JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA
Vol 16.2 (2007): 91-137

DOI: 10.1177/0951820706074303
http://JSP.sagepub.com

A Split Jewish Diaspora: Its Dramatic Consequences*

ARYE EDREI AND DORON MENDELS

Faculty of Law, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel
The Department of History, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem 91905, Israel

Abstract

This article proposes that a language divide and two systems of communication have brought to a serious gap between the western Jewish Diaspora and the eastern one. Thus the western Greek-speaking Jews lost touch with the Halakhah and the Rabbis, a condition that had far-reaching consequences on Jewish history thereafter. The Rabbis paid a high price for keeping their Halakhah in oral form, losing in consequence half of their constituency. An oral law did not develop in the western diaspora, whereas the existing eastern one was not translated into Greek. Hence it is not surprising that western Jews contributed nothing to the development of the oral law in the east. The Jewish communities that were isolated from the Rabbinic network served as a receptive basis for the development of an alternative Christian network by Paul and the apostles, which enabled it to spread throughout the Mediterranean basin. The Jews that remained 'biblical' surfaced in Europe in the Middle Ages.

Keywords: Eastern diaspora, western diaspora, Land of Israel, language divide, systems of communication.

* This study was written within the context of a research group of the Institute for Advanced Studies at the Hebrew University of which we were members during the academic year of 2004/2005. We would like to thank the institute on the opportunity that it afforded to us. We would also like to thank the members of the group, in particular Menahem Blondheim, Haym Soloveitchik, Yaron Eliav, and Elihu Katz, for their helpful

The Jewish world during the Hellenistic period was noticeably dispersed. In addition to the center in the Land of Israel, there were diaspora communities in both the east and the west. The eastern diaspora extended from Trans-Jordan to Babylonia, and the western diaspora included Asia Minor, Greece, Italy and the Mediterranean islands. Most of the scholars who have dealt with the Jewish diaspora during this period have blurred the distinction between the eastern and western diasporas, explicitly or implicitly assuming that knowledge about one disapora could inform the other.[1] In this article, we wish to re-examine this topic, and to suggest that the distinction between the two diasporas was not only geographic, but actually reflected a much more substantive split. The centrality of Jerusalem and the Land of Israel as a unifying force was a significant factor in the Jewish world prior to the destruction of the Temple. This was not so after the destruction. Our study will focus on the period following the destruction and the split that grew in its wake. The Jewish world had already been divided with regard to language in the early Hellenistic period. In the west, Jews wrote and spoke only Greek, while in the east, Hebrew and Aramaic prevailed. Israel served as the border between the two diasporas. Even in the Land of Israel, there were communities that wrote and spoke Greek. Our argument is that the language gap between the two diasporas led to a much deeper cultural

comments. This article was read at various stages by Berachyahu Lifschitz, Ruth HaCohen, Aharon Oppenheimer and Aharoni Rabinowitz, and we thank them for their comments. A special thanks to Shmuel Peerless for his translation of the article, and the Cegla Institute of the Tel Aviv University Faculty of Law for its financial support.

1. For a good summary of various approaches regarding the nature of the relationship between the diasporas and the center in the Land of Israel, see Levine 1996. In his 1979 doctoral dissertation, written under the guidance of Professor M. Stern, David Solomon concludes that the Rabbinic center in Israel exercised control over the entire diaspora. However, when we examine the sources on which he bases his conclusion, the vast gap between the eastern and Egyptian diaspora and the western diaspora is evident. The sources from the western diaspora are very sparse. Solomon also derives assumptions about the western diaspora from sources relating to the eastern diaspora without making the distinction that we are suggesting. Tessa Rajak (2001) discusses the connection between the Greek Jewish diaspora and the Rabbinic community in the Land of Israel (and see there much of the older bibliography). She claims that we do not have enough evidence to make a determination regarding this subject. Her discussion of the issue is insufficient and does not provide a clear answer. Other scholars dealing with the Jewish diaspora did not tackle this problem. See, for instance, Barclay 1996; Gafni 1997; and Gruen 2002. We would like to go a step further and argue that a dichotomy developed between the two diasporas which became catastrophic.

gap than we tend to think, and also led in practice to a division from a normative perspective. Later in our discussion, we will challenge the accepted scholarly claim that the rabbis in the center, that is, the Land of Israel, maintained contact with the entire Jewish diaspora and affected practice related to religious and cultural life. We will see that there are clear and unequivocal proofs that this connection existed with the eastern diaspora, but with regard to the western diaspora, there is a deafening silence on this issue in Jewish sources. We will explain this gap against the background of the ever widening gap between the eastern and western diasporas. This fact must be taken into account when considering not only the relationship between the diasporas, but also on a deeper level, the similarities and differences between the Judaisms of each diaspora.

Diaspora communities naturally vacillate between the desire to preserve both their unique identity and their connection to their cultural center and their desire to integrate into the broader cultural context in which they live (Barclay 1996; Barclay [ed.] 2004). The destruction of the Temple by its very nature upset the balance between these two aspirations,[2] as the connection to the center became an unclear, and even irrelevant, concept. The loss of the center has far-reaching implications for communication, which is enhanced by a strong center that controls a defined system of communication. As we know, the Temple constituted a clear and unequivocal center for the entire Jewish world. Its status derived from both its imposing physical symbolism and its recognized functions, as well as from a long supportive tradition.[3] When the Temple disappeared in 70 CE, an alternative center was established in Israel. As we will argue, however, this new center was inaccessible to the Greek Jewish diaspora. The messages that emanated from this center were essentially different from those that emanated from the previous center, and could not be deciphered by the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora. Our discussion in this study does not review the differences that developed between the motherland and Hellenistic Judaism, nor the distinction between the syncretic Judaism that developed in the diaspora and the less-syncretistic Judaism in the Land of Israel. Rather, our focus is on the

2. Safrai 1994. Later on, however, he claims that the connection with the diaspora was renewed in the time of Rabban Gamliel. We will discuss his sources below.

3. On the centrality of the Temple in the relationship with the diaspora and in the national consciousness before the destruction, see Kasher 1980; Rappaport 1996; Mendels 1997.

loss of communication and the clear gap in Jewish practice that developed in the aftermath of the destruction of the Temple.

Our argument might be better understood when contrasted with the situation in the Middle Ages in which the *Mishnah* and the *Talmud*, which had already been committed to writing, served as the basis for both a common learning curriculum and a common normative practice. These works were both accessible and studied extensively during this time period. Scholars throughout the Middle Ages wrote about the *Talmud*. Their works were written exclusively in Hebrew, with some intermittent Aramaic, the language of the *Talmud* that everyone knew.[4]

4. In Christian Europe, all rabbinic literature was written exclusively in Hebrew. This was true of the commentaries on the *Talmud*, biblical commentaries, and halakhic literature (Ta-Shma 1999: 25). This fact remained constant until the onset of the Enlightenment. There were, however, different levels of writing. Some of the literature, halakhic writing in particular, were written in 'Rabbinic Hebrew' that integrated Hebrew and Aramaic. The critical factor was not only that they were written in Hebrew, but perhaps more importantly, that this canon was not translated into other languages. Thus, the Bible, *Talmud*, and prayer book were published only in their original languages throughout the Middle Ages in Christian Europe. In reality, Hebrew was also the dominant language of writing and creativity in all disciplines in Moslem Spain, even if we can detect influences of Gaonic writings at the beginning of the eleventh century. The first Spanish scholars, such as R. Shmuel Ha-Nagid and Ritz Ge'ut, wrote a mixture of Hebrew and Arabic (Ta-Shma 1999: 157-59). It is perhaps for this reason that these works were lost to a great degree and had less influence. This is true as well of Gaonic literature that was composed in Judeo-Arabic (Arabic written in Hebrew characters with some Hebrew words included), particularly the halakhic monographs of the Gaonim that were written in Arabic and undeniably had little influence on the halakhic discourse. This phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that they were written in Arabic, a language that lost its importance in the Jewish world from the beginning of the twelfth century (Assaf 1955: 185; Brody 1998: 150). R. Saadia Gaon, in the tenth century, was the first scholar to write a book of Jewish law in Arabic. This phenomenon continued throughout the Gaonic period and in Spain throughout the eleventh century, as stated. Yet, those who wrote in Arabic utilized Hebrew characters. This clearly indicates that the target population, Jews whose primary language was Arabic, were able to read Hebrew letters and, therefore, able to read the Torah in Hebrew and pray from a Hebrew prayer book, even if they did not fully understand what they were reading. In the area of philosophy, a number of important works were written in Arabic until the middle of the twelfth century (*Hovot Ha-Levavot* of Rabeinu Bahya ibn Pakuda, *The Kuzari* of R. Yehuda Halevi, and *The Guide for the Perplexed* of Maimonides), but all of them were translated into Hebrew soon after they were written. Works that were not translated into Hebrew became marginal and less important (e.g. *Mekor Haim* of Shlomo ibn Gabirol). Maimonides wrote his early halakhic works, *The Commentary on the Mishnah* and *The Book of Commandments*, in Arabic, and only made the transition to Hebrew in the writing of the

As a result, in spite of the development of different academic approaches and different customs, everything flowed from community to community because there was no language barrier.[5] This was not the case in the period that we are discussing. We claim that during the period after the destruction of the Temple, there emerged in the eastern Jewish diaspora a hierarchical system of communication that included leadership, institutions, a bureaucracy, and a clear message. This system did not encompass the western diaspora. On the other hand, the western diaspora itself developed a flat system of communication, lacking both institutions that paralleled those in the Land of Israel and a leadership that spoke their language.

The distinction between the eastern and western diasporas is reflected in the Jewish literature that prevailed in each community. The Bible was the common literature of the entire Jewish community, with each separate community maintaining access to it in their own language. Yet, in the Land of Israel, a new Jewish literature developed during this period—the *Mishnah*, the *Midrash*, and subsequently the *Talmud*. This literature spread eastward, and the Babylonian community became full partners in its development. It could not, however, reach the west because the Jews of the western diaspora were unable to decode it. Simultaneously, the western diaspora adopted a very different collection of literature—the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—which was rejected by the Sages of the east.

A comparison of the two different and separate corpuses preserved in the two diasporas will illuminate and strengthen our theory regarding the

Mishneh Torah. In a *responsum* that Maimonides wrote to a scholar in Tyre, he related to his *Book of the Commandments* as follows: 'I regret that I wrote in Arabic since everyone should read it, and I am waiting to translate it into the holy tongue, with God's help' (Maimonides 1986: II, no. 447, 725). Maimonides continued to write in Arabic only in works that were designed for an Arabic-speaking population. The Meiri wrote in a clear Hebrew, and not in the mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic that was accepted in rabbinic literature, apparently because of the influence of Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*.

5. It is possible that the transition to a common language during the Middle Ages was influenced by the Catholic Church, which used Latin as its common language. The concept of a unified academic Jewish language was a new phenomenon in the Middle Ages. In the ancient Jewish world, there was Jewish literature in Aramaic, Greek, Latin and other translations. In addition, in Babylonia and Moslem Spain, a considerable number of the Gaonim and rabbis wrote in Arabic. The transition to national languages during the course of the Middle Ages and the period of the Renaissance caused a crisis in the Catholic Church as reflected in the movements of Wyclif (Allmand [ed.] 1998: 23), Hus (Allmand [ed.] 1998: 23, 377), and later Luther (Scribner 1994, in particular, p. 13).

isolation of the western diaspora. The halakhic and aggadic corpus built upon Hebrew and Aramaic was preserved as an oral tradition in the eastern diaspora (Sussmann 2005). In contrast, the corpus preserved in the west was a written tradition. The eastern corpus was not translated into Greek, and to the best of our knowledge, there was no attempt to translate it into Greek or Latin. This fact strengthens the hypothesis that the vast majority of Jews in the western diaspora had no access to this literature. In contrast, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, which developed in the early Hellenistic period, were fundamentally different from the eastern literature in both content and genre. Some of this literature was originally written in Greek (such as 2 Maccabees), while some others were written in Hebrew and subsequently translated into Greek (such as 1 Maccabees[6]), and distributed in the Greek-speaking community. Just as the halakhic and aggadic literature preserved in the east was not made accessible by translation in the west, most of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha did not continue to be preserved in the Hebrew–Aramaic speaking eastern diaspora (some exceptions are the Aramaic *Testament of Levi*, Tobit, the Ben Sira and *Jubilees* in Hebrew; but they were not accepted by the Rabbis). It is clear that in Babylonia they were similarly unable to access the literature written in Greek. This literature is practically not mentioned in the Rabbinic literature, and when it is mentioned, it is referred to as 'external' literature in order to distinguish it from the biblical canon.[7] One thus gets the sense of two very different communities on either side of the Mediterranean Sea, serviced by two diverse bodies of literature that were distinct in terms of content, genre, language, worldview, and normative practice. On one side, the Bible and Rabbinic literature that was still transmitted orally—on the other side, the Greek translation of the Bible and the 'external' literature. This created a reality characterized by two distinct universes of discourse, two different systems of communication, and the different ideologies that developed as a result.

Even before the destruction of the Temple, the normative system that was in force in the western diaspora differed from the practices that prevailed in the Land of Israel. For example, there were areas of practice

6. On the centrality of Greek and the almost complete disappearance of Hebrew from Jewish life in the Greek diaspora, see de Lange 1996.

7. Licht 1978. For Rabbinic sources that oppose the use of external literature, see *Mishnah Sanhedrin* 10:1; *Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin* 90a, 100b; *Jerusalem Talmud, Pe'ah* ch. 1, p. 16b; *Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin* ch. 10, pp. 27b, 28a; *Bamidbar Rabbah* 14.4, 15.22. See also Lieberman 1962: 1.

that were relevant to Jewish life in the Land of Israel but were irrelevant in the diaspora, such as laws relating to agriculture and working the land (*Seder Zeraim*) or laws relating to purity and impurity and the Temple service. There is no doubt that prior to the destruction of the Temple, these laws constituted a majority of the normative Jewish legal system. This fact accentuates the gap between the Land of Israel and the Diaspora, and the benefit that the Sages saw in living in the Land of Israel—the opportunity to fulfill the entire Torah. This gap should have narrowed after the destruction of the Temple, but in reality the opposite occurred—many normative areas that had previously been identical became different. Thus, for example, laws relating to the holidays and to prayer were transformed following the destruction because of the circumstances of the period. We claim that it is specifically this area of the normative system, which was adopted in the eastern diaspora as in the Land of Israel, that could not reach the western diaspora because of the communication and language barrier. After the destruction, when the leaders of the Jewish community in the Land of Israel struggled for their future survival, the normative gap between the community in the land of Israel and the community in the western, Greek-speaking diaspora almost developed into an ideological gap. For example, the concept of 'the impurity of foreign lands' developed in Rabbinic literature in the middle of the second century,[8] relegating Jewish life in the diaspora in principle to an inferior status. There is even a Rabbinic opinion claiming that the fulfillment of the commandments of the Torah outside of the Land of Israel had no inherent value, but served only as a method of remembering

8. See *Mishnah Nazir* 7.3; *Tosefta Ohalot* 18.1-5; *Tosefta Parah* 3.5. This law is not mentioned at all in the Bible. Although the Rabbis derived this law from verses in the Prophets (such as 'and you shall die in foreign land' in Amos when he spoke to the exiled king of Babylonia), it is clear that it is tannaitic in origin. Numerous references in both Talmuds indicate that this was an enactment of R. Yosi ben Yoezer and R. Yosi ben Yohanan. This impurity was considered to be very severe, similar to the impurity caused by a dead body. It is mentioned several times by Philo and Josephus. The formal reason given for this impurity is that bodies were buried everywhere. Gedaliah Alon, however, contends that the law is based on the perception that all of the nations were impure from worshipping idols, and that their land was thus also impure. This law grants a special status to the Land of Israel as the only place that a person can live a complete Jewish life without being influenced by idolatry. A person who returns to the Land of Israel from the diaspora must therefore purify him/herself from the impurity that he contracted there (Alon 1977: I, *passim*). See also H. Albeck, *Hashlamot le-Perush ha-Mishnah*, *Ohalot* 2.3 (p. 536); Safrai 1994: II, 632-34; Neeman 1997: 256-61; Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah, Nezirut*, p. 510 n. 34.

the commandments for the eventual return to Zion: 'Place markers for yourself'.[9] From this perspective, the Torah was given only to be fulfilled in the Land of Israel, and its performance in the diaspora was only to prevent it from being forgotten in the interim before returning to Israel.

Sanders has already demonstrated at length that during the Second Temple period, the Jews of the diaspora did not passively obey instructions from the pharisaic leadership in Israel, even though they attributed great importance to Jewish law and wished to observe it. He believes that the view held by many scholars that the Rabbis held sway over the entire diaspora is a baseless illusion. Sanders bases his opinion primarily on sources that preceded the destruction of the Temple, and it is logical to conclude that this would be even more accurate after the destruction when diaspora Jews traveled less often to Israel and the connection weakened. Thus, for example, Sanders claims that Jews who made pilgrimages to Israel for the festivals certainly purified themselves before entering the Temple and were familiar with the ritual baths of Israel. Nevertheless, we have no evidence of the existence of ritual baths in the diaspora at that time. This would certainly be the case as well in areas of Jewish law that were not noticeable from visits to Israel. The Jews of the Greek diaspora read the Bible and followed its commandments, as they understood them and according to the tradition that they had received. It is therefore obvious that these Jews observed the laws of *kashrut*, an area of Jewish law that is quite clear from the biblical injunctions themselves, as is confirmed in Jewish and non-Jewish sources:[10]

> The diaspora Jews, left entirely to their own devices, without Pharisees whizzing around the Mediterranean telling them what to do, read the Bible and did what they thought was appropriate…. Diaspora Jews too loved the law and wanted to obey it, and they did not depend on Pharisees to tell them to do so. (Sanders 1990: 298-99)

9. See *Sifre Devarim* 43 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 102): 'Although I am banishing you from the land and sending you into exile, keep yourselves identified with the mitzvot, such that when you return they will not be new to you. It is similar to a human king who got angry with his wife and banished her to her father's home. He said to her: "Bedeck yourself with your jewelry so that they will not be new to you when you return". So too, God said to Israel: "My son, excel in the performance of the mitzvot, such that when you return they will not be new to you". As Jeremiah said (Jer. 31.20), "Place markers for yourself"—these are the commandments in which Israel excels; "make for yourself road-signs"—this is the destruction of the Temple…' See in general Ravitzky 1991.

10. Sanders 1990, in particular Chapters 1 and 3.

Prior to the destruction of the Temple, pilgrimages and the donation of funds to the Temple were instrumental in maintaining a strong connection with the national and spiritual center in the Land of Israel. Even after the destruction, the Jews of the diaspora continued to send contributions to support the institution of the *Nasi*.[11] There are, however, convincing proofs that with time and the slackening of the connection, they viewed this as an outdated and unnecessary practice that did not serve to maintain the link. Two Roman laws dated to the years 363 and 399 CE deal with the cancellation of the tax that was collected on behalf of the *Nasi* in Israel.[12] In the latter law, Law 30, it states:

> It is a matter of shameful superstition that the Archsynagogues, the presbyters of the Jews, and those they call apostles, who are sent by the patriarch on a certain date to demand gold and silver, exact and receive a sum from each synagogue, and deliver it to him. Therefore everything that we are confident has been collected when the period of time is considered, shall be faithfully transferred to our Treasury, and we decree that henceforth nothing shall be sent to the aforesaid.

On the one hand, it is clear from these laws that until that point, the Jews had sent money to the *Nasi* administration. On the other hand, however, the fact that the Romans believed that it was possible to break the bonds between the Greek- and Latin-speaking diaspora and the *Nasi* in Israel indicates that they perhaps viewed the connection as purely bureaucratic. These two laws were apparently passed to serve the needs of the Jews who viewed the tax as an unnecessary yoke. The tax was demanded by the administration of the *Nasi* and was collected by means of Roman law. At a certain stage, however, the law was annulled and the *Nasi* could no longer collect the tax.[13] This supports the argument that the connection between the western diaspora and the Land of Israel became progressively weaker. For part of the Jewish communities in the eastern Aramaic-speaking diaspora who happened to be under Roman rule, the abolishment of the tax did not hamper their strong ties with the Rabbis. Yet if the administration of the *Nasi* was an institution with spiritual and

11. Funds collected in the diaspora were called *dmei klila*, or 'the collection of the Sages'. See Alon 1977: I, 156-59. There he also cites sources from after the destruction of the Temple. See also Rosenfeld 1988.

12. Linder 1987: Laws 13 and 30.

13. In the law from 363 CE, the emperor stated explicitly as follows: 'That which is termed by you the tax of the emissaries is nullified. In the future, no one will be able to harm your multitudes by exacting these taxes. You are thus freed from worry…' (Linder 1987: Law 13).

halakhic significance and influence on the Jews of the western diaspora, they would have undoubtedly been strongly interested in the continuation of the tax. It thus seems that by the third and fourth centuries, this tax was a remnant of the past, and that it was no longer clear to the Jews of the western diaspora why they should contribute these funds. The emperor intervened because he understood the reality. He was not working against the Jews, but was rather working on their behalf. The gap between the two normative worlds widened, and the strength of the bond between them correspondingly weakened. It appears from the language of the law of 399 that the 'apostles' were merely emissaries whose job was the transferal of silver and gold.

We base our theory on the assumption that is accepted by most scholars that the Jews of the west did not know Hebrew or Aramaic, and that their religious lives, including the reading of the Torah and prayer, were conducted only in Greek.[14] The Torah was translated into Greek in the third century BCE, and in subsequent centuries the rest of the Bible was translated as well. It should be pointed out that in certain Rabbinic circles, the translation to Greek was viewed as a necessity of the reality of the times. The Sages recognized that there were entire diaspora communities that spoke only Greek, and that would be lost to the Jewish people in the absence of an authentic translation. While the Sages struggled for the preservation of Hebrew as the sole language for religious activity, that is, prayer and Torah study, they simultaneously provided for an authorized translation of scripture for the Greek-speaking communities. A conspicuous example is the biblical translation of Aqilas,[15] the student of R. Akiva, who modified the Septuagint according to the unique approach of R. Akiva that attributed importance to every letter and word.[16] The Sages generally approved of this translation. Nevertheless,

14. See Tov 2003, who argues that there is ample literary evidence for the notion that Scripture was read in Greek in religious gatherings of the Greek-speaking communities in the diaspora from the first century onward. On the other hand, there are those who argue that the Greek translation of the Torah and the Psalms were read along with the Hebrew original. In our opinion, there is no solid evidence. For those who hold that the Greek Jews also read the Hebrew, see Baumgarten 2002. The fact that we do not know of any Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament from the western diaspora of before the ninth century CE, perhaps supports our view.

15. *Jerusalem Talmud, Megillah* 1.8 (71c): 'Aqilas the convert translated the Bible before R. Eliezer and R. Yehoshua, and they praised him, saying: "You are the most beautiful among men"'. See also Zunz 1954: 41.

16. Tov 1997b: 116. In general, see Tov 1997a, *passim*.

the Rabbinic literature of the time, namely, the *Midrash* and the *Mishnah*, whether preserved orally or in written form, was not translated. Therefore, as the years progressed, these works remained obscured from the Greek-speaking Jews.[17] We wish to emphasize that although scholars agree that the Sages in Israel knew Greek to varying degrees (Lieberman 1962: 1-21), one cannot conclude from this that Jews in the Greek diaspora knew Hebrew.

Research regarding inscriptions found in synagogues in Israel and in the Greek diaspora lends support to our contention. These discoveries lead to dramatic conclusions about the differences between the Jewish communities of Israel and the diaspora, differences that primarily can be assumed to be the result of a language barrier. Approximately 100 synagogue inscriptions were found in the Greek diaspora. These finds have greatly enriched our knowledge about the Greek diaspora, largely because of the discovery of communities that had previously been unknown (Roth-Gerson 1987). All of the inscriptions are in Greek, in contrast to the findings in synagogues in the Land of Israel that included inscriptions in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew. Of greater significance, however, are the differences in the content of the inscriptions found in the Land of Israel and those found in the Greek diaspora. Lea Roth-Gerson very convincingly demonstrated that the Greek concept *soteria* ('salvation') is found notably in the inscriptions of the Greek diaspora and at times in the Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel, but never in Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions. Similarly, the Greek inscriptions tend to emphasize the Hellenistic focus on the individual donor, while the Aramaic and Hebrew inscriptions reflect the Rabbinic worldview that places the community at the center. Roth-Gerson also points out that contributors are praised differently in the eastern inscriptions than they are in the inscriptions in the Greek diaspora. For example, the Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel state that 'He should be remembered for good and for blessing', which is a direct translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic terminology. In contrast, the Greek diaspora inscriptions utilize the term *eulogia* ('blessing'), but not in the context that it is used in Israel. On this point, Roth-Gerson comments as follows: 'While in Israel they related to the contributor with words of good wishes and blessing, they are honoured in the inscriptions in the diaspora in another style'

17. The question of the influence of Rabbinic law on the Septuagint has been raised frequently. It is clear that the controversy flows primarily from the fact that there are very few proofs of such influence. See, e.g., Grabbe 1982; Jobs and Silva 2001: 294-96.

(1987: 142). These three examples indicate three facts. First, that there was a difference between the character of the synagogues of the Land of Israel and those of the Greek-speaking diaspora as expressed in the synagogue inscriptions. Second, and even more important, in the Land of Israel there was a strong influence of the Rabbinic worldview, while the western diaspora was noticeably influenced by Hellenistic culture. Moreover, we see that the synagogue in the Land of Israel was actually influenced by both cultures, drawing from both the Hebrew and Greek concepts. The western synagogue, however, did not draw at all from the eastern synagogue model. This third astonishing fact indicates that even in the Greek Jewish world, influence went from west to east and not vice versa. The Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel reflect motifs from the inscriptions in the western diaspora, but the Greek inscriptions in the western diaspora were not influenced by the Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel. Thus, components of the Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel that were clearly translations from the Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions did not find their way to the west. Greek inscriptions from the west, however, did influence Greek inscriptions in the Land of Israel.

***

In contrast to the accepted opinion among most scholars, we believe that the Rabbis also did not view the western communities as an integral part of the diaspora as they defined it. We will attempt to demonstrate this point through an examination of relevant Rabbinic literature.

First, it is important to note that the evidence from Rabbinic literature would indicate that the western diaspora developed no spiritual centers dedicated to the study of oral law, no *yeshivot* ('academies'), and no Torah centers. There are practically no laws or sayings attributed to sages from the western diaspora in the entire corpus of the oral law (*Mishnah*, *Tosefta*, both versions of the *Talmud*, and the *Midrash*).[18] It is not

18. R. Abba the Carthaginian, a third-century *amora* in the Land of Israel, is mentioned approximately ten times in the *Jerusalem Talmud.* Carthage is located in North Africa. See Y. Felix, *Jerusalem Talmud, Shevi'it* II, 23. Similarly, we find a sage named R. Shmuel Kapadocia, also from the third century, mentioned three or four times in the *Jerusalem Talmud*, as well as R. Yudan Kapadocia, a fourth-century *amora* who studied under R. Yosi. We have no information regarding these sages, but we can assume that they were from Cappadocia in Asia Minor. There are a number of similar sages who were mentioned once in the *Jerusalem Talmud.* In all instances, it is clear that we are talking about sages of marginal importance, who are rarely mentioned and about whom we know

surprising that no literature parallel to the *Talmud*, that compiled the oral law, developed in the west. We do know of Matya ben Heresh who went from the Land of Israel to Rome to establish a *yeshivah*, but there are hardly references to his Torah teachings in the Rabbinic corpus. Apparently, he did not foster protégés, and we know nothing about the proceedings of his academy or its fate. Furthermore, according to the testimony of the Sages, there were no *yeshivot* in the Greek-speaking communities. For example, as the following source demonstrates, two agents who were sent by the Roman authority to learn the oral law had to come to Usha for that purpose:

> The government sent two agents and told them to disguise themselves as Jews and observe the nature of their Torah. They went to Rabban Gamliel in Usha and studied the Bible, the *Mishnah*, the *Midrash*, the laws, and the *Aggadah* (lore). When they left, they [the agents] said to them: 'All of the Torah is pleasant and praiseworthy except for one thing—that you say that something stolen from a non-Jew is permissible, but not something stolen from a Jew. But we will not inform the government of this.'[19]

It would have been natural for the two agents to have gone to a closer, Greek-speaking institution. It is thus clear that the closest opportunity for them to study *Mishnah* and *Aggadah* was in Usha. It was apparently impossible to study these texts in Rome, and if this was true of Rome, we can assume that it was surely the case in Greek- and Latin-speaking communities east and west of Rome.

A second indication is that the tension between the Land of Israel and the diaspora over the sanctification of the new moon and the ordination of rabbis recorded in the *Talmud* is clearly only with the eastern diaspora. We do not find any source in which sages from the western diaspora wished to assume responsibility for the sanctification of the new moon or the ordination of rabbis. This reflects the reality described above that the western diaspora was not familiar with the oral law. In addition, the information about the sanctification of the new moon that was decided by the court in Israel was important for the diaspora, as well, and was publicized by means of a system of fire signals or by emissaries. In

very little. Apparently, we are talking about individuals who came from the diaspora, or whose families came from the diaspora, but who clearly learned their Torah in the Land of Israel. This might hint to the fact that there was a degree of immigration to the Land of Israel from the diaspora at the end of the second century and in the third century. See Safrai 1994: I, 305.

19. *Sifre Devarim* 344 (ed. Finkelstein, pp. 400-401). See Heszer 1993: 15-24.

all of the sources that deal with this issue, we find no reference to the western diaspora. One gets the impression from these sources that only the eastern diaspora was within the Rabbinic communication system. This is demonstrated, for example, in the following source:

> There are two matters that constitute *prima facie* evidence that a person is a member of the priesthood in the Land of Israel: raising one's hands [during the priestly benediction], and receiving [heave-offerings] at the threshing floor. In Syria up to the place where the messenger who reports about the new moon reaches: raising one's hands [during the priestly benediction], but they do not receive the [heave-offerings] at the threshing floor. And Babylonia is like Syria. R. Shimon ben Elazar says: 'Also Alexandria [was like Syria] in the early days when there was a court there'.[20]

In a different context, mention is made of a letter that the Sages sent from Jerusalem to the diaspora that dealt with a number of issues, including the intercalation of the month. Here too, it is evident that the western diaspora was not included in the system of distribution. In addition, the letter was written in Aramaic, which implies that it was directed to the eastern diaspora:

> There was an incident in which Rabban Gamliel and the Sages were in session on the steps of the Temple, and Yohanan the scribe was before them. He said to them, 'Write: To our brethren, residents of the Upper Galilee and residents of the Lower Galilee, may your peace increase. I inform you that the time of the removal has come, to separate the tithes from the olive vats. To our brethren, residents of the Upper South and residents of the Lower South, may your peace increase. We inform you that the time of the removal has come, to separate the tithes from the sheaves of grain. To our brethren, residents of the Exile of Babylonia, and residents of the Exile of Media and of all the other Exiles of Israel, may your peace increase. We inform you that the

20. *Tosefta Pe'ah* 4.6 (and parallel sources in *Tosefta Ketubot* 3.1; *Babylonian Talmud, Ketubot* 25a). For a description of the fire signals and emissaries, see also *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah*, 2.2-4, which clearly indicates that the fire signals were directed only toward the eastern diaspora. See also Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah, Rosh Hashanah*, Part 5, 1028-30. Lieberman cites the opinion of the Raavad (died 1198) that the fire signals were only directed toward the east, but that the messengers went out to the entire diaspora, but he rejects his claim, arguing that according to the order of the fires, it seems they were directed to the north and the east: 'And it is also difficult to understand why they discriminated against the rest of the diaspora'. See also Tabory 1995: 30-34, which includes a map of the fires on p. 31; cf. further Alon 1977: I, 149-56. On the importance of communication in the sanctification of the month, see: Safrai 1994: I, 460 [298]: 'The emissaries were often Torah scholars, and they created a strong bond, regular contact, and supervision…'

> pigeons are still tender, the lambs are thin, and the spring tide has yet not come. So it is proper in my view and the view of my colleagues, and we have added thirty days to this year. (*Tosefta Sanhedrin* 2.6)[21]

There is, however, another source that discusses a visit by R. Meir to Asia in order to intercalate the month:

> There was an event in which R. Meir went to Asia to intercalate the year, and he did not find a Scroll of Esther written in Hebrew, so he wrote one from memory and read from it. (*Tosefta Megillah* 2.5)[22]

Gedaliah Alon has argued that this source refers to Etzion Gever, a place that was very close to southern Israel and was considered to be part of the Land of Israel because of its proximity.[23]

A third indication relates to the separation of tithes outside of the Land of Israel. Safrai (1994: II, 632) and others claim that the Jews of the diaspora were accustomed to sending tithes and *terumot* to Israel, even during the time of the Temple. Sanders disagrees and contends, based on his understanding of the source, that there is no proof for this argument. On the contrary, he claims that the opposite is the case. It is possible that they sent voluntary monetary contributions, and it is certain that they paid a Temple tax, but they did not send tithes and *terumot*. There is a relevant source in Rabbinic literature relating to the borders of the Land of Israel that discusses whether Syria is or is not part of Israel. This discussion clearly demonstrates that the obligation of giving *terumah* was in force only in areas that were considered part of the Land of Israel. Similarly, there are no Greek sources that indicate conclusively that

21. See Klein 1939: 210ff. In the *Jerusalem Talmud, Maaser Sheni* 5.8 (56c), after the 'Median exile' the 'Greek exile' was added. Yet, it appears that this wording is less genuine than that of the *Tosefta*.

22. For the possibility that the Jews of the western diaspora were not aware of the Rabbinic calendar, see Wasserstein 1991–92.

23. Alon 1977: I, 144-46. Oppenheimer (1997: 411-13) supports this view, and so did many others. B. Bar-Kochva (1997: 395-402) argues that in contradistinction with other passages where this term is used it may refer to Asia-Minor. Since in other instances where the term Asia is mentioned it does not refer to Asia-Minor, we have doubts about Bar-Kochva's hypothesis concerning this particular reference. Bar-Kochva himself holds the opinion that in the other instances where Asia is mentioned the reference is to a place in the Land of Israel. Moreover, even if we would accept Bar-Kochva's opinion, it should be noted that it is the sole account of one single rabbi going to one particular place in the west in order to intercalate the month within the whole corpus of Rabbinic literature. If we accept the version that our *baraita* mentions the word 'Hebrew', then our argument is strengthened; in a place in the western diaspora there is no Hebrew text.

members of the Greek diaspora were obligated to give *terumot*. The following *Mishnah* from tractate *Yadayim* discusses a controversy between the Sages regarding the giving of tithes in the sabbatical year outside of the borders of Israel:

> On that day they said: 'What of Ammon and Moav in the seventh year?' R. Tarfon decreed: 'They must give the poor man's tithe'. And R. Elazar ben Azaryah decreed: 'They must give the second tithe'. R. Yishmael said to him: 'Elazar ben Azaryah, you must bring proof since you issued the more stringent ruling, and the one who gives a more stringent ruling must bring proof'. R. Elazar ben Azaryah said to him: 'Yishmael my brother, it is not I who has changed the order of the years, but Tarfon my brother has changed it, and he must bring proof'. R. Tarfon responded: 'Egypt is outside the Land of Israel, and Ammon and Moav are outside of the Land of Israel. Therefore, just as in Egypt the poor man's tithe must be given in the seventh year, so too in Ammon and Moav poor man's tithe must be given in the seventh year'. R. Elazar ben Azaryah answered: 'Behold, you are as one who would bestow on them worldly gain, but you suffer souls to perish, you rob the heavens so they send down neither rain nor dew, as it is written: "Will a man rob God ? Yet you rob me. But you say, wherein have we robbed you? In tithes and heave offerings"' (Malachi 3:8). R. Yehoshua said: 'Behold, I am as one who will answer on behalf of Tarfon my brother, but not according to the subject of his words. [The rule relating to] Egypt is a new work, and [the rule relating to] Babylonia is an old work. Let us argue concerning a new work from a new work, but let us not argue concerning a new work from an old work. [The rule relating to] Egypt is the work of the elders, and [the rule relating to] Babylonia is the work of the prophets, and the argument before us is the work of the elders. Let us argue concerning the work of the elders from the work of the elders, but let us not argue concerning the work of the elders from the work of the prophets'. They voted and decided that Ammon and Moav should give poor man's tithe in the seventh year. And when R. Yosi ben Dormaskit came to R. Eliezer in Lod, he said to him: 'What new thing was learned in the house of study today?' He responded: 'They voted and decided that Ammon and Moav should give poor man's tithe in the seventh year'. R. Eliezer wept and said: ''The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant'. Go and tell them: 'Be not anxious by reason of your voting, for I have received a tradition from Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, who heard it from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, as a law given to Moses on Sinai that Ammon and Moav should give poor man's tax in the seventh year. (*Mishnah Yadayim* 4.3)

Whether we see this source as a reflection of a reality in which tithes were sent to Israel from the far reaches of the diaspora or as a 'romantic' portrayal of the ideal,[24] the *Mishnah* clearly mentions each part of the

24. Safrai derived historical lessons from the *Mishnah*. He saw in it a certain proof that in Egypt tithes were gathered and sent to the Temple in Jerusalem. Sanders (1990:

eastern diaspora—Ammon, Moav, Egypt, and Babylonia—while locations in the western diaspora were apparently not on the halakhic radar screen of the author of the *Mishnah*.

A fourth indication relates to the manner in which the western diaspora is referred to in Rabbinic sources. At the beginning of this study we mentioned the fact that scholars generally equate the relationship between the Rabbis and the two diasporas. This equation is based on the fact that the western diaspora is mentioned in Rabbinic literature. From both a qualitative and quantitative perspective, however, there is no comparison between the references to the eastern diaspora and the western diaspora. In fact, the Rabbinic sources that mention the western diaspora actually demonstrate the weakness of the connection between the center in Israel and the Greek diaspora. We will examine a number of those sources below. Before doing so, however, we bring a quote from S. Safrai, one of the experts on the Jewish diaspora who ascribes to the reading of the sources that equates the two diasporas. In his article entitled 'The Land of Israel and the Jewish Diaspora', Safrai deals with the connection between the leadership in Israel and the diaspora communities following the destruction of the Temple, a period of significant growth in the diaspora both because of emigration from Israel and a wave of conversion:

> The oral law did not coalesce and was not recorded in books of *Halakhah*, *Midrash*, and *Aggadah* until the end of the tannaitic and the amoraic periods. The prayer book and the regular reading of the Torah were set during the period of the *tannaim*, while the Hebrew calendar was set during the amoraic period. There are many similar phenomena. The matters that were innovated in the Land of Israel, particularly in the council chambers or the High Court when it was located in Yavneh, and subsequently in the cities of the Galilee, were transmitted and accepted in the Jewish diaspora. The *Mishnah*, which was redacted in the end of the second century and the beginning of the third century, became the foundation of the oral law and of Jewish law **both in the Land of Israel and the Babylonian diaspora.** Similarly, the approach of *Midrash Halachah*, formulated in the academies of R. Yishmael and R. Akiva became the basis for Midrashic study for generations in **Israel and Babylonia.**

301) disagreed with him, demonstrating in detail that this thesis has no basis. Sanders agrees that perhaps in the sabbatical year, Jews sent more donations to Israel in order to support the farmers that could not work the land. However, it is logical to assume that this *Mishnah* presents only a romantic description of the nature of the relationship with the diaspora. In light of his comments, the sense is strengthened that even in this 'romantic' picture, the western diaspora does not appear as an potential source of support for the community in the Land of Israel.

> The life style that was established after the destruction in Israel, such as the holidays, fasts, and the remembrance of the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, and the laws in general that were formulated in Israel, became the law for all of Israel to the far reaches of the diaspora. **Most of the sources on this matter are from Babylonian Jewry, but one can assume that this was the reality, at least in principle, in the other diasporas**.[25]

Thus, 'we know' for certain with regard to the Babylonian community, while 'we can assume' with regard to the western diaspora. We question whether this is really so. Is there any basis in the sources to support Safrai's conjecture that the knowledge that we have about Babylonia is true of the western diaspora? Let us examine the sources upon which the scholars base their opinion on this matter.

(1) There are a number of sources in which Rabban Gamliel of Yavneh traveled to other communities in order to answer Jewish legal questions:[26]

> R. Yehudah said: 'There was an event in which Savion, the head of the synagogue in Achziv purchased a vineyard in its fourth year of growth from a gentile in Syria, and he gave him payment. Then he came and asked Rabban Gamliel who was passing from place to place [whether the produce of that field is liable to the restriction of the fourth year]. He said to him: 'Wait until we can dwell upon the law'.[27]

> R. Yehudah said: 'Even though both of its witnesses are Samaritans, it is valid'. R. Yehudah said: 'There was an incident in which they brought before Rabban Gamliel in Kfar Otenai the writ of divorce of a woman, and its witnesses were Samaritans, and he declared it valid'. R. Akiva declares valid in the case of all [documents], and the sages declare invalid…[28]

There are also sources in which we find Rabban Gamliel in Tiberias and Lod. Yet, we do not see from these sources that Rabban Gamliel traveled overseas.[29] In fact, the opposite is the case. All of the locations mentioned

25. Safrai 1994: I, 294 (bold emphasis added). Safrai's article was written in 1982, but it appears that he later softened his position on this matter. He wrote the following in a 1996 article: 'While during the Temple period until the Jewish war in the days of Trajan in 115–117 C.E., the primary contact was with the Hellenistic diaspora, after that time, the primary contact was with the eastern diaspora, the Jewish community of Babylonia' (Safrai 1996: 26).

26. See Alon 1977: I, 146-47; Mantel 1969: 214; in general Safrai 1994: I, 294-310.

27. *Tosefta Terumot* 2.13. According to tradition, the immigrants from Babylonia occupied the land almost to Achziv, and it is therefore beyond the borders of the Land of Israel, just north of the border. See *Mishnah Shevi'it* 6.1; *Demai* 1.3.

28. *Tosefta Gittin* 1.4. Kfar Otenai is situated near Megiddo.

29. For Gamliel's circuits in the Land of Israel, see Oppenheimer 2005: 145-55.

are either in Israel or in close proximity (Kfar Otenai, Achziv), and there is no indication that Rabban Gamliel traveled outside of Israel for halakhic consultations with communities.

(2) It has also been argued that halakhic inquiries were sent to Rabban Gamliel from overseas.[30] This claim is based on the *Gemara* in the *Babylonian Talmud*, *Gittin* 34b:

> R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: 'The Jews from overseas sent to Rabban Gamliel the following inquiry: If a man comes to the Land of Israel whose name is Yoseph but is known as Yohanan, or whose name is Yohanan but who is known as Yoseph, how is he to divorce his wife?' Rabban Gamliel thereupon made a regulation that they should write in the writ of divorce 'The man so-and-so or by whatever names he is known, the woman so-and-so or by whatever names she is known' in order to prevent abuses.

It should be noted, however, that this source is a Babylonian source from a period much later than Rabban Gamliel, and that there is no parallel source in Rabbinic literature in Israel or from the time of Rabban Gamliel. It seems that we can say with some certainty that the *amora* Shmuel did not intend here to convey an historical tale, and that this source does not constitute, therefore, an historical document. Rather, it is a didactic explanation of the decree of Rabban Gamliel discussed in the *Mishnah*.

(3) It has also been argued that when the Sanhedrin was housed in Yavneh, halakhic inquiries were sent from all of the far reaches of the dispersion to Yavneh.[31] An orderly examination of the sources, however, reveals that all of the locations mentioned are within the borders of the Land of Israel or in close proximity (Tivon, Gennosar, Tsidon, Tsippori, Hamat Gader). There is only one source that appears in three places with the following wording:

> Concerning this law, the men of Asia went up for three successive festivals to Yavneh, and on the third festival, they [the authorities of Yavneh] declared it valid for them. (*Tosefta Hullin* 3.10)

This is apparently an important source that indicates that residents of Asia went to Yavneh to ask halakhic questions. This same expression appears in two other places in the *Tosefta*, in relation to the law of the red heifer and the regulations of ritual baths:

30. Mantel 1969: 215. See Goodblat 1994–95. Goodblat holds that the meaning of the phrase '*medinat ha-yam*' is the coast of the Land of Israel. If so, this story does not refer at all to the Greek diaspora.

31. Mantel 1969: 214-15 and n. 101; Safrai 1994: I, 298.

> Concerning this law, the men of Asia went up for three successive festivals to Yavneh, and on the third festival, they [the authorities of Yavneh] declared it valid for them as a special dispensation [based on a temporary need]. R. Yosi said: 'Not for this [law] did they give dispensation, but for…' (*Tosefta Parah* 7.4)

> A reservoir that distributes water among the villages, if it was perforated by a hole the size of the stopper of a water skin, it does not spoil the immersion pool, and if not, it spoils the immersion pool. Concerning this law, the men of Asia went up for three successive festivals to Yavneh, and on the third festival, they [the authorities of Yavneh] declared it fit even if it was perforated by a hole the size of a needle. (*Tosefta Mikvaot* 4.6)[32]

It appears that these sources are dealing with a practical halakhic question. Yet, how could the red heifer have been relevant to the diaspora when it relates to issues of purity and impurity that were practiced only in Israel and in the Temple. This idiosyncrasy supports the conclusion of Alon which we discussed above that Asia actually refers to Etzion Gever,[33] which was in close proximity to the border of Israel, and was considered from a Jewish legal standpoint to be part of the Land of Israel. It is clear that the diaspora with which they were in contact was close to Israel, and in any case was not the western diaspora. This leaves us with no Rabbinic sources that indicate that halakhic inquiries were sent from the western diaspora to the academy in Yavneh.

(4) One of the well-known arguments is that the Sages from the Land of Israel traveled throughout the diaspora in order to teach *halakhah*.[34] Here too, however, a thorough examination of the sources available to us indicates that a majority of the places to which the Sages traveled was across the Jordan, on the Mediterranean coast just north of Israel up to Tyre and Sidon, in Syria, or in Egypt. Testimony regarding a connection with the diaspora overseas is practically non-existent:

> R. Akiva expounded when he came from Tsiprin [apparently a place in Syria]… (*Tosefta Bava Kama* 10.17)

32. The continuation of the *Tosefta* reads: 'R. Elazar the son of R. Yosi said: "I taught this law in Rome, deeming it pure, and when I came to my colleagues, they said: you have ruled well" '. The main purpose of R. Elazar's trip was apparently for political purposes. See *Babylonian Talmud, Me'illa* 17a-b. The relevance of this question in Rome requires clarification, as we have not found that there was a pure immersion pool in that diaspora.

33. See n. 23 above. It should be noted that according to Bar-Kochva the references here is to a place in the Land of Israel with the name אסיא או עסיא.

34. Alon 1977: I, 147-49; Mantel 1969: 217-22.

> R. Yehoshua ben Levi once visited Gabla where he saw vines laden with clusters of ripe grapes that appeared like calves. He remarked: 'Calves among the vines!' (*Babylonian Talmud, Ketubot* 112a)

Gabla, in eastern Transjordan, is mentioned as well in a source relating to R. Hiyya bar Abba:

> R. Hiyya bar Abba once came to Gabla where he observed Jewish women who conceived from proselytes who had been circumcised but had not performed the required ritual immersion. He also noticed that idolaters were serving Jewish wine and Israelites were drinking it, and that idolaters were cooking lupins and Israelites were eating them. Nevertheless, he did not speak to them on the matter. He called, however, on R. Yohanan who instructed him: 'Go and announce that their children are bastards, that their wine is forbidden as wine of libation, and that their food is forbidden as food cooked by idolaters because they are ignorant of Torah.[35]

This source demonstrates that in these places the law was very different.

> R. Yehoshua ben Levi was in Laodecia and R. Yudan said to him: 'Wait while we immerse this female convert tomorrow'. The next day, R. Zeira asked R. Yitzhak bar Nahman: 'Why? Was it because of the honor due to an elder, or was it because they did not immerse a female convert at night?' He said to him: 'It is because they did not immerse a female convert at night'. (*Jerusalem Talmud, Yevamot* 8.1 [8d])

Laodecia is located on the Mediterranean coast south of Antiochia and north of Tyre–Sidon. We see again that the places on the itineraries and halakhic dealings of the Sages were close to the Land of Israel.

> R. Yehudah said: 'There was an event in which Savion, the head of the synagogue in Achziv purchased a vineyard in its fourth year of growth from a gentile in Syria, and he gave him payment. Then he came and asked Rabban Gamliel who was passing from place to place [whether the produce of that field is liable to the restriction of the fourth year]. He said to him: 'Wait until we can dwell upon the law'. (*Tosefta Terumot* 2.13)

Not a few scholars also built their arguments on this source. It does indeed state that Rabban Gamliel traveled 'from place to place', but in reality all that we know is that he arrived at Achziv, which is north of Israel.

There are many sources about sages from Israel that were in places such as Tyre and other locations around Syria. Here too, the sources prove that the reach was particularly to places that were close to the Land

35. *Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot* 46a; see also a parallel source in *Babylonian Talmud, Avodah Zarah* 59a. The law, here, however is quite different.

of Israel, as we stated above, but that there was either no contact or little contact with more remote overseas communities.[36]

In addition to the previous sources cited, there are a very limited number of sources that apparently testify to a link with the western diaspora. It appears from the following two sources that the Sages in the generation of Yavneh and following went to a variety of places throughout the Jewish diaspora, including the Greek diaspora, to deal with a number of matters including halakhic issues:

> R. Akiva said: 'When I was travelling on the sea, I saw a ship struggling in the waves, and I was saddened at the fate of a disciple of sages who was on board. And when I came to Caesarea-Mazaca in Cappodocia, I saw him in session and asking questions of law before me. I said to him: 'My son, how did you escape from the ocean?' He said to me: 'One wave tossed me to the next, and the next to the next, until I came up on dry land'. I said: 'How great are the words of the Sages, for they have said: If it is within the sight of the shore, his wife is permitted [to remarry]. If it is not in sight of the shore, his wife is not permitted. (*Tosefta Yevamot* 14.5)

> As it has been taught in a *baraita*: R. Akiva said: 'When I went to Arabia, they used to call a ram *yobla*'. R. Akiva further said: 'When I went to Gallia, they called a menstruant woman *galmudah*. Why *galmudah*? *Gemula da*—this one is isolated from her husband'. R. Akiva further said: 'When I went to Africa, they used to call a *ma'ah* (a small coin) *kesituh*.' What is the practical importance of this?—For explaining the Biblical expression: a hundred *kesituh* means a hundred *danki*. R. Yehudah said: 'When I went to the seaports, they called selling *kirah*'. What is the practical importance of this?—For

36. In this context, it is important to distinguish between Egypt and the rest of the Greek diaspora. It is clear that during the time of the Temple, there was a long-standing and strong connection between the Greek-speaking Jewish community of Egypt and the center in the Land of Israel. For example, we find high priests during the time of Herod who came from Alexandria (see Mendels 1997: Chapter 10); *2 Macc.* 2 opens with a letter from the Jews of Jerusalem and Judea to the Jews of Egypt (see D.R. Schwartz 2004: *ad loc*); *Tosefta Megillah* 2.17 (ed. Lieberman, p. 352) mentions a synagogue of Alexandrians in Jerusalem; and *Babylonian Talmud, Niddah* 69b discusses questions that were asked of R. Yehoshua ben Hananya by the Jews of Alexandria. In the last example, it is possible that the questions were still from the time of the Temple, as R. Yehoshua was a recognized scholar at that time (see *Tosefta Eduyot* 3.3). This situation changed after the destruction of the Temple. The close relationship was the result of geographical proximity and the existence of a land route between the communities, as well as the fact that Alexandria was a very old community with a long-standing history of contact with the community in the Land of Israel. If we were to draw up a scale depicting the gap between the communities, with the eastern diaspora in white and the western diaspora in black, Egypt would probably be depicted in gray. This is true in spite of the fact that the Jews in Egypt spoke Greek.

> explaining the Biblical expression: *asher karithi*. R. Shimon ben Lakish said: 'When I went to the district of Ken Nishraya, they used to call a bride *ninfe* and a rooster *sekhvi*'. Where do we find a bride referred to as *ninfe* in the Bible?—'*Yefeh Nof*—the joy of the whole earth'. (*Babylonian Talmud, Rosh Hashanah* 26a)

Yet, we must question whether these sources are reliable from an historical perspective. It should be noted that both of these sources deal with legendary stories that are suspect as historical documents.[37]

Another source that seems doubtful is the following:

> Come and hear what Ben Yasyan related: 'When I went to the coastal towns, I came across a certain proselyte who had married the wife of his maternal brother. I said to him: "Who, my son, permitted [this marriage] for you?" He replied: "Behold the woman and her seven children. On this bench sat R. Akiva when he made two statements: 'A proselyte may marry the wife of his maternal brother', and 'And the Lord came to Yonah a second time, saying' — only a second time did the Divine Presence speak to him, but a third time the Divine Presence did not speak to him."' (*Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot* 98a)

There is no parallel to this source in the rest of Rabbinic literature, and we do not even know who Ben Yasyan, the narrator of the story, is. The story relates to second hand testimony, and the *Talmud* itself questions whether the witness is reliable since he is affected by the decision. Nevertheless, we have here an historical source which documents a visit of R. Akiva to the western diaspora in which he deals with the laws of conversion, an issue of relevance to them given the large number of converts at that time. Another source that seems more credible is the story in the *Tosefta* regarding R. Natan who was in '*mizgat shel kapotkiyah*' and issued a ruling there relating to circumcision.[38]

As we have stated, these sources in general are somewhat suspect, but even if we accept their historical validity, their paucity in contrast to the large number of sources that deal with visits to Babylonia, Egypt, and locations in close proximity to northern Israel support the argument that there was a significant disconnection between the center in Israel and the western diaspora.

In addition, it should be noted that although we are aware of the existence of many synagogues throughout the Hellenistic diaspora, we have almost no documentation of scholars who spoke or taught Torah in any of them. In contrast, we do have a good amount of documentation of

37. See in general Safrai 2001: especially p. 216 n. 91; Alon 1977: I, 352-54.
38. *Tosefta Shabbat* 15.8 (ed. Lieberman, pp. 70-71) and parallels.

visits to Rome for political purposes, and of meetings with the leaders of the empire. It is possible that at the same time, the Rabbis met with the Jewish community there.[39] It is also possible that emissaries were sent to these communities for the purpose of fundraising.[40]

In summary, we can say that even if we assume that the above sources relate to locations in the western diaspora and that they recount the visit of a particular sage, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. Sources relating to a rabbinic visit to the western diaspora are sparse and questionable, particularly in contrast to the number of sources that deal with the connection between the center in Israel and the eastern diaspora.
2. The number of places in the western diaspora mentioned in Rabbinic literature are severely limited. Rabbinic literature almost totally ignores the vast western diaspora that existed at the time. This is particularly noticeable when compared with the relatively large number of places mentioned in ch. 2 of Acts , and in the chapters describing the journeys of Paul (Acts 13–28), as well as the Pauline epistles which give a comprehensive picture of the geography of the western Jewish diaspora.
3. The Rabbinic corpus testifies that the western diaspora was not consistently connected to the system of communication or the rabbinic authority in the east. The Sages admit and mention this.
4. It is our contention that the significance of these points is that during the period under discussion, two Judaisms arose with an ever-growing gap developing between them. As a generalization, we could label these Judaisms the western 'Written Torah Judaism' and the eastern 'Oral Law Judaism'. While in the east, a new normative standard, the Oral Law, developed, in the west, the Jewish communities remained biblical, maintaining the tradition as it existed before the rise of the Rabbis and their teachings.

39. See Safrai 1994: II, 365-81. Safrai deals with trips to Rome by the Sages of Yavneh, but it is clear that rabbis also traveled to Rome in later periods for political purposes. See, e.g., *Babylonian Talmud, Me'illah* 17b. It is important to note that a number of sources that mention Rome are referring to Kfar Roma located in the Galilee, as mentioned in Josephus Flavius, *War* 3.233. See the commentary of Y. Felix, *Shevi'it* I, 233; Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah, Eruvin*, p. 360, n. 80.

40. Thus, for example, it is recorded: 'There was an incident in which R. Eliezer, R. Yehoshua and R. Akiva went up to Hulat Antiochia for the purpose of raising funds for the sages' (*Jerusalem Talmud, Horayot* 3.3 [48a]). This source also refers to Syria and not to the overseas Greek diaspora. In this context, see also the Roman laws cited above.

****

We will now try to concretize the gap that developed in the Jewish lifestyle as a result of the language barrier described above through a demonstration of two aspects of Jewish daily life—the festivals and prayer.

A. Passover

The Biblical Passover consists of the prohibition of having *hametz* ('leavened products') in one's possession and of the injunction to eat *matzah* ('unleavened bread'), as well as of the sacrificing of the Passover offering (*korban pesah*). The pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the public offering of the sacrifice were central events in the celebration of the festival in the time of the Temple that were considered to be important by the entire people. Clearly, the focal point of the Passover celebration at that time was Jerusalem (Safrai 1965; Jeremias 1969). After the destruction of the Temple, the Rabbinic leadership intervened to try to reformulate the holiday so that it should not revolve around the Temple. Let us briefly mention what we know about the activities of the Rabbis in this regard during the first generations following the destruction. The significant question relating to our deliberation is whether or not the Rabbinic innovations were accepted in the Hellenistic diaspora overseas. The silence of the Greek sources regarding the content of the holiday and the fact that these communities did not speak Hebrew suggest that they remained with the law as described in the Greek corpus that was known to them—the Septuagint. It is important to emphasize that during the period that the Temple existed, pilgrims would travel from the overseas diaspora communities to participate in the Passover offering. This connection obviously ended after the destruction. Let us examine each source available to us individually.

Philo (*The Special Laws* 2.144-49), in describing the festive meal on Passover night, indicates that the food was not of primary importance. Rather, the significance of the occasion was the addition of 'prayers and songs of praise (*hallel*)'.[41] It is certain that his description relates not only to the Passover meal in Jerusalem, but to any place that the holiday was

41. The Greek source refers to 'prayers and hymns'. See Philo, *The Special Laws* 2.148; see in general Tabory 1995: 84-95.

celebrated. In the Land of Israel, in the wake of the destruction of the Temple, the Rabbis decreed many injunctions that reformulated the festive meal. There were two central elements of this newly designed celebration—the text of the *haggadah* and the various symbols designed to retain the memory of both the exodus from Egypt and the celebration of the festival in the Temple. The *haggadah* focused on the commandment of 'retelling the story of the exodus' (*sippur yetsiat mitsrayim*), a practice that is not known to us from the period in which the Temple existed.[42] Some of the new symbols instituted included the eating of bitter herbs in the absence of the Passover offering, drinking four cups of wine, dipping, etc. We might assume that the new symbols were adopted by the western diaspora, but that the *haggadah* did not find its place in the Greek and Latin speaking communities because it was written in Hebrew. Even if we assume that there were scholars or intellectuals in these communities who knew Hebrew, this would not impact on the Passover celebration, which was a family-based celebration and not a synagogue-based event, such as prayer or the reading of the Torah. There was certainly not a Hebrew speaker in every family. We must assume, therefore, that the *haggadah* and the commandment of *sippur yetsiat mitsrayim* were not central components of the Passover celebration in the western diaspora.

In the time of the Temple, the Passover offering was slaughtered in the Temple courtyard and eaten throughout Jerusalem, as is the case with all sacrifices categorized as *kodashim kalim* (lit. 'light sanctified sacrifices').[43] In fact, there is much evidence that the Passover offering was grilled and eaten in all of Jerusalem. For example, we learn that 'no man was able to say to his friend: "I did not find an oven in Jerusalem on which to roast the Passover offering"'.[44] Similarly, with regard to the 'last supper', which was a Passover meal, it states that 'after they sang songs of praise, they went out to the Mount of Olives' (Mt. 26.30). In

42. Safrai and Safrai 1998: 13-18; see in general Tabory 1996: 350.

43. *Mishnah Zevachim* 5.8; Safrai and Safrai 1998: 14 n. 14; *Jub.* 49.16-20; *Temple Scroll* 17.9.

44. *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*, version A, 35 (ed. Schechter), p. 52a. This also finds expression in Philo (*The Special Laws* 2.148). Jesus also said to his students as follows: 'Now on the first day of Unleavened Bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying, "Where will you have us prepare for you to eat the Passover?" He said, "Go into the city to a certain one, and say to him, 'The Teacher says, My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at your house with my disciples'." And the disciples did as Jesus had directed them, and they prepared the Passover' (Mt. 26.17-19).

other words, the Passover celebration is described here as consisting of two elements—the singing of songs of praise and the eating of the sacrifice. There is no mention of the *haggadah* or of the commandment of *sippur yetsiat mitsrayim*. The book of *Jubilees* also describes the Passover meal as consisting of meat, wine, and the singing of songs of praise. Philo, as well, describes the celebration as follows: 'They did not gather as in other meals to fill themselves with wine and food, but to fulfill the custom of their ancestors with prayer and song' (*On the Law* 2.148). The eating of the sacrifice accompanied by songs of praise is also indicated in tannaitic sources.[45] Furthermore, the centrality of Jerusalem in the celebration of Passover prior to the destruction of the Temple manifested itself in the fact that thousands flocked to Jerusalem on the eve of Passover from all over the Jewish world. Nevertheless, those who arrived were a small percentage of the total number of Jews living in the Land of Israel, and certainly a very small percentage of the number of Jews in the diaspora (Safrai 1965: 71-74). Apparently, as indicated in the sources cited, the singing of songs of praise was an integral part of the Passover offering. It is logical to assume that those who did not come to Jerusalem celebrated the evening with a normal meal, without *hallel* or the Passover offering.

The *haggadah* was created during the first generations of *tannaim* after the destruction of the Temple as a substitute for the Passover offering and the celebration surrounding it. The *Mishnah*, in the tenth chapter of *Pesahim*, parallels the *haggadah*, and all of the *tannaim* mentioned there are from the generation of Yavneh (Rabban Gamliel, R. Akiva, R. Tarfon, R. Elazar b'R. Zadok). While Finkelstein suggested that the *haggadah* is a more ancient text that existed already during the time of the Maccabees, all of his proofs have been refuted by other scholars (Goldschmidt 1960: 30-37). It seems clear that we have no evidence that the commandment of *sippur yetsiat mitsrayim* was part of the Passover ritual, and certainly no evidence regarding the existence of a text for Passover night prior to the destruction of the Temple. In fact, on the contrary, most of the evidence supports the fact that the holiday was celebrated only with the sacrifice and songs of praise, as we noted above. Interestingly, a number of *rishonim* claim that the tenth chapter of *Pesahim*, which serves as the foundation of the *haggadah* and contains its basic structure, was originally connected to the first four chapters of

45. See *Mishnah Pesahim* 10:6-7; *Tosefta Sukkah* 3.2; *Tosefta Pesahim* 3.11.

the tractate as a separate tractate called *Pesah Rishon*. Chapters 5 through 9, which deal with the offering of the Passover sacrifice, constituted tractate *Pesah Sheni*. In other words, the tenth chapter was not included in the description of the celebration of Passover in the time of the Temple.[46] This structure would indicate that the tenth chapter, which delineates the text of the night of Passover and its symbols, was not in force during the time of the Temple. It is worth noting, as well, that the literature of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha from the Land of Israel and the western diaspora make no mention of the *haggadah* or of the commandment of *sippur yetsiat mitsrayim* on the night of Passover.

Since we have no evidence of a change in the manner that Passover was celebrated in the western diaspora, it is logical to assume that it was celebrated after the destruction in the same way that it was celebrated before—according to the Bible and the Septuagint. It apparently involved a meal in which *matzah* was eaten, and, as indicated by Philo, songs of praise were sung. If, in fact, the story of the exodus was recounted, it was told in Greek according to the narrative in the biblical account in the book of Exodus. Philo, in his description of the Passover celebration, utilizes the term 'symposium' which refers in the apocryphal literature to a meal with wine. Indeed, we can assume that the *haggadah* was initially preserved only as an oral tradition, as was the *Mishnah*. This assumption has contradictory implications. On the one hand, it would indicate that the text of the *haggadah*, even in contrast to the *Mishnah*, was less organized and set, as a closed text might be. The tenth chapter of *Pesahim* presents general instructions for conducting the Passover night celebration, without a closed text that includes specific blessing or prayers. Thus, the essence of the *haggadah* as we know it is comprised of *Midrashim* on the biblical verses relating to the first fruits ceremony (Deut. 26.5-8). The *Mishnah* merely indicates that one should start reading and interpreting 'my father was a wandering Aramean', and in its initial stages probably allowed for a more free discussion. If so, even a Greek-speaking Jew could perform this ceremony. Interestingly, the Midrashim in the final text of the *haggadah* are comprised largely of verses from the book of Exodus that recount the story of the exodus from Egypt. On the other hand, the fact that the material was transmitted orally could cause greater difficulty for a non-Hebrew-speaking community. Oral transmission forces complete reliance on individuals who know the

46. See H. Albeck, *Perush ha-Mishnah, Seder Moed*, 140 n. 9; Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah Pesahim*, p. 647; Safrai and Safrai 1998: 19-32.

language, who can remember and transmit the material to others. Paradoxically, a written text might be more accessible to a community that does not speak the language, as the text can be read without understanding, or with partial understanding. As we know, the Hebrew prayers were preserved in later generations in various diaspora communities, in which the prayers were recited without understanding from the prayer book.

The uniqueness of the text of the *haggadah* goes well beyond the ritual compensation that it effected—that is, prayer in place of the sacrifice that could no longer be offered. It also compensated for the center that was lost. Prior to its destruction, the Temple served as the national center for the entire nation (Mendels 1997: Chapters 5 and 10). Even those who were not able physically to go to Temple fixed their gaze toward Jerusalem. There the national events took place. This was the place that defined and directed the community. The liturgy created by the Sages sought not only to substitute new rituals, but also to create a new way of defining the community. A person in any location who sat on that day and read that text defined himself as a member of the community. This new method of defining community, and connection to the community, was particularly well-suited for dispersed communities. Even though there was a diaspora during the time of the Temple, the big change after its destruction was the disappearance of the center. The text was the substitute for the center that had defined the community. It is therefore clear that one who could not read the text could not be part of a community of readers for whom the text was the means of connecting to the community.

Thus, our claim is not only that the western diaspora lacked the means to remain connected to the center after the destruction of the Temple, but that the newly created center gave rise to an entirely new medium for connectedness—that is, a common text. If, however, the text was to serve, among other functions, as the new medium for defining community, it was incumbent on everyone in the community to recite it in a common language. Ironically, the Greek-speaking, Hellenistic diaspora, which was so much in need of connectedness to the center, was essentially cut off from the community as a result of this new medium because of their inability to read Hebrew and the lack of translations into Latin or Greek in ancient times. This same phenomenon relates to the development of Jewish prayer, as we will discuss below.

In other words, prior to the destruction of the Temple, connectedness to the community was achieved through an emotional identification with the Temple through an ongoing awareness of what transpired there and an anticipation of traveling there on pilgrimages. Following the destruction, the *haggadah* became one of the primary means of identification with the community. Since it was not translated, the Greek-speaking communities were left dangling, and their level of connectedness weakened progressively. They lost the old method of bonding with the center, but were unable to adapt to the new method.

B. Prayer

The institution of a set prayer service was quite revolutionary. We do not find such a practice in biblical sources or in other ancient cultures (J. Heinemann 1966: 17-28). In the time of the Temple, we are aware of prayers that accompanied the sacrifices that were comprised of verses from the Bible, primarily from the book of Psalms. The concept of prayer as a form of divine worship in itself was an innovation of the Rabbinic leadership in the generations following the destruction of the Temple. The magnitude of this innovation was not just in the recognition of the value of prayer independent of the Temple ritual, but also in that it became obligatory and structured. The establishment of an obligatory prayer service with set times and a predetermined and closed liturgy was implemented in place of spontaneous prayer that flowed from the emotions of the individual and his internal spiritual need to communicate with his God. Obligatory and set prayer is not mentioned in sources from the time of the Temple, in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in the writings of Philo or Josephus, or in the New Testament (Fleischer 1989–90: 402). Research also indicates that ancient synagogues during the time of the Temple were not places of worship, but were primarily for the reading of the Torah (Levine [ed.] 1987). Fleischer demonstrated that the New Testament includes numerous references in which Jesus appears in a synagogue where he teaches, answers questions, and reads from the Torah, but never prays. The same is true of the visits of Paul and the Apostles to diaspora synagogues. The recurring theme is that the synagogue was a place for reading the Torah and for delivering sermons, but not for prayer (Fleischer 1989–90: 402-11). Prayer in the New Testament appears in a very individualized and intimate format, rather than in an institutionalized context. The new format of set prayer thus represented a significant shift in religious life. The formulation and organization of the

prayer service was part of a larger attempt by the Rabbis to construct an orderly and structured form of divine worship to replace the Temple service. Order was also needed as a means of creating structure for the people. Set ritual helps to create an organized community around it. Just as the worship in the Temple was not spontaneous, the new form of worship was similarly designed in a structured format. We have clear information from the generation of Yavneh that the Sages worked intently to formulate and establish structured prayer.[47]

There are many Rabbinic sources that claim that the source of the adopted prayer service was ancient, pre-dating the Temple period.[48] These sources prove that the Sages wished to attribute an ancient character to the prayers, but they do not prove that they actually existed prior to their time. Just as the history of *halakhah* during the Temple period is clouded with uncertainty, so too is the history of prayer. The one fact that is clear is that a central activity of the Sages during the generation of Yavneh was undoubtedly the creation of structured prayer as part of a reformulation of Jewish identity and the fashioning of a new form of divine worship to compensate for the loss of the Temple.[49] In prayer, as in other areas, the powerful innovations of the generation of Yavneh saved Judaism by refashioning its world anew. It is possible that they did not create this world *ex nihilo*. The degree to which the prayers established by the Rabbis were based on pre-Temple antecedents is a point of controversy in scholarly literature. It seems to us, however, that this very argument was contained in the deliberations in the study halls of Yavneh. The preponderance of evidence that the issue of prayer engaged so much of the attention of the Sages indicates that they viewed it as a significant innovation from recognized practice. This is demonstrated, for example, in the following Talmudic source regarding the *amidah* prayer, which represents the heart of the prayer service:

47. There are scholars who claim that the process of formulating set prayer was unrelated to the Temple service, but they admit that we have no sources from the Temple period that prove that there was prayer outside of the Temple. See Heinemann 1966: 22.

48. For example, 'The prophets established them' (*Babylonian Talmud, Megillah* 18a); 'The men of the Great Assembly established them' (*Babylonian Talmud, Berakhot* 33a); 'Moses established the prayer "*Ha-El ha-Gadol ha-Gibor veha-Nora*"…and when the men of the Great Assembly stood, they returned the greatness to its proper place…' (*Jerusalem Talmud, Megillah* 3.7 [74c]).

49. See, in general, Reif 1993.

> R. Gamaliel says, 'Each day one should recite the Prayer consisting of eighteen [benedictions]'. R. Yehoshua says, '[Each day one says] an abbreviation of the eighteen benedictions'. R. Akiva says, 'If one's prayer is fluent he says the eighteen benedictions. And if not, [he says] an abbreviation of them'. R. Eliezer says, 'One who recites his prayers in a routine manner—his prayers are not supplications'. (*Mishnah Berakhot* 4.3-4)

It appears in this source that Rabban Gamliel is strongly advocating that a newly formulated prayer be adopted as a set prayer. His colleagues, R. Yehoshua and R. Akiva, take a softer and somewhat equivocal stand. On the other hand, R. Eliezer, the conservative *tanna*, challenges the very concept of set prayer. R. Eliezer wishes to preserve prayer that constitutes 'supplication'—an intimate personal prayer that was known from the time of the Temple.[50] He therefore objects fundamentally to any prayer in which the text is predetermined.[51] R. Yehoshua and R. Akiva take a more compromising position. Yet, this fact in itself demonstrates that Rabban Gamliel, the *nasi*, sought to introduce a fixed structure. From the fact that R. Akiva raises the issue as to whether he has a fluent knowledge of the prayer, it is clear that Rabban Gamliel was lobbying for the adoption of a prayer with a set text. The following *Baraita* supports the contention that this prayer was created during the time of Rabban Gamliel:

> Shimon Happakuli in Yavneh laid out the eighteen benedictions before Rabban Gamaliel in proper order.[52]

50. For the meaning of the word *keva* as a form of the word *kavua* ('set'), see Ginsberg 1971: III, 333-37; Heinemann 1981: 77-79. Heinemann is correct that R. Eliezer follows in the footsteps of R. Shimon in *Mishnah Avot* 2.13, and essentially says the same thing—expressing opposition to a set format for prayer. It might be that both of them agree that one should recite the eighteen benedictions (*amidah*) each day, but oppose the idea of a set prayer service that was in the process of being formulated and becoming part of the Rabbinic world. See Aderet 1999: 95.

51. The *Babylonian Talmud, Berakhot* 29b brings three opinions as to the meaning of the concept 'set prayer' in R. Eliezer's statement: 'That his prayer is like a weight upon him'; 'Any prayer in which the person does not make supplication'; and 'Any prayer in which the person cannot innovate'. The first two opinions clearly relate to a prayer that has a set wording that the person praying simply recites, which is therefore like a weight upon him or which does not represent true supplication. The third opinion also relates to prayer that is already set, and that he therefore cannot introduce innovations because everything is already set.

52. *Babylonian Talmud, Berakhot* 28a. See Fleischer 1989–90: 425-33. See also Reif 1993: 60, who states: 'There is, however, no convincing evidence that even the earliest known text of the *amidah* itself predates the destruction of the Temple and only on the

Even if we accept the contention of many scholars that the source of the *amidah* prayer was from the latter part of the Temple period, the *Baraita* certainly confirms the importance that the Sages of Yavneh attributed to its adoption as an obligatory prayer with a set time.[53]

The following examples also indicate that prayers that had not existed earlier were adopted in the generation of Yavneh:

- *Mishnah, Berakhot* 1.4-5: 'In the morning one recites two [blessings] before it [the Shema] and one blessing after it. And in the evening two blessings before it and two blessings after it, one long and one short [blessing]: Where sages have said to say a long one, one is not permitted to say a short one. [Where they said] to say a short one, one is not permitted to say a long one. [Where they said] to conclude [with an appropriate blessing] one is not permitted not to conclude with one. [Where they said] not to conclude with a blessing, one is not permitted to do so. They mention the exodus from Egypt at night. Said R. Eleazar ben Azariah, 'I am about seventy years old and I have not been worthy [of understanding why] the exodus from Egypt is recounted at night, until Ben Zoma expounded it. 'As it says, "So that you may remember the day on which you left Egypt all the days of your life" (Deut. 16.3). "The days of your life" [implies only] the days. "All the days of your life" [includes] the nights". And sages say, "The days of your life" [includes only] this world. "All the days of your life"—encompasses the messianic age.' This means that the evening prayer was still not fixed in the generation of Yavneh.
- In the *Babylonian Talmud*, *Berakhot* 27b, we learn of the controversy as to whether the evening prayer is obligatory or simply

basis of intelligent and informed speculation can it be argued that some of the introductory and concluding benedictions were in existence as such at that time'.

53. There is a controversy among scholars as to the precise meaning of this *Braita.* The accepted view, that of Heinemann, that we are talking about the final editing and formulation is based on the sources available to him (see Heinemann 1966: 22-26). This is difficult to accept in our opinion, as he himself admits that we do not have any proofs regarding organized prayer during the time of the Temple. The use of the term *shemoneh esrei* ('eighteen benedictions') does not prove anything. Why would we not say, as is apparent from the simple meaning of the words, that they established and edited the *shemoneh esrei*? This is the position of Fleischer (1989–90: 426). In this context, we must also pay attention to the fact that we have much evidence regarding the work of the Sages of this generation on formulating many other prayers.

permissible. The protagonists in this argument are scholars from the generation of Yavneh, but their argument rests on the correlation between the prayer and the Temple service. The one who contends that the evening service is not obligatory bases his position on the fact that it has no parallel in the Temple service.

- *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah* 4.5: 'Regarding the order of the blessings: one recites the Patriarchs, Powers, and the Holiness of the Name, and includes *Malkhuyot*, but he does not blow [the shofar]; the Sanctity of the Day, and he blows [the shofar]; *Zikhronot*, and he blows [the shofar]; *Shofarot*, and he blows [the shofar]; and he recites Service, and Thanksgiving, and the Priestly Blessing; so says Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri. Rabbi Akiva said to him, If he does not blow for *Malkhuyot*, why does he mention it? Rather he recites Patriarchs, Powers, and the Holiness of the Name, and includes *Malkhuyot* in the Sanctity of the Day, and he blows [the shofar]; *Zikhronot*, and he blows [the shofar]; *Shofarot*, and he blows [the shofar]; and he recites Service, Thanksgiving, and the Priestly Blessing.' From this text It becomes clear that the rabbis are still in a process of formulating the set prayer of *Rosh ha-Shanah*.

Let us additionally emphasize two important points regarding prayer:

First, the prayers adopted by the Rabbis represent the ultimate text in terms of the triumph of the Hebrew language. There is a recognizable Greek influence in Rabbinic literature, indicating that the Sages were aware of Greek and that some were proficient in the language. Nevertheless, this does not find expression, as we find practically no Greek expressions or words in Jewish prayer.[54]

54. In fact, with regard to the *shema* prayer, we find that in Caesaria, it was recited in Greek: 'Rabbi said: "I say that *kriat shema* should only be recited in the holy language [Hebrew]. What is the reason? For it states: And these words shall be…" R. Levi bar Hayta went to Caesaria and heard them reciting the *shema* in Greek. He wanted to stop them. R. Yosi heard and was adamant, saying: "I say that a person who cannot read *ashurit* should not read it, but should say it in any language that he knows". R. Berachya responded: "With regard to the Scroll of Esther, if he reads in *ashurit* and in the vernacular, he only fulfils the requirement in *ashurit*". Rabbi said: "How do we know that if he knows how to read the Scroll of Esther in *ashurit* and in the vernacular, he only fulfils the requirement in *ashurit*? Rather, if he reads the vernacular, he fulfils the obligation in the vernacular. Similarly, he prays in any language that he knows so that he can request his needs and make the blessing over food. So he knows who he is blessing, we make him swear an oath of testimony or an oath on a deposit in his language…"'

Second, the prayers are essentially part of the Oral Law in that they were transmitted orally and were not committed to writing until the Oral Law itself was committed to writing. The first evidence of a written prayer book appears in tractate *Sofrim*, which was written in the seventh or eighth century. We also have clear proofs that the Sages opposed the publication of the prayers in written form, as reflected in the following *Tosefta*:

> If they were written in paint, red ink, gum ink, or calcanthum, they save them and store them away. As to the scrolls containing blessings, even though they include the Divine Name and many citations from the Torah, they do not save them, but they are allowed to burn where they are. On this basis, they have stated that those who write blessings are as if they burn the Torah. A certain person would write blessings and they told R. Yishmael about him. R. Yishmael went to examine him. When he climbed the ladder, he [the writer] sensed that he was coming. He took the sheaf of blessings and put it in a dish of water. And in accord with the following statement did R. Yishmael address him: 'The punishment for the latter deed is harder than for the former'. (*Tosefta Shabbat* 13.4)

We see that the Rabbis took dramatic steps to create a new prayer service. This form of prayer took shape during the period of the *tannaim* and became a set ritual for Jews in the Land of Israel and the eastern diaspora. As such, it also served as the glue that bonded people to the community. The Rabbis insisted on the use of pure Hebrew in the prayers, and that they not be committed to writing, and certainly not translated. These facts lead to the unequivocal conclusion that these prayers could not penetrate into the synagogues in the Greek-speaking diaspora. This means that the dramatic development of the liturgy that took place in the first generations following the destruction of the Temple and that became a significant component in the definition of Jewish identity from both a religious and a social perspective was essentially inaccessible to the Jews of the western diaspora. Apparently, the western diaspora remained with non-institutional prayer, and without a clear liturgical structure. The gap between the diasporas, caused by the deep language barrier, left the western diaspora beyond the reach of the new prayer structure developed by the Rabbis. It seems clear that there

(*Jerusalem Talmud, Sotah* 7.2 [21b]). It should be noted that this source is talking about *kriat shema* that is comprised of a number of biblical sections that had certainly been translated into Greek hundreds of years earlier. What interests us in this study are those prayers that were formulated and written by the Sages, particularly during the generation of Yavneh.

was no parallel liturgical development in the Greek-speaking diaspora because there was no recognized body that had the authority to create such a structure. We find support for this thesis from sources emanating from the western diaspora:

First, we find no reference to the *amidah* prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha literature.[55]

Second, the lack of an accepted version of the *amidah* in the Greek-speaking diaspora is ironically supported by the Christian Apostolic Constitution from the fourth century (Book 7, Chapters 33–38). It includes a hint that the author was aware of the *amidah* prayer that was recited on the Sabbath. This work is written in Greek, and recent studies have clarified that the source of these chapters of the Apostolic Constitution is from the Syrian Church, and that it was originally written in Syriac and translated later to Greek. It is known that the Syrian Church had close contacts with Jews in the Land of Israel and Syria. We can therefore assume that the prayer that was known to the author was not practiced in Greek-speaking communities, but from Hebrew renditions in communities in Israel.[56] The fact that the author of the Apostolic Constitution mentions only the *amidah* of the Sabbath relates to the reality that he was writing for a Christian population that meets for prayer only on the Sabbath.

There is no need to elaborate further on the impact of the ever-widening gap between the nature of prayer and of the synagogue in the eastern and western diasporas, and the deepening bifurcation into two distinct Judaisms that resulted.

* * *

We would like to bring four more proofs for our thesis:

(1) In the *Antiquities*, Josephus Flavius makes numerous references to Jewish Law. A. Shalit, in his excellent introduction to his Hebrew translation of *Antiquities*, claims that Josephus drew on two main sources: (1) his memory of the teachings of the Sages in Jerusalem, and (2) literary sources classified as 'external literature'—the book of *Jubilees*, addenda to *Megillat Esther* based on the Septuagint, Alexander Polyhistor, Philo, etc. (Shalit 1967: I, 36-49). Yet, when we examine his

55. See Chesnutt and Newman 1997. They speak rightfully about the 'scripturization of prayer' in the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha.

56. David A. Fiensy, 'Prayers, Hellenistic Synagogal', in *ABD*, V, cols. 450-51.

writings, we could say that Josephus was not influenced by the *halakhah* that was developed after the destruction of the Temple.[57] It is astounding that most of the laws that he cites are biblical, and not based on Rabbinic teachings. Apparently, these teachings did not reach Rome, where Josephus took up residence after the destruction. Based on his abundant citation of Jewish sources, we would have expected Josephus to cite Rabbinic law had he been aware of it.

The legal corpus of Philo also demonstrates that he relied strongly on the Septuagint. There is no indication that Philo drew on the Rabbinical Law. David Rokeah claims justifiably that the influence of Greek philosophy on Philo was particularly strong since his foundations in Judaism were built on the Septuagint, that is, on the written Torah as it appears in Greek translation through a philosophical prism (Rokeah 1976: 13-16). Philo was not familiar with other Jewish sources. Rokeah demonstrates that he only knew Jewish biblical sources through the Septuagint. In the controversy between Wolfson and Heinemann as to the similarity between the philosophy of Philo and medieval Jewish philosophy, Heinemann claims that there was a significant gap between them because Philo did not know the Rabbinic Jewish tradition (Heinemann 1950).

(2) A law enacted by Justinian in 8 February 553 CE supports our claim that the Jewish world was divided between Greek and Hebrew based communities (Linder 1987: law no. 66). The reality reflected in this law has far reaching implications regarding the duality of the community. As indicated by the law, Justinian is intervening in an internal Jewish matter at the behest of the community. The emperor states explicitly that the Jews presented him with a petition requesting his involvement: 'However we could not bear to leave them with an unresolved controversy. We have learned from their petitions.' We emphasize this point to negate the interpretation that this represented a Jewish–Christian conflict. It is logical to assume that the unresolved controversy was between the Jews of Israel and the Greek-speaking diaspora. This is indicated by the fact that the legislation permits reading in Greek and other languages, gives preference to the Septuagint translation over that of Aqilas, and negates the Oral Law.[58] The document reflects the tension

57. Regarding laws in *Antiquities*, see several laws cited in Goldenberg 1976. In general, however, one can assume that Josephus was not acquainted with oral Halakhah.

58. '…Those who read in Greek shall use the Septuagint tradition, which is more accurate than all the others, and is preferable to the others particularly in reason of what

between the two diasporas and the conflict over issues of language and acceptable translations.

The Justinian law takes a clear anti-Rabbinic position. It permits the use of Greek in prayer, explicitly prefers the Septuagint translation over that of Aqilas that was preferred by the Rabbis (Lieberman 1962: 14-15), unequivocally negates the *Mishnah* which is mentioned explicitly, and apparently negates the Oral Law in general. We can assume that the law addresses overseas Greek-speaking communities, for if not, it would be difficult to understand the conflict. The issue of the validity of the Oral Law had long been decided in the region of Israel by the sixth century. The Sadducees had already disappeared, and the Oral Law already stood at the center of Jewish activity and creativity. In fact, the *Jerusalem Talmud* had already been redacted.

(3) The impression of the Jew in Pagan, Greek and Latin literature is of one who lives according to the laws of the Torah, but not the Oral Law. For example, in the writings of Tacitus and others up until the sixth century, Jews are described according to the model known to us in the Bible. The characteristics of the Jew found in this literature include Sabbath observance, celebration of Passover, the prohibition of statues, circumcision, and separation with regard to marriage and eating. These are classical biblical motifs. Through them, we also find a shallow encounter with certain biblical characters such as Abraham and Moses. For example, the laws are referred to as the 'Mosaic Law'. On the other hand, we do not find in the literature of Tacitus or other Pagan literature references to innovations that took place in Rabbinic academies, including new practices such as prayer or novel holiday observances. Their descriptions could not rely on anything other that the Bible because the Oral Law was not written and was not translated to Latin or Greek. The Pagan writers usually relied on their surface knowledge of local Jews. Thus, their use of the term 'Mosaic Law' reflects the fact that they did not know of the existence of any other literature beyond the Bible (Stern 1976–80, *passim*). The fact that the Rabbis ignored Moses to a degree because he was emphasized in Pagan literature demands explanation.

happened while the translation was made… We give permission to use also Aqilas' translation, although he was a gentile and in some readings differs not a little from the Septuagint. What they call Mishnah…we prohibit entirely, for it is not included among the Holy Books, nor was it handed down from above by the prophets, but it is an invention of men in their chatter, exclusively of earthly origin and having in it nothing of the divine' (Linder 1987: 409, and see his commentary concerning the term Mishnah, pp. 402-405).

Apparently, it reflected a hidden debate over the centrality of a legislator because the Greeks and Romans viewed him as a Pagan legislator.

(4) The Jewish Rebellion (115–117 CE) might also support our argument. It is a surprising fact that the Jews were divided in their participation in the revolt. While the eastern diaspora from Mesopotamia to Egypt (doubts regarding the community in the Land of Israel as to the 'war of Kitos' are unjustified) actively participated in the rebellion, the western diaspora was completely passive, except for Cyprus and Libya, which were anyhow in close proximity to the east.[59]

***

We contend that Paul and the first Apostles, and subsequently the Church Fathers, took advantage of the vacuum that developed in the western diaspora as a result of the fact that it was cut off from the hierarchical systems of administration and communication of the eastern Jewish community. They worked toward spreading their beliefs in the western Jewish diaspora. It is a fact that Paul never considered going eastward, and that the only population that he thought might possibly accept his teachings was the Jews of the Greek-speaking diaspora (Mendels 1998: 394-419). Greek-speaking Jews who became part of the western diaspora could easily have perceived Paul, who was a student of R. Gamliel I, as a rabbi who came to teach the Oral Law. The big advantage for Paul, and consequently the Church Fathers, was that they taught in Greek. Paul's ability to enter the public sphere of the Jewish community via the synagogue was related to the fact that these Jews were spiritually cut off from the center in the Land of Israel and from Babylonia:

> Now Paul and his company set sail from Paphos, and came to Perga in Pamphylia… [B]ut they passed on from Perga and came to Antioch of Pisidia. And on the Sabbath day they went into the synagogue and sat down. After the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent to them, saying, 'Brethern, if you have any word of exhortation for the people, say it'. So Paul stood up, and motioning with his hand said: 'Men of Israel, and you that fear God…' As they went out, the people begged that these things might be told them the next sabbath. And when the meeting of the synagogue broke up, many Jews and devout converts to Judaism followed Paul and Barnabas, who spoke to them and urged them to continue in the grace of God.' (Acts 13.13-43)

59. Regarding the Jewish rebellion of 115–117 CE, see Mendels 1997: 385-86, and Pucci Ben Zeev 2006: 93-104.

The same is true of the later Church Fathers who could have been perceived by some Jews as Rabbinic authorities.[60] The lack of hierarchical and structured communication within the western diaspora, and its isolation from the east, created a place for early Christianity to establish a foothold, and to build a structured Christian hierarchy. The people who attached themselves to this hierarchy were Jews who were estranged from their brethren in the east. [61]

***

To summarize:

1. The Jewish world during the period under discussion began to separate into two worlds with an ever-widening gap between them.
2. This gap was the result of a geographical divide as well as a language barrier of Hebrew and Aramaic vs. Greek.
3. In the course of time, two different knowledge bases and two distinct literatures were created—in the west, the Bible in its Greek translation along with the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and in the east, Rabbinic literature.
4. This gap naturally led to a normative gap of distinct diasporas. While the east developed a normative standard presented by the Rabbis, the west maintained a biblical normative system based on the Septuagint. This gap came to expression particularly in the areas of prayer and synagogue life, and holiday celebration.
5. The scholarly claim of an ongoing connection between the Greek-speaking diaspora in the west and the center in Israel has been challenged in the present study.
6. In contrast, Talmudic sources point to a strong and clear connection between the center in the Land of Israel and the eastern diaspora.
7. The Jewish communities that were isolated from the Rabbinic network served as a receptive basis for the development of an

60. With regard to stories in the New Testament about the emissaries, the Christian emissaries were called 'apostles'. Jewish emissaries from the *nasi* were referred to in this way as well in Roman law. It is therefore possible that scholars did not always distinguish between the different emissaries, and claim that a source is referring to Jewish emissaries when it is actually referring to Christian apostles.

61. Regarding the development of a Christian system of communication at that time, see Mendels 1999.

alternative Christian network by Paul, which enabled it to spread throughout the Mediterranean basin.

8. An Oral Law did not develop in the western diaspora, and western Jews contributed nothing to the development of the Oral Law in the east.
9. The codex of Roman laws dealing with Jews confirms in a variety of places the gap between the eastern and western diasporas.
10. Archaeological findings also demonstrate that such a gap existed in a number of areas of life. The gap was not just a language barrier, but was also theological and cultural. This reality is contrary to the reality of later diasporas in which all of the diaspora communities were based on the Oral Law, and the 'official' Jewish language was Hebrew.
11. Sources that discuss rabbinic travels to western diaspora communities point to the fact that these visits were chance occurrences. The Church tried to create a communication network, bureaucratic unity, and a church law in order to impose standards in every place. Even the early apostles traveled to many places to preach. Such an approach did not exist among the Jews in the west, which fostered only a flat system of communication. There was no bureaucratic system that imposed, or even transmitted information about the *halahkah*. There were no emissaries who went out to preach.[62] In contrast, it is clear that the eastern diaspora did create a communication system that transmitted laws systematically. The *Talmud* is filled with stories of Sages who travel between the land of Israel and Babylonia, carrying with them laws and traditions. The *Mishnah* itself was transferred from Israel to Babylonia and there became the corner stone of Torah study. The comments of well-known scholars from Israel are quoted frequently in the *Babylonian Talmud*, and vice versa. No such thing is recorded in the western diaspora. The few sources that do exist demonstrate that the connection was sporadic.
12. Pagan literature paints a picture of Jews who live according to the Torah, and not according to the Oral Law.

In this study, we have described a phenomenon that challenges the accepted scholarly view of the Jewish diaspora in the period following

62. With regard to the Church, see Mendels 1999.

the destruction of the Temple. We dealt with the divide that developed between the eastern and western diasporas, and that continued to widen until it seemed unbridgeable. We focused on the language barrier between the Hebrew- and Aramaic-based east and the Greek-speaking west. Yet, we did not deal with the roots of this phenomenon, or its branches. We did not deal with the causes of this bifurcation, or with its implications for the future. We did not address a number of critical questions that flow from our analysis: Why did the Rabbinic leadership allow this fissure to develop and grow? Did they relinquish the western diaspora intentionally, and if so, why? On the other hand, why did the western Jews forfeit their connection with the center in Israel? Perhaps the language barrier that we described was not a cause but a symptom, reflecting a cultural divide that severed the relationship between the two communities. Or, perhaps the divide simply became so large in reality that it could not be bridged. What we can say for sure is that the Jews paid a high price for keeping their Halakhah in oral form, losing in consequence half of its constituency. In communication theory terms, orality is considered time-biased, effective in orienting society to its past; script is space-biased, effective in bridging distance but not in time. Opting for orality and time, the Rabbis had to surrender space; in the present case—the western half of the Jewish world.[63] We also did not ask what were the ultimate results of this bifurcation. What became of the Greek diaspora? Did it simply assimilate into the Christian community that captured Roman society? Or, did it remain an isolated and distinct community, a type of Biblical community that later influence the development of Karaism? We leave all of these questions open for future research.

It is also possible that future scholars will choose to see this divide as part of a larger context of similar schisms that occurred throughout the generations in Jewish history. It is not unlikely that the potential forces which drove the Jewish nation to such a rift, were immanent in Judaism all along from Biblical times. These forces conflict with the Rabbinic notion of *kol Yisrael arevim ze ba-ze* ('all Jews are responsible for each other', a notion that comes to the fore in the narrative of 1 Macc. 5). Rifts in Judaism were of social, political, religious, and Halakhic nature and became a driving force in the trial and error processes of Jewish history. We hope that our analysis will serve as a catalyst for further research, and will ultimately lead us to a deeper understanding of Jewish history and sociology.

63. See Innis 1951 and Blondheim 2003.

Bibliography*

* Note that encyclopedia entries and editions of Rabbinic sources have not been listed here.

Aderet, A.
1999 *From Destruction to Restoration: The Mode of Yavneh in Re-Establishment of Jewish People* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).

Allmand, C. (ed.)
1998 *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, VII (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Alon, G.
1977 *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age, 70–640 C.E.* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem).

Assaf, S.
1955 *Tekufat ha-Geonim ve-Sifrutah* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook [Hebrew]).

Bar-Kochva, B.
1997 'On the Festival of Purim and Some of the Succot Practices in the Period of the Second Temple and Afterwards', *Zion* 62: 387-407 (Hebrew).

Barclay, J.M.G.
1996 *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Barclary, J.M.G. (ed.)
2004 *Negotiating Diaspora. Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (London: T&T Clark International).

Baumgarten, A.I.
2002 'Bilingual Jews and the Greek Bible', in J. Kugel (ed.), *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 13-20.

Blondheim, M.
2003 'Harold Adams Innis and his Bias of Communication', E. Katz et al. (eds.), *Canonical Texts in Media Research* (Cambridge: Polity Press): 156-90.

Brody, R.
1998 *Readings in Geonic Literature* (Tel-Aviv: Hakkibutz Hameuchad Publishing House [Hebrew]).

Chesnutt, R.D., and J. Newman
1997 'Prayers in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', in Kiley et al. (eds) 1997: 38-42.

Cohen, J.D.
1999 *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

De Lange, N.
1996 'The Hebrew Language in the European Diaspora', *Te'uda* 12: 111-37.

Fleischer, E.
1989–90 'On the Beginnings of Obligatory Jewish Prayer', *Tarbiz* 59: 397-441 (Hebrew).

Gafni, I.M.
1997 *Land Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Ginsberg, L.
1971 *A Commentary of the Palestinian Talmud* (New York: Ktav).
Goldenberg, D.
1976 'The Halakhah in Josephus and Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study', *JQR* 67: 30-43.
Goldschmidt, E.D.
1960 *The Passover Haggadah: Its Sources and History* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute [Hebrew]).
Goodblat, D.
1994–95 '"*Medinat Hayam*" the Coastal District', *Tarbiz* 64: 13-37 (Hebrew).
Grabbe, L.L.
1982 'Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis', *JJS* 33: 527-36.
Gruen, E.S.
2002 *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Hasselhoff, G.K.
2004 *Dicit Rabbi Moyses* (Würtzburg: Königshausem & Neumann).
Heinemann, I.
1950 'Philo als Vater der mittelaltereichen Philosophie', *Theologisch Zeitschrift* 6: 99-116.
Heinemann, J.
1966 *Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im: Its Nature and its Patterns* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).
1981 *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).
Hezser, C.
1993 *Form, Function, and Historical Significance of the Rabbinic Story in Yerushalmi Neziqin* (Tübingen: Mohr).
Innis, H.A.
1951 *The Bias of Communication* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
Jeremias, J.
1969 *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London: SCM Press).
Jobes K.H., and M. Silva
2001 *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic).
Kasher, A.
1980 'Jerusalem as a "Metropolis" in Philo's National Consciousness', *Cathedra* 11: 54-56 (Hebrew).
Kiley, M., *et al*.
1997 *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (London and New York: Routledge).
Klein, S.
1939 *Eretz Yehuda* (Tel Aviv: Dvir [Hebrew]).
Kugel J.L., and R.A. Greer
1986 *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
Levine, L.I.
1996 'Unity and Diversity in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the Diaspora Synagogue', in I. Gafni *et al*. (eds.), *The Jewish Hellenistic–Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History): 379-92 (Hebrew).

2000 *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Levine, L.I. (ed.)
1987 *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research).

Licht, Y.S.
1978 '*Hitsonim u-Genuzim*', *Encyclopaedia Biblica*: V, 1104-1105 (Hebrew).

Lieberman, S.
1962 *Greek and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (Jerusalem: n.p. [Hebrew]).

Linder, A.
1987 *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities).

Maimonides
1986 *Maimonides*, II (Responsa, 447; ed. J. Blau; Jerusalem: Sumptibus Societatis Mekize Nirdamin [Hebrew]).

Mantel, H.D.
1969 *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin (Mehkarim be-Toldot ha-Sanhedrin)* (Tel Aviv: Dvir [Hebrew]).

Mendels, Doron
1997 *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd edn).
1998 *Identity, Religion and Historiography* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1999 *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
2005 '"Ancient or American Diaspora?" A Review of *Gruen's* Diaspora', *Katharsis* 3: 38-47 (Hebrew).

Neeman, Y.
1997 'Tumat Eretz ha-Amim- Hebet Histori', *Sinai*: 256-61 (Hebrew).

Oppenheimer, A.
1997 '"Love of Mordechai or Hatred of Haman"? Purim in the Days of the Second Temple and Afterwards', *Zion* 62: 408-18 (Hebrew).
2005 'Rabban Gamliel of Yavneh and his Circuits of Eretz Israel', in A. Oppenheimer, *Between Rome and Babylon: Studies in Leadership and Society* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Pucci-Ben Zeev, Miriam
2006 'The Uprising in the Jewish Diaspora, 116–17', in *Cambridge History of Judaism*: IV, 93-104.

Rajak, Tessa
2001 'The Jewish Community and its Boundaries', in her *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome* (Leiden: Brill): 335-54.

Rappaport, U.
1996 'The Jews of Eretz-Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora During the Hellenistic and Hasmonean Periods', *Te'uda* 12: 1-9 (Hebrew).

Ravitzky, A.
1991 '"Way Marks to Zion": The History of an Idea', in M. Hallamish and A. Ravitzky (eds.), *The Land of Israel in Medieval Jewish Thought* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi): 1-39 (Hebrew).

Reif, S.C.
1993 *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rokeah, D.
1976 *Philonis Alexandrini De Providentia-De Decalogo Hypothetica* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew]).

Rosenfeld, B.Z.
1998 'The Crisis of the Patriarchate in Eretz Israel in the Fourth Century', *Zion* 53: 239-57 (Hebrew).
Roth-Gerson, Lea
1987 'Similarities and Differences in Greek Synagogue Inscriptions of Eretz-Israel and the Diaspora', in A. Kasher, A. Oppenheimer, and U. Rappaport (eds.), *Synagogues in Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi): 133-46 (Hebrew).
Safrai, S.
1965 *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Tel-Aviv: Am Hassefer Publishers [Hebrew]).
1994 *In Times of Temple and Mishnah: Studies in Jewish History*, I–II (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).
1996 'Contacts between the Leadership of the Land of Israel and the Hellenistic and Eastern Diasporas in the First and Second Centuries', *Te'uda*, 12: 23-38 (Hebrew).
2001 'Links between Eretz Israel and the Diaspora in the Roman and Byzantine Period', in I. Gafni (ed.), *Kehal Yisrael*; *Jewish Self Rule Through the Ages*, I (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History): 199-229 (Hebrew).
Safrai, S., and Z. Safrai
1998 *Haggadah of the Sages* (Jerusalem: Carta [Hebrew]).
Sanders, E.P.
1990 *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International).
Schwartz, D.R.
2004 *The Second Book of Maccabees* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew]).
Schwartz, S.
2001 *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Scribner, B.
1994 'Germany', in B. Scribner, R. Porter, and M. Teich (eds.), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 4-29.
Shalit, A.
1967 *Kadmoniot Ha'yehudim*, I (Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv: Bialik Institute [Hebrew]).
Solomon, D.
1979 'Reciprocal Spiritual and Cultural Influences between Diaspora and Eretz Israel Jewry during the Second Temple Era and Until the Revolt under Trajan' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Jerusalem [Hebrew]).
Stern, M.
1976–80 *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities).
Stökl ben Ezra, D.
2003 *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Sussmann, Y.
2005 'Torah she-Beal Peh Peshutah ke-Mashma', *Mehqerei Talmud* 3: 209-305 (Hebrew).
Tabory, J.
1995 *Jewish Festivals in the Time of the Mishnah and Talmud* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).

1996 *The Passover Ritual Throughout the Generations* (Tel Aviv: Hakkibutz Hameuchad Publishing House [Hebrew]).

Ta-Shma, I.M.

1999 *Talmudic Commentary in Europe and North Africa*, I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University Jerusalem [Hebrew]).

Tov, E.

1997a *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 2nd edn [English]).

1997b *The Textual Criticism of the Bible: An Introduction* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2nd edn [Hebrew]).

2003 'The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogue', in B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell): 237-59.

Trebilco, P.

1991 *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wasserstein, A.

1991–92 'Calendaric Implications of a Fourth-Century Jewish Inscription from Sicily', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 11: 162-65.

Wright, B.G., III

2003 'Access to the Sources: Cicero, Ben Sira, the Septuagint and the Audiences', *JSJ* 34: 20-25.

Zunz, Y.L.

1954 *Ha'drashot Be'Yisrael ve'Hishtalshelutan Ha'historit* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute [Hebrew]).