

## Points of View on the Second Jewish Revolt

Shimon Applebaum

One would expect the interest of scholars in the second Jewish revolt to have reawakened with the discoveries in the Judaean Desert and the light they cast on Ben Koziba and his movement. The actual reactions were more restricted and, from some points of view, myopic. Important and informative as was the material found at Murabba'at and Naḥal Ḥever, it threw little actual light on the causes and the course of Hadrian's Jewish war. Wider reactions were slow to come, and most of them appear to post-date 1976, when my own *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt (132–135)*<sup>1</sup> was published.

I can sympathize with Professor Bowersock's somewhat sardonic reaction to the heroicizing, sometimes sentimental trend resulting from the Judaean Desert discoveries. He named his reaction 'A Roman Perspective on the Bar Kochba War.'<sup>2</sup> An analysis of the Roman perspective would be useful and enlightening. Actually this is not 'the other side of the hill'; it is merely a statement that 'this side' has nothing to offer that affects our information. To write from a Roman imperial point of view, moreover, is no novelty; it has been the normal approach of ancient historians, even when they possessed some knowledge of the rabbinical sources. A major work has recently been produced on the Jews under Roman rule, which deploys vast learning, unlimited care and much consideration for the Jewish point of view,<sup>3</sup> yet is

1 *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt, (132–135)*, *British Archaeological Reports*, Supplement 7, Oxford 1976.

2 G.W. Bowersock, *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, ed. W.S. Green, II, 1978, pp. 131 sqq.

3 A.M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, Leiden 1976.

written without direct knowledge either of Jewish sources in Hebrew Aramaic or of what some modern Israeli scholars are saying. It is a Roman official's report on relations with the troublesome minority.

In any case, to write from a Roman point of view implies a consideration of how it was influenced by Jewish thought and behaviour. And it should take into account what light Jewish sources throw on Roman attitudes and actions. It should certainly pay attention to what Jewish scholars are writing on the same theme. But Professor Bowersock is content to cite Dr. Peter Schaefer to the effect that 'there is, for the most part, no authentic history to be drawn from them' — sc. from the Jewish rabbinical sources. Further, Professor Bowersock has exhibited indifference even to new non-Jewish material which has a bearing on the history and nature of the revolt. My *Prolegomena* is either unknown to him or ignored.

It is unfortunately necessary to deal systematically with various statements in Professor Bowersock's article which are not reconcilable with past or recent information.

"Arms were accumulated, fortifications prepared in the field, funds were collected,... the rebels forced the Roman garrison to leave Jerusalem. A whole legion, the XXII Deiotariana, disappeared in the course of the war. We lack a Josephus to give us a just appreciation of the Bar Kochba war."<sup>4</sup> "All this, except the last remark," writes Bowersock, "is probably wrong." Having acknowledged the courtesy of the word 'probably' in reference to the late Professor Avi-Yonah's above statements, we are bound to observe that the accumulation of arms is recorded by Xiphilinus' epitomy of Dio (69, 12–14); the fortifications, even if we exclude the underground 'bunkers' used by the Jewish resistance, described in the same source, and now being discovered in increasing numbers in Judaea and Lower Galilee,<sup>5</sup> — are referred to by Xiphilinus,<sup>6</sup> who speaks of fifty strongpoints (φρούρια) and 985 presumably fortified villages taken by the Romans in the course of the war.<sup>7</sup> Such are also

4 M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine*, Oxford 1976, pp. 12–13.

5 For a list of sites, M. Gihon, *Revue internationale d'histoire militaire*, 42, 1979, p. 18, n. 15; further cases have now been found to the north and south of Beth Govrin — e.g. Hirbet Shem Tov.

6 69. 14.

7 The approximate authenticity of the first figure is confirmed by Rabbinical sources — *Mid. Lam. R.*, II, 5 (20); cf. S. Yeivin, *The War of Bar Kochba*, Jerusalem, 1946, p. 176, (Heb.). For a discussion of the village figure, v. Applebaum, *Prolegomena*, (n. 1), pp. 34–5; the evidence of archaeological surveys

referred to, we suppose, in Apollodorus' preface to his *Poliorketika*, addressed to Hadrian.<sup>8</sup> To the problems affecting the XXII Deiotariana and the X Fretensis I shall refer below.

Bowersock's utilization of Dr. Schaefer's bold assessment of the historical value of the rabbinical sources requires further comment. These sources vary a great deal in character and aim, and none claims to be a reasoned account such as Tacitus or Josephus might have written. But the midrashic accounts of agrarian conditions between 70 and 132 and the halakhic rulings connected with them<sup>9</sup> are genuine sources which must be seriously considered. Nor are the traditions collected in the talmuds to be ignored. Many of their details may be embroidery, but the general picture to be drawn from them is valid and useful once one is certain of their date. Whatever one concludes from the rabbinic reactions and rulings, (the latter can in no sense be classed as folklore) evoked by the harassment practised by the Roman government against Jewish customs before the rising,<sup>10</sup> or to the persecution after it<sup>11</sup> — they cannot be dismissed as having no bearing on history; they all furnish sociological material. The Arthurian 'legends' bear a folkloristic and epic character, but they rest on a substratum of history which British archaeologists and historians have been steadily uncovering over the last four decades. They contain, I believe, nothing so solid as a rabbinical ruling concerning behaviour in the hour of religious persecution, or the legal position when a farmer's field is seized by a Roman soldier.

As to Fronto's words to Marcus Aurelius reminding him of Roman military losses at the hands of Britons and Jews, and regarded by Bowersock as relating, in the latter instance, to the rising of Ben Koziba, — why is he so

carried out in Judaea and Samaria confirms, in the author's opinion, the genuineness of Dio's report.

8 ...ἀλλως γὰρ πολιορκεῖται κτλ. ....καὶ ἄλλως ἐθνή καὶ κλίματα ὑπὸ τῆς τυχοῦσης περιτροπῆς εὐτροπούμενα.

9 Applebaum, *Prolegomena*, pp. 9–12; *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 8, Berlin 1977, pp. 385–395.

10 G. Alon, *Hist. of the Jews of Eretz Yisrael in the Period of the Mishnah and the Talmud*, II, Tel Aviv, 1955, pp. 12 sqq. (Heb.); Applebaum, *Prolegomena*, p. 21 for the Roman intelligence operating to detect the observance of Jewish religious practices; cf. S. Safrai, *Roman Frontier Studies*, Tel Aviv 1971, p. 225; E. Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüdischen Volkes*, I, ii (Eng. transl.), Edinburgh 1890, pp. 62–3.

11 For the full sources, D.M. Herr, *Persecution and Martyrdom in Hadrian's Days*, *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, Jerusalem, 1972.

certain that they refer to that event? Could not the words *Hadriano imperium obtinente* imply a reference to the Jewish diaspora revolts of 115–117, not yet suppressed when Hadrian acceded? Recent students of Roman Britain find evidence of disaster in Britain under Trajan, but less so later, and the IX Hispana is no longer thought to have been lost so early, or in Britain.<sup>12</sup> Fronto may give the Roman perspective, therefore, but it may not be in reference to Judaea under Hadrian. As regards allusions to the war by a contemporary of Hadrian, Bowersock seems to have forgotten Appian, who mentions Jerusalem in the context of the Jewish war,<sup>13</sup> and also refers to Britain in a way suggesting that there was talk of giving up that province altogether.<sup>14</sup>

When we turn to matters military, I do not know on what evidence the inscription of VI Ferrata on the Caesarea aqueduct can be dated before 132. The milestone with an inscription of II Traiana south-east of 'Akko<sup>15</sup> is not, unfortunately, incontrovertible proof that the legion was then on the Judaeian establishment. Not all scholars agree that the II Traiana is recorded, although I personally am prepared to accept that reading. The trouble is that this is on the boundary between Syria and Judaea, and there is evidence, which Bowersock could have known, that the legion was operating in Syria<sup>16</sup> and further that it was at this time under a joint command with III Cyrenaica, which could mean also Arabia.<sup>17</sup> Nor was Judaea necessarily quiet between 115–117. Archaeological evidence of a burnt building at Jaffa<sup>18</sup> might belong to that time, but equally (I think more probably) to 107, when Pompeius Falco was governing the country. There may also have been trouble at Gerasa.<sup>19</sup> In any case, the term *Pulmus Qitos*<sup>20</sup> (*pulmus* = Greek πόλεμος), applied to the year 115–117, cannot relate to any country except Judaea.

12 E.B. Birley ap. Butler (ed.), *Soldier and Civilian in Roman Yorkshire*, Leicester 1971, pp. 71 sqq.; cf. *id.*, *Britain and the Roman Army*, Kendal, 1953, pp. 25–8. Further now P. Salway *Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981, p. 173, claiming trouble under the governor Pompeius Falco (118–122), but the evidence is uncertain.

13 *Hist. Romana*, Syriaca, 50.

14 Syriaca, Praef., 8.

15 *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epig.*, 33, 1979, pp. 149 sqq.

16 L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions grecques et romaines de la Syrie*, I Paris, 1929, pp. 234; cf. *CIL* III, 151 and p. 1139.

17 *CIL* XIII, 1802 (Lyon).

18 Y. Kaplan, *JQR* 54, 1963, pp. 112–113; revised from 107 to 104 CE.; also *Eretz Israel*, 15, 1981, pp. 412 sqq. (Heb.)

19 Applebaum, *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*, Leiden 1979, pp. 307–8.

20 *Seder 'Olam Rabba*, Rattner, 30, pp. 145–6.

'Scholars who wish to claim that the 'twenties of the 2nd century were a time of increasing pressures and persecutions in Palestine will have to rely on intuition instead of evidence.' (Bowersock). The fact remains that there are several cases of 'bandit' violence recorded in that time,<sup>21</sup> and to the same decade belongs a considerable group of rabbinical utterances expressing a strong messianic mood.<sup>22</sup> Apart from the oppressive agrarian situation<sup>23</sup>, the doubling of the legionary and auxiliary forces in the province implied by its promotion to consular status would have also meant the doubling of the contributions exacted from the population for their support. An instruction of Domitian<sup>24</sup> prohibiting the illegal commandeering of draught-teams and quarters in Syria, refers specifically to the exhausted state of the province and of the peasantry in particular. If this was the situation in Syria, then how much more so in contemporary Judaea. Jewish sources, moreover, refer to great poverty in the latter country under Hadrian.<sup>25</sup>

The latest known record of the XXII Deiotariana in Egypt, to the best of my knowledge, belongs to the year 122,<sup>26</sup> not to 119. 'There is no indication that the legion was in Palestine under Hadrian at any time' — writes Bowersock. Abel, however, noted as early as 1952, that Julius Africanus recorded its destruction by the Jews, alleging that its wine had been poisoned by the Pharisees (!).<sup>27</sup> Further, the legion's name was inscribed on a tablet affixed to the Caesarea aqueduct, and then duly erased — this was ascertained by Drs. B. Isaac, Y. Roll and myself several years ago.<sup>28</sup>

The praise of Hadrian in the *Sibylline Oracles* (V, 48–50) is problematic but not utterly surprising. There were always Jewish groups who were prepared "to go along" with the government. The lines might well reflect the brief period when Hadrian is thought to have opened negotiations with the Jewish leadership in Judaea concerning the possibility of the reestablishment of the

21 *Prolegomena*, pp. 18–19; Alon, *op. cit.*, (n. 10), II, pp. 1 sqq.

22 Cf. Y. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, Jerusalem 1927 (Heb.), pp. 250 sqq.

23 *Prolegomena*, pp. 9 sqq.; *Aufstieg u. Niederg.*, II, 8, pp. 385 sqq.

24 Jalabert, Mouterde, *op. cit.*, (n. 16), V, 1959, no. 1998: *Syria*, 34, 1957, pp. 278 sqq.

25 Alon, *op. cit.*, II, p. 3.

26 H.G. Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes equestres*, I, Paris 1960, no. 108, p. 259.

27 A. Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen der altkristlichen Literatur*, IV, 1882, p. 44; M.T. Abel, *Hist. de la Palestine*, II, Paris 1952, p. 93, n. 1.

28 *Latomus*, 38, 1979, pp. 60–1.

Temple cult.<sup>29</sup> Things might have looked singularly rosy after Hadrian's retreat from Parthia and the execution of Lusius Quietus. Against this passage we may set *Oracula Sibyllina* VIII, 57, which is a mocking rhyme concerning the deification of Antinous, to be derived, I believe, from a satiric ditty then current among the Jewish population. This cannot have been before the year 131, and must have been composed among Greek-speaking city-dwellers; Egypt, Cyprus and Cyrene are excluded from possible areas. The composition merely reflects a much broader Jewish reaction, and Hadrian's general policy and behaviour in the east were quite sufficient to generate hostility among the region's Jewish population.

On the founding of Aelia Capitolina before the revolt we may concur with Professor Bowersock. But it may encourage him to know that the numismatic evidence is not confined to one coin-hoard; four more such hoards from the Hebron district have yielded similar evidence. They were unfortunately published in a somewhat obscure work,<sup>30</sup> but were referred to in the *Prolegomena*.<sup>31</sup>

The vexed question of Hadrian's alleged ban on circumcision requires one preliminary remark. We encounter once again in Bowersock's article the hoary and hollow excuse that as the prohibition was general and not confined to the Jews, it was not directed against them. This approach seems to me to overestimate Hadrian's naïveté and to underestimate the state of his information. I can only repeat here what I wrote in the *Prolegomena*: 'Relevant is Anatole France's acid comment, that all men are equal before the law, which permits neither the rich man nor the poor to sleep on a bench in the park'. Fortunately for Professor Bowersock, it is still highly doubtful if Hadrian ever issued a general edict against circumcision. Dr. Schaefer's amendment to the translation of Pius' *rescriptio*, to mean that Jews might circumcise *only* their sons, does little to change the situation, and if it does suggest that a total prohibition had previously existed, Pius was nevertheless forced to refer for authority to Hadrian's edict against castration, which is so radically different from circumcision that it casts doubt on a previous prohibition of the latter. Recent studies have indeed led some Jewish scholars to suggest that the measure was applied locally and perhaps at various times and places by the

29 The sources are collected and analysed by Alon, *Hist. of the Jews* (n. 10), I, pp. 272–289; also Smallwood, *Historia* 11, 1962, pp. 505–541; *The Jews under Roman Rule*, (n. 2), pp. 424 sqq.

30 *The Hebron Mountains; collected Sources and Articles*, Dept. of Local Studies of the G kibbutz Movement, Tel Aviv 1970, pp. 67–8 (Heb.).

31 p. 8.

governor's powers of *coercitio*.<sup>32</sup> Important may be the Jewish attribution of such measures to Tineius Rufus; that local prohibitions existed is made plain by various rabbinical references.<sup>33</sup>

Rufus' career in Judaea is problematic and an assessment of his rôle before and during the war is complicated by a number of traditions, both Jewish and Christian, which must be subjected to criticism in order to decide whether they contain a measure of truth.

Eusebius speaks of Rufus' confiscation of Jewish land<sup>34</sup> and of his slaughter of large numbers of Jews;<sup>35</sup> he describes the Roman capture of Jerusalem, but, without naming its agent;<sup>36</sup> Jerome attributes to Rufus the ploughing of the Temple.<sup>37</sup> Talmudic sources attribute to Rufus the destruction of the Temple,<sup>38</sup> a ban on circumcision,<sup>39</sup> and various conversations with R. 'Aqiva, whom he had imprisoned.<sup>40</sup> Jewish tradition, indeed, sees Tineius Rufus as the suppressor of the revolt, and knows nothing of Julius Severus.

Eusebius is a source to be treated with caution with regard to Jewish affairs, but his report on the confiscation of Jewish land sounds circumstantial. Jerome's statement that Rufus ploughed the ruins of the Temple may have been, as several scholars have suggested, a misplacement of the ploughing of the colonial *sulcus primigenius*, which would have been performed before the war.

The problem of whether Jerusalem was captured by the Jews and whether the X Fretensis was compelled to abandon the city needs to be considered in connexion with the career of Rufus. We hear of the destruction of Jerusalem from Appian,<sup>41</sup> Eusebius,<sup>42</sup> Jerome,<sup>43</sup> and rabbinical sources. Eusebius uses the word 'besieged' (πολιορκηθέν). What led Bowersock to translate Appian's κατέσκαψεν as 'undermined' heaven only knows; that it means 'destroyed' is

32 Cf. Y. Geiger, *Zion*, 41, 1976, pp. 139 sqq.: The edict against circumcision and the Bar Kochba Revolt — and especially pp. 146–7 (Heb. — Eng. résumé).

33 For Rufus' alleged prohibition, see below. Rabbinical evidence for a local prohibition, Alon, *Hist. of the Jews*, II, p. 12; cf. *Prolegomena*, pp. 7 sqq.

34 *Hist. Eccl.*, 4. 6. 1.

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Dem. evang.*, 6. 18. 10.

37 *Ad Zech.*, 7: 18–19.

38 *B. Ta'an.* 29a.

39 *Mid. Gen. Rabbati*, 41–2; line 8; cf. *B. Shab.* 130a.

40 *Tanḥuma* V, ki tizra' etc.

41 *Hist. Rom.*, Syriaca, 50.

42 *Loc. cit.*

43 *Loc. cit.*



clear, but even if we accept the bizarre translation 'undermined', — surely that word reflects siege operations, even if undermining is not likely to have been practicable in Jerusalem's rocky terrain. But Eusebius says succinctly that Hadrian besieged and drove out the 'other half' of the Jewish population, which presumably still occupied part of the city.<sup>44</sup> As already admitted, Eusebius must be read with caution, but that the western part of the town was occupied by a Jewish population in Hadrian's time is attested by Epiphanius.<sup>45</sup> Finally, we have documents dated to Year 4 (134–5) of the Jewish revolutionary régime, and drawn in Jerusalem itself.<sup>46</sup> The retaking of the city, therefore, seems to rest on reasonable evidence, and the fact that only two coins of Ben Koziba have been found in the Western Wall excavations may be explicable in terms of what Eusebius and Epiphanius tell us. Avi-Yonah, indeed, based his belief in the evacuation of the X legion on a record in *Megillat Ta'anit*,<sup>47</sup> but most Jewish scholars do not believe the record to be so late and the question must be left open for the time being.<sup>48</sup> What does seem to be true is that Ben Koziba never reestablished the Temple cult, and had excellent reasons for not doing so.

It is when we come to consider the chronology of Tineius Rufus that we encounter interesting results. Julius Severus' successor in Britain was already in that province by April 135,<sup>49</sup> which means that Severus would have reached Judaea in late 134 or in early 135. As Hadrian was back in Rome by May 134,<sup>50</sup> his journey may have been connected with this move, and might imply that all was not well with the Roman campaign in Judaea. Bethar tradition-

44 *Dem. evang.* 6. 18. 10; — *PG.* 22, 453, ad Zech. 14: 2: τὸν λοιπὸν τῆς πόλεως μέρος ἡμισυ πολιορκηθὲν αὐθις ἐξελαύνεται ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου.

45 *PG* 43, *Lib. de mensuris et ponderibus*, col. 261–2, para. 14.

46 Benoît, Milik, de Vaux, *DJD* II, *Murabba'at*, p. 205 (addendum), no. 30, line 8.

47 Liechtenstein, Jerusalem 1970, p. 64.

48 It may be added that there is yet no real evidence showing where the cantonments of the legion were located, despite the finds of its stamped tiles at various points in the Old City. It should be noted that if the evidence of stamped tiles and coins countermarked with the name of the X Fretensis can be utilized, the legion was dispersed in detachments at a number of different points, which included at one date or other Ramat Raḥel, Giv'at Ram, Qiriat Ye'arim, Jaffa, Sebaste, Dor and Ascalon.

49 *Class. Rev.*, 42, 1928, p. 13.

50 *IG* 14, 1054.



ally fell in August 135,<sup>51</sup> coinciding with Hadrian's second *salutatio imperatoria*,<sup>52</sup> Jerusalem, however, was still held by a Jewish population after September–October of 135 according to the documents already referred to.

This chronology leaves Severus less than a year to carry out the lengthy and strenuous campaign aimed to capture the Jewish strong-points described by Xiphilinus. This suggests either that much more success must be ascribed to Rufus' conduct of the war than Dio's account would convey, or that prior to Severus' arrival Rufus had found himself faced with tactical problems which it was beyond his capacity to solve. Jewish tradition supports the first explanation, but Hadrian's return to Rome in 134 might be taken to favour the second.

The problem of the banning of circumcision. *Midrash Genesis Rabbati* (41–42, line 8) tells us that Rufus issued an order prohibiting circumcision, and that an offender who had nevertheless performed the rite on his son, questioned by the governor, replied: 'Two edicts have been issued: the emperor permits me to circumcise, while his servant (meaning the governor) prohibits. Which shall I obey?' Now the *Midrash Genesis Rabbati* is very late, but is thought to be derived from a lost *Midrash Genesis Rabba* based on the original of that title, a 5th-century document drawing on material of the 3rd and 4th centuries, and on a small group of earlier halakhot, also on much earlier apocryphal and pseudepigraphic material.<sup>53</sup> The tradition of Rufus' edict is transmitted by a R. Judan, who may be the scholar of that name whose activity was of the period of the Second Revolt.<sup>54</sup> In that case the report of Rufus' action against circumcision may be reliable and would confirm Dr. Y. Geiger's conclusion,<sup>55</sup> that it was a local measure carried out by virtue of the governor's powers of *coercitio* and not consistently applied.

Finally, a word on Ben Koziba the soldier. In the *Prolegomena*<sup>56</sup> I have endeavoured to arrive at an initial assessment of his military achievements,

51 Jer. *Ta'an.* IV 5; *Mid. Lam. R.* II, 5. Cf. Eus., *Hist. Eccles.* IV, 63.

52 F. Heichelheim, *JQR* 34, 1943–4, pp. 61–3.

53 M.D. Herr, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Eng.), 7, 1971, s.v. *Midrash Genesis Rabbati*, citing the views of Epstein and Albeck.

54 M. 'Eduyot VIII, 2; active c. 120–140 CE. Cf. his probable tombstone at Jaffa — S. Klein, *Ein Jüdisch-Palästinensisches Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vienna 1920, nr. 110.

55 See n. 32.

56 *Prolegomena*, pp. 58–62.

uninfluenced by sentiment. If in his written orders he sounds like a 'pious thug' (thus Bowersock), all I can say is that most high commanding officers might sound like this, and on the one occasion when I travelled with a Commander-in-Chief he barked at his chauffeur and, I suspect, at most other people, but his first question concerned Jewish law. Cromwell was certainly pious. But we are concerned with Ben Koziba's military capacities. He probably began as one of several guerilla commanders, but ended as the chief of them. His remarkable initial success is the only convincing explanation of his recognition by R. 'Aqiva (though not by a majority of the scholars) as the Messiah. He succeeded in carrying out a total mobilization of Jewish manpower.<sup>57</sup> It seems possible that he owed his major initial achievement (a) to a successful tactic of 'hit and run' attacks delivered from underground 'bunkers' to which the attackers could retire without fear of detection;<sup>58</sup> (b) to the factor of surprise. Xiphilinus' epitome of Dio reveals that Roman intelligence, despite a decade of tension and probably of violence in the province, had failed to gauge the scale of the coming insurrection. Archaeological finds show that the revolt extended over the Judaeian hill-country as far west as Emmaus and south-westward beyond Beth Govrin (Eleutheropolis). It seems to have affected the Samaritan rural areas and to have held the Plain of Esdraelon. Ben Koziba appears to have utilized to the full the tactical capabilities of peasant groups who knew the terrain and made use of ambush and the defensive virtues of defiles, cultivation terraces, isolated plateaux and highly-placed villages. Further, Ben Koziba avoided the error of defending large towns populated by non-combatants and non-committed elements. I believe that he refused to defend Jerusalem. He could bring the Roman forces to a standstill in the hillcountry and inflict heavy losses on them, but he failed to find a way to face them on the plains. The ultimate Roman counteroffensive was reorganized in small task groups corresponding to the unit known elsewhere in the Empire as *numeri*; in Judaea these included a strong component of missile troops. These were the formations which reduced the Jewish defensive system in the hill country.

57 Michael Syriacus, IV, 105–106; cf. Hieron., *Chron.*, II, p. 168 (Schoene) ad ann. 2150; Syncellus, Dindorf, I, 660; Eus., *Chron.*, II, p. 168 (Schoene), ad ann. 2149; Applebaum, *Proleg.*, p. 60.

58 See n. 4.

Ben Koziba used to the limit the means at his disposal and held his enemies at bay for three years, despite the enormous forces concentrated by Rome against him, in a period when the Roman army had reached the apogee of its efficiency and its success. This is not a record that justifies denigration.

Tel Aviv University