

ry, therefore, to assign the enunciation of general principles to the acts and of the particulars to the sages; and, as the Talmud declares, "the sage is more important than the prophet" (*Baba Batra*, 12a). And prophecy, with its impassioned and fiery exhortations could not accomplish in purging the Jewish people of idolatry and in uprooting the causes of the most degrading forms of oppression and violence, murder, sexual perversity, and bribery,—was accomplished by the Torah through the expanded development of the Torah, by raising many questions and by the assiduous study of the particular laws and their diverse applications. "The eternal paths lead to Him" (Habakkuk, the term for 'paths,' *halikhot* may also be read as *halakhot*, and the word could then mean that the laws lead to Him" (*Niddah* 73a).

In the course of time, the concern with the work of the sages pre-empted over the work of the prophets and the institution of prophecy altogether; after some time the general principles declined, they were immanent in the particulars but were not readily apparent. At the present epoch, when the light of prophecy will begin to have its revival, as we are promised, "I shall pour out My spirit on all flesh" (Isaiah 44:3), there will develop, in reaction, a pronounced disdain for the sages. This is alluded to in the Talmudic statement that, at the beginning of the messianic age, "the wisdom of the sages will become un-usable and those who live on the boundary (that is, the sages who define the law) will turn from city to city without finding grace" (*Sotah* 48b).

This will continue until the radiance of prophecy will re-emerge, its light will hide and reveal itself, not as an unripe fruit, but as the first fruits, full of vitality and life, and prophecy itself will acknowledge the efficacy in the work of the sages, and in righteous humility exclaim: "The sage is more important than the prophet." This transcending of the wisdom of the sages will vindicate the vision of unity expressed by the Psalmist: "The word of the Lord and truth have met, justice and peace have kissed, truth will prevail, and the Lord of the earth and mercy will show itself from heaven: the Lord will bestow what is good and our earth will bring forth its bounty" (Psalm 85:11). The spirit of Moses will then reappear in the world.

Judaism in a Time of Crisis

Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple

JACOB NEUSNER

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SECOND TEMPLE marked a major turning in the history of Judaism in late antiquity. The end of the cult of animal sacrifice, which from remote times had supplied a chief means of service of God, placed the worldly modes of divine worship upon a quite new foundation. The loss of the building itself was of considerable consequence, for the return to Zion and the rebuilding of the Temple in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. had long been taken to mean that Israel and God, supposed by prophecy to have been estranged from one another because of idolatry in First Temple times, had been reconciled. Finally, the devastation of Jerusalem, the locus of cult and Temple piety, intensified the perplexity of the day, for, from ancient times, the city, as much as what took place in its Temple, was holy. The cultic altar, the Temple and the holy city, by August, 70, lay in ruins—a considerable calamity.

My purpose is to survey some of the several ways in which individuals and groups of Jews of that day responded to the calamity. I do not propose new interpretations of individual texts or promise to present previously unknown facts, but, rather, hope, by putting together a number of hitherto unconnected data, to facilitate the comparison of the different forms of Judaism of the period.

The Political Problem

What kind of issue faced the Jews after the destruction of the Temple? It was, I contend, a fundamentally social and religious issue, not a matter of government or politics.

For most historians of the Jews, it is axiomatic that the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in 70 C.E. marked a decisive political turning-point. For example, current rhetoric uses the year 70 as the date for the end of "Jewish self-government." Precisely what is meant by that rhetorical flourish is difficult to determine. If one means the end of Jewish independent government in Palestine, then that came to an end with the procurators, and, one might say, even with the advent of Herod. So the importance of the date must be located elsewhere. The Jews continued to govern themselves, much as they had in procuratorial times, though through different institutions, long after 70 C.E. Patriarchal government finally ended at the start of the 5th century—a matter of Byzantine policy—but by that time large numbers of Jews had already left the

land, and their institutions of self-government persisted in the countries of their dispersion.

Then we must say that the significant event was the destruction of the Temple. But long before 70 the Temple had been rejected by some Jewish groups. Its sanctity, as we shall see, had been arrogated by others. And for large numbers of ordinary Jews outside of Palestine, as well as substantial numbers within, the Temple was a remote and, if holy, unimportant place. For them, piety was fully expressed through synagogue worship. In a very real sense, therefore, for the Christian Jews, who were indifferent to the Temple cult, for the Jews at Qumran, who rejected the Temple, for the Jews of Leontopolis, in Egypt, who had their own Temple, but especially for the masses of diasporan Jews who never saw the Temple to begin with, but served God through synagogue worship alone, the year 70 cannot be said to have marked an important change.

The diasporan Jews accommodated themselves to their distance from the Temple by "spiritualizing" and "moralizing" the cult, as with Philo. To be sure, Philo was appropriately horrified at the thought of the Temple's desecration by Caligula, but I doubt that his religious life would have been greatly affected had the Temple been destroyed in his lifetime. For the large Babylonian Jewish community, we have not much evidence that the situation was any different. They were evidently angered by the Romans' destruction of the Temple, so that Josephus had to address them with an account of events exculpating Rome from guilt for the disaster. But Babylonian Jewry did absolutely nothing before 70 C.E. to support the Palestinians, and, thereafter, are not heard from. The Babylonian and Mesopotamian Jews' great war against Rome, in Trajan's time, was not the result of the Temple's destruction, but, in my opinion, of Trajan's evident plan to rearrange the international trade routes to their disadvantage. Nor does one hear of any support from the diaspora for Bar Kokhba, so apparently no one was ready to help him reestablish the Temple in a new Jerusalem. At any rate, the political importance of the events of 70 can not be taken for granted. It was significant primarily for the religious life of various Palestinian Jewish groups, not to mention the ordinary folk who had made pilgrimages to Jerusalem and could do so no more.

We shall examine four responses to the challenges of the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the Temple, and the cessation of the cult. These responses had to deal with several crucial social and religious problems, all interrelated. First, how to achieve atonement without the cult? Second, how to explain the disaster of the destruction? Third, how to cope with the new age, to devise a way of life on a new basis entirely? Fourth, how to account for the new social forms consequent upon the collapse of the old social structure?

The four responses are of, first, the apocalyptic writers represented

in the visions of Baruch and II Ezra; second, the Dead Sea community; third, the Christian church; and finally, the Pharisaic sect.

When the apocalyptic visionaries looked backward upon the ruins, they saw a tragic vision. So they emphasized future, supernatural redemption, which they believed was soon to come. The Qumranians had met the issues of 70 long before in a manner essentially similar to that of the Christians. Both groups tended to abandon the Temple and its cult and to replace them by means of the new community, on the one hand, and the service or pious rites of the new community, on the other. The Pharisees come somewhere between the first and the second and third groups. They saw the destruction as a calamity, like the apocalyptics, but they also besought the means, in both social forms and religious expression, to provide a new way of atonement and a new form of divine service, to constitute a new, interim Temple, like the Dead Sea sect and the Christians.

The Apocalyptic Response

Two documents, the Apocalypse of Ezra and the Vision of Baruch, are representative of the apocalyptic state of mind. The compiler of the Ezra apocalypse (II Ezra 3-14), who lived at the end of the first century, looked forward to a day of judgment, when the Messiah would destroy Rome and God would govern the world. But he had to ask, How can the suffering of Israel be reconciled with divine justice? To Israel, God's will had been revealed. But God had not removed the inclination to do evil, so men could not carry out God's will:

For we and our fathers have passed our lives in ways that bring death. . . . But what is man, that thou art angry with him, or what is a corruptible race, that thou art so bitter against it? . . . (Ezra 8:26).

Ezra was told that God's ways are inscrutable (4:10-11), but when he repeated the question, "Why has Israel been given over to the gentiles as a reproach," he was given the answer characteristic of this literature—that a new age was dawning which would shed light on such perplexities. Thus, he was told:

. . . if you are alive, you will see, and if you live long, you will often marvel, because the age is hastening swiftly to its end. For it will not be able to bring the things that have been promised to the righteous in their appointed time, because this age is full of sadness and infirmities. . . . (4:10-26).

An angel told him the signs of the coming redemption, saying:

. . . the sun shall suddenly shine forth at night and the moon during the day, blood shall drip from wood, and the stone shall utter its voice, the peoples shall be troubled, and the stars shall fall. . . . (5:4-5).

And he was admonished to wait patiently:

The righteous therefore can endure difficult circumstances, while hoping for easier ones, but those who have done wickedly have suffered the difficult circumstances, and will *not* see easier ones (6:55-56).

The pseudepigraphic Ezra thus regarded the catastrophe as the fruit of sin, more specifically, the result of man's *natural* incapacity to do the will of God. He prayed for forgiveness and found hope in the coming transformation of the age and the promise of a new day, when man's heart would be as able, as his mind even then was willing, to do the will of God.

The pseudepigraph in the name of Jeremiah's secretary, Baruch, likewise brought promise of coming redemption, but with little practical advice from the intervening period. The document exhibited three major themes. First, God acted righteously in bringing about the punishment of Israel:

Righteousness belongs to the Lord our God, but confusion of face to us and our fathers. . . (Baruch 2:6).

Second, the catastrophe came on account of Israel's sin:

Why is it, O Israel . . . that you are in the land of your enemies. . . ? You have forsaken the fountain of wisdom. If you had walked in the way of the Lord, you would be dwelling in peace forever (3:10-12).

Third, as surely as God had punished the people, so certainly would He bring the people home to their land and restore their fortunes. Thus Jerusalem speaks:

But I, how can I help you? For He who brought these calamities upon you will deliver you from the hand of your enemies. . . For I sent you out with sorrow and weeping, but God will give you back to me with joy and gladness forever. . . (4:17-18, 23).

Finally, Baruch advised the people to wait patiently for redemption, saying:

My children, endure with patience the wrath that has come upon you from God. Your enemy has overtaken you, but you will soon see their destruction and will tread upon their necks. . . For just as you purposed to go astray from God, return with tenfold zeal to seek Him. For He who brought these calamities upon you will bring you everlasting joy with your salvation. Take courage, O Jerusalem, for He who named you will comfort you (4:25, 28-30).

The saddest words written in these times come in 2 Baruch:

Blessed is he who was not born, or he who having been born has died
But as for us who live, woe unto us
Because we see the afflictions of Zion and what has befallen
Jerusalem. . . (10:6-7)
You husbandmen, sow not again.
And earth, why do you give your harvest fruits?
Keep within yourself the sweets of your sustenance.
And you, vine, why do you continue to give your wine?
For an offering will not again be made therefrom in Zion,

Nor will first-fruits again be offered.
And do you, O heavens, withhold your dew,
And open not the treasuries of rain.
And do you, sun, withhold the light of your rays,
And you, moon, extinguish the multitude of your light.
For why should light rise again
Where the light of Zion is darkened? . . . (10:9-12)
Would that you had ears, O earth,
And that you had a heart, O dust,
That you might go and announce in Sheol,
And say to the dead,
"Blessed are you more than we who live." (11:6-7)

Yohanan ben Zakkai's student, Joshua, met such people. It was reported that when the Temple was destroyed, ascetics multiplied in Israel, who would neither eat flesh nor drink wine. Rabbi Joshua dealt with them thus:

He said to them, "My children, On what account do you not eat flesh and drink wine?"

They said to him, "Shall we eat meat, from which they used to offer a sacrifice on the altar, and now it is no more? And shall we drink wine, which was poured out on the altar, and now it is no more?"

He said to them, "If so, we ought not to eat bread, for there are no meal offerings any more. Perhaps we ought not to drink water, for the water-offerings are not brought anymore."

They were silent.

He said to them, "My children, come and I shall teach you. Not to mourn at all is impossible, for the evil decree has already come upon us. But to mourn too much is also impossible, for one may not promulgate a decree for the community unless most of the community can endure it. . . But thus have the sages taught: 'A man plasters his house, but leaves a little piece untouched. A man prepares all the needs of the meal, but leaves out some morsel. A woman prepares all her cosmetics, but leaves off some small item. . .'"

(b. *Bava Batra* 60b)

The response of the visionaries is, thus, essentially negative. All they had to say is that God is just and Israel has sinned, but, in the end of time, there will be redemption. What to do in the meantime? Merely wait. Not much of an answer.

The Dead Sea Sect

For the Dead Sea community, the destruction of the Temple cult took place long before 70 C.E. By rejecting the Temple and its cult, the Qumran community had had to confront a world without Jerusalem even while the city was still standing. In so stating matters, I am repeating the insight of my sometime colleague, Professor Yigael Yadin, who remarked to me that the spiritual situation of Yavneh, the community formed by the Pharisaic rabbis after the destruction of the Temple in 70, and that of Qumran, are strikingly comparable. Just as the rabbis had to construct—at least for the time being—a Judaism without the Temple cult, so did the Qumran sectarians have to construct a Judaism without the Temple

Kalmanowitz

cult. The difference, of course, is that the rabbis merely witnessed the destruction of the city by others, while the Qumran sectarians did not lose the Temple, but rejected it at the outset.

The founders of the community were Temple priests, who saw themselves as continuators of the true priestly line, that is, the sons of Zadok. For them the old Temple was, as it were, destroyed in the times of the Maccabees. Its cult was defiled, not by the Romans, but by the rise of a high priest from a family other than theirs. They further rejected the calendar followed in Jerusalem. They therefore set out to create a new Temple, until God would come and, through the Messiah in the line of Aaron, would establish the Temple once again. As Bertil Gärtner points out (in *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism in the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965], p. 15), "Once the focus of holiness in Israel had ceased to be the Temple, it was necessary to provide a new focus. This focus was the community, which called itself 'the Holy place' and 'the holy of holies.'" Thus, the Qumran community believed that the presence of God had left Jerusalem and had come to the Dead Sea. The community now constituted the new Temple, just as some elements in early Christianity saw the new Temple in the body of Christ, in the Church, the Christian community. In some measure, this represents a "spiritualization" of the old Temple, for the Temple, as Gärtner points out, was the community, and the Temple worship was affected through the community's study and fulfillment of the Torah. But, as Gärtner stresses (p. 18), the community was just as much a reality, a presence, as was the Jerusalem Temple; the obedience to the law was no less real than the blood sacrifices. Thus, the Qumranians represent a middle point, between reverence for the old Temple and its cult, in the here and now, and complete indifference to the Temple and cult in favor of the Christians' utter spiritualization of both, represented, for example, in the Letter to the Hebrews.

If the old Temple is destroyed, then how will Israel make atonement? The Qumranian answer, Gärtner tells us, is that "the life of the community in perfect obedience to the Law is represented as the true sacrifice offered in the new Temple." The community, thus, takes over the holiness and the functions of the Temple (p. 44) and, so, is the "only means of maintaining the holiness of Israel and making atonement for sin."

When these things come to pass in Israel according to all these laws, it is for the foundation of the holy spirit, for eternal truth, for the atonement of the guilt of sin and misdeeds, and for the well-being of the land by means of the flesh of burnt offerings and the fat of sacrifices, that is, the right offerings of the lips as a righteous sweet savour and a perfect way of life as a free-will offering, pleasing to God. . . (Manual of Discipline 9:3ff.)

The response of the Dead Sea sect, therefore, was to reconstruct the Temple and to reinterpret the nature and substance of sacrifice. The community constituted the reconstructed Temple. The life of Torah and obedience to its commandments formed the new sacrifice.

The Christian Community

The study of Judaism in late antiquity comprehends a considerable part of early Christian experience, simply because for a long time in Palestine, as well as in much of the diaspora, the Christian was another kind of Jew and saw himself as such. Moreover, the Christians, whether originally Jewish or otherwise, took over the antecedent holy books and much of the ritual life of Judaism. For our purposes they serve, therefore, as another form of Judaism, one which differed from the rest primarily in regarding the world as having been redeemed through the Word and Cross of Jesus. But one must hasten to stress the complexity of the Christian evidences. Indeed, the response of the Christians to the destruction of the Temple cannot be simplified and regarded as essentially unitary.

Because of their faith in the crucified and risen Christ, Christians experienced the end of the old cult and the old Temple before it actually took place, much like the Qumran sectarians. They had to work out the meaning of the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, and whether the essays on that central problem were done before or after 70 C.E. is of no consequence. The issues of August, 70, confronted Qumranians and Christians for other than narrowly historical reasons; for both the events of that month took place, so to speak, in other than military and political modes. But the effects were much the same. The Christians, therefore, resemble the Qumranians in having had to face the end of the cult before it actually took place, but they were like the Pharisees in having to confront the actual destruction of the Temple, here and now.

Like the Qumranians, the Christian Jews criticized the Jerusalem Temple and its cult. Both groups in common believed that the last days had begun. Both believed that God had come to dwell with them, as he had once dwelled in the Temple (Gärtner, p. 100). The sacrifices of the Temple were replaced, therefore, by the sacrifice of a blameless life and by other spiritual deeds. But the Christians differ on one important point. To them, the final sacrifice had already taken place; the perfect priest had offered up the perfect holocaust, his own body. So, for the Christians, Christ on the cross completed the old sanctity and inaugurated the new. This belief took shape in different ways. For Paul, in 1 Cor. 3:16-17, the Church is the new Temple, Christ is the foundation of the "spiritual" building. Ephesians 2:18ff. has Christ as the corner-stone of the new building, the company of Christians constituting the Temple.

Lloyd Gaston (in *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970], pp. 97ff.) has persuasively argued that the Jerusalem Christians probably did not continue to worship in the Temple. Jesus was fundamentally indifferent to the cult and, for him, Gaston claims (p. 240), the functions of the old Temple were to be fulfilled in the new Temple which Jesus had come to found. That new Temple was, as at Qumran, the community, not himself alone. Gaston says that the church, from the beginning, was uninvolved in the cult of the Temple. For the Christians long before 70, as much as for those coming later on, the Temple had ceased to exist as a holy place. But, unlike the Qumranian community, the Christian Jews continued to revere Jerusalem as the holy city—an important distinction. The Temple, before 70, served as the focus of Israel's national cult; it was, therefore, to be used as a place of proclamation of the Gospel. But while the early Christians felt a solidarity with Israel the people, with Jerusalem, and with the Temple, to them the cult of the Temple was meaningless, for the forgiveness of sins had taken place once for all through the last sacrifice, which rendered the continuation of the cult a matter of indifference.

Perhaps the single most coherent statement of the Christian view of cult comes in Hebrews. Whether or not Hebrews is representative of many Christians or comes as early as 70 C.E. is not our concern. What is striking is that the Letter explores the great issues of 70, the issues of cult, Temple, sacrifice, priesthood, atonement, and redemption. Its author takes for granted that the church is the Temple, that Jesus is the builder of the Temple, and that he is also the perfect priest and the final and most unblemished sacrifice. Material sacrifices might suffice for the ceremonial cleansing of an earthly sanctuary, but if sinful men are to approach God in a heavenly sanctuary, a sacrifice different in kind and better in degree is called for (F. F. Bruce, "Hebrews," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley [London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962], p. 1015). It is Jesus who is that perfect sacrifice, who has entered the true, heavenly sanctuary and now represents his people before God: "By his death he has consecrated the new covenant together with the heavenly sanctuary itself." Therefore, no further sacrifice—his or others'—is needed.

The Pharisees Before 70

We know very little about the Pharisees before the time of Herod. During Maccabean days, according to Josephus, our sole reliable evidence, they appear as a political party, competing with the Sadducees, another party, for control of the court and government. Afterward, they all but fade out of Josephus's narrative. But the later rabbinical literature fills the gap—with what degree of reliability I do not here wish to say—

and tells a great many stories about Pharisaic masters from Shammai and Hillel to the destruction. It also ascribes numerous sayings, particularly on matters of law, both to the masters and to the Houses of Shammai and of Hillel. These circles of disciples seem to have flourished in the first century, down to 70 and beyond.

The legal materials attributed by later rabbis to the pre-70 Pharisees are thematically congruent to the stories and sayings about Pharisees in the New Testament Gospels, and I take them to be accurate in substance, if not in detail, as representations of the main issues of Pharisaic law. After 70, the masters of Yavneh seem to have included a predominant element of Pharisees, and the post-70 rabbis assuredly regarded themselves as the continuators of Pharisaism. Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, who first stood at the head of the Yavnean circle, was later on said to have been a disciple of Hillel. More credibly, Gamaliel II, who succeeded Yoḥanan as head of the Yavnean institution, is regarded as the grandson of Gamaliel, a Pharisee in the council of the Temple who is mentioned in Acts 5:34 in connection with the trial of Paul. In all, therefore, we shall have to regard the Yavnean rabbis as successors of the pre-70 Pharisees and treat the two as a single sect, or kind, of Judaism.

What was the dominant trait of Pharisaism before 70? It was, as depicted both in the rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees and in the Gospels, concern for certain matters of rite, in particular, eating one's meals in a state of ritual purity as if one were a Temple priest, and carefully giving the required tithes and offerings due to the priesthood. The Gospels' agenda on Pharisaism also added fasting, Sabbath-observance, vows and oaths, and the like, but the main point was keeping the ritual purity laws outside of the Temple, where the priests had to observe ritual purity when they carried out the requirements of the cult. To be sure, the Gospels also include a fair amount of hostile polemic, some of it rather extreme, but these intra-Judaic matters are not our concern. All one may learn from the accusations, for instance, that the Pharisees were a brood of vipers, morally blind, sinners, and unfaithful, is one fact: Christian Jews and Pharisaic Jews were at odds.

The Pharisees, thus, were those Jews who believed that one must keep the purity laws outside of the Temple. Other Jews, following the plain sense of Leviticus, supposed that purity laws were to be kept only in the Temple, where the priests had to enter a state of ritual purity in order to carry out the requirements of the cult, such as animal sacrifice. They also had to eat their Temple food in a state of ritual purity, but lay people did not. To be sure, everyone who went to the Temple had to be ritually pure, but outside of the Temple the laws of ritual purity were not observed, for it was not required that noncultic activities be conducted in a state of Levitical cleanness.

But, as I said, the Pharisees held, to the contrary, that even outside

of the Temple, in one's own home, one had to follow the laws of ritual purity in the only circumstance in which they might apply, namely, at the table. They therefore held one must eat his secular food, that is, ordinary, everyday meals, in a state of ritual purity *as if one were a Temple priest*. The Pharisees thus arrogated to themselves—and to all Jews equally—the status of the Temple priests and did the things which priests must do on account of that status. The table of every Jew in his home was seen to be like the table of the Lord in the Jerusalem Temple. The commandment, "You shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy people," was taken literally. The whole country was holy. The table of every man possessed the same order of sanctity as the table of the cult. But, at this time, only the Pharisees held such a viewpoint, and eating unconsecrated food as if one were a Temple priest at the Lord's table thus was one of the two significations that a Jew was a Pharisee, a sectarian.

The other was meticulous tithing. The laws of tithing and related agricultural taboos may have been kept primarily by Pharisees. Here we are not certain. Pharisees clearly regarded keeping the agricultural rules as a chief religious duty. But whether, to what degree, and how other Jews did so, is not clear. Both the agricultural laws and purity rules in the end affected table-fellowship: *How and what one may eat*. That is, they were "dietary laws."

We see, therefore, that the Dead Sea Sect, the Christian Jews, and the Pharisees all stressed the eating of ritual meals. But while the Qumranians and the Christians tended to oppose sacrifice as such, and to prefer to achieve forgiveness of sin through ritual baths and communion meals, the Pharisees before 70 continued to revere the Temple and its cult, and afterward they drew up the laws which would govern the Temple when it would be restored. In the meantime, they held that (b. *Berakhot* 55a), "As long as the Temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel. But now a man's table atones for him."

The Pharisees never opposed the Temple, though they were critical of the priesthood. While it stood, they seem to have accepted the efficacy of the cult for the atonement of sins, and in this regard, as in others, they were more loyal to what they took to be the literal meaning of Scripture. More radical groups moved far beyond that meaning, either through rejecting its continued validity, as in the Christian view, or through taking over the cult through their own commune, as in the Qumran view.

While the early Christians gathered for ritual meals, and made them the climax of their group life, the Pharisees apparently did not. What expressed the Pharisees' sense of self-awareness as a group apparently was not a similarly intense, ritual meal. Eating was not a ritualized occasion, even though the Pharisees had liturgies to be said at the meal. No com-

munion-ceremony, no rites centered on meals, no specification of meals on holy occasions, characterize Pharisaic table-fellowship.

Pharisaic table-fellowship thus was a quite ordinary, everyday affair. The various fellowship-rules had to be observed in a wholly routine circumstance—daily, at every meal, without accompanying rites, other than a benediction for the food. Unlike the Pharisees, the Christians' myths and rituals rendered table-fellowship into a much heightened spiritual experience: *Do these things in memory of me*. The Pharisees told no stories about purity laws, except (in later times) to account for their historical development (e.g., who had decreed which purity-rule?). When they came to table, so far as we know, they told no stories about how Moses had done what they now do, and they did not "do these things in memory of Moses our rabbi."

In the Dead Sea commune, table-fellowship was open upon much the same basis as among the Pharisees: appropriate undertakings to keep ritual purity and to consume properly grown and tithed foods. As we know it, the Qumranian meal was liturgically not much different from the ordinary Pharisaic gathering. The rites pertained to, and derived from, the eating of food and that alone.

The Dead Sea sect's meal would have had some similarity to the Christian Eucharist if it had included some sort of narrative about the Temple cult, stories about how the sect replicated the holy Temple and ate at the table of God, how the founder of the community had transferred the Temple's holiness out of unclean Jerusalem, how the present officiants stood in the place of the High Priest of Jerusalem, how the occasion called to mind some holy event of the past, and comparable tales. But we have no allusions to the inclusion of such mythic elements in the enactment of the community meal. Josephus's Essenes have a priest pray before the meal and afterward: "At the beginning and the end they do honor to God as the provider of life." This seems to me no different from the Pharisaic table-rite. The primary difference is the prominence of priests in the life of the group. The table-fellowship of Qumranians and Pharisees thus exhibits less of a ritual embodiment of sacred myth than does that of the early Christians.

On the other hand, both Christians and Pharisees lived among ordinary folk, while the Qumranians did not. In this respect the commonplace character of Pharisaic table-fellowship is all the more striking. The sect ordinarily did not gather *as a group* at all, but in the home. All meals required ritual purity. Pharisaic table-fellowship took place in the same circumstances as did all non-ritual table-fellowship: common folk ate everyday meals in an everyday way, among ordinary neighbors who were not members of the sect. They were engaged in workaday pursuits like everyone else. The setting for law-observance was the field and the kitchen, the bed and the street. The occasion for observance was set

every time a person picked up a common nail, which might be unclean, or purchased a *se'ah* of wheat, which had to be tithed—by himself, without priests to bless his deeds or sages to instruct them. Keeping the Pharisaic rule required neither an occasional exceptional rite at, but external to, the meal, as in the Christian sect, nor taking up residence in a monastic commune, as in the Qumranian sect in Judaism. Instead, it imposed the perpetual ritualization of daily life, on the one side, and the constant, inner awareness of the communal order of being, on the other.

The Pharisees after 70

The response of the Pharisees to the destruction of the Temple is known to us only from rabbinic materials, which underwent revisions over many centuries. A story about Yoḥanan ben Zakkai and his disciple, Joshua ben Ḥananiah, tells us in a few words the main outline of the Pharisaic-rabbinic view of the destruction:

Once, as Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai was coming forth from Jerusalem, Rabbi Joshua followed after him and beheld the Temple in ruins. "Woe unto us," Rabbi Joshua cried, "that this, the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned for, is laid waste!"

"My son," Rabban Yoḥanan said to him, "be not grieved. We have another atonement as effective as this. And what is it? It is acts of loving-kindness, as it is said, *For I desire mercy and not sacrifice* [Hos. 6:6] (*Avot de Rabbi Natan*, Chap. 6).

How shall we relate the arcane rules about ritual purity to the public calamity faced by the heirs of the Pharisees at Yavneh? What connection between the ritual purity of the "kingdom of priests" and the atonement of sins in the Temple?

To Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, preserving the Temple was not an end in itself. He taught that there was another means of reconciliation between God and Israel, so that the Temple and its cult were not decisive. What really counted in the life of the Jewish people? Torah, piety. (We should add, Torah as taught by the Pharisees and, later on, by the rabbis, their continuators.) For the zealots and messianists of the day, the answer was power, politics, the right to live under one's own rulers.

What was the will of God? It was doing deeds of loving-kindness: "I desire mercy, not sacrifice" (Hos. 6:6) meant to Yoḥanan, "We have a means of atonement as effective as the Temple, and it is doing deeds of loving-kindness." Just as willingly as men would contribute bricks and mortar for the rebuilding of a sanctuary, so they ought to contribute renunciation, self-sacrifice, love, for the building of a sacred community. Earlier, Pharisaism had held that the Temple should be everywhere, even in the home and the hearth. Now Yoḥanan taught that sacrifice greater than the Temple's must characterize the life of the community. If one were to do something for God in a time when the Temple was

no more, the offering must be the gift of selfless compassion. The holy altar must be the streets and marketplaces of the world, as, formerly, the purity of the Temple had to be observed in the streets and marketplaces of Jerusalem. In a sense, therefore, by making the laws of ritual purity incumbent upon the ordinary Jew, the Pharisees already had effectively limited the importance of the Temple and its cult. The emergence of the *Bet HaMidrash* and *Bet HaKenesset* similarly transferred vital religious authority from the Temple priesthood to other sorts of religious leaders. The earlier history of the Pharisaic sect thus had laid the groundwork for Yoḥanan ben Zakkai's response to Joshua ben Ḥananiah. It was a natural conclusion for one nurtured in a movement based upon the priesthood of all Israel.

Why did Yoḥanan ben Zakkai come to such an interpretation of the meaning of the life of Israel, the Jewish people? Because he was a Pharisee, and the Pharisaic party had long ago reached that same conclusion. Though it had begun as a political party, not much different from other such groups in Maccabean times, toward the end of the Maccabean period the party faced the choice of remaining in politics and suffering annihilation, or giving up politics and continuing in a very different form. On the surface, the Pharisees' survival, the achievement of Hillel and his response to the challenge of Herod, tell us that the choice had been made to abandon politics. But that is not the whole answer.

The Pharisees determined to concentrate on what they believed was really important in politics, and that was the fulfillment of all the laws of the Torah, even ritual tithing, and the elevation of the life of the people, even at home and in the streets, to what the Torah had commanded: *You shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy people*. A kingdom in which everyone was a priest, a people all of whom were holy—a community which would live as if it were always in the Temple sanctuary of Jerusalem. Therefore, the purity laws, so complicated and inconvenient, were extended to the life of every Jew in his own home. The Temple altar in Jerusalem would be replicated at the table of all Israel. To be sure, only a small minority of the Jewish people, to begin with, obeyed the law as taught by the Pharisaic party. Therefore, the group had to reconsider the importance of political life, through which the law might everywhere be effected. The party which had abandoned politics for piety now had to recover access to the instruments of power for the sake of piety. It was the way toward realization of what was essentially not a political aspiration.

The Outcome

Of the four responses briefly outlined here, only the ones associated with the Christians and the Pharisees produced important historical consequences. The visionaries who lamented the past and hoped for near

redemption enjoyed considerable success in sharing their vision with other Jews. The result was the Bar Kokhba War, but no redemption followed; rather, severe repression for a time. Then the Pharisees' continuators, the rabbis led by the patriarch, gained complete control within the Jewish community of Palestine, and their program of attempting to make all Jews into priests, which to them meant into rabbis, was gradually effected.

The Qumran community did not survive the war, but its viewpoint seems to have persisted within the complex of Christian churches. For the Christians, the events of August, 70, were not difficult to explain. Jesus had earlier predicted that the Temple would be destroyed; the Jews' own words had convicted them, as Matthew, writing in the aftermath of 70, claims, "Our blood be upon our own heads." But the new Temple and the new cult would go forward. The picture is complex, involving Jesus, become Christ, or the Church, embodying the new Temple, but the outcome is clear. The events of 70 served to confirm the new faith, and the faith itself supplied a new set of images to take over and exploit the symbols of the old cult.

The destruction of the Temple, Jerusalem, and the cult therefore marked a considerable transformation in the antecedent symbolic structures of Judaism. The ancient symbols were emptied of their old meanings and filled with new ones; they continued formally unchanged but substantively in no way the same.

Conclusion

It remains to compare the experience of first-century Jews with that of Jews in our own time for, alas, both have endured difficult times. So far as both have had to confront a profound spiritual crisis, formulated in terms of the problem of evil, we may observe that the apocalyptic mind of the first century has a close counterpart in the theological and fictional writings about the Holocaust. Both dwell upon the disaster. Both lament it. Both ask how God could have done such a thing. Both look for a redemption in the near future, and the twentieth century apocalypics found the beginnings of redemption in the rise of the State of Israel, as, for a time, those in the second century probably regarded Bar Kokhba as a messianic figure. The destruction of the Temple posed cultic problems in no way faced by twentieth century Jews. But may one compare the evident necessity to reconstruct a basis for meaningful social life, faced in the first century, with that recognized by twentieth-century counterparts? Here matters are less clear. It may be argued that the Holocaust in an extreme form signified the disintegration of western society. Just as the ancient cult had assured folk of the permanence of the old values and the old society, so the persistence of Jewries in the several European societies may have meant, to Jews at least, the con-

tinuing viability of the liberal and democratic ideals of the Enlightenment, ideals which gave those societies teleological consequence and coherence. So the end of the several Jewries may likewise have signified the impossibility of the old hope of building a diverse but stable society. Then the effort to construct smaller, but better integrated social groups as communes and other discrete societies would be a counterpart to the salvific table-fellowship societies formed by Christian and Pharisaic Jews. I tend to be dubious of such comparisons; they ignore too many variables and rely too much upon inflated rhetoric in place of sound data and hard facts. To be sure, one cannot ignore certain obvious resemblances, but what one should make of them is not clear. Obviously, the first century was, and the twentieth is, a time of great flux. In both, the old order came to a decisive conclusion. Both have witnessed the birth of new religions of various sorts, the reorganization of world politics, and other changes of immense, and, for our times, unfathomable consequence. Perhaps, if lessons must be drawn from one age for another, the lesson of both the Pharisaic Jews and the Christian Jews—the two groups that emerged from pre-70 times and survived the disaster of 70—is this: Not to let slip from one's grasp the ties to the past, but also not to be knotted in them. Both groups preserved the Temple, each in its strange way. But for both, the Temple endured in a form which no one, before the destruction, could have recognized.

perhaps rabbinic preoccupation with Temple = world
of pre-70 belief in ritual purity of the kingdom
of priests and the atonement of sin in Temple.