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**The Book**

**1. Brief Description** - In one or two paragraphs, describe the work, including its rationale, approach, and pedagogy. (This book is... It does... Its distinguishing features are...)

This book describes the various incarnations of the idea of ​​rebellion against the Roman Empire among Jewish groups, as well as its realization, beginning with the conquest of Judea by Rome in 63 BCE and up to the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 136 CE. During this period, the idea of ​​rebellion took different forms, its ideology and values ​​changing over time and varying among the different groups that operated during this period. The degree of ​​support for the revolt also varied: sometimes only a handful of people from the margins of society sustained the flame of the rebellion, while at other times, it was joined by broader circles in Jewish society, and even by sections of its elites. The book focuses on Judaea in its broadest sense (the territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River and the Dead Sea, as well as to eastern Transjordan, including the Galilee and the Lower Golan), because most of the rebellions took place within this area. However, this book also addresses the attitudes of Jews outside the Land of Israel toward the idea of rebellion and its manifestations, and, in particular, everything related to the Jewish Diaspora Revolt (the Kitos War). The aim of the book is to examine the links between the ideology of rebellion and contemporary Jewish society. How did the ideology of the rebellion affect the organization and actual fighting of various rebel groups, and in what ways did the perception of the revolt change and did rebel circles transform themselves in light of the historical circumstances? I will also address the question of whether it is possible to identify a mass movement of resistance to Rome in occupied Judaea, or whether there were disparate conflagrations, each the result of unique historical circumstances.

The book is unique in its subject matter, and in its selection and treatment of sources. Although many books and articles have been devoted to the Roman period in general and to the Jewish uprisings in particular (see details below), to date, there has been no systematic attempt to trace the various incarnations and relationships of the idea of ​​rebellion against Rome (if, indeed, there was such an idea) from ideological or sociopolitical perspectives. In this book, these topics will be examined in accordance with current theories of rebellion and revolution, especially in reference to Jack A. Goldstone’s highly influential research. The theoretical analysis will allow for a better understanding of the various violent events in terms of their goals and the possible connections between them. Regarding the sources that will be used, the understanding and methods of analysis of ancient sources have undergone significant changes in recent years. There is now a research infrastructure that makes it possible to go far beyond the portrayal of events in Josephus’s books or in the brief descriptions by Greek and Roman writers. The Dead Sea Scrolls, apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphic literature, archaeological finds (coins, inscriptions, and other physical remains of human activity), and rabbinic literature (despite the many problems involved in its use as a historical source) make it possible to confirm, reject, modify, and amplify Josephus’s descriptions of the rebellions. The significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls and parts of the apocryphal literature is that they were written by Jews at the time these events were taking place, and therefore, they can reveal the attitudes of certain segments of contemporary Jewish society, including attitudes toward Rome and the idea of ​​rebellion. Archaeological remains can both reveal ideology (for example, through inscriptions and images on coins) and indicate the extent of rebel circles and rebellions at different times. More importantly, we have no “Josephus” for the Kitos War and Bar Kokhba Revolt. The rich archaeological finds of the last decades enable a much more detailed and nuanced historical reconstruction of all the events, especially the Bar Kokhba Revolt..**2. Outline** - A detailed outline of the book should be prepared, including the chapters being submitted for review. This gives us an idea of how the material fits together, and how the remaining chapters will be developed. It should include chapter headings and sub-headings, with explanations as necessary.

***Chapter 1: Theorizing Rebellion***

This chapter will contain a brief description of the book’s purpose and unique methodology. I will begin by presenting the theoretical foundation and conclude with methodological comments on the nature of the sources used.

* 1. *Rebellion: Ideology and practice*

Opposing an existing regime with the goal of replacing it is a recurring phenomenon in human history, and has therefore been a subject of intense interest to historians and sociologists. For years, sociologists have been suggesting various theories to explain the causes of revolution. Most historians tend to hold a principled aversion to sociological theories, fearing they may obscure the unique qualities of the specific event under study. However, I believe that in the present context, sociological theories can be of great benefit, leading to a more nuanced understanding of the events and helping guide how we think about the issues and focus our research efforts. Applying these theories can enable us to suggest ways to infer missing information and connections, which is especially important when studying ancient periods for which we have few detailed sources.

Although much of sociology’s theoretical research on revolts and revolutions is based on events that have taken place in the modern age, quite a few studies demonstrate the value of examining revolts and revolutions in ancient times in light of sociological theories (@). This is especially true in relation to sociology’s “fourth generation” of revolutionary theory. In the last thirty years, there has been a growing recognition that revolts and revolutions erupt not only because “relative deprivation,” as was suggested by sociologists in in the 1970s (the second generation of revolutionary theory), and not just in response to structural factors, such as class structure, power relations within the country, or the international situation, as was suggested by sociologists of the third generation of revolutionary theory. Rather, rebellions are also the product of a revolutionary ideology that, justifying rebellion and change, serves as a catalyst of mass movements. Ideology and culture also play a role in influencing the course of events. Fourth-generation scholars emphasize the significance of agency in the revolutionary process, both in leadership positions and as activists on behalf of the leadership (@).

In this section, I will briefly review the theoretical basis of the fourth-generation scholarship on revolts and revolutions, as formulated by Jack Goldstone, considered a leading proponent of this theory. In his books and articles (of particular interest to our case is @), Goldstone presents a complex set of structural circumstances and historical conditions that make a revolution possible. Goldstone emphasizes the role of the elites in abandoning the existing regime and the formation of coalitions between popular forces associated with the lower classes and elements from the elites. He also stresses that mobilizing the masses requires that they feel a deep sense of the existing regime’s injustice and unfairness, along with believing belief in a revolutionary vision that they expect will change the situation for the better.

Even a superficial familiarity with the history of the late Second Temple period indicates the potential inherent in this theory. Various clashes between Jews and Romans were taking place from the very beginning of the Roman conquest, but, as will be seen, only on the eve of the Great Revolt, and probably on the eve of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, did the conditions described by Goldstone actually coalesce. Thus, for example, the phenomenon of elites defecting from supporting the ruling government and joining forces with opponents of the regime is manifest in the decision of Eleazar ben Hananiah – son of the high priest and head of the Temple – to cease bringing the Temple sacrifice for the peace of the emperor. To this can be added the willingness of some of the families of the high priesthood and the wealthy of Jerusalem to head the rebel government in cooperation with extremist forces. These examples make it possible to understand why it was during the Great Revolt specifically that the rebels succeeded in establishing an alternative government in Jerusalem and Judea, albeit for a limited period of time. This is but one of the approaches suggested by Goldstone and other fourth-generation scholars (e.g., Poren, Lawson, Beck, Selvin, McAdam @) that offer insights into the evolution of the revolutions.

* 1. *Taxonomy of anti-government violence*

Another important contribution of Goldstone involves classifying the nature and significance of the violent clashes between a present regime and its opponents.

During the first two centuries of Roman occupation in Judea (63 BCE–136 CE), there were many violent acts of resistance to Roman rule. Many scholars (including, for example, Farmer, Stern, and most recently, Sharon @)) suggest that all the violent clashes stemmed from a basic enmity, even hatred, between Jews and Romans, with occasional factors dictating the intensity of the events. In contrast, there are those who argue that each event should viewed in isolation, since each has a unique explanation related to a specific, unique circumstance (in particular, see Mason, Goodman @)). Goldstone’s classification makes it possible to better define each of the events, thus negating the “general hostility” approach suggested by Farmer and others. On the other hand, a comparison between the various events makes it possible to see how the idea of ​​rebellion changed, and how the successes and failures shaped the ideology of resistance to Rome in the next generation.

* 1. *Sources*

I will describe the varied sources at our disposal, beginning with Josephus and other Greek and Roman authors, through the Dead Sea texts, apocryphal literature, archaeological findings, and rabbinic literature. I will identify the strengths and weaknesses of the different sources and conclude by suggesting a way to integrate this wealth of sources to produce a coherent picture of historical processes at the time.

* 1. *Structure of the book*

A brief description of the book’s structure.

***Chapter 2: The Hasmonean Legacy: Between Passivity and Action***

According to many scholars, the idea of rebellion against the Roman Empire originates in the Maccabean Revolt during the middle of the second century BCE. This chapter identifies which elements of the Maccabean uprising were assimilated into Jewish collective memory and determines whether they could have served as justification for the rebellion against Rome. I will argue that neither the Books of the Maccabees, nor additional Hasmonean propaganda, provided justification for a popular uprising against the Roman Empire. The Maccabean Revolt, as fixed in collective memory – that is, in the Books of the Maccabees (setting aside the actual history of this rebellion, which is currently the subject of a lively debate) – was a religious rebellion, led by priests ostensibly chosen by God. All the same, the legacy of the Hasmoneans, as passed on to subsequent generations, embodied the very idea of violent resistance to empire, despite nearly impossible numerical odds, rather than passive acceptance of the vicissitudes of history, as well as the importance of the religious context.

***Chapter 3: Games of Thrones and the Rise of the Ideology of Resistance (63–37 BCE)***

3.1 *Power struggles between Judas Aristobulus and John Hyrcanus*

The Roman conquest deepened the rift in Hasmonaean house. The attempts of Judas Aristobulus and his descendants to regain power actually represent a continuation of the Hasmonaean civil war that preceded the conquest by Pompey far more than they constitute an act of resistance against Rome. Indeed, Judas Aristobulus’s willingness to collaborate with Julius Caesar in order to depose Hyracanus is evidence of this (Josephus, Wars 1:183–186; Antiquities 14: 123–126).

3.2 *Emergence of an ideology of resistance to Rome*

Early ideological and practical foundations of resistance to Rome, unrelated to the Hasmonaeans, already existed during this period. The Psalms of Solomon and some commentaries (*pesharim*) authored by the Qumran sect contain fierce principled objections to Roman rule, at the same time that an extreme ideology objecting to Gentiles started to emerge (Book of Jubilees, laws of purity, and more). Moreover, the Hebrew word for zealot, *kanai*, appears for the first time in the Dead Sea Scrolls, referencing the biblical figure Pinchas, the archetypal “zealot,” and describing a person who is committed to acting against those compromising Jewish religious principles and harming the homeland promised by the Lord to his chosen (4Q423, Thanksgiving Hymns). Josephus also describes cases of extreme resistance to existing authorities at this time (the old man in the Arbel caves; Hezekiah of Galilee). Clearly, the obvious question, on which this section focuses, is what led to the emergence of an ideology opposed to Rome that is unrelated to the Hasmoneans, and perhaps, even hostile to them.

3.3 *Antigonus II Mattathias: Heir or rebel?*

The struggle to regain their power waged by the sons of Aristobulus culminated in the brief reign of Antigonus II Mattathias. Numismatic and written evidence indicate that his reign represented the final days of the Hasmonean period. Although there are certain indications of broad public support for Antigonus, he continued the Hasmonean tradition of collaborating with foreign powers in order to bolster his own position. From this point on, resistance to Roman rule would be of a completely different nature.

***Chapter 4: The Herodian Period: Rebellion against Rome or Hatred of Herod?***

Herod was appointed King of Judea by the Romans in 40 BCE. Did this appointment mean that Herod was the representative of Rome? Or was Herod a Jewish king who ruled over Judea under the auspices of Rome?

During his rule there were multiple conflicts with sections of Jewish society. Does the hostility towards Herod indicate hostility towards Rome? Or did the hatred of Herod stem from other sources? It is probable that different Jews and different groups had different answers to these questions, which we will examine in this chapter.

4.1 *Herod and the Hasmoneans*

The popularity of the Hasmonean dynasty cast a shadow over Herod’s entire reign. All the same, a study of Josephus’s writings reveals that the remnants of the Hasmoneans never succeeded in rallying significant power around them. It is nonetheless likely that Herod’s cruelty contributed to hatred and fueled additional forces that resisted his rule. Still, it appears that the remnants of the Hasmonean family, despite their hatred of Herod, did not view Rome as the problem, but rather, as a possible solution to their plight.

4.2 *Herod and the new rebels*

The story of the golden eagle hung in Herod’s temple, which was removed towards the end of his reign, reveals the complexity of the dilemma faced by Herod’s adversaries when they tried to explain why they were resisting.



First of all, we have to take note that the resistance is, for the first time, led not by claimants to the throne, but by religious leaders. More important is that the arguments in favor of removing the eagle are not political, but religious, even “halachic,” based on Jewish law. Indeed, ultimately, Herod’s adversaries are willing to give their lives for the sake of respecting the laws. No real expression of opposition to Rome can be found at any point in this story, so it seems that the importance of this incident for the future lies in its outlining the principles for creating opposition to the government. It is arguable that the political aspect (who will be the ruler, the desire for independence) is not particularly significant, while factors related to observance of the religious laws may be more powerful, motivating more people to undertake more daring actions. The conclusion of the events in the days following Herod’s death, and the demand to appoint a high priest to be a kind of successor to the slain rebel leaders, reveals the connection between the political and the religious aspect. While this episode confirms the centrality of ideology in driving revolutions, as we will see later on, it appears that religious rather than political language is adopted by various rebel groups.

***Chapter 5: Transitions (4 BCE–6 CE)***

Following Herod’s death, Jewish society in Palestine experienced a decade during which various elements struggled to attain power. Although all factions opposed the existing order, their conflicting motives prevented cooperation and revealed the ideological schisms and social divides among those resisting Rome. Goldstone explains that one of the conditions required for a successful revolution is the ability to form coalitions. The absence of this condition in the post-Herodian period helps explain why change was unattainable, despite many different parts of Jewish society desiring it. A close reading of Josephus on this subject (*Wars* II 39–79; *Antiquities* 17 250–298) reveals the depth of the divide among the groups that opposed the existing order. However, from Jewish sources dealing with these events (and a new reading of Josephus in light of those sources), it appears that in the Jewish collective memory, the uprising against Herod’s successors was perceived as the first revolt in Rome, and within a few years, this perception led to the formation of a new and extreme ideological basis for opposition to Rome.

5.1 *Transition of power and seeds of chaos*.

Immediately following Herod’s death, there were at least four factions opposing the transition of power to Archelaus, Herod’s son.

5.1.1 Pilgrims from all over the country and from Judea gather in Jerusalem. Josephus does not say who was leading them or what their purpose was. In the course of the events, they imply that they are interested in restoring self-rule (τὴν πάτριον αὐτονομίαν [BJ 2:53]) or the freedom of the forefathers (ἐλευθερίαν τὴν πάτριον [*Ant*. 17:267]). It is difficult to know whether this expresses a desire for freedom from Rome, freedom from the Herod’s rule, or something else. Nonetheless, I will focus on this matter because it represents a significant development in the ideological conception of the opponents of the existing regime.

5.1.2 Simon, Herod’s slave, represents the danger of internal coups in royal houses during a change of government, and to some extent, he continues the types of activities that characterized the civil wars at the close of the Hasmonean kingdom – wars that demoralized parts of the population from pursuing the idea of sovereignty.

5.1.3 Athronges represents the potential threat of charismatic leaders.

5.1.4 Judas of Galilee is most likely connected with the formulation of a distinctly anti-Roman ideology that will be discussed in the next section.

5.2 *Varus’s campaign*

In response to these developments, Publius Quinctilius Varus,the Roman governor in Syria, arrives with two legions. From the description of his campaign, he apparently faced all the various forces mentioned in the previous section, but without any differences noted among the groups, which are perceived as a single entity. I would like to show that this is not simply a literary description, nor (only) the result of using different sources. Rather, it actually represents two possible points of view. Varus probably understood very well that the Jewish public was divided in its attitude toward Rome, and that the various rebels and opponents differed from each other. It can be shown that Varus acted differently toward each of the different groups. On the other hand, in the collective memory, Varus’s campaign was perceived as a campaign against the Jews, as is clear from the Jewish sources that allude to it (*Assumption of Moses* 6:8-9; *Seder Olam* 30), and, to some extent, from Josephus. The Jewish collective memory of the Varus campaign as the first *polemos* between the Palestinian Jewry and the Roman empire shaped the resistance to Rome over the next generations.

5.3 *The census of Quirinius and the “fourth philosophy.”*

In 6 CE, when it was decided to transfer Judea to direct Roman rule and annex it to the province of Syria, the “fourth philosophy” appears for the first time, proposing a cohesive ideology for opposing Rome. This philosophy did not suddenly emerge out of nowhere, and I will show the connections between it and religious conceptions opposing foreign rule found in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Book of Jubilees.

The innovation of the fourth philosophy was the way it combined religious commitment with the political situation. The claims that had been raised previously against the Roman rule – and would continue to be raised – concerned religious issues that arose as a result of decisions and actions of Roman rule that transgressed religious laws. The most prominent examples include Herod’s golden eagle and the affair of the idols in the Temple in the days of Caligula. In contrast, the fourth philosophy, as Josephus describes it, saw in the political situation, that is, in subservience to Rome, a violation of the religious dimension. This ideological difference will later lead both to a split among the rebel factions and to very different perceptions regarding the nature of the conflict and the strategy of fighting against Rome.

***Chapter Six: Under Roman Rule (6–41 CE).***

6.1 *The status quo*

Numismatic and literary findings indicate that the first period under Roman rule is characterized by a status quo of relative quiet regarding the religious aspects of Roman-Jewish relations.

6.2 *Appeal of the status quo*

From the time of Pontius Pilate, there is both literary (Josephus, New Testament) and archeological (mostly numismatic) evidence of an erosion in the status quo. Here, the discussion will focus on whether the looting of the Temple by Pontius Pilate and the affair of the idols in the Temple in the days of Caligula led to an increase in the tendency to rebel and support the ideologies of rebellion.

It appears that Judea was on the verge of rebellion in the days of Caligula, and only a fortunate confluence of events prevented this. But it is precisely these events that reveal that the willingness of the masses and the elites (including the Jews of Egypt, as shown by Philo’s writings) to use force against Rome was limited only to issues directly related to the Temple. In fact, notwithstanding the lack of clear evidence to this effect, it is possible that opposition to Caligula may have been based on a particular, predominantly religious, version of the memory of the Hasmonean Revolt. Even if this the case, the idea of ​​rebellion was still too inchoate to enable it to transform readiness for religious martyrdom into a national revolution. The main contribution of the events of the years 30–40 CE was not in the formation of opposition to Rome, but in the recognition that Rome was working (sometimes) against what was holy to many Jews, and in the perception of, in Goldstone’s language, “the injustice in the activities of the existing regime.” This realization, according to Goldstone, is a necessary condition for mobilizing the masses toward rebellion and revolution.

***Chapter Seven: Agrippa: Hope for Disappointment (41–44 CE)***



Was the hope for self-government reignited under the reign of Agrippa? The numismatic and literary findings (Josephus’s writings and the few rabbinic sources) indicate that certain circles, with nothing or no one else to rely upon, may have placed their hopes in Agrippa. The events in the coming years may be better understood against this background.

***Chapter Eight – Towards Rebellion (44–Summer 66 CE)***

These twenty years were rife with the activities of individuals and groups opposing Roman rule, while revealing the fundamental gaps among them. At the same time, a number of events can be seen to have driven social changes that may have led more people to support anti-Roman activity.

8.1 *The Sicari*

During this period, both Josephus and the rabbis recorded the activities of local terrorist groups. Josephus lingers on their modus operandi (murder using a small dagger, *sica* in Latin). The rabbinic literature, as well as the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul, reveal the affinity of these groups to the Pharisees. Josephus connects this group with the adherents of the fourth philosophy. The first Sicarii were probably influenced by the ideology of the fourth philosophy, but it is difficult to pinpoint an allegiance of the Sicarii to the descendants of Judas the Galilean during this period, especially given the fact that at least in one case, the Sicarii served the Roman commissioner Felix (*Ant.* 19 162–163). It appears that the connection between the successors of Judas the Galilean and the Sicarii was created only close to the time of the Great Revolt.

8.2 *Towards an ideology of Zealotry*

Although the terms “Zealots” and “Zealotry” do not yet appear in the ideological discourse (at least according to the material that is available to us), ideological developments can be found during this period that will later become more fully developed among the Zealots, as described in Josephus. This ideology fueled the opposition to Rome because of its perception that it was impossible to lead a life faithful to the Torah and its commandments under Roman rule. In Second Temple literature, and especially in the New Testament, this sentiment is expressed in the growing divide between Jews and Gentiles in the Land of Israel. From the Talmudic traditions and archeological findings, one can point to the halachic-religious aspects of this conception, while Josephus cites events in which a sense of religious deprivation and frustration were the catalysts for violent outbursts against the Roman presence (Pontius Pilate and the affair of military standards and the aqueduct [*Wars* II 172–177); Caligula and the idols; the desecration of the Temple in the days of Comanus [*Wars* II 224–227], etc.). Yet it is not possible to point to the existence of Zealots as a cohesive political or even ideological group.

8.3 *Toward a rebellion?*

The narrative of Josephus about the twenty years prior to the revolt is quite clear. On the one hand, a series of corrupt Roman governors cause the Jewish public to lose confidence in Rome, and on the other, prophetic and/or messianic rebels appear among the Jews, calling for a fundamental change in the political order. Judea plunges towards rebellion. This picture was, and still is, the accepted version of the period, although scholars such as Mason and Goodman sought to paint an almost completely contrary picture, arguing that most of the Jewish population lived peacefully and that the various rebels were insignificant marginal figures.

A re-reading of Josephus in light of other sources, chief among them the Book of Acts, reveals a more complex situation, in which Jewish society was in a waiting position. The few but significant mentions of Theudas, Judas the Galilean and the “Egyptian” prophet show that these figures were present in the collective memory of the people and were perceived as possible role models. Rabban Gamliel’s comparison between the disciples of Jesus and Judas the Galilean and Theudas shows the willingness of Jewish society to accept charismatic leaders with a radical message, albeit accompanied by a sober realism that the degree of truth of the charismatic leader would be judged by his success. As we shall see below, the test of success presented by Rabban Gamliel has a double meaning. First, it expresses the willingness of the elites to join the opposition under certain conditions. Second, it offers leaders and radical ideologies an opportunity to prove themselves by the test of their accomplishments. This shows significant progress in the willingness of sections of Jewish society to promote and enable rebellious activity even if it was not anchored in purely religious contexts.

***Chapter 9: Rebellion and Defeat***

The Jewish population of Judea began the revolt with multiple groups adhering to different ideologies. Theories of revolution suggest that during a revolution, radical groups and charismatic leaders combining elements from both old and new emerge. A study of the development of the different rebel groups and their leaders confirms these theories, which also help clarify the different stages in the revolt’s development.

9.1 *Approaching rebellion and joining by the elites*

It is clear that by the time Eleazar ben Ananias, the deputy to the high priest of the Temple, refused the sacrifice on behalf of the emperor, some of the elites had already joined the rebellion. This completes the various conditions set forth by Goldstone for the development of a rebellion. From this point onwards, we can examine the unfolding of what in Jewish tradition is referred to as the Great Revolt in comparison with other rebellions.

9.2 *The Sicarii*

The Sicarii were active in the twenty years before the uprising. Yet the extent of their organization and ideological commitment is unclear. In the years leading up to the Great Revolt, they (all or some of them) developed as a militarily and ideologically active group around the leadership of Menachem, apparently a descendant of Judas the Galilean.

Their attempts to lead the rebellion, however, were defeated, and they withdrew to Masada and did not take an active part in the revolt during the ensuing years. This event emphasizes the ideological gap between the Sicarii and the other rebels, a divergence noted above. It is possible that another dimension was added to it, if we accept the argument about the messianic nature of Menachem. The first split among the rebels is also a hint of the significant role of internal rivalry later in the revolt.

9.3 *Zealots and the radicalization of the rebellion*

With the outbreak of the revolt, another group formed, the Zealots, as Josephus called them. Even after much research, there is still no consensus among scholars as to the nature and origins of the group. I argue that a distinction should be made between the ideology of the Zealots and the Zealots as a political group. The ideology of the Zealots had different expressions throughout Roman rule, as was mentioned above, and they organized as a political group only close to the outbreak of the revolt. Once the revolt began, Zealotry ideology prevailed among the priestly elite, as expressed in the decision taken by Eleazar ben Hananiah, the governor of the Temple, to cancel the daily sacrifice brought on behalf of the emperor. Throughout the revolt, the Temple and priestly circles serve as the Zealot’s base of power as a political and military group.

Josephus and the rabbis both attest to the Zealots’ affiliation to the Temple in Jerusalem, and their belief in the power of Temple worship to protect the city of Jerusalem. Traces of the Zealots’ beliefs regarding Jerusalem and the Temple are found both in halachic literature and rabbinic stories of the destruction of the Temple and numismatic findings. Still, it is important to emphasize that we find no expression of messianic or apocalyptic views among the Zealots.

9.4 *Moderate rebels*

The early stages of the revolt were led by elements of the veteran elites, including former high priests, Pharisaic leaders, and the city’s wealthy. Josephus did not leave a description of this coalition’s ideology, but archaeological evidence and rabbinic literature provide a few prominent characteristics of this group’s ideals: the central sacredness of Jerusalem, as found in coinage of “sacred Jerusalem”; the absence of messianic expectations –coins with the words “For the Redemption of Zion” and “For the Freedom of Zion” were minted at a later date by others; and the desire for a certain degree of autonomy.

Probably the most important difference between this group and the other rebel groups was its willingness to enter into negotiations with the Romans on terms of surrender. Josephus presents the leaders of this group as having a penchant for “realpolitik.” Still, a variety of sources, including the New Testament and the writings of the Sages, make it possible to suggest other directions regarding its ideological position.

9.5 *John of Giscala*

The life story of John of Giscala is typical of other Jews who joined the revolt, as he gradually adopted aspects of the Zealot ideology with time. Although the Romans did not perceive John as the most important leader, for Josephus, he is the central figure of the story, likely because of the conflict between them at the beginning of the revolt. We will try to analyze the ideological radicalization in John as expressed in the development of his leadership and his attitudes towards the various rebel groups. I seek to show that although John adopts considerable elements of the Zealots’ positions, he neutralizes the priestly component on the one hand, while adopting a unique conception of “the sanctity of Jerusalem” that is not directly related to worship at the Temple. It is this unique ideology, I will argue, that supports the revolt and the rebels who enlist in it in the final stages of the revolt.

9.6 *Simon bar Giora and internecine war*

Simon was viewed by the Romans as the leader of the revolt, probably because of the military strength he had amassed. The actions and experiences of Simon bar Giora permit us to discuss two phenomena that have not yet been considered. First, some argue that bar Giora was a social revolutionary. We will examine this claim, as well as the question of whether economic circumstances and/or expectations of a change in the socioeconomic order were of concern to any of the rebel groups. Second, at the beginning of his career, bar Giora enjoyed some support from the Sicarii. Does this suggest some level of ideological kinship? Might this imply an eschatological belief or even an argument for messianism?

9.7 *The Civil Wars in the Great Revolt*

After having portrayed the main factions, we are now able to examine the development of the relationships between them. I will argue that one must distinguish between three different civil wars that took place in this context. The first confrontation, which is the easiest to understand, took place between the supporters of the revolt and its opponents. Here it is possible to point to the cooperation of most of the rebel groups against the opponents of the revolt. However, a closer examination of the events reveals the tensions between the rebel groups already at the stage of appointing commanders and around Josephus’ activity in the Galilee. The success of the Romans in the conquest of the Galilee and the Judean Plain culminated in battle, which ended in a clear victory for the supporters of the revolt.

The second confrontation was between the “moderate leadership” that had led the uprising to this point, and more radical groups (the Zealots and John of Giscala). The lack of trust and suspicion between the groups sharpened the ideological differences that existed between them. We will see how the common belief in the sanctity of Jerusalem became an ideological bone of contention between the moderates, who argued that due to the sanctity of the city, negotiations with Rome should be considered, and those (including John of Giscala and the Zealots) who argued that the sanctity of the city mandated the continuation of the fighting and even guaranteed victory. References to this controversy are found in both Josephus and Talmudic sources, where sermons for and against continued fighting are preserved.

The third confrontation, which is, perhaps, the most difficult to understand, broke out between factions that were all committed to the revolt in Rome. The violent struggle of Simon Bar Giora with John and the Zealots is reminiscent of the coup d’etat phenomenon characteristic of many rebellions. It is possible that echoes of the ideological differences between the rebel factions are found in the “For the Redemption of Zion” coins, which were probably minted by an authority other than that who minted the “Sacred Jerusalem” coins, and perhaps express Bar Giora’s messianic aspirations. Regardless, the conflict itself is more likely to be understood as an example of the radicalization that characterizes revolutions, when anything perceived as a deviation from revolutionary doctrine appears to be a threat that requires an immediate, violent response. I will try to explain the dynamics of revolutionary violence in Jerusalem in light of later historical examples, chief among them the Münster Rebellion (1534–1535). In the course of that revolt, an extremist Anabaptist group imposed an extremist religious regime accompanied by terrorism and the elimination of dissidents, including those who had supported the revolt in its infancy.

9.8 *Masada*

Only three years after the destruction of the Temple, the Romans turned their attention to the Sicarii who had taken cover in Masada. The Sicarii had apparently adopted the fourth philosophy under the influence of Elazar ben Yair, a descendent of Judas the Galilean. This ideology dictated both their retreat to Masada due to their harsh critique of the rebel leadership, with the hope that their distance from centers of power would enable them to attain freedom, as well as their purported suicide when it became clear that Roman rule would extend over the entire land. While we can be certain that Elazar ben Yair’s speech is a fictitious literary device created by Josephus for the sake of his readers, there are still a number of elements in the speech that explain why, ideologically, surrender was not an option for this group.

***Chapter 10: Tradition and Crisis in the Resistance to Rome***

This chapter deals with the effects of the Temple’s destruction on the tradition of rebellion and the extent of the will of the Jews to initiate another revolt against Rome.

10.1 *From earth to heaven*

Apocalyptic literature (4 Ezra, 2Baruch) continues the tradition of hostility toward Roman rule, but deferred the hope of redemption to the End of Days. More importantly, in contrast to earlier apocalyptic literature, these texts clearly call on readers to focus on following the Torah and upholding its commandments. Deferring redemption to the End of Days and focusing on adherence to the law during the present is evidence of an unwillingness to revolt again and of a diversion of resistance into spiritual channels.

10.2 *From Jerusalem to Yavneh*

After the destruction of the Temple, a cadre of sages who aspired to lead the Jewish public gradually coalesced. Although it is difficult to reconstruct the thoughts of these sages during the first two generations after the destruction of the Temple, it is possible to identify two primary trends. The first is acceptance of reality as is and adaptation of religious life to a world without the Temple, while relinquishing the expectation of political change in the near future.

10.3 *Whispering embers*

The second trend hinted at in the rabbinic literature is a continued tradition of resistance to Rome. This resistance is expressed in strongly anti-Roman sermons, as well as the halachic tradition of maintaining separation from the Gentiles.

***Chapter 11: The Kitos War as Rebellion?***

Were the incidents described in Jewish sources as the Kitos War (or “rebellion of the diaspora” in modern Hebrew, 115–117 CE) an outcome of the spread of Zealot or other revolutionary ideology? A study of the events using the above theoretical framework shows that they should not be viewed as a continuation of the Great Revolt and that the reasons for these violent outbursts are linked primarily to local events. Nonetheless, the events were viewed in hindsight by both the Romans and the Jews as yet another expression of the war between Rome and Judea, and this might be the justification for the fatal blows dealt to Jewish communities that took part in the events. In fact, we must admit that the sources available to us are few and far between, and, at best, allow for educated guesses.

***Chapter 12: The Bar Kokhba Revolt and the End of the Age of Rebellion***

The Bar Kokhba Revolt was the final organized attempt by the Jews of Palestine to rebel against Roman administration and establish Jewish self-rule. In this sense, it is a direct continuation of the Great Revolt. However, a number of archaeological finds and textual testimonies demonstrate that the idea of rebellion had undergone certain transformations, and that the nature of military and political action had also changed at this time.

12.1 *Leaders, leadership and the public*

The Bar Kokhba Revolt is characterized by charismatic leadership that seems to have lent the rebellion a distinct messianic dimension, as expressed in coinage from the rebellion and other contemporary documentation, as well as later descriptions of the rebellion in the literature of the Sages and Church Fathers. These sources indicate that enlisting the masses to the cause of the rebellion was based on charismatic leadership and the expectations it aroused, while taking advantage of Roman politics. Indeed, charismatic leadership is not an ideology. It is probable that the rebels linked the situation of Jerusalem to the hopes of redemption. A reading of a number of homiletical teachings of the rabbis that have not yet been discussed in this context, together with the description of Cassius Dio and archeological findings, indicate that the establishment of Aelia Capitolina was perceived not only as a violation of the sanctity of Jerusalem, but as a sign of redemption. These hopes were placed in the messianic figure of Bar Kokhba.

12.2 *The rebellion*

Bar Kokhba’s charismatic leadership resulted in coordinated activity across Judea, including the use of tunnels as hiding places from which to attack, the organization of a fighting force, and more. In light of this, I will also examine the status of Jerusalem. While the “sacredness of Jerusalem” was a central strategy for some rebels during the Great Revolt, it is likely that during the Bar Kokhba revolt, “Jerusalem” became a mere slogan to mobilize the masses.

From all the evidence we have, it is clear that Jerusalem was not captured by the rebels, and apparently no real effort was made to reach it, which reflects the tension between a charismatic personality and an ideological commitment. Interestingly, this tension is reflected in the descriptions of Bar Kokhba that appear in both rabbinic and Christian literature.

***Chapter 13: What’s Next?***

The destruction of Judea during the Bar Kokhba revolt led to the relocation of the center of Jewish life to the Galilee. The primary text authored by Jews during this period was the Mishna (even if its degree of acceptance is unclear). In this chapter, I identify three tendencies of the Mishna, which reflect a suppression and separation from the ideas of rebellion and revolution.

13.1 *For whom is the Mishnah written?*

The Mishnah does not address the “People of Israel” or any other public, but rather, speaks to the Jewish individual. The Mishnah thus relinquishes any ambitions to promulgate a social or legal agenda for the organization of Jewish society. It offers no alternative to Roman rule and dismantles the social foundations that could have served for plans and aspirations to replace it.

13.2 *The Temple, Jerusalem and the Mishnah*

The Mishnah offers a comprehensive prescription for individual religious life that does not require the reconstruction of the Temple or even visiting Jerusalem.

13.3 *The Messiah?*

The Mishnah is far removed from apocalyptic visions and messianic hopes, and in fact, does not offer the possibility of change in the present.

***Chapter 14: Summation and Conclusions***

This chapter summarizes the findings of the book by asking whether the various violent events that took place in Judea across two centuries were the result of constant resistance to Rome or, alternatively, whether they should be understood as independent and random occurrences. This question will be addressed using two perspectives:

Modern research on Judea-Rome relations between 63 BCE and 136 CE has arrived at contradictory conclusions. Some scholars argue that a consistent ideology of rebellion existed throughout this period, while others claim that the various incidents of violence stemmed from local circumstances and should not be linked. This book offers an alternative approach, arguing that various groups in Judea perceived events differently. Indeed, some groups displayed ideological and practical persistence in opposing the Romans (e.g., Judas the Galilean and his supporters). In contrast, the priestly elites expressed different attitudes at different times. It should be understood that between these two poles there is a wide range of groups and possibilities. The question of whether there was a prolonged opposition movement to Rome in Judea, therefore, depends on the identity of the respondents.

Furthermore, the Romans clearly changed their attitudes towards Jews and Judea over time. In the beginning, Herod and the first governors were inclined to view every episode of violence in isolation. It would appear, however, in the course of the Great Revolt, the Roman perception changed radically, and Jews everywhere were perceived as members of a rebelling nation.

**3. Outstanding Features List** - Briefly what you consider to be the outstanding, distinctive, or unique features of the work.

The unique features of this book in relation to existing literature are as follows:

1. **Defining topic: the idea of rebellion**. Two fundamental positions have developed in research literature over recent decades: on the one side are scholars who believe that Jewish society resisted Rome from the very beginning of Roman occupation. These scholars are preoccupied with the question of why resistance in principle found expression during some periods and not during others. In contrast, there are scholars who argue that Jews generally accepted Roman rule. Violent actions against Roman occupation are explained as the result of exceptional local circumstances and tend to understate the importance of ideology. In this book, I will trace the iterations of the idea of rebellion and its association with violent acts of resistance. In this sense, the book is a history of ideas. It will demonstrate that the notion of rebellion underwent considerable transformations over time and among the different groups involved, with the nature of the idea of rebellion significantly influencing the perceived means and goals of the struggle among specific groups. On the other hand, I will show that some of the violence had nothing to do with the ideology of rebellion, but that its very occurrence sometime fueled the ideology of rebellion and bolstered its supporters.
2. **Theory and history**. Although many historians resist the imposition of theory onto the dynamic and contingent unfolding of historical events, contemporary theories of rebellion and revolution allow for the conceptualization/ abstraction of violent events and illuminate the causal links that help us interpret certain phenomena. Carefully applying such theories can help clarify the complex history of Judea. At the same time, this history can assist us in revising certain theoretical perspectives, especially as related to the changing ideology of rebellion as it spread among different groups.
3. **Sources**. I intend to make more extensive use than generally accepted of Second Temple literature (i.e., the Dead Sea and apocryphal literature) and of archaeological finds (inscriptions, coins) in order to trace the various ideological streams. Indeed, various publications may have occasionally examined one aspect or another of the ideology that may or may not have been imprinted on the coins of the Great Revolt or the Bar Kokhba Rebellion. However, to my knowledge, there has been no systematic treatment of them in distinguishing the different periods and events.
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The book will contain a bibliography, photographs, and maps.
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Dozens of books and hundreds of articles about the rebellions of the Jews against the Romans have been written over the years. The following survey refers to the more recent books and studies of significance, in chronological order.

1. **Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Jerusalem against Rome*. Leuven: Publisher 2006**. This book is a faithful representative of the established approach whereby all Jewish rebellions against Rome, in Palestine and abroad, were expressions of a more or less uniform anti-Roman sentiment. Moreover, the desire for independence, according to this approach, is an obvious product of Hasmonean independence. It was this period that fueled the aspirations for independence and the flames of rebellion for over two hundred years.
2. **Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. London & New York: Allen Lane, 2007.** Goodman’s book provides a broad survey of the relations between Jews and Romans, beginning with the conquest by Pompey the Great and culminating in the times of Constantine I. In contrast to the book’s title, Jews and Romans were not caught up in an inevitable conflict. According to Goodman, the Great Revolt was the unnecessary outcome of a tragic sequence of events. This book has had a dramatic effect on the way Jewish resistance to Rome is perceived. In many respects, it is the complete opposite of Hadas-Lebel’s book, highlighting the periods of quiet and prosperity under Rome. Goodman examines every aspect of Jewish-Roman relations, including culture, politics, and religion. This comprehensive portrayal does provide perspective on Judean society as a whole, but it can overlook less dramatic ideological developments that infiltrated mainstream society from the margins. These developments, as they pertain to the idea of rebellion against Rome, are the focus of the proposed book. Goodman makes extensive use of Greek and Roman authors, but these, were unfamiliar with the nuances of spiritual and religious life in Judea. Josephus probably knew the nuances quite well but chose not to record them in his history. To fill this gap, I intend to give more precedence to contemporaneous Jewish sources, including the New Testament (with all the methodological complications this entails).
3. **Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008.** Eshel’s book traces the development of the Hasmonean state beginning with the Hasmonean rebellion and culminating in the conquest by Pompey. Its purpose is to demonstrate that the Dead Sea Scrolls provide a better understanding of social processes and political and other events in Judea. Eshel does not deal with the same period covered by the proposed book, but he does indicate a way in which the Dead Sea Scrolls and other contemporary Jewish texts can help reconstruct history and evaluate other historical sources such as Josephus.
4. **Mark Andrew Brighton, *Sicarii in Josephus’s Judean War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.** Brighton provides an in-depth analysis of the term Sicarii in Josephus. He argues that Josephus used this term to denote a particular type of Jewish terrorism against Jews during the Great Revolt. The Sicarii as a group appeared only at the beginning of the Great Revolt. Brighton barely discusses other rebel groups (the Zealots, John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora). His focus on a linguistic analysis of Josephus tends to underplay the contribution of Talmudic sources to the understanding of this group, as well as the possible intellectual affinities between the various radical anti-Roman ideologies circulating in first-century Judea.
5. **Mladen Popović (ed.), *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.** This important collection provides innovations in a range of research fields, particularly the archaeology of the Great Revolt. It, of course, has no central thesis regarding the revolt, nor does it attempt to comprehensively address the broad range of questions and issues surrounding it.
6. **Anathea Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.** Portier-Young sets out a theoretical framework and provides an admirable example of research into the way that Second Temple literature in general, and apocalyptic literature specifically, can reveal ideologies of resistance to imperial power. The book deals with the Hellenistic period and with the links between the apocalyptic literature of the period and the Maccabean rebellion. This project can provide methodological and historical frameworks for the proposed book, but the various critiques of Portier-Young’s methodology and of other aspects of the book must be taken into consideration.
7. **William Horbury, *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.** Horbury’s book surveys the Jewish rebellions under Trajan and Hadrian. It is based primarily on familiar Roman sources (Josephus among them), while also drawing from studies that used Jewish sources. This book embraces the conventional approach, which viewed Jewish acts of revolt as being part of a Jewish movement of resistance to Rome, beginning with Pompey. It contains a wealth of primary and secondary sources, but does not attempt to identify or analyze the transformations in the idea of rebellion or its implementation among different sections of Jewish society.
8. **Gil Gambash, *Rome and Provincial Resistance*. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies 21. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis, 2015.** This book deals with rebellions and resistance to Roman rule in the various provinces, but it nonetheless devotes considerable space to Judea. One of the book’s purposes is to clarify the differences between the Judean revolt and other rebellions in other provinces – from the Roman perspective. It contains a rich discussion regarding the Romans’ perceptions of the various rebellions, but it consciously avoids dealing the rebels’ perspective, including that of the Jews. In this sense, the proposed book complements Gambash’s book by focusing on the Jewish perspective. Gambash’s book, furthermore, helps advance the understanding of Jewish reactions to Roman actions and vice versa.
9. **Vasily Rudich, Religious Dissent in the Roman Empire: Violence in Judaea at the Time of Nero. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. London & New York: Routledge, 2015.** Rudich’s book is the third in a series describing opposition to the Roman politico-religious order based on religious motivation during Nero’s time. According to Rudich, the various rebel groups in Judea not only acted on the basis of religious ideology, but this ideology had a profound effect on the psychology of the rebels. He argues that the unique characteristics of rebel psychology make it possible to understand how they could act in contradiction to the commandments of the Torah (for example, by murdering their Jewish opponents), and even contrary to the logic of war (burning grain stores), all in the name of their religious beliefs. Rudich deals almost exclusively with the way in which religious psychology influenced the intensity of resistance and almost does not address the specific unique religious content. As such, he barely touches on the ideological differences between the various rebel groups. Rudich draws almost exclusively on Josephus while the Dead Sea scrolls and other Second Temple Jewish sources are barely mentioned. Even if one accepts the central claims in Rudich’s argument, his book still needs significant supplementation in terms of everything related to the content of the various rebellion ideologies. Such a supplement cannot make do with Josephus’s account, and should be based on a variety of sources, Jewish and non-Jewish, describing the vibrant ideological life of Judaism in the first century CE.
10. **John J. Collins and Joseph Gilbert Manning (eds.), *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East: In the Crucible of Empire*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, v. 85. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2016.** Most of this book does not specifically address Jewish resistance to Rome, but some of its chapters investigate the relationship between theoretical models of rebellion and the revolts of antiquity. The article by James McLaren and Martin Goodman even analyzes the Great Revolt using Jack Goldstone’s theoretical model. This article reveals the fruitfulness of using theoretical foundations to examine the historical. I propose to expand this application to understand the phenomenon of rebellion and its ideological transformations.
11. **Steve Mason, *A History of the Jewish War A.D. 66-74.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016**. This is the most comprehensive book to date on the Great Revolt, based on Mason’s many studies of Josephus’s writings. Mason details the processes and events that led to the outbreak of the Great Revolt, and, like Goodman, doubts the existence of a long-established institution of resistance to Rome. Mason’s research gives little weight to contemporary Jewish sources (such as the writings of the Judean Desert), and almost completely ignores the literature of the Sages due to the methodological difficulties it poses, instead using Roman sources extensively to understand Roman policy. Naturally, the focus on Roman policy leaves little room for a discussion of internal developments in Judea and transformations in the ideology of rebellion and resistance to Rome. In my opinion, there remains a need to re-examine the place of Jewish sources, their connection to Greco-Roman literature in general and of Josephus in particular, and in light of this, to evaluate the idea of rebellion and its meaning, as well as the continued Roman policies toward the Jews.
12. **Nadav Sharon, *Judea under Roman Domination: The First Generation of Statelessness and Its Legacy*. Early Judaism and Its Literature, No. 46. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.** This is the first book devoted exclusively to the period of John Hyrcanus II. According to Sharon, this was the period during which the resistance to Rome movement was consolidated. Sharon makes extensive use of contemporary Jewish sources, as well as critical and thoughtful use of the writings of the Sages, creating a detailed description of the events in Judea. However, without a theoretical framework, Sharon identifies every act of resistance to Rome or to Hyrcanus II as part of a well-formed anti-Roman ideology that extended to large portions of the Jewish public. This book, then, indicates the potential of contemporary Jewish sources in illuminating history. Nonetheless, it is necessary to refine and update Sharon’s descriptions, especially of the transformations in concepts of rebellion against Rome from 37 BCE and onward.
13. **Anthony Giambrone (ed.), *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archaeology, Society, Texts and Traditions*, Leuven: Peeters (2021).** This is a collection of essays examining various aspects of Mason’s work, as well as Mason’s response. Some essays demonstrate that using additional sources (Second Temple period literature, coins and the archaeological record) can confirm, deny or add information to Josephus’s descriptions, with regard to the unfolding of the rebellion and religious and cultural ideology of the rebels. Mason’s reply is just as interesting, and in any event, the conversations taking place within the book suggest a new more extensive and complex picture of this history is needed.
14. **Katell Berthelot, *Jews and Their Roman Rivals: Pagan Rome’s Challenge to Israel*. Princeton University Press, 2021.** Unlike the other books on Judea and Rome, this book’s focus is not the political or military conflict, but rather the way that Jews, especially in Rabbinic literature, responded to a range of Roman ideas and values having to do with power, law and citizenship. The book, then, does not address the ideology that led the Jews to rebellion. Similarly, although it claims to deal with the entire Roman period, the book focuses on rabbinic literature and the rabbis’ responses to the Roman world, beginning with the Second Century – later than the periods covered in the proposed book. Nonetheless, the insights it raises can prove useful in assessing Jewish-Roman relations in the first century AD.
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2. If this is a text, for what course is the book intended? Is the book a core text or a supplement? What type of student takes this course? What is the level? (Major or non-major; freshman, senior, graduate?) Do you offer this course yourself? If so, how many times have you given it? Is your text class-tested?
3. If the market is scholarly/professional, reference, or trade, how may it best be reached? (Direct mail, relevant journals, professional associations, libraries, book or music stores?) For what type of reader is your book intended?

The primary market for this book is the academic one, and is intended primarily for anyone studying with ancient Judaism, and particularly the turbulent times at the end of the Second Temple period. It will interest scholars in political science and sociology who work on the dynamics of rebellions. The relevant academic communities can be reached through professional journals, conferences, and direct email.

**Status of the Work**

1. Do you have a timetable for completing the book?
   1. What portion or percentage of the material is now complete?
   2. When do you expect to have a complete manuscript?

Different aspects of this project have already been the subject of prior publications, especially those related to the Great Revolt. However, the conceptual and theoretical organization of material still needs to be done, including for the Great Revolt. I expect to complete the entire project in about two years.

1. What do you estimate to be the size of the completed book?
   1. Double spaced typewritten pages normally reduce about one-third when set in type; e.g., 300 typewritten pages make about 200 printed pages. There are about 450 words on a printed page.
   2. Approximately how many photographs do you plan to include?
   3. Approximately how many line drawings (charts, graphs, diagrams, etc. ) will you need?
   4. Do you plan to include material requiring permission (text, music, lyrics, illustrations)? To what extent? Have you started the permissions request process?

I expect the length of the book to be about 300–350 printed pages. It will include about 15 photographs of various archaeological items (Dead Sea Scrolls, ritual baths, and other remains of the Second Temple period). I also intend to include seven or eight maps.

1. Do you plan to class-test the material in your own or other sections of the course? (Any material distributed to students should be protected by copyright notice on the material.)

I do not intend to use any of the material for course work.