LESSONS FROM INTER-COMMUNAL CONFLICT DURING THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

Joshua Schwartz

Jewish society of the Second Temple period was fragmented, sectarianism was rampant, and strife was widespread. There was corruption at the highest levels of leadership and the atmosphere was often charged with messianism. Inter-communal conflict often seemed to be the natural order of things and the results of all this were catastrophic. There are, though, a number of lessons to be learned from all this, particularly regarding the need for pluralism in the intellectual and religious spheres of Judaism, but within the framework of some agreed upon common ground. It is also especially important for communal and religious leaders to recognize the existence of problems, even if sometimes they are the source and cause of those problems.

Introduction

Historians study and teach the past in order to help prevent repetition of mistakes and errors. Regarding inter-communal conflict in the Jewish community, repeating blunders of the past would indeed be catastrophic, although the modern variety of such conflicts, even at their worst, are hardly as severe as they were in ancient times. Jewish society in the past was fragmented

and class strife was rampant. Many of the leaders of society, at all levels, were corrupt. Sectarianism was extensive and violence was too often a ready tool for the achievement of goals of all types.

Are there any lessons to be learned, therefore, from the acrimonious relationships of the past? The lessons are, for the most part, negative. One can learn how not to behave as a community, and how not to solve problems. After all, the end result of the hatred and acrimony of the Second Temple period was the destruction of Jerusalem, its Temple, and indeed almost the entire Jewish world. The rabbis have noted that Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed on account of *sin'at hinam* — gratuitous hatred, or, in today's terms, socio-economic tension and cultural conflict.[1] There was more hatred back then than we can possibly imagine, but the causes were not necessarily gratuitous, as this essay will seek to show.

While this essay relates to the Second Temple period (586 BCE–70 CE), it also includes some discussion of the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods (70 CE–circa 400). Due to constraints of time (and space), a discussion of methodological problems connected with the use of the various types of literature which serve as the source material has been omitted.[2]

In the ancient world, the rules were sometimes very different from modern-day norms regarding "conflict resolution." While this is not necessarily a Jewish phenomenon, let us take an example from the Jewish world. When Herod became king he had a serious problem.[3] Although Herod had been installed by the Romans, he could not maintain his rule by depending on them alone and sought support from the Jewish upper class, the aristocracy. Unfortunately for Herod, the members of the existing Hasmonean aristocracy who had not been killed in the wars against Herod (40 BCE–37 BCE) refused to transfer their support to him. In response, Herod killed the entire old aristocracy and appointed a new one,[4] a particularly extreme form of conflict resolution.

A Society Divided: Fragmentation and Conflict

Jewish society was heavily fragmented during the Second Temple period, ethnically, politically, economically, socially, and religiously. For the most part, this reflected an inward perspective, relating to the Land of Israel. The fragmentation became more acute, and attendant problems were compounded, when Jewish communal relationships were extended to include the diaspora and when Jewish society had to relate to other peoples, nations,

ethnoi, and religions. Instead of one Jewish society, there were an almost infinite number of societies and communities, many of which claimed religious primacy or sought cultural, political, or economic supremacy.[5] Most were not tolerant of other Jewish societies which contested claims to religious supremacy or competed in other spheres of power. Thus, the seeds for tension and conflict were spread widely.

The Seeds of Conflict and the Advent of a New World Order[6]

For the most part, in the course of world history, majorities and minorities are silent. Tension may exist, but full scale explosions are unusual. However, this was not the case during the Second Temple period. In fact, silence was very rare. This was basically because the old "world order" was falling apart and the Jews in the Land of Israel found themselves facing a new "world order."

With the coming of Alexander the Great (332 BCE), the Jewish axis began to rotate in a westward direction instead of eastward. Even if at first Hellenism did not make significant inroads into Jewish society, at least during the period of Ptolemaic rule (301-198 BCE), social tension and communal strife increased.[7] Take, for example, the following passage from the second century BCE work of Ben Sira:

> How can one become wise who guides the plow, who thrills in wielding the goad like a lance, who guides the ox and urges on the bullock and whose concern is for cattle? So with every engraver and designer who, laboring night and day fashions carved seals....So too with the smith sitting by the anvil...so with the potter sitting at his feet....All these are skilled with their hands, each one an expert in his own work; without them no city could be lived in...but they are not sought out for the council of the people, nor are they prominent in the assembly. They do not sit on the judge's bench, nor can they understand law and justice. They cannot expound the instruction of wisdom, nor are they found among the rulers (38:25-33).[8]

This quote reflects the attitudes of the upper class and intellectual elite toward the workers and lower classes. The proletariat may be necessary, and society depends on their toil, but their stations are fixed. There is no hint of social or intellectual mobility,

allowing for movement into the upper classes or the scribal class. Such was the accepted way in a Hellenistic city or society. Rebellion would be directed against someone else. In addition, these workers were probably in the stages of rebuilding their own social fabric and structure. Many might have just come from the rural sector to the city, where they faced the challenges of urbanism for the first time, and were, therefore, in no position to rebel.

After Seleucid rule began in 198 BCE, changes proceeded at a rapid pace. The Jewish elite saw Hellenism as the key to control and Jerusalem was "re-founded" as a Hellenistic polis. This included the construction of a gymnasium in close proximity to the Temple Mount.[9] The High Priest Menelaus handed over Temple vessels to Antiochus IV, according to the account in II Maccabees 5:15-17.[10] One can well anticipate the strong reaction to that and subsequent attitudes towards the high priesthood, the institution charged with guarding both the Temple and Jewish law.

The Hellenizers included priests who served in the Temple itself. According to II Maccabees 4:14, the Jerusalem priests were no longer diligent in the performance of their tasks at the altar and that, despising the Temple and neglecting sacrifices, they preferred to spend their time at the local sports arenas. Their actions must have aroused not only strong opposition but also feelings of utter astonishment, even if much of this Hellenism was based on simple political opportunism.[11]

During the Hasmonean revolt in 167 BCE, Mattathias killed his Hellenizing brethren,[12] and the Hasmoneans replaced the old Zadokites as High Priests.[13] They fought the Seleucids and established a new empire. Just prior to this, Onias had set up a competing temple in Leontopolis, Egypt.[14] Therefore, most conflict resolution occurred at the edge of a sword. The rotten Hellenistic upper class was replaced by the Hasmoneans, who, in turn, became corrupt.

The Hasmoneans: Expansion and Corruption

Conflicts became acute during the Hasmonean period.[15] The Hasmoneans became more Hellenized and out of touch with the people, stimulating greater opposition to their rule.[16] The Psalms of Solomon, a work of the Pseudepigrapha with definite historical allusions to the Hasmoneans,[17] describes the leaders thus:

> They stole from the sanctuary of God as if there were no redeeming heir. They walked on the place of sacrifice of the Lord

(=Temple) (coming) from all kinds of uncleaness; and (coming) with menstrual blood (on them) they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common meat. There was no sin they left undone in which they did not surpass the gentiles.[18]

The Hasmoneans themselves went about smashing idolatrous altars, destroying pagan temples, and expelling pagan populations. In a fit of pietistic fervor, they sought to redeem the Land of Israel and purify it from paganism, but they were, at the same time, becoming less worthy of ruling the very land they were redeeming.[19] Many felt the Hasmoneans were unworthy of this role and, in any case, saw them as usurping what rightly belonged to the Davidic dynasty.[20]

The Corruption of Leaders and the Building of Economic Power Bases

The potential for strife was not limited to the Hasmonean rulers, since the wealthy Sadducean aristocracy in general was not much better.[21] For example, the Hasmoneans and their priestly aristocratic colleagues apparently sought to control the food supply for priests coming to Jerusalem to work in the Temple.[22] Any attempts to control the economic aspects of pilgrimage would undoubtedly become a source of tension and ill-feeling.[23]

The problem, however, was more complex. While the Graeco-Roman world had a sense of noblesse oblige regarding lower classes,[24] the Jews apparently did not. The upper classes seem to have had a tradition of duplicity regarding the lower classes. The Babylonian Talmud (Pesahim 57a) discusses the upper-class families of the high priests as follows:

> Woe is me because of the house of Boethus, woe is me because of their staves! Woe is me because of the house of Hanin, woe is me because of their whisperings! Woe is me because of the house of Kathros, woe is me because of their pens! Woe is me because of the house of Ishmael the son of Phiabi, woe is me because of their fists! For they are High Priests and their sons are [Temple] treasurers and their sons-in-law are trustees and their servants beat the people with staves.[25]

A second story refers to pilgrimage to Jerusalem from the nearby suburb of Beitar. Apparently, the members of the Jerusalem town council would take advantage of this holiest of times to

try and steal the lands of innocent pilgrims from that town. Thus,
the Palestinian Talmud [Taaniyot 4:8 (69a)] reports:

> For the members of the town council of Jerusalem used to sit in
> the middle of the city and when they saw people going up to Jeru-
> salem used to say: For we heard that you want to become a leader
> and a member of the council. And he would reply: No, this was
> not my desire. And they (=council members) would then say that:
> For we have heard that you wish to sell your fields. And he would
> reply: No, this was not my desire. And his (=council member's)
> friend would say: What do you want from him? Write (a false bill
> of sale) and I will sign it.

The Talmud then states that messengers were sent with this
false bill of sale to the home of the pilgrim and informed his fam-
ily that the house and field had been sold and that they had to
leave immediately. When the pilgrim returned home after the fes-
tival he found that he had been dispossessed. There was appar-
ently little that he could do. This caused so much ill feeling that
the residents of Beitar are reported to have lit candles in joy when
Jerusalem was destroyed.[26] Both traditions not only reflect the
lack of concern of the upper classes for their poorer brethren, but
also seem to describe modes of conflict resolution, although the
conflict resolution may be described as resolution through fraud.

Sectarianism

The problems leading to conflict were not only political or
economic, they were also "sectarian." Thus, one of the major
long-term conflicts of the period was between the Pharisees,
Saduccees, and Essenes,[27] as well as their sub-branches.[28] There
were also charismatics like John the Baptist and Jesus, as well as
the early Christians, who were, after all, just another Jewish
group.[29] The possibility of tension between all these groups and
sub-groups was great.

Sectarianism also spilled over to nationalism. For instance,
there were the Zealots — apparently a nationalistic branch of the
Pharisees, and there were the monarchical, murderous anarchists,
the long-robed bearers of short knives known as the *sicarii*.[30]

Baumgarten has suggested that much of the tension of the
times was related to the increase in literacy at the time.[31] As a re-
sult, sacred documents were accessible to more groups, with each
sect learning them differently, demanding exactitude and preci-

sion, and usually denying the interpretations of other groups. Ironically, an increase in learning led to more group boundaries which, in turn, narrowed the limits of tolerance. After all, differences were often over matters of the greatest importance, such as the Temple, which would not be conducive to compromise. The Pharisees and Sadducees disagreed over the Temple procedures and the Essenes and/or the Dead Sea sect denied the legitimacy altogether of the existing Temple and planned a new one.

Eventually the Pharisees took over the Temple Mount and cult, but the High Priest remained a Sadducee, as seems to be clear, for instance, from the descriptions of the Day of Atonement rite in Mishnah Yoma. The High Priest did not have much choice and was not even free to follow his own rite. When he attempted to do so, he was usually unsuccessful, and sometimes the differences in practice even led to bloodshed.[32]

According to Josephus, the Pharisees took over because they enjoyed the support of the people.[33] They were certainly more liberal, and the Romans would not necessarily have opposed this. The Sadducees, however, were identified with the Hasmoneans, and from the Roman point of view it might have seemed better to have Pharisees ruling on the Temple Mount. The Sadducean priests were also rich and unpopular.

However, it is important to remember that the Pharisees themselves were far from monolithic and a good deal of fragmentation existed in their society. Thus, Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai represent different Pharasaic approaches. According to Israel ben Shalom, Beit Shammai derived its ideological antecedents from Hasmonean nationalism, supported the Zealots, and was anti-Roman. Beit Hillel, on the other hand, was more liberal in the sense of being willing to find some type of modus vivendi with the Romans.[34] Apparently, there was also a tremendous degree of tension between the two groups.

In spite of this, Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai did find some common ground. Thus, Mishnah Yebamot 1:4 states that although Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai had differences in certain matters of marriage law, even in major areas such as the sensitive issues of *mamzerut* (bastardy), and in the laws of purity: "Those of Beit Shammai did not refrain from marrying the women of Beit Hillel, nor those from Beit Hillel from taking in marriage the women from Beit Shammai." It is not clear, however, to what extent there could be intermarriage between the other groups and sects, or to what extent they were willing to even make the effort to search for common ground.

Class Strife Revisited: *Haver* and *Am Ha-aretz*

The destruction of the Temple led to a decrease in sectarianism. The Sadducees, Essenes, and/or the Dead Sea sect for the most part disappeared. Judaeo-Christians were removed from the fold. There were still, however, numerous opportunities for inter-communal conflict.

Chapter 2 of Tosefta Demai relates the requirements for being accepted as a *haver*, a member of one of the associations of rabbis which became common at this time. Most of these requirements represented stringencies not demanded by *halakhah* and related to restrictions regarding contact with the *am ha-aretz*, or those Jews who did not observe these stringencies. Thus, for instance, one could not give heave-offerings or tithes to an *am ha-aretz* priest or trust the *am ha-aretz* in general on matters of purity. A *haver* should not seek hospitality at the house of an *am ha-aretz* or eat there at all. Needless to say, this did not lead to social harmony, but rather served as potential for disruption in society.[35]

Indeed, some of the comments on the strife between the rabbis and the *am ha-aretz* represent seemingly strained social relationships. Thus, the Babylonian Talmud (Pesahim 49b) relates:

> It was taught: one should always sell all that one possesses in order to marry the daughter of a Sage. If one did not find the daughter of a Sage then one should marry the daughter of the leaders of society (in good deeds)...daughters of the heads of the synagogues...daughters of those who collect charity...daughters of teachers. One should not marry the daughter of an *am ha-aretz* for they are an abomination and their women are likened to crawling things and regarding their daughters it is stated, "cursed be he who lies with any manner of beast" (Deuteronomy 27:21).

The *am ha-aretz* apparently felt much the same about the Sages. Thus, Pesahim 49b describes the feelings of Rabbi Akiva before he began to study and before he became a Sage, when he, too, had been an *am ha-aretz*:

> It was taught: Rabbi Akiva said: when I was an *am ha-aretz* I used to say, "would that I meet a Sage so that I could bite him like a donkey (would)." His disciples said: master, at least say, "like a dog (would)." He replied (to them): "this one (=donkey) bites and breaks a bone and this one (=dog) bites and does not break a bone."[36]

Even if there is some exaggeration in these legends, it is clear that they do reflect the tensions and conflicts of the time. The very fact that Talmudic literature chose to include such traditions shows that the rabbis were aware of the dangers and evils inherent in their society.

Lessons from the Past

What lessons are to be learned from the descriptions of strife, conflict, and tension described above?

First, while the increase in literacy and learning in the Second Temple period may have been the cause of many schisms, the transition from a Written to an Oral Law allowed for a loosening of the rigid and inflexible boundaries that the strict sectarian constructionists had set up. Thus, learning or study must be in the pluralistic spirit of the Oral Law — expanding the limits of tolerance for Jewish ideologies that may be different from our own.

Yet, in the Second Temple period, despite all the problems, there was a basic agreement that *halakhah* was the determining factor in Jewish life. The question was about which *halakhah*. Sometimes the differences resulted in almost complete separation of communities, as was the case regarding the Dead Sea sect which simply picked up and left for the desert.[37] However, there were schismatics who did not leave. Both Josephus and Philo relate that the Essenes lived in numerous settlements,[38] and undoubtedly they found some modus vivendi to maintain some type of normal relations with their neighbors. This is certainly true regarding the Sadducees who, for the most part, were able to live in some type of harmony with their non-Sadducean neighbors, despite differences in *halakhah* and religious thought.[39]

Today, however, it is not always certain that all branches of Judaism relate to *halakhah* as the determining factor in Jewish life. However, it should not be impossible to find common ground, even in the *halakhic* sphere. Indeed, learning or study in the spirit of pluralism will help in determining this common ground, which should help provide further basis for some type of harmonious coexistence.

It is necessary to recognize that problems do exist. The rabbis wrote of the explosive social situations which existed in their times and for which they themselves were sometimes to blame. They realized that they were not perfect and pointed out their own foibles. The rabbis also apparently had much less power than had previously been assumed.[40]

The Second Temple period represented a failure in Jewish leadership at almost all levels. Matters improved during, the Mishnah and Talmud period because many of the leaders — the rabbis — were sensitive to the needs of the community.

The Second Temple, Mishnah, and Talmud periods are crucial for the understanding of the history of the Jewish community in all aspects, but especially in terms of communal strife. Almost every conceivable mistake was made, and the results were catastrophic. The rabbis of the Mishnah and Talmud period may have managed some damage control, but the results of a super-fragmented society and attendant strife of the Second Temple period were never completely erased.

Notes

1. PT (=Palestinian Talmud) Yoma 1:1 (38c). The First Temple was destroyed on account of idolatry, incest and murder; the Second Temple "because they loved money and hated each other gratuitous hatred." The tradition stresses that this was equal to the seemingly more serious sins that led to the destruction of the First Temple. Cf. BT (Babylonian Talmud) Yoma 9b. Other reasons were also cited by the rabbis. See BT Shabbat 119b which mentions the following causes: the Sabbath was desecrated, the reading of the *shema* was neglected, education of school children was neglected, the inhabitants were not ashamed of each other, the small and the great were made equal, the inhabitants did not rebuke each other, scholars were despised therein and because men of faith had ceased there. See also the list in Lamentations Rabbah 1:20 (pp. 46b-47a, ed. Buber) and cf. Avot d'Rabbi Nathan, Version B, Chapter 5 (p. 9b, ed. Schechter) and Tanhuma Buber Shoftim 2 (pp. 14b-15a). Not all the lists clearly differentiate between the causes of destruction of the two Temples.
2. For a basic discussion of some of these matters see, for instance, G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1996).
3. For a general discussion of these times, see Emil Schuerer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.-A.D. 135), revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1973), I, pp. 281-329.
4. See M. Stern, "The Politics of Herod and Jewish Society Towards the End of the Second Commonwealth," *Tarbiz*, 35 (1966):235-253 (Hebrew); M. Stern, *Studies in Jewish History*, edited by M. Amit, I. Gafni, M.D. Herr (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, 1991), pp. 180-198 (Hebrew).

5. The literature on all this is voluminous. We make do here with cit-
    ing a few major works. See, for instance, M. Goodman, *The Ruling
    Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome
    A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); S. Ma-
    son, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical
    Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1991); L.H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the
    Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); I.
    Ben-Shalom, *The School of Shammai and the Zealots' Struggle
    against Rome* (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi and Ben-Gurion
    University, 1993) (Hebrew); A.I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of
    Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden:
    Brill, 1997) and S.J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness:
    Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertanties* (Berkeley: University of Cali-
    fornia Press, 1999).
6. The immediate discussion below is based on the formulations of
    Albert Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Macca-
    bean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). See also A.I.
    Baumgarten, "Literacy and Polemic Concerning Biblical Hermeneu-
    tics in the Second Temple Era," in R. Feldhay and I. Etkes, eds.,
    Education and History: Cultural and Political Contexts (Jerusalem:
    Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1999), pp. 33-45 (He-
    brew).
7. The extent of Hellenization in the Land of Israel is obviously be-
    yond the purview of our discussion. See the convenient summary of
    Lester L. Grabbe, "The Jews and Hellenization" in his *Judaism
    from Cyrus to Hadrian, Volume One: The Persian and Greek Peri-
    ods* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 147-170. See also
    most recently L.I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism: Conflict or Con-
    fluence* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History,
    2000) (Hebrew).
8. The translation is from P.W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A
    New Translation and Notes* (New York: Doubleday, Anchor Bible
    39, 1987), pp. 445-446.
9. See M. Stern, "'Antioch in Jerusalem': The Gymnasium, the Polis
    and the Rise of Menelaus," *Zion*, 57 (1992):233-246 (Hebrew). On
    the location of the gymnasium, see p. 236, n. 12.
10. See D.R. Schwartz, "On the Visits of Antiochus Epiphanes in Jeru-
    salem," in Eyal Baruch, ed., *New Studies on Jerusalem: Proceed-
    ings of the Fourth Conference, December 10, 1998* (Ramat-Gan:
    Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 1998), pp. 40-47
    (Hebrew).
11. On the extent of Hellenism in Jerusalem beyond priestly circles, see
    Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism*, p. 39, n. 9 and the bibliography
    cited *ad loc.*
12. See I Maccabees 2:23-26 on his slaying of the Jewish man in
    Modiin who was ready to comply with the decree of the king. On
    his slaying of "apostate" Jews in general, see I Maccabees 2:44.

13. However, apparently not everyone was happy with the Hasmonean liberation of Jerusalem in 164 BCE and the subsequent purification and dedication of the Temple. On the opposition of the Book of Daniel, for instance, see J.J. Collins, "Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period," *International Rennert Guest Lecture Series,* 1 (1998):10-11. Cf. *idem,* "The Meaning of the End in the Book of Daniel," in *idem, Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 157-165.

14. See D.R. Schwartz," The Jews of Egypt Between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem and Heaven," *Zion,* 62 (1997):5-22 (Hebrew). Schwartz points out that there was some opposition to this temple in the Jewish community of Egypt itself, but that this did not necessarily mean that the Jews of Egypt supported the Jerusalem Temple either. All of this would provide avenues for conflict within the Egyptian Jewish community, both in terms of their internal relationships, as well as their relationship with Jerusalem and its Temple hierarchies and leaders.

15. See M. Stern, *Hasmonean Judaea in the Hellenistic World: Chapters in Political History,* edited by D.R. Schwartz (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1995) (Hebrew).

16. On Hellenistic models of kingship adopted by the Hasmoneans, see U. Rappaport, "The Hasmonean State and Hellenism," *Tarbiz,* 60 (1990/91):477-503 (Hebrew).

17. See, for example, J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), pp. 49-56.

18. Psalms of Solomon 8:11-13. The translation is that of R.B. Wright in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), II.

19. See Baumgarten, *Jewish Sects*, pp. 172-177. See also D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism: Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 97ff.

20. See Collins, *The Scepter and the Star,* pp. 51-54.

21. See E. Regev, *The Sadducean Halakhah and the Influence of the Sadducees on Social and Religious Life in the Land of Israel,* unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bar-Ilan University, 2000.

22. See J. Schwartz, "On Priests and Jericho in the Second Temple Period," *Jewish Quarterly Review,* 79 (1988):23-48.

23. See, for instance, Psalms of Solomon 1:4: "Their wealth (=Hasmoneans) was extended to the whole earth." The Dead Sea Sect also objected to the wealth that Jerusalem priests apparently amassed. See, for instance, 4Q159 11.6-7 and 4Q169 1.11-12. Cf. J.M. Allegro, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, V, Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q158-4Q186)* (Oxford, 1968), p. 38; and E. and H. Eshel, "4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War

Scroll," in J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner, eds., *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 611-620.

24. Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

25. The translation is that of ed. Soncino (London, 1938), p. 285. Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities,* 20.181: "Such was the shamelessness and effrontery which possessed the High Priests that they actually were so brazen as to send slaves to the threshing floors to receive the tithes that were due to the priests, with the result that the poorer priests starved to death."

26. Cf. E. Baruch, "The Economic Hinterland of Jerusalem in the Herodian Period," *Cathedra,* 89 (1998):41-62 (Hebrew).

27. For a general discussion of these sects, see Emil Schuerer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135), revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and Matthew Black (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1979), II, pp. 381-414.

28. See L.H. Schiffman, "The Battle of the Scrolls: Recent Developments in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Cathedra,* 61 (1991):2-23 (Hebrew). See also Schuerer, II, pp. 555-597.

29. See J. Schwartz, "John the Baptist, the Wilderness and the Samaritan Mission," in G. Galil and M. Weinfeld, eds., *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography Presented to Zecharia Kallai* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 104-117.

30. Schuerer, II, pp. 598-606.

31. See n. 6.

32. See Mishnah Yoma 1:5; Tosefta Kippurim 1:8 (pp. 222-223, ed. Lieberman); PT Yoma 1:5 (39a); BT Yoma 19b and Sifra Ahare Mot 3:11. The controversy relates to the offering of the incense.

33. See, for example, War 2.166

34. I. Ben-Shalom, *The School of Shammai and the Zealots' Struggle against Rome* (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi and Ben-Gurion University, 1993) (Hebrew). Ben-Shalom, however, does occasionally take his argument too far. See the review of J. Schwartz in *Zion,* 59 (1994):515-520 (Hebrew).

35. On these matters in general, see A. Oppenheimer, *The 'Am ha-Aretz — A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977). Cf. J. Neusner, "The Fellowship (חבורה) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth," *Harvard Theological Review,* 53 (1960):125-142.

36. On Rabbi Akiva, see S. Safrai, *Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph: His Life and Teachings* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1970) (Hebrew).

37. Cf. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea* (n. 5 above), pp. 80-81.

38. See Schuerer, *History* (n. 3 above), II, pp. 583-585. Philo stresses that they lived in villages and not cities (*Quod omnis probus liber* 12-13).

39. See Regev, *The Sadducean Halakhah,* esp. pp. 297-318. Regev sees the struggle between the Sadducees and Pharisees as one between

priest and Sage with a shift in religious experience between holy place to holy person. In terms of everyday relationships, this might not have been of all that much importance.

40. See, for instance, L.I. Levine, *The Rabbinic Class in Palestine during the Talmudic Period* (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, 1985), pp. 73-75, 79-85 (Hebrew); and C. Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), pp. 372-383, 395-402.