JUDAISM (GRECO-ROMAN PERIOD)


Tiede, D. 1972. The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker. SBLDS 1. Missoula.


J. Andrew Overman
William Scott Green

PALESTINIAN JUDAISM

Judaism emerged in Palestine during the period following the return from Babylonian exile in 538 B.C.E., and Palestine remained a center of the religious, cultural, and intellectual development of Judaism for centuries. The chronology of Judaism’s development in Palestine can be broadly outlined. The textual sources for emerging and developing Judaism can be categorized by type. And the major issues which united and divided Jews in this period can be examined as evidence of the unity and diversity of Palestinian Judaism.
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A. Chronology

1. Where to Begin. While the idea of “Judaism” as denoting the way of life of the Jewish people or a portion thereof is traditionally traced back to the revelation of the Torah to the Israelites at Mount Sinai in the time of Moses, historically it can be traced back only to the period following the return from the Babylonian Exile in 538 B.C.E., commonly referred to as the Second Temple period. While the Greek term θουασία for Jews (rather than simply Judaism) is first attested in inscriptions from the 3rd century B.C.E. in Ptolemaic Egypt, the Greek term θουασίασιν, from which the English “Judaism” derives and for which there is no ancient Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent, is not attested until the 2nd century B.C.E. Then it first appears in the context of recounting the struggle, internal as well as external, between Judaism and Hellenism during the Maccabean Revolt of 167–164 (2 Macc 2:21; 8:1; 14:38). Although the history of Judaism is very much rooted in the Hebrew Bible, it is neither synonymous nor simply continuous with that text. Rather, the matrix of beliefs, practices, and institutions that comes to define the subsequent history of Judaism in all its diversity may be said first to recog-
nizable shape in the context and as a consequence of the extended and complex encounter between Israelite society and the broader international cultural matrix we call Hellenism.

That encounter was to have a deep impact on virtually every aspect of Jewish society and culture, albeit to varying extents in different locations and at different socioeconomic strata. Its beginnings may be dated roughly to the conquest by Alexander the Great in 331 B.C.E. of Palestine and the surrounding Mediterranean lands in which Israelite diasporic communities were already found or soon to be established. That historical juncture, more simply denoted as the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.E., marks therefore the opening bracket of the present survey, even though the preceding period will be regarded as its backdrop.

2. **Where to End.** The concluding historical bracket for present purposes is more difficult to determine. Postbiblical Judaism was not consolidated, in relative terms to be sure, until the emergence of the rabbinic movement as the dominant religious force in Jewish society in the centuries following the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. That process of transformation had roots in the period preceding the destruction and was accelerated as one of its consequences; but it only comes to literary expression in the 3rd century C.E., starting at the beginning of that century with the "publication" by Rabbi Judah the Patriarch of the Mishnah, a pedagogic digest of rabbinic rules (halakah) accompanied at times by exemplifying narratives (aggadah). While both those rules and narratives may derive from the actual teachings and deeds of sages of the preceding centuries, in their present rhetorical configuration they attest most directly to the social and intellectual agenda of the early 3rd century patriarchate in its program of solidifying the rabbinic class and extending its influence into the larger Jewish society of Palestine in a lesser extent, the Diaspora, to the Jewish diaspora, notwithstanding resistance from within and without rabbinic circles.

The ancillary, less-tightly structured Tosefta, or supplement, to the Mishnah not only gives us a sense of the Mishnah’s high degree of rhetorical redaction, but also of the extent to which its succinct laws and narratives required the amplification of interpretation. In other words, most of what we think we know of the lives and teachings of the mishnaic sages known as the tannaim (first 2 centuries C.E.) has been filtered through the works of the post-mishnaic amoraim (3rd through 4th centuries C.E. in Palestine). The same can be said for the other major rabbinic constructions of the 3rd century, those being the earliest collections of rabbinic scriptural commentary or midrash (the Meilat, the Sifra, and the Sifrei); while incorporating traditional raw materials with long prehistories, they conform them according to the pedagogical plans and purposes of those 3rd-century documents.

We therefore have virtually no internal or external direct witnesses to Judaism of Palestine between the year 90 C.E. and the early 3rd century (the major exception being the letters and other archaeological finds associated with the rebel leader Bar Kokhba/Kosiba from around 132-135 C.E.). If we wish to look critically at post-Temple Judaism we must extend our sights into the early and mid 3rd century C.E., from whence our first literary evidence de-
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it was a shocking repudiation of the very hope that an end to the present order of foreign domination could be expected soon or could be hastened by human acts on the political plane of history. The tragic consequences of the Bar Kokhba revolt were to be a major contributing factor in the full-fledged emergence of rabbinic Judaism, both socially and literally, during the next century.

B. Nature of the Extant Sources

Our ability to describe ancient Judaism of Palestine, both in its overall character and in its more specific varieties, is severely hampered by the nature of our ancient sources. The difficulties of using rabbinic writings, the earliest of which can be dated in the 3rd century c.e., to reconstruct the history of Judaism in the period of the Second Temple have already been noted. In the Second Temple period itself, there is a rich abundance of Jewish sources of diverse types and from a variety of socioreligious perspectives, yet these do not make historical reconstructions less complex: These very differences in perspective produce pictures that are often in discord with one another when they overlap and that leave gaping holes when they do not. These sources are mainly literary and can be divided among 3 types of "authorship": (1) works of named individuals, (2) ideological expressions of an identifiable group, and (3) writings pseudopeigraphically attributed to a biblical seer.

1. Individually Authored Writings. In the first category are works by only two known Palestinian Jewish authors: the early 3rd century B.C.E. wisdom collection of Yeshua Ben Sira (included in the Apocrypha), and the late 1st century C.E. Jewish history (Antiquitates Judaeas), account of the revolt of 70 C.E. (Bello Judaeo), defense of Judaism (Contra Aponem), and autobiography (Vita) of Flavius Josephus (37-ca. 100 C.E.). Josephus, although he lived most of his life in Palestine, produced all of his works in Rome, in part under Roman patronage and largely as apologia, whether for Rome's conduct in the war, for his own conduct in the same, or for Judaism against pagan vilification.

These two writers, while having lived in very different times and having produced very different types of writings, had much in common: They were both members of a priestly, aristocratic, significantly Hellenized, and politically active Jewish intelligentsia, and considered themselves to have been divinely inspired mediators of Israel's scriptures, teachings, and history to their respective times of transition. Ben Sira gives a firsthand view of Hellenized scribal wisdom during the seeming calm before the Maccabean storm. Josephus provides the sole continuous narrative history of postbiblical Judaism, drawing upon extensive Jewish and Roman sources as well as personal experience. In seeking to extend the story of Israel from its biblical beginnings into his own stormy time, Josephus draws his models from the conventions of non-Jewish Greco-Roman historiography. In the course, however, he provides extensive descriptions of the major varieties of Judaism of the period between the Maccabean Revolt and the destruction of the Temple.

For both Ben Sira and Josephus, it is difficult to determine to what extent their writings are broadly representative of Jewish society and culture of their times, or to what degree they are limited by the skewed vantage of their particular personal, political, or social circumstances. For example, when Ben Sira (38:24-39:11) provides a glowing encomium to the sagely Jewish scribe (our only such ancient description) as one who is financially independent enough to devote himself to piety, learning, worldliness, and political influence, is he describing himself; the scribal class of his time; or some ideal type? Similarly, given Ben Sira's strong priestly proclivities, are we to assume a close if not inseparable link between Jewish scribalism and the priesthood in his time or only in himself?

Likewise with respect to Josephus, on whom modern historians are so dependent in reconstructing so many aspects of Jewish history and Judaism of late Second Temple times: To what extent are his schematic portrayals of Judaism's 3 or 4 "philosophies" or "schools" (baraites), as he calls them (JW 2:119-66; Ant 13:171-73; 18:11-25; Life 10-12), colored by his desire to present Judaism in philosophical terms attractive to a Hellenized audience (whether Jewish or non-Jewish)? Does he wish to suggest apologetically that all of the respectable Greco-Roman philosophical currents of his time can be found among the one people, or to argue polemically on behalf of one of those philosophies, namely the Pharisees, as the most attractive and responsible occupiers of the moderate middle way? Similarly, to what extent may Josephus' portrayals of the various Jewish nationalistic insurrectionists of the 1st century C.E.—groups for whom we have hardly any other sources—be taken at face value? This applies especially to those involved in the revolt of 70 C.E. To what extent should Josephus' view be tempered in light of his desire to remove blame for the failed revolt and its disastrous consequences from Rome, the Jews as a whole, or from himself, and place it squarely on these irrational hotheads?

2. Writings of an Identifiable Group. In the first category there are only two named Jewish individuals whose works have been preserved, in the second category there is only one Second Temple Jewish group whose own writings have survived. That is the community at Qumran, usually identified with, or at least thought to be a part of, the Essene movement, long known secondarily from ancient sources (Josephus, Philo of Alexandria, and Pliny), but whose own writings, included among the Dead Sea Scrolls, have only recently come to the light of scholarship and publication. Which of these scrolls are the product of, and therefore directly reflective of, this community, its history, practices, and ideology, and which were simply preserved in their library, the products of different times or groups? Turning to these scrolls for which there is a consensus that they are indeed "sectarian," to what extent are their representations of the past events and present practices of the Qumran community to be trusted, and to what extent are they idealized or stylized projections either from present self-understandings to past origins, or from future expectations to present circumstances?

The difficulties in employing the specifically "sectarian" Dead Sea Scrolls for historiographic purposes apply not only to our reconstruction of the Judaism of the Qumran community itself and its satellite "camps," but also to our understanding of Second Temple Judaism more generally. Since the Qumran community is the only Second Temple group from which we have substantial firsthand data, it
tempting (indeed often necessary) to extrapolate from it to other varieties of ancient Judaism, or to the overall character of Jewish life and institutions, about which we have much less direct evidence. Yet given the highly rhetorical and introverted nature of these writings, such extrapolation poses great difficulties. To what extent should we presume that this group defines the nature of Jewish “sectarianism” more generally? For example, might we surmise that other such groups (Pharisees and early followers of Jesus) were similarly organized or similarly viewed themselves in absolute distinction from those outside their community and from the institutions centered in the Temple? To what extent can we use these scrolls’ denigrative symbolic allusions to other groups (perhaps the Pharisees and the Sadducees) to inform us of the nature of those groups? To what extent can we infer the nature of “normative” Jewish practice (to the extent that such existed, at least in the Temple and under the influence of its priesthood) from the community’s self-defining repudiation of those practices?

3. Pseudepigraphic Writings. The third type of literary sources, of which we have the largest number, are those that are attributed to a venerated biblical authority (e.g., Enoch, Abraham, the 12 patriarchs, Moses, Solomon, Baruch, Daniel, Ezra). Such a pseudepigraphic writing may convey an account of a heavenly vision (apocalypse) or divine revelation which was couched in a biblical phrase, perhaps hinted at but never fully recorded in what came to be considered canonical Scriptures. Or it may convey the unrecorded final words (testament) of exhortation and prediction of a biblical patriarch to his biological or spiritual progeny. For these works, we know the identities neither of their historical authors nor of their historical communities of “readers.” To the extent that some of them were preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls or at Masada, we can connect them, indirectly at least, with a known group which considered them to be sufficiently consistent with their own self-understandings to warrant their copying and safekeeping.

Like the writings of Ben Sira and Josephus, the many pseudepigraphic writings from the period 300 B.C.E.-100 C.E. were preserved by various Christian churches, who considered their hortatory or predictive messages to be particularly appropriate to their own self-understandings, often with the added assistance of editorial glosses or reframings. Aside from the Dead Sea Scrolls, archaeological remains, and the sparse ancient testimonies of Greco-Roman pagans, most extant sources for Second Temple Judaism were preserved because they suited the needs of later Christian churches. Presumably much more was written, perhaps of very different nature from what has survived, but was not preserved because it did not suit the canonical tastes of the post-70 C.E. rabbinc and early Christian "victors."

This is not to deny the immense importance of the extensive pseudepigraphic literature that has survived, but to recall how few pieces of the puzzle of ancient Judaism are available with which to reconstruct its picture. The surviving texts often seem to have been produced by, or at least for, small groups that considered themselves to be part of a covenantal elect, notwithstanding their seeming pariah status vis-a-vis the larger Jewish society and its central institutions. Such groups probably sought and found in these pseudepigraphic writings confirmation of their socioreligious self-understandings in terms of a former revealed but presently concealed larger divine plan, both moral and historical, whose realization, often thought to be imminent, would redress the present imbalance of power and vindicate their readers’ sufferings. The specific literary conceits of such texts were part of their rhetorical message: Their privileged readers could experience being exorted by ancient covenantal patriarchs and seers, or could gain visionary access to a heavenly, undefiled holy realm, in either case fortifying through the experience of such knowledge their elect self-understandings in the midst of discordant historical circumstances.

But who were such groups? How large or widespread might they have been? What would have been their socioreligious profiles? Might they together have constituted a movement, or should they be differentiated more precisely one from the other? How might they have been related to named groups or individuals known to us from other sources? Or might we be mistaken in thinking in terms of coherent groups at all? Do these writings denote the mood of the time, or reactions to it?

4. Rabbinc Writings. Having previously noted the difficulties of employing rabbinic texts, all edited in their present forms no earlier than the early 3d century C.E., for reconstructing pre-70 C.E. Judaism, let us now stress that even for the period after 90 C.E., for which historiography is largely dependent on rabbinic sources, their historiographic employment is still fraught with problems. Like the Dead Sea Scrolls (from which rabbinic texts obviously differ in many significant ways), we are dealing with a collective, intramural literature that is not the simple product of a single author. Rabbinic texts sometimes explicitly and otherwise implicitly claim to be transmitting an ancestral heritage that goes back ultimately to the revelation at Sinai. However, they are also texts that subtly yet radically transform received traditions so as to attenuate them rhetorically to the rabbinic movement’s program of training new disciples and socializing them through the very dialectic of their Torah studies into a cohesive class which would be confident in its self-understanding as Israel’s divinely authorized teachers, judges, and leaders. In so doing, 3d century rabbinic texts may be expected to project such self-empowering rabbinic self-images back—not only onto their considered biblical antecedents, but also onto the rabbinic founding figures (e.g., Hillel, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakai, Rabbi Akiba) of earlier generations. Notwithstanding this primary, introverted nature and function of early rabbinic texts, they emerge at precisely the time when the rabbinic class itself emerges as a major force in broader Jewish society, largely through the strengthening of the Patriarchate under Judah the Patriarch at the beginning of the 3d century C.E. Under the leadership of Judah and his successors, the newly expanded and solidified class of sages sought to position themselves so as to transform Israel’s practices, institutions, and self-understandings along rabbinic lines.

Thus, there are two intertwined transformations underway that not only are reflected in the earliest rabbinic texts but to which those texts discursively contribute: the transformation of rabbinic society itself and that of its relation...
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with Jewish society more broadly. For this reason, both legal (halakhic) and narrative (aggadic) texts cannot be assumed to be representational of their own historical settings, whether rabbinic or extra-rabbinic, in any simple way. For example, we cannot assume that stories about rabbinic sages happened as told; or that rabbinic rules were broadly normative at the time of their formulation. Rather, such rabbinic representations have to be evaluated in complex relation to the rhetorical nature of their discursive contexts, and wherever possible to the sparse but significant contemporary evidence of extra-rabbinical sources. Only by such critical analysis can historians understand the relation of these texts to the sociohistorical contexts and emerging religious system of which they are to some extent symptomatic, and which they are yet in the process of transforming.

5. Nonliterary Sources and Non-Jewish Writings. The above concentration on Jewish literary sources should not be taken to minimize the importance of our nonliterary sources for Judaism of Palestine of the same period. For the most part, however, nonliterary sources from this period must also be interpreted before they can be employed, and it is usually necessary to interpret them in relation to our known literary sources. Often the pictures derived from nonliterary sources enable us to complement or supplement those derived from literary sources, but just as often they force us to reconsider our accustomed ways of reading and interpreting those literary sources.

For the late Second Temple period, recent nonliterary discoveries of particular significance derive from excavations along the W and S walls of the Jerusalem Temple, from the discovery of Herodian priestly villas nearby, from the Qumran encampment, and from Herod’s fortress and palace and the remains of Masada. From the period between the fall of the Temple and the 3rd century C.E. there is very little archaeological evidence, except for the important letters, writs, coins, and other finds from the so-called Bar Kokhba caves of Wadi Murabba’at and Nahal Hever. In the 3rd century this relative archaeological silence comes to an end with the proliferation of Galilean synagogue remains, coinciding with the emergence of rabbinic literature. Also significant for the period of rabbinic emergence are the archaeological remains of the catacombs at Beth Shearim, and more recently those of the urban centers of Caesarea, Sepphoris, and Beth Shean (Scythopolis). Another important ancillary source, but once again literary, are the scattered references to Jews and Judaism in non-Jewish Greek and Latin writers, both Christian and pagan, although most of these derive from outside of Palestine.

C. Issues Which United and Divided

In light of the above, it is impossible to paint a single picture of Judaism in Palestine in late antiquity. Our sources, for the most part rhetorically written from some partisan position or another, do not permit a simple description of what Jews in general (the man or woman “in the street”) of that time believed or practiced. Those common characteristics of Judaism which from an “outside” perspective may be said (and were said) to have distinguished the Jews as a group from the surrounding Greco-Roman cultures and religions (e.g., Sabbath and festival observances, Temple rites, dietary and purity rules, sexual modesty), when viewed from an “inside” perspective may be said to have been precisely the issues which deeply divided the Jews (and hence Judaism) of antiquity. Rather than smoothing over these differences and divisions in order to obtain some composite picture of how ancient Judaism might have looked from an undifferentiating distance, it is preferable to delineate those issues which define both the common concerns and the differing responses that repeatedly recur in our extant sources in all of their diversity of perspective. For the sake of convenience, they may be grouped under three headings.

1. The Temple and Its Priesthood. At the center of Judaism of the Second Temple period was the Jerusalem Temple itself, rebuilt after the destruction of 586 B.C.E. in 515 B.C.E. But this rebuilt Temple was not simply a restoration of what had previously been. Sacrificial worship was now for the first time centralized in one place, even though there were those who thought that cultic centralization need not preclude the establishment of sites of worship and the application of purity strictures elsewhere in Israel. The centralization of sacrificial worship in Second Temple times was in part due to the strictures of the book of Deuteronomy, newly incorporated into a Torah canon, and in part due to the desire of the ruling Persian empire and its successors to locate local political and religious authority in one place and under one leadership, that leadership (with some notable exceptions) having been the Temple’s priesthood (see Ezra 1:3-4; 7:13-24). But if the Temple and priesthood benefited from the political and economic backing of the empire, it also functioned at its will. While in covenantal terms the priesthood and their service mediated between God and Israel, maintaining the equilibrium of that tippy balance, then in Second Temple times they similarly served as mediators between Israel’s foreign rulers and its local populace.

Thus, the Temple was now the national center not only of worship, both daily and festival, but also of political and judicial authority—and controversy. It is not surprising therefore that virtually every major conflict, both internal—whether deriving from differences regarding Israel’s covenantal duties or from tensions between its socioeconomic strata—and external—between the local populace and its foreign rulers—repeatedly centered on the Temple and its priesthood. Notwithstanding the unifying role of the Temple, to which all Jews were expected to contribute and to which very large numbers flocked for the annual pilgrimage festivals, it was also a source and focus of deep divisions from the very time of its rebuilding. In fact, it may be said that precisely because of its centrality, as the primary national institution and symbol, the Temple was a magnet for national and religious tensions.

From the time of the Maccabean Revolt in particular, Temple-centered tensions intensified: Not all were happy with the Hellenization of its wealthy upper priesthood; not all recognized the genealogical legitimacy of its High Priest; not all considered its practices to be in compliance with proper standards of levitical purity. Some even questioned whether such a Temple, built at the direction of a foreign empire rather than a truly anointed Israelite leader, was a proper divine abode at all. Some partici-pated fully in the Temple services notwithstanding their discontent; others sought to reform it; others attempted to wrest...
control from the reigning priesthood. Still others declared their alienation and exile from it, developing alternative forms of worship, alternative purity realms and priestly hierarchies, and even alternative routes of access to a heavenly Temple unsullied by the worldly forces of evil and pollution.

The very centralization of religious worship and authority in the Second Temple necessitated, for some at least, the need for decentralized complements (e.g., the synagogues and Phariseic fellowship) or alternatives (e.g., the Qumran camp), even while the Temple was still standing. But once it was destroyed, the need to create or locate alternative media of worship and atonement, alternative loci for human access to the divine presence, became even more pressing. In short, how would Israel become a “kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod. 19:6) without its priestly, holy center? The rabbinic response to this crisis was not to discredit the destroyed Temple or its priesthood—quite to the contrary, they kept Temple and priesthood symbolically and intellectually alive. To shift Judaism’s primary focus from Temple to Torah and from priests to sages, and to make of Torah study and practice (including the study of priestly matters and the practice of ritual purity) the central religious acts of which they themselves would be the officiants. Rabbinic Judaism, like that of the Qumran community before it (see 1QS 9:3-6, 4QFlor 1:7), viewed Torah deeds as occupying the central religious place once held by the performance of Temple sacrifices. Even without a sanctuary, Israel could sanctify God’s name and their collective life through prayer and study and practice of His Torah (for examples from early rabbinic literature, see Fraade 1990).

2. Scripture and Its Interpretation. The “returnees” from the Babylonian Exile introduced another change that was to be central in defining and dividing Judaism in the Second Temple period: the establishment of the “Torah of Moses” as Israel’s commonly held canonical charter around 450 B.C.E. (Nehemiah 8). Again, this was the consequence not only of internal needs: interpreting their Exile and Return in prophetic, covenantal terms, the restored Judean community required the establishment of a commonly acknowledged expression of those terms. It was the consequence also of external, imperial dictates. The Persian empire and its successors (with some notable exceptions) sought to rule its subject peoples by giving them autonomy of local rule under their own laws and legal authorities, to which the empire would lend its authoritative backing in return for payment of taxes and peaceful conduct (see Ezra 7:25-26; and the “Passover Papyrus” from Elephantine).

But the composite and didactic nature of this Torah text, with its many repetitions and gaps, required that it be interpreted and amplified before it could be societally implemented in any systematic way. Most immediately such interpretation was required to set the Temple and its priesthood on their proper functioning courses: the Temple’s plan, the sacrificial procedures, the priestly regulations, the cultic-festal calendar, purity strictures, etc. But other areas of Israel’s covenantal obligations also needed to be regularized to the extent possible: Sabbath, diet, tithing, marriage and divorce, etc. The authority to inter-
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pret and adjudicate Torah law rested with professional scribes closely associated with the priesthood.

Naturally, those groups that questioned the central priesthood’s legitimacy or conduct also questioned the authority and interpretations of their allied scribes. They propounded and practiced alternative rules (to them they were not the alternatives but the originals), and would justify their rules through the citation or rephrasing of Scripture. But often they simply claimed that their rules had been divinely conveyed through a prophetic teacher; or through a long-hidden revelatory writing by an ancient biblical seer which they were now privileged to possess, to read, and to follow. Such disaffected groups would also comment upon, more often simply “rewriting,” biblical narratives, poems, and prophecies in such a way as to justify their self-understandings as the true inheritors of Israel’s covenantal code—the central actors in Israel’s sacred history. That history they might interpret, not simply as a continuous line from the biblical past to the historical present, but as a prologue to the imminent consummation of history by a reenactment of the primeval cataclysm in which God vanquished the forces of evil and vindicated the persevering righteous few.

So precisely such rewritten scriptures were understood in relation to what came to be considered canonical Scripture is not always clear: Were they supplements, or substructures? The Qumran community in some writings seems to have distinguished between Scripture and its commentary or interpretation (e.g., the pesharim, and the scriptural citations of the Damascus Document), while in others it seems to have substituted rewritten Torah for Torah (e.g., the Temple Scroll). The Pharisees, according to Josephus and the NT, viewed the nonscriptural legal traditions of which they were the self-proclaimed advocates and authorities as the inherited “traditions/laws of the elders/ancestors” (Ant 13.3.97, 408; 17.41; Matt 15:2; Mark 7.3, 5), for which they claimed divine authorization (Ant 17.41.1). Later rabbinic writings, beginning in the 3rd century C.E., redrew this distinction as being one between written Torah and oral Torah. Both were revealed by God to Moses and Israel at Mt. Sinai, and the two together constituted the complementarity totality of revelation: Written Torah was closed and forever immutable, while its oral (rabbinic) amplification was open and forever fluid. Implicit in these differences in approach to Scripture and its supplementation was the question of the continuity of revelation. How and by whom was new knowledge—whether of correct conduct, of the cosmos and humanity’s place therein, of divine justice, or of Israel’s sacred history—to be revealed? And what was the relation of such newly revealed or discovered knowledge to that which was commonly acknowledged as Israel’s Torah? But another important development, evidenced already in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QSa 6:6–8; 8:12–16), comes to full expression in early rabbinic literature: The very engagement in study, whether of the Torah itself or of its authoritative amplifications, could itself be experienced as a redemptive act of divine service—an enactment of the covenant rather than simply the means toward its fulfillment—and this, ideally at least, for a society as a whole and not just for its scribal virtuosi.
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3. Foreign Domination and Its Termination. With the help of the classical prophets, the Babylonian returnees and their descendants interpreted their Exile and Return in positive covenantal terms: God had not only punished Israel for its infidelity, but had demonstrated His own fidelity by employing the Persian king Cyrus to redeem a righteous remnant and reestablish both them and His house in Jerusalem. But these very same prophetic understandings engendered the expectation that foreign rule, like foreign exile, would soon come to an end and Davidic rule be restored (e.g., Amos 9:11; Isa 11:1), thereby completing the redemptive plan whose beginning had been so dramatically experienced. As time dragged on, and as one ruling empire was succeeded by another (Persian, Macedonian, Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and eventually Roman), the question “How much longer?” grew all the more urgent. When prophecies seem to fail, or at least to be delayed, the first response is to reinterpret them. Thus, when the Seleucid Antiochus IV upset the equilibrium of Jewish religious and political autonomy, the consequent tumult had to be placed within the received prophetic scheme: Jeremiah’s prediction of 70 years between Israel’s exile and final vindication (Jer 25:1–14; 29:10) had been divinely decoded as 70 weeks of years for the exilic seer Daniel (Dan 9:24–27) so as to point roughly to the time of the Maccabean Revolt. Then Syrian rule, itself encoded as the final horn of the last of four beasts (Daniel 7), would fall, after which Israel’s salvation would immediately follow (for similar calculations see CD 1:3–12; 1 En. 98.9–10).

Even so, what was to be Israel’s role in this divine drama now entering its final act? For those who rejected the Hellenizing reforms forced upon them from within and without, there were essentially two alternatives: armed revolt against the Hellenizers and Syrian forces (emphasized in 1 Maccabees), or passive resistance and martyrdom in the face of their edicts (emphasized in 2 Maccabees). But behind this choice lay a more fundamental question: Was Israel’s sacred history totally in divine hands—He alone bringing it to its redemptive end, both employing and terminating foreign rule according to His plan? Or did it require some human assistance—a demonstration of the readiness of Israel’s pious to rid themselves of the defiling foreign influences in their midst? The Maccabean Revolt, in the context of the most acute encounter between Judaism and Hellenism, brought this dilemma to its first clear expression. Both responses presumed that divine intervention would be required to bring the events to their redemptive consummation; the question was the required human role in a sacred history that was rapidly approaching its long-anticipated climax.

But once again that climax was delayed, and its delay became even more irksome with the rule of Rome beginning in 63 b.c.e. Although Rome preserved the rudiments of local autonomy, the disintegration of Hasmonean rule meant that the pressure brought on Rome was closer to home in its administrative and military presence in Palestine, and especially in Jerusalem. And since the Roman emperor was regarded as a deity, the presence of his image on coins, statues, and military standards meant that subservience to Rome added religious insult to political injury. A series of skirmishes and insurrections, beginning under Herod’s rule (37–4 b.c.e.) and extending through the period of Roman governors and procurators ensued. These stemmed in part from the incompetency and insensitivity of Roman rulers and their agents, and in part from a growing irritability and impatience of the local population. But also to be figured into the volatile situation were growing internal Jewish socioeconomic and religious cleavages and tensions, which often became interlaced with resentment against Roman rule and anticipation of its end.

Many self-proclaimed prophets, miracle workers, and would-be kings (some examples, about whom we know only from Josephus, being the "sophists" Judah and Matthias, Judah the Galilean who founded the "Fourth Philosophy," and a prophetic miracle worker named Theudas) appeared on the scene: they tapped into such popular anti-Roman sentiments only to be cut down, thereby frustrating the expectations that had been placed in them. One such figure may have been Jesus of Nazareth, whose followers, however, maintained and transformed their faith in him after his crucifixion by Rome.

The ignominy of Roman rule, the unrelenting pressures of socioeconomic cleavage, and the intensification of internal religious conflict led many to reflect upon the nature and origins of evil in a world they had been taught was created and guided by an omnipotent and benevolent God. The Deuteronomic scheme of reward and punishment no longer provided an adequate explanation. The sacrificial immune system was no longer up to the job. More radical diagnoses and cures were sought. For those to whom Rome itself epitomized the very force of evil and darkness which ruled the world and under which they suffered, the elimination of that rule would represent much more than just a political release. Jeremiah’s 70 years of Babylonian rule, reinterpreted by Daniel to extend to Syria as the last of the wicked beasts, was now reinterpreted to extend to and hopefully terminate with Rome’s rule (2 Baruch 3).

Once again three alternatives of human response presented themselves: accommodation, passive resistance, and active revolt. According to Josephus, these three paths were followed respectively by, among others, the Pharisees, the Essenes, and the Zealots. With the cessation of the Temple sacrifices on behalf of the Roman emperor in 66 C.E., the political, socioeconomic, and religious combustibles ignited, both in war with Rome and in equally violent internal fighting, resulting after 4 years in the destruction of the Temple and the ravaging of its city, and after another 4 years in the elimination of the last remaining Jewish resistance at Masada.

Once again, some Jews interpreted the catastrophe as an immediate prelude to the end, which would soon come if only Israel returned to the terms of the Torah (2 Baruch), while others counseled that the righteous should simply sit tight while God’s inscrutable plan ran its course (4 Ezra). For yet others, the utter failure of the revolt and the dashing of its engendered expectations, the loss of Israel’s atomic center, and the intensification of Roman rule with its consequent economic burdens, these were too much to bear. Some were led to apostasy and others to a dualistic renunciation of this world so as to pursue personal salvation in otherworldly realms.

But for many, the hope for the overthrow of Rome on the plane of history, to be followed by the restoration of Jerusalem, the Temple, and Davidic messianic rule, re-
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The post-Bar Kokhba rabbinc sages despised Rome and what it represented, even as they accommodated to the reality of its rule. If, in biblical terms, Israel was Jacob and Rome was Esau, then their struggle in the womb of history would continue, but as one between competing cultures and not armies. That struggle would eventually end with Jacob succeeding on the heels of Esau, but the time for that succession would be determined by God and not humans.

It was not that Israel had no role to play toward that end, but rather that its role was now conceived to lie on the inner rather than outer plane of history. Its internal life, both social and religious, required a radical restructuring and redirecting in accord with the divine plan of Torah (as rabbincly construed). Even while accommodating to the brute realities of the Roman kingdom, Israel could experiment the joys of the heavenly kingdom by attuning its collective life to the laws and narratives of the written Torah as interpreted in the oral. Israel’s task now was not to rid itself of Roman rule but to bring its collective life under heavenly rule; not to rebuild the centralized Temple but to fashion and frequent decentralized institutions (such as the synagogue) for worship and the experience of God’s transcending presence in the midst of historical exile. While Rome was evil and would eventually be removed, battle needed to be waged more immediately with the inclination to do evil within each person. The weapons necessary for bringing that inner evil under control were to be fashioned in the communal life of Torah study and practice. As the Roman empire declined and was Christianized, the terms of the struggle and the hope for its eventual termination remained essentially the same, but with Esau reinterpreted—as Jeremiah’s 70 years had once been—to refer now to Christendom.
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STEVEN D. FRAADE

JUDAISM IN EGYPT

The connection of the Jews with Egypt goes back into the distant past of the 2d millennium b.c. The memory of the captivity and the Exodus has been central to the Jews throughout the centuries and has contributed much to the identity of the people. Evidence of Jewish settlement in Egypt comes from a later time, however (Davies and Finkelstein CHJ 1: 375–70). Emigration took place around 600 B.C., increased by the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the First Temple by the Babylonians in 587. Documentation for this emigration is found in Jer 44:11: "The word came to Jeremiah concerning all the Jews that dwelt in the land of Egypt, at Migdol, at Tah’panhes, at Memphis, and in the land of Pathros."

A. Preludes
B. The Hellenistic Period
1. From Alexander to Ptolemy VI
2. From Ptolemy VI to the Roman Conquest
C. The Roman Period
D. Status of the Jews

A. Preludes

A series of Aramaic papyri of the 5th century found at Elephantine Island, opposite Aswan in S Egypt, has revealed that there was a military colony of Jews on the island (Davies and Finkelstein CHJ 1: 376–400; Sayce and Cowley 1906; Sachau 1911; Porten 1986). They had a temple with pillars of stone and 5 stone gateways. There was an altar for sacrifices to their god Yahwe. In addition there are other gods, such as Anath and Bethel. Thus, the religion of these Jews tended to be syncretic, such as presupposed by Jeremiah in the word of God addressed against the Egyptian Jews: "Why do you provoke me to anger with the works of your hands, turning incense to other gods in the land of Egypt?" (44:8). The temple at Elephantine existed before the Persian king Cambyses invaded Egypt in 525 B.C.

An order issued by the authority of Darius II in 419 B.C. instructs the colony to celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread and probably the Passover. There are also probably