadin, *Bar Kokhba*, pp. 192-3.

167. See p. 548 above.

bulwark too was taken in the 18th year of Hadrian = A.D. 134/135<sup>168</sup> on the 9 Ab, according to rabbinical tradition.<sup>169</sup> In the conquest of the town, Bar Kokhba, 'the author of their madness', paid 'the just penalty'.<sup>170</sup> Nothing is known of the siege and capture. Rabbinic legends give various accounts of the struggle, but these are products of the imagination. The only story deserving mention relates that before the capture, R. Eleazar, the uncle of Bar Kokhba, was put to death by his nephew because he falsely suspected him of having come to an understanding with the Romans.<sup>171</sup>

With the fall of Bether, the three and a half years of war (A.D. 132-135) were at an end.<sup>172</sup> During it, many rabbis had died a martyr's death. Ten such martyrs, among them R. Akiba, are particularly honoured in rabbinic tradition.<sup>173</sup>

168. Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 3.

169. m.Taan. 4:6, and Jerome, in *Zachariam* 8:19 (CCL lxxviA, p. 820). If this tradition is to be believed, Ab of A.D. 135 is probably meant, for the war is likely to have lasted until that year.

170. Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 3.

171. The legends relating to the fall of Bether are to be found mainly in yTaan. 68d-69a, and Lam. R. 2:2. On the death of Eleazar, see J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 433-4; W. Bacher, *Tannaiten* I, pp. 187-8. In describing the frightful bloodbath caused by the Romans, rabbinical legend employs the same hyperbole as used by the writer of the Book of Revelation, viz., that the blood came up to the horses' nostrils (Rev. 14:20, 'up to their bridles, ἄχρι τῶν χαλῶν τῶν ἵππων. . .'). Cf. also i Enoch 100:3, 'A horse will wade up to its chest in the blood of the sinners.'

172. That the war of Bar-Kokhba lasted 3½ years is attested by *Seder Olam* (see above, p. 534). Jerome also gives it as the view of some *Hebraei* that the last septennium of Daniel 9:27 is to be divided between the time of Vespasian and that of Hadrian, *Com. in Daniel* 9:27 (CCL lxxvA, p. 888), 'tres autem anni et sex menses sub Hadriano reputentur: quando Hierusalem omnino subversa est et Iudaeorum gens catervatim caesa'. In the Palestinian Talmud (yTaan. 68d) the 3½ years are given as the duration of the siege of Bether; in Lam. R. 3½ years for the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian and 3½ years for that of Bether by Hadrian; see J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 431. Although these sources are not of great weight, it is in fact correct that the war lasted about three and a half years (the late sources confuse the duration of the war with that of the siege of Bether). For the beginning of the war in A.D. 132, see p. 542 above. For the evidence that it ended in 135 see p. 553 below.

173. According to bBer. 61b R. Akiba was martyred by having the flesh ripped from his body with iron combs. But he continued to utter the words of the *Shema*, and just as he was prolonging the word **יהוה** (one), as prescribed, he breathed his last. Thereupon a Bath Kol (voice from heaven) proclaimed, 'Blessed are you, R. Akiba, that your soul departed with **יהוה**'. There are numerous references elsewhere in the older Midrashic literature and in the Talmuds to the martyrdom of other rabbis, but the list of ten martyrs is first found in the post-Talmudic midrash *Elleh Ezkerah*. Cf. Zunz, p. 150; Strack, pp. 226-7. Cf. M. Beer, 'An Ancient saying regarding Martyrdom in Hadrian's Time', *Zion* 28 (1963), pp. 228-32 (in Hebrew).

The victory brought Hadrian his second acclamation as *Imperator*.<sup>174</sup> Iulius Severus was granted the *ornamenta triumphalia*, and officers and men were given the usual rewards.<sup>175</sup> It was a victory gained at a heavy cost however. So great were the casualties that Hadrian, in his letter to the Senate, omitted the usual opening formula that he and the army were well.<sup>176</sup> Even more serious than the direct loss of men was the spoliation of the fruitful and prosperous province. 'The whole of Judaea was practically a desert.' Fifty forts were destroyed and 985 villages, 580,000 Jews (?) fell in battle and those who succumbed to illness or starvation were uncounted.<sup>177</sup> Innumerable multitudes were sold as slaves. So many were offered for sale at the annual market at the Terebinth at Hebron that a Jewish slave fetched no more than a horse. Those who could not be disposed of were taken to Gaza and sold there, or were sent to Egypt, many of them dying on the way from hunger or shipwreck.<sup>178</sup>

In Jerusalem the plan conceived already before the war was put into effect; the city was turned into a Roman colony with the name Aelia Capitolina.<sup>179</sup> To ensure the permanence of its purely pagan character, Jews still residing there were driven out and Gentile colonists settled in their place.<sup>180</sup> From then on no Jew was permitted to enter the city area; any Jew seen there was punished with death.<sup>181</sup> The official name of the newly-founded city appears on the coins as 'Col(onia) Ael(ia) Cap(itolina)', though writers as a rule call it simply 'Aelia'.<sup>182</sup> Its

174. In Hadrian's titulature, the title *Imp(erator)* II is still missing from two diplomas dated from 2 April and 15 September A.D. 134 (CIL XVI 78-9). It is also absent in other inscriptions from A.D. 134 (CIL VI 973; IX 4359). But it appears in A.D. 135, see RE I, cols. 514-15.

175. On Sex. Iulius Severus, see p. 519 above.

176. Dio lxix 14, 3. Cf. Fronto, *Epistulae*, ed. Naber, pp. 217-18; Van den Hout, p. 206, 'Quid? avo vestro Hadriano imperium optinente quantum militum a Iudaeis, quantum ab Britannis caesum?'

177. Dio lxix 14, 3.

178. Jerome, in *Zachariam* 11:5 (CCL lxxviA, p. 851); in *Hieremiam* 6:18 (CCL lxxiv, p. 307). *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf I, p. 474. On the Terebinth at Hebron, see Jos. B.J. iv 9, 7 (533).

179. See Abel, *Histoire* II, pp. 97-102; CAH XI, pp. 313-14; A. H. M. Jones, 'The Urbanisation of Palestine', *JRS* 21 (1931), pp. 77-85, esp. 82 ff.

180. Dio lxix 12, 2; Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 4; *Demonstr. evang.* vi 18, 10; Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 279. Cf. M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte*, pp. 50-1, 79-81.

181. Justin, i *Apol.* 47, 6 ὅτι δὲ φυλάσσειται ὑφ' ἑμῶν ὅπως μηδεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ γένηται, καὶ θάνατος κατὰ τοῦ καταλαμβανομένου Ἰουδαίου εἰσιόντος ἄριστοι, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 16; Ariston of Pella, in Euseb. *HE* iv 6, 3. Tertullian, *adv. Iudaeos* 13. Cf. pp. 37-9 above.

182. The name 'Aelia Capitolina' is given in full in Dio lxix 12, 1; Ulpian, *Dig.* I 15, 1, 6 and the Peutinger Table ('Helya Capitolina'); Ptolemy v 16, 8 and viii 20, 18 reads *Αἰλία Καπιτωλιάς*. On milestones it is found abbreviated as *Κολ. Αἰλία Καπιτωλ.* (CIL III 6649). It was called 'Aelia' after Hadrian's family name, and 'Capitolina' after Jupiter Capitolinus. For the coins, see L. Kadman, *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina* (1956).



constitution was that of a Roman colony, although it did not have the *ius Italicum*.<sup>183</sup> Needless to say, it was not lacking in the usual splendid buildings: the *Chronicon paschale* lists τὰ δύο δημόσια καὶ τὸ θέατρον καὶ τὸ τρικάμαρον καὶ τὸ τετράνυμφον καὶ τὸ δωδεκάπυλον τὸ πρὶν ὀνομαζόμενον ἀναβαθμοὶ καὶ τὴν κώδραν.<sup>184</sup> The image of a pig is said to have been carved on the southern gate of the city, facing towards Bethlehem.<sup>185</sup> The main cult of the city was that of Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom a temple was erected on the site of the former Temple of the Jews.<sup>186</sup> It appears to have contained the statue of Hadrian, of which Christian writers speak.<sup>187</sup> Besides Jupiter, the following deities of the city are represented on coins: Bacchus, Serapis,

183. Ulpian, *Dig. L 15, 1, 6*: 'In Palaestina duae fuerunt coloniae, Caesarensis et Aelia Capitolina, sed neutra ius Italicum habet'. Cf. Paulus, *Dig. L 15, 8, 7*; CIL III 116 = 6639. The coins of the colony extend as far as Valerian (A.D. 253-260). According to the *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf I, p. 474, the city was divided into seven districts: καὶ ἐμέρισεν τὴν πόλιν εἰς ἑπτὰ ἀμφοδὰ καὶ ἔστησεν ἀνθρώπους ἰδίους ἀμφοδάρχας καὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀμφοδάρχη ἀπένευμεν ἀμφοδόν.

184. *Chron. paschale*, ed. Dindorf I, p. 474. The Bordeaux Pilgrim mentions a tombstone of the Patriarchs in Hebron 'per quadrum ex lapidibus mirae pulchritudinis' (*Itinera Hierosolym.*, ed. P. Geyer, CSEL xxix (1889), p. 25 = CCL clxxv, p. 20), and in Jerusalem, by the Pool of Siloam, a 'quadriporticum' (*ibid.*, p. 22; CCL clxxv, p. 16).

185. Jerome, *Chron. ad ann. Abr. 2152* (Eusebius, *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 169; Jerome, *Chron.*, ed. Helm, p. 201). 'Aelia ab Aelio Hadriano condita, et in fronte eius portae qua Bethleem egredimur sus sculptus in marmore significans Romanae potestati subiaccere Iudaeos'. The image of a pig, or rather of a boar, is also found on a coin discovered in Jerusalem, belonging to the *leg. X Fretensis*, see Kadman, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-8. Likewise on stamps of the *leg. X Fret.* found in Jerusalem, see D. Barag, *Bonn. Jahrb. 167* (1967), pp. 245-6.

186. Dio lxix 12, 1: Jupiter is represented relatively rarely on the coins from Aelia, see Kadman, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-3. Note the questionable testimony of Hippolytus, in a fragment of commentary on Matth. 24:15 f. preserved in Syriac: 'Vespasian placed no idolatrous image in the Temple, but rather that legion which Traianus Quintus, a Roman commander posted there, erected an idol named *Cove*'. GCS Hippolytus Werke I. 2 ed. Achelis (1897), pp. 244-5. Cf. Harnack, TU VI, 3, pp. 141-2, 147. The temple erected by Hadrian was certainly devoted to Jupiter, but a pagan cult was surely not established on the site of the Sanctuary in the period between Vespasian and Hadrian. There is therefore some confusion in this statement which may have arisen subsequently to the original text of Hippolytus.

187. Jerome, in *Esaiam* i 2, 9 (CCL lxxiii, p. 33) 'ubi quondam erat templum et religio Dei, ibi Hadriani statua et Iovis idolum collocatum est'; *Com. in Matt.* 24:15 (CCL lxxvii, p. 226), 'potest autem simpliciter aut de Ante Christo accipi aut de imagine Caesaris, quam Pilatus posuit in templo, aut de Hadriani equestri statua quae in ipso sancto sanctorum loco usque in praesentem diem stetit'. This would seem to imply that the statue of Hadrian stood in the temple of Jupiter. Cf. also Chrysostom, *Orat. adv. Iudaeos*, v 11; Cedrenus, ed. Bekker I, p. 438; Nicephorus Callistus, *Eccl. hist.* iii 24. The Bordeaux Pilgrim speaks of two statues of Hadrian (*Itinera Hierosolym.*, ed. P. Geyer, CSEL xxix, p. 22 = CCL clxxv, p. 16).

Astarte and the Dioscuri. A shrine to Aphrodite (Astarte) stood on the traditional site of Jesus' tomb;<sup>188</sup> or according to another version, a shrine to Jupiter stood on the grave; and a sanctuary to Venus on the place of the crucifixion.<sup>189</sup>

The total paganisation of Jerusalem was the fulfilment of a scheme long before attempted by Antiochus Epiphanes. In another respect, too, the measures adopted by Hadrian resembled his. The ban on circumcision, promulgated before the war and not specifically directed against the Jews (see above, p. 538), was now unquestionably maintained. Not until the time of Antoninus Pius were Jews permitted to circumcise their children again (see above, p. 539). Jewish tradition, which likewise commemorates this ban, maintains that it was also forbidden to celebrate the Sabbath and to study the Torah.<sup>190</sup> Whether or not this statement is reliable, the prohibition of circumcision was, to the Jewish mind, tantamount to a ban on Judaism itself. As long as it was maintained, there could be no question of pacification. In point of fact, another attempted rebellion under Antoninus Pius needed to be put down by force.<sup>191</sup> Here the Roman administration were faced with the choice of either tolerating the religious rites or totally destroying the people. Presumably, it was the recognition of these alternatives that persuaded the emperor Antoninus to permit circumcision again and exercise tolerance.

Under Hadrian's successor, therefore, essentially the same state of affairs prevailed as had existed since Vespasian. It in no way corresponded to the political ideals of the Jews. But as regarded their religion they could be satisfied with it. It was, in effect, precisely the annihilation of Israel's political existence which led to the triumph of rabbinic Judaism.

Development now continued along the lines marked out earlier by the great upheaval resulting from the destruction of Jerusalem. Without a political home and unified only by the ideal of the Torah, the Jews from then on held all the more tenaciously to this common

188. Euseb. *Vita Constant.* iii 26; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* 21 (1931), p. 82.

189. Jerome, *Epist.* 58 *ad Paulinum*, 3 (CSEL liv, pp. 531-2): 'Ab Hadriani temporibus usque ad imperium Constantini per annos circiter centum octoginta in loco resurrectionis simulacrum Iovis, in crucis rupe statua Veneris a gentibus posita colebatur'. Jerome's divergence from Eusebius obviously has its basis in the legend of the discovery of the Cross. Cf. RE: VII 2, cols. 2830 ff.

190. See, e.g., Mekh. on Exod. 20:6 (ed. Lauterbach II, p. 247). Cf. E. M. Smallwood, 'The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision', *Latomus* 18 (1959), pp. 334-47. See also J. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 430; G. Alon, *op. cit.* II, pp. 56-8. Cf. S. Klein, 'The Hadrianic Persecution and the Rabbinic Law of Sale', *JQR* 23 (1932-3), pp. 211-31.

191. HA, *vita Ant. Pii* 5, 4. 'Iudaeos rebellantes contudit per praesides ac legatos'.

treasure and cherished it. In the process, the division between them and the rest of the world became more pronounced. Whereas in the heyday of Hellenistic Judaism the boundaries between the Jewish and Graeco-Roman philosophy of life had threatened to vanish, Jews and Gentiles now joined forces to ensure that the gulf between them remained deep. Proselytism slowed down, and pagans ceased to flock to the God of the Jews, partly because the Roman state, without revoking the toleration of Jewish religion guaranteed since the time of Caesar, none the less erected legal barriers to its propagation.

The Jews thus tended to become more and more strangers in the Gentile world, despite the many surviving bonds linking them to it.<sup>192</sup> The re-establishment of a Jewish state was, and remained, an object of religious expectation. But the contrast between the ideal and reality was at first, and continued for centuries to be, so sharp and severe that Jews were not even permitted to enter the capital of their hoped-for kingdom as visitors. Even by the fourth century, they were only allowed access to the city once a year by Constantine, on the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem (9 Ab), to make their lamentations on the site of the Temple.<sup>193</sup> Jerome depicts in graphic terms how the Jews used to come there on that day in pitiful proces-

192. For a fuller understanding of the evolution of Judaism, many other factors must also be taken into account. Note for the development of the political position of the Ethnarchy and its holders' contacts with the outside world, M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud* (1962); for the presence of Greek influence in rabbinic writings, S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (1942; <sup>2</sup>1965); *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (1950); for Greek inscriptions on tombs, including those of leading rabbis, B. Lifshitz, 'L'hellénisation des Juifs de Palestine: à propos des inscriptions de Besara (Beth-Shearim)', *RB* 72 (1965), pp. 520-38; *Beth She'arim II: The Greek Inscriptions* (1967) (in Hebrew with English summary); cf. also J. N. Sevenster, *Do you know Greek?* (1968); J. Brand, 'Concerning Greek Culture in Palestine during the Talmudic Period', *Tarbiz* 38 (1968-9), pp. 13-17 (in Hebrew); for the architecture and decoration of synagogues of the third century A.D. onwards, E. L. Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (1934); E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period I: The Archaeological Evidence from Palestine* (1953); for the more liberal rabbinic attitude to representational art in this period, C. H. Kraeling, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report VIII.1: The Synagogue* (1956), pp. 340-6; E. E. Urbach, 'The Rabbinical Laws of Idolatry in the Second and Third Centuries in the Light of Archaeological and Historical Facts', *IEJ* 9 (1959), pp. 149-65, 229-45; J. Guttman, 'The Second Commandment and the Image of God', *HUCA* 32 (1961), pp. 161-74; E. R. Goodenough, 'The Rabbis and Jewish Art in the Greco-Roman Period', *ibid.*, pp. 269-79; cf. G. Vermes, *CHB I* (1970), pp. 217-18; for the survival of Jewish proselytism, M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (<sup>2</sup>1964), pp. 334-51, 482-8; B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental* (1960), pp. 159-62; cf. also S. Zeitlin, 'Proselytes and Proselytism during the Second Commonwealth and The Early Tannaitic Period', *H. A. Wolfson Jubilee Volume II* (1965), pp. 871-81.

sions, how they lamented and bought permission from the Roman guards to remain longer at their place of wailing.

'Usque ad praesentem diem, perfidi coloni post interfectionem servorum, et ad extremum Filii Dei, excepto planctu prohibentur ingredi Hierusalem, et ut ruinam suae eis flere liceat civitatis pretio redimunt, ut qui quondam emerant sanguinem Christi emant lacrimas suas et non fletus quidem eis gratuitus sit. Videas in die, quo capta est a Romanis et diruta Hierusalem, venire populum lugubrem, confluere decrepitas mulierculas et senes pannis annisque obsitos, in corporibus et in habitu suo iram Domini demonstrantes. Congregatur turba miserorum; et patibulo Domini coruscante et radiante ἀναστάσει eius, de Oliveti monte quoque crucis fulgente vexillo, plangere ruinas templi sui populum miserum, et tamen non esse miserabilem: adhuc fletus in genis et livida brachia et sparsi crines, et miles mercedem postulat, ut illis flere plus liceat; et dubitat aliquis, quum haec videat, de die tribulationis et angustiae, de die calamitatis et miseriae, de die tenebrarum et caliginis, de die nebulae et turbinis, de die tubae et clangoris? Habent enim et in luctu tubas, et iuxta prophetiam vox sollennitatis versa est in planctum. Ululant super cineres sanctuarii, et super altare destructum et super civitates quondam minitas et super excelsos angulos templi, de quibus quondam Iacobum fratrem Domini praecipitaverunt.'<sup>194</sup>

Yet the tears of mourning concealed hope, and hope refused to die.

193. See M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte . . .*, pp. 165-6.

194. Jerome, in *Sophon.* 1:15-6 (CCL lxxviA, pp. 673-4). Cf. also Origen, in *Iosuum* 17:1 (GCS Origenes VII, pp. 401-2). The Bordeaux Pilgrim (*Itinera Hierosol.*, ed. P. Geyer, CSEL xxxix, p. 22=CCL clxxv, p. 16).