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Hadrian’s Actions in the Jerusalem Temple Mount According to Cassius Dio and Xiphilini Manus*

YARON Z. ELIAV

As the last trumpet blast of the Bar Kokhba revolt faded away, a new urban and cultural reality was forming in Jerusalem. A Roman *colonia* was established on the ruins of the Herodian city of Second Temple days; pagan soldiers, mainly of the tenth legion, which was now situated in the city, took the place of those Jews and Christians who had been exiled by an imperial order. At the same time, a foreign, non-circumcised Christian community was gradually forming. The history of Jerusalem in this period is obscure: The growth of the city was slow and it remained unfortified for over a hundred and fifty years until the end of the third century; its size was obviously small, and it was clearly unimportant as far as the Roman administration was concerned. Its former Jewish identity gradually grew so inconspicuous, that Firmilian, the Roman governor in Caesarea at the beginning of the fourth century, was no longer acquainted with the name “Jerusalem”.

One of the unresolved questions regarding the city at this time concerns the *temenos* (τεμένος), known as the Temple Mount, built by Herod, which had been the heart and the center, both physically and spiritually, of the ancient city: What happened on the Temple Mount

---

* I wish to thank G. Bohak, G. W. Bowersock, J. Geiger, M. D. Herr, M. Himmelfarb and P. Schäfer, who read various versions of this paper and made useful comments. By no means does this indicate their agreement with any of the arguments below. I alone stand responsible for that.

1 Eus., *De martyribus Palaestinae* 11.8–12. This story appears in both the short Greek version and the long one preserved in Syriac. In general see: B. Isaac, ‘Roman Colonies in Judaea: The Foundation of Aelia Capitolina’, *Talanta* 12–13 (1980–1), 31–54; F. Millar, ‘The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: a Study of Cultural Relations‘, in H. Solin and M. Kajava (eds.) *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History* (1990), 8, 23–30. The notes below should provide additional literature about the history of Jerusalem in those days; however, they do not intend to cover the entire history of research (which adds up to dozens of items), but only to illustrate it.

*Jewish Studies Quarterly*, vol. 4 (1997)
when that pagan *colonia* was established? The dominant approach, already apparent in the earliest studies, holds that, following Hadrian’s instructions, a Capitoline shrine was constructed on the mountain. This was the *communis opinio* throughout the nineteenth century. Scholars believed that “no place was more suitable for the Roman temple than the rocky surface of the Moriah”. Such a temple was so vivid in their minds that they could visualize its “pure style and noble shapes”, and claim that “in these the Jupiter shrine surpassed perhaps even the three temples of God which had been situated on the very same place” (An edleren Formen und reinerem Style übertrat dieser Jupiter-Tempel vielleicht sogar die drei Jehovah-Tempel, die nach der Reihe an demselben Flecke gestanden hatten). One scholar took the matter even further, and not only “placed” the pagan temple on the Temple Mount, but also related all archaeological remains with which he was familiar to that temple (Robinson’s arch etc.).

At the turn of the century, the fragmented pieces of information about Aelia Capitolina and the pagan temple on the Temple Mount were fused into a systemized conception by G. Durand and E. Schürer. Their approach was accepted almost without reservations in the first half of the twentieth century by the great scholars of the study of Jerusalem, H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, and later also by M. Avi-Yonah and others. Since then, the Capitoline temple has become anchored in every

---


4 Schlatter, ibid., 152–6.


6 H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, *Jérusalem II: Jérusalem nouvelle* 1–2 (1914), 33–5. Although Vincent stops short of asserting that the shrine is Capitoline, he does not doubt its existence and location; M. Avi-Yonah, *Historical Geography of Palestine: from the End of the Babylonian Exile to the Arab Conquest* (1963), 98 (Heb.), and
treatment of this period: atlases of Jerusalem in Late Antiquity place it on the Temple Mount on the site of the Second Temple; scholarly studies take its existence for granted; and it is only natural, then, for popular books, guides, and museums to follow suit, and so this pagan temple has become a “reality” in the public mind.

Only a few scholars have doubted the existence of such a pagan sanctuary on the Temple Mount. The main question mark has concerned Cassius Dio’s testimony, which is the only source that explicitly men-

following the same notion, also the map he drew, infra (n. 7). For some reason this was omitted from the English version of the book: id., The Holy Land: from the Persian to the Arab Conquest (1977), 114. See also: B. W. Henderson, The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian A. D. 76–138 (1923), 219; C. Watzinger, Denkmäler Palástinas II (1935), 79–80.


tions the existence and location of such a shrine (see below);\textsuperscript{10} this was provoked by other sources, mainly Christian, which do not mention the shrine on the mountain. To the best of my knowledge, however, no comprehensive critical examination of the evidence – either Dio’s or that of other sources – has yet been undertaken.\textsuperscript{11} Furthermore, even those scholars who took into account the doubts and "erased" the building from the mountain, left the open square on its top, i.e. the Herodian temenos, as an integral part of the Roman city. They either called it a "sacred area" or simply drew it on maps as an inseparable part of the city.\textsuperscript{12} These maps of Aelia Capitolina, which have been drawn for more than a hundred years now, by "believers" and "doubters" alike, demonstrate the way in which the mountain and the city are fixed in our minds. The outline of the ancient city in those maps coincides with today's old city wall, thus embracing the square of the Temple Mount. This is the "mythological map" of the city of Jerusalem. In our consciousness, the mountain and the city are strongly interwoven.

Recently, the discussion took a new turn when two sixth-century Byzantine texts, one in Georgian and the other in Greek, were published,

\textsuperscript{10} I first learned of this doubt (broadly and critically discussed below) from Prof. Benjamin Isaac, during a lecture in the Institute for Advanced Studies 1993 (see his ‘renewed’ translation of Cassius Dio: B. Isaac, \textit{The Limits of Empire} (1990), 353, but cf. id., op. cit. (n. 1), 48 at the end of note 78). But it seems that he was preceded by several other scholars, see: F. Grelle, \textit{L’autonomia cittadina fra Traiano e Adriano} (1972), 227–8, and after him G.W. Bowersock, ‘A Roman Perspective on the Bar Kokhba War’, in W. S. Green (ed.), \textit{Approaches to Ancient Judaism II} (1980), 137–8. This approach was cited in some other works, such as: R. L. Wilken, \textit{The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought} (1992), 41–3 (cf. ibid., p. 82); P. Schäfer, ‘Hadrian’s Policy in Judaea and the Bar Kokhba Revolt: A Reassessment’, in P. R. Davies and R. T. White (eds.), \textit{A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History} (1990), 288–9. Others, though not explicitly stating their doubts, left the Capitoline temple out of their descriptions of the Temple Mount in the days after the Bar-Kokhba revolt, e.g.: I. Wilkinson, \textit{Egeria’s Travels to the Holy Land} (1981), 36, who asserts that the mountain remained in ruins from Hadrian’s time onward. See also: F. E. Peters, \textit{Jerusalem} (1985, 129–30; G. Stemberger, \textit{Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius} (1987), 53–4 (cf. p. 51, where he claims that large parts of the Jewish Temple walls remained standing until the end of Byzantine times!); Millar, op. cit. (n. 1), 29 n. 95.

\textsuperscript{11} This issue is broadly discussed in the first chapter of my doctoral dissertation ("A Mount without a Temple" – the Temple Mount of Jerusalem during Late Roman and Byzantine Times: Realia & Theology), which is now in process at the Hebrew University, under the guidance of Profs. M. D. Herr and Y. Tsafrir.

\textsuperscript{12} E.g.: Y. Tsafrir, ‘Jerusalem’, in \textit{Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst} 3 (1978), 546, who ‘erases’ the Capitoline temple and leaves in its place a reconstructed structure for which no specifications are provided; he nevertheless refers to the mountain as ‘Kultplatz’; Wilkinson, op. cit. (n. 10), 37 (map); P.W.L. Walker, \textit{Holy City – Holy Places?} (1990), 7 (map), 284 (map).
both referring to the Temple Mount by the name “Kapitolian”.\(^{13}\) Scholars disagree as to the significance of these texts for Dio’s work. One scholar holds that the Byzantine traditions clearly confirm Dio’s reports, while another rejects those accounts entirely and considers them a late Byzantine tradition completely unrelated to the Jerusalemite reality of Hadrian’s time.\(^ {14}\) However, neither scholar re-examines Dio’s report in and of itself.

The current paper, which does not deal with the issue of the history of the Temple Mount as a whole (see note 11), focuses on clarifying one piece of information – Dio’s statement about Hadrian’s deeds on the Temple Mount – which stands at the heart of the question: was a Capitoline temple ever built on the mountain?

One passage in the 69th book of Dio’s *Roman History* has functioned as a cornerstone in the discussion about the Temple Mount after the Bar Kokhba revolt. This entry deals with Hadrian’s deeds in Jerusalem at the beginning of the third decade of the second century. The relevant paragraph reads as follows:

1 Ες δὲ τὰ Ἰεροσόλυμα πόλιν αὐτοῦ ἄντι τῆς κατασκαφείσης
2 οἰκίσαντος, ἥν καὶ Αἰλίαν Καπιτωλίναν ἀνόμασε, καὶ ἐς τὸν τοῦ
3 ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τόπον ναὸν τῷ Διὶ ἔτερον ἀντεγείραντος πόλεμος
4 οὔτε μικρὸς οὔτε ὀλιγοχρόνιος ἐκινήθη.\(^ {15}\)

The clause καὶ ἐς τὸν τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τόπον ναὸν τῷ Διὶ ἔτερον ἀντεγείραντος served most of the scholars mentioned above as evidence that Hadrian built, or at least commenced building, a shrine for Jupiter (Zeus) on the Temple Mount. The few scholars who doubted the facts related in this entry favored sources which do not mention the Capitoline shrine, but describe other objects (mainly statues) on the mountain. These scholars found various ways of explaining Dio’s entry. Glen Bowersock went so far as to take issue with the accepted translation of Dio’s words. He claimed that the preposition ἐς followed by ὁ τόπος


\(^{15}\) C.D., *Hist.* 69:12:1, trans. Cary. My reading of the text diverges from Cary’s translation, though not over significant details, and on this matter see further on. See also: M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* II (1980), 391–405, and there see bibliography regarding commentary and historical aspects of the text.
in the accusative should not be translated as “in the place (i.e. site) of”, but as “instead of”. According to this argument, the opening of the clause does not serve as a locative but rather as an attribute, and thus Dio is saying that Hadrian intended to build a temple to Jupiter instead of the destroyed Temple of God, but not necessarily on the site of the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{16}

Yet the proper question, it seems to me, does not concern the translation of Dio’s words, but whether they were his at all. Though most scholars to date have focused on the meaning of the words and assumed the authenticity of the authorship,\textsuperscript{17} there are reasonable grounds for asking whether the clause at issue was actually produced by Dio.

Cassius Dio, who wrote his treatise at the outset of the third century, is generally considered a most reliable historian. He indicates that it took him a decade to collect the material for the treatise and another twelve years to study and write it up.\textsuperscript{18} Dio’s relative closeness to Hadrian’s time and his position in the upper echelons of the imperial bureaucracy, which allowed him easy access to its documents, increased his credibility despite his apparent disregard of the official imperial inscriptions.\textsuperscript{19} Unfortunately, from the 61st volume on, all of Dio’s books have been lost. A few fragments are conserved in anthologies and Byzantine lexicons, but those which quote Dio very carefully are exceedingly fragmented. There are also two abridged editions (Ἐπιτομαί) made by Byzantine monks: Xiphilinus in the eleventh century, and Zonaras, a century later.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{16} Bowersock, op. cit. (n. 10). I do not agree with this suggestion (though, my conclusion resembles it, for different reasons). See detailed criticism below.

\textsuperscript{17} The origins of this process go back to the 19th century. Schlatter could, on the one hand, claim that “…das schrieb Dio nicht”, and, on the other, state that “Allen konkreten Angaben des Epitomators schenke ich Glauben; was er Thatsächliches giebt… hat die Zuverlässigkeit Dios”. See: A. Schlatter, Die Tage Trajans und Hadrians (1897), 49 n. 2. And in the same vein see his stand regarding the Capitolinean temple, op. cit. (n. 3). Recently in the same manner, see Bowersock, ibid, 137, a major ‘dubitator’ of Dio’s words, who agrees that in this clause ‘The language of Xiphilinus… could be that of Dio’, and more on this issue further on (n. 21).


\textsuperscript{19} D. R. Stuart, ‘The Attitude of Dio Cassius toward Epigraphic Sources’, in H. A. Sanders (ed.), Roman Historical Sources and Institutions (1904), 101–47.

only reference left to the paragraph under discussion is Xiphilinus’ abridgement of books 36–80, which was prepared for Emperor Michael VII during the 1060’s. These facts are known to scholars and have been noted in various writings about Cassius Dio and the Bar Kokhba revolt. What has not been considered, however, is their historiographic significance.21 In other words, could it be that Xiphilinus added to or subtracted from Dio’s original narrative? And more importantly, are his “alterations” detectable?

The prevalent opinion, which relies on extensive comparisons between Dio and Xiphilinus at points where both works exist (books 36–60, 78/79), holds that Xiphilinus not only paraphrased Dio’s words rather than quoting them, but he also worked carelessly and was not attentive to details.22 On the other hand, Bowersock showed that some of the words in the passage, namely the use of κινέω, are rooted in the classical world and are therefore likely to have come from Dio. In addition, B. Isaac proved some details in the paragraph under discussion to be authentic.23 Nevertheless, this does not mean that all the information is accurate; doubts regarding individual items can still prevail. Instead of the comparative method with which Isaac chose to work (and by no means do I reject his conclusions), I wish to use “form criticism” methods in order to question the authenticity of the clause which deals with the Temple Mount.

Syntactically, the segment under discussion is formed as a resultative sentence, consisting of a main clause and two subordinate clauses. The main section is at the end of the unit (line 3, starting from πόλεμος to

21 See e.g. Millar, (ibid., 68), who, on the one hand, determines that Xiphilinus elaborated on the revolt ‘...no doubt because it was of greater religious interest than much else in his narrative’, but, on the other hand, treats the very same paragraph as Dio’s own authentic words (and see also in his article, op. cit. n. 1). Other scholars who dismissed Dio’s validity speculated, without actual proof from the text itself, that it came from Xiphilinus, see, e.g., Grelle, op.cit. (n. 10); Murphy-O’Connor, op.cit. (n. 14), 415, and more. Mango remarked of such scholars that their “reasons...are not entirely clear...”, op. cit. (n. 14), 2.

22 E. Cary, Dio’s Roman History I (1914), xx, xxv; Millar, ibid., 2; but cf. a more positive assessment of Xiphilinus’ work: J.W. Rich, Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement (1990), 18–9. See also Brunt, op. cit. (n. 20) for an analysis of Xiphilinus’ working methods.

23 In a letter he wrote me (Feb. 11 1996), G. Bowersock demonstrates the similarities between Dio’s style here and Thucydides’ κύνηγος γύρω οὖσα δη μεγίστη τοῖς “Ελλησσαν ἐγκέντρο (Th. 1:1:2; I would like to thank Prof. Bowersock for the permission to publish this); B. Isaac, ‘Cassius Dio on the Revolt of Bar Kokhba’, SCI 7 (1983–4), 68–76. See also Millar, ibid., 68. But cf. a much “milder” approach towards this passage: M. Gichon, ‘New Insight into the Bar Kokhba War and a Reappraisal of Dio Cassius 69.12–13’, JQR 77 (1986), 15–43.
the end). It recounts what happened – a war broke out (πόλεμος ... ἐκινήθη) – and thus functions as the subject of the unit. Preceding this main section are two subordinate clauses, separated from each other by the conjunction καὶ and by their contents. Both clauses are in the genetivus-absolutus, and each deals with one of two actions performed by Hadrian (who is mentioned here in a genetival demonstrative pro-noun αὐτόν – line 1), which caused the result – the war. In the first clause (from the beginning of the unit to ὁνόμασε in line 2) Hadrian founds a city, whereas in the second (from καὶ in line 2 to ἀνεγείραντος in line 3) he builds a temple.24 Not only do both clauses have the same grammatical structure, but they also have the same internal ordering – a locative phrase, an object, and finally Hadrian’s action (here in the participle). The structure of the unit as a whole can be drawn as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First subordinate clause:</th>
<th>Place: Jerusalem</th>
<th>Object: City</th>
<th>Action: Founding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Relative clause: the name of the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second subordinate clause:</th>
<th>Place: Temple Mount</th>
<th>Object: pagan shrine</th>
<th>Action: Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main clause: Result
A war broke

What, then, does the second subordinate clause reveal about the Temple Mount? According to this version, and according to the way in which the writer constructed the paragraph, the answer, in my opinion, is unequivocal: Hadrian built a shrine for Zeus-Jupiter in the place (τόπος), i.e. the location, of the Temple. This conclusion is at odds with Bowersock’s. Even if, as Bowersock argues, the pattern εἰς τὸν...τόπον could mean “instead of”, this is not the meaning of Dio’s words here. My main reservation about Bowersock’s suggestion derives from the reciprocity of the form and its function which underlies the paragraph. The structural pattern of the two causal clauses is identical. This correspondence is significant for the interpretation of the unit, since it postulates the two clauses as parallel limbs. Hence, if the first limb reads “in Jerusalem... such and such was done”, then the second limb would say, respectively,

---

24 The first clause carries a subordinate relative clause (line 2: ἤν-ὁνόμασε), which adds, as if fortuitously, that the city built by Hadrian was called Aelia Capitolina.
“in the Temple Mount...such and such was done”. Bowersock’s interpretation (in Jerusalem...was done..., instead of the temple...was built) disrupts that symmetry. Moreover, in the first clause (line 1) the writer used the preposition ἀντί to express “instead of”. Had he wanted to express “instead of” again in the second clause, would he not have used the same term?

This analysis of the passage enables us to consider whether the clause concerning the Temple Mount is a “genuine” Dio, or was it completely distorted by Xiphilinus’ paraphrase. Several factors support the latter possibility.

a) Gaps in content: The description of Hadrian’s actions on the Temple Mount (clause 2) is not smoothly woven into the wider tapestry of the narrative in this passage. The beginning of the narrative about the revolt of the Jews, as told by Dio, is composed of two segments. The first, closely analyzed above, deals with Hadrian’s deeds in Jerusalem. The second, which describes these occurrences from the Jewish perspective (as perceived through Dio’s eyes), reads as follows:

Ἐνδιάτι οὖσα δείκνυτι τὸ ἀλλοφύλους τινὰς ἐν τῇ πόλις σφῶν οἰκίσθηναι καὶ τὸ ἱερὰ ἄλλατρια ἐν αὐτῇ ἱδρυθῆναι.25

This second segment reiterates Hadrian’s two actions in Jerusalem (founding a colonia and building the Temple), but this time from the point of view of the Jews. There is a direct parallelism between the two segments that recount Hadrian’s actions. The first tells of founding the colonia (clause 1); the second reads: ἀλλοφύλους τινὰς ἐν τῇ πόλις σφῶν οἰκίσθηναι. The city (πόλις) is mentioned in both segments, and the writer even uses the same verb (ὁικίζω), first in the active and then in the passive voice. The only difference lies in the emphasis: in the first segment focusing on Hadrian, the act of founding is emphasized, while in the second, taking the Jews’ point of view, the emphasis is on the consequence of that founding, i.e. on the arrival of foreigners (ἀλλοφύλου) and their settlement in the Jewish city.

Similarly, the second action – building the temple (clause 2 of the first segment) – also has a parallel in the second segment (ἱερὰ ἄλλατρια ἐν αὐτῇ ἱδρυθηναι). But here there is a gap. The first segment deals with a temple on the Temple Mount (“in the place of God’s shrine”). But this

---

25 C. D., Hist. 69:12:2a. After this a new (third) segment begins, which describes the beginning of the revolt. Thus the first two segments in Dio’s narrative deal with the reasons for the war: the first presents Hadrian’s actions, while the second tells of the Jews’ reactions to these.
temple is not mentioned in the second segment, which randomly scatters temples (or 'religious rites' in Cary’s translation26) about the city (ἐν αὐτῇ – the pronoun refers to the city it follows). This gap raises two problems. The first is literary: as shown above, the structure of Dio’s passage is balanced in its literary design, while here the two parts of the story do not entirely correspond. The second and much more difficult problem is that of realia. If indeed there was a pagan shrine on the Temple Mount, as clause 2 of the first segment reads (or if such a shrine was being built), then it is clear that what disturbed the Jews, apart from its pagan orientation, was its location on the very mountain where their own Temple used to stand. The writer knew this, and therefore chose to emphasize that the pagan shrine was located on the site of the Jewish Temple. But if this is the case, why is this fundamental point absent from the second segment?

b) The verb ἀντεγείρω: this verb, which here employs the genetival aorist participle form (ἀντεγείραντος), came into use at a very late stage of the Greek language. It is a compound, consisting of the preposition ἅντι (stand counter to27) and the verb ἐγείρω (to raise), which does not exist either in Classical Greek works, in Hellenistic literature or in Greek writings from the early Roman period. It does not appear in the New Testament, in the Septuagint or in any of the early Christian writers. In fact, there is only one pre-Byzantine example of this verb, and there it has a military meaning. In describing one of the last Carthaginian efforts towards the end of the third Punic War, Appian of Alexandria indicates that the Carthaginian army stood counter to the Roman army led by Scipio (ἀντήγειραν αὐτῷ χάρακα).28 Late pagan literature similarly applies this verb in contexts of confrontations and clashes. In some cases, the meaning of the verb is identical to its initial meaning, as in Heliodorus (of Emesa’s?) adventure novel ‘Ethiopian Tales’, in which he describes the laying of a siege (τῷ πολιορκομένῳ τείχῳ ἔτερον ἀντεγείροντες).29 In other cases, the verb has the broader figurative

---

26 Cary translates ἱερά as ‘religious rites’, but I have certain doubts about this, see: H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (1948), 822, s.v. II.2–3.
27 Here, too, similar to Bowersock’s note, op. cit. (n. 16) concerning the structure εἰς τόν…τόσον, the prefix ἅντι sometimes means “instead of”. See broadly on that: S. Szolnok, ‘Compounds with “Anti” in Hellenistic Jewish Sources’, Filologia Neotestamentaria 3 (1990), 101–1. However, as I argued in regard to Bowersock, this is not what it means here, nor in any of the instances in which it is used.
28 App., Pan. 114.
29 Heliodorus, Aethiopica 9.3.1, ed. Rattenbury et al., III, 40. See also the function of the verb in the dramatic climax of the plot, ibid. 10.15.1; and I have no doubt that the military sense of this verb expressed the extreme suspense and the dramatic turning point.
meaning of a 'clash'. For example, in Eunapios of Sardis, towards the end of the fourth century, the verb refers to competition and controversy among philosophers. \(^{30}\) Similar though more abstract usage can be traced in rhetorical treatises ascribed to Sopater, also dating from the fourth century. \(^{31}\)

Only Patristic writers, mainly the Cappadocian Fathers, made frequent use of this verb. \(^{32}\) In their works its meaning as a 'military encounter' was very rare. One example for this rare usage can be found in the fifth-century Syrian historian and bishop Theodoret, who uses the verb to describe Shapur II's siege of Nisibis, much as Appian had done three hundred years earlier. \(^{33}\) But this and similar usages are marginal. In most cases, Christian writers use the verb theologically, in the sense of a religious confrontation. Sometimes it describes an opposition to God or church dogma; at other times it refers to a counter-position, either physical or ideological, taken by the faithful against rivals. At the end of the fourth century, for instance, Gregory of Nyssa uses this verb to describe Arrian's mutiny against God. \(^{34}\) A generation later, Cyril of Alexandria uses it in his apologetic books to describe the solid position of the Orthodox Fathers in confronting the wicked Nestorius and his predecessors. These are only two of many subsequent instances. \(^{35}\) In

---

\(^{30}\) Eun., *Vitae sophistarum* 494.


\(^{32}\) On this linguistic phenomenon in the Byzantine world, see: R. Browning, 'Language', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* II (1991), 1175-1176; Sznol, op. cit. (n. 27), 111 and n. 15.

\(^{33}\) Theodoretus, *Historia religiosa* 1.11, in P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen (eds.), *Théodore de Cyr: Histoire des moines de Syrie I*, Sources chrétiennes 234 (1977), 184 l. 12. The same meaning is used by Theodoretus for describing a Sasanian siege over Theodosiopolis (Erzurum), see: id., *H. E.* 5.37.7. The non-theological meaning of the verb, as employed by Theodoretus, which exceeds its traditional use in Patristic texts, may be related to the verb as used by Nestorius' opponents (infra, n. 35), when describing their resistance to him.


\(^{35}\) Cyrilus Alexandrinus, *Ad Joannem Antiochenum*, in E. Schwartz (ed.), *AOD*, 1:1:4 (1928), 39, l. 4. The two verbs chosen by Cyril to shape the two sides of the equation in his letter offer an interesting comparison: in the beginning of the letter, which describes Nestorius' stand against the dogma, Cyril uses the verb ἄντανακτησας τοὶς τῆς ἄληθείας δόγμασιν, Schwartz, 37, l. 20–21. This verb stands counter to the verb under discussion (ἄντεγείρω), which is later used to describe the Fathers' stand against Nestorius. The juxtaposition of these verbs is clear: their meaning is almost the same, they were created in a similar morphological process, and the writer uses both to sharpen his descriptions of two juxtaposed sides—
the sixth century, a group of monks wrote a letter to Pope Agapetus I, in which the verb, used in relation to the Monophysite blasphemers’ revolt against Christianity, combines the sense of a violent physical clash, reminiscent of its initial military meaning, with the later meaning of theological confrontation. 36

Hence it seems clear that ἀντεγείρω carries a specific meaning. In Dio’s time it was rare and unusual, and even if Dio had been familiar with it, he would not have used it to describe Hadrian’s actions, because in his description of the pre-revolt phase, Dio’s point of view is that Hadrian’s actions carried neither military nor religious tension. Without delving too deeply into this issue, it is sufficient to note the choice of the passive voice of the verb κινεῖ (ἐκινήθη) in Dio’s account of the war. 37

It is as if the passage says: Hadrian was not interested in fighting this war, but was forced to do so. In my opinion, these are sufficient grounds for concluding that it was Xiphilinus or someone of his kind, motivated by theological impulse, who chose the verb ἀντεγείρω, common in his days, to describe Hadrian’s actions. 38

c) Naming the temple: Dio calls it ‘the temple of the God’ (“τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ…”). About this phrase Vincent determines: “La main de l’abbreviateur se trahit par cette expression “temple de Dieu” qu’un palen comme Dion n’a pu employer“. 39 It seems that his conclusion should be somewhat moderated, because Dio was indeed familiar with the Jewish God and referred to him in his writings (see below); moreover, in one instance, in an authentic passage, he even refers to the temenos in Jerusalem as τὸ τέμενος τοῦ θεοῦ. 40 Nevertheless, a comprehensive examination of the way in which pagan writers referred to the Jewish Temple would enhance the essence of Vincent’s argument.

Nestorius counter to the dogma, and in return, the Fathers confronting Nestorius. See also: id., Adversus orientales episcopos 26, ACO, 1:1:7 (1929), 39, l. 22; id., Adversus Nestorii blasphemias, ACO, 1:1:6 (1928), 56, l. 2. For more examples in Patristic writings which apply ἄντεγείρω in theological contexts, see under the entries of this verb in: E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, rev. ed. (1914), 177; G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (1961), 151.

36 Libellus Monachorum ad Agapetum, ACO, III (1929), 138, l.8-9.


38 It is also possible that Xiphilinus took this verb from Dio, and that it led him to interpret all events as religious confrontations (according to the meaning of this verb in his own time). On the basis of what has been said in the article itself, this suggestion seems less likely, though not completely impossible.

39 Vincent and Abel, op. cit. (n. 6), 883.

The expression δι ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, which directly connects the Jerusalem temple to God, and defines God with an unexplained definite article ('the God' with no modifier specifying which God), is extremely rare in non-Jewish literature, both Greek and Latin. The name of Jerusalem and its temple reached pagan writers and was introduced in their writings before the destruction of the Temple, but in contrast to the Jews, who regarded the Temple as the biblical “house of God”, the pagans rarely associated the Temple in Jerusalem with the Jewish God in their common terminology.

Pagan writers usually referred to the Temple as templum (ναὸς; ἱερόν). To identify it more specifically, they used geographic or ethnic terms. The clearest geographic identification can be found in Polybius, in a fragment of the 16th book of his historic treatise, preserved in Josephus. Describing the Jews' joining the camp of Antiochus III, Polybius states that they lived near the temple called Jerusalem (the temple! — περί το ἱερόν το προσαγωρεύμενον Ἰερόσολυμα). A similar approach is established in the Bill of Rights given by the same Antiochus to the residents of Jerusalem. This document mentions the Jews, their city and their temple. The workers of the temple, its scribes and poets are also mentioned, as well as the Jewish law, referred to as 'laws of the ancestors'. However, there is no reference whatsoever to 'the God'. This is a good example of the overall context in which the Temple was described during the Roman period. Further examples range from Livy,

---


42 On the Jews' approach to the Temple during the Second Temple period and after the destruction, see the introduction to my doctoral dissertation (op. cit. n. 11). A good example of the Jewish view is the ancient legend concerning Alexander's visit to Jerusalem. As the version preserved in Josephus holds (AJ 11.329ff.), the only appropriate ending for the story is Alexander's arrival at the Temple and a sacrifice to God. A like approach is reflected in Philo's definition: δι τοῦ ὕψιστον θεοῦ ναὸς ἄγιος (Philo, in Flaccum 46). On this phrase and its controversial aspects, see E. M. Smallwood, Philonis Alexandrini: Legatio ad Gaium (1970)2, 241, and bibliography there.

43 E.g.: Tac., Hist. 5.5; ibid.:12 and many more. On the same phenomenon in earlier times (second and first centuries B.C.), see Stern, op. cit. (n. 15) I, 129 f. 8; ibid., p. 163 l. 5.


45 Jos., AJ 12.138–144. Leaving aside the argument about who is being referred to in the phrase τιν ἐκζέβεσιν (ibid. 140), it seems safe to say that it does not relate to the Jewish God, see: M. Stern, The Documents on the History of the Hasmonaean Revolt (1965), 36–37 (Heb.).
at the beginning of the first century A. D., who identifies the Temple as *fanum eorum Hierosolyma*, and Strabo just a short time afterwards, who uses the parallel Greek phrase to describe the temple as τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἔν Ἰεροσολύμωι, through the Neoplatonist Porphyry in the third century who like Strabo calls the Temple τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἔν Ἰεροσολύμωι, up to Ammianus Marcellinus at the close of the fourth century, who calls it *apud Hierosolymam templum*. The only exception is a fragment by Diodorus, preserved in Photius, which deals with Antiochus Sidetes’ siege of Jerusalem and identifies the Temple as τοῦ θεοῦ σηκός. But this passage, which was clearly written by a person very close, albeit hostile, to the reality in Jerusalem, is the exception that proves the rule.

The reasons for omitting references to the Jewish Temple as the “Temple of God” are complex. On the one hand, it is unlikely that the pagans never connected the various traditions about the Jewish God (however strange they thought the traditions to be) to the Temple in Jerusalem (see below). On the other hand, the common pagan belief, notably that of Tacitus, that the Jewish Temple was empty, may have

---

46 *eorum* refers back to *Iudaeos*. This tradition was preserved in the *Periochae*, an abridgement of Livy’s book; see A.C. Schlesinger, *Livy* 14 (1959), 126; cf. Stern, op. cit. (n. 15) I, 329 no. 131. On Livy’s religious world, see below n. 53.

47 Str., Geo. 16:2:34.

48 Porphy., *De Abstinentia* 4.11, ed. Nauck, 245, l. 8. Stern’s translation should be corrected, op. cit. (n. 15), II, 438. It should be noted that as a result of his debates with Jews and Christians alike, Porphyry understood their basic creeds and was much more familiar with their religious terminology than an average pagan. In this he resembles Julian, see: D. Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict* (1982), 111–32.


50 D. S. 34(35).1.3. The last word has yet to be said regarding the identification of the writer (or the source) of this passage; see: Stern, op. cit. (n. 15), I, 184–5. A comparison between the terminology the writer uses here and in another authentic paragraph by Diodorus should be borne in mind (on this text see below n. 54).

obviated any need to name a god. Livy’s uncertainty, preserved in the Scholia in Lucanum, as to the real identity of the God who dwells in the Jerusalem temple (Hierosolymis fanum curis deorum sit non nominant) may have provided a similar rationale.

Another possible reason is that in writing which comes from a polytheistic background it is necessary to define the god under discussion. The term “god’s temple” could have referred to any of dozens of gods. When it is a Greco-Roman god of the Pantheon, his name clears all doubts, but when this is not the case, then an identification is required. Although the use of ‘gods’ in general was habitual in Greek-Roman writings, it would have been an inadequate pointer to the Jewish God. Many examples could be found to support this claim, as for instance, in the discussion of the first century B.C. Diodorus Siculus about Moses and the Jews. In that case, ‘gods’ are οἱ θεοὶ καὶ οἱ θρώοι, i.e., the gods of the Greek Pantheon. However, when referring to the Jewish God, an explicit specification is required “τὸν Ἰαω ἐπικαλομένων θεόν”. Another example can be found in Tacitus’ detailed description of the Jewish religion. In that source, deus refers to the Roman gods, whereas the Jewish God is called unum nomen, and Tacitus dedicates a whole paragraph for explaining this god’s special quality.

Indeed, apart from Diodorus’ case explained above, the phrase ‘the Temple of the God’ does not carry the meaning of the Jerusalem temple throughout Greco-Roman writings. In contrast, in Jewish or Christian

---

52 Tac., Hist. 5.9. It seems that in spite of Tacitus’ hostile attitude, he reflects a common pagan belief, and see Stern, op. cit. (n. 15), II, 49–50. The cry exceedere deos, which Tacitus mentions in describing the destruction (ibid.13), should not be understood as referring to the temple’s gods (as the plural form indicates), but rather as a common expression which describes demolished temples; see Stern, ibid., 66–1.


54 D. S. 1.94:1–2. For more see: Stern, op. cit. (n. 15), I, 172. He brings additional examples for such a reference to the Jewish God.

55 Hist, 5.5. See Tacitus’ similar approach to the ‘god of Carmel’ (ibid. 2.78). On this see: MacMullen, op. cit. (n. 51), 88–9.

56 Though obviously I have not examined comprehensively the way in which pagan writers refer to their own temples, my impression is that a pagan would not use the general expression “the temple of the god” when referring to any specific temple. This expression is used by writers in order to avoid repetitions, or for other stylistic reasons; for example, when Diodorus writes τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, he points to what has been said in the previous line ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος (D. S. 16.27.2). Alternatively, this expression appears in the plural form οἱ ναοὶ τῶν θεῶν without relating to a particular temple. I am not familiar with a pagan temple called: “the temple of the god”; the
writings coming out of a monotheistic environment, the phrase ‘the Temple of the God’ has only one possible meaning, and in hundreds (!) of examples it is directed, in one way or another, to the Temple in Jerusalem. A comparison of Dio’s words here – καὶ ἐξ τὸν τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τόπον ναὸν τῷ Διὸ ἔτερον ἀντεγείραντος – with Paul’s words in the letter to the Thessalonians regarding the Antichrist – ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρομένος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα ὡστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι ἀποδείκνυτα ἑαυτὸν ὑπὶ ἔστιν θεὸς – demonstrates the lexical proximity of these descriptions in referring to “the Temple of the God”. Moreover, such a comparison may shed light on the theological motives behind the choice of terminology in the Dio paragraph: the writer may have wanted to substantiate Paul’s words.

It seems to me that Julian’s writing faithfully reflects the shift in pagan terminology. Someone like Julian, who was highly acquainted with the Old Testament and the Judeo-Christian terminology, and who adhered to theological trends, could definitely refer to the temple as τὸν ναὸν τοῦ “Υψίστου θεοῦ.”

closest to that would be Ἀγαθοῦ θεοῦ ναὸς in Paus. 8:36:5, but this, though intriguing, does not influence my arguments directly.

To what has been said in n. 42 above, add G. Kittel (ed.), Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (1938), entries for: θεὸς (III, 65–120), ἀρχαῖον (ibid. 230–47), and ναὸς (IV, 884–95). See also: E. E. Urbach, The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs (1975), 19–96; G. L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (1952), 1–75; I. Teixidor, The Pagan God (1977) esp. 122–30. See also its Syriac parallel, in: R. Payne-Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus I (1879), 1004, s.v. 3. In order not to exceed the limits of this discussion, I have not dealt with the phenomenon of ‘God fearing’ (Θεοσκεπής), which is an exception indicative of the whole. See also E. Peterson, Εἱς ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen (1926). Cf.: L. Di Segni, ‘Ελκ Θεός in Palestinian Inscriptions’, SCI 13 (1994), 94–115 (I would like to thank my friend Raki Millmann-Brun who referred me to the latter).

If Thess. 2.4.

See also: I Cor. 3:16; Rev. 11.1. For more on the Antichrist prophecies and their effect on Christian historiography and on Jewish Rabbinic literature, see Eliav, op. cit. (n. 11), chap. III and IV.

This quote from Julian’s letter appears in John Lydus, De Mensibus 4:53, ed. Wünsch, 110, l. 6–7. It is of no importance to the discussion here whether this is an accurate quote, since it reflects the evolving world of terms and phrases which developed during the Byzantine period. On Julian’s conceptions of the Jewish God and Temple, see: Levi, op. cit. (n. 51), 4–22; C. Aziza, ‘Julien et le Judaïsmé in R. Braun et J. Richer (eds.), L’Empereur Julien: de l’histoire à la légende (331–1715) 1 (1978), 141–58; W. J. Malley, Hellenism and Christianity (1978), 36–43, 53–4. On religious developments in the Late Empire and at the beginning of Byzantine times, see: J. H. W. Liebeschuetz, Continuity and Change in Roman Religion (1979) 223ff.
Cassius Dio also drew his terminology about Judaism in general and the Jewish Temple in particular from the pagan collection of terms. Though he did not abstain from calling the Jewish God just θεός, as I have shown above, for the most part, very much like his predecessors, Dio employs indirect language to introduce the Jewish God. In an unabridged text he refers to 'their God' "τοῦ σφετέρου θεοῦ συντός ἐστιν", and attaches the customary locution ὅσις ποτὲ συντός ἐστιν (καὶ ἡ ἀγαθὴ καὶ). Further on, he employs a more complex definition of the Jewish God when he designates him as ἑνα δὲ τινα ἱσχυρὸς σέβουσιν. In a similar vein, though Dio is familiar with the Jewish Temple and even connects it with the Jewish God, he almost invariably refers to it as merely "a temple". Bearing in mind the evidence from previous examples, he is quite justified in doing so. A quick glance through the appendix at the end of this paper would confirm the incompatibility of the combination "the Temple of the God", as referring to the Jewish Temple, with Dio's writing style. The many examples found there which reflect Dio's linguistic vocabulary in describing temples do not even hint at such a possibility.

The following comparison enhances the claim that the term "the Temple of the God" is unusual throughout Dio's work. On three occasions Dio mentions disasters involving the Jerusalem Temple. These are the conquest by Pompey, the destruction of the Temple, and the revolt against Hadrian. But while in the first two, which are perserved in Dio's original version, he does not associate the Temple with the Jewish God, in the third passage, i.e. Xiphilinus' abridgement which is under discussion in this paper, the phrase τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ suddenly appears. What about the phrase τὸ τέμενος τοῦ θεοῦ? Although pagan writers usually label τεμένη according to the god situated in the temple in the pattern: "the temenos of X", the expression τὸ τέμενος τοῦ θεοῦ, where the god is not referred to with a specific name, also appears sporad-

---

62 C. D., Hist. 37.15.2.
63 Ibid. 17.2.
64 On the ties between the temple and God, see: ibid. 3. Other references to the temple are: ιερὸν – 37.16.1; 49.22.5. ναὸς – 66.4.1–6.3 (six references).
65 The conquest of Pompey: ibid., 37.15.2–16.4; the destruction: 66.4.1–7.2; the revolt against Hadrian: 69.12.1–14.3. In two of these cases he includes Jupiter as an integral part of the occasion: in the passage under discussion, and in the description of the destruction, where he tells about changing the Jewish donation for the Temple (Ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) to a Capitolinian tax.
ically. Generally speaking, this is not a widespread expression. But the fact of its existence, along with Dio’s inclination to refer to the Jewish God simply as “a god”, allow him to use this expression with reference to the temenos in Jerusalem. Apparently, as we can see from the text, he does so indeed (but possibly this is how he found it in the source before him). Nevertheless, it has nothing to do with the Jewish name of the temple in Jerusalem – ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, which Dio, like all other pagan writers, never used. This expression remains alienated and carries theological connotations which do not fit the wider terminology of pagan writers in general and of Dio in particular; and it is from this perspective that Vincent has it right.

To summarize, the clause describing Hadrian’s actions on the Temple Mount bears the stamp of a Christian writer such as Xiphilinus (or anyone before him). This conclusion is derived from content gaps in the structural design of the passage, from its vocabulary, and from the theological tendencies it reflects. Dio’s original version has been lost, but it might be possible to reconstruct it using the clues in the second segment. Describing the events from the Jewish perspective, Dio tells of the Jews’ dissatisfaction with the foreign shrines placed in their city (τερα ἀλλοτρία ἐν αὐτῇ Ἰδρυθηναι). It may be that the first segment described the same situation, that is, Hadrian’s founding of a foreign city and building a pagan shrine (or shrines) there. In the course of paraphrasing this passage, a later writer turned the situation into a theological confrontation between Hadrian and the Jewish God. This writer re-situated the pagan shrine, shifting it from the city in general to the Temple Mount in particular. Moreover, he painted a neutral act customary in the establishment of a new colony in the harsh colors of a religious confrontation by using a “loaded” verb and referring to the temple by a name familiar to both Jewish and Christian readers.67

This conclusion extracts the historical barb from the story of the pagan shrine on the Temple Mount, and shows it to have been planted by a religiously motivated writer. What, then, was on the Temple Mount during the Late Roman and Byzantine periods? What role did the

66 E.g.: Ar., Pl. 659; Pl., Ax. 367c; D.S. 2.28.2; Polyaen., strategemata 8:52. On this phrase in Jewish and Christian literature see my work, op. cit. (n. 11).
67 Such a characterization of the writer’s intentions may be the reason that, as Isaac has already pointed out, op. cit. (n. 10), 353–354, this passage, unlike other descriptions found in Dio, focuses wholly on the temple built by Hadrian without mentioning any other urban actions (of the kind mentioned later in the Chronicon Paschale).
mountain occupy in the urban framework and in the religious consciousness of Jerusalem? These complex questions depend on many other sources. The current paper merely asserts that Dio should not be relied upon in this matter.

Perhaps this is what Boissevain meant when he wrote in a marginal note at the turn of the century: Xiphilinit manum agnosco.68

Appendix: ναὸς in Cassius Dio’s writings

The aim of this appendix is to show how the term ναὸς appears in Dio’s work, both in his original writings and in the different abridgements of his work. It shows the way in which these temples are described, and the factors which are mentioned to indicate the temples’ identities. Due to the vast extent of the material, I have narrowed it to ναὸς exclusively; not including references to other names of holy places (such as ἱερόν), as well as the passages in which Dio uses a variation of ναὸς (ναύς; ναὸς). Nevertheless, it seems that this examination as it is has a vivid and unequivocal conclusion regarding the issues of this paper.

ναὸς in its various forms, appears 67 times in Dio’s writings, in the following distribution69:

I. Identification of the temple through the god or ritual it contained:


2. Venus: 43:1 (II, 72, 7); 69:4 (III, 226, 3).

3. Ares – Mars: 55:1 (II, 477, 8); 55:10 (II, 489, 19); 56:24 (II, 536, 14); 56:46 (II, 556, 1); 60:5 (II, 667, 33).

4. Apollo: 45:1 (II, 142, 8); 51:1 (II, 352, 22); 53:1 (II, 413, 2).

5. Isis: 40:47 (I, 529,5); 79:10( III, 463, 25).


---

68 U. P. Boissevain, Cassii Dionis Cocceiani: historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt III (1901), 232, in his note to line 14. See also: op. cit. n. 21.
69 References are to the Boissevain edition (ibid.), and they are cited according to chapter and section (volume, page, line).
11. Under the name of the worshiped Emperor⁷⁰: 51:20 (II, 371, 13) –
Caesar (expressed in the demonstrative ἀντίοδον); 59:28 (II, 654, 3) – Ca-
ligula; 79:11 (III, 464, 13) - Elgablos⁷¹.
Τύχης τῆς δημοσίας καλομένης ναὸν”; 50:8 (II, 329, 29) – Genius
Populi.

II. A temple which has an explicit geographical identification:

III. An unscribed temple ⁷²:
2 (I, 30, 17); 6:7 (I, 73, 25); 17: 57 (I, 257, 6); 24:84 (I, 329, 4); 30-35:109
(I, 351, 19); 39:9 (I, 472, 11); 43:49 (II, 103, 2-3); 44:6 (II, 109, 21); 44:50
(II, 137, 28); 52:35 (II, 406, 23 and 30); 53:2 (II, 415, 7); 55:10 (II, 490,
9); 56:5 (II, 522, 33); 58:9 (II, 598, 9); 59:4 (II, 621, 27); 59:24 (II, 645,
15); 60:5 (II, 668, 8); 61:17 (III, 40, 7); 64:17 (III, 130, 13); 66:6 (III, 139,
17ff.) – twice; 69:4 (III, 226, 5); 69:10 (III, 231, 7); 69:11 (III, 231, 18);
70:4 (III, 245, 8).

⁷⁰ Other references to these temples, which are not explicitly named after the emper-
or, are listed below in section III.
⁷¹ There is no basis for Cary's translation “God's Temple”.
⁷² In many of these cases, the context clearly indicates which temple is discussed.
Mostly, these temples are in Rome. In one occasion it is a temple in Egypt (53:2), and
twice the temple in Jerusalem (66:6).