18. Hadrian, the Bar Kokhba Revolt, and the Epigraphic Transmission

A Josephus to tell the story of a Jewish revolt occurs but once. His description of the first uprising in the Roman province of Judaea has greater depth and goes into more detail than the description of any other event in the provincial history of the imperial period. The second great uprising against Rome under Bar Kokhba found no historian, Jewish or other, to tell its tale — at least none whose work has survived. The consequences of this lack for the reconstruction of the course of events are well known, and even more keenly felt, for the evaluation of what happened before, during, and after the uprising in Judaea/Syria Palaestina.

I. Preliminary Remarks on Epigraphic Transmission

In the almost total absence of any direct, contemporary or even later historiographical tradition for the second revolt, the chance survival of contemporary documentation becomes all the more significant.[1] The contributions of archaeological finds and papyri are discussed by others in this volume.[2] Here only the contribution of inscriptions to the reconstruction of historical events and the conclusions to be drawn from them will be examined. I shall deal summarily with problems already discussed in two previous discussions of the epigraphic material,[3] and, using the conclusions drawn from them, I shall go into more detail in the analysis of the new material.

First some methodological remarks about the interpretation and evaluation of epigraphic sources here and elsewhere:

> The epigraphic texts considered here are contemporary, conceived in the course of the events or at least in direct connection to them. In other words they reveal what contemporaries knew or thought they knew about the events. The inscriptions contain mostly statements of facts, such as the participation of military units or specific persons in the fighting, the erection of victory monuments, chronological details etc. As such, they are incontestable

Epigraphic texts and the monuments to which they belong constitute direct statements by those participating in past events. They have not (necessarily) been subject to interpretation by people who lived later, knew more or differently — nor are they colored by the perceptions and experiences of later generations. We may take as an example of the latter Tacitus's report on the proceedings against Cn. Calpumius Piso pater in the year 20 AD,[4] or of the Emperor Claudius's speech on the so-called *ius honorum* of the Gauls in 48.[5] The accidental

survival of contemporary epigraphic documents allows us to regard both reports, to a large extent, as subjective interpretations. This is not to say that the statements contained in epigraphic documents and the monuments on which they are inscribed were devoid of intent and lack a specific declarative purpose — often the contrary is true.[6] But we can identify them, deal with them and challenge them directly without the intervening influence of an intermediary. Precisely in the case of a subject like the revolt of Bar Kokhba, which has been subject to conflicting interpretations and evaluations both in ancient and modem times,[7] such primary documentary evidence has a decisive methodological advantage over the literary sources of both gentile and Jewish origin, composed (long) after the actual incidents took place, and in the light of their consequences.

II. Inscriptions from the Province of Judaea Referring to Hadrian

At first glance, there seem to be quite a few inscriptions in this province mentioning Hadrian himself. Many milestones have been found, attesting, as suggested long ago by Benjamin lsaac,[8] to the improvement of the road network in the entire province from 120 onwards. This may well have been the result of unrest during Trajan's last years, and the stationing of a second legion in Judaea at about the same time: both increased the need for communication between a greater number of military bases, and for the safe transport of supplies and reinforcements. Milestones disclose the names of the *legio 11 Traiana* and the *legio VI Ferrara* in addition to that of the *legio X Fretensis*. However, the ten texts attesting the building of an aqueduct to supply the colony of Caesarea Maritima with water can only be roughly dated to the Hadrianic period.[9] In the absence of other evidence, I tend to doubt that the aqueduct was built by units present in the province during the revolt; [10] were this the case, many more *vexillationes* would have been attested on the construction.

In recent excavations at Caesarea, a fragment of a Latin inscription has come to light in the vicinity of the governor's *praetorium*. This text, which on the whole can be safely reconstructed, shows the *beneficiarii* of the governor Tineius Rufus honouring the emperor with a statue,[11] I thus confirming what until now could only be a sound guess,[12] namely that Hadrian is likely to have visited Caesarea in person. According to all the literary sources, the revolt broke out under Tineius Rufus, and this new piece of evidence proves that he had been in office as a *legatus Augusti pro praetore* already when Hadrian visited Judaea in 129/130. In other words, Jewish preparations for the revolt took place under his governorship. I would mention in passing two epigraphic monuments from Scythopolis, still unpublished, in which the polis honours Tineius Rufus's wife, Claudia Rufina, and daughter, Tineia Iulla, with statues — presumably the husband and father, Tineius Rufus himself, was not excluded.[13]

A base[14] which supported a statue of Hadrian and displays on its sides an image of Neptune and possibly one of Victoria, may also have come from Scythop-olis. The decorations may refer to some fighting in the province, but may equally well be related to the rising in the diaspora in the early years of the reign, or even to the Bar Kokhba revolt itself (despite the tentative dating to 128).[15]

The same uncertainty reigns in the case of two, may be three Hadrianic inscriptions from Jerusalem. Again, the texts are too fragmentary to allow for safe conclusions.[16] Two of the inscriptions perhaps belonged to gates or arches dedicated to Hadrian. Perhaps *a biga* or *quadriga* with a statue of Hadrian stood on it. A third inscription was perhaps part of a base, on which a column was erected in Honor of Hadrian. But the fragmentary state of the inscriptions allows no secure interpretation.

If these inscriptions composed the entire epigraphic evidence from the province of Judaea in connection with Hadrian and the Bar Kokhba revolt, there would scarcely have been need to mention them here, since little that is specific about the revolt can be drawn from them.[17] This is not the case with an epigraphic document found in 1976 in Tel Shalem, some 12 km to the south of Scythopolis, and published with a full commentary in 1999.[18] The latter need not be repeated here. Only some decisive facts and premises must be established, however, since these were not fully taken into consideration by those arguing against the interpretation of the monument offered there.

Imp(eratori) Cae[s(ari) divi T]ra[iani Par-]
th[i]ci f(ilio) d [ivi Nervae nep(oti) Tr]aiano [Hadriano Aug(usto)]
pon[t]if(ici) m[ax(imo), trib(unicia) pot(estate) XX?, imp(eratori) IJI, co(n)s(uli) [III, p(atri)
p(atriae) S(enatus) P(opulus)q(ue) R(omanus)?].

The inscription must be interpreted as part of a monumental arch measuring more than 10-11 m in length, since the inscription alone occupies that much space. The size of the letters is also monumental: in line 1 the letters measure 41 cm, in line 2 around 24 cm and even in line 3 not less than 18-19 cm. Nothing comparable has ever been found in Judaea. Even Rome with its monumental public edifices exhibits but few inscriptions whose letters can match those of the inscription from Tel Shalem, and only the inscriptions on the Pantheon, the Temple of Castor and Pollux and on the Arch of Titus compete with them.[19] The arch was erected 12 km from the autonomous polis of Scythopolis, an area in which Greek would be used exclusively in the public domain. Not a single Latin inscription is known from this region from the first century to the end of the third AD.[20] The order to build the arch must have been issued by a Latin-speaking authority that is a Roman authority. Furthermore, the name of this authority stood in the last line of this three-line inscription. Only three possibilities are theoretically conceivable for the identity of this authority.

1. the governor of the province,
2. a military unit, that is a legion, or
3. the Senate in Rome.

The first possibility can be rejected outright as there is not enough space at the end of the last line for the name and title of the governor. Therefore either one of the two legions stationed in the province erected the arch, or the sponsor was the SPQR. In either case, quite an extraordinary event must have led to the erection of such a monument — an event, moreover, which was connected with the area in which the arch was set up.

Before going any further in deciding between the two alternatives as to the identity of the author of the arch, we should try and make the choice clearer by looking into the occasion which called forth the erection of such a magnificent arch. As in the case of the authority responsible for its erection, we may start by ruling out improbabilities. Some have toyed with the idea that the occasion was an imperial visit to the province. Hadrian visited the province at least once, probably twice. His first visit took place in 130 while he was on a journey from Arabia to Egypt.[21] The second one occurred probably in the course of the Bar Kokhba revolt, as could be inferred from the use of the term *expeditio* to describe the campaign.[22]

Cities might erect an arch on the occasion of an imperial visit, but the use of Latin, as pointed out above, rules out the possibility that the city of Scythopolis erected this arch. However, neither the army nor the SPQR, it should be stated here categorically, had ever honoured an imperial visit to a province with an arch. No parallel to such an undertaking can be found in any other province, whether in Hadrian's case or in the case of any other emperor. An interpretation of a fragmentary inscription which conjures up a fact unattested and unparalleled elsewhere in the Roman world *prima facie* cannot be accepted — nay, it should be rejected without much ado. All this makes it quite certain that the arch was built in the context of the Bar Kokhba revolt, and had nothing to do with Hadrian's first visit to the region.

On the other hand we do know that triumphal *arcus* were occasionally erected by order of the Senate (or rather the SPQR) also outside Rome and Italy on the occasion of a decisive victory won by Rome at great cost; on one such occasion an *arcus* was built even by a legion: the *legio 111 Cyrenaica* raised such a monument for the emperor Trajan outside Dura—Europos in 116, at the conclusion of a seemingly successful campaign against the Parthians.[23] In other words, theoretically either the SPQR or a legion could be responsible for erecting the arch near Tel Shalem in the context of the final victory in the Bar Kokhba revolt. Nevertheless, in view of the existence of several examples of such an arch initiated by the SPQR as against a single example of one initiated by a legion, it seems far more likely that here too it was the SPQR rather than one of the two legions serving in Judaea that is mentioned at the end of the third line of the inscription — and, as it happens, the space fits

the four letters of SPQR better than the name of either of the two legions. We should therefore prefer the restoration of SPQR at the very end of the inscription as giving the author of the arch, though without excluding altogether the possible restoration of a legion's name there.

As for the timing and the occasion for the construction of the arch, it is a matter of indifference whether the SPQR or a legion was responsible for it. Whoever built it, the erection of this impressive monument could not have been conceived — let alone taken place — at any moment except when victory appeared certain. The erection of this gigantic monument must have coincided with the conclusion of the revolt. Inevitably Hadrian's acclamation as *Imperator* — a title assumed by Hadrian now for the first (and last) time since his accession (when he received it so to speak automatically)[24] — must have been recorded on this triumphal arch as *imp. II*. There is an inescapable correlation between the end of the revolt, Hadrian's acclamation as *imperator II,* and the erection of the arch at Tel Shalem — all three events are inextricably connected; each of them presupposes and assumes the other two. Thus it seems difficult to deny, or even doubt, the logic of restoring of *imp. II* in Hadrian's titulature in this inscription.[25] Anyone who wishes to deny this must first refute the above considerations.

The intimate linkage between the assumption of *imp. II* by Hadrian and the end of the revolt (i. e. once the title was assumed, the revolt was over and vice versa), allows us to determine with some precision the date of the latter. As is well known there is no direct information, and consequently no consensus, about the date: there is nothing in the literary sources, apart from the traditional date of the fall of Beithar on 9 Ab (July/August 135 AD); the coins and papyri do not go beyond the `year three to the freedom of Israel under Bar Kokhba',[26] which in view of the lack of agreement about the beginning of the Bar Kokhba era is not very helpful. The dateless letters from the so-called Bar Kokhba archive, which are likely to belong to the last phase of the revolt, imply a date in the autumn of 135, but they do no more than that.[27]

Against this uncertainty, it can be maintained with a great deal of conviction that Hadrian accepted his second acclamation as *imperator* at the beginning of 136 at the earliest. There is not a single official document from the year 135 in which the title *imp. II* appears. The inscription from Merida in Spain which used to serve as the main support for the assumption that Hadrian received the title already in 135 has turned out to be a pastiche of different epigraphic fragments that do not belong together.[28] Furthermore, *imp. II* is missing in a dedication by Hadrian himself (or his friends in his name) to the goddess Iuno Sospita in Lanuvium,[29] which is dated by his 20th *tribunicia potestas* to the period between 10 December 135 and 9 December 136 — i.e. only 21 days in 135. In other words, as late as the

very end of 135, but much more likely even beyond this date, *imp. II* does not appear in an official dedication in Italy. The dedicator, whether Hadrian himself or his friends, could not have been in error about Hadrian's titulature at the time: the title *imp. II* had not been assumed when the dedication was made; the war in Judaea was still going on.

The claim that the title *imp. II* was not accepted by Hadrian before 136 is now put beyond doubt by three fragmentary military diplomas, published after 2003, and all of them dated by the suffect consuls P. Rutilius Fabianus and Cn. Papirius Aelianus to 31. December 135 with Hadrian's titulature reading: *[crib. pot.] XIX cos [III],* but no *imp. II* follows the XIX of the *tribunicia potestas*.[30] Since, as pointed out above, the element imp. *II* comes always and forever after the *tribunicia potestas,* it is now proved, that on the last day of 135 Hadrian had not yet assumed the second acclamation. In addition, the inscription from Lanuvium is now securely dated to 136. The earliest precisely dated document bearing the title *imp. H* is an edict of Hadrian, published on 31st. of May 136 in Alexandria;[31] the edict was probably issued in Rome in April 136.

The consequence is clear: It is unlikely in the extreme that either the army in Judaea or the Senate in Rome would have withheld the acclamation once the war was over. Thus it is also clear that fighting in Judaea ended not before 136. And it is only now that the SPQR (or a legion) would have issued the instruction to raise a monumental arch near Tel Shalem.[32]

What survives of the inscription, as far as it can be reconstructed, is fully commensurate with the considerations outlined above, as well as with what we know about Hadrian's (or his governors') observation of a meticulous sequence in his titulature. Until the second acclamation as Imperator, the following sequence can be observed: first comes the high priesthood *(pontifex maximus),* followed by the *tribunicia potestas,* the third consulate, with *pater patriae* at the very end. Once the second imperatorial acclamation was assumed, at the end of the Bar Kokh-ba revolt, *imp(erator) II* invariably appears in *official* texts after the *tribunicia potestas* and before *cos. III*.[33] In the inscription from Tel Shalem on two joining fragments we find COS to the right of the letter I with a horizontal line above it which discloses (as was to be expected) that the letter I stands for a digit. In view of what has been said before about the rigid order of Hadrian's nomenclature, the I must stand for the second I of *imp. II*. In other words the I does *not* belong to the *tribunicia potestas,* which at the date at which this arch is to be seen as having been erected, i.e. after the conclusion of the revolt, preceded *imp. II, i.*e.: *[trib(unicia) pot(estate) XX* or *XXI, imp(eratori) I]I, co(n)s(uli) [III* etc.].

Why was the arch constructed in Tel Shalem?[34]

Only hypotheses can be offered in answer to this question, and they must remain more or less speculative so long as they are not supported by other evidence. However, one

presupposition must be maintained: the location was closely associated with the war; it held some significance for its triumphant conclusion; it could *not* have been *outside* the war zone.[35] And this is put beyond the slightest doubt by the lack of all distinction in the location in every other respect. Tel Shalem lies in the flat land to the south of Scythopolis which slopes almost imperceptibly towards the Jordan river. Any visitor to the place can testify to its utter banality. But even more importantly: no large settlement was situated nearby, and the *via publica* which passes in the vicinity was not sufficient by itself to turn it into a *locus celeberrimus,* a place frequented by all and sundry. There were quite a few *viae publicae* in the province; any of them would have provided a better stage for the spectacular display of this magnificent arch to a wider public; but a wider public is precisely what was lacking in this area. In short: were it not for its association with a significant event which took place in the course of the revolt, Tel Shalem would not have been selected as the right place for a `war memorial' on account of any inherent significance of its own. It thus contrasts sharply with the 'fropaeum Alpium near Monaco chosen to celebrate the victory over the Alpine tribes in 15 BC, which overlooks the conquered territory and through which ran the Via Iulia Augusta, the main artery between Gaul and Italy, thus turning the place into a true *locus celeberrimus*. We can be confident that the Senate's resolution to erect an arch in Tel Shalem to commemorate the victory — if indeed it was the Senate's initiative — was not an uninformed one. The meeting of the Senate must have been attended by at least some of the generals and commanders who had taken part in putting down the revolt. They were in a position to know and tell their colleagues why Tel Shalem was the right choice. Tel Shalem was not chosen arbitrarily.[36]

Finally, and quite independently of the specific reason for the erection of this monument in this place, the arch bears witness to the intensity of the revolt and its deep impact on Rome; and conversely to the enormous relief, deeply felt, when it was over.

III. Epigraphic Texts in Rome

Celebrations of the costly victory in Judaea were not confined to the battlefield. Monuments commemorating the event were set up also in Rome. Two epigraphic texts, both fragmentary, must be interpreted as parts of victory monuments. The first is a fragment of a slab which originally measured ca. 2 m or more in length. This time the *Senatus Populusque Romanus* is explicitly stated to have erected a monument for Hadrian after he had freed someone or something. Geza Alfoldy is probably right in restoring Syria Palaestina in the missing part of the text.[37] The presumed shape of the panel makes it likely to have been attached either to a small arch or to a large statue base. In either case the monument bore a statue of Hadrian like the Tel Shalem arch, although much more modest. Even more important than the shape of the monument is the find site. The fragment was found on the slope of the Capitoline hill,

directly beneath the *templum divi Vespasiani.* The monument itself could also have stood there. Here too, the place was surely not arbitrarily chosen. Vespasian had crushed the first revolt in Judaea and turned that achievement into the foundation of his rule.[38] The theme *ofludaea capta,* the *triumphus de ludaeis,* dominates his coinage, and is present everywhere in the new aspect of the centre of Rome: the *templum Pacis,* the *Amphitheatrum Flavium* and at least one triumphal arch for Titus.[39] If Hadrian allowed the senate to regard his achievement in Judaea as continuing Vespasian's victory, or even exceeding it,[40] what would be a more fitting place for the victory monument than the temple of the *divus* Vespasianus?[41]

In the same topographical context, another fragmentary inscription has been discovered which contains an *elogium,* either to an emperor or to a high military commander,[42] referring to a *bellum ludae[icum]* or better *ludae[orumJ.* It has recently been dated by Geza Alfoldy to the imperial period, and more precisely to the second century.[43] In the epigraphic sources of the time only one war against the Jews is termed *bellum,* the war against Bar Kokhba — not the revolt of the Jews in the Diaspora in the years 115-117[44] At first sight the reference to marine warfare involving ships makes the attribution to the Bar Kokhba revolt puzzling: when and where were Roman naval forces engaged in the revolt? But in fact this happens to be attested: Hadrian awarded *dona militaria* to Sex. Cornelius Dexter, *praefectus classis Syriacae,* a subordinate of the governor of Syria, on the occasion of a *bellum Iudalcum.*[45] This can refer only to the years between 132 and 136. A naval officer could distinguish himself in battle on land, but this is less likely, especially when taken together with the reference to *ora maritima* and a *classis* in the elogium mentioned above. Three possible sites for this action come to mind: first, the Mediterranean across which supplies for the rebels, mercenaries (mentioned by Dio 69.13.1 f. as coming from far and wide) and Jewish sympathizers from other provinces could travel. Two other ` seas' are possible: the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. In both cases, one must imagine rowers and combatants of the *classis Syriaca* marching overland under the command of Cornelius Dexter, with suitable equipment or with previously constructed boats, before engaging in sea battle. Similar preparations on land for naval battles on rivers are not unknown in Rome's military history: as examples we may mention Germanicus' expedition against the Germans in 16 AD and Trajan's on the Euphrates and Tigris during the Parthian war.[46] While the Sea of Galilee may have been used to transport soldiers and supplies for battles conducted in the Peraia, the Dead Sea may have played a greater role. A new reading and interpretation of the famous *P Yadin* 52 by Hannah Cotton[47] and the recent publication of a Safaitic inscription by S. Abbadi and F. Zayadine which attests a three-year revolt against the tyrant Nepos,[48] if accepted, would imply that at least part of the Nabataean people revolted against Rome in Arabia. To this we must add the uncontested evidence for the active participation of the governor of Arabia, T. Haterius Nepos, with his *legio 111 Cyrenaica,* in putting down the revolt for which he was

awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* at its conclusion.[49] Moreover, the archives of Babatha and Salome Komaise found in Nahal Hever imply that the Jews of Arabia became involved in the uprising, something which is hardly surprising in view of the close contacts which had existed between Jews on either side of the Dead Sea before 132, presumably conducted across the then navigable waters of that sea.[50] We may suggest, cautiously, that parts of the Syrian fleet under the command of Cornelius Dexter were stationed on the Dead Sea in order to cut off communications between groups of Jewish — perhaps also Nabataean — rebels and interrupt their supply-lines.

Nevertheless, when all is said and done, the battles in which Cornelius Dexter was involved and to which the *elogium* from the city of Rome refers — even if the two do not necessarily refer to the same event — are more likely to have taken place on the Mediterranean Sea: *ora maritima* can hardly refer to the coast of the Dead Sea, and the term *liburni, if* it means the same as *liburnae,* suggests a regular fleet rather than small ships constructed on the spot. These sea battles, wherever they took place, were fought outside the area directly controlled by Bar Kokhba — a decisive argument against the common assumption that the battles took place only in that area where coins minted by Bar Kokhba were in circula-tion.[51] Or, to put this differently: the area of fighting and the area in which Bar Kokhba exercised direct control need hardly have overlapped completely; the coins tell us where his hold lasted for over three years, but not about the area of the war itself. The arch in Tel Shalem is another decisive argument in favour of this conclusion (and cf. n. 35).

The temple of *divus Vespasianus* in Rome and its immediate surroundings were used probably to present Hadrian as Vespasian's successor in Rome's war against its Jewish rebels. His victory, which was the victory of Rome, was thus demonstrated in the public domain in Rome, but much less than Vespasian's victory in70.[52]

IV. Epigraphic Texts outside Rome

Not only in Judaea and in Rome was victory celebrated. Three commanders were awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* for their part in putting down the Bar Kokhba revolt: Sex. Julius Severus, governor of Judaea, C. Quinctius Certus Poblicius Marcellus, governor of Syria, and T. Haterius Nepos, governor of Arabia. It must not be overlooked that in no other war waged by Rome, since the Augustan principate, were so many senators awarded the highest marks of honour available to those belonging to their class.[53]

Poblicius Marcellus, governor of Syria, the province bordering Judaea on its north, between 132 and 136, came from the northern Italian city of Aquileia, where the monument attesting his *ornamenta triumphalia* was found:[54]

C(aius) Quinctius
C(ai) f(ilius) Vel(ina tribu)
Certus Poblicius
Marcellus co(n)s(ul),
augur, legat(us) divi
Hadrian(i) provinc(iarum)
Syriae et German(iae)
Superior(is), ornament(is)
triumphalibus

The text is inscribed on an extraordinarily large base: 181 cm high, 106, 5 cm wide, and 84 cm thick. It is much larger than any other statue-base from this period known in the whole of Venetia et Histria. It could not have been lost on Poblicius Marcellus's fellow citizens that its sheer size implied that this was an unusual monument.[55] For in Roman cities such monumental statues diplayed in *loci celeberrimi* never stood alone, but always vied with each other, inviting a comparison with others of similar type. Needless to say, the huge base was not in itself the object of display; it was rather the bearer of a message which the entire monument expressed. Until now the base was tacitly or *express is verbis* interpreted as being the bearer of a statue of Poblicius Marcellus himself,[56] thus overlooking the fact that Marcellus' name stands in the inscription in the nominative, and not in the dative which would be the appropriate way of referring to him had his own statue stood there, dedicated by others. However, the dedicator was none other than Poblicius Marcellus himself.[57] But it was not his own statue that was displayed on the base: self-dedication of this type, i.e. raising a statue to oneself, was *not* the form self-representation in the Roman world of the second century would take.[58]

The size of the base implies that a monumental object was displayed on it, and the absence of its description or of any reference to it on the base itself implies that there was no need for either; the meaning was obvious to the beholder after he had learnt that Marcellus' highest offices culminated in the grant of the *ornamenta triumphalia*. It was clear to the citizens of Aquileia, as it should have been to posterity, that Poblicius Marcellus, in a daring and original gesture, erected this monument in his own home in order to celebrate and commemorate his own share in achieving the glorious victory over the rebellious Jews. All this suggests that a pictorial representation of the victory, such as a statue of the goddess Victoria with corresponding concrete symbols, or a *tropaion* with characteristic pieces of booty, was there on display.[59]

Nothing comparable has been found in the case of the other two senators to whom Hadrian awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* at the conclusion of the revolt: Sex. Iulius Severus and

T. Haterius Nepos. True, each of them was honoured with a statue in his home town, at the base of which an inscription described their military distinctions. In Fulginiae, from where the Haterii hailed,[60] a statue was set up for T. Haterius Nepos, who was governor of Arabia from 130 to 134/5. The dedication mentions the *triumphalia ornamenta* immediately after his consulate and priesthood.[61] Because the text is fragmentary, nothing can be said about the more immediate circumstances, or about those who were responsible for the text and the erection of the statue. This is not the case, however, with Cn. Minicius Faustinus Sex. Iulius Severus, who had commanded the Roman troops against Bar Kokhba in the province of Judaea and appears in the literary sources as the victorious genera1.[62] The erection of a statue was decreed to him by the city council of Bumum in his native province of Dalmatia inscribed with an exact copy of the inscription which accompanied the statue erected for him in the forum of Augustus or Trajan's forum in Rome, as was done also for the two other commanders; the *statua triumphalis* in the forum in Rome was a standard component of the triumphal *insignia: Huic [senatus aluctore [imp(eratore) Trail/an° Hadrian[o AuJg(usto) ornamenta triu[mpialia decrevit ob res in [Iuidea* (sic) *prospere gelstias*.[63] The same formula can be found on many other Roman honorific monuments for *viri triumphales*.[64] The repetition of the Roman formula on the monument in Burnum proves that the occasion for honouring Julius Severus there was no other than the distinctions he had earned in putting down the revolt. Not far from Burnum, in the same province, Iulius Severus' own *patria,* the colony of Aequum,[65] also honoured its celebrated son with several monuments. Of the one relevant here only a fragment has survived: *Gn(aeo) Iul(io) S[everoJ co(n)s(uli), le[g(ato) Aug(ustWpr(o) pr(aetore) pr[ovinc(iae)J Syriae Pa[laestinaeJ, triunf[alibus* (sic) *ornamenJtis [honorato* 4[66] The inscription reveals to us that the name of the province was changed from Judaea to Syria Palaestina while Julius Severus was still governor, probably at the end of the war. The change of name is commonly interpreted as a loss of a name: the land was no longer named after the people who occupied it. This exceptional form of punishment had never been inflicted on any other people in the entire history of the Roman Empire. However, the initiative for renaming the province may have come in fact from the non-Jewish part of the provincial population who had always desired to dissociate itself from the implications of the name, and Hadrian was all too glad to accommodate their wishes.[67] Never again was the name Judaea used for the province, as the epigraphic sources demon-strate.[68] The date of the inscription could not be earlier than the first months of 136,[69] since the grant of Severus' *ornamenta triumphalia* followed the end of the revolt and Hadrian's second acclamation, which, as we have seen above, cannot be dated any earlier. Iulius Severus' *patria* Aequum, and especially its council, must have followed closely the course of the events in Judaea and reacted with remarkable alacrity to their fellow-citizen's singular distinction in the final victory, since although the renaming of Judaea to Syria Palaestina is already recorded, but Iulius Severus' allegedly next post in Syria, is still missing:[70] This is the commonly accepted

interpretation of the text in the inscription of Burnum (CIL III 2830 = 9891= Dessau 1056): *leg(ato) pr(o) pr(aetore) / [plovinciae Iud(a)eae Relg(ato) pr(o) pr(aetore) [proviJnciae Suriae,* which suggests that immediately after the conclusion of the war in Judaea he was transferred (and restored to his previous level) to the governorship of Syria.[71] However, *Suriae* in this inscription may not refer to a command of the great military province to the north of Judaea; the people in Burnum may have been mislaid by the new and unfamiliar title of *Syria Palaestina,* now bestowed on the "old" province of *Iudaea* and wrote *Suria* instead of *Syria Palaestina*. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that not enough space is left in the fasti of the governors of Syria to fit in Iulius Severus.[72]

The reaction to the *ornamenta triumphalia* of the three Hadrianic generals in their own hometowns is quite unexpected and exceptional[73] — to say nothing of the personal involvement of the decorated generals themselves in celebrating their own distinctions.[74] All three governors who led the fighting in the Bar Kokhba revolt were celebrated in their own *patriae* and apparently took an active part in the celebration. Nothing similar had ever taken place before: other *viri triumphalis* were honoured only at the centre of empire, in Rome itself; nothing is known about reactions in their own home towns or of their own personal involvement in the celebration of their achievements. It is clear though, as we have just seen that Iulius Severus and Haterius Nepos must have been involved in one way or another with the decision of the cities of Burnum and Aequum, in the case of the first, and Fulginiae, in the second case, to honour them in public. And Poblicius Marcellus went one step further and erected his own `war memorial' and left it to posterity. How are we to explain this behaviour unparalleled elsewhere in the history of Rome's wars and victories? No ready answer comes immediately to mind.

However we must not forget another forum where the honours were discussed, recognised and voted on: the imperial Senate in Rome. As a collective body the Senate shared the prestige of its members, and conversely within its walls the prestige accrued in battle mattered most. At the meeting where Hadrian proposed to award the *ornamenta triumphalia* to three of his generals, probably all of them were probably present, as was Q. Lollius Urbicus, *consul suffectus* 135/136, who had participated in the Jewish war as a *legatus imperatoris Ha-driani* and was honoured for his share in it,[75] as well as other legates who had commanded individual legions during the war.[76] The reports and tales of the battles fought and won in Judaea, perhaps also in the neighbouring provinces, were well-informed and detailed, and the relief was felt intensely. The idea of immortalizing the hard-won victory in Judaea by erecting a monumental arch near Tel Shalem took shape here. They all knew, Poblicius Marcellus, Haterius Nepos, Lollius Urbicus, and the legionary legates present, as did Hadrian himself, the meaning this place had in the context of the hard fighting against the Jews led by Bar Kokhba. The arch symbolized the disappearance of the threat and it was

time now for *laetitia publica,* referred to in the *elogium* recovered right next to the temple of *divus* Vespasianus.[77] This *laetitia senatus* found its lasting expression in the triumphal arch at Tel Shalem.

ENDNOTES

1 Cf. B. Isaac — A. Oppenheimer, The Revolt of Bar Kokhba: Ideology and Modem Scholarship, in: B. Isaac, The Near East under Roman Rule. Selected Papers, Leiden 1998, 220ff., esp. 228 f. — I am very grateful to Hannah Cotton for editing the English version of this article and improving its argument, and to Claude Eilers for the English translation of the lecture on which the article is based.

2 See contributions by H. Cotton and A. Kloner —B. Zissu in: Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered 133ff. 181ff.

3 W. Eck, The Bar Kokhba Revolt; W. Eck — G. Foerster, EM Triumphbogen fur Hadrian im Tal von Beth Shean bei Tel Shalem, JRA 12, 1999, 294 ff.

4 W. Eck —A. Caballos — F. Fernandez, Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre, Munchen 1996.

5 M. Griffin, Claudius in Tacitus, CQ 84, 1990, 482 ff.

6 Once again one may emphasize the tendentious trend of the senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre, which comes out only in the comparison with Tacitus historiographical narrative; cf. W. Eck, Die Tauschung der Offentlichkeit oder: Die "Unparteilichkeit" des Historikers Tacitus, Antike and Abendland 46, 2000, 190 ff. = Cheating the Public: or Tacitus Vindicated, SCI 21, 2002, 149 ff.

7 See Eck, The Bar Kokhba Revolt 76.

8 Isaac, Near East (n. 1) 100 f. 228.

9 Lehmann — Holum nos. 45-54 = CI1P 11 1200-1209.

10 For the discussion of this problem see K. G. Holum, Hadrian and Caesarea: An Episode in the Romanization of Palestine, Ancient World 23, 1992, 51 ff., esp. 59f. For a comparable problem with many legions mentioned in an inscription from Jerusalem see CLIP I 2, 717.

11 H. M. Cotton — W. Eck, Governors and Their Personnel on Latin Inscriptions from Caesarea Maritima, in: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings Vol. VII, No. 7, 2001, 215 ff., esp. 235E: *[Imp. Caes(ari) divi Traiani Parth(ici)f(ilio), divi Nervae nep(oti) Traiano Hadriano] Aug(usto) pont(ifici) ma [x(imo), tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) XIV(?),*

co(n)s(uli) III, p(atri) p(atriae)J b(eneficiarii) Iinei Rufi [leg(ati) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) I --]; see now CIIP II 1276.

12 H. Halfmann, Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Romischen Reich, Gottingen 1986, 207, does not mention Caesarea; contra, Lehmann — Holum p. 1. 10. 12 f. and Holum, Hadrian and Caesarea (n. 10), 51 ff., who without direct evidence in the sources considered Hadrian's visit to Caesarea as a fact.

13 Another text, published by L. di Segni, A New Toponym in Southern Samaria, LA 44, 1994, 579ff. = SEG 44, 1361 (and published once more: ead., The Hadrianic Inscription from Southern Samaria (?) —A Palinode, Liber Annuus 53, 2003, 335 ff.), was used, when this article was first published in 2003; the inscription turned out to be a forgery. A photograph seen after the first publication was enough to prove that it is a forgery; no text would ever be found written completely on a stone broken on all sides, and be reproduced once more, on a miserable piece of bronze, as was discovered later; for the fake see W. Eck, Comprendere contesti: 11 nuovo multilingue *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae,* in: Rationes Rerum 1, 2013, 17 ff.

14 CIL III 13589 = 14155, 14.

15 Cf. B. Isaac, The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in the East[2], Oxford 1992, 433.

16 P. Thomsen, Die lateinischen und griechischen Inschriften der Stadt Jerusalem und ihrer nachsten Umgebung, ZDPV 44, 1921, 1 ff., esp. 2 ff. no. 2. 3a and b = CIIP I 2, 715-717.

17 Some importance might be attached to a few epigraphic texts testifying to the presence of units in the province at the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt; see above all Isaac, Limits (n. 15) 427 ff. Whether or not CIL III 14155, 2, found near Bettir, belongs to this time must remain undecided due to its fragmentary state.

18 See Eck — Foerster, Triumphbogen (n. 3).

19 Eck — Foerster, Triumphbogen (n. 3) 304 f.

20 Eck — Foerster, Triumphbogen (n. 3) 300; W. Eck, Ein Spiegel der Macht. Lateinische Inschriften romischer Zeit in Iudaea/Syria Palaestina, ZDPV 117, 2001, 47ff.

21 Halfinann, Itinera principum (n. 12) 206 f.

22 The arguments for a second visit in: W. Eck, Der Bar Kochba-Aufstand der Jahre 132-136 und seine Folgen fiir die Provinz Judaea/Syria Palaestina, in: Iudaea socia — Iudaea capta, ed. P. Urso, Pisa 2012, 249 ff. with the previous literature = article no. 19 in this volume.

23 S. Gould, Inscriptions. I. The Triumphal Arch, in: The Excavations of Dura Europos IV, 1933, 56 ff.; Supplementary Inscriptions. **I.** An Addition to the Inscriptions of the Arch of Trajan, ibid. VI, 1936, 480 ff.

24 On this account alone **P.** Schafer's suggestion (Der Bar Kokhba Aufstand, Tubingen 1981, 14 f.) that Hadrian received the title before the conclusion of the revolt, must be rejected. Had Hadrian been so inclined, a whole series of battles and wars throughout his reign would have supplied him with the excuse (or opportunity) to adorn his person with such honorific titles. He was obviously not interested. Rather than personal ambition, it was the challenge to Rome and its might posed by the Bar Kokhba revolt that made him change his mind. Furthermore, once he received the imperatorial salutation, he could bestow the *ornamenta triumphalia* on his generals, for the two acts were politically interdependent, cf. W. Eck, Kaiserliche Impera-torenakklamationen and ornamenta triumphalia, ZPE 124, 1999, 223 ff.

25 See more below

26 L. Mildenberg, The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War, Aarau 1984, 123

27 See H. Cotton's contribution to: Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered on P. Yadin 52 and 57.

28 CILI1478; cf. L. Garcia Iglesias, La hipotetica inscripcion del teatro de Merida reconstruida por Hubner, Badajoz 1975, 5 ff.; id., La hipotetica inscripcion del Teatro de Merida, REE 30, 1975, 591 ff.; AE 2006, 582.

29 CIL XIV 2088 = Dessau 316.

30 RMD V 382; W. Eck — D. MacDonald — A. Pangerl, Acta Musei Napocensis 39/40, 2002/3, 38; vgl. P. Weill, ZPE 162, 2007, 249 f.

31 J. H. Oliver, Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri, Philadelphia 1989, no. 88.

32 One can hardly compare the situation then with what Tacitus tells us about the *tropaea de Parthis arcusque* which Nero erected for himself in Rome *integro adhuc bello* (ann. 15, 18, 1); until then, and for a long time afterwards, Hadrian declined every kind of military distinction.

33 See the list of data in Eck — Foerster, Triumphbogen (n. 3) 312 f.

34 We do not know where exactly the arch was erected, but it could not have been very far from where these gigantic blocks were found. The idea of dragging more than six huge blocks —all of which must have belonged to the same monument as the letters inscribed on six of them and the production style of the uninscribed blocks show —

over a substantial distance merely to enclose and cover an early Byzantine cemetery can be rejected outright.

35 Recent excavations above the Wadi Arbel (Hamam) gorge, in eastern Lower Galilee, two kilometers west of the Sea of Galilee, have revived the discussion as to how far fighting extended outside the area directly controlled by Bar Kokhba (http://archaeology.huji.ac.il/ Hamam/): "a massive destruction layer in a residential structure which buried the entire house-hold (including weapons and a hoard of coins from the days of Hadrian); houses with passages to underground chambers; oil lamps; pottery vessels and hundreds of coins." This suggests a village destroyed during the Bar Kokhba revolt.

36 See below, p. 223.228

37 CIL VI 974 = 40524: *[S(enatus) p(opulus)q(ue)J R(omanus) [Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) divi Traiani] Parthici f(ilio) [divi Nervae nep(oti) Traiano HaJdriano Aug(usto), [pont(ifici) max(imo), trib(unicia potest(ate) XX (?), Imp(eratori)] II, co(n)s(uli) III p(atri) p(atriae), [quod summo pugnandi akdore misso [exercitu suo superatis imperatloribus max[imis Syriam Palae-stinam ab hoJste liberaverit*. The *tribunicia potestas* is restored before the second acclamation as in all of Hadrian s official inscriptions after the assumption of *imp. 11*. See n. 33 above.

38 See most recently B. Levick, Vespasian, London/New York 1999, 70 f.

39 BMC Emp. II no. 311T. 357 ff. 370 f. 388 ff. 532 ff. 763 ff. For the amphitheatrum Flavium see the reconstruction of the building inscription by Gen Alffildy in CIL VI 40454: *I[mp(era-tor)] Caes(ar) Vespasi[anus Aug(ustus)J amphitheatru[m novum? ex] manubis [fieri iussit(?)]*.

40 CIL VI 40524 is reconstructed by Geza Alffildy in this spirit. Cf. no. 37 above.

41 Cf. A.R. Birley, Hadrian. The restless Emperor, London 1997, 287.

42 CIL VI 1565 = 37054 = VI, VIII 3, p. 4713. The text, as restored by Geza Alffildy, reads: *[--t]riumph[--] senatus laeti[tia--coJnpage ima[-]a? bello ludae[orum/ico --]va liburni[--cflassis ornatul·--Js orae mari[tim?-]arum*

43 G. Alfoldy on CIL VI, VIII 3, p. 4713. Photograph in Supplementa Italica. Imagines. Roma (CIL VI) I, ed. G. L. Gregori — M. Mattel, 1999, 384 f., no. 1223.

44 Despite Schafer, Bar Kokhba Aufstand (n. 25) 130.

45 CIL VIII 8934 = Dessau 1400: *Sex(to) Cornelia Sex(ti) f(ilio) Arn(ensi tribu) Dax ro proc(uratori) Asiae, iuridico Alexandriae, proc(uratori) Neaspoleos et mausolei, praef(ecto) classis Syr(iacae), donis militarib(us) donato a diva Hadrian ob bellum*

Iudaicum hasta pura et vexillo, praef(ecto) alae I Aug(ustae) Gem(ellae) colonorum, trib(uno) leg(ionis) VIII Aug(ustae), praef(ecto) coh(ortis) V Raetorum, praef(ecto) fabrum III, patrono coloniae, P Blaesius Felix (centurio) leg(ionis) Traian(ae)fort(is), adfinipiissimo, ob merita. SchaTer's (Bar Kokhba Aufstand [n. 25], 130) objection that it is unclear "in welcher Funktion Sextus die Auszeichnungen erhalten habe, ob als Kommandant der ala oder der classis Syriaca" should be set aside: in inscriptions displaying a descending order of posts (cursus), such as we have in the case of Cornelius Dexter, the distinction, i.e. the *dona militaria, is* to be associated with the post preceding it, i.e. with the prefecture of the *classis Syriaca,* and not with the one following it, i.e. the command over the *ala I Aug. Gem. colonorum*. H. Devijver, Prosopographia Militiarutn Equestrium ... I, Leuven 1976, C 234 and J. Spaul, Ala[2], Andover 1994, 92 f. are also wrong. E. Baltrusch — M. Schuol's indecisiveness (Die Juden und das Meer in der Antike, in: Medi-terraneo Antico 4, 2001, 103 ff., esp. 119 f.) is unnecessary; they take CIL VIII 8934 to refer to Hadrian (!) and don't know the recent bibliography. Equally idle is S. Applebaum's speculation that Cornelius Dexter was chosen for the task because of his experience as commander of Jewish troops (Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt (A.D. 132-135), Oxford 1976, 81 n. 215.

46 Tacitus, ann. 2, 6, 1E; Cassius Dio 68, 26, 1.

47 See P. Yadin 52 in Y. Yadin — J. C. Greenfield — A. Yardeni — B. Levine, The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters II, Jerusalem 2002, 351 ff.; the reading is modified slightly in her contribution in this volume (Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered 133 ff.).

48 S. Abbadi — F. Zayadine, Nepos the Governor of the Provincia Arabia in a Safaitic Inscription, Semitica 46, 1996, 157.

49 See Eck, The Bar Kokhba Revolt 83 ff.; idem, Der angebliche Krieg des Aelius Caesar in Pannonien and die ornamenta triumphalia des Haterius Nepos, in: Von der Entstehung Roms bis zur AuflOsung des ROmerreiches, ed. L. Borhy, 1999, 28 ff.; idem, Vier mysteriOse Rasuren in Inschriften aus Gerasa: Zum "Schicksal" des Statthalters Haterius Nepos, in: 'Entypaccd. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini, ed. G Paci, vol. 1, 2000, 347 ff. = article no. 6 in this volume.

50 See H. M. Cotton, Ein Gedi between the Two Revolts, SCI 20, 2001, 139 ff., esp. 153 f.

51 See D. Barag, A Note on the Geographical Distribution of Bar-Kokhba Coins, Israel Numismatic Journal 4, 1980, 30 ff.

52 The survival of only two monuments should not be taken as evidence that only two monuments in Rome celebrated the victory over the Jews. The contrary is true: when two fragments of the almost entirely lost memorial epigraphy are preserved, we should assume that the victory was more widely celebrated in the capital of the world-empire.

53 The example of Claudius' war in Britain is irrelevant here since he bestowed the *ornamenta triumphalia* on his *comites* as well as on people who followed him to Britain without taking any real part in the war.

54 AE 1934, 231 = G. Alfaldy, Romische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen, Heidelberg 1984, 99 f. = G. Brusin, Inscriptiones Aquileiae, Udine 1991, no. 499.

55 Not one of the many examples of large bases from Venetia and Histria enumerated by Alftildy in ROmische Statuen (n. 52), 38 f. n. 89 reaches the monumental dimensions of our base.

56 So L. Schumacher, Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur Besetzung der vier hohen rOmischen Priesterkollegien Diss. Mainz 1973, 224; implied in Alt eddy, Romische Statuen (n. 54), 38f. n. 89; PIR^2 P 1042.

57 So A.M. Andermahr, Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der Fruhen und Hohen Kaiserzeit, Bonn 1998, 388.

58 Cf. the inscription of Pliny the Younger from Comum, with W. Eck, Die grosse Plinius-inschrift aus Comum: Funktion und Monument, in: Varia Epigraphica. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia, Bertinoro, 8-10 giugno 2000, ed. A. Bertinelli — A. Donati, Faenza 2001, 225 ff.

59 The monument, as the reference to Divus Hadrianus implies, must have been raised after Hadrian s death. According to Schumacher, Prosopographische Untersuchungen (n. 56), 224 (cf. L. Vidman, PIR^2 N 55 p. 344) Marcellus was driven to commit suicide by Hadrian. **In** that case, the execution of the monument would have been stipulated in the dead man's testament. Nothing in the inscription supports Schumacher's conjecture; in fact were this the case, Hadrian's name would have been simply suppressed.

60 Cf. PIR^2 H 29. 30; M. Gagiotti — **L.** Sensi, Ascesa al senato e rapporti con territori d'orig-Me. Italia: Regio VI (Umbria), in: Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, ed. S. Panciera, Rome 1982,11 245 ff., esp. 251, 261.

61 CIL XI 5212 = Dessau 1058: *T Haterio Nepoti Atinati Probo Publicio Mateniano co(n)-s(uli), pontif(ici), triumphalib(us) [ornamentis honorato J.*

62 See Cassius Dio 69, 13, 2.

63 CIL III 2830 = Dessau 1056

64 See e.g. Dessau 1022.1023.

65 PIR^{2}J 576.

66 AE 1904, 9 (Aequum).

67 See Eck, The Bar Kokhba Revolt 88 f.

68 The name remained to the end of the third century. Only under the most exceptional circumstances does the title [ijAcItthv louSctiac rather than Syria Palaestina, surface on one occasion under Marcus Aurelius (Inschriften von Ephesus III 665); see W. Eck, A. Iunius Rufi-nus, proconsul Asiae unter Marc Aurel, und seine Familie, in: Steine und Wege. Festschrift flir Dieter Knibbe zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. P. Scherrer — H. Taeuber — H. Thtir, Wien 1999, 299 ff.

69 Not 134, as in PIR^2 J 576, reproduced in M. Sartre, L' Orient Romain, Paris 1991, 388 and idem, in: Rome et ('integration de l'empire, 44 ay. J.-C.-260 ap. J.-C., ed. C. Leppeley, 1998, 430, to name but a few; see Eck, The Bar Kokhba Revolt 88 n. 97.

70 Had he been governor of Syria at the time, this post would have been recorded in the inscription right after the consulate and before the *ornamenta triumphalia;* whereas now this place is occupied by the governorship of Syria Palaestina. This shows clearly that a chronological order was followed here. For the supposed governorship in Syria see the following argumentation.

71 See e.g. PIR^2 J 576; E. Dabrowa, The Governors of Roman Syria from Augustus to Septimius Severus, 1998, 94ff.

72 Contra Dabrowa (n. 71) 94ff.; but the latter's attempt to fit him in does not carry much weight seeing that Iulius Severus would have spent but few month in Syria — not very likely for such a highly decorated officer.

73 If the *ornamenta triumphalia* are displayed outside Rome at all this is either in funerary inscriptions (e. g. Dessau 921. 985. 986), or in building inscriptions (Dessau 273. 957; AE 1929, 1166 = 1987, 250). Only CIL IX 2487 = Dessau 971 may be an exception.

74 I am aware of only two texts which belong to this category: Dessau 997 (unless the inscription actually belongs to a grave) and Dessau 970 = J. H. Oliver, AJPh 69, 1948, 219 ff. (review of A. Stein, Die Legaten von Moesien, 1940) = U. Vogel-Weidemann, Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14-68 n. Chr.: eine Untersuchung zum Verhaltnis Princeps und Senat, Bonn 1982, 348 ff. = L. Petersen — L. Vidman, Zur Laufbahn des A. Didius Gallus, in: Actes de la XII' conference internationale d'etudes classiques Eirene, Amsterdam — Bucharest, 1975, 653 ff. Against all current

interpretations of the inscription, I would maintain that the inscription does not show that Didius Gallus was honoured in Olympia, but rather, as his name in the nominative suggests, that he had a monument erected there, not for a divinity, which would have been named, but in order to say something about himself. Since his command in the Danube and the *ornamenta triumphalia* won there follow closely after his name, they may well have been the reason for erecting the monument. The example of Poblicius Marcellus comes immediately to mind.

75 CIL VIII 6706 = Dessau 1965.

76 The names of the other legionary commanders serving then in Judaea are unknown to us, about ten of them were in the province during the three year and a half of the revolt, if we add those who came at the head of vexillationes from other provinces to those stationed in the province.

77 See n. 42.

Source of this chapter: Werner Eck, "Hadrian, the Bar Kokhba Revolt, and the Epigraphic Transmission," in *Judäa – Syria Palästina: Die Auseinandersetzung einer Provinz mit römischer Politik und Kultur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 212–28.

SOURCE INDEX

This index groups the works and source collections cited in ENDNOTES. Note numbers identify their locations in the chapter. Citation details and abbreviated titles are retained as supplied; incomplete references and apparent transcription irregularities have not been supplemented or independently corrected.

Ancient literary sources

- **Tacitus** — *ann.* 15, 18, 1 (note 32); *ann.* 2, 6, 1E (note 46).
- **Cassius Dio** — 68, 26, 1 (note 46); 69, 13, 2 (note 62).

Epigraphic, numismatic and prosopographical collections

- **CIL** — III 13589 = 14155, 14 (14); III 14155, 2 (17); "CILI1478" (28); XIV 2088 (29); VI 974 = 40524 (37, 40); VI 40454 (39); VI 1565 = 37054, VI, VIII 3, p. 4713 (42, 43); VIII 8934 (45); XI 5212 (61); III 2830 (63); IX 2487 (73); VIII 6706 (75).
- **Dessau** — 316 (29); 1400 (45); 1058 (61); 1056 (63); 1022, 1023 (64); 921, 985, 986, 273, 957, 971 (73); 997, 970 (74); 1965 (75).
- **AE** — 2006, 582 (28); 1934, 231 (54); 1904, 9 (66); 1929, 1166 = 1987, 250 (73).

- **CIIP and variant transcriptions** — “CI1P 11” 1200–1209 (9); “CLIP I 2, 717” (10); CIIP II 1276 (11); CIIP I 2, 715–717 (16). The variant abbreviations are reproduced as they appear.
- **SEG** — 44, 1361 (13).
- **RMD** — V 382 (30).
- **BMC Emp.** — II no. 311T., 357 ff., 370 f., 388 ff., 532 ff., 763 ff. (39).
- **PIR²** — P 1042 (56); N 55, p. 344, with L. Vidman named (59); H 29, 30 (60); J 576 (65, 69, 71).
- **Inschriften von Ephesus** — III 665 (68).
- **G. Brusin** — *Inscriptiones Aquileiae*, Udine 1991, no. 499 (54).
- **G. L. Gregori — M. Mattel, eds.** — *Supplementa Italica. Imagines. Roma (CIL VI)* I, 1999, 384 f., no. 1223 (43).
- **J. H. Oliver** — *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*, Philadelphia 1989, no. 88 (31).

The revolt, its interpretation and documentary evidence

- **B. Isaac — A. Oppenheimer** — “The Revolt of Bar Kokhba: Ideology and Modem Scholarship,” in B. Isaac, *The Near East under Roman Rule. Selected Papers*, Leiden 1998, 220 ff., esp. 228 f. (1).
- **B. Isaac** — *The Near East under Roman Rule. Selected Papers*, Leiden 1998; also cited as “Near East,” 100 f., 228 (1, 8).
- **W. Eck** — “The Bar Kokhba Revolt,” cited without full publication details: p. 76 (7), 83 ff. (49), 88 f. (67), 88 n. 97 (69); also cited in note 3.
- **P. Schafer** — *Der Bar Kokhba Aufstand*, Tubingen 1981, 14 f.; cited subsequently as “Bar Kokhba Aufstand,” p. 130 (24, 44, 45).
- **L. Mildenberg** — *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*, Aarau 1984, 123 (26).
- **D. Barag** — “A Note on the Geographical Distribution of Bar-Kokhba Coins,” *Israel Numismatic Journal* 4, 1980, 30 ff. (51).
- **S. Applebaum** — *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt (A.D. 132-135)*, Oxford 1976, 81 n. 215 (45).
- **Y. Yadin — J. C. Greenfield — A. Yardeni — B. Levine** — *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* II, Jerusalem 2002, 351 ff.; P. Yadin 52 (47).
- **Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered** — contributions by H. Cotton and A. Kloner — B. Zissu, 133 ff., 181 ff. (2); H. Cotton on P. Yadin 52 and 57 (27); modified reading of P. Yadin 52, 133 ff. (47). Full volume details are not supplied.
- **H. M. Cotton** — “Ein Gedi between the Two Revolts,” *SCI* 20, 2001, 139 ff., esp. 153 f. (50).

Hadrian, Judaea and regional inscriptions

- **W. Eck — G. Foerster** — "EM Triumphbogen fur Hadrian im Tal von Beth Shean bei Tel Shalem," *JRA* 12, 1999, 294 ff.; cited as "Triumphbogen," 304 f., 300, 312 f. (3, 18, 19, 20, 33).
- **W. Eck** — "Ein Spiegel der Macht. Lateinische Inschriften romischer Zeit in Iudaea/Syria Palaestina," *ZDPV* 117, 2001, 47 ff. (20).
- **W. Eck** — "Der Bar Kochba-Aufstand der Jahre 132-136 und seine Folgen fiir die Provinz Judaea/Syria Palaestina," in *Iudaea socia — Iudaea capta*, ed. P. Urso, Pisa 2012, 249 ff.; article no. 19 in the volume (22).
- **K. G. Holum** — "Hadrian and Caesarea: An Episode in the Romanization of Palestine," *Ancient World* 23, 1992, 51 ff., esp. 59 f. (10, 12).
- **H. M. Cotton — W. Eck** — "Governors and Their Personnel on Latin Inscriptions from Caesarea Maritima," *The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings* VII, no. 7, 2001, 215 ff., esp. 235E (11).
- **Lehmann — Holum** — abbreviated reference only: nos. 45–54 (9); pp. 1, 10, 12 f. (12). Title and publication details are not supplied.
- **H. Halfmann** — *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Romi-schen Reich*, Gottingen 1986, 207; cited as "Halfinann," 206 f., in note 21 (12, 21).
- **A. R. Birley** — *Hadrian. The restless Emperor*, London 1997, 287 (41).
- **P. Thomsen** — "Die lateinischen und griechischen Inschriften der Stadt Jerusalem und ihrer nachsten Umgebung," *ZDPV* 44, 1921, 1 ff., esp. 2 ff., nos. 2, 3a and b (16).
- **L. di Segni** — "A New Toponym in Southern Samaria," *LA* 44, 1994, 579 ff.; "The Hadrianic Inscription from Southern Samaria (?) — A Palinode," *Liber Annuus* 53, 2003, 335 ff. (13).
- **W. Eck** — "Comprendere contesti: 11 nuovo multilingue Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae," *Rationes Rerum* 1, 2013, 17 ff. (13).
- **Hamam excavation reference** — Wadi Arbel (Hamam), eastern Lower Galilee; web address supplied in note 35 as "http://archaeology.huji.ac.il/ Hamam/" (35).

Military history, naval warfare and Arabia

- **B. Isaac** — *The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in the East*, second edition, Oxford 1992, 433; also cited as "Limits," 427 ff. (15, 17).
- **S. Gould** — "Inscriptions. I. The Triumphal Arch," in *The Excavations of Dura Europos* IV, 1933, 56 ff.; "Supplementary Inscriptions. I. An Addition to the Inscriptions of the Arch of Trajan," ibid. VI, 1936, 480 ff. (23).

- **W. Eck** — "Kaiserliche Impera-torenakklamationen and ornamenta triumphalia," *ZPE* 124, 1999, 223 ff. (24).
- **W. Eck — D. MacDonald — A. Pangerl** — *Acta Musei Napocensis* 39/40, 2002/3, 38; article title not supplied (30).
- **P. Weill** — *ZPE* 162, 2007, 249 f.; article title not supplied (30).
- **H. Devijver** — *Prosopographia Militiarutn Equestrium* ... I, Leuven 1976, C 234 (45).
- **J. Spaul** — *Ala*, second edition, Andover 1994, 92 f. (45).
- **E. Baltrusch — M. Schuol** — "Die Juden und das Meer in der Antike," *Medi-terraneo Antico* 4, 2001, 103 ff., esp. 119 f. (45).
- **S. Abbadi — F. Zayadine** — "Nepos the Governor of the Provincia Arabia in a Safaitic Inscription," *Semitica* 46, 1996, 157 (48).
- **W. Eck** — "Der angebliche Krieg des Aelius Caesar in Pannonien and die ornamenta triumphalia des Haterius Nepos," in *Von der Entstehung Roms bis zur AuflOsung des ROmerreiches*, ed. L. Borhy, 1999, 28 ff. (49).
- **W. Eck** — "Vier mysteriOse Rasuren in Inschriften aus Gerasa: Zum 'Schicksal' des Statthalters Haterius Nepos," in *'Entypaccd. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini*, ed. G Paci, vol. 1, 2000, 347 ff.; article no. 6 in the volume (49).

Epigraphic method, Roman monuments and imperial history

- **W. Eck — A. Caballos — F. Fernandez** — *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, Munchen 1996 (4).
- **M. Griffin** — "Claudius in Tacitus," *CQ* 84, 1990, 482 ff. (5).
- **W. Eck** — "Die Tauschung der Offentlichkeit oder: Die 'Unparteilichkeit' des Historikers Tacitus," *Antike and Abendland* 46, 2000, 190 ff. = "Cheating the Public: or Tacitus Vindicated," *SCI* 21, 2002, 149 ff. (6).
- **L. Garcia Iglesias** — *La hipotetica inscripcion del teatro de Merida reconstru-ida por Hubner*, Badajoz 1975, 5 ff.; "La hipotetica inscripcion del Teatro de Merida," *REE* 30, 1975, 591 ff. (28).
- **B. Levick** — *Vespasian*, London/New York 1999, 70 f. (38).
- **G. Alfaldy** — *Romische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quel-len*, Heidelberg 1984, 99 f.; cited under variant name spellings as "Romische Statuen," 38 f., n. 89 (54, 55, 56).
- **W. Eck** — "Die grosse Plini-usinschrift aus Comum: Funktion und Monument," in *Varia Epigraphica. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale di Epigrafia, Bertinoro, 8-10 giugno 2000*, ed. A. Bertinelli — A. Donati, Faenza 2001, 225 ff. (58).

Senatorial careers, property and provincial administration

- **L. Schumacher** — *Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur Besetzung der vier hohen rOmischen Priesterkollegien*, Diss. Mainz 1973, 224 (56, 59).
- **A. M. Andermahr** — *Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der Fruhen und Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Bonn 1998, 388 (57).
- **M. Gagiotti — L. Sensi** — "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con territori d'orig-Me. Italia: Regio VI (Umbria)," in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio*, ed. S. Panciera, Rome 1982, "11" 245 ff., esp. 251, 261 (60).
- **W. Eck** — "A. Iunius Rufi-nus, proconsul Asiae unter Marc Aurel, und seine Familie," in *Steine und Wege. Festschrift flir Dieter Knibbe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Scherrer — H. Taeuber — H. Thtir, Wien 1999, 299 ff. (68).
- **M. Sartre** — *L' Orient Romain*, Paris 1991, 388; contribution in *Rome et ('integration de l'empire, 44 ay. J.-C.-260 ap. J.-C.*, ed. C. Leppeley, 1998, 430; contribution title not supplied (69).
- **E. Dabrowa** — *The Governors of Roman Syria from Augustus to Sep-timius Severus*, 1998, 94 ff. (71, 72).
- **A. Stein** — *Die Legaten von Moesien*, 1940 (74).
- **J. H. Oliver** — review of A. Stein, *Die Legaten von Moesien*, *AJPh* 69, 1948, 219 ff. (74).
- **U. Vogel-Weidemann** — *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14-68 n. Chr.: eine Untersuchung zum Verhaltnis Princeps und Senat*, Bonn 1982, 348 ff. (74).
- **L. Petersen — L. Vidman** — "Zur Laufbahn des A. Didius Gallus," in *Actes de la XII' conference internationale d'etudes classiques Eirene*, Amsterdam — Bucharest, 1975, 653 ff. (74).

Use of the index: Parent-volume titles and their editors are retained with the contributions they contain. Notes containing only argument, internal page directions or a reference back to another note do not create separate work entries. The original ENDNOTES remain the reference point for inscription texts, interpretations and qualifications.