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Foreword

The first section of Compendia was published in two volumes in 1974 and 1976. At that time it could not be foreseen that the preparation of the next section would take so many years, that only now a first part appears in print. The Compendia project is based on teamwork, which necessarily involves a great deal of consultation and discussion. At an advanced stage of preparation it became evident that the original plan was too narrow for an adequate treatment of the sources. In 1979 a new outline was prepared, providing for a three volume work instead of the original two, and a fresh team of editors was engaged to complete the work. The present volume is the first fruit of this undertaking and it is expected that the remaining two volumes will appear within two years.

It is an honourable duty for the Compendia Foundation to acknowledge all scholars who have given their contributions to the realization of the second section. First of all, we mention M. de Jonge, who very skilfully and energetically directed the editorial procedure in the first stage of the project and unselfishly cooperated in the move towards its final form. The basic outline of the section we owe to R. Le Déaut, whose great sensitivity to both the Jewish and Christian dimensions of the project substantially influenced the actual scope of the work. S. Sandmel was a full member of the editorial team of our section till 1970, when he resigned after his appointment as editor-in-chief of HUCA. His inspiring cooperation was very much appreciated and with deep sorrow we received the tidings of his sudden death in 1979. He was succeeded by G. Vermes, who resigned in 1974 because of other commitments, among them the heavy burden of the new edition of Schürer's History of the Jewish People. We also mention with gratitude the name of B. S. Jackson, who was a skilful and careful editor from 1972-1978.

The list of our acknowledgements is rather long, due to the extended editorial history of our section and we refrain from mentioning all the present members of the editorial board; their names appear on the title page of the present book. Some exceptions should, however, be allowed. We wish to mention with gratitude S. Safrai, who has guided the Compendia project from the beginning, was one of the chief editors of the
first section and signed for the volume in preparation on the Literature of the Sages. We feel also much obliged to M. E. Stone, who was first engaged as an author and at a critical stage of the projected accepted full editorial responsibility for the present volume, taking an active part in the revision of its outline. Full and continuous assistance was provided in the preparation of the volume by the Foundation’s executive editors W. J. Burgers and P. J. Tomson. We finally express our sincere thanks to the authors, who have shown a great deal of patience and understanding during the long history of the book.

We use this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of W. C. van Unnik, who died in March 1978. Van Unnik has shown great interest in the Compendia project from its start in 1967 and took part in many editorial meetings. He read all the contributions in the first section before printing and many of his comments found their way into the printed text. It is very regrettable that we had to miss him as reader in the preparation of the present volume. As early as 1947, in his inaugural lecture held at the University of Utrecht, Van Unnik expressed the view that early Christianity could be fully understood only in the context of Judaism: ‘Jesus and Paul have after birth not been carried around the hearth, but they have been circumcised on the eighth day and they lived accordingly.’ It is this view which guided the Compendia project.

The Compendia Foundation deeply regrets the passing away of two of its members, C. A. Rijk and A. C. Ramselaar, who both fostered the Jewish-Christian dialogue in the Roman Catholic Church. Rijk was a member of the founding committee of the Compendia project, whereas Ramselaar was an active member of the Foundation from 1969 until his death in 1982. May their memory be a blessing for all who follow their steps on the road of brotherhood and peace between Jews and Christians. H. van Praag, who initiated the Compendia and has been president of the Foundation since its start in 1967, handed over the chairmanship to R. A. Levinson in January 1984.

J. van Goudoever,
Secretary of the Compendia Foundation.

The production of this volume has drawn upon the talents and energies of many. The Editor wishes to express his thanks in particular to those authors who so patiently bore with his new decisions, who agreed to revise, sometimes to rewrite, articles and sections of articles, and to all the authors without whose writing and generous participation the volume could not have come into being.

A good deal of the intensive work of this volume was carried out while the Editor was Fellow-in-Residence of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities in 1980-81. His gratitude is expressed to the NIAS for the opportunities that year offered him.

M. E. Stone
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Michael E. Stone

From its inception, Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum has been a joint Jewish and Christian endeavour. This is worth considering, for it is essential to the understanding of the project of which the present volume is part. It was not just to advance the cause of mutual understanding by general contacts and interchanges, essential as that aim is; the endeavour had to be jointly Jewish and Christian because learning about this period has developed essentially in two separate (and not always equal) streams.¹

The implications are far-reaching for the study of history.² The understanding and view that we have of Jewish history of the age of the Second Temple are conditioned by these two main factors—the presuppositions of historiography and the character of the sources ... Clearly, the nature of the sources which have been transmitted in both the Jewish and Christian traditions has been determined by the particular varieties of Judaism and Christianity which became “orthodox”, or in other words, which became dominant and survived ... The material they preserved ... is that which was acceptable through the filter of orthodoxy.³ In other words, which material actually survived was determined by these two separate later traditions and their tendencies. Moreover, the influence of the later ‘orthodoxies’ was even more pervasive than this, for they determined not only what range of material survived, but also what parts of it were studied by scholars and what questions they posed to it. Jewish scholars tended on the whole to search for documents with resonances in classical rabbinic literature or, at least, not contrary to it. Christian scholars sought material that illuminated the background of the New Testament, and what is more, some of them highlighted material that could be interpreted to justify their pejorative theological attitudes towards Judaism.

Recently, the distortions caused by theological tendenz have again been forcefully set forth by E. P. Sanders, echoing at many points the late George Foot Moore’s strictures, half-a-century old. Sanders expounded

¹Cf. Compendia 1/1, p. x.
²Stone, Scriptures, Sects and Visions, p. 49-S 1.
³Ibid. 53.
Apart from the fostering of anti-semitism, such distorted images of Judaism produced a distorted description of Christianity which issued from Judaism. The formulation of descriptions of Judaism, as indeed the evaluation of such descriptions, is a task within the historian’s bailiwick, but naturally the description accepted by exegetes profoundly influences their interpretation of the New Testament.

The historical task should not be confused with the exegetical one, and the historical realities demand that the New Testament be viewed in the overall context of Judaism as well as in the light of the Church that sprang from it. It is to the former aspect of the historical task that the editor hopes that this volume will make a contribution, for its aim is to present as balanced a picture as possible of the literary evidence for the description of Judaism. An honest rapprochement between Jewish and Christian scholarly traditions is an essential precondition of this. The desire to use as wide a range of evidence as possible and make it available to the reader also requires this cooperation, for Jewish and Christian scholarly traditions have developed different fields of expertise and different scholarly emphases. Such a rapprochement will bear fruit first and foremost for the scholarly task. Moreover, in the final analysis it will also enhance the mutual respect and understanding of these two religious traditions.

Naturally, the general character of the Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum has determined the approach of the Editor in setting the policy for this volume. One sustained interest and concern which is expressed in all the articles, is that they should embody the results or critical, objective scholarship. Not only this, but they are written and edited with a consciousness of the scholarly discussion of the issues involved and its development. Furthermore, particular emphasis has been placed on showing the relationships between the various types of literature and themes included within the volume and other bodies of contemporary Jewish and Christian literature, as well as their biblical sources and rabbinic implications. These latter aspects are, of course, to form the subject matter of other volumes of this section (see below). Nonetheless, interlocking ideas, themes and literary forms have been highlighted even at the risk of some repetitiveness, since it is the basic perception of the volume that the literature it describes must be viewed in its broader context. Divisions had to be made between the various volumes of this literature

1 Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, especially 1-58; Moore, ‘Christian Writers’.
2 See Stone ibid. 53-55 for detailed development of these views.
3 By the preceding we do not intend to condemn, of course, all previous scholars and the complete tradition of learning developed over the past centuries. Nonetheless, the attitudes noted have been predominant enough to foster the most grave imbalances of presentation.

The volume presents the literary production of Judaism in the period of the Second Temple, with the exclusion of the Bible on the one hand, and rabbinic literature on the other. In the text, the emphasis has been on producing a readable, balanced exposition which avoids the use of technical jargon, of untranslated ancient languages and of unnecessarily detailed catalogues of scholarly views and disputes. The aim is to produce a text which is available to the non-specialist, yet not tautological to the scholar. Access to the scholarly literature is provided by footnotes, by the annotated bibliography, and by the complete bibliographical list at the end of the volume. This provides both a key to abbreviations and an extended bibliography of the subject matter. Furthermore, this volume, like the others in this section of Compendia, is provided with its own indexes.

The volume is one of a projected three, and the two others of this section of Compendia will deal respectively with rabbinic literature and with the Bible as interpreted and understood in this period. The division into volumes is in a certain sense artificial like any other division, and so an impediment to understanding. The division that was finally accepted, after the most painful consideration, in part reflects the transmission of the documents. The volume on rabbinic literature comprises material relevant to the history of Jewish literature and thought transmitted within the Jewish tradition and in Semitic languages. The present volume includes material that was not transmitted by Jewish tradition. Part was preserved by the various Christian churches and part was uncovered by archaeological chance. The Bible volume, however, centres around the theme of how Sacred Scripture evolved, developed, and was used and regarded, draws on Jewish and Christian transmissions equally. This is, of

---

1 Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, especially 1-58; Moore, ‘Christian Writers’.
2 See Stone ibid. 53-55 for detailed development of these views.
3 By the preceding we do not intend to condemn, of course, all previous scholars and the complete tradition of learning developed over the past centuries. Nonetheless, the attitudes noted have been predominant enough to foster the most grave imbalances of presentation.
course, natural enough since the Bible is the common basis on which both traditions built. Chronologically, the present volume comprises Jewish literature that was written after the Bible and is not rabbinic literature. Some of it, in fact, was written before the form of some of the biblical books we have preserved. So, parts of 1 Enoch are certainly older than the visions of Daniel 7–12 and this is also true of Ben Sira. At the other end of the chronological spectrum, some of the books are later in date than parts of the Mishnah and other rabbinic traditions. Here the Apocalypse of Abraham may be mentioned as an example, a book probably written in the mid-second century C.E.

Most chapters of the book are organized by literary types; we hesitate to say simply ‘genres’ for, although that may be true of chapters on Apocalyptic Literature, Testaments or Prayers, it is surely not true of the chapters on historiography or on narrative literature. Dividing the literature by historical or social context was not consistently feasible. On the one hand, the Qumran sectarian writings do form a cohesive group as far as context of origin, date, character, theological and conceptual language and so forth are concerned. Consequently, it was possible to set them together in a single chapter and to pay due attention to their historical background. The same is true for the writings of Philo and Josephus. On the other hand, however, most of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha exist in a sort of limbo in which our knowledge of their context of origin, the groups that wrote them, and the way in which they were used remains within the realm of imagination or at best of informed guess.

In this matter are implicit both the importance and the difficulty of the study of the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha and the other literature dealt with in this volume. A great range of types of religious thought, cultural orientation, language of origin and apparently of context of origin are represented, yet, in spite of the plethora of documents, little is known of their actual socio-religious matrices or transmission.

The vast majority of the works handled in this volume are of literary types older than or different from those produced by the Rabbis. They all stem from the period between the Persian hegemony and the generation following the destruction of the Temple. They were all, with the exception of the Dead Sea scrolls and part of Ben Sira, transmitted to us only through the Christian churches. These features combine with the absence from rabbinic sources not just of these literary types, but even of basic aspects of the traditions contained in these writings, to indicate that they were most likely created and cultivated in circles or groups that were not ‘proto-rabbinic’; or else that the sorts of literature and traditions that they preserved were later rejected (or at the very least neglected) by the Sages.

In general, explanations that seek to attribute this change in Jewish literary modes to rabbinic reaction against eschatological writing are not adequate in themselves, since they do not account for the lack of works of narrative or sapiential character from rabbinic tradition. Nor do theories highlighting the sectarian character of some works, such as 1 Enoch, account for the neglect of other doctrinally unexceptional writings like Judith or the Epistle of Jeremiah. Nor does the language of composition play a major role, for most of the writings were written in Hebrew or Aramaic, not in Greek.

It is very likely the case, then, that there is no simple or single explanation of the non-transmission of much of this literature by the Sages. Certain of these factors may have led to the suppression of some of the works, but others, like Ben Sira, were known among the Sages (at least in a florilegium) and were positively regarded.

When the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are compared with rabbinic literature, one is struck by the radical change in literary genres. None of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books written in Hebrew or Aramaic was composed as biblical exegesis citing and expounding verses. In contrast, the tie to the actual biblical text and its exposition lies very close to the heart of rabbinic creativity. On the whole, then, these writings show a different attitude to scriptural authority that is most likely the result of a specific attitude to scriptural authority. This is an essential factor for understanding the literature of the period.

Two further observations must be made on this point. The first is that the particular constellation of attitudes to authority and inspiration in the circles of the Qumran sect, and reflected therefore in their writings, differs from both of the above. The peshers and certain other Qumran documents are commentary on the Bible. Yet, the nature of the peshers which reveals, as the Habakkuk Pesher tells us, the meaning which even the prophets knew not when they spoke their words, indicates that the sect cultivated a particular sort of pneumatically inspired exegesis. The form of the Temple Scroll as a pseudepigraphon of God, paraphrasing and often changing the actual wording of the law of the Pentateuch, is another, striking indication.

Apocalyptic–Eschatological Writings,” *JBL* 41 (1922) 115–36; see further below, chap. 10. Wherever possible in this book, the relationship of the literature discussed with rabbinic traditions has been underlined.

There is a sensitive analysis of aspects of this issue in Heinemann, *Darkei Ha-Aggada*, p. 177; see also below, chap. 10, pp. 427–33, chap. 3, pp. 100–101. This matter will be explored more fully in the volume on Miqra.
cutor of a dominant, particular Essene self-understanding, different both from the Rabbis and from the vast body of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

As far as Philo is concerned, he does present most of his writing in the form of biblical commentary. He had his forerunners in Jewish Hellenistic milieux, and the question of the Sitz im Leben of the various types of exegesis he uses is much discussed in scholarly circles. If it has a synagogal connection, it is to that extent like the midrashic homilies that were designed around the weekly Torah readings, although these can certainly not be traced back as far as Philo's time. Yet, with all that, the modes and style of his exegetical endeavour differ from those of the Rabbis and are obviously influenced by Hellenistic scholarship.

Indeed, there is no doubt about the influence of Hellenistic culture on the whole range of Jewish creativity in our period.10 This is most evident in the writings produced in Greek by the Jews in the Diaspora. Philo's corpus has already been mentioned. Josephus too wrote his histories according to Greek historiographic norms rather than the biblical patterns used by, say, 1 Maccabees. Other Jewish Greek historians did the same, not to mention rhetors like the author of 4 Maccabees, or poets like Ezekiel the Tragedian and Pseudo-Phocylides. Sadly, much of this literature survives only in small fragments. In our treatment the fragments have generally been integrated into the chapters where they belong on grounds of content or general character.

The writings discussed in this volume indicate an extraordinary wealth and variety of Jewish religious and literary creativity in a very crucial period—that from which both rabbinic Judaism and Christianity issued. It is of intrinsic interest for the historian of Judaism to draw as full and detailed a picture he can of the varieties of Jewish life and creativity in that age. For it appears that, subsequently to it, many of these varieties disappeared or became subterranean. Moreover, in order truly to set the stage for the understanding of the New Testament, to compose a work ad Novum Testamentum, we need to enter the perspective of the age in which Christianity, and for that matter rabbinic Judaism, emerged. The primary means of entering into that perspective is the attentive study of the literary production of the era. That is done, we hope, in this volume. But not just the study of the literature is needed; it must be placed in context, both social and religious. This task has constantly been before the editor and the authors and if we have not always succeeded in it, it is for lack of information needed to make balanced judgements. Yet a perception of the

10 The extent and character of this influence are, of course, much debated. Although not all of his conclusions are universally accepted, the magistral work of Martin Hengel states the case strongly for the period down to the Maccabean revolt: Judaism and Hellenism. The books by the late Saul Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine are rich contributions to a later period. The other literature is extensive.
Chapter One

The Historical Background

Isaiah Gafni

Introduction

The conquests of Alexander the Great ushered in a new era in the political and cultural history of the Near East.¹ In their wake, both the Jews of Judaea and their brethren in a rapidly expanding diaspora were subjected to radical forces of social and cultural change. These changes, effected by the introduction of Greek culture into the lands of the Near East that led to the emergence of the phenomenon commonly known as Hellenism,² greatly transcended the purely political vicissitudes that were destined to envelop this part of the inhabited world.² Moreover, the perception of Alexander’s military success as a major crossroads in the history of the region is not merely the product of modern historiographical hindsight, but apparently was already felt by Jews and non-Jews who experienced first-hand the far-reaching impact of the Greek conquest of, and assimilation into the East. Thus, for example, when the late second century B.C.E. author of 1 Maccabees set out to record the events leading up to the Hasmonean uprising, as well as that family’s emergence as the central Judaean authority, he chose to introduce the events of 175-135 B.C.E. with a preamble describing however erroneously what came to pass ‘after Alexander of Macedon, son of Philip... had completely defeated Darius, King of the Persians and the Medes’.³

The impact of Hellenism, and the reactions to that cultural...
nomene, is one of the factors that left their mark on much of the literary activity of the Jewish people, during the period of the Second Temple as well as in the immediate aftermath of its destruction (70 C.E.). Indeed, this activity, which serves as the focus of the present volume, must be seen in the perspective of the ongoing interaction between political events, religious tendencies, and influences resulting from contacts between Jews and a variety of non-Jewish ethnic and social groups.34

One of the striking features of Second Temple history is the fact that most Jews, not only in the Diaspora but in Palestine as well, never experienced complete Jewish sovereignty. The following chronological chart, listing the various rulers and regimes in Second Temple Palestine, clearly attests to this fact:

- 536-332 B.C.E. — The Persian Period
- 332-167 B.C.E. — The Hellenistic Period
- 167-141 B.C.E. — The Hasmonean Uprising
- 141-63 B.C.E. — The Hasmonean State
- 63 B.C.E.-70 C.E. — Roman Rule (in varying stages and forms)

In a period of 600 years, only the approximately 80 years of Hasmonean statehood can be fairly categorized as a period of Jewish sovereignty, which even during this period was frequently of a very tenuous nature. This observation, however, reflects a modern value system, and one may ask whether the quest for national independence was uppermost in the minds of Jews throughout much of the Second Temple period. A closer look may reveal the dominant role religious interests played in this period.

Indeed, beginning with the edict of Cyrus itself (538 B.C.E.), the focus of Judaean restoration was around the Temple; the disappearance from the sources of any Davidic heir after Zerubabel probably also reflects the dashing of any hopes for immediate restoration of the monarchy. If one perceives a national consolidation under Ezra and Nehemiah, this nevertheless was largely in the nature of a religious revival, and the reforms instituted by both leaders — cessation of intermarriage, enforcement of tithes and enhanced sanctification of the Sabbath — all place a stress on this revitalization of the Jewish religious community.

While the Hasmonean revolt was the first of a series of Jewish uprisings all linked to the establishment of Jewish hegemony in Jerusalem and throughout Judaea, it is equally true that all these uprisings were linked to some infraction of Jewish religious practice. Whether these took the form of outright religious persecution, as was the case under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, or whether the ideology of the rebels equated political subjugation with religious infidelity, it was a real or perceived interference with Jewish religion and ritual that — more than any other single factor — could induce large numbers of Jews to take up arms, or not to defend themselves and sacrifice their lives. Religious commitment, while not always commensurate with the degree of practice maintained by all Jews throughout the period under discussion, nevertheless seems to emerge as a constant factor in Jewish society, regardless of the nature of political rule at any given time or place. This circumstance not only helps to explain the ongoing tensions between Jews and non-Jews, in Palestine as well as much of the diaspora, but also accounts for the passion displayed by various segments of the Jewish population in their disputes with other Jews.

The phenomenon of sectarianism might well be considered another outstanding feature of this particular stage of Jewish development. Much of the spiritual ferment and of the ensuing literary activity of the Second Temple period owes its proliferation to these divisions within Jewish society. This fact becomes all the more pronounced in light of subsequent rabbinic attempts at resolving certain internal disputes. While one might take issue with the appellation of ‘normative’ even for post-Temple Judaism, the existence of various religious and political movements and sects remains one of the dominant factors of Second Temple Judaism.5 An appreciation of the origins and social significance of these groups, which are vital for the understanding of the literary documents treated in this volume, can best be served by establishing a chronological framework for the various periods of Second Temple history.

The Hellenistic Period

As defined by purely political criteria, the Hellenistic period in Palestine may be subdivided as follows: a) 332-301 B.C.E., the conquests of Alexander and wars of the diadochi; b) 301-200, Ptolemaic (Egyptian) rule over Palestine; c) 200-167, Seleucid (Syrian) rule over Palestine, up to the outbreak of the Hasmonean uprising.

Insofar as Jewish history is concerned, much of the Hellenistic period is marked by an extreme paucity of sources. One has only to glance through the relevant section of Josephus’ Antiquities (Books 11-12) to realize that the best that historian could do was to weave together various legends and sources of a novelistic nature in an attempt to fill in the lacuna that exists. Thus we advance from the popular accounts of Alexander’s encounter with the residents of Judaea and their high priest (Ant. 11:304-345), to the historian’s rendition of the Epistle of Aristeas and the events surrounding

34 In this article we do not touch on the question of languages used in Palestine. See for this matter Compendia, Section I, chapters 21 and 22.

4 This was the essence of the ‘Fourth Philosophy’, which served as the religious grounds for armed opposition to Rome by the sicarii; cf. Stern, ‘Sicarii and Zealots’; id., ‘Zealots’.

5 Cf. Simon, Jewish Sects, 1-16.
the appearance of the Septuagint (Ant. 12: 1 118), and conclude — if scholars are correct in placing the event in the late third century B.C.E. — with the story of the Jewish tax collector Joseph son of Tobias (Ant. 12: 158-222). To be sure, even these stories, however touched up or fictionalized they appear to be, nevertheless provide us with valuable insights into the atmosphere pervading Jewish-Greek relations in the early Hellenistic period. Thus the Alexander stories, whether in the version provided by Josephus or in the parallel rabbinic traditions, attest not only to the impact of Alexander's conquests on the residents of Palestine, but on passant seem to reflect on an early positive relationship between Jews and Greeks. This relationship is borne out by the earliest statements on Jews and Judaism in the writings of Hellenistic authors, which for the most part were favourable and even laudatory, frequently describing the Jewish people as 'philosophers by race', from whom much can be learned. Yet another statement in the Alexander stories, whereby the young general accedes to the request of the high-priest that the Jews be granted permission 'to observe their country's laws and in the seventh year to be exempt from tribute' (Ant. 11: 338) seems to reflect the recognized status of Judaism as a religio licita during much of the Greek and Roman period, thereby illuminating the sensitivity displayed when this basic right was encroached upon.

In similar fashion, the story of Joseph, son of Tobias seems to contribute to our comprehension of the inroads made by the hellenizing process among certain strata of Jewish society. The background to the story, which must be sketched first, is Ptolemaic rule in Palestine. Here, information is equally scant, but the following is clear. In Egyptian eyes Judaea seems to have been part of a larger territory called 'Syria and Phoenicia', encompassing Palestine, the Trans-Jordan, the cities of Tyre and Sidon as well as portions of southern Syria. At the head of all this territory stood a strategos, while the area itself was divided into hyparchi, probably defined along ethnic lines. Thus Palestine incorporated the hyparchies of Idumea, Trans-Jordan, Samaria, with Judaea probably the hyparchy with the highest concentration of Jews. Judaea closely resembles the Persian administrative unit of Yehud, and it appears that the borders of this area remained relatively fixed for centuries, until the changes introduced by the Hasmoneans. The northern boundary of Judaea was Bet-El (north of modern Ramallah), and the southern boundary, Bet Zur (just north of Hebron). To the east Judaea reached the Jordan river and Jericho, while the western border was situated approximately by the plain of Lydda. Certainly, Jews resided beyond these borders, such as in the Jewish enclave of Trans-Jordan known as the Peraeo, as well as in the Galilee, albeit in smaller numbers. In the eyes of the Ptolemaic administration, however, Judaea was the area of the Jewish ethnos, and its residents — Judaeans. The Hellenistic period served as the catalyst for the creation of two major Greek concentrations in Palestine. One of these was the stretch of coastal poleis from Ptolemais (Acre) in the north to Gaza in the south, while the other was the series of Greek cities in the Trans-Jordan, such as Pella, Dion, Gerasa and Philadephia (Amman). Here again, the demographic developments of the early Hellenistic period will have a lasting effect on the history of the land until the Destruction, in particular on the nature of relations with gentiles in Palestine throughout the Second Temple period. As more and more scholars have come to note, the social tensions encountered in the last century of Second Temple Palestine are not merely a reflection of animosity between conquered Jew and ruling Roman, but the result of a far more complex reality in which different ethnic and cultural societies lived in close proximity to each other, ruled over by yet a third party not always capable of maintaining a neutral position between the various groups. It would appear then, that while sources for the Hellenistic period in Judaea are few, it is crucial for a precise understanding of much of the subsequent historical development of the Jewish people in the Greco-Roman world.

Given the scarcity of sources, scholars are fortunate to have at their disposal a number of documents from the archive discovered in the Fayyum (Darb el Gerza) in 19 15, and known as the Zenon papyri. Named after an official serving under Apollonius, the Ptolemaic finance minister of the mid-third century B.C.E., the papyri provide information bearing primarily on the economic and administrative situation in Palestine at the
time.” One document stands out. It was written by (or for) Tobias, a prominent landowner in Trans-Jordan, and most probably the father of Joseph, the hero of our story. It is addressed to Apollonius; and while dealing with mundane issues itself, it opens with the preamble: ‘Tobias to Apollonius greeting. If you and all your affairs are flourishing, and everything else is as you wish it, many thanks to the Gods (πολλῆς χάρις τοῖς θεοῖς).’

Much has been argued to the effect that no intrinsic polytheistic overtones should be read into what was primarily a fixed and standard opening formula, possibly written by Tobias’ scribe rather than by the Jewish landowner himself. All this notwithstanding, if one takes into account the fact that Tobias was apparently married to the sister of the high priest Onias II, it becomes clear that certain new elements of a particular cultural and political orientation had begun to infiltrate portions of the Judaean establishment. Into this context the Joseph story, preserved by Josephus, finds its place. Approximately in the year 240 B.C.E. we encounter the highpriest refusing to fulfill his obligations as chief tax-collector on behalf of the Ptolemaic regime. A crisis looms, and in a major gathering on the Temple mount Joseph appears and saves the day, succeeding his uncle in the position of tax-farmer (Ant. 12: 158ff.). His subsequent escapades in Alexandria, and in particular his passion for a local dancing-girl, point to a man who, while serving as representative of the Jewish people on the one hand, has nevertheless departed from traditional Jewish behaviour. Before us, in fact, emerges a typical example of the possibilities opened up by the Hellenistic world to certain ethnic leaders. This tension between fealty to ancient local traditions and the newly accessible and highly attractive cosmopolitan stage, serves as a major factor in the social ferment in Judaea, ultimately and inexorably leading to the clash between the two forces in the second century B.C.E. And so while novelistic in its present form, the Joseph story is nevertheless enlightening, particularly since the sons of this family were destined to serve as the vanguard of the hellenizing movement in Palestine. All but one of Joseph’s sons, Hircanus, would ultimately throw in their lot with the successors to the Ptolemies in Palestine, the Seleucid Empire.

Politically, Palestine during much of the Hellenistic period served as a bone of contention between the two great Hellenistic monarchies in the east, and the third century B.C.E. was witness to at least five battles between the two powers, frequently referred to as ‘the Syrian wars’ due to the Ptolemaic orientation of our sources. While the Ptolemies succeeded in withstanding Syrian pressure during most of the third century, the ascent to the throne of Antiochus III ‘the Great’ in 223 B.C.E. marks the beginning of a shift in power. Invading in 218 B.C.E., Antiochus succeeded in conquering almost all of Palestine, only to be defeated the following year by Ptolemy IV at Raphia, in one of the great battles of ancient history. Syrian pressure, however, was maintained, and in 200 B.C.E. following the defeat of the Egyptian army at Paneas, Antiochus III became ruler in Palestine.

The effects of Seleucid rule in Palestine are at first glance enigmatic, for what appears in 200 B.C.E. to be a favourable relationship between the Jewish community and the new rulers of the land, deteriorated within three decades into turmoil and outright revolution, far exceeding anything of a similar nature under 100 years of Ptolemaic rule. Moreover, in the famous proclamation issued by Antiochus III upon his conquest of the land, not only ‘was provision made for the physical restoration and economic well-being of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple, but the king explicitly proclaimed that ‘all members of the nation shall have a form of government in accordance with the laws of the fathers’ (μαθί τοις πατριώτικοι λόγοις). All the more striking, then, is the fact that thirty-two years later the son of that same conqueror, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, inaugurated a systematic religious persecution in Judaea that was diametrically opposed to his father’s decree. The change in Seleucid policy may be attributed at least in part to external events. Following the defeat of Antiochus III at the hands of Roman legions at Magnesia in 190 B.C.E., and the ensuing peace treaty of Apamea (188), the Seleucid Empire found itself in dire need of funds to pay the tributes forced upon it by Rome. Antiochus himself was killed while attempting to sack a temple in Elymais (187), and under his successor Seleucus IV (187-175) the Jews of Palestine experienced a similar attempt to extract funds from the Temple of Jerusalem. The event, described in Maccabees 3, reflects not only on the predicament of the Seleucids, but more importantly on the internal developments among the ruling class of Jerusalem. Apparently, elements within the priesthood and particularly the family of Bilga, had joined forces with the Tobiads in an attempt to usurp power from the high priest Onias. This new coalition seems to indicate not only a power struggle within the priestly oligarchy, but a cultural clash as well, for it is this element that ultimately carried out (if it did not instigate) the reforms initiated by Antiochus IV in Jerusalem, culminating with religious persecution.

Certainly, the exact part played by Jewish elements in the events leading up to the Hasmonean uprising is far from certain, and one must attribute at least part of the initiative to the king himself. The latter, who succeeded his...
brother in 175 B.C.E., was by all accounts a dynamic and original statesman, intent on reviving the glory of the Hellenistic East. To this end he devoted the first seven years of his reign to plans for the conquest of Ptolemaic Egypt. In this context one can understand the steps taken to ensure a loyal leadership in Judaea, which would necessarily serve as a staging area for the invasion of Egypt. Accordingly, a new highpriest — Jason, brother of Onias — was installed, and Jerusalem was effectively rendered a Greek polis (city-state) named Antioch.23 This of course entailed the setting up of standard Greek civic institutions such as a gymnasium, and the author of 2 Maccabees (4: 13-17) bemoans the sight of priests ‘no longer interested in the services of the altar, despising the sanctuary, neglecting the sacrifices’ and running to participate in Greek athletic games. The culmination of this reform was the appointment of yet another high priest, Menelaus (of the house of Bilga), a representative of the more extreme hellenizing forces.

The question of how far the hellenizing process had advanced within Jewish society by this time is still heatedly debated by historians. One school of thought, following in the steps of Schirrer, contends that quite considerable progress had already been made, the Hellenists having the upper hand, and the only path open to the devout being ‘to become a sect’.24 The arguments adduced for this position all point to an obvious adoption of Greek language and phraseology, accompanied by various manifestations of Hellenistic art forms, systems of administration and diplomacy, public institutions, as well as the incorporation of basic Greek ideas and concepts into the literature of the period.25 Thus, claimed Schirrer, if the hellenization of the Jewish people ultimately failed, it was due to the over-zealous steps taken too hastily by Antiochus to advance this process, which lead in the end to the Hasmonean reaction. Ironically then, according to this line of thought Antiochus emerges as the one person responsible for saving Judaism.26

Countering this approach, one finds Tcherikover stressing two points: 1) much of the hellenizing process was confined to a particular class of Jews, namely the Jerusalem aristocracy and its peripheral elements; 2) the hellenization encountered and cited by scholars is frequently an external manifestation, serving political ends rather than reflecting deep-rooted cultural assimilation.27

These arguments were employed by Tcherikover in his attempt at solving the riddle posed by the very institution of religious persecution under Antiochus IV. As an exponent of Hellenistic polytheism, one might have expected Antiochus to reflect the tolerance characteristic of Greco-Roman culture. Various theories have been proposed on this issue,28 one of the most noted being Bickermann’s placing of the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Jewish leadership, i.e. Menelaus and the Jerusalem hierarchy.29 Common to all theories was the assumption that religious persecution served as the catalyst for the Jewish uprising. If, however, Tcherikover is correct in his reconstruction of the chronological sequence of events leading up to the Hasmonean uprising, it would appear that popular opposition to the hellenizing process had been seething for some time, and that with Antiochus’ retreat from Egypt in 168 this opposition broke out into open rebellion. After cruelly crushing this uprising, Antiochus followed through with the installation of gentile cults in Jerusalem, together with the placing of the Jewish religion outside of the law, and it was this that led to the rebellion of Mattathias and the Hasmonean family.30 Whether or not we accept this approach in its entirety, one result is beyond argument. The Hasmonean uprising set in motion a process that not only succeeded in destroying the hellenizing party in Jerusalem and effectively placing a halt to all further assimilation of the Jewish community into the surrounding Greek environment, but ultimately led to the creation of a national political entity, the Hasmonean state, that changed radically the course of Second Temple history.31

The Hasmonean Uprising

The goals of the Hasmonean uprising were either never definitively stated by its leaders, or — as is more likely — underwent constant revisions in response to Seleucid reaction, and in light of the opportunities that presented themselves at various stages of the Jewish-Greek confrontation. At its inception under Mattathias (d. 166/5 B.C.E.) the revolt was primarily aimed at achieving religious freedom and the restoration of traditional Jewish worship in Jerusalem. These aims are the central theme of statements attributed to Mattathias (1 Macc 2: 19-27), and were the immediate objectives of his son Judah (Maccabee),32 at least until the re-dedication of

23 Following the interpretation of Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization, 161, and 404-9.
24 Schirrer, History 1, 145.
25 id. 2, 52-80; see especially Hengel, Hellenism.
26 Schirrer, History 1, 145.
27 Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization, 1 18ff., 202ff.; compare Hengel, Hellenism 1, 299.
28 Cf. Tcherikover’s summary, Hellenistic Civilization, 175ff.
29 Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabder; for a detailed refutation of this theory see Heinemann, ‘Wer verfanlasse den Glaubenszwang’. Hengel concurs with much of Bickermann’s approach, but see Millar, ‘The Background’.
30 Cf. Tcherikover 186ff.; if accepted, this reconstruction would revolutionize our approach to the nature of the persecution, which now emerges far more as apolitical means for solving a state of unrest, rather than a cultural-religious act taken by the champion of hellenization. Compare, however, Schirrer, History 1, 15 1 ff. and note 37.
31 Stern, ‘The Hasmonean Revolt’.
32 Only Judah goes by this title in the sources; for the various suggestions on etymology cf. Schirrer, History 1, 158 n. 49.
the Temple in Kislev (December) 164 B.C.E.33 This having been achieved,34 there emerges a second stage of revolution, begun by Judah and carried forward by two of his brothers, Jonathan (160-142 B.C.E.) and Simon (142-135 B.C.E.).

In the immediate aftermath of the re-dedication of the Temple, Jews not only in Judaea but throughout Palestine (in particular in Galilee, Gilead, the Trans-Jordan and Idumea) found themselves confronting hostile neighbours bent on seizing the opportunity to attack these somewhat isolated Jewish communities. It is now for the first time that the Hasmonean brothers asserted themselves as defenders of the Jewish people at large, and not merely as local Judaean guerilla fighters. In a series of campaigns during the years 163-162, they clashed with various gentile populations outside of Judaea,35 at times limiting themselves to inflicting military blows on their opponents (but with no intention of permanent conquest), and in certain cases warranted by the precarious state of the local Jewish population (such as in Western Galilee and the Gilead) accompanying military activity with the removal of Jewish communities to a safe haven in Judaea. The effect of this activity was to establish the Hasmonean brothers as national leaders over much of Jewish Palestine, a situation unacceptable to the Seleucids. Subsequent attempts by the monarchy to subdue Judah were either thwarted by unrest in the Syrian capital,36 or met with defeat on the battlefield.37 These defeats notwithstanding, it now became clear to Judah that the Seleucid Empire was not about to willingly relinquish its hold over Palestine, and thus the second stage of the Hasmonean revolution — the quest for national independence — was fully initiated. The first step in this direction was the mutual defense treaty established between the Jews and the Roman Republic during the last year of Judah’s life (161 B.C.E.).38 The treaty served the interests of both parties; Rome had never recognized the legitimacy of the new Seleucid monarch, Demetrius I, and in any case was

33 Official Syrian recognition of Jewish control over the Temple, as well as the abrogation of religious persecution, was proclaimed only in a letter from the child-king Antiochus V to Lysias (2 Macc.11:22-26) but was in essence achieved by Judah with the conquest of Jerusalem in 164 B.C.E.
34 Judah’s early military victories (166-164 B.C.E.) all follow a similar pattern: Seleucid forces from outside of Judaea attempt to link up with the Greek garrison at Jerusalem, and Judah succeeds in surprising these forces at various sites along their marches towards the city. With the citizens of the surrounding Judaean hills supportive of Judah’s aims, there ensued a virtual Jewish siege of Jerusalem, ultimately enabling the Jewish leader to enter the city and re-establish traditional worship therein; cf. Avi-Yonah, ‘The Hasmonean Revolt’.
35 1 Macc. chap. 5; Ant. 12:327-53.
36 1 Macc. 6:28-63; Anti. 12:367-81.
37 1 Macc.7:26-50; 2 Macc. 15:1-39; Ant. 12:402-12; The defeat of Nikanor (13 Adur 161 B.C.E.) was established as a festival, with the event commemorated in Megillat Taaniz as ‘Nikanor’s Day’. Lichtenstein, ‘Die Fastenrolle’, 279-80, 346.
38 1 Macc. 8:23-32; Ant. 12:417-19.

interested in weakening the Syrian hold on the Near East, as witnessed by the earlier ultimatum preventing the Seleucid conquest of Egypt.” As for Judah, the pact effectively served as the first official recognition of developing Jewish independence, and must have also served as a tremendous boost of morale for obviously battle-weary Jewish soldiers. In any case, the authenticity of the document has generally been accepted by modern scholars,40 and Roman-Jewish friendship became a mainstay of Hasmonean policy almost until the conquest of the Hasmonean state itself by the Romans.41

The independence of Judaea was nevertheless far from established by the time of Judah’s death in battle,42 only a few months following the pact with Rome. It was left to the last of the Hasmonean brothers, Jonathan and Simon, to complete the process, and this was achieved not so much on the basis of military power, but rather thanks to ‘keen political acumen that took maximum advantage of the growing decay within the Seleucid Empire. Constant dissension within the royal family created a situation of perpetual contenders and pretenders to the throne, and the Hasmonean brothers found themselves in a unique situation of being courted by the various sides for their support, with concomitant promises of Syrian recognition and support in return for Hasmonean allegiance. Thus on the Feast of Tabernacles, 152 B.C.E., the first Hasmonean high priest, Jonathan, was installed by a pretender to the Syrian throne, Alexander Balas,43 and it was this recognition that convinced the King himself, Demetrius I, to make similar overtures. Against this background, the Hasmonean brothers were free to establish control over portions of Palestine beyond the borders of Judaea: Jonathan captured Jaffa for the first time, fought near Ashdod and received the city of Ekron from Alexander Balas. Some years later (following Balas’ defeat in 145) portions of southern Samaria were added to the growing Jewish territory.44 While Jonathan was executed by yet another Seleucid contender (Tryphon; 142 B.C.E.), Simon, the last of the Hasmonean brothers officially annexed Jaffa to the Judaeate state,45 and together with the conquest of Gezer,46 a-fortress controlling the road from Jerusalem to the newly established Jewish port, rendered the Jewish state a

40 Schürer, History 1, 171-13 and n. 33; Stern, Greek and Latin Authors 1, 342; Timpe, ‘Der römische Vertrag’.
42 1 Macc. 9
43 1 Macc 10: 18-20; Balas claimed to be the real son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.
44 Cf. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization, 235ff.; Schürer, History 1, 174-88 (Jonathan), 188-99 (Simon).
45 1 Macc 13: 11.
46 1 Macc.13:43ff.; the ‘siege-engines’ employed by Simon in this battle are evidence of the advances made by the Hasmonean army, slowly emerging as a major military force in the region.
viable economic as well as political entity. With the fall of the remaining Greek garrison (Hakra) in Jerusalem in 141 B.C.E. as well as the foregoing that year of all Jewish taxation on behalf of the Seleucid Empire, the Jewish state was an established reality. Diplomatic activity was enhanced, and in a great assembly on the Temple mount on the 18th of Elul 140 B.C.E. Simon and his sons were officially recognized by the Jewish people as high priests, political and military leaders 'until a faithful prophet should arise.' This last clause, stressing the provisional appointment of the Hasmoneans, may allude to a certain opposition to Hasmonean rule or priesthood among some elements of Jewish society, and the appearance of certain political groups on the Judean scene at this time is possibly an outgrowth of such opposition.

Beginning with the outbreak of the revolt at Modiin (1 Macc 2: 15-28) the Hasmonean family played a central role in Jewish history for over one hundred and twenty years. While the prior history of the family is unclear, the fact that it was descended from the priestly order of Joarib (1 Macc2: 1), listed first among the priestly families in 1 Chr 24: 7, must have rendered it a prominent family even before the uprising. Nevertheless, the ultimate establishment of the Hasmoneans as high priests was a departure from earlier Second Temple tradition, which linked the high priesthood with the 'sons of Zadok.' This is frequently cited as the catalyst for the establishment of a Sadducean party, stressing its own legitimacy as priests. In similar fashion, the Dead Sea sect placed great stress on the fact that within their ranks reside 'the sons of Zadok, the priests.'

In general, the ferment caused both by the hellenizing movements of the early second century B.C.E., as well as by the Hasmonean uprising and subsequent concentration of power in that family's hands, seems to have supplied the major impetus for the formation of various groups and sects within the Jewish community. Already in Judah's day we encounter the Hasidim, a group willing to make do with the religious freedoms regained in the early stages of the revolt, to the extent of embracing a Syrian-appointed high priest (Alkimos) ultimately responsible for their massacre. While these Hasidim may or may not be the 'plant root' which God caused 'to spring from Israel and Aaron to inherit his land' according to Daniel 9:24, it is generally accepted that Qumran was settled by the time of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 B.C.E.), and thus the origins of the sect probably date to the early Hasmonean period, with either Jonathan or Simon serving as 'the wicked priest called by the name of truth when he first arose.' Similarly, Josephus makes his earliest references to Pharisees and Sadducees, as well as Essenes, within the context of Jonathan's rule.

### The Hasmonean State

From the days of Simon on, the ideological platform upon which the Hasmonean state was founded was clear. In reply to the demands of the last powerful Seleucid monarch, Antiochus VII Sidetes, to return conquered territories, Simon proclaims: 'We have neither taken other men's land, nor hold that which appertaineth to others, but the inheritance of our fathers which our enemies had wrongfully in possession a certain time. Wherefore we, having opportunity, hold the inheritance of our fathers' (1 Macc 15:33-34). To be sure, the conquests of Simon did not effect major ethnic changes in the settlement of Palestine, and the Hasmonean state still was comprised primarily of the historical district of Judaea (Yehud), with the addition of Jaffa and Gezer in the west, as well as portions of the Jewish Trans-Jordan (Perea). Only following the death of Antiochus VII (129 B.C.E.), and during the reign of Simon's son John Hyrcanus I (135-104 B.C.E.) are we witness to the first stages of major territorial expansion. The brunt of Hyrcanus' attacks was felt by two ethnic groups in particular, the Samaritans and the Idumeans. The first community witnessed the destruction of its temple on Mount Gerizim, together with the conquest of Shechem, whereas the Idumeans were permitted to remain in their land after agreeing to undergo conversion to Judaism. Interestingly, this conversion had longlasting results, and with the subsequent conquest of Palestine by Pompey and removal of non-Jewish territory from the
remaining Jewish state.62 Eastern Idumaea nevertheless remained a part of Judaea. Needless to say, the most noteworthy consequence of the Idumean conversion was the subsequent introduction of the house of Antipater into the mainstream of Jewish affairs, but one might also take note of another prominent Idumean influence on later history, with the appearance of Idumean fighters among the most fanatical participants of the Great War against Rome.63 Inasmuch as the territory of the Hasmonean state under Hyrcanus was almost three times that of earlier Judaea, one can appreciate the demographic constraints that required such steps as mass conversion64 and one might also assume that certain elements of society were further alienated by such political realities. In addition, Hycranus appears to be the first Hasmonean ruler to have employed a gentile mercenary army,65 and a slow process of hellenization seems to have been introduced by this time into the new leadership of Judaea. Hints of this are apparent already in the proclamation appointing Simon and his sons,66 whereas Hycranus’ son Aristobulus I saw nothing wrong in attaching the title ‘Philhellenes’ to his name.67 The social unrest that resulted may serve to explain why Hycranus’ rule serves as the first major stage for divisions between Pharisees and Sadducees,68 with the Hasmonean ruler abandoning his traditional ties with the former party and joining forces with the latter. The Sadducee party would henceforth remain a major force on the political scene, until the last days of Hasmonean independence and the Pharisaic ressurgence under Queen Alexandra Salome (76-67 B.C.E.).69

The fall of the cities of Scythopolis and Samaria in the last days of John Hyrcanus paved the way for the Hasmonean conquest of Galilee, which was achieved in the brief rule of Hycranus’ son Aristobulus (104-103 B.C.E.).70 With this conquest, all of the Jewish territories of Palestine were incorporated into the Hasmonean state, and the massive territorial expansion under Hycranus’ successor Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.)71 was primarily at the expense of the Greek population of the land. By the end of his rule, almost all of the Greek cities along the coast of Palestine (save Acre and Ashkelon), as well as most of the Hellenistic cities of the Trans-Jordan (with the exception of Philadelphia) were annexed to the Hasmonean kingdom. Jannaeus’ successes were in no small part due not only to his military skills, but to the political constellation of the times, with a decaying Seleucid empire to the north,72 and a still powerful Ptolemaic ally to the south.73 The growing Nabatean encroachment into southern Palestine was another determining factor in Jannaeus’ military policy, and the Hasmonean conquest of Gaza after a particularly cruel siege may partly have been motivated by the wish to prevent the Nabateans from using the city as a major port.74 If internal dissension existed in earlier Hasmonean times, it developed into outright rebellion during the days of Jannaeus. Josephus attributes numerous acts of cruelty to the Hasmonean monarch, including the execution of 50,000 Jews in a period of six years.75 The ‘furious young lion’ reported in a Dead Sea scroll to have ‘executed revenge on seekers of smooth things’ and hung men alive,76 may refer to Jannaeus and to that king’s crucifixion of eight hundred Jews described by Josephus.77 Opposition to the Hasmonean monarchy and priesthood is attested in various apocryphal works, where ‘kings calling themselves priests of the
most high God’ are accused of ‘working iniquity in the Holy of Holies’ and are guilty of ‘laying waste the throne of David in tumultuous arrogance’. To be sure, the negative picture of the late Hasmonean period is not a completely objective one. Almost all the literary sources for the period derive from the opposition to the Hasmonean family, and even Josephus, who prides himself on his Hasmonean lineage, was forced by the paucity of sources to resort to a decidedly anti-Hasmonean historian, Nicolaus of Damascus, for a description of the last stages of Hasmonean rule.

Moreover, even Josephus seems to allude to a certain rapprochement between the nation and Jannaeus towards the latter’s final days. To his wife Salome (76-67 B.C.E.) Jannaeus bequeathed a kingdom embracing almost all of the biblical Land of Israel, as well as imparting to her the good advice to restore Pharisaic influence to the royal court, as a means of re-establishing popular support for the monarchy. Nothing, however, was capable of saving the Hasmonean state, whose days were numbered with the advance of Roman legions eastward. The civil war that erupted between Salome’s two sons, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, merely provided a pretext for subsequent Roman intervention into the affairs of Judaea, and in any case the ultimate fall of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. to the army of Pompey must be considered a foregone conclusion.

Nevertheless, the impact of Hasmonean rule in Palestine transcends the brief period of Jewish independence, and its social, cultural and religious consequences were of primary importance. Under the Hasmoneans the hellenization that had swept through much of the Near East encountered an opposing cultural phenomenon, and in the ensuing battle between the Greco-Syrian elements in Palestine and the Jewish nation, the latter emerged victorious to a large extent. While territorial conquests were torn away from Judaea by the Romans, the dominant ethnic and cultural community of the land remained the Jewish people, and this was destined to be the case for at least two more centuries, and in many ways through much of the late Roman and Byzantine periods as well.

78 Ass. Mos. 6: 1.
79 Psa. Sol. 17: 8. In both cases Herod, while himself cruel and ‘alien to our race’, nevertheless punishes his predecessors as they deserved.
80 Josephus, Life 2.
81 Cf. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors 1, 227ff. and in particular 230f.; id., ‘Nicolaus of Damascus’.
82 Ant. 13: 393-4; 398f.
83 Ant. 13: 400.
84 Ant. 14: 30f.
85 On the seeming contradiction between this process and the above-noted ‘hellenization’ of the Hasmoneans themselves, cf. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization, 264f.

Roman Rule in Judaea

The fall of Jerusalem to the armies of Pompey in 63 B.C.E. signifies the end of the independent Jewish state, and the Roman conqueror was now required to choose a system of government for the newly acquired territory. Numerous options existed, from the outright annexation of the country to the province of Syria, to the setting up of a vassal state to be run by a member of the Hasmonean family. In fact, the former option was applied to the majority of Greek cities throughout Palestine, but this system, it was felt, would be detrimental to the maintenance of peace within the Jewish portions of the land, given the unique nature of that population.

In general, Rome was not out to totally eradicate the Jewish nation, or even to abolish all existing Jewish political frameworks. The Jewish religion remained religio licita throughout almost all of Roman rule, and numerous attempts were made to grant the Jews of Palestine some semblance of self-rule. Certain principles of Roman rule in Palestine, however, begin to assert themselves almost immediately: a) whoever rules Judaea as a vassal king, prince or high priest — must bear total allegiance to Rome; b) any autonomous Jewish state will rule only over territory populated primarily by Jews (this principle was established by Pompey, but modified in later periods); c) the natural base of Roman rule throughout the East, and in Palestine as well, were to be the Greek cities, who were in Roman eyes the natural allies of Rome by virtue of their obvious cultural affinity. As noted above, this policy had far-reaching results in Judaea.

Based on the spirit of these principles, the arrangements under Pompey involved a total reorganization of the Jewish state. Almost all of Jannaeus’ conquests were torn from Judaea (as well as those non-Jewish territories annexed under his predecessors), and in Josephus’ words ‘the nation was confined within its own boundaries’. These boundaries included primarily Judaea, Galilee, Eastern Idumaea and the Jewish Trans-Jordan, and at their head Pompey reinstated Hyrcanus II as high priest, apparently adding to this the title of ‘Etharch’ (Ant. 20: 244), but abolishing the monarchy. The early history of this vassal state, however, makes it clear that the legacy of the Hasmoneans was not easily forgotten. Having succeeded in creating a unified Jewish state in much of Palestine, the Jewish population reacted violently to the attempt by Gabinius, a successor to Pompey and governor of Syria in 57-55 B.C.E., to divide the Jews of the land into five geographical and administrative units. The lesson was not lost on subsequent Roman rulers, and from the days of

86 War 1: 155-7; Ant. 14: 75-76.
89 War 1: 155; Ant. 14: 74.
90 War 1: 170; Ant. 14: 91; cf. Schürer, History 1, 268 n. 5.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Julius Caesar!" (48-44 B.C.E.) down to the destruction and beyond, the question of Jewish unity in the various territories of Palestine was never raised again.

Another and more pressing legacy of the Hasmonean period, however, was the unwillingness of major segments of the Jewish population to relinquish the political independence enjoyed during approximately eighty years of Hasmonean statehood. In this respect *Josephus* is justified in having a victorious Titus attack the Jews who ‘ever since Pompey reduced you by force never ceased from revolution’.96 Opposition to Rome, in fact, manifested itself in Judaea in one form or another from the earliest stages of Roman rule, and the various systems of government introduced by Rome into Palestine — from Pompey to the destruction of the Temple and the Bar-Kokhba war — all attest to the difficulties raised by the Roman-Jewish confrontation.

In general terms, Roman rule in late Second Temple Palestine may be divided into three major stages: 1) Vassal state under Hyrcanus II, 63-40 B.C.E.; 2) Herodian rule, 37 B.C.E. -6 C.E.; 3) Direct Roman rule, 6-66 C.E. (save for the brief reign of Agrippa I, 41-44 C.E.).

The first of these stages has been discussed briefly above, and what must be added here are two major phenomena. On the one hand, these years were constantly characterized by civil and political unrest, with the centre of dissent frequently focussing on the disenfranchised branch of the Hasmonean dynasty: Aristobulus II, the brother of Hyrcanus II; Aristobulus’ son Alexander; and during the Parthian invasion of the Near East yet another of Aristobulus’ sons, Antigonus. The latter was then briefly recognized by the Parthians — and enthusiastically by the Jews of Judaea — as the new Hasmonean monarch (40-38 B.C.E.).94 It was this phenomenon that probably disqualified the Hasmonean family from serving as future Roman vassals in the land.

91 Caesar’s benevolent attitude towards the Jews is attested in the decrees granting privileges to Jews both of Judaea and the diaspora, cf. *Ant*. 14:190-222; the well known statement of *Suetonius*, *Jul.* 84:5, regarding the extent of Jewish mourning over Caesar’s death, is just one of numerous allusions to this favourable relationship, cf. *Schermer*, *History* 1, 270-5.

92 *War* 6:329.

93 The following lines, far from being a detailed description of the period, are intended merely as an overview of certain central issues. For the vassal state in Judaea from Pompey to Herod cf. *Schermer*, *WHJP* 7, 34-59; *Schermer*, *History* 1, 267-86; *Smallwood*, *The Jews* 21-43; On the Herodian Period cf. *Jones*, *The Herods of Judaea*; *Schiirer*, *König Herodes*; *Schermer*, *History* 1, 287-357; *Smallwood*, *The Jews*. 44-119; *Stern*, ‘Herod’. For direct Roman rule, cf. *Smallwood*, *The Jews* 144-80, 256-92; *Schermer*, *History* 1, 357-98, 455-70; *Stern*, ‘The Province of Judaea’.

94 Beginning with this episode in Roman-Parthian affairs, and the short-lived Jewish independence reestablished by the Parthians, Jewish eyes in Palestine would henceforth turn eastwards, towards the Parthians in general and their brethren in that empire in particular, as a source for ultimate deliverance from Roman rule, cf. *War* 2:388-9, and compare *War* 6:343; cf. *Ghirshman*, *Iran*. 272; *Debevoise*, *A Political History of Parthia*, 93-95.


96 *Ant*. 15:22.


98 For a comprehensive discussion of the priestly nobility see: Jeremias, *Jerusalem*. 147-22; 1; *Schermer*, *History* 2, 227-91; *Stern*, ‘Aspects of Jewish Society’, 561-612; on the appointment of high priests in late Second Temple history, see also *Alon*, *Jews, Judaism*, 48ff.


100 Cf. *Smallwood*, ‘High Priests’.

101 Two significant examples of this phenomenon are the invitation addressed to a Babylonian-Jewish military leader, Zamaris, to settle with his countrymen in the north-eastern territories of Palestine (cf. *Ant*. 17:22-31), and the appearance of Hillel the Babylonian in Jerusalem.

At the same time, the idumean family of Antipater and his sons (Herod and Phasael) displayed unwavering loyalty to the various Roman rulers who successively laid claim to the eastern provinces (Pompey, Julius Caesar, Cassius, Mark Anthony, Octavian). It is therefore not surprising that with the Parthian retreat from Palestine and the fall of Antigonus, Herod — with the full backing of Anthony and the Roman legions, became the new vassal King of Judaea.

Herod’s rule (37-4 B.C.E.) in Jerusalem brought about one of the most pronounced social upheavals in all of Second Temple history.95 The elimination of the Hasmoneans as the dominant priestly family necessitated the creation of a new social aristocracy, one with no ties to the previous elite and that would also not pose a threat to the Herodian dynasty itself. The problem was particularly acute regarding the high priesthood, and here Herod solved the issue by turning to the diaspora. The high priesthood was first given to one Hananel of Babylon96 and then to a succession of priestly families from the Egyptian diaspora.97 The latter were by all means legitimate priests, but probably closely attuned to the Hellenistic tendencies of Herod himself. Beyond the introduction of new families, the innovation here was also in the idea that the high priesthood was no longer the sole possession of one family, transmitted from father to son, but rather an appointment to be decided by the monarch. What ensued from Herod’s reign was the creation of a priestly oligarchy,98 from whose ranks high priests might be chosen, and in general a decline in the prestige of the office, at least in the eyes of certain popular elements of Jewish society.99 It would be a mistake, however, to underestimate the power still wielded by the priests in the last generations of Second Temple history.100

In this context, Herod’s cultivation of diaspora Jewry in general is noteworthy, and manifests itself both in the encouragement of immigration to Judaea101 as well as Herod’s defense of the religious and civic rights of Jews in the Greek diaspora.102 That he was successful, for instance, in intervening on behalf of the Jews of Ionia, is primarily testimony to the
excellent relations maintained by Herod with the imperial court at Rome, whether Augustus himself or the commander of the Roman armies, Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa. This dual affinity of Herod’s to the Greco-Roman world on the one hand, and nevertheless to Jewish interests — in Jerusalem as well as the diaspora — on the other hand, is certainly a major factor in the paradoxical behaviour of the Judean monarch. The greatest contributor to Greek cities in Palestine, with his two major projects being the foundation of Cæsarea and Sebaste, was nevertheless commemorated in Talmudic literature for building ‘the Temple of Herod’. In sum, however, the tyrannical nature of Herod’s rule was its ultimate legacy: the same Talmudic text that praises him also stresses that he destroyed the Hasmonean family as well as the community of Sages (B. T. Bava Bathra 3b-4a), and his selling of Jews into slavery abroad must have alienated the vast majority of Jews, with no appeasement capable of winning their hearts. The author of the Assumption of Moses leaves no doubt as to popular sentiment towards Herod:

An insolent king will succeed them (the Hasmoneans), who will not be of the race of the priests, a man bold and shameless, and he will judge them as they shall deserve. And he will cut off their chief men with the sword, and will destroy them in secret places, so that no one may know where their bodies are. He will slay the young and the old, and he will not spare. The fear of him will be bitter unto them ...

during thirty and four years. (Ass. Mos. 6:2-6)

Herod’s success, in the long run, was in his capability of maintaining law and order, and thereby fulfilling the sine qua non required for Roman support. Upon his death in 4 b.c.e. it became abundantly clear that his chosen successor as king of Judæa, Archelaus, was incapable of maintaining this order. After ten years of disturbances and Jewish exhortations Judæa became a Roman province under direct Roman rule. What should not be overlooked, however, was that during this period of turbulence definite signs of eschatological expectations appear on the Judean scene. Various popular uprisings seem to be led at this time by figures of a particular social stratum and physical bearing, i.e. men of low rank graced with impressive physical strength, who — placing crowns on their head and proclaiming themselves kings — begin to attack Roman forces. Three such cases (Judah son of Ezekias, Simon, Athronges) all suggest a definite messianic zeal, and this phenomenon is not without parallel in the sicarii movement and its leadership in the last years of the Second Temple period.

With the introduction of direct Roman rule Judæa became a Roman province ruled by governors from 6–66 c.e. with the exception of the short reign of Agrippa I (41–44). Two major concentrations of Jewish population, however, remained beyond direct Roman rule for some time: Galilee and the Jewish Trans-Jordan remained part of the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas until 39 c.e., passing then into the hands of Agrippa I, and only upon the latter’s death in 44 were joined to the Judean province. In similar fashion the territories under Philip reverted upon his death in 34 to the Syrian province, in 37 to Agrippa, and finally to the province of Judæa.

In general, the status of Judæa in Roman eyes did not warrant its establishment as either a senatorial or imperial province, along the lines set up by Augustus. Due to its proximity to Syria and the major concentration of forces there, no discernible need existed for the dispatch of a legion to Judæa. Frequently, in fact, the Syrian governor was considered responsible for Judæan affairs, beginning with the census carried out under Quirinius with the setting up of the province, and up until the attempt by Cestius Gallus to quash the great Jewish rebellion in its early stages. As a result of this policy, the governors of Judæa were not of the highest Roman rank, but rather of the equites; their official title at first was procurator, and from the rule of Claudius (41 c.e.) it became, which indicates primarily an economic function.

The first stages of direct Roman rule in Judæa appear to have restored a measure of tranquillity to the land, and compared to Herodian times may have eased some tension. Before long, however, relations between the Jewish sector and the authorities deteriorated, beginning in the days of Pontius Pilate (26–36 c.e.) and getting progressively worse under the emperor Gaius Caligula (37–41 c.e.). The latter almost pushed the nation into outright rebellion with his demand that a statue be set up in the Jerusalem Temple, the affair being resolved only by his assassination.
the time of the last Roman governors, total anarchy seems to have prevailed in Judaea, and even Josephus who ordinarily refrains from blaming the Roman regime for the Jewish rebellion, makes no attempt to conceal his contempt for the last governors, in particular Gessius Florus.\footnote{The ‘Men of the Great Synagogue’ appear in rabbinic sources as a link in the chain of Jewish tradition, spanning the period between the prophets and the sages (M. Abot 1:1). Attributed to them in later rabbinic literature are the canonicization of portions of the Scriptures, establishment of certain prayers and benedictions, as well as the division of the oral Law into various categories; cf. Mantel, ‘The Nature of the Great Synagogue’, 69ff.; id. in WHJP, 44-52. For further discussion see Kraus, ‘The Great Synod’; Engleman, ‘The Men of the Great Synagogue’; Finkelstein, The Men of the Great Synagogue.\footnote{For example, Ant. 12:138; on the change in the status of the gerousia under the Hasmoneans cf. Stern, Documents, 34.}\footnote{The most comprehensive compilation of the material is Mantel, Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin; see also Schürer, History 2, 199ff.}\footnote{Ant. 14:168ff. The term appears first in Josephus in connection with the attempts by Gabinius to divide Judaea into five synhedria, cf. Ant. 14:91.}\footnote{For the trial of James see Ant. 20:200.}\footnote{See for example Josephus, Life 62, where the Sanhedrin serves as the governing body of Jews at the outset of the Great Revolt, instructing Josephus as commander of Galilee.}\footnote{Cf. Alon, The Jews in their Land, 187-8.}\footnote{T. Hagigah 2:9; T. Sanhedrin 7:2.}\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 210ff.}\\\footnote{\textsuperscript{113} War 2:278; it is worth noting that during the reign of Claudius there was a marked change in the ethnic origin of officials in the Roman administration of Judaea. At least three of the last seven governors were of Greek or Eastern origin (as opposed to governors of Latin origin in the earlier period). This helps to explain the consistent support of Greek-Syrian elements displayed by the last governors, a phenomenon that contributed in no small measure to the strained relations between the authorities and the Jewish population.}\footnote{ Cf. Safran, ‘Jewish Self-Government’.
\footnote{On the Temple and its place in Jewish life cf. Safran, in WHJP 7, 284-337; see also Flusser, WHJP 8, 17-19; Schürer, History 2, 237-33.}\footnote{Ant. 12:136; for the inference here cf. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors 1, 114, note to line 136.}\footnote{Cf. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors 1, 28.}}

Institutions and Parties in Second Temple Judaea

The Roman conquest notwithstanding, considerable autonomy in local affairs as well as non-intervention in the religious life of the Jewish people was characteristic of much of the period under discussion.\footnote{Cf. Mantel, ‘The Nature of the Great Synagogue’, 69ff.; id. in WHJP, 44-52.} Needless to say, much of this activity centered around the Temple and Jerusalem, which, beginning with the days of Persian rule over Yehud, remained a focal point of Jewish existence.\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} By early Hellenistic times the Jews were commonly identified with Jerusalem, to the extent that Polybius could refer to them as those ‘living about the Temple of Jerusalem’.\footnote{Ant. 14:168ff. The term appears first in Josephus in connection with the attempts by Gabinius to divide Judaea into five synhedria, cf. Ant. 14:91.} As a result, the various components of Jewish leadership, and even those not of a strictly religious or ritualistic nature, nevertheless found themselves linked to Jerusalem. The most obvious of these elements was the high priesthood, which remained the central office within Jewish society throughout the Second Temple period. Not only was the high priest responsible for Temple ritual, but during much of the period he served as the political representative of the nation, and frequently as an economic functionary, responsible for the collection of taxes. Thus there emerged in the early Hellenistic period an impression of the Jewish people as a nation ruled by priests, spelled out in detail by Hecataeus of Abdera.\footnote{E.g. Ant. 12:138; on the change in the status of the gerousia under the Hasmoneans cf. Stern, Documents, 34.}\footnote{The most comprehensive compilation of the material is Mantel, Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin; see also Schürer, History 2, 199ff.}\footnote{Ant. 14:168ff. The term appears first in Josephus in connection with the attempts by Gabinius to divide Judaea into five synhedria, cf. Ant. 14:91.}\footnote{For the trial of James see Ant. 20:200.}\footnote{See for example Josephus, Life 62, where the Sanhedrin serves as the governing body of Jews at the outset of the Great Revolt, instructing Josephus as commander of Galilee.}\footnote{Cf. Alon, The Jews in their Land, 187-8.}\footnote{T. Hagigah 2:9; T. Sanhedrin 7:2.}\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 210ff.} By the late Second Temple period the existence of yet another institution is beyond doubt. An abundance of sources refer to the Sanhedrin from the first stages of Roman rule in Judaea, with the first clear allusion to a trial before that body being the case of Herod, a young governor of Galilee under Hircanus II and accused of murder.\footnote{Cf. Stern, Documents, 34.}\footnote{The most comprehensive compilation of the material is Mantel, Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin; see also Schürer, History 2, 199ff.}\footnote{Ant. 14:168ff. The term appears first in Josephus in connection with the attempts by Gabinius to divide Judaea into five synhedria, cf. Ant. 14:91.}\footnote{For the trial of James see Ant. 20:200.}\footnote{See for example Josephus, Life 62, where the Sanhedrin serves as the governing body of Jews at the outset of the Great Revolt, instructing Josephus as commander of Galilee.}\footnote{Cf. Alon, The Jews in their Land, 187-8.}\footnote{T. Hagigah 2:9; T. Sanhedrin 7:2.}\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 210ff.} Later trials appear in the New Testament, in relation to Jesus (Mark 14:53ff.), Peter (Acts 4) and Paul (Acts 22:30ff.).\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} Common to Josephus and the New Testament is the depiction of the Sanhedrin primarily as a tribunal and political body,\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} with the high priest serving in some major capacity. The rabbinic sources, on the other hand, frequently refer to the Sanhedrin (or ‘The Great Court’ and a variety of other names)\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} as a legislative body comprised of 70 or 71 elders, ‘from whence halakah goes out to Israel’.\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} Beyond those scholars who simply reject the historicity of one set of sources or another,\footnote{Cf. Schürer, History 2, 199ff.} various theories have been proposed to reconcile the different descriptions. Some...
have suggested concomitant bodies functioning alongside each other in Jerusalem,\(^{128}\) while others have postulated a change in the nature and composition of the institution reflecting the political vicissitudes of the different periods.\(^{129}\)

This last theory in particular takes into account the ongoing tension between the various sects and parties in Second Temple Judaism, a phenomenon discussed briefly above. As for the institutions in Jerusalem, the prolonged struggle between Pharisees and Sadducees could not help but make itself felt in almost all areas of religious and political activity. While the Pharisees never encouraged a total removal from Temple worship, their opposition to the Sadducean control of that Temple nothwithstanding, it is a fair guess to assume that the growing stress on the reading and preaching of the Torah in synagogues served as a major vehicle for enhancing the independent status of the Sages.\(^{130}\) In the Temple itself numerous disputes erupted between proponents of the two groups, or more precisely between the priestly oligarchy given to Sadducean influence and the gathered masses supporting Pharisaic tradition. These disputes, needless to say, might have been rooted in the major distinction between the two groups, with the Pharisees 'passing on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses' (i.e. Oral Tradition) while the Sadducees considered valid only those regulations written down.\(^{131}\) Certain disputes, nevertheless, must have also reflected social and political tensions between the groups.\(^{132}\)

**Opposition to Rome and the Great Revolt**

Pharisees and Sadducees chose to remain, and frequently clash, within the mainstream of Jewish life. At the same time, certain segments of society appear to have opted for a preparation towards the future, and a distinct apocalyptic fervour emerges towards the latter part of the Second Temple period.\(^{133}\) This eschatological expectation of cataclysmic events and the 'end of days' need not, in and of itself, have required one to sever all ties with society. Most certainly such phenomena as the anticipation of a messianic deliverance had been widely accepted by a broad spectrum of Jews.\(^{134}\) In this context, the Qumran community seems to have taken a more radical approach, believing that only those who prepare themselves totally for this event will ultimately share in its fruits; hence the well-known break of this group from the rest of society, their total separation 'from all perverse men who walk in the ways of wickedness' and their removal into the wilderness.\(^{135}\) While the numerous components of apocalyptic and oracular literature, as well as the particular theology of the Qumran sect, will be dealt with in subsequent chapters of this volume, the political aspect of these eschatological hopes must be stressed here, because it had an immediate impact on Jewish history in the last days of the Second Temple. As noted above, the Roman conquest in general, and in particular the turbulent days in Judaea following Herod's death, were an ideal setting for the propagation of beliefs regarding an imminent deliverance from the yoke of foreign conquest. Indeed, that messianic overtones are discernible within the anti-Roman movement appears beyond doubt. Josephus, who commonly refrained from alluding to messianic expectations, states openly that what aroused the rebels to take up arms 'was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from this country would become ruler of the world'.\(^{136}\) These hopes hardly remained secret. Even Tacitus reports that in the priestly writings of the Jews there was a prophecy 'that this was the very time when the East would grow strong and that men starting from Judaea would possess the world'.\(^{137}\)

In stressing this undercurrent of Jewish sentiment, however, one point must not be overlooked. Jewish opposition to Rome was far from united under one common banner or ideology. One of the striking aspects of the movement is the bitter fratricide that ensues almost until the fall of the Temple itself.\(^{138}\) In describing the various groups, Josephus appears to...

\(^{128}\) In particular Büchler, Das Synedrium; Mantel, Studies, 6:1-101.

\(^{129}\) Cf. Alon, The Jews in their Land, 185-205.

\(^{130}\) For the Synagogue and its place in Second Temple history see Safrai, in WHJP 8, 65-98; id., 'Temple', 908-44.


\(^{132}\) Cf. Marcus, 'The Pharisees'. However, this does not warrant the relegation of the Pharisees as a whole to the social class of 'urban Plebeians'; see Finkelstein, The Pharisees, 13. The literature on Pharisees and Sadducees is enormous, and to a degree reflects the source problem cited above regarding the Sanhedrin. In this case Josephus stresses the 'philosophical' differences between the groups (War 2:162-6; Ant. 13:171-3; 297-8; 18:11-18); the New Testament is interested primarily in the groups as background for presenting the early Christian message (cf. Neusner, From Politics to Piety, 67-80); whereas the Rabbis were obviously interested in legal traditions over which differences existed, although it would be mistaken to overlook the numerous rabbinic references to disputes of a theological nature. For a bibliography on Pharisees and Sadducees cf. Schriner, History 2, 38 l-2.

\(^{133}\) The phenomenon itself, of course, is apparent throughout Second Temple history; cf. Charles, Eschatology; Russell, The Message.

\(^{134}\) Cf. Schürer, History 2, 505-13; even one as moderate as Philo was party to such hopes, see War, Philo 2, 395-426.

\(^{135}\) Qumran sect, 1QS 13:9; 19:20.

\(^{136}\) War 6:3.12.

\(^{137}\) See also Suetonius, Vespasian 4.5; 'there had spread all over the orient an old and established belief that it was fated at that time for men coming from Judaea to rule the world.' On these prophecies cf. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors 2, 61-2.

\(^{138}\) For various theories on the nature and identity of the different movements see: Farmer. Maccabees: Hengel, Die Zeloten; Smith, 'Zealots and Sicarii'; Appelbaum, 'The Zealots'; Stern, 'Zealots'; id., in WHJP 8, 263-301, 374-7; Rhodeis, Israel in Revolution.
The implication cf. joined these ranks somewhat if Josephus’ account is to be trusted Simon bar Giora. To be sure, the have rule as governor of Galilee, through the leadership of Judah For recent studies on John of Gischala see Rappaport, ‘John of Gischala’. The proponents of this theology, which Cf. But obviously these were only the last overt expressions of an and the sacking of the Temple by Florus one Given the variety of personal I. Whereas, however, these groups were joined by a variety of anti-Roman ele-
ments, initially the Idumeans, and after the fall of Galilee in autumn of 67, raised a radical social banner as well, and in the course of the early fighting in Jerusalem they set fire to the municipal archives ‘eager to destroy the money-lender’s bonds and to prevent the recovery of debts, in order to win over a host of grateful debtors, and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich’.142 To be sure, the sicarii appear in Jerusalem at the very beginning of the war in 66, but were turned away by the local Zealot movement, with many of its members, among them Menahem, killed. Remants of the group retreated to Masada, where they were destined to live out the war until 74, when, having conquered the rest of the land, Roman forces finally confronted them, precipitating — if Josephus’ account is to be trusted — one of the epic and tragic episodes of ancient Jewish history.143

In contrast to the sicarii, the Zealots appear in Josephus’ account primarily as the Jerusalemite rebels, headed by several members of the priesthood, and with their major stronghold the Temple itself. During the war, however, these groups were joined by a variety of anti-Roman elements, initially the Idumeans, and after the fall of Galilee in autumn of 67, distinguish between a Galilean element the roots of which go back to the early days of Roman rule, and the later rebels who appear on the Jerusalem scene with the outbreak of hostilities in 66 C.E., and are commonly referred to by Josephus as ‘Zealots’.

The former group, Josephus claims, established a clearcut ideology of rebellion, as a reaction to the census of Quirinius: ‘They said that the assessment carried with it a status amounting to downright slavery, and appealed to the nation to make a bid for independence’.139 The implication of ‘slavery’ here has a decidedly religious overtone, and in this respect the ideology of the revolt assumed a religious motivation: ‘They have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master’.140 The proponents of this theology, which in effect raised the idea of political independence to a religious plane, are frequently designated as sicarii by Josephus. Rooted in Galilee, they were associated with a family of rebels, beginning with Ezekias in the days of young Herod’s rule as governor of Galilee, through the leadership of Judah the Galilean (possibly the son of Ezekias), and down to the third and fourth generations of that family during the Great War. This attachment to a dynasty of sorts manifests itself with the appearance of yet another member of the family, Menahem, who appears in Jerusalem at the outset of the Great War as a sort of king,141 and it is a reasonable assumption that messianic hopes were attached to his person. This party seems to have raised a radical social banner as well, and in the course of the early fighting in Jerusalem they set fire to the municipal archives ‘eager to destroy the money-lender’s bonds and to prevent the recovery of debts, in order to win over a host of grateful debtors, and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich’.142 To be sure, the sicarii appear in Jerusalem at the very beginning of the war in 66, but were turned away by the local Zealot movement, with many of its members, among them Menahem, killed. Remants of the group retreated to Masada, where they were destined to live out the war until 74, when, having conquered the rest of the land, Roman forces finally confronted them, precipitating — if Josephus’ account is to be trusted — one of the epic and tragic episodes of ancient Jewish history.143

In contrast to the sicarii, the Zealots appear in Josephus’ account primarily as the Jerusalemite rebels, headed by several members of the priesthood, and with their major stronghold the Temple itself. During the war, however, these groups were joined by a variety of anti-Roman elements, initially the Idumeans, and after the fall of Galilee in autumn of 67, distinguished between a Galilean element the roots of which go back to the early days of Roman rule, and the later rebels who appear on the Jerusalem scene with the outbreak of hostilities in 66 C.E., and are commonly referred to by Josephus as ‘Zealots’.

The former group, Josephus claims, established a clearcut ideology of rebellion, as a reaction to the census of Quirinius: ‘They said that the assessment carried with it a status amounting to downright slavery, and appealed to the nation to make a bid for independence’.139 The implication of ‘slavery’ here has a decidedly religious overtone, and in this respect the ideology of the revolt assumed a religious motivation: ‘They have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master’.140 The proponents of this theology, which in effect raised the idea of political independence to a religious plane, are frequently designated as sicarii by Josephus. Rooted in Galilee, they were associated with a family of rebels, beginning with Ezekias in the days of young Herod’s rule as governor of Galilee, through the leadership of Judah the Galilean (possibly the son of Ezekias), and down to the third and fourth generations of that family during the Great War. This attachment to a dynasty of sorts manifests itself with the appearance of yet another member of the family, Menahem, who appears in Jerusalem at the outset of the Great War as a sort of king,141 and it is a reasonable assumption that messianic hopes were attached to his person. This party seems to have raised a radical social banner as well, and in the course of the early fighting in Jerusalem they set fire to the municipal archives ‘eager to destroy the money-lender’s bonds and to prevent the recovery of debts, in order to win over a host of grateful debtors, and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich’.142 To be sure, the sicarii appear in Jerusalem at the very beginning of the war in 66, but were turned away by the local Zealot movement, with many of its members, among them Menahem, killed. Remants of the group retreated to Masada, where they were destined to live out the war until 74, when, having conquered the rest of the land, Roman forces finally confronted them, precipitating — if Josephus’ account is to be trusted — one of the epic and tragic episodes of ancient Jewish history.143

In contrast to the sicarii, the Zealots appear in Josephus’ account primarily as the Jerusalemite rebels, headed by several members of the priesthood, and with their major stronghold the Temple itself. During the war, however, these groups were joined by a variety of anti-Roman elements, initially the Idumeans, and after the fall of Galilee in autumn of 67,
role for the synagogue, and in similar fashion leadership passed to a great extent from priests to Sages. These new elements of religious expression and authority, synagogue and Sages, ultimately served as geographically decentralizing factors within the Jewish community. The leadership framework set up at Yavneh following the destruction, while taking care to stress continuity with Jerusalem, nevertheless served as a model for subsequent institutions, whether in other parts of Israel, particularly Galilee, or throughout the diaspora in a later stage. The argument for viewing the destruction as the beginning of Jewish *galut* (exile) commonly stresses the mobility of these new institutions, which assured a slow but definite centrifugal process leading away from one recognized centre, be it the Land of Israel in general, or Jerusalem in particular. Certainly, Jews living in the first centuries after the destruction tended to distinguish between two eras in Jewish history: ‘the time of the Temple — and that of no Temple’, with the latter being referred to as ‘this era’ (זאת תקופת העדה). Nevertheless, the very fact that no major mass exodus of Jews followed the destruction, coupled with an awareness that the major components of Jewish authority, the Patriarchate and the body of rabbis that functioned alongside that office, continued to be based in the Land of Israel for generations after the events of 70 C.E. — all this suggests that a distinction must be drawn between the creation of a potentially decentralized Judaism, and the outright commencement of *galut itself.\(^{152}\)

While the number of Jews who died during the Great War was by all accounts exceedingly high, the spiritual devastation felt by the survivors was no less acute, and this emerges from a wide variety of sources. Among the last apocalyptic books written by Jews and included in the corpus of apocryphal and pseudopigraphal literature are works such as 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, both written in the immediate aftermath of the destruction. The lamentation expressed in these works is accompanied by serious questions regarding the meaning of Jewish existence without a temple (e.g. 2 Baruch 30-31).

---

150 See Neusner, ‘A Life’, pp. 196-199 for a summary of the advantages of Pharisaic leadership created by the destruction. On the nature of the transformation within rabbinic leadership following the destruction see Urbach, ‘Class-Status’.


152 For an excellent exposition of this Hebrew term and its implications in Jewish history, see Ben-Sasson, *Galut*.
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154 E.g. M. *Hullin* 5: 1.
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commission a new translation of the Bible into Greek, namely that of Aquila. Clearly, those rabbis of Palestine who are mentioned in connection with this project — R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, R. Joshua b. Hananiah and R. Akiva — must have had the needs of Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman diaspora in mind. But this endeavour, which succeeded to a certain degree in replacing the Septuagint as the commonly accepted text among Greek-speaking Jews, also reflects on another issue which Yavnean leadership seems to have taken up. If the Septuagint had fallen into disfavour in rabbinic eyes, one major reason was the fact that it had evolved into the widely accepted version of the growing Christian community.

One of the major tasks taken up by the leadership of the Yavneh generation appears to be a redefinition of the boundaries of the Jewish community, slowly leading up to a negation of the very legitimacy of sectarian Judaism. In this context one might view the period between the two great revolts in terms of Jewish-Christian relations as transitory. In Palestine the issue was not yet one of confrontation between two distinct communities, but rather one of formulating a policy towards Jewish-Christians. While not all minim (heretics) in rabbinic literature are Judaean-Christians, it is a fair assumption that the formulation of the birkat ha-minim and its insertion into the main prayer at the initiative of Gamaliel 11.15 part of a process of isolating and declaring against the legitimacy of Jewish-Christianity.

While the term ‘normativization’ may be a bit extreme in defining the process of consolidation that Judaism underwent following the destruction, there is an undeniable feeling that concerted efforts were being made to minimize further fragmentation of the Jewish community. This tendency is particularly manifest in the realm of rabbinic literature and the history of halukhah. The opening statement of Tosefta Eduyt (1:1) is frequently cited in this context: ‘When the Sages entered the vineyard of Yavneh, they said: A time shall come when man shall seek a word of Torah and not find it, a word of the scribes and not find it. , , for one precept of the Torah shall not be like another. They declared: Let us begin with Hillel and similarly that various Sages accept the ruling of the Patriarch.

It is, of course, difficult to appraise how successful all these efforts were at immediately effecting a more cohesive Jewish community. Two great Jewish revolts were to follow the destruction of the Second Temple by no more than one and a half generations: the Jewish uprising under Trajan (114-117 CE) which engulfed major segments of the Jewish community in Egypt, Nort Africa (Cyrene), Cyprus, Mesopotamia and possibly (albeit to a lesser degree) Judaea and the Bar-Kokhba uprising in Judaea itself (132-135). Whether the initial successes of these wars, particularly of the Bar-Kokhba uprising, attest to the degree of Jewish consolidation achieved by the sages of Yavneh is still a matter for scholarly debate. What cannot be denied is the crucial role of the first generation of Sages following the destruction in overcoming the initial trauma, as well as redefining and passing on to subsequent generations much of what ultimately came to be recognized as historic post-Temple Judaism.
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