

THE CALENDAR OF SABBATICAL CYCLES DURING THE SECOND TEMPLE AND THE EARLY RABBINIC PERIOD

BEN ZION WACHOLDER

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati

Introduction

The Evidence

1. The Pledge to Keep Shemitah
2. Alexander Exempts the Jews from Taxation during Shemitah
3. Judah Maccabee's Defeat at Beth-Zur Ascribed to Shemitah
4. The Murder of Simon the Hasmonean in 177 A.S.
5. Herod's Conquest of Jerusalem
6. King Agrippa I Recites Deut. 7:15 in a Post-Sabbatical Year
7. A Note of Indebtedness on a Papyrus of Wadi Murabb'at 18
8. Was the Second Temple Destroyed During a Sabbatical or Post-Sabbatical Year?
9. Renting Land from Bar Kosba
10. Three fourth and fifth Century Tombstone Inscriptions in Sodom

Appendix:

A Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles from 519/18 B.C.E. to 440/41 C.E.

INTRODUCTION

THE observance of the Sabbatical year (also known as Release, Shemitah or Shevi'it), when agricultural activity ceased and debts were cancelled, remained a living institution from post-exilic times to about the fifth century after the Christian era. Of the actual status of Shemitah during the pre-exilic times little is known; some scholars deny its historicity altogether while others compare the antiquity of the Sabbatical year to that of the weekly Sabbath.¹ But from the time of the building of the Second Temple until the period of the Amoraim our knowledge of the institution is not only extensive, but sufficiently precise to enable us to construct a calendar of the cycles of Shemitot.

Three items need to be pointed out. First, the closely related institution of Jubilees is of no importance for the calendar of Shemitot during

1 Exod. 23:10-11; Lev. 25:1-7, 19-22; Deut. 15:1-11. For the scholarship, see *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971), XIV, cols. 585 f.

the post-exilic times. For although Lev. 25:8-28 ordains in addition to the Sabbatical year also a Jubilee year, when bonded men and land were to be restored to tribal ownership, we have no record of the Jubilee's observance during post-exilic times.² Furthermore, the exact meaning of the "Sabbath of Sabbaths," or the fiftieth year, as the Jubilee is called, is obscure. Even the rabbinic authorities could not agree whether the Jubilee constituted a separate year from the septennial Shemitah cycle and equaled the fiftieth year or whether there was only a forty-nine year cycle and the Jubilee was considered part of the first Shemitah cycle.³ But most, if not all, Talmudic authorities grant, what we know to be a fact, that the Jubilee was not observed in the post-exilic Jewish calendar.⁴ To be sure, the sectarian literature, found recently in the Judaean desert, and in works such as the Book of Jubilees,⁵ frequently alludes to an era of "the Sabbath of Sabbaths," but it is of little significance for this study since it had no effect upon the Judaean calendar during the period under consideration. Modern scholarship is equally divided as to the method by which the year of the Jubilee was computed; but it is agreed that the institution of the Jubilee did not function during the Second Temple.⁶

Second, the Sabbatical year began on the first day of Tishri and

2 See also Lev. 27:17-24; Num. 36:4; Ez. 46:16-18.

3 Bab. Tal. Nedarim 61a; Rosh Hashanah 9a; Arakhin 12b; 24b; 33a. The majority of talmudic sages counted the Jubilee on the 50th year; Rabbi Judah, however, subsumed the Jubilee as part of the new Sabbatical cycle; cf. Sifra, *Emor* 12, 8 (101a); *Behar* I, 6 (105c); Philo, *De sp. leg.*, II, 110; Jos. *A.J.* III, 282. S. Zeitlin offers a modern version of Judah's view, cited by Sidney B. Hoenig, "The Sabbatical Years and the Year of the Jubilee," *JQR*, 49 (1969), 222-36, who defends Zeitlin against the critics.

4 According to Yer. Shevi'it X, 3, 39c; (Sifra, *Behar*, 2,3 [107a]; B. Arakhin, 32b), the Jubilee was abolished after the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.E.), since Lev. 25:10 prescribes this institution only when "all the inhabitants" of Israel live in the Holy Land. Furthermore, since Lev. 25 ordained the Jubilee and Shemitah as a unit, it follows, the Rabbis say, that Shemitah without the observance of Jubilee falls under "rabbinic" rather than "biblical" ordinances. See Bab. Tal. Gittin 36a-b; Yer., IV, 3, 45d. But Sifra, *Behar*, II, 2 (106d); Arakhin, 32b, cites views which maintain that Jubilee and Shemitah are independent of each other. Cf., however, Tosafot on 'Arakhin 32b, s.v. *manu*.

5 The Book of Jubilees' calendar (A. Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques," *V.T.* 3 (1953), 350-64), assumes a 49-year Jubilee, which accords with Rabbi Judah's position (note 3). See also CD. XVI, 4; 1 QM, VII, 14; cf. B. Noack, "Qumrân and the Book of Jubilees," *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* (Lund), 27/28 (1957/58), 191-207; J. Morgenstern, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and Character," *V.T.* 5 (1955), 34-76.

6 See Maimonides, *Hilkhot Shemitah Veyovel*, X, 5-6. Cf. D.E. Eisenstein, in *J.E.* X, 606a; S. Loewenstamm, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, II (Jerusalem: Institute Bialik, 1958), 580 f.

ended on the last day of Elul.⁷ Thus the Shemitah year differed basically from the civil and religious calendar which in preexilic as well as in postexilic times commenced on the first day of Nisan.⁸ Even during the Judean revolts of 66–70 and 132–35 when the era of “the Redemption of Israel” was proclaimed, the year began in the spring.⁹ But such was the influence of the institution of Shemitah that it played a major role in the gradual shifting of the Near Year from Nisan to Tishri, which has been formalized into our Rosh Hashanah. The fact that the Sabbatical year did not coincide during the period of the Second Temple with the civil and religious year probably explains why the Shemitah cycle was rarely employed, except in sectarian circles, for reckoning time.

Third, a study such as this is now possible for the period of the Second Temple, but not, in the present state of knowledge, for the biblical times. It is not only that, as has been mentioned, we do not know the workings of institutions of Shemitah and Jubilee during the days of David and the monarchy, but we are also ignorant of the basic chronology of the period.¹⁰ Midrashic chronography, as advocated in the talmudic treatise *Seder Olam*, is of no help. Tannaitic chronography assumed an interval of 480 years from the exodus to the building of the Solomonic Temple (I Kings 6:1) and 410 years from its construction to the final destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, for a total of 890 years. Deducting 40 years for the wanderings in the desert and 14 for the conquest of Canaan, or a total of 54 years, whereupon the Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles went

7 M. Rosh Hashanah I, 1; cf. Lev. 25:9.

8 Except for agricultural activities, biblical chronology (Neh. 1:1; 2:1 which is probably corrupt) uniformly assumes that the year begins in the first month of spring, which in post-exilic times is called Nisan. See also Philo, *De Sp. leg.* I, 180; Josephus, *A.J.* I, 80–82; M. Rosh Hashanah, I, 1, and talmudic commentaries thereon. Morgenstern, “The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel,” *HUCA* I (1924), 13–78, “Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel,” X (1935), 1–148; S. Zeitlin, *Megilat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1922); E. A. Mahler, *Handbuch für jüdischen Chronologie* (Frankfurt am-Main, 1916, reprinted in Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971), among others, have been misled by a misinterpretation of M. Rosh Hashanah, I, 1, that Tishri, not Nisan, was the first month of the year during the Second Temple. More recent books, such as E. Frank *Talmudic and Rabbinical Chronology* (New York: P. Feldheim, 1956), 18; J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press), 89–92, are also not reliable.

9 See now B. Kanael, “Notes on the Dates Used During the Bar Kokhba Revolt,” *Israel Exploration Journal*, 21 (1971), 39–46. For the evidence from talmudic literature, see Ch. Albeck, *Shishah Sidre Mishnah* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1956), II, 306.

10 See Ch. Tadmor, “Khronologyah,” *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1962), IV, 245–310.

into effect, the Rabbis computed that during the remaining 836 years ($890 - [40 + 14] = 836$), there were altogether 16 Jubilees ($836:50 = 16 + 36$) and that the destruction of the Solomonic First Temple occurred during a post-Sabbatical year ($36:7 = 5 + 1$).¹¹ Obviously, midrashic chronography is of no help for the student of Shemitah; but neither is modern scholarship dealing with the chronology of the biblical period. For the postexilic period, however, the papyri recently discovered in the Judaean Desert help to solve the problem.

Of the vast literature that deals with our subject, a little known monograph by Benedict Zuckermann deserves special mention. In 1856 Zuckermann published a study of the Jubilee and Sabbatical years to which he appended a table of Shemitot from 535/34 B.C.E. to 2238/39 C.E.¹² Such was Zuckermann's technical competence that, directly or indirectly, his datings of the Shemitot have, often in a modified form, elicited the approval of scholars, including such authorities as Emil Schürer, F. M. Ginzler, Solomon Zeitlin, and T. S. Milik.¹³ But a handful of dissenting voices, Heinrich Graetz, Friedrich Unger, and Ralph Marcus, among others, have noted that this accepted chronology of Shemitot was ahead of some recorded dates by one year.¹⁴ Of course, such a difference between the two views may seem insignificant, but let us not forget that a calendar that misses by a year is always wrong. In fact, the dating of

11 Seder Olam 11 (ed. B. Ratner, Wilno, 1897) pp. 48–50; Bab. Tal. Arakhin 12b–13a. Actually, it occurred 17 jubilees (850 years) from the entry into Canaan. This calendar, which is contrary to Rabbi Judah's view (cited in note 3; cf. note 4), is based on Ez. 40:1, which synchronizes the 25th of our exile, Rosh Hashanah, 10th of the [7th] month, with 14 years after the fall of the city. Seder Olam interprets the New Year of the 10th day of the month to refer to a Jubilee year, which fell 14 years after Hurban, 25 years after the exile of Jeconiah, hence the Hurban occurred in the 36th of Jubilee cycle. Cf. also Maimonides, note 6 and *Teshuvot Harambam* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1934), No. 234, pp. 221–23.

12 Benedict Zuckermann, "Ueber Sabbatjahrcyclus und Jobelperiode," *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars "Fraenckelscher Stiftung"* (Breslau, 1857). Pages 2–3 list the literature to his day; 43–45, a table of Sabbatical years.

13 Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (Leipzig, 1901), 14, 35–37, who updated the literature (p. 37); F. K. Ginzler, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1911), II, 52–54; S. Zeitlin (note 8); *The I Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), 254–57; for T. S. Milik, see below sections 7 and 9. See also H. J. Bornstein, "Heshbon Shemitim Veyovelot," *Hatekufah*, 11 (1921), 230–60; Mahler, *Handbuch* (note 8), 115; Frank (note 8), 74–76.

14 H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig, 1906), III⁵, 2, 654–57; F. Unger, *Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie* (philos. philol. und historische Classe [1895]), 208–81; R. Marcus, in notes to *A.J.* XII, 378; XIII, 234; XIV, 475 (Loeb Classical Library).

events such as John Hyrcanus' accession to the high priesthood and the beginning of the Bar Kosba revolt depend on the chronology of Sabbatical years. This study reviews the entire evidence showing that Zuckermann's calendar of Shemitot is no longer acceptable in light of the recently discovered epigraphical and papyrological documents. Unlike Zuckermann's study, however, which deals with Shemitot from the days of Moses to modern times, this essay is limited to the period of the Second Temple and the Tannaim and Amoraim.

THE EVIDENCE

1. THE PLEDGE TO KEEP SHEMITAH

The memoirs of Ezra, as preserved in Neh. 8–10, record the first allusion to the observance of the Sabbatical year after 587 B.C.E. Chapter 8 reports that, led by Ezra, the Judaeans assembled on the first of Tishri (the year is not given) to hear Ezra and his associates recite from the Mosaic Torah; Chapters 9–10 transcribe the events of the meeting of the assembly on the twenty-fourth of the same month, when the Israelites, fasting and wearing sacks, confessed to their past sins and solemnly swore to observe the Law, specifying significant commandments, such as the prohibition of intermarriage, the observance of the Sabbath, and the routine of the Temple. After mentioning the pledge not to trade with the foreign people on Sabbaths and Holy Days, Neh. 10:32(31) concludes: "We will forego the crops of the seventh year and the exaction of every debt."

Does the pledge to observe the Shemitah suggest that this institution referred to had been only recently inaugurated? If the answer is yes, this passage, assuming it could be dated, would yield the time when the calendar of Shemitah, which apparently continued without interruption to the fifth century of the post-Christian era, was introduced.¹⁵ It is more likely, however, that the pledge to observe the Shemitah referred not to a new but to a well-known but neglected institution. The brevity and technical nature of Neh. 10:32(31)c suggests that the concept of Shemitah was then quite established. In fact, the pledge ונטש את השנה ונטש את השביעית ומשא כל יד indicates that this wording telescoped Exod. 23: 10–11: ויש שנים תורע את ארצך ואספת את תבואתה והשביעית תשמטנה וזה דבר השמטה שמוט כל בעל משה ידו... with Deut. 15:2:

15 Cf. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Meridian Library, 1957), 116–20, Hildegard and Julius Lewy, "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar," *HUCA*, 17 (1942/43), 97, note 391. Wellhausen regarded the institutions of Jubilee and Shemitah as Priestly, hence post-exilic; the Lewy's found their traces in Assyrian records.

with the spaced words directly borrowed from these passages.¹⁶ The Sabbatical year, like the weekly Sabbath, which is also mentioned in the first half of Neh. 10:32(31), apparently had been an ancient norm, certainly going back to pre-exilic times, and possibly to the time of the very inauguration of the Sabbath.

It cannot be denied, however, that Neh. 10:32(31) suggests a situation reflecting greater neglect of the laws of Shemitah than those of the weekly Sabbath. With regard to the latter, our passage alludes to the laxness of trading with foreigners, mentioned again in Neh. 13:14-22; as to the former, the pledge refers to the basic legislation of Shemitah. The evidence is not decisive, however, whether the computation of Shemitot began at the time of this pledge or had then been established. My own inclination is for the latter alternative. If so, the appended calendar of Sabbatical years (Appendix) begins with the period of Zerubabel circa 519-18 B.C.E.

As to the date in Neh. 10, this chapter is part of frequently debated but unresolved issues of post-exilic chronology, into which we cannot enter here.¹⁷ Briefly, the main problem is whether to assign Neh. 10 to Ezra's memoirs though it appears to be a part of Neh. 8-10; or, on the other hand, to assign chapter 10 to Nehemiah alone, since his name heads the list of men who signed the pledge (Neh. 10:2).¹⁸ If our passage belongs to Ezra, then the crucial date is the 7th year of Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:1), either 458 B.C.E. (if Artaxerxes I) or 397 if Artaxerxes II). But if our passage belongs to the days of Nehemiah, as many scholars maintain, the likely date of our passage is sometime after the 20th year of Artaxerxes II (allusions in the Elephantine papyri exclude Artaxerxes I), i.e., 445 B.C.E. (Neh. 1:1).¹⁹

Briefly, we regard Neh. 10:32(31)c as a reasonably datable allusion to the observance of Shemitah during the post-exilic period, but because of the many doubts involved, forego its precise dating.

2. ALEXANDER EXEMPTS THE JEWS FROM TAXATION

DURING SHEMITAH

A lost semi-fictional semi-historical treatise, partly preserved by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities*, XI, 313-47, contains the second post-exilic

16 Cf. Rashi on Neh. 10:32; W. Rudolph, *Ezra und Nehemia*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), 177.

17 H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," in *The Servant of the Lord*² (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965).

18 Cf. Rudolph, *Ezra und Nehemia*, 169; 173.

19 See now Emil G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven; Yale University Press, 1953), 106-9; Peter Ackroyd, *Israel Under*

allusion to the observance of the Shemitah.²⁰ In fact, the author of this treatise makes Shemitah the focal point of his argument showing how Alexander favored the Jews, but disliked the allegedly two-faced Samaritans. After his conquest of Gaza the Macedonian king marched against the Judaeans, who had remained faithful to Darius.²¹ But upon reaching Jerusalem and seeing the face of the high priest, Alexander recalled that it was the same face of a person he had seen in a dream, and who promised him the conquest of the Persian empire. After sacrificing at the Temple, the conqueror asked what gifts the Jews would like to receive. The high priest then requested that the Jews be permitted "to observe their ancestral laws and that each septennial year they be exempt from tribute;" all of which Alexander gladly granted.²² The Samaritans, to whom Alexander had formerly given permission to build a sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, thereupon begged that the same exemption from tribute on the Shemitah be also granted to them. Alexander asked them whether they considered themselves Jews; the Samaritans replied that they were not Jews but Hebrews, known as Sidonians of Shechem. Alexander rejected the Samaritans' request, for the remission of tribute on account of Shemitah was granted only to the Jews.²³

Since the story of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem is fictional and since this "treatise" is marked by a strong anti-Samaritan bias, Alexander's involvement in the Shemitah may not be historical. It is a fact, however, that the Macedonian rulers, like the Persians who preceded them, and the Romans who followed them, remitted the taxes of the Sabbatical years. It does not matter whether Alexander himself, as our treatise claims, or one of his subordinates, as seems more probable, remitted the taxes. It is likely that the privileges bestowed on the Jews to follow their ancestral laws, including the keeping of Shemitah, were granted sometime after Alexander's conquest of Tyre and Gaza.²⁴ The only remaining question is the likely date of these privileges.

Babylon and Persia (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), 191-96.

20 Cf. Megillat Ta'anit (*HUCA*, 8-9, (1931/32), 339-40; Yoma 69a; See also Pseudo-Callisthenes, II, 24 (ed. C. Mueller, Paris, 1877); R. Marcus, "Appendix C," in Loeb edition of Josephus, VI, pp. 512-32. But Marcus' doubts concerning the historicity of Alexander's privileges (pp. 530-31) are not justified. See now A. Schalit, in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, II, 577-79.

21 *A.J.* XI, 317 f.

22 *A.J.* XI, 338: τοῦ δ' ἀρχιερέως αἰτησαμένον χοῦσθαι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις καὶ τὸ ἑβδομὸν ἔτος ἀνείσφορον εἶναι, συνεχώρησε πάντα. See also below, note 25, for a similar privilege by Caesar. The Jews also requested that their coreligionists of Media and Babylonia be permitted to follow their ancestral laws, allowing any Jew to join Alexander's army, while adhering to the customs of his people.

23 *A.J.* XI, 340-45.

24 See note 22. Some scholars, Mahaffy, for example, speculate that Alex-

Alexander's movements during his conquest of the Near East are more or less known. After a six-month siege, Alexander seized Tyre in August of 332 B.C.E.; Gaza's resistance lasted till November, by the end of which month he reached Egypt; and evidently in January of 331 he laid the foundation of Alexandria; in the spring Alexander was back in Tyre, appointing a satrap for Coele-Syria; and in summer he reached Mesopotamia on his way to Babylon and the Far East, never to return to the West. According to Zuckermann's calendar of Sabbatical years, the beginning of the Shemitah of Tishri 332/Elul 331 coincided roughly with Alexander's investment of Gaza. However, according to my reckoning, the Shemitah season occurred a year later, in 331/30 B.C.E. The commencement of the Sabbatical year coincided roughly with the battle of Gaugamela, on October 1, 331. This is the case because although either chronology of Shemitot could be made to fit into the historical events, it would seem that the latter dating is preferable, for it is unlikely that Alexander settled minor problems of governing Judaea at a time when his energies were engaged in conquering the eastern Mediterranean coast. It appears more probable that Alexander or his satrap granted the privileges to the Jews, chief of which was tax exemption during a Shemitah year, in the spring or summer of 331, with the beginning of the Sabbatical year due in the fall of the same year.²⁵

3. JUDAH MACCABEE'S DEFEAT AT BETH-ZUR ASCRIBED TO SHEMITAH

The First and Second Books of Maccabees report that Antiochus V Eupator (Dec. 164–Oct. 162 B.C.E.) and his general Lysias, in their attempt to crush the Judean rebellion, besieged Beth-Zur, a fortified town south of Jerusalem.²⁶ I Macc. 6:49 attributes the fall of Beth-Zur to the town's "having no food to withstand a siege as it was a Sabbath in the land."²⁷ Antiochus' forces, after taking this fortress, invested the area of the Temple. The resistance was feeble, according to I Macc.

and deliberately pursued a pro-Jewish policy, since there were many Jews in Babylonia.

²⁵ Alexander's remission of taxes during Shemitah should be compared to the grant of Julius Caesar: "Gaius Caesar, Imperator (and Dictator: *Lat.*) for the second time, has ruled that they shall pay a tax for the city of Jerusalem, Joppa excluded, every year except in the seventh year, which they call the Sabbatical year, because in this time they neither take fruit from the trees nor do they sow . . ." (Marcus' translation in Loeb's *A.J.* XIV, 202). If the Latin reading "dictator for the second time" is correct (so Niese, in apparatus) which is by no means certain, the decree was issued early 44. Tishri 44/Elul 45 was a Shemitah.

²⁶ I Macc. 6:20–54; II Macc. 13:1–26.

²⁷ καὶ ἐποίησεν εἰρήνην μετὰ τῶν ἐκ Βαβυλωνίων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖ διατροφή τοῦ συγκεκλεισθαι ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι σάββατον ἦν τῇ γῇ.

6:53 since "there was no food in the storerooms because it was the seventh year."²⁸ Josephus amplifies this account of First Maccabees with details which apparently reflected the observance of Shemitah in his own day: "This [the Jews'] supply of food, however, had begun to give out, for the present crop had been consumed, and the ground had not been tilled, but had remained unsown because it was the seventh year, during which our laws oblige us to let it lie uncultivated. Many of the besieged, therefore, ran away because of the lack of necessities, so that only a few were left in the temple."²⁹

First and Second Maccabees differ, however, as to the date of Antiochus V's march into Judaea. II Macc. 13:1 dates the march in the 149th year of the Seleucid era, I Macc. 6:20, repeated by Josephus, in the 150th year. Presumably (though this remains a question) the capture of Beth-Zur as well as the siege of the Temple during Shemitah, which are described in I Macc. 6:48-53, occurred within the same calendar year as recorded either in II Macc. 13:1 or in I Macc. 6:20, i.e. in the 149th or 150th year of the Seleucid era.

A number of complex technical questions need to be considered before we can confidently give the Julian date of the Shemitah mentioned in First Maccabees.

1. Does the different dating of Antiochus' campaign in First and Second Maccabees reflect a real difference or is the difference only apparent and due merely to a difference in their calendars?

2. The Seleucid era, employed by First and Second Maccabees, commemorates Seleucus' entry into Babylon in October of 312 B.C.E. But the occasion for the beginning of the Seleucid era varied from city to city. In Antioch the year began on the first of the Macedonian month Dios, i.e., October; in Babylon, on the first of Nisannu.³⁰ What calendar(s) was (were) used by the authors of the Maccabean Books?³¹

3. Many details of the Judaeian calendar during this period remain unknown. A number of scholars have maintained that the festival now known as Rosh Hashanah, which falls on the first of Tishri (September-October) was regarded then as the beginning of the year. But the Mac-

28 βρώματα δὲ οὐκ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις διὰ τὸ ἑβδομον ἔτος εἶναι.

29 A.I. XII 378 (Marcus' translation, in Loeb).

30 See Elias Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), 71.

31 Walther Kolbe, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten Testament, Heft 10; Stuttgart, 1926), 19-58, offers a fair summary of the controversy. But his work has become somewhat obsolete since the publication of *Babylonian Chronology* by R. Parker and W. Dubberstein (Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1956). See also Klaus-Dietrich Schunck, *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1954), 16-31.

cabean books, like all other biblical sources, without exception, take it for granted that Nisan was the first month.³² There is no doubt, however, that the season of Shemitah commenced on the first of Tishri and ended on the last day of Elul.³³

4. Several scholars have added to these complexities of the problem by suggesting not only that First and Second Maccabees use diverging calendars, but that First Maccabees itself reflects two calendars, depending whether the date used was taken from a Seleucid or from a Jewish source. To this must be added a third variable, when one does not know, which is the case in most instances, whether the source happens to be Seleucid or Jewish.³⁴

This is not the place to discuss the pros and cons of the calendrical controversies except as they relate to the Sabbatical year mentioned in I. Macc. 6:49-53. Table One offers five proposed synchronisms, by no means exhaustive, of the Julian dates and the Sabbatical year under discussion.

TABLE ONE

Source	Anno Sel.	B.C.E.	Shemitah
A. II Macc. 13:1	149	Tishri 164/Elul 163	Tishri 164/Elul 163
I Macc. 6:20	150	Tishri 163/Elul 162	Tishri 164/Elul 163
B. II Macc. 13:1	149	Oct. 164/Sept. 163	Tishri 164/Elul 163
I Macc. 6:20	150	Nisan 163/Adar 162	Tishri 164/Elul 163
C. II Macc. 13:1	149	Oct. 164/Sept. 163	Tishri 164/Elul 163
I Macc. 6:20	150	Nisan 163/Elul 162	Tishri 164/Elul 163
D. II Macc. 13:1	149	Nisan 163/Adar 162	Tishri 163/Elul 162
I Macc. 6:20	150	Nisan 162/Adar 161	Tishri 163/Elul 162
E. II Macc. 13:1	149	Oct. 163/Sept. 162	Tishri 163/Elul 162
I Macc. 6:20	150	Nisan 162/Adar 161	Tishri 163/Elul 162

Table 1 shows some of the divergent datings of Antiochus V's entry into Judaea during a Sabbatical year. A, B and C follow Zuckermann's table of Sabbatical years; D and E are in accord with the calendar prepared in this paper. A presumes that either the dating of I Macc. 6:20 is in error or that the reference in I Macc. 6:49, 53 to a Shemitah in fact means to say a post-Shemitah year. B assumes that since Antiochus' campaign started in the summer of 163, there is no divergence between

32 See above, note 8.

33 Cf. Lev. 25:9; M. Rosh Hashanah, I,1.

34 See J. C. Dancy, *A Commentary on I Maccabees* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954), 50 f.

Zuckermann's table of Shemitot and the Maccabean differing datings; this difference resulted from the fact that the First Book of Maccabees follows the Jewish practice of beginning the year in Nisan; Second Maccabees follows the Seleucid calendar of starting the year in October. C accepts B's reasoning, but, because of other alleged divergences between the chronological schemes of the two Maccabean books, assumes that I Macc. posits a Seleucid era which started in Nisan 311; II Macc., in October 312 B.C.E.

D. differs from E in that it presumes an error in First Maccabees; while E grants that I Maccabees began the Seleucid era in October 312 and II Maccabees, in Nisan 311; both sources agree that Antiochus V's campaign occurred in the spring or summer of 162.³⁵

This somewhat technical discussion suggests that although I Macc. 6:20-53 assures us that a Shemitah occurred in either 164/63 or 163/62 B.C.E., the evidence from here alone is not conclusive.

4. THE MURDER OF SIMON THE HASMONEAN IN 177 A.S.

The next dated Shemitah occurred during the year of the murder of Simon the Hasmonean and the accession of John Hyrcanus. I Macc. 16:14-21 reports that Simon and his two sons, Mattathias and Judas, while visiting Simon's son-in-law, Ptolemy, in Dok, near Jericho, were treacherously murdered by Ptolemy, "in the eleventh month, which is called Sabat (Shevat), of the 177th year."³⁶ The account goes on to relate that Simon's third son, John, escaped the assassin's hands, an episode with which the First Book of Maccabees ends.³⁷

Josephus, who here used a source other than that of First Maccabees, does not mention the date of Simon's assassination, but he does say in the *Antiquities* that Simon ruled eight years.³⁸ Furthermore, Josephus adds in both the *Bellum* and *Antiquities* that John Hyrcanus' efforts to avenge the heinous crime were futile,³⁹ for while John besieged Ptolemy's fortress, which Josephus calls Dagon, "there came round the year in which the Jews are wont to remain inactive, for they observe the custom every seventh year, just as on the seventh day. And Ptolemy, being relieved

35 See note 31. Cf. E. Bickerman, "Mackabäerbücher," *R.E.* 27 (Stuttgart, 1928), 779-97; Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I⁴, 35-37; Zeitlin, *The I Book of Macc.*, 254-61; Starcky, in *Les livres des Maccabées* (La Sainte Bible, Paris: les Éditions du Cerf, 1961), 47; 136, note d.; F. Kugler, *Von Moses bis Paulus* (Münster, 1922), 5; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 140-44.

36 I Macc. 16:14.

37 I Macc. 16:21-22 (John's escape), 23-24 (book ends).

38 *A.J.* XIII, 228.

39 *B.J.* I, 54-60; *A.J.* XIII, 228-35.

from the war for this reason, killed the brothers and the mother of Hyrcanus (the mother is not mentioned in I Maccabees), and after doing so fled to Zenon, surnamed Cotylas, who was the ruler of the city of Philadelphia."⁴⁰

One might suggest, perhaps gratuitously, as did Walter Otto, that the Shemitah was a historian's invention in order to excuse John Hyrcanus for letting Polemy escape unpunished.⁴¹ But this is highly unlikely, for the 177th A.S. necessarily must have been a Shemitah if the 149th or 150th A.S., mentioned in section three, was one; this excludes the possibility that chroniclers simply manufactured Sabbatical years haphazardly. By juxtaposing the 149 and 177 and Shemitot we can conclude that the calendar of Sabbatical years was required rather than arbitrary, politically motivated, or an invention of apologists.

As to the Julian year of the Shemitah under discussion, Table Two shows three divergent schemes as proposed, among others, by Schür(er),⁴² Zuck(ermann),⁴³ and Wach(older), preceded by the suggested dates of the Shemitah treated in the previous section:

TABLE TWO

A.S.	B.C.E.	Shemitah (Schür)	Shemitah (Zuck)	Shemitah (Wach)
148	Nisan 165/Adar 164	Tishri 164/Elul 163		
149	Tishri 164/Elul 163		Tishri 164/Elul 163	
149	Nisan 163/Adar 162			Tishri 163/Elul 162
TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS LATER				
176	Nisan 137/Adar 136	Tishri 136/Elul 135		
177	Tishri 136/Elul 135		Tishri 136/Elul 135	
177	Nisan 135/Adar 134			Tishri 135/Elul 134

Granting that Josephus' dating of Simon's assassination in Shebat 177 A.S. presupposes a Julian date of Shemitah in 135/34 B.C.E., Schürer suspects not only the date but also the reliability of the tradition. Josephus' statement that, like the weekly Sabbath, the Sabbath of years was a period of inactivity, according to Schürer, was not factual and

40 A.J. XIII, 234 f.; B.J. I, 60: *τριβομένης δὲ διὰ ταῦτα τῆς πολιορκίας ἐπέστη τὸ ἀργὸν ἔτος, ὃ κατὰ ἑπταετίαν ἀργεῖται παρὰ Ἰουδαίους ὁμοίως τοῖς ἑβδομάσι ἡμεραῖς...*

41 Walter Otto, "Herodes," No. 14, R.E., Suppl. II (1913), 31 note (34); separately printed (Stuttgart, 1913), 33 note (36).

42 Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I⁴, 36; 259.

43 Zuckermann, "Ueber Sabbatjahrcyclus," 33.

was based on an unreliable pagan source.⁴⁴ For the true reason of Hyrcanus' lifting of the siege was not the inactivity of the alleged Shemitah of 135/34, but the hunger of the historical Shemitah of 136/35. Schürer's dating of Simon's death in February of 135, however, results in a chronology of Hasmonean high priests that is inconsistent with Josephus' traditions in general. Josephus says that Simon held the high priestly office eight years (meaning no doubt from 170 to 177 A.S.), but Schürer attributes to Simon only seven years, from 142 to February 135;⁴⁵ Josephus gives John Hyrcanus a reign of thirty-one years, Schürer has thirty-two, from February 135 to 104 B.C.E.⁴⁶ Some scholars rightly reject Schürer's Hasmonean chronology, but inconsistently follow Schürer's table of Sabbatical years.⁴⁷

Josephus' dating of Simon's death during the Shemitah of 177 A.S., which is equivalent to 135/34 B.C.E., offers unambiguous testimony for the calendar of Sabbatical cycles appended to this study.

5. HEROD'S CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM

In his detailed account of Herod, Josephus speaks of a Sabbatical year in connection with the protracted siege of Jerusalem which was led by the Rome-appointed Jewish king and the Roman general Sossius.⁴⁸ The siege evidently began in the spring of 37 B.C.E. and lasted, according to *B.J.* 5:398, six months; according to *B.J.* 1:351; until the fifth month; but according to *A.J.* 14:487, in the third month. *A.J.* 14:476, says, however, that the taking of the first wall lasted forty days, the second wall fifteen days, making a total of fifty-five days of siege. Some scholars favor the version of minimal length; others, the full five months.⁴⁹

44 Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I⁴, 36. Schürer's construction of ἀργέω uncultivated or inactive, employed by Josephus, probably means only that it is related to the rest of the Sabbath, not that types of rest of the two were alike. Schürer's understanding of Shemitah as described by Tacitus (*Hist.*, V, 4), that it required total rest, is probably too literal.

45 *A.J.* XIII, 228; Schürer, *ibid.*, I⁴, 241, n. 1.

46 *A.J.* XIII, 299; XX, 240; *B.J.*, I, 68 has 33 years. Schürer *ibid.*, I⁴, 256.

47 Cf. Kolbe, *Beiträge*, 26–28; Jean Starcky, in *Les livres des Macc.*, 9; Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 140–44; 377. See also E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921), II, 232, n. 1, who is consistent in coordinating Zuckermann's calendar of Shemitot with Hasmonean chronology; Ralph Marcus, in his notes to *A.J.* XII, 378; XIII, 234, differs with Schürer on the table of Shemitot, but follows Schürer in the dating of the Hasmonean princes.

48 *B.J.* I, 343–57; *A.J.*, XIV, 465–91. Otto, *R.E.*, Suppl. II, 30–34; Reprint, 32–37; see now Abraham Schalit, *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969), 95–97; 764–68.

49 Otto, *R.E.* Suppl. II, 30 f., Reprint, 36 f. argues that the siege lasted

The latter cite as evidence *A.J.* 14:487, that the city fell "on the day of fast" (*τῇ ἐορτῇ νηστείας*), which, taken to mean the Day of Atonement, implies that Jerusalem was conquered in October. The scholars who argue that Herod's siege lasted only fifty-five days or so, until June or July, explain that *ἐορτῇ* here means not the Day of Atonement but (erroneously, they say) the Sabbath, the fast of Tammuz; or, if it does mean Yom Kippur, this was an invention of an anti-Herodian chronicler, which Josephus thoughtlessly copied.⁵⁰ But, except for the last explanation, which is conceivable, it seems rather unbelievable that Josephus (or his source) would have either confused the Sabbath with the Yom Kippur or that the fast of Tammuz could have been called *the* fast day, to commemorate a date when Jerusalem was twice conquered, first by Pompey (63 B.C.E.) and twenty-seven (twenty-six?) years later, in 37 B.C.E.

Josephus gives another datum by referring to a Sabbatical year. Describing Jerusalem's famine during the siege, *A.J.* 14:475 adds that it was aggravated "for a Sabbatical year happened to fall at that time."⁵¹ Since the defense of the Holy City against Herod took place in the spring and summer of 37 B.C.E., as expressly dated by Josephus, the Sabbatical year must have begun in Tishri 1 of 38 B.C.E. If so, it follows that the two Sabbatical years discussed in the previous two sections, sixteen (section 3) and twelve Shemitot (section 4) earlier, must be dated respectively in 164/63 and 135/34 B.C.E. Zuckermann and the scholars who have accepted his calendar of Sabbatical years, cite the Shemitah during Herod's siege of Jerusalem as the basis for their version of the calendar of Shemitot.⁵²

But the evidence here from Josephus is not quite as clear-cut as it would seem. For Josephus, in *A.J.* 15:6-7, after describing the terrible sufferings which Herod inflicted upon Jerusalem's population, adds: "And there was no end to their troubles, for on the one hand their greedy master, who was in need [of money], was plundering them, and on the other hand the seventh year, which came round this time, forced them to leave the land unworked, since we are forbidden to sow

3 months; J. Klausner, *Historiah shel Habayyit Hasheni*² (Jerusalem: Ahiasaf, 1950), III, 269 f., favors the account of a long siege; Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I⁴, 358, note 11, cites the literature and the diverse opinions. See also Schalit, *König Herodes*, 464-66.

⁵⁰ Herzfeld, *MGWJ*, 5 (1855), 109-15, and Graetz, *Gesch.*, III⁵ (1905), 161, note 1, maintain that the city fell on a Sabbath day; Schalit (following Otto) rejects the tradition—a fastday—altogether (see note 49).

⁵¹ *A.J.* XIV, 475: τὸν γὰρ ἑβδοματικὸν ἐνιαυτὸν συνέβη κατὰ ταῦτ' εἶναι.

⁵² In a note *A.J.* XIV, 475, Marcus argues that Josephus either erred here in dating Herod's capture of Jerusalem in the summer of 36 B.C.E. (see XIV, 488), rather than in 37, or that he alluded to the forthcoming Sabbatical year of 37-36.

the earth at that time.”⁵³ The phrase *ἐνειστήκει γὰρ τότε* which Marcus has rendered “which came round at that time,” seems to suggest that the Shemitah fell not during the siege but after it had ended, i.e., while Herod was master of Jerusalem. If the city fell on Yom Kippur, as Josephus says it did, *A.J.* 15:7 would seem to refer to the Shemitah of 37/36 B.C.E. But even if the city fell in Tammuz, as some scholars argue, it is quite likely that Josephus here alludes to the first year of Herod’s reign, virtually all of which fell during the Sabbatical year of Tishri 37/Elul 36.⁵⁴ But however one dates the fall of Jerusalem to Herod, there is no escaping the fact that Josephus’ evidence here for the calendar of Sabbatical years appears to be contradictory: *A.J.* 14:475 suggests that the Shemitah fell during the Julian years 38/37; *A.J.* 15:7, 37/36 B.C.E. Both cannot be right.

6. KING AGRIPPA I RECITES DEUT. 7:15 IN A POST-SABBATICAL YEAR

Referring to Deut. 31:10–13, which ordains the public recitation of the Law “at the end of every seven years, at the set time of the year of release, at the feast of booths,” Mishnah Sotah 7:8 says: “The section of the king, how [is it recited]? On the day following the first day of the Festival (Sukkot), on the eighth year, during a post-Shemitah, they make for him [the king] a platform of wood in the Temple Court on which he sits as it is written: ‘At the end . . .’ (Deut. 31:10). The *hazzan* of the synagogue takes the scroll of the Torah and hands it to the head of the synagogue, the head of the synagogue hands it to the sagan (assistant of the high priest), the sagan to the high priest, the high priest hands it to the king, the king receives it standing and reads it sitting. But King Agrippa received it standing and read it standing, and the sages praised him. And when he [Agrippa] reached (Deut. 17:15): ‘You many not put a foreigner over you who is not your brother,’ his eyes flowed with tears. They [the sages] said to him: ‘Fear not, Agrippa, you are our brother! you are our brother! you are our brother!’”⁵⁵

53 *πέρας τε κακῶν οὐδὲν ἦν. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἡ πλεονεξία τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐν χρεῖα γεγεννημένου διεφόρει, τὴν δὲ χώραν μένειν ἀγεώργητον τὸ ἑβδοματικὸν ἡνάγκαζεν ἔτος. ἐνειστήκει γὰρ τότε, καὶ σπείρειν ἐν ἔκλειψι τῇ γῇ ἀπηγορευμένον ἔστιν ἡμῖν.*

54 See note 52. The Marcus-Wikgren note to *A.J.*, XV, 7 (Loeb) is worth repeating: “The Sabbatical year extended from Oct. 37 to Oct. 36 B.C., although Josephus may have placed it a year earlier; see the notes to *Ant.* XII. 387, and *XIV.* 475.”

55 פרשת המלך כיצד? מוצאי יום טוב של חג, בשמיני במוצאי שביעית, עושין לו בימה של עץ בעזרה, והוא יושב עליה, שנאמר: ‘מקץ שבע שנים במועד’ וגו’, חזן הכנסת נוטל ספר תורה ונותנה לראש הכנסת, וראש הכנסת נותנה לסגן, והסגן נותנה לכהן גדול, וכהן גדול נותנה למלך, והמלך עומד ומקבל וקורא יושב. אגריפס המלך עמד וקבל וקרא עומד,

Beginning with Wieseler,⁵⁶ the dating of this story has often been debated. Since King Agrippa II (28–92 or 93 C.E.) had no control of Jerusalem and probably could not or would not read Hebrew, scholars generally have assumed that Mishnah Sotah 7:8 referred to King Agrippa I (10 B.C.E.–44 C.E.).⁵⁷ A man with a checkered career, he was imprisoned by Tiberius; in 37 C.E. Caligula appointed him king of Herod Phillipus' tetrarchy of Gaulanitis and Trachonitis; in 39, he was awarded Herod Antipas' realm of Galilee and Peraea; in 41 Claudius added Judaea and Samaria to his kingdom. Agrippa died in 44.⁵⁸

What is the date of Agrippa I's reading of Scripture? It is generally assumed that this occurred during the post-Sabbatical Sukkot of 41 C.E., for following Zuckermann's chronology, Tishri 40/Elul 41, was a Shemitah, the only one to fall during Agrippa I's reign of Judaea (41–44) and indeed of his entire realm (37–44).

An incidental remark in Josephus shows, however, that 40/41 could not have been a Shemitah. Describing in great detail the rebellious mood in Judaea which followed Caligula's order to place his statue in the Temple, *A.J.* 18:271–72 speaks of the Jewish petitioners at Tiberias, who said that they were ready to die rather than to violate their ancestral laws: "And falling on their faces and baring their throats, they declared that they were ready to be slain. They continued to make these supplications for forty days (fifty: *B.J.* 2:200). Furthermore, they neglected their fields, and that, too, though it was time to sow the seed."⁵⁹ Philo Alexandrinus, referring to the same incident records: "For the wheat crop was just ripe and so were the other cereals."⁶⁰ We know that the turmoil in Judaea described by both Josephus and Philo took place during the final months of the reign of Caligula, who was assassinated on the twenty-fourth of January of 41 C.E. Since these Jews were ready to die for the Law, they presumably were observing the laws of Shemitah which, according to Zuckermann, were then in force.

ושבחוהו חכמים. וכשהגיע ל'לא תוכל לחת עליך איש נכרי' זלגו עיניו דמעות. אמרו לו: אל תתירא, אגריפס, אחינו אתה, אחינו אתה, אחינו אתה!

⁵⁶ Wieseler, *Stud. und Krit.* (1879), 529 f.

⁵⁷ On the other hand, J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine I* (Paris, 1867), 217; A. Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des jerusalemischen Tempels* (Vienna, 1895), 10–12; and Zeitlin, *JQR*, 9 (1918/19), 99, n. 70, among others, maintain that M, Sotah VII, 8, refers to Agrippa II.

⁵⁸ On Agrippa I, see N. H. Feldman's general index to the Loeb edition of Josephus, IX (1965), 595.

⁵⁹ *B.J.* II, 199–200. Schürer; *Gesch. d. jud. Volkes*, 14, 36, grants that this passage suggests a different table of Sabbatical years, but rejects the evidence as indirect and as not sufficient to refute the positive evidence from the other datings of Shemitah.

⁶⁰ Philo, *De leg.* 249.

In fact, however, by our reckoning, Tishri 40/Elul 41 was only the sixth year of the Shemitah cycle. This dating, moreover, adds new dimension to the accounts of Philo and Josephus of the self-sacrificing piety of the petitioners; for though unable to tend the fields the next year on account of Shemitah they nevertheless disdained to work the field in the permitted year, so as to protest Caligula's outrageous orders. It follows that Agrippa I's recitation from the Book of Deuteronomy, if historical, took place on the second day of Sukkot of 42 C.E.

I feel, however, a modicum of uncertainty concerning the historicity of the tale recorded in Mishnah Sotah 7:8. To be sure, there is intrinsically nothing in the anecdote that would contradict Agrippa I's character, as known to us from Josephus' accounts. Shrewd and subtle, pious where piety was called for, the king was quite capable of shedding tears to elicit a reply that would ease the un-Jewish reputation of the Herodian princes.⁶¹ But talmudic literature recounts a handful of anecdotes to illustrate the Jewish king's piety, or even his superpiety in halakhic matters. The Babylonian Talmud, for example, tells that the king's train once encountered a bridal procession. According to halakhah, the bridal procession was supposed to let the king pass by. Agrippa, however, so the tale goes, chivalrously removed himself from the bridal path, saying, according to Semahot 11, "I wear a crown every day, she only once." These anecdotes, like the one we are discussing here, are probably fictional tales that grew around the remarkable personality of Agrippa I.⁶² But if Agrippa I did in fact recite Scripture in connection with the septennial celebrations, the incident of Mishnah Sotah 7:8 occurred during the first year of the Sabbatical cycle, on Sukkot of 42 C.E.

7. A NOTE OF INDEBTEDNESS ON A PAPYRUS OF WADI MURABBA'AT 18

Thus far all the passages cited come from literary texts; this section introduces a document recently found in the Judaean desert in the caves of Wadi Murabba'at near Bethlehem. Zachariah bar Yehoḥanan signed a deed for Abshalom bar Ḥanin, promising the repayment of twenty (and ?) denars which he had borrowed during a Sabbatical year. We reproduce here the Aramaic text as published by Milik in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*,⁶³ with corrections and an English translation:

1. [] [שנ] תרתין לנרון קסר []
2. בצויה איתודי אבשלום בר חנין מן צויה
3. בנפי מניה עמי אנה זכריה בר יהוחנן בר ה []

61 Cf. the derisive comments of Tos. Sotah VII, 16; Yer. Sotah VII, 7, 22a.

62 See also M. Bikkurim, III, 4; Tos. Pesahim, IV, 3; B. ibid. 107b.

63 P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*,

4. יתב בכסלון כסף זוזין עס[רי]ן [] מש []
5. אנה [] [] [] לא די זבינת עד זמ[נא]
6. דנה אפרוענך בחמש ואפשר בתמ[ימותא]
7. ושנת שמטה דה והן כן לא אעבד תשלומ[תא]
8. לך מנכסי ודי אקנה לקובליך
9. [זכ]ריה בר יהוח[נן] ע[ל] גפשה
10. [כת]ב יהוסף ב[ר] [] מאמרה
11. יהונתן בר יהוחנא שהד
12. יהוסף ב[ר] י[הודן] עד

Recto

1. [] of yea]r two of Nero Caesar []
2. in *Swya*; declared by Abshalom bar Ḥanin, of *Swyah*.
3. in his presence, of my own accord,⁶⁴ that I Zachariah bar Yeho-
ḥanan bar Ḥ[]
4. dwelling in Keslon, silver denars twen[t]y
5. I [] not sell until the ti[me]
6. of this, I will pay you in five and possibly in its enti[rety];
7. in this year of Release; and if not so, I will make a paym[ent]
8. to you from my properties, even those that I will buy later, will
be pledged to you as mortgage.

Verso

9. [Zacha]riah bar Yeho[ḥanan, i]n person
10. [writt]en (for) Yehosef ba[r], by dictation
11. Yehonatan bar Yehoḥanna, witness
12. Yehosef ba[r Ye]hudan, witness

This document has many ramifications and is of immense interest, but here we must restrict the discussion to lines one and seven. "In the second year of Nero Caesar" (line 1) equals, according to Milik October 13, 55/October 12, 56 C.E.;⁶⁵ according to Lehmann and Koffmahnn, 54/55.⁶⁶ Milik translates the first three words of line 7: "même si c'est une année sabbatique,"⁶⁷ and notes: "ושנת שמטה דה: la phrase subordi-

II, No. 18, 100–04 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961). Republished with a German translation and commentary by E. Koffmahnn, *Die Doppelturkunden aus der Wüste Juda* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 80–89.

⁶⁴ Translation doubtful.

⁶⁵ Milik, in *Discoveries*, II, 100 and 103.

⁶⁶ Manfred R. Lehmann, "Studies in the Murabba'at and Naḥal Ḥever Documents," *Revue de Qumrân* IV, 13 (1963), 53–81, esp. 56 f.; Koffmahnn, *Doppelturkunden*, 41 f.

⁶⁷ Milik, in *Discoveries*, II, 102.

née, nominale (דה pour שנתה דה), qui supprime le privilège de l'année sabbatique; c'est la fameuse loi du *proszbol*, attribuée à Hillel (cf. *Sebi'it* X 4 où on cite une formule différente et la formule בלא שמיטתא des contrats traditionnels).⁶⁸ Koffmahnn, however, translates: "in diesen Erlassjahr."⁶⁹

There is no doubt that, contrary to Lehmann and Koffmahnn, Milik's dating of the second year of Nero in 55/56 C.E. is right, but that Milik's rendition of line seven as a conditional phrase, the legal equivalent of the Hillelite *proszbol*, is wrong.⁷⁰ Lehmann-Koffmahnn's "in this year of Shemitah," however, is a simple and correct rendition.

It seems that Milik chose a complicated rendition of the phrase דה ושנת שמיטה because, according to the standard table of Sabbatical years, the year 54/55, not 55/56, the date of our note, was a Shemitah.⁷¹ But Lehmann, followed by Koffmahnn, regards our document a *get mekushar*, ("folded" note), which according Bab. Tal. Baba Batra 164a-b, was to be antedated by a year.⁷² If antedated by a year, as Lehmann and Koffmahnn maintain, the document was written in 54/55, a Shemitah in Zuckermann's calendar of Sabbatical years.

There is no reason, however, to assume that our document was in fact antedated. The second year of Nero refers, as Milik says, to Tishri 55/Elul 56 C.E., which was contrary to the general opinion, in fact a Sabbatical year, as attested by the phrase "in this year of Shemitah." Indeed, Murabba'at 18 presents convincing evidence that the calendar of Sabbatical years appended to this study is right.

8. WAS THE SECOND TEMPLE DESTROYED DURING A SABBATICAL OR POST-SABBATICAL YEAR?

Thus far all the passages discussed allude to Shemitah incidentally. In this section, however, the Sabbatical year becomes a crucial symbol of the schematic cycle of Jewish history. The *Seder Olam* reads:

היה רבי יוסי אומר : מגלגלין זכות ליום וזכות וחובה ליום חייב ; נמצאת אומר, כשחרב הבית בראשונה, אותו היום מוצאי שבת היה, ומוצאי שביעית היתה, ומשמרתו של יהויריב היתה, ותשעה באב היתה. וכן שניה. ובוה ובוה הלויים עומדים על דוכנם ואומרים שירה. ומה שירה אומרים ? 'וישב להם את אונם' וכו'.

68 Ibid., II, 103.

69 *Doppelturkunden*, 81; Lehmann, *RQ*, IV, 56 "and the Shemittah year."

70 It should be noted that although the Murabba'at documents allude to Shemitah (see below, section 9), there seems to be no indication of the existence of the Hillelite *proszbol*.

71 See below, section 9, note 85.

72 The talmudic tradition, also attested from other ancient sources (Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, 50), mentions two types of notes:

Rabbi Jose says: 'Favorable judgment forbode favorable days and guilty judgments guilty days. You find it said: When the Temple was destroyed for the first time, that happened on a day after the Sabbath (Sunday), during a post-Sabbatical year, and during the Watch of Jehoiarib, and on the ninth of Ab; and so also when the Second (Temple was destroyed). And at the point of the destruction of both Temples the Levites were standing at their posts reciting the (same) psalm. And what was the psalm? 'He will bring back on them their iniquity and wipe them out for their wickedness; the Lord our God will wipe them out' (Ps. 94:23).⁷³

This passage appears to support Zuckerman unambiguously and to contradict my calendar of Shemitot. For we know that the Second Temple was destroyed in the month of Ab of the year 70, which our passage dates as a post-Sabbatical year. It follows that the preceding year 68/69 was a Shemitah. Counting backwards we get:

TABLE THREE

Section	Shemitah(s)	Julian Date	A.S.
8		68/69 C.E.	379/80
7	2	54/55 "	365/66
6	4	40/41 "	351/52
5	15	38/37 B.C.E.	274/73
4	27	136/35 "	176/75
3	37	164/63 "	148/49
2	57	332/31 "	
1	?	?	

גט פשוט a "simple" note and גט מקושר, a "folded" note, with three witnesses not two as in simple notes. The document was folded and the witnesses' signatures appeared on the back of the note. Bab Tal. Baba Bathra, 164a-b, quotes Rabbi (Judah Hanasi) as challenging the view of Rabbi Ḥanina ben Gamaliel, that "folded" notes were customarily antedated. But the reference, if not a misinterpretation of Tos. Baba Bathra, X, 1, must allude to exceptional cases. No other talmudic tradition knows of such antedating; certainly not the Tosephta, as claimed by Lehmann (*R.Q.*, IV, 57). In fact, Mur 22 (*Discoveries*, II, 118-22; Koffmahn, *Doppelturkunden*, 158, apparently a "folded" note, bears the date of the first year of the Redemption of Israel which, according to Lehmann's view of antedating, should be inconceivable.

73. Seder Olam Rabbah, 30, 74a-75a (ed. Ratner); Tos. Ta'anit, III, 9, p. 340 (Lieberman ed.) Yer. Ta'anit, IV, 5, 68d; B. Ta'anit, 29a; Arakhin, 11b.

Indeed, this famous passage, repeated in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, seems to have been decisive in persuading scholars to adopt Zuckermann's table of Shemitot despite the problematical aspects which such a calendar involves.⁷⁴ For surely, could it be seriously argued that Rabbi Jose ben Ḥalafta, a tanna who flourished less than a century after the Second Temple's destruction, a chronographer (the treatise *Seder Olam* is attributed to him), who wrote at a time when the institution of Shemitah had been part of a millenium-long tradition, might be mistaken as to the Sabbatical date of the Ḥurban?⁷⁵

But the statement attributed to Rabbi Jose is problematical, being based, not on factual information, but on midrashic chronography. Rabbi Jose, no doubt, alludes to another of his exegetical datings. Chapter 28 of *Seder Olam* reads: רבי יוסי אומר: 'שבעים שבועים' משחרב בית ראשון ועד שחרב בית אחרון, שבעים לחרבנו, וארבע מאות (ועשרה) [ועשרים] לבנינו. ומה תלמוד לומר 'שבעים שבועים'? אלא שהיתה גזירה גזורה קודם לשבעים שנה.

"Rabbi Jose says: 'Seventy weeks' (Dan. 9:24): From the time of the destruction of the First Temple to the destruction of the Second Temple. The Temple was rebuilt 70 years after its destruction and was destroyed 420 years after its rebuilding ($70 + 420 = 7 \times 70$). Why does Scripture then say 'seventy weeks' (i.e., it would have been more accurate for Daniel 9:24 to say: 10 weeks + 60 weeks)? But because the decree (for the destruction and the rebuilding) had been issued prior to the (beginning of the) seventy years."⁷⁶ Rabbi Jose, it would seem, uses chronology to expound upon a difficult prophecy of Daniel, a book which is full of enigmatic statements.⁷⁷ But this midrashic exegesis forms the foundation of Talmudic chronology likewise attributed to Rabbi Jose, that a) the Solomonic Temple was destroyed 490 years before the Herodian Sanctuary (actually 587 or 586 B.C.E. + 70 C.E. = 657 or 656); b) both were destroyed in a post-Sabbatical year; c) both were burned on the ninth day of Ab (which is contrary to II Kings 2:8 and to Jer. 52:6 as far as the Solomonic Temple was concerned, and may be contrary to Josephus as to the Herodian

74 Almost all scholars who have dealt with the Sabbatical chronology cite our passage (see notes 12-13), beginning with the sixteenth century Azariah de Rosi, *Mezaref Lakesef* (Wilno, 1864), 114.

75 On authorship and date of *Seder Olam*, see Zunz-Albeck, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt* (Hebrew ed., Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1947), 43; 267 f., and Ratner's *Mavo Lehaseder Olam Rabbah* (Wilno, 1894).

76 *Seder Olam Rabbah* 28, p. 130 (ed. Ratner). Cf. Tos. Zebahim, XIII, 6; Bab. Tal. Yoma 9a; Arakhin, 12a-13a.

77 Jose's exegesis of Dan 9:24 appears to be linked with the rabbinic chronology of the Jubilees during the first Temple. See above, notes 3-5.

Temple), and d) both Temples were destroyed on a Sunday; and e) the Levites happened to chant the same song.⁷⁸

Few students are likely to defend the historicity of any part of Jose's statement, except for b), a passage that seems to have proved decisive in determining the calendar of Shemitah. In fact only a segment of b), as few students would grant, although quite possible, that the year 587 or 586 B.C.E., the date of Nebuchadnezzar's burning of the First Temple was a Shemitah. Only the author of *Seder Olam* who, as was pointed out above, maintained that from the time when the laws of Shemitah and Jubilee became effective in the 15th year of Joshua's conquest, until the *Hurban*, there elapsed 836 years, of which sixteen jubilees of fifty years each make a total of 800 years, with a remainder of thirty-six years, or five Shemitot plus one year of the next Sabbatical cycle. To be sure, the fact that other parts of Rabbi Jose's statement reflect midrashic chronography does not exclude the possibility that his dating of the Shemitah nearest to the destruction of the Herodian Temple in 68/68 is necessarily inaccurate. It may just be the historical grain upon which Rabbi Jose built the rest of his hermeneutics of Daniel 9:24. But, regardless of the other evidence, the statement cannot be made the foundation upon which to construct a reliable calendar of the Sabbatical cycles.

Three more points need to be remembered, however. First, technically Rabbi Jose's synchronism of the destruction of the second Temple with the first year of a Sabbatical cycle is not inaccurate. For although Tishri 69/Elul 70, not 68/69, was a Shemitah, it is nevertheless quite true that more than a half of the year of the *Hurban* fell during a post-Sabbatical period. For the Jewish year, as stated in *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah* 1:1, formally commenced on the first of Nisan and ended on the last day of Adar. When Rabbi Jose says that the year of the *Hurban* was a post-Sabbatical he may be referring to the second part, i.e., between Tishri and Adar.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ On the song of the day, see now 11QPs^a *DavComp*, in *Discoveries* IV (1965), 48; 92. M. Tamid, VII, 4, knows only of songs varied every day of the week; *Seder Olam* 28 seems to be alluding to unique songs for every day of the year.

⁷⁹ Maimonides, moreover, *Hilkhot Shemitah Veyobel*, X, 4, alluding to our passage, says: נמצאת למד שהשנה שחורב בה הביט באחרונה, שתחלתה מתשרי שאחר החורבן כשני חדשים, שהרי מתשרי הוא המנין לשמיטים וליובלות, אותה השנה מוצאי שביעית היתה.

"You must say that the year when the Second Temple was last destroyed, whose beginning commenced in Tishri, about two months after the destruction (since the computation of Shemitot and Jubilees begins in Tishri), that year was a Shemitah." Maimonides thus expressly says that the *Hurban* actually occurred during a Shemitah, but that the post-Sabbatical commenced, according to him, during Tishri of the New Year.

Second, scholars may be misrepresenting the talmudic tradition when they ascribe to it a solid synchronism of the *Hurban* and the first year of the Shemitah cycle. Arakhin 12a-13b, after quoting Rabbi Jose's statement concerning the remarkable coincidences of the two Temples in its entirety, attempts to disprove only the part referring to the Sabbatical synchronism. Quite clearly, the Amoraic sages were quite aware that it did not conform to the facts as they knew them.

Third, a chronological passage, seemingly merely expanding upon Rabbi Jose's dictum, cited in Abodah Zarah 9b, maintains that the *Hurban* of the Second Temple actually occurred during a Shemitah:

אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: האי מאן דלא ידע כמה שני בשבוע הוא עומד: ניטפי חד שתא ונחשוב כללי ביובלי ופרטי בשבועי, ונשקל ממאה תרי ונשרי אפרטי ונחשובינהו לפרטי בשבועי; וידע כמה שני בשבוע. וסימנך: 'כי זה שנתים הרעב בקרב הארץ.

Said Rabbi Huna, the son of Rabbi Joshua: If one does not know the current year of a Sabbatical cycle, let him add one year (to the era of the *Hurban*). He may then compute jubilees by dividing the date into large numbers (50 years), and Shemitot into small numbers of 7; for each 100 years, let him deduct 2, adding these 2's, and then divide them by 7. Thus, he will know the year of the Sabbatical cycle. And your mnemonic is: 'For there have been two years of hunger in the land' (Gen. 45:6).⁸⁰

In this passage Rabbi Huna, the son of Rabbi Joshua, a head of the Academy of Naresh, who evidently died in 411, offers a formula to find the year of any Sabbatical cycle if one knows the date of the era of *Hurban*. Simply stated, the formula is: (date of *hurban* + 1): 7. The remainder of the division yields the year of the Sabbatical cycle; if 0, a Sabbatical year. The deduction of 2 from each 100 results from dividing 100 by 7 ($12 \times 7 + 2 = 100$) which has a remainder of 2; which if added and divided by 7, again yields the year of Shemitah cycle.

As Huna's formula, according to our talmudic tradition, calls for adding one year to the era of the *Hurban*, it necessarily assumes a synchronism of the year of the *Hurban* (69/70) with Shemitah, rather than a 68/69 Shemitah. There is simply no need to add one year to an era that begins in the first year of the Sabbatical cycle. Since Huna's formula appears to follow Jose's midrashic exegesis, it follows that Huna interpreted Rabbi Jose to mean that as stated by Maimonides the *Hurban* took place during, not after, a Sabbatical year. Hence, the formula calls for the addition of one year to the date of *Hurban* to make the

⁸⁰ I have reproduced the passage as found in our editions and the Mss. of Abodah Zarah 9b. But a long string of geonic and rabbinic authorities has

division by seven correspond with cycles of Shemitah. Certainly, our reading of Abodah Zarah 9b suggests that 69/70 was a Shemitah.⁸¹

Finally, a passage in Josephus implies that the year 68/69 was not Sabbatical. According to *B.J.* 4:529–37, “Simon the son of Gioras, the leader of the Zealots, invaded Idumaea in the winter of 68/69 and gained abundant booty and laid hands on vast supplies of corn.”⁸² This clearly indicates that it was not a part of a Sabbatical season, for surely the Idumeans by now appear to have been following the traditions of Jewish law.⁸³

9. RENTING LAND FROM BAR KOSBA

Among the remnants of Simon bar Kosba's (or Kochba's, as he is known from Greek sources) archives found recently at Murabba'at (see Section 7 above) are fragments of a dozen rental contracts which subordinates of the Jewish Prince executed at Herodium.⁸⁴ Judging from the remnants, the legal wording of these contracts, aside from the names of the renters, differed slightly, but the state of preservation of Mur 24 A–L (as numbered by Milik) ranges from only traces of scattered letters to nearly approaching the original form. Since each of the twelve contracts, written in Hebrew, apparently contained both the same date of issuance and the clause relating to the Sabbatical year, they

divergent readings, some of them questioned the authenticity of the underlined words וְנִסְפִי חָדָשָׁה “let him add one year.” See, for example, *Teshuvot Hageonim*, ed. A. Harkavy (Berlin, 1887), No. 45, 20–22; Razah, *Hama'or Hagedol*, on Alfasi Avodah Zarah, 96; Rabbenu Ḥananel ad locum; Tosafot Avodah Zarah, 9b, s.v. *hay*. It would seem that because of calendar changes many medieval savants emended the reading of our passage, to make it conform with their own datings; it appears, however, to be authentic as it is in the printed editions.

81 See below, note 109.

82 *B.J.* IV, 537.

83 Edom, judaized by John Hyrcanus (*A.J.*, XIII, 257) was considered part of the Holy Land, unlike Ammon and Moab, over which the Rabbis differed whether or not their territory fell under the laws of Shemitah (see M. Yadayyim, IV, 3; Tos. *ibid.*, II, 15–17). During the war against the Romans, the Idumaeans were associated with the Zealots, suggesting strict observance. Zeitlin, *JQR* 9 (1918–19), however, argues that the date of the march in winter of 68, commonly accepted, must be erroneous; on p. 101 he maintains that “the laws of the sabbatical year affected only the lands of Palestine, and had no application in Edom or in any other country that was annexed to Palestine,” citing M. Shevi'it, I, 1, as reference, By Maimonides' definition (*Hilkhot Shemitah*, IV, 28), however, Edom would be included. See also Yer. Shevi'it, VI, 36; Tosafot, *Ḥagigah*, 3b, s.v. *Ammon*.

84 According to Milik, *Discoveries*, II, 125 ff., Herodium served as the Bar Kosba's headquarters. Yadin (*IEJ*, 11 [1961] 51), however, punctuates the documents (see below, line 3) so that Herodium refers to the location of a sub-camp.

are crucial for this study. We reproduce here Mur 24 E, partly but plausibly restored on the basis of the parallel fragments of papyri, as transcribed by Milik in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, II, p. 131:

1. [On the twentieth of She]vat of the year tw[o] of the Redemption of [ב]עשרין לש[בט שנת ש]ת[ים] לגאלת
2. [I]srael by Shimeon ben K[os]ba, the prince of [י]ש[ר]א[ל] על יד שמעון בן כ[וס]בא נסיא
3. [Is]rael. In the camp which is located in Herodium, [י]ש[ר]א[ל] במחנה שיושב בהרודיס
4. [Ye]hudah ben Raba' said to Hillel ben Gry[s]: [י]הודה בן רבא אמר להלל בן גריס
5. "I of my free will have [re]nted from you today the אני מרצוני [ח]כרת המך היום את
6. land which is my re[n]tal in 'Ir העפר שהוא שלי בח<כ>רתי בעיר
7. Naḥash which I hold as a tenant from Shimeon, the Prince of Israel, נחש שחכרת משמעון נסיא יש[ר]א[ל]
8. This land I have rented from you from today [א]ת עפר הלז חכרתי המך מן היום
9. until the end of the eve of She-mitah,⁸⁵ which are years עד סוף ערב השמטה שהם שנים
10. full, [fi]scal years, five, of tenancy; שלמות שני [מ]כסה חמש תחכיר
11. [that I wi]ll deliver to you in [Her]odium: wheat, [שאה]א מודד לך ב[הר]ודיס חנטינ
12. [of good and pure quality,] th[ree kor]s and a lethehh, [יפות ונקיות] שלו [שת כור]ין ולתך
13. [of which a tenth part of the tithe] of these [מ]עשרת מעשרת ת אלה
14. [you will deliver to the silo of the treasury.] And [I am obli]gated [שתהא שוקל על גג האוצר] ו[ק]ים
15. [in regard of this matter thus-ly] [עלי לעמת ככה]
16. [Yehudah ben Raba', in person] [יהודה בן רבא על נפשה]
17. [Shim'on ben Kosba', by dic-tation.] [שמעון בן כוסבא מן מאמרה]

85 *Discoveries* II, 122-34. The Shemitah clause, missing in the defective parts of Mur 24 A, is preserved in 24 B, line 14; C, 12; D, 14-15; E, 9; but lost in the fragments of 24 F-L.

As pointed out by Milik: "Mur 24 fournit un synchronisme précieux entre le comput fondé sur les cycles sabbatiques et celui de l'ère de la Liberté."⁸⁶ The date of the contracts (as clearly attested in *Mur* 24 B, line 1; D 1) is certain: the 20th of Shevat of year 2 of the Redemption of Israel. Lines 8–10 of *Mur* 24 E offer the Sabbatical relationship: "From today," i.e., the 20th of Shebat of year 2, "until the end of the eve of Shemitah, which are five full years, fiscal years, of tenancy."⁸⁷ Citing Schürer (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I⁴, 36) and North (*Biblica*, 34 (1953), 501–15), Milik attributes to Josephus and the Rabbis the dating of 68/69 C.E. as a Shemitah.⁸⁸ It follows, Milik says, that the Shemitah year nearest to Bar Kosba's revolt was 130/31, since Roman sources unambiguously date the rebellion's conclusion in 135.⁸⁹ This could only mean, according to Milik, that the date of the rental contracts was the second year of the Sabbatical cycle, ending in 137/38, and equalled 132/33 (137/38 — 5 = 132/33). Now since the second year of the Shemitah cycle was also the second year the Redemption of Israel (lines 1–2), it necessarily follows, according to Milik, that the revolt commenced in 131/32, contrary to the accepted view which dates the beginning of the Bar Kosba rebellion in the spring of 132.⁹⁰

Milik's chronology is mistaken on several levels. First, Josephus nowhere mentions that 68/69 was a Shemitah year; Schürer (I⁴, 35) and others deduce it from the dating of Herod's conquest; mistakenly, I believe (see above, section 5). Second, assuming the year 68/69 as a Shemitah, the Sabbatical year nearest Bar Kosba's rebellion was not 130/31, as maintained by Milik, but 131/32 ($68/69 + (9 \times 7) = 131/32$).⁹¹ Third, the beginning of the year of Redemption of the Bar Kosba era commenced not on the first of Tishri of 131, as stated by Milik,

86 *Discoveries*, II, 125.

87 Milik, *ibid.* (II, 131) translates: "dès aujourd'hui jusqu'à la fin de la veille de la Rémission, ce qui fait (un nombre d') années complètes, années fiscales, (de) cinq."

88 See above, section 8, esp. note 74, for rabbinic citations: since Josephus nowhere says that 68/69 was a Sabbatical year, Milik probably alludes to the passages cited above in section 5.

89 "L'année sabbatique la plus proche de la fin de la Révolte, 135 ap. J.-C. (date assurée par les sources romaines), est donc 130/1 et la deuxième année du cycle suivant correspond à 132/3. *Mur* 24 a donc été écrit au début de février 133, qui tombait 'l'an deux de la Libération d'Israël.' Le début de l'ère de la Liberté se place au premier Tishri 131" (*ibid.* II, 125). On p. 67, however, Milik adds: that the New Year of Tishri was valid only for the dating of contracts: for coins, though, the first of Nisan was more likely to have been the New Year. Cf. Kanael, *IEJ*, 21, (1971), 41 n. 16.

90 Milik, in *ibid.* II, 125; cf. Sh. Yeivin, *Milḥemet Bar Kokhba* (Jerusalem, 1952), 197–99.

91 This has been also noted by Lehmann, *RQ*, IV (1963), 56.

but on the first of Nissan of 132.⁹² Fourth, the last Shemitah prior to Mur 24 A-L took place not in 131/32, as Zuckermann says, but in 132/33. Therefore the next Shemitah that is mentioned in line 9 of Mur 24 E refers to Tishri 139/Elul 140.

The contracts of Mur 24 provided, however, that the lease would expire on the last day of Elul of 139: "until the end of the pre-Sabbatical year." The rebellion commenced, according to conventional dating, and now attested by numismatic evidence, in the spring of 132.⁹³ The first year of the Redemption of Israel equals Nissan 1 of 132/Adar 29 of 133. It follows that the 20th of Shevat of year 2 of the Redemption of Israel corresponds roughly to February of 134; the time of the contract ("five full years") in fact meant five years, six months and ten days; until the last day of Elul (roughly September) of 139. Milik's statement (citing Mur 24 E, 9-10) that the contract provided for "une durée de cinq ans, précise"⁹⁴ is not quite exact.

Although his chronology is erroneous, Milik rightly felt that Mur 24's synchronism of the Sabbatical year with the year of Redemption of Israel would yield a more precise chronology of the Bar Kosba's rebellion. The rebellion lasted, according to the chronography of Seder Olam, "three and a half years" (the reading "two and a half" is erroneous).⁹⁵ Since the uprising started in the spring or possibly in the summer of 132, it lasted as attested by Eusebius to the fall or early winter of 135. In terms of Jewish dating, the rebellion commenced in the spring of a pre-Sabbatical year and lasted to the beginning of the fourth year of the next Shemitah cycle, the fourth year of the Redemption of Israel by the Prince of Israel, Shim'on bar Kosba.⁹⁶

92 See Kanael (note 89). The earliest dated document of the Bar Kosba period appears to be the one found in Naḥal Ḥever 42, published by Yadin, *IEJ* 12 (1962), 248: "On the first of Iyar of year two of the Redemption of Israel..."; Mur 22 (*Discoveries*, II, 118 ff.), dated in 14th of Marḥeshwan of the first year, was written 6½ months later. If this is correct, the revolt started in the spring of 132. Kanael's explanation (*IEJ* 21, [1971], 41, note 15), that the scribe erred is not convincing.

93 See preceding note.

94 Milik, in *Discoveries*, II, 123.

95 See Seder Olam, 30, p. 146 (Ratner), note 82, who cites the Ms reading; Neubauer, *Medieval Jewish Chronicles* (Oxford, 1887), I, 198; II, (1895), 66, note 23.

96 Mur 30 (*Discoveries*, II, 30, pp. 144-46; Koffmann, *Doppelturkunden*, 182-85), dates the 21st of Tishri of the 4th year of the Redemption of Israel, in Jerusalem, which suggests that, contrary to general assumptions, the Holy City was still in Bar Kosba's hands in October of 135 (cf. Milik, *Discoveries*, II, 205). But the proof is not conclusive, for Mur 30 may have been composed in a provincial town, whose scribe continued to date according the era of "the Redemption of Israel in Jerusalem" even after the fall of the Holy City.

10. THREE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURY TOMBSTONE

INSCRIPTIONS IN SODOM

All three tombstone inscriptions to be discussed in this section have a number of common features, the most important of which for us is the fact that they contain the contemporary date of the Sabbatical cycle. The first inscription was discovered by John Philby in 1924 and published by A. Cowley in 1925; in 1943 E. Sukenik found two more inscriptions which he printed in 1945, together with a reprint of Cowley's find and chronological commentaries by A.H. Frenkel, U. Cassuto, and A. Akavia.⁹⁷ All three tombstones were found in or near Zoar, the biblical Sodom, where a Jewish community flourished apparently since Herodian times, if not earlier. The three tombstones contain a synchronism of the Shemitah cycle with the year of the Hurban era. We reproduce a Hebrew transcription of Cowley and Sukenik, plus an English translation:

Inscription A (Cowley)

1. May the soul rest,	1 תתניח ⁹⁸ נפשה
2. of Sha'ul bar[]lat	2 דשאול בר [] לת
3. who died on the first of the month of	3 דמית בריש ירח
4. Marḥeshwan, of the year	4 מרחשון משתה
5. first of Shemitah;	5 קדמיתה דשמטתה
6. the year of three hundred and sixty	6 שנת תלת מא ושתין
7. and four years after the Hurban	7 ורבע שנין לחרבן
8. of the House of the Temple. Peace!	8 בית מקדשה שלם

⁹⁷ A. Cowley, in *Palestine Exploration Fund* (1925) 207–10; S. Daiches, *ibid.*, (1926), 31 f.; L. H. Vincent, *Revue biblique*, 36 (1927), 404–07; Th. Reinach, *REJ*, 85 (1928), 1–6; A. Marmorstein, in *Yerushalayim* (Lunch Memorial Volume, in Hebrew [1928]), 41 ff.; *Sefer Hayishuv I* (ed. S. Klein; Jerusalem, 1939), 126; J. B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (Vatican City: Pontificio Instituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1952), 243; E. I. Sukenik, *Kedem*, II (1945), 83–88; A. Frenkel, *ibid.*, 89; M. D. (U.) Cassuto, *ibid.*, 90 f.; A. Akavia, *ibid.*, 92–98. See also Cassuto, *ibid.*, 99–120, who republished the Hebrew 9th century inscriptions of Venosa, dated by the era of the Hurban, first edited by G. I. Ascoli, *Inscrizioni inedite or mal note greche, latine, ebraiche di antichi sepolcri guidaici del Napolitano* (Torino and Rome, 1880), 66–79; Frey, *CII*, I, Nos. 469–619. See also S. Baron, *Social and Religious History of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1952), 116; 376 n. 33; M. Kasher *Torah Shelema* (New York: American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, 1949), XIII, 176–79.

⁹⁸ I follow the reading of Cowley and Sukenik (see previous note), rather than that of Daiches, et al. For the meaning of *nefesh*, see Sukenik (previous note), 84 f., who, however, in line 1 of Inscription B, renders *nefesh* as *ziyyun* (monument), but “soul” seems perhaps preferable.

Inscription B (Sukenik)

1. Here (rests) the soul	הדה נפשה	1
2. of Esther the daughter	דאסתר ברתה	2
3. of Edyo, who died	דעדיו דמיתה	3
4. in the month of Shevat	בירח שבט	4
5. of the year "3 of Shemitah"	שנת ג דשמטת[ה]	5
6. the year of three hundred [and 3]	שנת תלת מא [ותלת] ⁹⁹	6
7. of the years of the Hurban	מן שנין לחרבן	7
8. of the House of the Temple	בית מקדשה	8
9. Peace! Peace!	שלום שלום	9
10. A burnt-offering! (?)	עלת ¹⁰⁰	10

Inscription C (Sukenik)

1. May the soul rest of Halifo	תתניח נפשה דחלפו	1
2. the daughter [of . . .] who died	ברתה / / / דמיתה	2
3. on Tuesday, the eleventh	ביום תלתה בחדעשר	3
4. day of the month of Elul, "the year [2]	יומין בירח אלול	4
	בשת [ב] ¹⁰¹	
5. of Shemitah," which is the year	דשמטתה דהיא שנת	5
6. four hundred and thirty	ארבע מאה ותלתין	6
7. and five years after the Hurban	וחמש שנין לחרבן	7
8. of the House of the Temple, Peace	בית מקדשה שלום	8
9. to Israel. Peace!	על ישראל שלום.	9

The readings of the three inscriptions, if not emended, present inconsistent synchronisms of the Hurban era and Shemitah:

A	Marḥeshwan	364 of Hurban	1 of Shemitah cycle
B	Shevat	300 of Hurban	3 of Shemitah cycle
C	Elul	435 of Hurban	7 of Shemitah cycle

For if the year 300 of the Hurban, as B apparently reads, was the year 3 of the Shemitah, then 364 should have been year 4 ($7 \times 9 + 1 = 64$), and 435 the year 5 of the Sabbatical cycle. If, however, with Inscript-

⁹⁹ See below, p. 182.

¹⁰⁰ Sukenik (note 97), 86, leaves the meaning of עלת open. See Targum (Onk, and Ps.-Jon.) on Num. 29:23, though the form usually appears only in the construct עלתא possibly suggests that she died on the Rosh Hodesh, when a special burnt offering was sacrificed (Numb. 28-23), the day of the month having been inadvertently omitted (for other omissions see below). Possibly, however, the death of Esther the daughter of Edio resulted from some kind of execution by enemies of the Jews.

¹⁰¹ See below, p. 182.

tion A we assume that 364 was year 1 of Shemitah, then 300 should have been the year 7 and 435 the year 2 of the septennial cycle. Should we take C as the basis, i.e., that 435 was a Sabbatical year, then 300 should have been the year 5, and 364 the year 6 of the Shemitah cycle. To synchronize the dates of the tombstones, Umberto Cassuto proposed to emend line 7 of inscription A: רבע (four) to חמש (five); line 7 of B instead of מן (since) to ו[ו] (and) 46), and to assume that the beginning of the year of the Hurbān era of C began not in Tishri, but on the ninth of Ab.¹⁰² Akavia thought that קדמיתה "of the first year of Shemitah," may perhaps be more properly rendered here as the year preceding (i.e., the year 6) of the Shemitah; in B instead of "the year 3," read "5," but in a note to his own article he conceded that no plausible solution for the reconciliation of the Sabbatical chronology of the three inscriptions is possible.¹⁰³ None of the tombstones' dates of Shemitah, if not radically emended, corresponds to Zuckermann's table of Sabbatical years, which Cassuto and Akavia take for granted.

But the calendar appended to this study requires the Julian year of 434/35, which equals 364 of Hurbān to be the first year of a Sabbatical cycle, in consonance with Inscription A. The synchronisms of B and C remain problematical, however. The solution would seem to lie, as assumed in the transcription above, in the negligence of the engravers of tombstones B and C. On line 6 of B, if not destroyed by age, the engraver forgot to inscribe the last word וְאוֹתָלַת וְג' "and 3" (three); at the end of line 5 of C, the missing word is ב' "of 2."¹⁰⁴ Although with these proposed readings we have a consistent chronology of Shemitah for all three tombstones, we exclude Inscriptions B and C from our discussion since their dates are only conjectural.

If the preceding is correct, Inscription A yields the date of the Hurbān according to the Jewish era (known as לְבִרְיַאת הָעוֹלָם or לְיִצְיָרָה) a problem that aroused much controversy among Rashi, Rashbam, Jacob Tam, and Maimonides, and in modern times, between Shir (Shelomoh Yehudah Leib Rapoport) and Ch. J. Bornstein.¹⁰⁵ One reason for the doubt stems from the fact that the era of Yezirah or Beri'at Ha'olam came into vogue some centuries after the Hurbān, having been superimposed

102 Cassuto, *Kedem*, II, (1945), 90 f.

103 Akavia, *Kedem*, II, (1945), 92-98, esp. 94, note 3.

104 For another such negligence by the engraver of B, see his omission of the day of Shevat. It should also be noted that the construction of בִּשְׁתִּי דְשִׁמְיִתָּה, in lines 4-5 of C, implies a missing date of the Sabbatical cycle. If the intended meaning were "in the year of Shemitah," it would have said either בִּשְׁמִיטָה or בִּשְׁתִּי דְשִׁמְיִתָּה without the ד.

105 See above notes 74; 79-80. See also Bornstein, *Hatekufah*, 8 (1921), 321-31.

upon the Seleucid era, in which the Babylonian minhag and that of Eretz Israel diverged.¹⁰⁶ Another reason was that in our rabbinic permanent calendar the year follows the Babylonian custom of beginning the year in Tishri in contrast to the Palestinian tradition which commenced the year in Nisan.¹⁰⁷

Now let us see which of the Jewish dates of the era of the Hurban proposed by the rabbinic savants—3828, 3829, or 3830—conforms to our inscription:¹⁰⁸

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1) 3828 + 364 = 4192 | 2) 4192 : 7 = 598 + 6 |
| 3829 + 364 = 4193 | 4193 : 7 = 599 + 0 |
| 3830 + 364 = 4194 | 4194 : 7 = 599 + 1 |

Since Inscription A synchronizes 364 of the era of the Hurban with the first year of the Shemitah cycle and since 364 is divisible by 7, it follows that the first year of the Hurban era (not the date of the destruction) was also the first year of a Shemitah cycle. It further follows that 3830 equals the first year of the Hurban, which is to say that 3829, the date of the Second Temple's actual destruction, and 4193 of Yezirah or 363 of Hurban were Sabbatical years. Hence, the formula for finding the year of the Shemitah cycle for any given date is either the era of Yezirah or Hurban or $(\text{date} + 1) : 7$.¹⁰⁹ It follows that the inscription's 364 of Hurban era equaled our 4194 of Yezirah.

The reader should remember, however, that for reasons alluded to above, the era of Yezirah discussed here is not identical with the one

106 The oldest reference to this divergence is that of Saadia Gaon, as cited by Abraham bar Hiyya, *Sefer Ha'ibur* (London, 1851), 96 f.: 1238 A.S. (936/7 C.E.) corresponded to the Jewish year of 4686; not 4687, which Saadia says is erroneous. In some computations, however, there is a divergence of two years. See also Bornstein, *Hatekufah*, 9 (1921), 224–30.

107 As explained by Razah (note 80), the difference has its origin in the dispute whether the first lunation (*molad*) of Tishri begins as in the Western Jewish Calendar with ב'ה"א (Monday, 5th hour, 204/1080), or, as in the East, one year later, with ו'ה"א (Friday, 14th hour). See now A. Akavia, *The Calendar and its Use for Chronological Purposes* (Jerusalem: the Magnes Press, 1953), 64–66; Frank, *Talmudic and Rabbinical Chronology*, passim, esp. 13 ff. The divergence between the two eras of Yezirah, however, is probably older than the setting of the first *molad*.

108 The reader should keep in mind that the date of the actual destruction of the Temple and the era of the Hurban are not necessarily identical. There is no doubt that the Second Temple was burned sometime in Ab (August–September) of the year 70. The first year of the Hurban either begins with Nisan 70/Adar 71 or with Tishri 70/Elul 71. The controversy hinges, however, on whether the first year of Hurban equaled the 3828, 3829, or 3830 of Yezirah. In other words, those who say that 3828 would also say that the current year of 5733 is in fact 5731. See above, note 106.

109 As Reinach noted (*REJ* 85 [1928], 4 f.), the dating of Inscription A conforms to that of Huna in Avodah Zarah, 9a (section 8).

currently in practice. The current Jewish dating has one year more than the old era of Yezirah. The Julian date for the latter is October 3760 B.C.E.; for the former October 3761 B.C.E.¹¹⁰ Table Four lists the Julian, Seleucid, Hurban, and Jewish (old and new styles) years of the ten historical Shemitot discussed in this paper.

TABLE FOUR

Source	Section	Julian Year	Anno Sel.	Yezirah		
				Old	New	Hurban
Neh. 10:32(31)	1	?		?	?	
A.J. 11:347	2	331/30 B.C.E.		3430	3431	
I Macc. 6:49,53	3	163/62 B.C.E.	149/50	3598	3599	
A.J. 13:234	4	135/34 B.C.E.	177/78	3626	3627	
A.J. 14:475	5	37/36 B.C.E.	275/76	3724	3725	
M. Sotah 7:8	6	41/42 C.E.	352/53	3801	3802	
Mur 18	7	55/56 C.E.	366/67	3815	3816	
Seder Olam 30	8	69/70 C.E.	380/81	3829	3830	
Mur 24	9	132/33 C.E.	443/44	3892	3893	62
Kedem II, 84	10	433/34 C.E.	744/45	4193	4194	363
		440/41 C.E.	751/52	4200	4201	370

¹¹⁰ The third formula, which diverges from the current era of Yezirah by two years, is ignored here (see notes 102, 106).

APPENDIX
A CALENDAR OF SABBATICAL CYCLES
FROM 519/18 BEFORE THE CHRISTIAN ERA TO 440/41 OF
THE CHRISTIAN ERA

Ruler	B.C.E.	Ruler	B.C.E.	Ruler	B.C.E.	Ruler	B.C.E.
Darius I	1. 519/18		1. 477/76		1. 435/34		1. 393/92
	2. 518/17		2. 476/75		2. 434/33		2. 392/91
	3. 517/16		3. 475/74		3. 433/32		3. 391/90
	4. 516/15		4. 474/73		4. 432/31		4. 390/89
	5. 515/14		5. 473/72		5. 431/30		5. 389/88
	6. 514/13		6. 472/71		6. 430/29		6. 388/87
	S. 513/12		S. 471/70		S. 429/28		S. 387/86
	1. 512/11		1. 470/69		1. 428/27		1. 386/85
	2. 511/10		2. 469/68		2. 427/26		2. 385/84
	3. 510/09		3. 468/67		3. 426/25		3. 384/83
	4. 509/08		4. 467/66		4. 425/24		4. 383/82
	5. 508/07		5. 466/65		5. 424/23		5. 382/81
	6. 507/06		6. 465/64	Darius II	6. 423/22		6. 381/80
	S. 506/05	Artaxerxes I	S. 464/63		S. 422/21		S. 380/79
	1. 505/04		1. 463/62		1. 421/20		1. 379/78
	2. 504/03		2. 462/61		2. 420/19		2. 378/77
	3. 503/02		3. 461/60		3. 419/18		3. 377/76
	4. 502/01		4. 460/59		4. 418/17		4. 376/75
	5. 501/00		5. 459/58		5. 417/16		5. 375/74
	6. 500/499		6. 458/57		6. 416/15		6. 374/73
	S. 499/98		S. 457/56		S. 415/14		S. 373/72
Xerxes	1. 498/97		1. 456/55		1. 414/13		1. 372/71
	2. 497/96		2. 455/54		2. 413/12		2. 371/70
	3. 496/95		3. 454/53		3. 412/11		3. 370/69
	4. 495/94		4. 453/52		4. 411/10		4. 369/68
	5. 494/93		5. 452/51		5. 410/09		5. 368/67
	6. 493/92		6. 451/50		6. 409/08		6. 367/66
	S. 492/91		S. 450/49		S. 408/07		S. 366/65
	1. 491/90		1. 449/48		1. 407/06		1. 365/64
	2. 490/89		2. 448/47		2. 406/05		2. 364/63
	3. 489/88		3. 447/46	Artaxerxes II	3. 405/04		3. 363/62
	4. 488/87		4. 446/45		4. 404/03		4. 362/61
	5. 487/86		5. 445/44		5. 403/02		5. 361/60
	6. 486/85		6. 444/43		6. 402/01		6. 360/59
	S. 485/84		S. 443/42		S. 401/00	Artaxerxes III	S. 359/58
	1. 484/83		1. 442/41		1. 400/399		1. 358/57
	2. 483/82		2. 441/40		2. 399/98		2. 357/56
	3. 482/81		3. 440/39		3. 398/97		3. 356/55
	4. 481/80		4. 439/38		4. 397/96		4. 355/54
	5. 480/79		5. 438/37		5. 396/95		5. 354/53
	6. 479/78		6. 437/36		6. 395/94		6. 353/52
	S. 478/77		S. 436/35		S. 394/93		S. 352/51

Ruler	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.
	1. 351/50		3	1. 309/08		38	1. 274/73
	2. 350/49		4	2. 308/07		39	2. 273/72
	3. 349/48		5	3. 307/06		40	3. 272/71
	4. 348/47		6	4. 306/05		41	4. 271/70
	5. 347/46Ptolemy I		7	5. 305/04		42	5. 270/69
	6. 346/45		8	6. 304/03		43	6. 269/68
	S. 345/44		9	S. 303/02		44	S. 268/67
	1. 344/43		10	1. 302/01		45	1. 267/66
	2. 343/42		11	2. 301/00		46	2. 266/65
	3. 342/41		12	3. 300/299		47	3. 265/64
	4. 341/40		13	4. 299/98		48	4. 264/63
	5. 340/39		14	5. 298/97		49	5. 263/62
	6. 339/38		15	6. 297/96		50	6. 262/61
Arses	S. 338/37		16	S. 296/95	Antiochus II	51	S. 261/60
	1. 337/36		17	1. 295/94		52	1. 260/59
Darius III	2. 336/35		18	2. 294/93		53	2. 259/58
	3. 335/34		19	3. 293/92		54	3. 258/57
	4. 334/33		20	4. 292/91		55	4. 257/56
Alexander III	5. 333/32		21	5. 291/90		56	5. 256/55
	6. 332/31		22	6. 290/89		57	6. 255/54
	S. 331/30		23	S. 289/88		58	S. 254/53
	1. 330/29		24	1. 288/87		59	1. 253/52
	2. 329/28		25	2. 287/86		60	2. 252/51
	3. 328/27		26	3. 286/85		61	3. 251/50
	4. 327/26		27	4. 285/84		62	4. 250/49
	5. 326/25		28	5. 284/83		63	5. 249/48
	6. 325/24		29	6. 283/82		64	6. 248/47
	S. 324/23Ptolemy II		30	S. 282/81		65	S. 247/46
Philip	1. 323/22Antiochus I	31	1. 281/80	Ptolemy III	66	1. 246/45	
	2. 322/21	32	2. 280/79		67	2. 245/44	
	3. 321/20	33	3. 279/78		68	3. 244/43	
	4. 320/19	34	4. 278/77		69	4. 243/42	
	5. 319/18	35	5. 277/76		70	5. 242/41	
	6. 318/17	36	6. 276/75		71	6. 241/40	
	S. 317/16	37	S. 275/74		72	S. 240/39	
Alexander IV	1. 316/15						
	2. 315/14						
	3. 314/13						
	4. 314/12						
	5. 312/11						
	S.E.						
Seleucus I	1 6. 311/10						
	2 S. 310/09						

Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.
	73	1. 239/38		115	1. 197/96
	74	2. 238/37		116	2. 196/95
	75	3. 237/36		117	3. 195/94
	76	4. 236/35		118	4. 194/93
	77	5. 235/34		119	5. 193/92
	78	6. 234/33		120	6. 192/91
	79	S. 233/32		121	S. 191/90
	80	1. 232/31		122	1. 190/89
	81	2. 231/30		123	2. 189/88
	82	3. 230/29		124	3. 188/87
	83	4. 229/28	Seleucus IV	125	4. 187/86
	84	5. 228/27		126	5. 186/85
	85	6. 227/26		127	6. 185/84
	86	S. 226/25		128	S. 184/83
Seleucus III	87	1. 225/24		129	1. 183/82
	88	2. 224/23		130	2. 182/81
Antiochus III	89	3. 223/22		131	3. 181/80
	90	4. 222/21		132	4. 180/79
	91	5. 221/20		133	5. 179/78
	92	6. 220/19		134	6. 178/77
	93	S. 219/18		135	S. 177/76
	94	1. 218/17		136	1. 176/75
	95	2. 217/16	Antiochus IV	137	2. 175/74
	96	3. 216/15		138	3. 174/73
	97	4. 215/14		139	4. 173/72
	98	5. 214/13		140	5. 172/71
	99	6. 213/12		141	6. 171/70
	100	S. 212/11		142	S. 170/69
	101	1. 211/10		143	1. 169/68
	102	2. 210/09		144	2. 168/67
	103	3. 209/08		145	3. 167/66
	104	4. 208/07		146	4. 166/65
	105	5. 207/06		147	5. 165/64
	106	6. 206/05	Antiochus V	148	6. 164/63
Ptolemy IV	107	S. 205/04		149	S. 163/62
	108	1. 204/03		150	1. 162/61
	109	2. 203/02	Demetrius I	151	2. 161/60
	110	3. 202/01		152	3. 160/59
	111	4. 201/00		153	4. 159/58
	112	5. 200/199		154	5. 158/57
	113	6. 199/198		155	6. 157/56
	114	S. 198/197		156	S. 156/55

Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.
	157	1. 155/54		185	1. 127/26
	158	2. 154/53		186	2. 126/25
	159	3. 153/52		187	3. 125/24
	160	4. 152/51		188	4. 124/23
	161	5. 151/50		189	5. 123/22
Alexander I	162	6. 150/49		190	6. 122/21
	163	S. 149/48		191	S. 121/20
	164	1. 148/47		192	1. 120/19
	165	2. 147/46		193	2. 119/18
	166	3. 146/45		194	3. 118/17
Demetrius II	167	4. 145/44		195	4. 117/16
	168	5. 144/43		196	5. 116/15
Antiochus VI	169	6. 143/42		197	6. 115/14
Simon	170	S. 142/41		198	S. 114/13
	171	1. 141/40		199	1. 113/12
	172	2. 140/39		200	2. 112/11
Antiochus VII	173	3. 139/38		201	3. 111/10
	174	4. 138/37		202	4. 110/09
	175	5. 137/36		203	5. 109/08
	176	6. 136/35		204	6. 108/07
John Hyrcanus	177	S. 135/34		205	S. 107/06
	178	1. 134/33		206	1. 106/05
	179	2. 133/32		207	2. 105/04
	180	3. 132/31	Aristobulus I	208	3. 104/03
	181	4. 131/30	Alexander Jannaeus	209	4. 103/02
	182	5. 130/29		210	5. 102/01
	183	6. 129/28		211	6. 101/00
	184	S. 128/27		212	S. 100/99

Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.
	213	1. 99/98	Pompey	248	1. 64/63
	214	2. 98/97	(Hyrchanus II)	249	2. 63/62
	215	3. 97/96		250	3. 62/61
	216	4. 96/95		251	4. 61/60
	217	5. 95/94		252	5. 60/59
	218	6. 94/93		253	6. 59/58
	219	S. 93/92		254	S. 58/57
	220	1. 92/91		255	1. 57/56
	221	2. 91/90		256	2. 56/55
	222	3. 90/89		257	3. 55/54
	223	4. 89/88		258	4. 54/53
	224	5. 88/87		259	5. 53/52
	225	6. 87/86		260	6. 52/51
	226	S. 86/85		261	S. 51/50
	227	1. 85/84		262	1. 50/49
	228	2. 84/83	Julius Cæsar	263	2. 49/48
	229	3. 83/82		264	3. 48/47
	230	4. 82/81		265	4. 47/46
	231	5. 81/80		266	5. 46/45
	232	6. 80/79		267	6. 45/44
	233	S. 79/78	Triumvirate	268	S. 44/43
	234	1. 78/77		269	1. 43/42
	235	2. 77/76		270	2. 42/41
Alexandra	236	3. 76/75		271	3. 41/40
	237	4. 75/74		272	4. 40/39
	238	5. 74/73		273	5. 39/38
	239	6. 73/72		274	6. 38/37
	240	S. 72/71	(Herod)	275	S. 37/36
	241	1. 71/70		276	1. 36/35
	242	2. 70/69		277	2. 35/34
	243	3. 69/68		278	3. 34/33
Aristobulus II	244	4. 68/67		279	4. 33/32
	245	5. 67/66		280	5. 32/31
	246	6. 66/65	Augustus	281	6. 31/30
	247	S. 65/64		282	S. 30/29

Ruler	S.E.	B.C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
	283	1. 29/28		318	1. 7/8
	284	2. 28/27		319	2. 8/9
	285	3. 27/26		320	3. 9/10
	286	4. 26/25		321	4. 10/11
	287	5. 25/24		322	5. 11/12
	288	6. 24/23		323	6. 12/13
	289	S. 23/22	Tiberius	324	S. 13/14
	290	1. 22/21		425	1. 14/15
	291	2. 21/20		326	2. 15/16
	292	3. 20/19		327	3. 16/17
	293	4. 19/18		328	4. 17/18
	294	5. 18/17		329	5. 18/19
	295	6. 17/16		330	6. 19/20
	296	S. 16/15		331	S. 20/21
	297	1. 15/14		332	1. 21/22
	298	2. 14/13		333	2. 22/23
	299	3. 13/12		334	3. 23/24
	300	4. 12/11		335	4. 24/25
	301	5. 11/10		336	5. 25/26
	302	6. 10/9		337	6. 26/27
	303	S. 9/8		338	S. 27/28
	304	1. 8/7		339	1. 28/29
	305	2. 7/6		340	2. 29/30
	306	3. 6/5		341	3. 30/31
	307	4. 5/4		342	4. 31/32
(Archelaus)	308	5. 4/3		343	5. 32/33
	309	6. 3/2		344	6. 33/34
	310	S. 2/1		345	S. 34/35
	311	1. 1 B.C.E./1 C.E.		346	1. 35/36
	312	2. 1/2	Caligula	347	2. 36/37
	313	3. 2/3		348	3. 37/38
	314	4. 3/4		349	4. 38/39
	315	5. 4/5		350	5. 39/40
	316	6. 5/6	Claudius	351	6. 40/41
(Procurators)	317	S. 6/7	(Agrippa II)	352	S. 41/42

Ruler	S.E.	C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	S.E.
	353	1. 42/43		388	1. 77/78
	354	2. 43/44	Titus	389	2. 78/79
	355	3. 44/45		390	3. 79/80
	356	4. 45/46		391	4. 80/81
	357	5. 46/47	Domitian	392	5. 81/82
	358	6. 47/48		393	6. 82/83
	359	S. 48/49		394	S. 83/84
	360	1. 49/50		395	1. 84/85
	361	2. 50/51		396	2. 85/86
	362	3. 51/52		397	3. 86/87
	363	4. 52/53		398	4. 87/88
Nero	364	5. 53/54		399	5. 88/89
	365	6. 54/55		400	6. 89/90
	366	S. 55/56		401	S. 90/91
	367	1. 56/57		402	1. 91/92
	368	2. 57/58		403	2. 92/93
	369	3. 58/59		404	3. 93/94
	370	4. 59/60		405	4. 94/95
	371	5. 60/61	Nerva	406	5. 95/96
	372	6. 61/62		407	6. 96/97
	373	S. 62/63	Trajan	408	S. 97/98
	374	1. 63/64		409	1. 98/99
	375	2. 64/65		410	2. 99/100
	376	3. 65/66		411	3. 100/01
	377	4. 66/67		412	4. 101/02
Galba	378	5. 67/68		413	5. 102/03
Otho	379	6. 68/69		414	6. 103/04
Vespasian	380	S. 69/70		415	S. 104/05
	381	1. 70/71		416	1. 105/06
	382	2. 71/72		417	2. 106/07
	383	3. 72/73		418	3. 107/08
	384	4. 73/74		419	4. 108/09
	385	5. 74/75		420	5. 109/110
	386	6. 75/76		421	6. 110/111
	387	S. 76/77		422	S. 111/112

Ruler	S.E.	C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
Hadrian	423	1. 112/13		458	1. 147/48
	424	2. 113/14		459	2. 148/49
	425	3. 114/15		460	3. 149/50
	426	4. 115/16		461	4. 150/51
	427	5. 116/17		462	5. 151/52
	428	6. 117/18		463	6. 152/53
	429	S. 118/19		464	S. 153/54
	430	1. 119/20		465	1. 154/55
	431	2. 120/21		466	2. 155/56
	432	3. 121/22		467	3. 156/57
	433	4. 122/23		468	4. 157/58
	434	5. 123/24		469	5. 158/59
	435	6. 124/25		470	6. 159/60
	436	S. 125/26	Marcus Aurelius	471	S. 160/61
	437	1. 126/27		472	1. 161/62
	438	2. 127/28		473	2. 162/63
Antoninus Pius	439	3. 128/29		474	3. 163/64
	440	3. 129/30		475	4. 164/65
	441	5. 130/31		476	5. 165/66
	442	6. 131/32		477	6. 166/67
	443	S. 132/33		478	S. 167/68
	444	1. 133/34		479	1. 168/69
	445	2. 134/35		480	2. 169/70
	446	3. 135/36		481	3. 170/71
	447	4. 136/37		482	4. 171/72
	448	5. 137/38		483	5. 172/73
	449	6. 138/39		484	6. 173/74
	450	S. 139/40		485	S. 174/75
	451	1. 140/41		486	1. 175/76
	452	2. 141/42	Commodus	487	2. 176/77
	453	3. 142/43		488	3. 177/78
	454	4. 143/44		489	4. 178/79
	455	5. 144/45		490	5. 179/80
	456	6. 145/46		491	6. 180/81
	457	S. 146/47		492	S. 181/82

Ruler	S.E.	C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
	493	1. 182/83	Elagabalus	528	1. 217/18
	494	2. 183/84		529	2. 218/19
	495	3. 184/85		530	3. 219/20
	496	4. 185/86		531	4. 220/21
	497	5. 186/87		532	5. 221/22
	498	6. 187/88	Severus Alexander	533	6. 222/23
	499	S. 188/89		534	S. 223/24
	500	1. 189/90		535	1. 224/25
	501	2. 190/91		536	2. 225/26
	502	3. 191/92		537	3. 226/27
Pertinax; Julianus	503	4. 192/93		538	4. 227/28
Septimus Severus	504	5. 193/94		539	5. 228/29
	505	6. 194/95		540	6. 229/30
	506	S. 195/96		541	S. 230/31
	507	1. 196/97		542	1. 231/32
	508	2. 197/98		543	2. 232/33
	509	3. 198/99		544	3. 233/34
	510	4. 199/200		545	4. 234/35
	511	5. 200/01	Maximinus Thrax	546	5. 235/36
	512	6. 201/02		547	6. 236/37
	513	S. 202/03	Gordian I	548	S. 237/38
	514	1. 203/04	Gordian III	549	1. 238/39
	515	2. 204/05		550	2. 239/40
	516	3. 205/06		551	3. 240/41
	517	4. 206/07		552	4. 241/42
	518	5. 207/08		553	5. 242/43
	519	6. 208/09	Philip	554	6. 243/44
	520	S. 209/10		555	S. 244/45
	521	1. 210/11		556	1. 245/46
Caracalla	522	2. 211/12		557	2. 246/47
	523	3. 212/13		558	3. 247/48
	524	4. 213/14	Decius	559	4. 248/49
	525	5. 214/15		560	5. 249/50
	526	6. 215/16		561	6. 250/51
Macrinus	527	S. 216/17	Gallus	562	S. 251/52

Ruler	S.E.	C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
Aemilianus	563	1. 252/53		598	1. 287/88
Gallienus II	564	2. 253/54		599	2. 288/89
	565	3. 254/55		600	3. 289/90
	566	4. 255/56		601	4. 290/91
	567	5. 256/57		602	5. 291/92
	568	6. 257/58		603	6. 292/93
Gallienus III	569	S. 258/59	Constantius I	604	S. 293/94
	570	1. 259/60		605	1. 294/95
	571	2. 260/61		606	2. 295/96
	572	3. 261/62		607	3. 296/97
	573	4. 262/63		608	4. 297/98
	574	5. 263/64		609	5. 298/99
	575	6. 264/65		610	6. 299/300
	576	S. 265/66		611	S. 300/01
	577	1. 266/67		612	1. 301/02
Claudius II	578	2. 267/68		613	2. 302/03
	579	3. 268/69		614	3. 303/04
Quintillus	580	4. 269/70		615	4. 304/05
Aurelian	581	5. 270/71	Constantine I	616	5. 305/06
	582	6. 271/72		617	6. 306/07
	583	S. 272/73		618	S. 307/08
	584	1. 273/74		619	1. 308/09
Tacitus	585	2. 274/75		620	2. 309/10
Florianus	586	3. 275/76		621	3. 310/11
Probus	587	4. 276/77		622	4. 311/12
	588	5. 277/78		623	5. 312/13
	589	6. 278/79		624	6. 313/14
	590	S. 279/80		625	S. 314/15
	591	1. 280/81		626	1. 315/16
Carus	592	2. 281/82		627	2. 316/17
Carinus	593	3. 282/83		628	3. 317/18
Diocletian	594	4. 283/84		629	4. 318/19
	595	5. 284/85		630	5. 319/20
	596	6. 285/86		631	6. 320/21
	597	S. 286/87		632	S. 321/22

Ruler	S.E.	C.E.	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
	633	1. 322/23		668	1. 357/58
	634	2. 323/24		669	2. 358/59
	635	3. 324/25		670	3. 359/60
	636	4. 325/26	Julian the Apostate	671	4. 360/61
	637	5. 326/27		672	5. 361/62
	638	6. 327/28		673	6. 362/63
	639	S. 328/29	Jovian	674	S. 363/64
	640	1. 329/30	Valens	675	1. 364/65
	641	2. 330/31		676	2. 365/66
	642	3. 331/32		677	3. 366/67
	643	4. 332/33		678	4. 367/68
	644	5. 333/34		679	5. 368/69
	645	6. 334/35		680	6. 369/70
	646	S. 335/36		681	S. 370/71
Constantius II	647	1. 336/37		682	1. 371/72
	648	2. 337/38		683	2. 372/73
	649	3. 338/39		684	3. 373/74
	650	4. 339/40		685	4. 374/75
	651	5. 340/41		686	5. 375/76
	652	6. 341/42		687	6. 376/77
	653	S. 342/43		688	S. 377/78
	654	1. 343/44	Theodosius I	689	1. 378/79
	655	2. 344/45		690	2. 379/80
	656	3. 345/46		691	3. 380/81
	657	4. 346/47		692	4. 381/82
	658	5. 347/48		693	5. 382/83
	659	6. 348/49	Arcadius	694	6. 383/84
	660	S. 349/50		695	S. 384/85
	661	1. 350/51		696	1. 385/86
	662	2. 351/52		697	2. 386/87
	663	3. 352/53		698	3. 387/88
	664	4. 353/54		699	4. 388/89
	665	5. 354/55		700	5. 389/90
	666	6. 355/56		701	6. 390/91
	667	S. 356/57		702	S. 391/92

Ruler	S.E.	Ruler	Ruler	S.E.	C.E.
Theodosius II	703	1. 392/93		731	1. 420/21
	704	2. 393/94		732	2. 421/22
	705	3. 394/95		733	3. 422/23
	706	4. 395/96		734	4. 423/24
	707	5. 396/97		735	5. 424/25
	708	6. 397/98		736	6. 425/26
	709	S. 398/99		737	S. 426/27
	710	1. 399/400		738	1. 427/28
	711	2. 400/01		739	2. 428/29
	712	3. 401/02		740	3. 429/30
	713	4. 402/03		741	4. 430/31
	714	5. 403/04		742	5. 431/32
	715	6. 404/05		743	6. 432/33
	716	S. 405/06		744	S. 433/34
	717	1. 406/07		745	1. 434/35
	718	2. 407/08		746	2. 435/36
	719	3. 408/09		747	3. 436/37
	720	4. 409/10		748	4. 437/38
	721	5. 410/11		749	5. 438/39
	722	6. 411/12		750	6. 439/40
	723	S. 412/13		751	S. 440/41
	724	1. 413/14			
	725	2. 414/15			
	726	3. 415/16			
	727	4. 416/17			
	728	5. 417/18			
	729	6. 418/19			
	730	S. 419/20			



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.