



## A Split Jewish Diaspora: Its Dramatic Consequences II\*

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

The article deals with the consequences of the split Diaspora that was described in Part I of this study (published in *JSP* 16.2 [2007]: 91-137). This second part demonstrates that the gap between western Jews and eastern ones continued and even widened in the early Middle Ages. The Jews in the west either converted to Christianity or remained biblical Jews. The latter were more agreeable to the Christian environment in Latin Europe, but at the moment the Rabbinic Law and lore started to arrive in Europe, the friction between Christians and Jews increased dramatically. Also, this study shows that the Jews living in the Byzantine Empire underwent the same processes that were experienced by their brethren in Latin Europe due to lack of communication with Rabbinic Judaism. In both Greek and Latin Europe, the Rabbinic revolution arrived circa the ninth century. This article also discusses various reactions to the earlier part of the study and thus add some useful information, clarify and strengthen some of their arguments in part I.

\* We offer our thanks to all who provided reactions to our article both in writing and orally: Menachem Blondheim, Kathy Ehrensperger, Hannan Eshel, Ranon Katzoff, Yehudah Liebes, Berachyahu Lifschitz, Israel Lee Levin, Vered Noam, Levi Yitzchak Rahmani, Serge Ruzer, Danny R. Schwartz, D. Moody Smith, Yaakov Sussmann, Shifra Sznol, Yaácov Vertzberger, Israel Yuval, and many others. We also express our deep gratitude to the Institute for Advanced Studies at the Hebrew University, under whose auspices this article was written, for providing hospitality that fosters academic growth. Thanks also 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. In particular we wish to thank Haym Soloveitchik and M. Toch for their support and assistance.

**Keywords:** Vernacular, anti-Semitism, nationalism, genizah, Christian laws, Jewish epigraphy, Jewish symbols (iconography), Rabbinic Judaism, Middle Ages, Toledo, Justinian, Agobard, western and eastern Judaism

### *Introduction*

This study is a continuation and completion of our previous article, which appeared in an earlier issue of this journal (Edrei and Mendels 2007). In the present study we have two primary objectives. Our first objective is to demonstrate that the gap between the eastern and western communities discussed in the previous article, which began in the first century of the Common Era, continued to exist well into the Middle Ages. We view this as a fact that strengthens our position regarding the estrangement of these two communities during the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods. We will demonstrate that this phenomenon impacted significantly on medieval Jewish history in the Greek-speaking Jewish communities of Byzantium and in the Latin-speaking communities in Western Europe. As any historian knows, research that produces evidence of the continuity of a historical trend contributes significantly to our understanding of the phenomenon. Thus, beyond its importance in shedding light on Jewish history during the Middle Ages, the continuity of the gap between the two Jewish diasporas supports our claims regarding the initiation of the process in the first century, and perhaps also our supposition that the greater part of the western diaspora disappeared and a smaller part remained biblical. Our second objective is to respond to the numerous comments that we received subsequent to the publication of our previous article, and to present a number of thoughts that have arisen in the interim.<sup>1</sup>

1. In this context, it might be worthwhile to relate to the thesis proposed by some scholars that Rabbinic Judaism constituted only a small percentage of the eastern Jewish diaspora (Schwartz 2001; Eliav 2004; 2006). The question that we raise in our two articles is completely different from questions regarding the degree to which the Rabbis were accepted in the Hebrew- and Aramaic-speaking communities. Our basic theory regarding the gap between the two diasporas relates primarily to the fact that Rabbinic Judaism did not proliferate in the west because of the language gap that existed between the two communities, regardless of the degree to which it was accepted in the east. Thus, the claim that the acceptance of Rabbinic Judaism was limited in the east does not negate our claim regarding the dichotomy between the east and the west.

*The Middle Ages*

The gap between the Jewish and non-Jewish sources regarding European Jewish history in the early Middle Ages is vast. Historians who attempt to write the history of European Jewish history are confused. There are essentially no contemporary Jewish sources that enable us to learn about Jewish history in Christian Europe between the first centuries and the ninth century.<sup>2</sup> Surprisingly, however, particularly in this period, we find a great deal of information from Christian sources about the local Jews.<sup>3</sup> One of the results of the lacuna in Jewish sources is that Jewish communities in Christian Europe that were well established by the tenth century developed legends that dealt with the origins of their communities.<sup>4</sup> This reality raises the question of how to explain the gap between Christian and Jewish sources during this period. Additionally, we might ask why, during the very same period, we find an unusual surge in literary creativity in the eastern Jewish communities, Palestinian and Babylonian, that does not acknowledge the Jews of the west. As we indicated in our first article, in the entire *Talmud*, practically no scholars from the west are mentioned. Although the allusions concerning communications of the *Geonim* with Jewish centers before the ninth century are very scarce (Brody 1998: 123-34), it seems that the Jews of Christian Europe had no contact with those centers until possibly in the mid-ninth century.

From the second century onwards, the sources available to us relating to the Jews in Europe become increasingly sparse. From this period until approximately the ninth century, practically the only sources available are the laws issued by secular leaders, Church synods, and the opinions of individual Christians about the Jews. There are scholars who claim that the legal sources reflect a repetitive nature that brings into question the degree to which they relate to real Jewish communities in the legislators' locales. In the view of these researchers, this explains the lack of

2. For a brilliant summary of research on the history of the Jews in Europe during this period, see Toch 2005.

3. See, for example, the sources collected from legislation in Linder 1987; 1997; and Schreckenberg 1990, I.

4. See, for example, Zfatman 1993, which relates the rise of the communities of Spain and Germany *vis-à-vis* the decline of the Babylonian domination. Regarding the Jews of Italy, see the *Scroll of Ahima'atz* and Bonfil 1987. Nevertheless, tales are problematic as historical documents. See Grossman 1982: 1-8.

parallel Jewish sources.<sup>5</sup> We will demonstrate further on that this conclusion is not inevitable, and will try to explain the dearth of Jewish sources in a manner that is consistent with the thesis of our previous study.

It is worth emphasizing the extent of the lack of contemporary Jewish sources during this period by pointing out that the Jewish bookshelf, or alternatively the Jewish cultural tradition, contains practically nothing that was created in Christian Europe during the first millennium. As stated previously, we know from religious and secular legal sources, as well as from Christian theological writings, of the presence of Jews in a variety of locales. These sources clearly testify that Jews observed circumcision, the Sabbath, the festivals, and the dietary laws. However, as previously mentioned, none of this information has been preserved in Jewish sources. One possible explanation would be that the Church completely destroyed existing Jewish literary works. This explanation does not seem plausible to us. In later periods, as is well known, the tremendous efforts of the Church to burn and completely destroy Jewish books were only partially successful. Why would we assume a much greater degree of success in the period under discussion, in which the relationship of the Church to the Jews was much more favorable, as we will discuss later. Suffice it to say that the hostility toward the Jews in this period paled by comparison to the persecutions in the High Middle Ages. It is more logical to assume that during this period the Jews did not produce significant literary works.

Since there is some evidence that there were Jews in Europe during the period under discussion, we believe that the aforementioned points strengthen our claim that throughout the period, Jews in Latin and Greek (Byzantine) Europe were either almost completely cut off from the Rabbinic tradition and from an ongoing connection to the Jews in the east and their literature, or had left Judaism altogether. In our opinion, this fact explains the gap between information found in Jewish and Christian sources in Europe. The Jew who was the subject of Jewish literature in the east (Palestinian and Babylonian), and for whom it was written, was a Jew already committed to the Rabbinic tradition to some degree. This Jew knew Hebrew and Aramaic, languages in which he studied, prayed, and read the Torah. In contrast, the European Jew was cut off from this, and was thus understandably not referred to in later medieval Jewish traditional sources. The Jews of the east and the west

5. See, for example, Lotter 2003 in contrast to Toch 2005.

were unable to communicate with each other, from the perspectives of both the language and content of their traditions. On the other hand, the Christian literature in that period viewed the Jews of the west as the preservers of the biblical tradition in every way. The Christians viewed them as being faithful to the Old Testament, and therefore mentioned them in that context in their literature.

A study of Christian laws from this period reveals a well-known trend that the Church tried vigorously to create legal barriers between Christians and Jews. Various approaches have been suggested to explain the motivation for this separation (J. Cohen 1999; Stow 2006), which is not the subject of this article. One can, however, conclude, based on the efforts of the Church to create barriers that such barriers did not naturally exist in practice. The prohibitions imposed by the Church imply that Jews and Christians actually did business with each other, ate together, celebrated together, mingled socially, and even married each other (Toch 2005). The Church tried to alter this reality and create a separation between Christians and Jews. Yet, as far as we know, there were not serious persecutions of the Jews in Europe during this period as part of a broad policy, with the exception of some unusual incidents, which we will discuss soon.<sup>6</sup>

Be that as it may, a close look at these laws continuously raises the image of the Jew as one who lives according to the guidelines of the Bible, as we suggested in our previous article. Thus, for example, references to the synagogue relate to the reading of the Torah (Novella of Justinian, 553 CE), to the recitation of Psalms<sup>7</sup>, and, one can infer, to assembly for prayer on the Sabbath and festivals.<sup>8</sup> Yet, we do not find references, for example, to two paradigmatic Rabbinic innovations—organized prayer on weekdays in the morning or evening, and regular Torah study. It is fascinating to take note, in this context, of the Jewish holidays mentioned in the Christian laws. Pesach (Passover), Shavuot (Pentecost), Sukkot (Tabernacles), and Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), which are all biblically ordained holidays, are mentioned. Purim,

6. See, for example, for the moderate tone, Linder 1997: 465-66 (Gaul, the Vannes Synods in 465 CE).

7. See Linder 1997: 477, on the Synod of Narbonne in 589 CE, which prohibited the Jews from singing psalms during a funeral.

8. It appears from various documents that the Jews would gather on holidays in order to conduct communal celebrations. Nevertheless, the implication is that the place in which they gathered was not a synagogue. See, for example, the letter of Gregory I to Peter, the Bishop of Terracina in March 591 CE, which is found in Linder 1997: 417-18.

a holiday cited in the Writings, is also mentioned in the early Christian laws, and naturally offended the Christians.<sup>9</sup> To the best of our knowledge, Hannukah is not mentioned at all, probably, we can assume, because the western Jews did not celebrate it, since it was a Rabbinic innovation. It is worth pointing out in this context that also in anti-Jewish laws, such as can be found in Visigoth Spain, Jewish rituals that are prohibited include only circumcision, the Sabbath, the festivals, and the dietary laws, and not rituals that are characteristically Rabbinic.<sup>10</sup> Let us give an example.

The laws relating to Jews deal significantly with issues associated with Christian slaves serving Jews. Toch (2005: 563) claims that it is difficult to assume that there were Jewish slave merchants since the Jews were religiously observant and according to *halakhic* Law would have to convert the slaves in their possession. He concludes that the Christian law forbidding ownership bore no resemblance to the reality. However, the prohibition of retaining in one's possession uncircumcised slaves is not a biblical one (Urbach 1988). It is thus probable that the western Jews, who relied solely on biblical tradition, were not familiar with this halakhic innovation. If so, this proof of Toch falls by the wayside, and we could, therefore, assume that the Christian law had some basis in reality.

9. See, for example, Linder 1997: 263 (Passover and Sabbath), 27 (Passover, fast—apparently Yom Kippur, and presents [apparently Purim]), 48 (Sabbath, Purim, and other festivals), 64 (Sabbath and other holidays), 68 (festive gifts), 80, 83, 86, 138 (Sabbath and other holidays), 184-85 (festivals and Passover), 220 (Sabbath and other festivals), 240 (festivals), 263 (Sabbath, Passover, and other festivals), 285 (Sabbath, Passover, and other festivals), 294 (Sabbath, the New Month, Sukkot, and other holidays), 322 (Sabbath and other festivals), 324 (Sabbath and other holidays), 418, 443 (festivals), 463 (Passover, acceptance of gifts, other festivals), and so on. With regard to Passover, we find in several laws a reference to the fourteenth of Nisan as the date that the Jews celebrated the holiday. See, for example, the Visigoth law (Linder 1997: 263) which was codified in the seventh century. Is it possible that the fourteenth of Nisan is mentioned instead of the fifteenth because the Jews continued to celebrate by roasting a lamb on the afternoon before Passover, a practice that was unequivocally prohibited by the Rabbis? The *Tosefta* (*Yom Tov* 2.15) records that Todos the Roman would roast a lamb on Passover, which incurred the wrath of the Rabbis.

10. Linder 1997: 517-21. It is an interesting fact that formal documents from the period that deal with the Jewish holidays do not, to our knowledge, mention Hannukah (a passage in the *Canons of the Apostles* [Linder 1997: 27] definitely does not refer to Hannukah). This too might be because it is a holiday that was initiated by the Rabbis and which was not adopted in the west.

In his excellent article regarding the Jewish diaspóra during the period under discussion, Michael Toch claims that a majority of the Jews disappeared from Europe during this time. As such, he suggests that Christian legislation relating to Jews was not based on contemporary reality, but was at times a rehash of earlier laws that the legislator utilized (Toch 2005). This position, however, is not universally accepted by all researchers. Some claim that there were significant pockets of Jewish population in Europe during this period (Lotter 2003). We believe that regarding the issue as to whether or not there were Jews in Europe at the time, we must consider the possibility that the gap between what is implied by Christian and Jewish sources is not the result of a gap between the legislation and the reality, but rather reflects a gap between *two* types of Jews. According to this suggestion, the Christian legislator describes the Jew in his locale as a biblical Jew who refused to accept Jesus and who continued to observe a number of biblical commandments. In contrast, sources from the east and tenth-century European Jewish sources deal with a normative Rabbinic Jew. These sources, therefore, do not refer to European Jews during the period under discussion. In addition, Christian laws and Church synods often refer to apostate Jews who ostensibly accepted Christianity, but whose allegiance was suspect. The sources suggest that this phenomenon was widespread. There is also evidence of apostate Jews, or crypto-Jews, in historical sources that include stories, in our opinion aetiological, which explain why so many Jews living in the cradle of Christianity disappeared.<sup>11</sup> These points all strengthen the conclusion at the end of our first article that many Jews in Christian areas disappeared, and that the rest remained Biblical Jews.

We can set a *terminus ad quem* for the indifference of the Jews of Latin Europe to Rabbinic law. Agobard of Lyons, writing to Emperor Louis the Pious in Aachen in the third decade of the ninth century, portrays the Jews as abiding by minutia of the Rabbinic laws of kosher food ('Kashrut'; for instance, Agobard, in E. Duemmler, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolarum Tomus V, Karolini Aevi III* [1899], pp. 189-90). They also possess the Shiur Qomah (a mystical work on the dimensions of the Godhead), some of the mystical Hekhalot literature and traditions about the God's abode taken either from the Talmudic

11. Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.38 (The Jews of Crete); Severus of Minorca (see Schwartz 2001: 197); Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, Book 5, chapter 11 (mass conversion of the Jews in Clermont-Ferrand).

tractate of *Hagigah* or from works sharing this tradition (CC CM, 52, pp. 189-95). We may assume that these religious practices and traditions were characteristic of the Jews around Lyon and, probably, also of those in Lotharingia where the Carolingian capital was located. However, this may not be true for all Jews in the Carolingian Empire. The transformation both in practice and in outlook may not have been completed until the mid-tenth century or so.

Without seeking to enter the complex debate of the reasons behind the transformation of European anti-Semitism in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth century (Funkenstein 1968; 1971; Merchavia 1970; J. Cohen 1999: 147-66), we would like simply to make the following observation. Cohen and others have observed that in the course of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century Europe discovered that the Jews did not live by biblical law but by a different code of religious conduct known as the Oral Law. This discovery placed under heavy question the long-standing Augustinian doctrine of tolerance of the Jews. Thus we wish to note that it may not be simply a question of Christian discovery but also of Jewish re-making. The Jews themselves discovered the Oral Law and undertook to live by its light only in the late eighth and early ninth centuries, at the earliest, a large number possibly only in the course of the tenth. As long as Jews in Europe were faithful only to the biblical tradition and viewed only the Bible as canon, the Christians viewed them as a people that preserved the ancient faith that preceded Christianity. While they might have viewed them as stubborn, misguided, and perhaps even dangerous because they did not accept the new revelation, they also saw them as proof of the New Testament that was built upon the Old (according to the view of Augustine). Once Rabbinic literature became known in Europe, however, the Jews constituted a more blatant challenge to the Christian interpretation of their common roots. From a Christian perspective, a biblical Jew is 'stuck' in the past, anachronistic, but still a 'member of the family'.<sup>12</sup> A Rabbinic Jew, in contrast, is one who has

12. It is possible to argue that before the ninth century, prior to the arrival of Rabbinic literature, the Jews received informal Christian education, a practice that was presumably minimized with the introduction of formal Jewish education in Hebrew-Aramaic. In our examination of the recent book of Teresa Morgan (1998) regarding education in the late Greco-Roman period, we did not find any answer to this question, as the book is merely an unsuccessful rehash of work that is already well established in the study of Marrou (1948); referring to Morgan's book, Grafton and Williams (2006: 304), justifiably state that Marrou is still a standard reference. With regard to education in the Middle Ages, see Begley and Koterski 2005 and Fontaine 2005. We cannot reconcile

chosen an interpretation of the Old Testament that diverges from the Christian interpretation, and is thus more foreign, more different, and more of a threat. Such a Jew can no longer be considered a 'member of the family' who lends credence to the New Testament. It may be worthwhile to integrate this new perspective on the belated Rabbinism of the Jews of Latin Europe with the recent studies of the transformation of medieval anti-Semitism and see if there are any significant connections between these two far-reaching mutations.

It is possible to find the initial stages of this metamorphosis already in seventh-century Spain. Scholars have wondered (Toch 2005: 551; J. Cohen 1999: 103-105) why in the decisions of the Councils of Toledo in 638 CE<sup>13</sup> the Christians adopted an increasingly aggressive tone toward the Jews in contrast to the relatively moderate tone that characterizes this era. Perhaps we can find the answer in the formulation of the legislation itself. In the oath to be taken by Jews who converted to Christianity, they had to declare, among other things, that:

We undertake to present to your inspection all the Scriptures that are customarily held by our nation in the synagogues for the sake of the doctrine, those which are authoritative as well as those they call *deuterias*; and those they name *apocrypha*... (Linder 1997: 499)

In other words, there is a hint here that the appearance of the *Mishnah* (*deuterias*, and perhaps the Oral Law in general) in Spain, albeit as a non-binding text,<sup>14</sup> caused an increase in the harshness of the Christian tone toward the Jews. By the time Rabbinic literature was in force among the Jews of Europe in the tenth century, this harshness was at its height. As such, we can point to the Councils of Toledo as a harbinger of future developments in Europe several centuries later. We would not attribute the change of approach solely to the aggressiveness of Isidore (J. Cohen 1999: 100-15). We emphasize that the events in Toledo apparently corresponded to the first appearance of Rabbinic literature there, a phenomenon which, according to Jewish sources, occurred much earlier

ourselves to the idea that most Jews at that time received formal Christian education, but it is reasonable to assume that perhaps the Jewish elite did. We might also assume that the introduction of Rabbinic literature and formal, institutionalized Jewish education distanced the Jews from Gentile education and widened the gap between Christians and Jews. This issue requires further research.

13. Linder 1997: 494-500 (Toledo 6).

14. It is interesting to note that there is here a clear distinction between three categories of literature: the Old Testament, the Oral Law, and the Apocrypha.

in Spain than in Germany. It is possible to see the first signs of the arrival of Rabbinic literature in Europe in the writings of Agobard on the Jews. It appears that he had some familiarity with this literature, if not from reading it himself, then at least from his discussions from local Jews or from hearsay (Merchavia 1970: 71-84; J. Cohen 1999: 130). An even earlier reference to the *Mishnah* (*dueteras*) is found in the Novella of Justinian in 553 CE, which was written in Greek-speaking Byzantium several decades prior to the Councils of Toledo. These two references are like a drop in the ocean in comparison to the activity in the same locations several centuries later, corresponding to the appearance and proliferation of Rabbinic literature in Europe, apparently arriving with waves of immigration from the east.

We wish to strengthen what we said in our first article (Edrei and Mendels 2007: 127) about the Novella of Justinian, and shed a new light on it, by analyzing the following citation:

Furthermore, those who read the Greek shall use the Septuagint tradition, which is more accurate than all others, and is preferable to the others particularly in reason of what happened while the translation was made. [...] Let all use mainly this translation, but in order that we shall not appear to prohibit them all the other translations, 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, on the other hand, 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: 66)

Scholars have wondered about the identity of those mentioned by Justinian. It should be emphasized here that we do not view the Novella as a proof of our theory, but rather, we believe that it is explained well by our theory. This interpretation completes the picture regarding the gap between the diasporas that we described. It is important to keep in mind that Justinian ruled in Palestine as well, and that he thus ruled over different types of Jews—on the one hand, Aramaic-speaking Jews in Israel who were committed to the Rabbinic tradition, and on the other hand, Greek-speaking western Jews who were not connected to this tradition. It is thus reasonable to posit that the Novella suggests an attempt by the Jews of the east in the sixth century to bridge the gap and bring Rabbinic literature to the attention of the western Jews. It reflects a conflict between the Jews of the east and the west. The western Jews, who were already cut off from these developments for centuries, were

apparently opposed to accepting the Oral Law as binding and authoritative. Justinian was called upon to mediate between them, and he did indeed come to a compromise of sorts. On the one hand, he allowed the use of the translation of Aqilas in the synagogue, a move that appeased the Rabbis who preferred this translation to the Septuagint. On the other hand, he appeased the western Jews by opposing the Oral Law. This implies that the Rabbis tried—at least at a later stage—to create a substantive connection with the Jews of the west, and to bring them into the fold of Rabbinic law, but they were rebuffed. In our opinion, a similar attempt is reflected in the rulings of the Councils of Toledo several decades later. This latter attempt succeeded to the degree that the Jews of the west accepted Rabbinic law as a non-binding text. We see at the end of the first section of the Novella that Justinian warns the Rabbis of Israel not to meddle any more in matters relating to the Jews of the west, and not to try to impose the Oral Law upon them. Here the Emperor probably expresses the aspiration of the Christians that the Jews remain dedicated solely to the Old Testament, as well as their severe opposition to the Oral Law.

An alternative explanation that we might suggest to the Novella (which does not negate our theory regarding the split in the Diaspora) is that the internal conflict that it reveals was within the Jewish community in Palestine, and that the community turned to the Emperor for a decisive ruling. The Novella includes several classic indications of language used in Palestine at the time. For example, the use of the term *rosh perek* (literally ‘beginning of the chapter’) is an expression that was well known in Eretz-Israel—*reish pirka*. Thus, it could be that the Novella responds to a controversy over the language for the reading of the Torah between the Greek-speaking and Hebrew-speaking Jewish communities in the Land of Israel itself. While addressing this issue, Justinian, as a Christian Emperor, takes the opportunity to prohibit the reading of the *Mishnah*, which he views as a human creation that 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’. If this interpretation is correct, then the Novella of Justinian does not suggest an attempt by the Rabbis to disseminate the *Mishnah* among the Jews of the west. This would be consistent with our claim in our previous article that the Rabbis did not initiate any attempts to connect the western Diaspora to Rabbinic law.

We would like to add that evidence regarding the Jews in Greek-speaking Europe (the Byzantine Empire) in the early Middle Ages is

even more dismal. Indeed, fragments found in the Cairo genizah written in Judeo-Greek (Greek written in Hebrew letters) were published by De Lange (1996).<sup>15</sup> This collection includes, among other things, a translation of Ecclesiastes to Judeo-Greek, and fragments of the Passover *haggadah* also in Judeo-Greek. The genizah also includes two Hebrew–Greek glossaries for the language of the *Mishnah* (De Lange 1996: 295–305; Sznol 2005; 2006). This fact only gives evidence that the *Mishnah* and the Passover *haggadah* were known in Europe by the tenth century,<sup>16</sup> as the Cairo genizah only includes material from the ninth–tenth centuries onward. There are scholars (Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1999) who claim that these fragments testify to the existence of a Greek Jewish community that represents a direct and natural continuation of Judaism during the Roman–Hellenistic period. In our opinion, this theory is built upon unfounded assumptions. In addition, De Lange published the translation of a section of Ecclesiastes in Judeo-Greek that appears to be very close to the translation of Aqilas (De Lange 1996: 71–78). As is known, the Rabbis supported the translation of Aqilas (Edrei and Mendels 2007: 127–28). To the best of our knowledge, the Judeo-Greek translation was a precise literal translation.<sup>17</sup> If, however, it included Rabbinic influences, it would prove that the Rabbis knew that they could only influence the western community through the Bible and Greek language! They understood that the Bible was considered by this Jewish community to be the authentic religious literary creation, and that it would be impossible to impose any other literature (Sznol 1996; 2006).

With regard to our claim, it is clear beyond doubt that the Jews in both Greek and Latin Europe who did not convert to Christianity remained biblical Jews at least until the ninth–tenth centuries. If there are still scholars who believe that Rabbinic literature was known in Europe before the ninth century, they are certainly not supported by either the

15. See, among others, the criticism of Jacoby 1998, Niehoff-Panagiotidis 1999, and Ta-Shema 2000. For a comprehensive bibliography, see Sznol 1999.

16. It is important to note that the Greek *haggadah* found in the genizah includes the opening section *Ha Lahma Anya* ('This is the bread of affliction'). This section, the only section of the *haggadah* written in the original Aramaic rather than in Hebrew, dates from the period of the *Geonim* in Babylonia, as opposed to the rest of the *haggadah*, which originated in the Land of Israel. In other words, it is certain that the Greek *haggadah* in the genizah is a later text that originated in Babylonia and does not give evidence to the continuity of the Byzantine Jewish community. See Safrai and Safrai 1998: 109–12.

17. See, for example, the recent work of Zipor 2005: 33–35.

Church laws and synods, or by the writings of Christian theologians. On the contrary, these sources clearly prove that the Christians in these areas were not familiar with Rabbinic literature, and that the Christian reactions when they did appear were substantively different from their earlier reactions, to the extent that the Jews were merely seen as the testimony of the Old Testament.

As stated, there is hardly any internal Jewish information until approximately the ninth century regarding the presence of Jews in Greek and Latin Europe and their history.<sup>18</sup> It is interesting to consider at what point Jewish sources begin to provide systematic information, and why. The simple fact is that the appearance of internal Jewish information and inscribed fragments of a collective memory regarding the Jews of Europe parallels, in terms of both time and location, the beginning of Rabbinic writing in Europe, or in other words Torah study, in the ninth–tenth centuries. From the time that we have Rabbinic writings that are preserved in the Rabbinic tradition, we also have the preservation of information that allows for the initial writing of history. As mentioned previously, from the first centuries through the ninth century, the only information available to us is through Christian sources. It is quite certain that a Jewish presence all over Europe was apparent, albeit a significant minority, and that those Jews were not connected to the tradition of Rabbinic writing and thought. It is, therefore, no wonder that this tradition does not mention them. In contrast, the literature of the Christians, who maintained a dialogue with them, does mention them.

### *Supplemental Comments and Reactions to the First Article*

#### *Epigraphy and Iconography*

(1) We had a fascinating discussion with Levi Yitzchak Rahmani on the question of the presence of the Jews in Europe during the first millennium. In light of this discussion, we would like to expand on the subject of epigraphic remnants that give evidence to the presence of Jews in the areas under discussion. In fact, Jewish gravestones have been found in southern Europe, providing evidence of the existence of Jewish communities there (Noy 1993). It is doubtful that these Jews had contact with eastern Jewish communities and with the spiritual world of the Rabbis. We draw the readers attention to the following facts and claims:

18. For a stimulating attempt to prove the twilight of Judaism in Europe in this period in the literature of the later period, see Bonfil 1987.

- a. A vast majority of the inscriptions on Jewish gravestones and amulets are in Greek or Latin. This fact demonstrates that these languages were the primary languages, if not the exclusive languages, for both interpersonal communication and public expression in the spiritual and intellectual lives of these Jews.
- b. Indeed, on a significant percentage of inscriptions, there is also some Hebrew writing. The Hebrew inscriptions indicate that even though Hebrew was not the language of these Jews, they viewed it as an important symbol of their identity. They also indicate that these Jews wished to preserve their separate Jewish identity. However, in examining the inscriptions themselves, it becomes clear that their knowledge of Hebrew as a living language was quite weak. Furthermore, the content of the inscriptions is not connected to the innovations of the Rabbis. It is interesting to note that along with the Hebrew inscriptions, or in their place, the monuments often include drawings of Jewish symbols such as a *shofar* or a *menorah* (Goodenough 1965; Noy 1993). We will comment on this iconography later on.
- c. It should be noted that a large percentage of the Hebrew inscriptions consist of isolated words that are found repetitively on many monuments, such as *shalom* ('peace'), or phrases such as *shalom al yisrael* ('peace on Israel') or *shalom al menuhato* ('rest in peace'). These words and phrases are repeated frequently and were apparently copied in a mechanical fashion. It is therefore correct, in our opinion, to view these inscriptions as accepted cultural symbols, and not as a proof of the use of Hebrew as a vernacular, and certainly not as an indication of familiarity with Rabbinic Hebrew.
- d. There are a number of inscriptions that demonstrate a somewhat more sophisticated Hebrew (Noy 1993: 151, 157, 169, 207), and there are similarly a number of biblical quotes in Hebrew, at times accompanied by a Greek or Latin translation (Noy 1993: 57, 151, 155, 204, 247-48 etc.). We believe that with the passage of time, the knowledge of Hebrew increased to a certain degree, and not the opposite as might have been expected. That is to say, if our hypothesis is correct, that while the Jews of southern Europe did not know Hebrew during the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods, the knowledge of Hebrew increased very slowly in subsequent years as it made its way from the east to southern Europe (Noy 1993: 247 [Tortosa, fifth–sixth centuries]). In this context, we would point

out that while Hebrew served at times as a cultural symbol, only later—that is, with the proliferation of Rabbinic literature in the ninth century—did it become a vernacular.<sup>19</sup>

- e. Shaye Cohen proved that the title ‘Rabbi’ that appears on inscriptions in Italy (and in other places) does not refer to the title as used in the *Mishnah* and *Talmud*. Rather, it is used in a popular fashion to refer to a person that has a respected standing in the community (S. Cohen 1981). Therefore, the appearance of the title in inscriptions does not give evidence of a leadership position that is parallel to the position accepted in Rabbinic Judaism.

All of these points, in addition to the fact that the inscriptions found were located in a confined geographic area, indicate that epigraphy does not support the conclusion that Jews in the west had a significant knowledge of Hebrew, or that they were influenced in any way by Rabbinic Judaism.

(2) In addition to gravestones, there are other archaeological finds of interest, including the remains of synagogues in Byzantine Europe (Levine 2000: 232-37), in which we find Jewish symbols such as the *menorah* (candelabrum), the *shofar* (ram’s horn), and the *lulav* (palm branch). For example, on the gravestone of Claudia Maximilla and a Jewish family from Panonia (today number 62.70.1 in the Archaeological Museum in Budapest) there is a Latin and Greek inscription accompanied by the picture of a *menorah*. The inscription is from the fourth century of the common era. Be that as it may, these symbols are all of biblical origin and served as (iconographic) symbols prior to the Second Temple period.

Professor D. Moody Smith of Duke University mentioned to us that our claim in the first article supports the well known position of Goodenough that the art from the period and location under discussion reflects a Judaism that is certainly not Rabbinic.<sup>20</sup> While we do not see ourselves as

19. In the Carolingian law of the ninth century, it is mentioned that when a Jew swears, ‘He must have in his right hand Moses’ five books according to his law, and if he could not have it in Hebrew he shall have it Latin’ (Merovingian and Carolingian Capitularies in Linder 1997: 346). The entry of the Bishop who is mentioned in Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, Book 8.1, describes an event in 585 CE in which it is written that the Jews ‘sang...praises in their own tongue’.

20. In his monumental work, Goodenough stated the following: ‘But it seems to me overwhelmingly probable that the actual artifacts in Rome and Dura are more reliable evidence for Jewish thought in Rome and Dura than are the *Mishnah* and early *Midrashim* of the rabbis in Palestine’ (Goodenough 1965, XII: 185).

having the expertise to discuss art, we would like to point out that biblical Jewish symbols were not antithetical to Rabbinic practice, as they continued to be accepted and authorized in all generations and across all geographical boundaries (from Dura Europus, to Palestine, to Europe). These symbols represent an agreed upon and accessible common denominator between the Jewish communities of the east and the west. In reality, because of the language gap that we described in our previous study, the visual arts served as a common and accessible language of communication for all of Judaism. In addition, it is important to note that even in later periods, particularly Rabbinic Jewish symbols did not develop. The ancient symbols that we have mentioned, with additional motifs from pagan and Christian art, continued to serve the needs of Jewish iconography well into the Middle Ages. A Jew who was committed to Rabbinic Judaism and a western Hellenistic Jew could both accept the Jewish iconography discussed without any dissonance with the form of Judaism that they adopted. (Similarly, we do not necessarily agree with Goodenough regarding the sources from which the art sprouted—that is, Hellenistic literature, and primarily the works of Philo of Alexandria.<sup>21</sup>) Iconography can provide a unifying symbolism that bridges language differences, and even sectarianism. Even a Jew who does not know Hebrew can remain connected to iconographic symbols.

#### *The Controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees*

One of the most interesting comments that we received to our previous article dealt with the sectarian divisions that characterized the Jewish world at the end of the Second Temple period. Professor Berachyahu Lifschitz, who is in the process of publishing an article on this topic, argued that we must take into account that a variety of sects developed in the Land of Israel at this time in spite of the fact that they all spoke the same language. The focus of the polemic between these sects was *halakhah*. Historians have wondered at the apparent disappearance of these sects, which were not heard from again after the destruction of the Temple. Lifschitz claims, however, that the sects did not disappear, but continued to exist as separate factions. According to his thesis, the split in the Jewish world was not between east and west, as we claimed in our article, but that it was divided along ideological religious lines, regardless of geographical dispersion. He claims that the Jerusalem sectarian-

21. See Goodenough 1965: XII, 3-21. For a recent academic digest of research on this topic, see Fine 2005.

ism that is familiar to us from the Hasmonean period is essentially the picture of the Jewish world during the remainder of the Second Temple period, and after the destruction. The Jews of Israel that emigrated or were dispersed to the west brought with them the multifaceted character of the Jewish community in Israel. The western Jewish diaspora was essentially the same as the eastern diaspora. In both locations the Jews were divided into sects. In both locations there were Pharisees and Sadducees. Lifschitz questions our thesis, claiming that the Sadducees were the ones who wanted no part of Rabbinic Judaism, which was the continuation of Pharisaic Judaism, without relation to language or to geography—east or west.

The problem with this proposal, in our opinion, is that it is difficult to claim, in light of the proofs cited in our previous article, that there were Pharisees in the west who relied on the tradition of the Rabbis and accepted their authority. As we have demonstrated, there is hardly a mention of Rabbinic sages who taught in the west, of traditions or teachings that came from there, of institutions of Torah study, or any other manner in which the Rabbinic teachings were proliferated in those regions. The few references that do exist are actually, in our opinion, proofs to the contrary. In fact, two Rabbinic sages from the west are mentioned in the *Talmud*—Todos *Ish Romi* (the Roman) and Matya b. Heresh, who went from Israel to Rome in order to establish a *yeshivah* (Talmudic academy). Yet, the references to them are so minimal that it actually points to the almost complete absence of Rabbinic teaching in the west. The one teaching of Todos in all of Rabbinic literature, is in fact a degradation of his position. The *Tosefta* records that his instruction to take a lamb on the night of Passover was ‘close to feeding people sanctified meat outside of the confines of the Temple’ (*t. Beitzah* 2.15). Similarly, there is only one homiletical teaching in his name in Rabbinic literature. We really know nothing about this scholar, to the point that scholarly estimations of the time that he lived span 200 years, ranging from the first century BCE through the first century CE.<sup>22</sup> How might we

22. The *Babylonian Talmud* wonders who this man was: ‘They asked him, “Was Todos the Roman a great man or a sycophant?”’ (*Berakhot* 19a). The *Jerusalem Talmud* also raises the question: ‘What is Todos?’, meaning ‘Who is Todos?’ In both Talmuds, the response is that he supported scholars: ‘Who is Todos? R. Hananya said, “He sent support to the scholars”’ (*Jerusalem Talmud, Pesahim*, 7.1, *Tur* 536). And in the *Babylonian Talmud*, ‘R. Yosi bar Avin said, “He filled up the pockets of the scholars”’ (*Pesahim* 53a, and parallels). The contention that he supported scholars is not cited in

explain that we know hardly anything about a well-known scholar in Rome? Is there a significant *tanna* or *amora* about whom we do not know the generation in which he taught, his activities, his teachers and his students? Furthermore, how is it possible that an important scholar has only one law and one homiletical teaching recorded in the *Talmud*, and these in an off-handed manner? Indeed, there was apparently a Jewish religious leader in Rome named Todos (or Tavdas), but the fact that he is practically not mentioned in the *Talmud* itself proves that there was a lack of contact between the Sages in Palestine and the Jewish community in Rome.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, with regard to Rav Matya ben Heresh, who we are told migrated from the Land of Israel to Rome to establish a *yeshivah*,<sup>24</sup> it is interesting to note that, in the final analysis, we know nothing about his activity in Rome. We do not know if he succeeded in establishing a *yeshivah*, and, if so, what was taught there. There is no record in all of Rabbinic literature of a new idea that emanated from

either *Talmud* as a historical assertion, but rather as an explanation of his name. Nevertheless, the fact that each *Talmud* asks about his name indirectly implies that they did not know of him or his activities.

23. The *Tosefta* states that the Rabbis opposed Todos' custom of eating a roasted lamb on Passover because 'it is close to feeding sanctified meat outside of the Temple since they call them Paschal lambs' (*t. Yom Tov* 2.15). Lieberman claims that those who roasted a lamb in the Land of Israel on Passover eve did not call it a Paschal lamb because they made a distinction between a sacrifice and plain meat, while in Rome they did not make that distinction and referred to the roasted lamb as the Paschal lamb. In other words, the Rabbis vigorously opposed it because they saw it as the Paschal lamb. More than this example teaches us about a particular scholar in Rome, it demonstrates how estranged the Roman community was from Rabbinic opinion. See Boxer 1987.

24. The legend that appears in *Yalkut Shimoni* (*Exodus* [*Va'yera*], 182) is certainly from a relatively very late date and can thus certainly not serve as a historical source for the ancient world. In the first part of this study (Edrei and Mendels 2007), we mentioned that there are scholars from the west who are mentioned in the Talmuds in a very marginal fashion. We emphasized that they are mentioned only once or a few isolated times, and that although they might come from the west, they certainly lived in Palestine and studied Torah there exclusively. There is, however, no proof of scholars from the Land of Israel going to the west to teach Torah, and certainly not to learn Torah. In all of the cases that we cited, the *Talmud* mentions the person's origin in the west, but does not refer to his title or to his activities there. In this context, it is worth mentioning also R. Shimon ben Yosi ben Lakonia, who is mentioned several times in Talmudic literature, and about whom it is claimed that his family may have originated in Sparta (Amitay 2007). Even if this claim is correct, it supports our thesis that the degree to which scholars of western origin are mentioned in the *Talmud*, it refers to scholars or families that emigrated to Palestine.

there. We also know nothing about his students or about sayings that he delivered while serving in Rome.

Perhaps, a question that should arise from Professor Lifschitz's thesis is whether the split between the east and west was not a linguistic division, as we have claimed, but rather an ideological split between Pharisees and Sadducees. In other words, might it be that the sectarian distinctions familiar to us in Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple continued after the destruction as a division between the two Judaisms on opposite banks of the Mediterranean Sea? Was the eastern Jewish community Pharisaic and the western community Sadducean? We believe that this was not the case. In addition to the fact that we find no evidence of Sadducean Judaism in the west, we would like to raise other points that make this thesis improbable in our eyes.<sup>25</sup>

First, there is a controversy as to what motivated and initiated the sectarian divisions in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period. Some place its beginnings as early as the third century BCE and some as late as the middle of the second century BCE. Nevertheless, everyone agrees that the phenomenon disappeared when the Temple was destroyed. Our primary source of information about the sects is from the writings of Josephus Flavius. Josephus wrote in Rome and described the Jewish sects during the time of the Second Temple period (*War* 2.8; *Ant.* 18.11-25), but he writes about them as a phenomenon that occurred in historical times. Since Josephus's work does not go beyond 73 CE, his historical writings cannot serve as evidence for the existence of the 'Jewish sects' after the destruction.

Second, we must keep in mind that although the appearance of sectarian movements during the Second Temple period was an important phenomenon, it was relatively marginal in its scope. Although much of the information about the sects is inaccessible, there are some points that are clear and agreed upon, such as the fact that it was centered primarily in Jerusalem, and that it involved maximally 10 per cent of the total Jewish population of Israel (Baumgarten 1997, Ch. 1). There is a debate as to whether there were sects in the Galilee region, but there is certainly no evidence that the sects existed in the diaspora. Thus, the remaining 90 per cent of the Jews in Palestine and all of the Jews of the diaspora at that time were simply Jews—not Pharisees or Sadducees, or members of any other sect. Let us cite one of the important scholars of the period on this point:

25. The Jewish–Hellenistic literature cited by M. D. Herr (1996) cannot give definitive evidence to Sadducean views. We hope to elaborate on this point in the near future.

The question has been raised, what characterized the others—90% of the population—who were not members of the various sects. We might say that the silent majority were dedicated to the Temple, which was the central institution in the life of the nation. They did not identify with any particular group, and the controversy between the sects did not interest them. He who was connected to the mass of the people accepted the traditions received from his parents and grandparents as self evident, and fulfilled the commandments of the Torah with the assumption that whatever was good for them, was correct for him as well. (Baumgarten 1997: 16)

Third, we must ask how it could happen that the position of one group took hold in one region, while the other dominated in another region. It is clear that at the outset both had followings in all areas. A historian would have to explain how this pluralism ended and was replaced by a dichotomy.

Fourth, the essence of the Sadducean laws as we know them, and the essence of the polemic between the Sadducees and the Rabbis, revolved around the administration of the Temple. The Pharisees were the ones who transferred the focal point of the Jewish religious experience from the Temple to daily life, an approach that was continued by the Rabbis. A significant portion of the extant halakhic controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees relate to the stringencies of the Sadducees regarding the Temple ritual and regarding purity and impurity. The religious experience of the Sadducees focused on the Temple, where they waged their religious struggles and sought to strengthen the standing of the priesthood. In light of these facts, it is logical to assume that Jews who were geographically distant from the Temple would also be distant from the Sadducean approach. It would be hard to explain why a community that was so far removed from the world of the Temple, and that was integrated to some degree in a non-Jewish daily life, would adopt an ideology that was primarily concerned with the administration of the Temple. While the Qumran sect was known to be very involved with Temple ritual in spite of their distance from Jerusalem, they existed in isolation, unlike the western Jews who were integrated in the life of the surrounding society.

Thus, even if we accept Berachyahu Lifschitz's claim regarding the continued existence of the Sadducees in the first centuries of the common era, there is no relationship between his claim and the dichotomy that we have posited. The question of the disappearance of the Sadducees is a completely different question than the one that we are addressing. Turning the gap between the eastern and western diasporas into a Jewish

ideological issue is simply a reduction of the central question that we have raised.

### *The Septuagint and the Church*

A comment that we received from Professor Ranon Katzoff of Bar Ilan University relating to our thesis is particularly interesting. In accordance with our argument that western Judaism did develop its own literature during its early stages—that is, some of the apocryphal literature—Katzoff claims that our suggestion might explain why the Church adopted some of this literature (*1 and 2 Maccabees, Baruch, Ben Sira, The Wisdom of Solomon*, etc.) into its own canon even though it was clearly Jewish literature and was not integral to its worldview. In other words, he suggests that those Jews who converted were apparently accepted into Christianity with all or part of their literature. We would like to point out that not all of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature belonged to the Greek and Latin diaspora. Only part of this literature was accepted by the Greek-speaking diaspora, and subsequently the Latin-speaking communities. The process of rejection of the external literature on one side—being branded ‘foreign’ by the Rabbis (to the exclusion of Ben Sira)—and its acceptance on the other, is a complex process that requires further research. We do not rule out the possibility that some of the external literature was accepted by the Hebrew- and Aramaic-speaking communities in the east parallel to its acceptance by the Jews of the west. Those latter Jews, after their literary canon was formed, for centuries did not add any single item to it.

### *Nationalism*

The most recent research on Jewish nationalism by David Goodblatt (Goodblatt 2006) is very interesting from our perspective. Goodblatt rightly contends that Jewish nationalism during the Second Temple period and afterwards was based on the vernacular—that is, on Hebrew. Goodblatt, therefore, strengthens our claim, since the process of dichotomization between the east and the west thus coincided with the dawn of nationalism among the Jews of the west who did not know Hebrew. This dichotomy, in addition to the dichotomy created by the estrangement of these western Jews from the Rabbinic revolution, led to their feelings of dissimilarity and their disengagement from the Jews of the east. Those who claim that the destruction of the Temple did not bring about the end of Jewish nationalism are correct (Mendels 1997; Goodblatt 2006).

According to Goodblatt, however, the nationalism was based on Hebrew language, and was thus according to our view minimal in the west.

#### *Jewish Historiography—Josephus Flavius*

The reference to the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius in our first article elicited a variety of reactions. We would like to emphasize that Josephus was undoubtedly aware of the developing Rabbinic tradition from his time in Palestine. This raises the question as to why he almost completely ignored these traditions in his writings. The reason, we believe, is that his target population was the pagan community and the Greco-Roman Jewish community. He understood that his readership, both pagan and Jewish, was not at all involved in the Rabbinic deliberations.

#### *Paul and the First Apostles*

New Testament scholars Kathy Ehrensperger from the University of Wales and Serge Ruzer from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem drew our attention to the fact that, according to the New Testament, communications in Greek, such as the epistle of James, were sent from Palestine to the western diaspora. These scholars claim, therefore, that this constitutes proof that ‘religious commodities’ were sent from the Land of Israel to the west, demonstrating that a connection between the Jews of Palestine and the western diaspora did exist in the first century CE. This fact, nevertheless, strengthens our thesis regarding the deep significance of language in the creation of the split between the diasporas. Most scholars believe that the New Testament was originally written in Greek. Thus the New Testament and the sermons delivered by Paul in synagogues in the western diaspora, as described in the New Testament, could be understood by the Jews of the west, even by the simple Jews who knew Greek but not Hebrew. If so, we might see Paul and the first apostles as agents who brokered between the two worlds. Paul, a Jew from the western diaspora (Tarsus), is an excellent example, for he had one foot in Palestine, planted in the Hebrew–Aramaic world, but also traveled to the west and was fluent in Greek. He thus carried in his bag a ‘religious commodity’ from the Land of Israel that he could transmit in Greek. If this claim is correct, then Paul and the first apostles were insightful enough to understand the deepening gap that was developing between the western diaspora and the Jews of the east, and the benefits of bridging between the worlds by maintaining a dialogue with the Greek-speaking diaspora. Yet, in this way, Paul and the apostles contributed to

widening the schism between the Rabbinic Jews of the east and the biblical Jews of the west.

To conclude, we return to the last passage of Part I and confirm that as a result of the split between eastern and western Jews, many of the latter converted to Christianity and were lost to the Jewish people, whereas a small group of Jews remained biblical until the entrance of Rabbinic Judaism into Europe.

### *Bibliography*

- Almog, S.  
1985 *Anti-Semitism through the Ages* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar [Hebrew]).
- Amitay, Ory  
2007 'Some Ioudaio-Lakonia Rabbis', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 26: 131-34.
- Baumgarten, A.I.  
1997 *Second Temple Sectarianism: A Social and Religious Historical Essay* (Tel-Aviv: Ministry of Defense [Hebrew]).
- Begley, R.B., and J.W. Koterski, SJ  
2005 *Medieval Education* (New York: Fordham University Press).
- Bonfil, R.  
1987 'Between Eretz Israel and Babylonia', *Shalem: Studies in the History of the Jews in Eretz Israel* 5: 1-30 (Hebrew).
- Boxer, B.  
1987 'Todos and Rabbinic Authority in Rome', in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *New Perspectives in Ancient Judaism. I. Religion, Literature, and Society in Ancient Israel, Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Langham, MD: University Press of America): I, 117-29.
- Brody, R.  
1998 *The Geonim of Babylonia and the Shaping of Medieval Jewish Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Cohen, J.  
1999 *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: California University Press).
- Cohen, S.J.D.  
1981 'Epigraphical Rabbis', *JQR* 72.1: 1-17.
- De Lange, N.  
1996 *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck).
- Edrei, A., and D. Mendels  
2007 'A Split Jewish Diaspora: Its Dramatic Consequences', *JSP* 16: 91-137.
- Eliav, Y.  
2004 'The Matrix of Ancient Judaism: A Review Essay of Seth Schwartz's *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 BCE to 640 CE*', *Prooftexts* 24: 116-28.  
2006 'Jews and Judaism 70-429', in D.S. Potter (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell): 116-28.
- Fine, S.  
2005 *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- Fontaine, J.  
2005 *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, I (ed. P. Fouracre; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 735-59.
- Funkenstein, A.  
1968 'Changes in the Patterns of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the 12th Century', *Zion* 33.3-4: 125-44 (Hebrew).  
1971 'Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages', *Viator* 2: 373-82.
- Goodblatt, David  
2006 *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Goodenough, E.R.  
1965 *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, XII (NY: Pantheon Books).
- Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Williams  
2006 *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (Boston: Harvard University Press).
- Grossman, A.  
1982 *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz: Their Lives, Leadership and Works (900–1096)* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew]).
- Herr, M.D.  
1996 'The End of Jewish Hellenistic Literature: When and Why', in I.M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic–Roman World Studies in Memory of Menachem Stern* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History and The Historical Society of Israel): 361-75 (Hebrew).
- Jacoby, D.  
1998 Review of De Lange 1996, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 91: 110-12.
- Levine, L.I.  
2000 *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Linder, A.  
1987 *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press; Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities).  
1997 *The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press; Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities).
- Lotter, F.  
2003 'Die Grabinschriften des lateinischen Westens als Zeugnisse jüdischen Lebens im Übergang von der Antike zum Mittelalter (4.–9. Jahrhundert)', in Ch. Cluse, A. Haverkamp and I.J. Yuval (eds.), *Jüdische Gemeinden und ihr christlicher Kontext in Kulturräumlich vergleichender Betrachtung* (Hanover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung): 87-147.
- Marrou, H.I.  
1948 *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité: Nouvelle édition* (Paris: Editions due Seuil).
- Mendels, D.  
1997 *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2nd edn).
- Merchavia, Ch.  
1970 *The Church Versus Talmudic and Midrashic Literature (500–1248)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik [Hebrew])

- Morgan, T.  
1998 *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J.  
1999 Review of De Lange 1996, in *Suedost-Forschungen* 58: 474-80.
- Noy, D.  
1993 *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rutgers, L.V.  
1998 *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism* (Leuven: Peeters, 2nd edn).
- Safrai, S., and Z. Safrai  
1998 *Haggadah of the Sages* (Jerusalem: Carta [Hebrew]).
- Schreckenberg, H.  
1990 *Die Christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr Literarisches und Historisches Umfeld (1.–11. Jh.)* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2nd edn).
- Schwartz, S.  
2001 *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Stemberger, G.  
1996 *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn).
- Stow, K.R.  
1976 'The Church and the Jews: From St. Paul to Paul IV', in Lawrence V. Berman et al., *Bibliographical Essays in Medieval Jewish Studies* (The Study of Judaism, 2; New York: Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith): 107-65.  
2006 *Jewish Dogs: An Image and its Interpreters: Continuity in the Catholic–Jewish Encounter* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Sznol, S.  
1999 'Medieval Judeo-Greek Bibliography: Texts and Vocabularies', *Jewish Studies* 39: 107-32.  
2005 'A Comparative Lexical Study of Greek and Latin Words in Late *Midrashim* and Judeo-Greek Vocabularies from Biblical Translations and Glossaries', *Erytheia* 26 (2005): 87-103.  
2006 'A Mishnaic Hebrew Glossary in Judeo-Greek from Cairo Gniza', *Massorot: Studies in Languages Traditions and Jewish Languages* 8-9: 225-52 (Hebrew).
- Ta-Shema, I.M.  
2000 'Hebrew–Byzantine Bible Exegesis ca. 1000 from the Cairo Geniza', *Tarbiz* 49: 247-56 (Hebrew).
- Toch, M.  
2005 'The Jews in Europe 500–1050', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, I (ed. P. Fouracre; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 547-70.
- Urbach, E.E.  
1998 *The World of the Sages: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew]).
- Zfatman, S.  
1993 *The Jewish Tale in the Middle Ages: Between Ashkenaz and Sepharad* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew]).
- Zipor, M.  
2005 *The Septuagint Version of the Book of Genesis* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press [Hebrew]).