ELECTRUM * Vol. 26 (2019): 159–176
doi: 10.4467/20800909EL.19.010.11213
www.ejournals.eu/electrum

Leḥerut Yerushalayim: The Temple on the Coins of the Bar Kokhba War[1]

Michaël Girardin
Université du Littoral – Côte d'Opale

Abstract: In the third year of his fight against Rome (134/135 CE), Bar Kokhba minted coins with the slogan "*leḥerut Yerushalayim*: For the freedom of Jerusalem". In this paper, I argue that what was meant by this expression was not the geographic place but a powerful idea: the worship center of the Jewish identity. Jerusalem as a slogan seems to be a metonymy for the temple, and the temple was the link between God and the Jews. By proclaiming the necessity to liberate Jerusalem, Bar Kokhba actually tried to regroup all the Jews under his banner, exploiting the theocratic ideals and the eschatological hopes of the time. However, the documents found in the desert reveal that this propagandist expectancy was not universally shared by his own troops. For the political needs of the leader, "Jerusalem" was probably the best slogan possible, but it appears to have meant little in real life, even perhaps in the eyes of Bar Kokhba himself.

Keywords: Aelia Capitolina, Bar Kokhba, Coins, Elephantine Temple, Gerizim Temple, Hasmoneans/ Maccabees, Jerusalem, Jewish Revolt, Leontopolis Temple, Paleo-Hebrew script, Sicarii, the Temple, Theocracy, Zealots.

Introduction

"*Leḥerut Yerushalayim*: For the freedom of Jerusalem!". Such was the slogan adopted by the administration of the rebel Bar Kokhba for the coins of his third year (134/135 CE), while he was fighting against the Romans in the last great Jewish revolt of the Antiquity. The type was the more widespread of the many types minted the whole war long.[2] The iconographic symbols accompanying the legend on a type that year refer explicitly to the core of Jerusalem: on the obverse one can see a tetrastyle temple and, on the reverse, the *lulav* and the *etrog*, symbols of Sukkot (**Fig. 5**). In this monetary discourse, the

[1] I am grateful to Chr.-G. Schwentzel for his support and his invaluable comments on this paper. I thank C. Jennings and M. Sanders for their language corrections. Any error remains mine.

[2] Mildenberg 1984, 91.

temple and the city seem to be synonyms. This may be because the temple materialized the city, but most likely because Jerusalem was a metonymy for the temple. Indeed, it is well known that Jerusalem was thought of as the city of the sanctuary, and that its sacredness, as well as its centrality, resulted from this association.[3] In the present paper, the point shall be to demonstrate that the documentation of the second revolt, both from numismatics as well as from papyrology, shows Jerusalem as a revolutionary slogan, which symbolized the temple and was not very different from the ideology of centrality developed in the Hasmoneans times.

The Centrality of the Temple in Hellenistic and Roman Judaism

It is noteworthy that the centrality of the temple in the ancient Judaism was never totally complete. This fact is particularly evident by the well-known temple founded in Leontopolis in Egypt by Onias IV. The Samaritans, for their part, worshiped God on mount Gerizim, whose shrine was also honored by the Samaritan diaspora.[4] Isaiah the prophet announced that one day, Yahweh would be worshiped in Egypt (Isa 19.19–21). However, this is an ancient ideal, repeated throughout the Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy, 1 and 2 Kings and 1 and 2 Chronicles in particular offer rich testimony to this concern.[5] Of course, the question was partially a political one, since the temple was directly associated with the king who used it as an instrument of self-legitimation.[6] The ideal of centrality benefited the royal power. This can partially explain the centralizing reforms of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18.4; 2 Chr 23–31) and Josiah (2 Kgs 23).[7] Yet the centralization cannot be reduced to this sole reading, since religious considerations must be brought in to account. Besides, the temple of Leontopolis would have been patterned after that of Jerusalem, according to Josephus (*BJ* 1.31–33; 7.420–433) and the temple of Elephantine recognized itself as dependent on the Jerusalemite priests.[8] The powerful place of the temple in Jewish cosmogony has especially been demonstrated by Francis Schmidt, who named it "*la pensée du temple*" ("the thought of the temple").[9]

The importance of the temple is clearly displayed in the way the society of Hellenistic and Roman times elevated the occupation of high priest to that of highest prestige. In this he stood at the head of the Jewish *ethnos* and governed it on behalf of the occupying powers.[10] Under the reign of Herod, the priesthood lost most of its authority,[11] but it kept

[3] See for instance Reich 2011, 328 for the time of Herod: "Jerusalem … is the great and wealthy city of the Temple" and Berthelot *et al*. 2016, 82: "C'est grâce à son Temple réputé unique que Jérusalem jouit d'une place aussi centrale dans le judaïsme du tournant de notre ère."

[4] Kartveit 2014; Hamidović 2015.

[5] See: Römer 2000; Abadie 2001.

[6] Busink 1970, 618–650; Riley 1993; Lux 2002. Such a use of rituals was current in Ancient times. For the Mesopotamian example, see Talon 1993.

[7] On Ezechias, see Spieckermann 1982, 174; Pakkala 2010. About Josias, see Römer 2014, 30–31.

[8] Nutkowitz 2011.

[9] Schmidt 1994.

[10] See, for instance: Schürer 1973, 227–235 and 275; Milgrom 2004, 22; Dąbrowa 2010b, 106; Schwentzel 2013, 67–69.

[11] Wilker 2007, 217–221; Marshak 2015, 306–307.

intact its powerful and evocative power. Herod himself felt the necessity to appropriate the temple in order to guarantee the legitimacy of his power.[12] Like the Hasmoneans, he adroitly made use of the theocratic foundation of ancient Judaism.[13]

While the ideal is old indeed, the reality on the other hand is late, since it was mainly the Hasmoneans who assimilated the centrality of worship into the homogeneity of their kingdom.[14] In this regard, two major events are noteworthy: the destruction of Mount Gerizim in Samaria in 112/111 BCE.[15] and the forced conversion of Idumeans. The Jewish dynasts even strove to multiply links with the diaspora, for instance by inventing the half-shekel tax and the festival of Hanukkah.[16] Here again, centrality was a political matter. Since they justified their uprising by the need to protect the shrine, Hasmoneans employed it as the foundation of their legitimacy. The mix of political and religious motivations in the "*pensée du temple*" is again to be noted in the first hours of the revolt of 66, when the population resisted the procurator Florus after he took seventeen silver talents in the temple. The latter was clearly perceived as a threat to the core of Judaism.[17] In like manner, the monetary discourse of the short-lived Jewish State born of this revolt emphasized the theocracy and the temple of Jerusalem, both representative of the unity of all Jews.[18] Thus the fact that Bar Kokhba proposed this galvanizing slogan could hardly be surprising. He was continuing the legacy of the Maccabees and rebels of the Great Revolt.[19]

Jerusalem under War

However, the temple occupied a different place at the time of Bar Kokhba. While the Maccabees claimed the motive of their fight was its liberation and eventual rededication in 165 BCE, and while the rebels of 66–70 began the war in the temple and defended

---

[12] Schwentzel 2009b.

[13] On the exploitation of the theocracy by the Hasmoneans, see: Dąbrowa 2010a, 8; Regev 2013, 56; Babota 2014, 285.

[14] Dąbrowa 2010a; Eckhardt 2013, 77–87; Schwentzel 2013, 87.

[15] For the date, see Crown 1991; Barag 1992.

[16] For Hanukkah, see Regev 2006. For the half-shekel, once believed to have been the continuity of the tax levy established by Moses, see especially: Bikerman 1939, 14–15; Gruen 2002, 244; Regev 2013, 73–78 and 280–281; Girardin 2016a, 59–60.

[17] About this event, see: Girardin, forthcoming. In this paper, I try to offer a synthesis of the relationships between religion and taxation in Hellenistic and Roman Judaea. The notion of "representation," that is, the manner in which the sources distort the facts in order to give them an interpretation, is here demonstrated in his usefulness for understanding the fiscal matters in the period. Concerning Florus, nothing suggests that he exceeded his prerogative, but the source, Flavius Josephus, transformed the evidence in order to justify the rise of tensions. What is remarkable is that the people challenged the legitimacy of the procurators, rather than the charge by itself. However, one cannot explain the absence of the clergy in the disputes, except if one supposes that it complied with Florus, as it did in the time of Pilatus.

[18] Girardin 2016b, with a discussion about the divergences in discourse between Sicarii of Simon bar Giora and Zealots entrenched on the Mount of the temple. In this paper, I underscore moreover that this unity was only apparent, thanks to the autobiography of Flavius Josephus. Many points of view are to be found. But the fact remains that the State founded during the war claimed to be united.

[19] As demonstrated by Berthelot 2006, 112–113, the ideology of resistance in the Bar Kokhba War was very close to the one of the Maccabees.

it until the very end of the war, Jerusalem does not seem to have been for even a moment in the hands of Bar Kokhba. Indeed, numismatics proves that the re-foundation of the city was not a repressive element but rather predated the uprising.[20] The reason was to promote the city, following a typically Roman logic.[21] In 130, when Emperor Hadrian wrote to Hierapolis in Phrygia, he stated that he was writing from Jerusalem, and did not yet refer to the city as Aelia Capitolina.[22] It is then possible that the foundation did not mean a change in name, and that this symbolic abolition was in fact a part of the post-135 repressive arsenal, playing a role in the *damnatio memoriae* of Judaea.[23]

It was once believed that the year 3 slogan, "for the freedom of Jerusalem," meant that the city, taken over by the rebels in the early months of the war, had just been lost.[24] Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz even hypothesized that Bar Kokhba, having restored the temple, had been forced to abandon Jerusalem because it was indefensible.[25] But it is hardly imaginable that the rebels abandoned the core of Judaism without a fight. Moreover, the only tangible evidence of the rebels' presence were two coins found in Jerusalem.[26] This is hardly conclusive, as they may have been brought there by Roman soldiers,[27] but mainly because they do not come from a legal excavation and cannot be certified as to their provenance.[28] It is more likely that Jerusalem was never controlled by the rebels,[29] and that the temple was never rebuilt after its destruction by Titus in 70 CE.

The slogan "for the freedom of Jerusalem" is therefore to be understood otherwise. It was a watchword, a project that gave a theological justification to the struggle.[30] The tetrastyle façade of the coins (**Figs. 4, 5**) would not represent a memorable exploit but an objective. This is consistent with the fact that no known modifications in iconography occurred between the year 2 and the year 3 on the coins. The loss of the city, even if it ever took place, cannot be the reason for the presence of the temple in year 3 coins.

The Temple in the Rebels' Ideology

This objective can be deduced by examining the motifs on the coins. Even without reviewing all the symbols, it is clear that some referred explicitly to the temple. This was the case, for example, of the coins in the name of Eleazar the priest in year 1 (**Fig. 1**).

[20] Meshorer 1967, 92; Mildenberg 1984, 100–101; Kindler 2000. Actually, Schäfer (1990, 285) and Di Segni (2014, 442) doubt of it, because the coins could have been buried together after the war.

[21] Smallwood 1976, 433–434; Hengel 1984; Labbé 2012, 459; Berthelot *et al*. 2016, 92–93.

[22] Ritti 2004, 336–338.

[23] Tsafrir 2003. This argument casts doubt on the theory of Di Segni 2014. This scholar, followed by Lykke (2015, 146), thinks that Aelia Capitolina was founded in 117 and named during the travel of Hadrian in 130.

[24] See, for instance: Reifenberg 1947, 35; Kanael 1963, 61; Philonenko 1974, 184; Smallwood 1976, 443–445.

[25] Laperrousaz 2007, 121–129.

[26] Meshorer 1967, 95–96; Ariel 1982, 293.

[27] Barag 1980, 33.

[28] Kindler 2000, 176–179.

[29] The question of the four *papyri P. Mur* (22, 25, 29, and 30) that date from the "fourth year of freedom of Jerusalem," has been rubbed away by Eshel 2002: their origin dates from the first revolt.

[30] Mildenberg 1984, 31.

This Eleazar was perhaps the religious counterpart to Bar Kokhba, a priestly figure accompanying the warlord.[31] It may be also a reminiscence of biblical time, using the name of the priest *par excellence*, the son of Aaron.[32] In both cases, the legend referred to a paradigmatic world in which the sacred law occupied a place of preeminence.

On the same coin, one finds on the obverse a dating referring to the redemption of Israel (*lg'lt yšr'l*). It recalls the bronzes of year 4 of the first revolt, perhaps struck by Simon bar Giora, who proclaimed the redemption of Zion (*lg'lt ṣywn*).[33] The term "redemption" itself was very strong, evoking not merely political freedom, but reconciliation with God and eternal salvation. As for the name "Israel," it also referred to biblical times, replacing the name "Judaea" for the land and "Jews" or "Judaeans" for the people, as they were known to foreigners.[34] Here again, the lexical choice brought Bar Kokhba closer to the ideology of the first revolt.[35] Hearkening back to ancient times was a way of suggesting the uprising bore a conservative cast. It is therefore no coincidence that the legends were written in Paleo-Hebrew, again like those of the first revolt. This script, obsolete since a long time,[36] remained identifiable and brimmed with symbolic meanings. In the Hasmonean age, it was probably used in order to evoke the great priesthood, and worship within the biblical tradition.[37] This same purpose can be evidenced during the Great Revolt[38] and most certainly during that of Bar Kokhba,[39] whose official discourse seems decidedly close to those of the two previous revolts.

Even the title taken by the leader, *nšy' yšr'l* (**Figs. 2**, **3**), leads in the direction of continuity. The term *nšy'* appears 134 times in the Hebrew Bible and designated a chief, with a relatively neutral meaning, very close to the Greek ἄρχων. This latter term is a frequent translation used in the Septuagint. It therefore carried neither royal nor messianic connotation and brought no political innovation, making its carrier a ruler, or better a *leader*, without his power being officially superior to that of the priests.[40]

Yet, this clever discourse concealed a notable fact, which distinguished it from the rebels of 66–70: the former had striven to keep absent any human leader on their coinage, giving the (wrong) impression that a unified Israel was directly governed by God.[41] By displaying his power on coins, Bar Kokhba was thus closer to the ideology expressed by the Hasmoneans.[42] As iconography was comparable, one should remember that the

[31] This is the *communis opinio*, defended among others by Philonenko 1974 and still adopted by Lykke 2015, 154–160.

[32] Hendin 2014.

[33] See Girardin 2016b, 29, and bibliography there.

[34] Goodblatt (2009) studied the ambiguities of the appellations "Judah" and "Israel" in the Hasmonean period.

[35] Cf. Girardin 2016b, 32–33.

[36] Zissu – Abadi 2014.

[37] Dąbrowa 2010b, 136–137.

[38] Girardin 2016b, 32–33.

[39] Lykke 2015, 153–154.

[40] For the implications of the term *nšy'* at the time of Bar Kokhba, see Choi 2013, 110–113.

[41] Girardin 2016b.

[42] The numismatic discourse of the Hasmoneans has been studied by Schwentzel (2007, 2009a, and 2014).

coins of Bar Kokhba were once attributed to them, and in particular to Simon Maccabeus.[43] In year 2, the name of the issuing authority changed: the title of Simon disappeared in favor of its simple name (**Figs. 5–7**) or that of Jerusalem (**Fig. 4**). The propaganda was therefore centered more on the temple and its place in the general ideology.

Despite all of this, the "conservative" aspect of politics is not attested by the parchments. On the contrary, it would seem that Bar Kokhba took over from the Roman administration, without changing anything in the structures except the language: he kept the imperial domains to his own advantage,[44] preserved the formal aspects of administrative acts[45] and even his taxation, to a certain extent, was a preservation of that raised by Rome.[46] Such are the pieces of information that can be extracted from the eleven contracts of renting cataloged in *P.* Mur 24 and some other in the *P.* Yadin (42–46) archive. Tradition was thus preserved in appearance (language, monetary iconography), but remained absent in social, governmental and administrative structures. This is still the case even in the architecture of the temple appearing on the coins (**Figs. 4**, **5**), since this tetrastyle façade resembles more closely to some found on other eastern, pagan coinages of the Hadrian era (see **Fig. 8** for the example of Tiberias) than at the descriptions of the Hebrew Bible, of Josephus or of the Mishna.[47] The iconography bears some vestiges of the one of Roman coins and is not totally Jewish, even if the message is such.

Such patterns make it possible to ensure that, beyond the word "Jerusalem," it was the temple which was evoked. In this regard, attention may be drawn to the cluster of grapes (**Fig. 1**), an ordinary symbol in the Hebrew Bible of divinely bestowed prosperity.[48] Such blessing can be seen in the enormous cluster, requiring two men to carry, brought back to Moses by those who had been sent to explore the "Promised Land' (Num 13.23). Vineyard symbolism is further depicted in the prophecy of Hosea where God declares that he found Israel as a vine in a desert, yet this does not deter her from abandoning his commandments (Hos 9.10). Isaiah presents God as the divine winegrower, who harvests the evil fruit of the vineyard, his people, notwithstanding the care he has shown them (Isa 5.10–11). Note that the same image is to be found in Jesus' teaching (John 15.1–11). In all likelihood the symbol reflects biblical imagery, evoking as it does the richness of divine blessing.

One can see also a palm, the *lulav* (**Fig. 2**), stirred up by believers during the festival of Sukkot according to Leviticus (Lev 23.39–40). In the same manner, *lulav* and *etrog* appeared together on some coins (**Fig. 4**, **5**). Bar Kokhba himself, in one of his letters, commanded Yeḥudah bar Manasheh to have handed over to him *lulavim* as well as lemons (*etrogim*) by the two donkeys he sent to him on the occasion of the feast (*P.* Yadin 57). Similarly, his administrator Soumaios asks Yeḥonathan son of Ba'yan for

43 The confusion was corrected by Saulcy 1854, 11–17.

44 Mildenberg 1984, 93–94; Cotton 2001; Horbury 2014, 352–353.

45 Benoit *et al*. 1961, 123; Girardin 2018, 22–23.

46 Horbury 2014, 353–354, with some prudence. For the evidences of the Roman taxation in Judea prior to the Bar Kokhba war, see now Girardin 2019. A few insight are given here about the taxation of Bar Kokhba, waiting for the publication of my PhD thesis that consecrates a full chapter to this question.

47 For the descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple, see Busink 1970 and 1980. The resemblance has already been showed by Lykke (2015, 163–165).

48 For example, Joel 3.13.

lemons for Sukkot (*P.* Yadin 52). This proves that the rebel leader was trying to keep the festivals according to tradition, and that this image on his coins was not merely a symbol, but a reflection of the actual practice of worship within his army too.

Musical instruments are also to be recognized (a harp in **Figs. 2** and **7**). Music indeed had its own place in ceremonies. The Psalmist invites praise to God with the trumpet, lyre, harp, timbrel, stringed instruments, pipe and cymbals (Psalm 150.3–5), while Ezra mentions the "prescriptions" (*ydy*) of king David (Ezra 3.10) in a similar fashion. The Talmud of Jerusalem mentions harps, lyres and cymbals (*Sukkah*, 5.4). Generally speaking, in Antiquity, music was an integral part of worship.[49]

As for the vase which appeared in **Fig. 6**, it was probably, like the utensils of the same type on the coins of the first revolt,[50] a symbol of libations. At the time the temple stood as after 70, and again in the rabbinic period, sacred vessels were part of sacrificial rhetoric and represented the heart of all rituals.[51] Moreover, according to David Hendin, the seven-branched palm-tree (**Figs. 1**, **3**) may allude to the *menorah*.[52]

There remains, finally, a symbol for which no interpretation is unanimous: it appears between the four columns of the temple on the tetradrachms (**Figs. 4**, **5**). Alice Muehsam and Claudia Wallack Samuels saw there the ark of the covenant[53] or the gate of Nicanor, seen from the colonnade of Solomon; Dan Barag has recognized the table of the showbread.[54] Anyway, this image remains a clearly temple-oriented representation.

It is therefore notable that the coins of Bar Kokhba, by their legends as well as by their pictorial representations, ascribed to the temple and to the service of worship an important place in their propaganda.[55] This does not mean that the temple was rebuilt, nor can we say that these symbols had no meaning in the daily life of the rebels. On the contrary, the practice of worship seems to have been an important symbolic element of the army, as seen on coins and documents of the war. But such worship, deprived of the temple, necessitated compromises, as hope of one day rebuilding the vanished sanctuary would have to wait.[56] Even absent, the temple remained central to Bar Kokhba's propaganda, and occupied a place comparable to which it occupied in the times of the Hasmoneans and of the rebels of 66–70. One must see here a direct inheritance, in continuity with the "*pensée du temple*" of Judaism of the Second Temple. Thus, Jerusalem as a slogan was destined to be intertwined with the sanctuary.

---

[49] Brulé – Vendries 2001.

[50] Romanoff 1944, 31–33.

[51] Fraade 2009.

[52] Hendin 2012, 139.

[53] This view is shared by Lykke 2015, 162–163.

[54] Muehsam 1966, 18; Barag 1994; Wallack Samuels 2000, 89–90.

[55] See Berthelot *et al*. 2016, 92: "L'espoir de la libération et de la restauration de la ville est néanmoins vivace parmi eux, comme en témoignent certaines légendes de monnaies frappées durant cette période."

[56] As noted by Clements 2012, the significance of the destruction of the temple seems to be posterior to 135, because there was, until the defeat of Bar Kokhba, the conviction that it would be soon rebuilt. One can say then, that the temple was central to the cosmogony during the time of Bar Kokhba. The coins do not propose merely symbolic meanings, rather they reveal the profoundest of aspirations. However, the faith of the leader cannot be determined, since the numismatic discourse had a long heritage and tells nothing about the *nšy'* himself. Of necessity he had to emphasize the place of the temple. Perhaps he truly had pious motives, but in any case, political reasons to emphasize the shrine ran deep.

Fighting for Jerusalem, Fighting for the Temple

Beyond this heritage, the claim to fight for the temple and the call for the freedom of Jerusalem in 134/135 CE carried special meaning, distinct from that of the Maccabees or of 66–70. For since the destruction of the temple, dated traditionally on August 30 in 70 CE, the date of the fall of the first temple (Mishna, *Ta'anith*, 4.6), Judaism was facing profound questions. The apocalyptic literature reveals near total incomprehension of the event. 4 Ezra, in particular, wondered whether God is unjust, for allowing the destruction of his own dwelling place:[57] was Babylon more pious than Jerusalem?[58] Why did God choose a foreign people to destroy it?[59] Were not the Jews destined to rule over the world?[60]

If credence is given to the discourse associated with the coins, the leader had the objective to rebuild the sanctuary, thus becoming the new Judas Maccabeus.[61] His propaganda revolved around this idea. "Jerusalem," in his speech, was a metonymy for the temple, the lost cosmogonic heart of Judaism. It was less a geographic place than a powerful ideal: it is even probable that already before 70 it was for many only a distant place, though it remained an extremely strong symbol that united all Jews.[62] By using the slogan *leḥerut Yerushalayim*, Bar Kokhba offered a unifying slogan, transcending the cleavages of plural Judaism. His purpose was not so much to liberate the city than the temple itself,[63] the place chosen by God for his name to dwell. For it was only in that place that the believers could bring their holocausts (*'lh*), their sacrifices (*zbḥ*), their tithes (*m'šr*), and their heave-offerings (*trwmh*) according to Deuteronomy (12.11). Thus, to liberate Jerusalem signified the re-establishment of sacrificial cult to God. Since this cult was the foundation of Israel's identity,[64] even before its establishment in the "Promised Land," the message was more than a call to armed resistance: it was an identity claim, an attempt to unify the whole people, to call all those who recognized themselves as Jews to rally to his cause. He may even have thought to the Diaspora, possibly hoping that it might arise once again as it did in 115–117 during the "Kitos War,"[65] though it is unlikely

[57] As demonstrated by Berthelot 2011, it is a way of responding to contemporaries: such questions were not the stance of the author of the apocalypse, which tried to explain that human beings cannot understand godly ways.

[58] 4 Ezra 1.28–36.

[59] 4 Ezra 3.28–30; 6.27–34; 7.11–21; 8.8–15. See also the Apocalypse of Abraham 27.3–5.

[60] 4 Ezra 4.59. See also 2 Bar 14.4–19.

[61] Indeed, as demonstrated by Honigman (2014, 65–94 and 147–181), the legitimation of the actions of Judas Maccabees rests on the appearance of refunding the temple, instead of liberating it. One may add that the victories legitimize Judas Maccabees as well, as a new divinely elected leader of Israel, as seen by Berthelot 2014. These two pillars of the legitimation of the Hasmoneans are to be supposed in the case of Bar Kokhba.

[62] This is an idea from Fraade 2009, 263: the temple was "much more of a powerful idea than a regularly and directly lived experience."

[63] Though in English language it cannot be translated, it is to note that in French language, one makes a distinction between the urban zone ("*la ville*"), which is a geographical place, and the institutional city as could be found in classical Greece ("*la cité*"). The purpose to Bar Kokhba was not merely to liberate the *ville*, but the *cité* of the temple, that is, the political and religious meanings of the identity of Jerusalem, instead of the location.

[64] Smith 1927, 226–227; De Vaux 1964, 18–19; Marx 1992; Schmidt 1994, 14–15.

[65] About this war, see especially Pucci 1981 and Horbury 2014, 164–277. About the Roman reaction to this war, see Gambash 2015, 167–169.

that this would have occurred.[66] Nevertheless, the presence of a certain number of Jews from Arabia among the rebels, known from the Naḥal Ḥever archives, could account for a measure of success in spreading his ideas to the regions nearby to Judaea.[67]

The apocalypses claimed that the time without temple was only temporary: God would not forget his people (4 Ezra 12.47), "pagans" were a retribution on the wicked of Israel, yet they too would be punished in their turn (1 Enoch 58.12–14), and this destruction was intended only to hasten the punishment of the ungodly ones (2 Bar 20). In each post-70 apocalyptic text, one finds the constant theme of imminence: the end time was thought to be near.[68] This, with the passing years, became more and more difficult to both live with and to understand given the constant delay.[69] Revolt was the culmination of these expectations.[70] Thus the most significant rupturing of hope was not the destruction of the temple, rather it was the defeat of Bar Kokhba, which itself led to understand that the temple could not be rebuilt in the near future.[71] It was only from this moment that rabbinical Judaism backed away from a hastening of the end of times in order to wait for God to send his messiah.[72] It was only after 135 that the temple took a new place in Judaism[73].

The Other Side of the Coin—Jerusalem Where There Was No Propaganda

However, it is important not to overemphasize the propaganda of Bar Kokhba: the letters found in the Judaean desert, on the contrary, tend to relativise any general enthusiasm.[74] Faced with a lack of zeal among his administrators in Ein Gedi, the leader wrote to them the following words:

66 Mildenberg 1984, 94–96.

67 For the Nabatean participation, see Cotton 2003. The presence of Babatha in Judaea during the war is puzzling. Perhaps she was convinced by the motives of the uprising; perhaps she was expelled from her home by the Gentiles horrified by the fights nearby. See Goodman 1991; Isaac 1992; Hamidović 2014a.

68 Even if one cannot but agree with Baumgarten 1999 when he shows that not all forms of messianism made the temple central.

69 See the book of Hamidović 2014b, whose title means "The Endless End of the World."

70 One can quote Collins 2003, 18: "Both Deuteronomy and the apocalypses fashion identity by constructing absolute, incompatible contrasts. In the older literature, the contrast is ethnic and religious, but regional. In the apocalypses, it takes the form of cosmic dualism. In both cases, the absoluteness of the categories is guaranteed by divine revelation and is therefore not subject to negotiation or compromise. Herein lies the root of religious violence in the Jewish and Christian traditions."

71 See Schwartz – Weiss 2012.

72 Hadas-Lebel 2000; Berthelot 2006, 115–116.

73 Even if it kept a deep role in the ideology, and still today. In order to qualify this role, Berthelot *et al*. 2016, 98–100 name it "the presence of the absent temple" ("la présence du temple absent"). In the same order of facts, the synagogue seems to have appeared long before the destruction and not as a response, according to Sharon 2012.

74 However, Mildenberg (1984, 108), wrote: "Still, the rebels clung to some very real hope—their coins, letters and documents make this clear." Lykke (2015, 150) even wrote, against all evidence: "The impression of an effective Jewish … dissident state, without the internal political tensions that had dominated the time leading up to the First Jewish War in 66 CE, is supported by the picture obtained from the desert documents."

> In comfort you sit, eat and drink from the property of the House of Israel, and care nothing for your brothers.[75] (*P.* Yadin 49, 2–4)

The tone of his correspondence is quite strong; every command is accompanied by a threat. He seems to have been very harsh with those who did not take part in the war effort[76] and used the fate of an unknown Ben Aphlul as a threatening reminder in order to recall the price paid by those who disobeyed him (*P.* Mur 43).[77] Masabala and Yeḥonathan son of Ba‘yan were chastised by their superior (*P.* Yadin 49 and 63), and the former, perhaps, under the name of Ionathes in Greek, received a letter which could be the complaint of Annanos, announcing that Bar Kokhba was still asking him for resources (*P.* Yadin 59). Clearly, not everyone believed that Jerusalem had to be liberated at all costs. The documents even revealed a part of the business of an Eliezer ben/bar Shemuel, who seems to have rent pieces of public lands in order to sublet them for his own profit, with the connivance of the administrators (*P. Yadin* 42–46).

Therefore, it may be that the slogan *leḥerut Yerushalayim* and the façade of the temple on the coins were a way of bringing to task the negligent officers, by reminding them of the cause they were fighting for. This cause went far beyond the political, social and economic motivations that certainly helped fuel the uprising: it was also seen as a matter of hastening the messianic era, a kind of forcing the end times. After year 1 "of the redemption of Israel," and year 2 "of the freedom of Israel," the purpose would have been to remind those involved that freedom was not a time of peace and that the fighters should not relax in their efforts; the objective was not to seize power in order to exercise it in a secular way. If I am correct, this slogan, opposed to generals and administrators satisfied with their position and showing no zeal for the struggle, recalls the prophecy of Amos:

> Alas, you who are longing for the day of the Lord, for what purpose will the day of the Lord be to you? It will be darkness and not light; as when a man feels from a lion and a bear meets him, or goes home, leans his hand against the wall and a snake bites him. Will not the day of the Lord be darkness instead of light, even gloom with no brightness in it? (Amos 5.18–20, *New American Standard Bible Version*)

Moreover, in the same context of the "day of the Lord," note the conclusion the prophet Joel gave to a long exposition of that day of darkness:

[75] This is the translation of Yadin 1971, 133. The scientific edition has been performed by Yadin et al. 2002, 279–286 with the following translation: "In good (circumstances) you are dwell[i]ng; eating and drinking in the property of the House of Israel, but showing no concern for your brothers in any manner."

[76] See *P. Yadin* 54, 55, 61 and *P. Mur* 47 for the example of the treatment of the population of Teqoa. These people may have refused to pay the contribution according to Yadin *et al*. 2002, 337, or may not have taken part in the fights according to Smallwood 1976, 453.

[77] The opinions about the managing of Bar Kokhba are particularly hostile: Schäfer 1981, 74: "Charakteristisch für Bar Kokhba ist zunächst der strenge und autoritäre Führungstil"; Mildenberg 1984, 75: "a stern ruler and an autocratic commander-in-chief"; Choi 2013, 178: "The Bar Kokhba that emerges from the letter written to his military commanders is strong and tough"; Hendin 2014, 163: "Bar Kokhba was an egocentric micromanager"; Schwartz 2016, 247: "a prince who was an irascible, ineffective micromanager, ignored by his lieutenants in the field". However, the presentation of Yadin (1971, 133), is much more interesting: according to him, the leader was disappointed and perhaps affected by the lack of zeal of his subordinates.

> Yet even now, declares the Lord, return to me with all your heart, and with fasting, weeping and mourning; and rend your heart and not your garments. Now return to the Lord your God … (Joel 2.12–13)

On the other hand, it is remarkable enough that the leader himself never mentioned in his letters the reason why his men should fight. He never justified his actions nor developed the slightest theocratic argument. In view of his letters, obedience seemed to him not to be open to discussion. It was by threat rather than persuasion that he claimed mastery over his men. Therefore, one is pressed to nuance the monetary propaganda of Bar Kokhba, which owed much to the Maccabees. It seems, more precisely, to have been a matter of cultural inheritance rather than deep religious conviction, for him as for his officers.

Conclusions

Bar Kokhba, it appears, never controlled the city of Jerusalem, but made it one of the foundations of his fighting ideology. According to the monetary discourse of the time, the purpose was to fight in order to capture the city of the temple, the core of the Jewish identity and cosmogony. Understood in this way, Jerusalem was a metonymy to designate the sanctuary. The leader, according to such language, fits well in immediate continuity with both the Maccabees and the rebels of 66–70, despite some variation in details. Nevertheless, in his own times, the meaning of such symbols necessarily changed, since the temple stood no more, and messianic expectations were no doubt stronger than they had ever been. Thus, Bar Kokhba responded to a genuine expectation of those who wondered as to why God permitted his sanctuary to be destroyed.

But historians are now fortunate enough to possess first-hand documents, deriving from the leader himself, which reveal the reverse side of the propaganda. The officers whose archives have been found do not seem to have shown an overflowing zeal for the cause of Israel. The passionate fervour which was said to be characteristic of the men fighting for God,[78] thus dubbed "Zealots" during the first revolt, is totally absent in the records, though it can be deduced from the iconography and legends of the coins. And while consulting these letters unearthed from the desert, one cannot suppress the feeling that the leader himself recognized a conspicuous dichotomy and therefore pressed hard for the call to *qn'*, the zeal for God, in order to keep his officers mobilized. It appears that for many of them, the slogan "Jerusalem" only carried little more than a beautiful idea.

To proclaim "for the freedom of Jerusalem" in the third year of the war meant calling to remember the deeper reason for the struggle. It likewise meant a striving to assemble the people to counter the looming defeat. It meant abandoning the idea that had appeared on the coins of the first two years, that freedom had already been acquired. Beyond the differences that fractured the Jewish communities, Bar Kokhba brought to task a resolute call for unity: Jerusalem, the city of the temple, as a metonymy for the cult. One notes

[78] See for instance: Num 25.11; 1 Kgs 19.10; 19.14; 2 Kgs 10.16; Isa 59.17; Ezek 5.13; Zech 1.14; 8.2; etc. See also Hengel 1961, 61–72; Mézange 2003, 30–31; Collins 2003; Berthelot 2006. For a comparison of the notion of zeal in Essenism and in Zelotism, see Hamidović 2011.

the manner in which he legitimized his fight in the name of ancestral theocratic convictions and according to the eschatological expectations of his own time. However, Bar Kokhba himself did not take the trouble to theologically justify his war in his letters, and was more of a warlord than a pious leader. The coins carried ethnic propaganda inherited from the Maccabees, but one cannot guarantee that they conveyed the deep conviction of the rebels.

Plate

Fig. 1. Year 1. Bronze, 19 mm, 6.49 g. Obverse: Bunch of grapes. *šnt ʼḥt lgʼlt yšrʼl*. Reverse: Harp. *ʼlʻzr hkhn* (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 2. Year 1. Bronze, 19 mm, 5.72 g. Obverse: Palm in the middle of a vegetal crown. *šmʻwn nš*[*yʼ yšr*]*ʼl*. Reverse: Harp. *šnt ʼḥt lgʼlt yšrʼl*. (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 3. Year 1. Bronze, 24 mm, 15.94 g. Obverse: Vine leaf. *šnt ʾḥt lgʾlt yšrʾl*. Reverse: Palm-tree. *šmʿwn nšyʾ yšrʾl*. (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 4. Year 2. Silver, 24 mm, 12.61 g. Obverse: Tetrastyle façade with an unidentified motif in the middle. *yrwšlym*. Reverse: Beam of *lulavim*, *etrog* left. *š b lḥr yšrʾl* (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 5. Year 3. Silver, 24 mm, 14.26 g. Obverse: Tetrastyle façade with an unidentified motif in the middle. *šmʿwn*. Reverse: Beam of *lulavim*, *etrog* left. *lḥrwt yrwšlm* (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 6. Year 3. Silver, 20 mm, 3.28 g. Obverse: *šm'wn* in the middle of a vegetal crown. Reverse: Vase. *lḥrwt yrwšlm* (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 7. Year 3. Silver, 19 mm, 3.06 g. Obverse: *šm'wn* in the middle of a vegetal crown. Reverse: Harp. *lḥrwt yrwšlm* (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Fig. 8. Bronze, 20 mm, 10.07 g. Obverse: Laureate and cuirassed bust right ΑΥΤ ΤΡΑ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΩ ΚΑΙΣ ΣΕΒ. Reverse: Temple of Zeus, pellet in pediment. ΤΙΒΕΡ ΚΛΑΥΔ. Date ΕΤΑΡ below (Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.)

Bibliography

Abadie, P. (2001), La symbolique du Temple dans l'oeuvre du chroniste, *Transeuphratène* 21: 13–29.

Ariel, D. T. (1982), A Survey of Coin Finds in Jerusalem (Until the End of the Byzantine Period), *Liber Annuus* 32: 273–326.

Babota, V. (2014), *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood*, Leiden–Boston.

Barag, D. (1980), A Note on the Geographical Distribution of Bar Kokhba Coins, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 4: 30–33.

Barag, D. (1992), New Evidence on the Foreign Policy of John Hyrcanus I, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12: 1–12.

Barag, D. (1994), The Table of the Showbread and the Facade of the Temple on Coins of the Bar-Kokhba Revolt, in: H. Geva (ed.), *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed*, Jerusalem: 272–276.

Baumgarten, A. I. (1999), The Role of Jerusalem and the Temple in 'End of Days' Speculation in the Second Temple Period, in: L. I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality*, New York: 77–89.

Benoit, P. *et al.* (eds.) (1961), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, II : Les grottes de Murabba'ât*, Oxford.

Berthelot, K. (2006), L'idéologie maccabéenne : entre idéologie de la résistance armée et idéologie du martyre, *Revue des Études Juives* 165: 99–122.

Berthelot, K. (2011), Is God Unfair? The Fourth Book of Ezra as a Response to the Crisis of 70 C.E., in: A. Lange *et al*. (eds.), *Judaism in Crisis*, Göttingen: 73–89.

Berthelot, K. (2014), Judas Maccabeus' Wars against Judaea's Neighbours in 1 Maccabees 5: A Reassessment of the Evidence, *Electrum* 21: 73–85.

Berthelot, K. *et al*. (2016), *Jérusalem. Histoire d'une ville-monde des origines à nos jours*, Paris.

Bikerman, E. (1939), Héliodore au temple de Jérusalem, *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 7: 5–40.

Brulé, P., Vendries, C. (eds.) (2001), *Chanter les dieux. Musique et religion dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine*, Rennes.

Busink, T. A. (1970), *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes*, Leiden.

Busink, T. A. (1980), *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes*, Leiden.

Choi, J. (2013), *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70 C.E. to 135 C.E.*, Leiden–Boston.

Clements, R. A. (2012), Epilogue: 70 C.E. after 135 C.E. The Making of a Watershed?, in: D. R. Schwartz, Z. Weiss (eds.), *Was 70 C.E. a Watershed in Jewish History ?*, Leiden–Boston: 517–536.

Collins, J. J. (2003), The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122: 3–21.

Cotton, H. (2001), Ein Gedi between the Two Revolts, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20: 139–154.

Cotton, H. (2003), The Bar Kokhba Revolt and the Documents from the Judaean Desert: Nabataean Participation in the Revolt (P. Yadin 52), in: P. Schäfer (ed.), *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*, Tübingen: 133–152.

Crown, A. D. (1991), Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 82: 17–50.

Dąbrowa, E. (2010a), The Hasmoneans and the Religious Homogeneity of their State, *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 8: 7–14.

Dąbrowa, E. (2010b), *The Hasmoneans and Their State: A Study in History, Ideology, and the Institutions*, Kraków.

De Vaux, R. (1964), *Les sacrifices de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris.

Di Segni, L. (2014), Epiphanius and the Date of Foundation of Aelia Capitolina, *Liber Annuus* 64: 441–451.

Eckhardt, B. (2013), *Ethnos und Herrschaft. Politische Figurationen Judäischer Identität von Antiochos III. bis Herodes I.*, Berlin–Boston.

Eshel, H. (2002), Documents of the First Jewish Revolt from the Judean Desert, in: A. M. Berlin, J. A. Overman (eds.), *The First Jewish Revolt : Archaeology, History and Ideology*, London: 157–163.

Fraade, S. D. (2009), The Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity before and after 70 C.E.: The Role of the Holy Vessels in Rabbinic Memory and Imagination, in: L. I. Levine, D. R. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Identities in Antiquity*, Tübingen: 237–265.

Gambash, G. (2015), *Rome and Provincial Resistance*, New York–London.

Girardin, M. (2016a), L'impôt dû à Dieu : une conséquence financière de la théocratie, in: M.-F. Baslez, C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.), *Les dieux et le pouvoir. Aux origines de la théocratie*, Rennes: 53–69.

Girardin, M. (2016b), The Propaganda of the Jewish Rebels of 66–70 C.E. according to Their Coins, *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 14: 23–40.

Girardin, M. (2018), The Use of Greek in Judaea: New Linguistic Habits for Individuals and the Roman Administration, in: N. Monnier (ed.), *Languages for Specific Purposes in History*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: 18–34.

Girardin, M. (2019), Dans le quotidien du collecteur : l'impôt romain d'après l'archive de Murabbaʿât, *Revue de Qumrân* 113: 11–49.

Girardin, M. (forthcoming), Religion et fiscalité en Judée hellénistique et romaine, in: M.-C. Marcellesi, A.-V. Pont (eds.), *Religion et fiscalité de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Paris.

Goodblatt, D. (2009), 'The Israelites Who Reside in Judah' (Judith 4:1): On the Conflicted Identities of the Hasmonean State, in: L. I. Levine, D. R. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Identities in Antiquity*, Tübingen: 74–89.

Goodman, M. (1991), Babatha's Story, *Journal of Roman Studies* 81: 169–175.

Gruen, E. S. (2002), *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge.

Hadas-Lebel, M. (2000), Il n'y a pas de messie pour Israël car on l'a déjà consommé au temps d'Ezéchias (TB Sanhédrin 99a), *Revue des Études Juives* 159: 357–367.

Hamidović, D. (2011), Entre jalousie et envie : le cas de l'essénisme, in: H. Rouillard-Bonraisin (ed.), *Jalousie des dieux, jalousie des hommes*, Turnhout: 173–186.

Hamidović, D. (2014a), *Babatha. Une vie ou l'humble vérité*, Paris.

Hamidović, D. (2014b), *L'interminable fin du monde*, Paris.

Hamidović, D. (2015), De la judaïté des inscriptions dans la mondialisation des premiers siècles de notre ère, in: C. Clivaz *et al*. (eds.), *Les Judaïsmes dans tous leurs états aux Ier–IIIe siècles*, Turnhout: 149–173.

Hendin, D. (2012), Jewish Coinage of the Two Wars, Aims and Meaning, in: D. M. Jacobson, N. Kokkinos (eds.), *Judaea and Rome in Coins, 65 B.C.E.–135 C.E.*, London: 123–144.

Hendin, D. (2014), On the Identity of Eleazar the Priest, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 18: 155–167.

Hengel, M. (1961), *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n.Chr.*, Leiden.

Hengel, M. (1984), Hadrians Politik gegenüber Juden und Christen, *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 16/17: 153–182.

Honigman, S. (2014), *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV*, Oakland.

Horbury, W. (2014), *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*, Cambridge.

Isaac, B. (1992), The Babatha Archive: A Review Article, *Israel Exploration Journal* 42: 62–75.

Kanael, B. (1963), Ancient Jewish Coins and Their Historical Importance, *The Biblical Archaeologist* 26 (2): 37–62.

Kartveit, M. (2014), Samaritan Self-Consciousness in the First Half of the Second Century B.C.E. in Light of the Inscriptions from Mount Gerizim and Delos, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 45: 449–470.

Kindler, A. (2000), Was Aelia Capitolina Founded before or after the Outbreak of the Bar Kokhba War? A Numismatic Evidence, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 14: 176–179.

Labbé, G. (2012), *L'affirmation de la puissance romaine en Judée (63 a.C.–136 p.C.)*, Paris.
Laperrousaz, E.-M. (2007), *Les Temples de Jérusalem*, Paris.
Lux, R. (2002), Der König als Tempelbauer. Anmerkungen zur sakralen Legitimation von Herrschaft im Alten Testament, in: F.-R. Erkens (ed.), *Herrschaftslegitimierung im Wechsel der Zeiten und Räume*, Berlin: 99–122.
Lykke, A. (2015), *Reign and Religion in Palestine: The Use of Sacred Iconography in Jewish Coinage*, Wiesbaden.
Marshak, A. K. (2015), *The Many Faces of Herod the Great*, Grand Rapids.
Marx, A. (1992), Familiarité et transcendance. La fonction du sacrifice d'après l'Ancien Testament, in: A. Schenker (ed.), *Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament*, Tübingen: 1–14.
Meshorer, Y. (1967), *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period*, Tel-Aviv.
Mézange, C. (2003), *Les Sicaires et les Zélotes. La révolte juive au tournant de notre ère*, Paris.
Mildenberg, L. (1984), *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*, Aarau.
Milgrom, J. (2004), *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*, Minneapolis.
Muehsam, A. (1966), *Coin and Temple: A Study of the Architectural Representation on Ancient Jewish Coins*, Leiden.
Nutkowitz, H. (2011), D'Éléphantine à Jérusalem : liens religieux et politiques, in: C. Arnould-Béhar, A. Lemaire (eds.), *Jérusalem antique et médiévale*, Paris–Louvain–Walpole: 75–89.
Pakkala, J. (2010), Why the Cult Reforms in Judah Probably Did not Happen, in: R. G. Kratz, H. Spieckermann (eds.), *One God—One Cult—One Nation*, Berlin: 201–236.
Philonenko, M. (1974), Observations sur des monnaies juives de la Seconde Révolte (132–135), *CRAI* 118: 183–189.
Pucci, M. (1981), *La Rivolta Ebraica al Tempo di Traiano*, Pise.
Regev, E. (2006), Hanukkah and the Temple of the Maccabees: Ritual and Ideology from Judas Maccabeus to Simon, *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 13: 1–28.
Regev, E. (2013), *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity*, Göttingen.
Reich, R. (2011), *Excavating the City of David: Where Jerusalem's History Began*, Jerusalem.
Reifenberg, A. (1947), *Ancient Jewish Coins*, Jerusalem.
Riley, W. (1993), *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, Sheffield.
Ritti, T. (2004), Documenti adrianei da Hierapolis di Frigia : le epistole di Adriano alla cità, in: S. Follet (ed.), *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine*, Paris: 297–340.
Romanoff, P. (1944), *Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins*, Philadelphia.
Römer, Th. (2000), Du Temple au Livre. L'idéologie de la centralisation dans l'historiographie deutéronomiste, in: S. L. McKenzie, Th. Römer (eds.), *Rethinking the Foundations*, Berlin: 207–225.
Römer, Th. (2014), *L'invention de Dieu*, Paris.
Saulcy, L. F. de (1854), *Recherches sur la numismatique judaïque*, Paris.
Schäfer, P. (1981), *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand. Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom*, Tübingen.
Schäfer, P. (1990), Hadrian's Policy in Judaea and the Bar Kokhba Revolt: A Reassessment, in: P. R. Davies, R. T. White (eds.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes*, Sheffield: 281–303.
Schmidt, F. (1994), *La pensée du Temple. De Jérusalem à Qoumrân*, Paris.
Schürer, E. (1973), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (*175 B.C.– A.D. 135*), Edinburgh.
Schwartz, S. (2016), The Impact of the Jewish Rebellion, 66–135 C.E.: Destruction or Provincialization?, in: J. J. Collins, J. G. Manning (eds.), *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East*, Leiden–Boston: 234–252.
Schwartz, D. R., Weiss, Z. (eds.) (2012), *Was 70 C.E. a Watershed in Jewish History ?*, Leiden–Boston.
Schwentzel, C.-G. (2007), La monarchie hasmonéenne d'après le témoignage des monnaies : État juif ou État hellénistique?, *Res Antiquae* 4: 135–148.
Schwentzel, C.-G. (2009a), Images du pouvoir et fonctions des souverains hasmonéens, *Revue Biblique* 116: 368–386.

Schwentzel, C.-G. (2009b), L'appropriation du temple de Jérusalem : de Judas Maccabée à Hérode le Grand (165–4 av. J.-C.), in: G. Hoffmann, A. Gailliot (eds.), *Rituels et transgressions de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Amiens: 75–80.

Schwentzel, C.-G. (2013), *Juifs et Nabatéens. Les monarchies ethniques du Proche-Orient hellénistique et romain*, Rennes.

Schwentzel, C.-G. (2014), Les choix identitaires des Hasmonéens d'après leurs images monétaires, in: M.-F. Baslez, O. Munnich (eds.), *La mémoire des persécutions. Autour des livres des Maccabées*, Paris–Louvain: 119–132.

Sharon, N. (2012), Setting the Stage: The Effects of the Roman Conquest and the Loss of Sovereignty, in: D. R. Schwartz, Z. Weiss (eds.), *Was 70 C.E. a Watershed in Jewish History ?*, Leiden–Boston: 415–445.

Smallwood, E. M. (1976), *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*, Leiden.

Smith, R. (1927), *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, New York.

Spieckermann, H. (1982), *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*, Göttingen.

Talon, P. (1993), Le rituel comme moyen de légitimation politique au I[er] millénaire en Mésopotamie, in: J. Quaegebeur (ed.), *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near-East*, Leuven: 421–433.

Tsafrir, Y. (2003), Numismatics and the Foundation of Aelia Capitolina — A Critical Review, in: P. Schäfer (ed.), *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*, Tübingen: 31–36.

Wallack Samuels, C. (2000), The Bar Kokhba War, in: C. Wallack Samuels *et al*. (eds.), *The Numismatic Legacy of the Jews as depicted by a Distinguished American Collection*, New York: 83–100.

Wilker, J. (2007), *Für Rom und Jerusalem. Die herodianische Dynastie im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Heidelberg.

Yadin, Y. (1971), *Bar-Kokhba: The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome*, London.

Yadin, Y. *et al*. (2002), *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri*, Jerusalem.

Zissu, B., Abadi, O. (2014), Paleo-Hebrew Script in Jerusalem and Judea from the Second Century B.C.E. through the Second Century C.E. : A Reconsideration, *Journal for Semitics* 23: 653–664.