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Abstract
This article challenges the standard picture that religious variety within Judaism before 70 CE was focused on the Temple, and that variety was replaced by unity in 70 when the Temple was destroyed. Evidence is presented that different groups shared the Temple despite their disagreements on how the cult should be organised, and it is argued that the loss of this shared institution did not cause such groups to disappear, although it may have made it easier for them to ignore each other.

For the past quarter of a century, since the publication of an influential article by Shaye Cohen in 1984, the standard narrative of the history of variety within Judaism in the first two centuries CE has assumed a radical change following the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. According to this narrative, Judaean Judaism was fractured before 70 CE into a number of groups, most importantly the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes described by Josephus in BJ 2 and in AJ 18, and the Dead Sea sect; these groups confronted each other in competition for the allegiance of ordinary Jews, the main focus for competition being the service in the Temple itself, to the extent that the most extreme groups separated themselves altogether from the Temple cult; finally, after 70 variety was replaced by unity because the rabbis at Yavneh, in response to the crisis, created a new broad church within which dissent was both permitted and possible because the lack of Temple removed the grounds for dispute which had so dominated Jewish life while the Temple stood. The aim of this study is to re-examine this analysis, in particular by questioning whether any of the groups attested from pre-70 Judaism really separated themselves from the Temple, and whether variety within Judaism really came to an end after 70 when the Temple was destroyed. The basis of this re-evaluation will lie in the application of two principles: the need to avoid

2 This study was written originally for the conference on Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History held in University College London in June 2008 and as the keynote lecture for the BAJS conference held in Manchester in July 2008 on the theme of Normative Judaism. I am grateful to the organisers of both these conferences for their invitations to bring together in a single study ideas which I have published elsewhere piecemeal, and I am grateful to the participants in both conferences for many helpful and perceptive comments and criticisms.
hindsight from later Jewish and Christian traditions in the interpretation of evidence from this period, and the need to take account of the preservation of almost all such evidence through those traditions (and the implications of absence of evidence in light of this process of preservation).

It is of course a truism that Judaism by the first century CE was very varied. The caution of those who resist any tendency to reduce the history of Judaism to a narrative about one strand, as if that constituted the essence of the religion, is justified. On the other hand, to talk about ‘Judaism’ in the plural has no ancient warrant, and outsiders at least seem to have thought that the different types of Jewish piety overlapped sufficiently for it to be possible to refer to ‘Judaism’ in the singular. It is possible to find at least one type of Jew from this period who was presumably pious in his own eyes but who failed to conform to most of the characteristics identified by Ed Sanders as constitutive of ‘common Judaism’ (most obviously the extreme allegorists attacked by Philo in De Migratione Abrahami), but a lowest common denominator which includes even such Jews remains: it is empirically the case that all those individuals and groups who presented themselves in this period as pious Jews worshipped the God who was worshipped in Jerusalem, and accepted that the Torah, enshrined in the Pentateuch, encapsulates a covenant between God and Israel incumbent on all Jews. Variety began with interpretation of that Torah, which could lead in very many directions. Some preoccupations, such as an interest in purity or apocalyptic, or the correct way to keep the laws of shabbat and kashrut, or the right attitude to the making of oaths, were shared by Jews of many different persuasions, but these common trends can be distinguished from the emergence of groups which defined themselves in contrast to other Jews as distinctive or superior, or (in extreme cases) cut themselves off from other Jews.

A straight reading of the Pentateuch can leave no doubt about the centrality of sacrifices and other offerings on an altar in the worship demanded by God from his people. The Torah lays down precise stipulations for the sabbath, festivals and the new moon, leaving no room for uncertainty what God requires and when it is to be offered. The Pentateuch is slightly less clear about precisely where such offerings are to be made, although it is evident that this is to be somewhere selected not by worshippers for their convenience but at ‘the place that the Lord will choose’. Such worship, through sacrifices, libations

---

3 So, for example, M. L. Satlow, Creating Judaism: history, tradition, practice (New York, 2006).
4 For the earliest recorded references to *ioudaismos* as a word, see 2 Macc. 2:21, 8:1, 14:38 (cf. S. J. D. Cohen, The Beginnings of Jewishness: boundaries, varieties, uncertainties, Berkeley, 1999); for *ioudaismos* as compared to *christianismos*, see Ignatius, Magn. 8.1, 10.3; Philad. 6.1 (cf. J. M. Lieu, Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World, Oxford, 2004, p. 252).
8 Deut. 12:26–27.
and incense, was standard in the ancient world, both in the Near East and among Greeks and Romans. The ancient landscape was littered with altars to a plethora of deities, and the building of temples to provide a dwelling-place for the god beside the altar was common. Of all the aspects of Jewish religiosity treated by Greeks and Romans as absurd, stupid or disgusting, worship with a Temple and altar was not one. On the contrary, pagans admired the Jerusalem Temple for its size and magnificence. In c. 300 BCE Hecataeus of Abdera, according to a citation found in the histories of Diodorus Siculus, noted with apparent approval that worship in the Temple in Jerusalem had been instituted by Moses, who was ‘outstanding both for his wisdom and for his courage’; in the mid second century BCE Polybius referred to the ‘renown of the Temple’; when in 15 BCE Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa visited Herod in Judaea, he himself made a sacrifice in the Temple. The main reason for the impressiveness of the Jerusalem Temple—that Jews from all over the land of Israel and the diaspora made contributions to sacrificial worship in one place rather than (as for other cults) in local shrines—does not seem to have attracted attention, although Romans were well aware of the transfer of wealth to Jerusalem from diaspora communities in Italy and Asia. Both Greeks and Romans could refer neutrally (as Hecataeus) or with disapproval (as Cicero) to the Jewish sacrificial system as different from that of other nations, but it would not have occurred to them to question the principle of worship through sacrifices. They will probably have been unaware of one of the most distinctive characteristics of the ritual carried out in Jerusalem, which was that, in contrast to pagan priests whose task was to determine, by following precedent, interpreting auguries, or enquiring from oracles, which offerings would be acceptable to the gods, the priests in Jerusalem simply followed divine instructions as mediated through Moses. To the outsider, the Jerusalem cult looked simply like a particularly fine example of normal worship, and Josephus capitalised on this in his description of Judaism for Roman readers in C. Apionem: ‘We have just one Temple for the one God […] common to all as God is common to all. The priests are continually engaged in his worship […] Our sacrifices are not occasions for drunken self-indulgence […] but for sobriety […]’.

10 For pagan attitudes to Judaism, see M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, 3 vols (1974–1984), and M. Goodman, Rome and Jerusalem: the clash of ancient civilizations (London, 2007), ch. 10.
11 Hecateus, ap. Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica 40.3 (= Stern, Greek and Latin Authors, vol. 1, p. 26).
15 Hecateus, ap. Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica 40.3 (= Stern, Greek and Latin Authors, vol. 1, p. 26); Cic. Pro Flacco 28.69.
17 Num. 30:1 (Heb).
In this description of Jewish sacrificial worship, Josephus stressed the importance of community: ‘at these sacrifices, prayers for the welfare of the community must take precedence over those for ourselves, for we are born for fellowship (κοινονία)’.

Josephus laid great stress in C. Apionem on the harmony to be found among Jews, and on the importance of such harmony:

To this cause above all [i.e. our education in our laws] we owe our admirable harmony. Unity and identity of religious belief, perfect uniformity in habits and customs, produce a very beautiful concord in human character. Among us alone will be heard no contradictory statements about God, such as are common among other nations, not only on the lips of ordinary individuals under the impulse of some passing mood, but even boldly propounded by philosophers; some putting forward crushing arguments against the very existence of God, others depriving Him of His providential care for mankind. Among us alone will be seen no difference in the conduct of our lives. With us all act alike, all profess the same doctrine about God, one which is in harmony with our Law and affirms that all things are under His eye. Even our womenfolk and dependants would tell you that piety must be the motive of all our occupations in life.

In light of such comments, the standard picture of Judaism as fractured into numerous competing sects seems to fly in face of the ancient evidence, but Josephus evidently saw no contradiction between this picture of unity and uniformity and his account of the Jewish haireseis in his earlier writings, for in Book 1 of C. Apionem he specifically drew the attention of his readers to the excellence of his history of the Jewish war, which (he claims) he had composed as an eyewitness and participant, and the accuracy of his Antiquities, which he had interpreted correctly because of his status as a priest.

The extraordinary unanimity among Jews to which Josephus drew attention in his account of the Jewish constitution in Book 2 of C. Apionem impressed only by contrast to Greeks, whose varied ideas about the gods and the right way to worship them were subjected to a sustained attack later in the book. Compared to Greeks, one thing Jews had genuinely in common, in a way that marked them out as special, was the ‘one Temple for the one God, for like always loves like’.

Nothing in Josephus’ description of the haireseis in BJ and AJ suggests the Temple as the main focus for disagreement between Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. The reason may, of course, in part lie in a different kind of idealisation of Jews and Judaism in these earlier works, since Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes are portrayed (at times explicitly) as equivalent to Greek philosophies, and this may account for the emphasis on abstract points of doctrine—especially the relationship of fate to free will—rather than practical issues.

---

to do with the practice of the Torah.\textsuperscript{25} This is not to suggest that Josephus disguised disagreements on how the Temple should be run—evidence for precisely such disagreement will be presented below, although the interest of the early rabbis in describing and prescribing the Temple service accounts for the preponderance of the rabbinic testimony on this issue—but that it did not, in his view, prevent unanimity between these groups on the value of the worship carried out in Jerusalem by the priests on behalf of the whole nation. If we take seriously his emphasis on the Temple in \textit{C. Apionem} and the importance, according to the Torah, of bringing the required offerings to the place stipulated by God, it seems wholly implausible that any of these Jewish groups could have cut themselves off from the Jerusalem Temple without this aspect of their identity being mentioned by Josephus as the primary mark of their distinctiveness, in the same way as Samaritans were distinguished, both by themselves and by Jews, as those who worshipped the God of Israel on Mt Gerizim.\textsuperscript{26}

From where, then, comes the common notion that some Jewish sects, specifically Essenes and the Dead Sea \textit{yahad}, abandoned the Temple in Jerusalem? It will be part of the burden of this study that this notion is probably wrong, and that ultimately it depends on anachronistic assumptions derived from later religious developments, but the idea is not without a basis in ancient sources, even if (I shall suggest) their interpretation is not as straightforward as is often thought. What appear to be the most explicit texts refer to the Essenes. In the Latin version of Josephus, \textit{AJ} 18.19, the text states specifically that the Essenes ‘send votive offerings to the Temple but do not offer (\textit{non celebrant}) animal sacrifices’;\textsuperscript{27} this reading is followed also in the Greek Epitome of Josephus’ text;\textsuperscript{28} and Philo in one passage describes the Essenes as ‘utterly dedicated to the service of God (\textit{therapeutai theou}), not offering up animals, but judging it more fitting to render their minds truly holy’.\textsuperscript{29} To read these texts as evidence that the Essenes avoided participation in Temple worship altogether is patently possible,\textsuperscript{30} but it is not inevitable, and in light of the centrality of the Temple in Judaism it seems to me that such an interpretation should be the last resort. And in fact other interpretations prove to be quite possible. Thus the Greek manuscripts of \textit{AJ} 18.19 state that the Essenes ‘sending votive offerings to the Temple perform sacrifices with a difference of purifications’ and that ‘because of this they carry out sacrifices by themselves, being banned from the common precinct’, which would suggest that the Essenes participate as much as they are allowed to in the Temple cult,

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{25} Jos. \textit{BJ} 2.119–61; \textit{AJ} 18.11–22.
\footnotespace
\footnotespace
\textsuperscript{27} For the reading, see B. Niese, \textit{Flavii Iosephi Opera} (Berlin, 1955), vol. 4, p. 143, note ad loc. On the manuscript tradition behind the Latin text, see F. Blatt, \textit{The Latin Josephus}, vol. 1: \textit{Introduction and Text. The Antiquities Books I–V} (Aarhus and Copenhagen, 1958).
\footnotespace
\textsuperscript{28} See Niese, ibid.
\footnotespace
\textsuperscript{29} Philo, \textit{Q.o.p.} 75.
\footnotespace
\end{footnotesize}
with their own place for free-will and other voluntary sacrifices somewhere in Jerusalem near the Temple site (perhaps near the Essene gate!). It has long been recognised that the meaning of Philo, *Q.o.p.* 75 is not necessarily that Essenes disapproved of animal sacrifices but only that, as idealised philosophers, they showed their special dedication to God through sanctification of the mind rather than only through the offering of animal sacrifices which was the standard way to worship.

The similar notion that the Dead Sea *yahad* cut itself off from the Temple seems to have become established in part less because of the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls themselves than because of the widespread view that the members of the *yahad* were Essenes and that Essenes were separated from the Temple. The consensus view was stated clearly in 1979 in the new Schürer: ‘For the desert sectaries of Qumran, the Temple of Jerusalem was a place of abomination; its precincts were considered polluted, its priests wicked, and the liturgical calendar prevailing there, unlawful. The sect therefore offered spiritual worship until the time when the sacrificial cult, properly performed, could be restored in the seventh year of the eschatological war [...] The sacred meal of the sect was no doubt a substitute for the sacrificial meals of the Temple’. It is, however, far from clear that the undoubted evidence for disapproval of the Jerusalem authorities to be found in the scrolls, and the clear signs that the *yahad* believed themselves to have separated from the majority in some sense and to have established a new covenant, should be read as an indication that the sectarians had cut themselves off from the Temple.

There are, of course, a number of references in the sectarian scrolls to a time in the past when the community fell out with a Wicked Priest, and to a time in the future when corrupt priests will suffer for their sins, and at times the community could present itself as comprising within itself an atonement for the land as ‘a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron’. But such notions should not preclude the sectarians continuing to treat the Jerusalem Temple and its worship as central to their lives. Among the non-biblical Dead Sea scrolls there are 63 references to Jerusalem and few to other cities. The Temple Scroll provides detailed rules for the Temple
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34 Schürer, *History*, vol. 2, p. 582.
35 For the separation of the Yahad from the rest of Israel, see *IQS* 8:12–13; for the notion of the ‘new covenant’, see 1QpHab 2:3; CD8: 21,35; for the issue of their relation to the Temple in general, see M. Goodman, ‘The Qumran sectarians and the Temple in Jerusalem’, in C. Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (Leiden, 2009), forthcoming.
36 1QpHab 11:4–6.
37 E.g. 1QpHab 11:13–15.
38 *IQS* 8:5–7.
cult, buildings and furnishings. The mishmarot contain calendars for the priestly courses. There are frequent references in a variety of texts to priests, to Aaron and to Zadok. The Copper Scroll contains a list of what appear to be Temple treasures. The Damascus Document legislates on sacrifices and offerings in the Temple, and MMT contains helpful advice directed (apparently) to the High Priest on how he should administer the Temple, and especially its purity laws. Above all, the popularity of Deuteronomy among the biblical scrolls found at Qumran, with its explicit injunctions to cultic sacrifices and pilgrimage, renders deeply implausible the notion that those who treated this text as authoritative will simply have ignored its injunctions.

Doubtless interpretation of the scrolls evidence can and should be complicated by taking into account the possibility that the scrolls represent more than one sectarian community, and that some of the scrolls are not sectarian either in origin or in use, but the notion that any of these sectarians could simply spiritualise the notion of sacrifices, and stop doing them in practice, would be very difficult for anyone to hold without knowledge that this was precisely the interpretive move made by later rabbinic Judaism and by Christians. Nothing prevented sectarians from combining the continued practice of sacrifices with the notion that their own community could also be like a Temple—indeed the notion might seem to be all the more powerful precisely because it could draw on the imagery of existing practice. According to the Community Rule the yahad should ‘establish the spirit of holiness in truth eternal to atone for the guilt of iniquity and for the unfaithfulness of sin [. . .] without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice—the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice and the perfectness of behaviour will be acceptable like a freewill offering’. but this notion is no different from that expressed by the prophets without implying opposition to the Temple cult. The book of Isaiah, which was very popular at Qumran, could declare that the Lord protests ‘I do not delight in the blood of bulls, or of lambs, or of goats [. . .] bringing offerings is futile’, but only because sacrifice is useless without morality: ‘Remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil’. Prayers, as described by Hosea, are ‘the calves of our lips’ which are offered up like sacrifices, but

40 11QTa 46:9–12, and passim.
41 4Q320–30.
42 1QS8:8–9; 4QS 6:2–3; 4QS2:16–18.
43 3QCopper Scroll 11.7.
45 E.g. 4Q395:8–10.
46 Tov, Discoveries: Introduction and Indexes, pp. 169–70 (30 manuscripts); it is probably just a chance result of the fragmentary nature of these manuscript remains that the injunction to pilgrimage three times a year in Deut. 16:16–17 does not happen to be included in any of the surviving passages of Deuteronomy (cf. Tov, Discoveries, p. 190); the parallel text at Exod. 34:23 survives (albeit in very fragmentary form) in 4QpaleoExod (see P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, eds, Qumran Cave 4, IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts, DJD IX, Oxford, 1992, p. 128).
47 1QS 9:3–5.
48 Isaiah 1:11–15, 16; on the copies of the text of Isaiah found at Qumran, see Tov, Discoveries: Introduction and Indexes, pp. 167–70.
that did not make the offering of real sacrifices redundant.49 In the extended attack by Philo to which I have already referred (above, n. 5), his assault on the extreme allegorists who taught that only the symbolic meaning of the biblical text mattered and not the literal, the last and most extreme example chosen to demonstrate the foolishness of their approach was the effect it would have on attitudes to the Temple: ‘We shall ignore the sanctity around the Temple and a thousand other things, if we are going to pay heed only to what is shown through covert meanings’.50

By implication, of course, these extreme allegorists opposed by Philo will, very unusually among first-century Jews, have believed it unnecessary to participate in the Jerusalem Temple cult because the real interpretation of the laws of sacrifice is symbolic. All other Jews we should expect to have felt a duty to attend the Temple and to send offerings there, even if in practice they went infrequently because they lived too far away.51 And if the Dead Sea sect was no different from other Jews in this respect, they will also have been no different from many other Jews in considering the Temple cult, which was so important to them, as flawed.

That this sense of dissatisfaction must have been widespread can be deduced from the comments of Josephus, the rabbis and the New Testament about the relationship of Pharisees and Sadducees to the Temple. That Sadducees went to the Jerusalem Temple is not in doubt, and Josephus states explicitly that one Sadducee, Ananus son of Ananus, was High Priest in the early sixties CE.52 If Ananus was conscientious in his Sadducean interpretation of the Torah, which according to Josephus involved a fundamentalist return to the written text of scripture and a refusal to accept the validity of traditional interpretation,53 he will have found himself compelled by popular opinion to serve at the altar in a fashion that he himself believed invalid. According to Josephus, whenever the Sadducees came to office, they submitted to ‘what the Pharisee says’, since otherwise ‘they would not be tolerated by the masses’.54 In the same passage, Josephus explains that the Pharisees are ‘very influential among the people’ and that ‘all divine matters both of prayers and of the performance of sacred rites are done following their exposition’,55 a claim that is probably to be believed since (according to Josephus elsewhere) the special characteristic of the Pharisees was their conservative acceptance of ancestral tradition.56

49 Hos. 14:2.
50 Philo, De Migr. Abr. 92.
51 On practical difficulties for most Jews in attending the Temple, see Sanders, Judaism, pp. 130–31.
52 Jos. AJ 20.199.
54 Jos. AJ 18.17.
55 Jos. AJ 18.15.
Scholars have not often attempted to empathise with the crisis of conscience that might afflict a scrupulous Sadducee high priest as a result, but there is no need to doubt the evidence of the Mishnah that Sadducees, like Essenes and Pharisees, had specific views about purity rules, and (even if the historicity of this particular story in unprovable) the Mishnah gives some idea of the sort of problem that a Sadducee high priest might face if he believed that the ashes of the red heifer, which alone could provide the purification from corpse pollution essential before he approached the divine presence in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement to make the offering on behalf of all Israel, had themselves been created by a priest whose fitness to perform the ritual was in doubt because he was not in a sufficient state of purity. And calendar disputes will always have left some Jews who attended the Temple uneasy that the prescribed offerings were not being made on the correct day: disagreement on the meaning of the biblical injunction to start counting the omer from ‘the day after the Sabbath’, which most Jews understood as the day following the festival of Pesach but (according to the Mishnah) Boethusians, who are perhaps to be identified with Sadducees, took to mean the first Sunday after the start of the festival, will have led to the pilgrimage festival of Shavuot, and its associated offerings as stipulated in the Torah, almost always being celebrated in the Temple on a day which some of those present believed to be wrong. As Sacha Stern has noted, different ideas about the calendar were rife in the ancient world without necessarily leading to conflict of any kind—if various communities in Palestine and the Diaspora kept the same festivals on different days, this did not matter much to anyone—but it is hard to imagine the same insouciance about the national offering of the festival sacrifices for Shavuot, which were, at least in principle, paid for out of the annual half-shekel offerings of all adult male Jews.

The Jerusalem Temple permitted all sorts of quarrelsome and discontented groups to worship at the national shrine, including (according to Acts) the early followers of Jesus, who ‘spent much time together in the Temple […] praising God and having the goodwill of all the people’, even though the burden of their message, when ‘every day in the Temple […] they did not cease to teach and proclaim Jesus as the Messiah’, will hardly have been accepted by ancient Mediterranean societies, as described by Greeks and Romans, worked, and there is no obvious reason to doubt Josephus’ account in this respect. This would not, of course, preclude local variations on ancestral tradition, such as the differences between Judaean and Galilean customs recorded in tannaitic texts (cf. M. Goodman, ‘Galilean Judaism and Judaean Judaism’ in W. Horbury, W. D. Davies and J. Sturdy, eds, The Cambridge History of Judaism, vol. 3, 1999, pp. 596–617).

57 m.Parah 3:7.
58 Lev. 23:11, 15–21.
59 m. Menahot 10:3.
60 S. Stern, Calendar and Community: a History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE to 10th Century CE (Oxford, 2001).
62 Acts 2:46–47 (but note that a theological and a literary motivation for the location of these events in the Temple by the narrator is not impossible).
all. The worst that might happen to a group like the Essenes was, as we have seen, exclusion from some parts of the Temple site because of their idiosyncratic purity laws. The relationship of such Jews to the Temple should be contrasted to the real sectarians who broke away totally from Jerusalem, such as the Samaritans, or the priest Onias in the second century BCE, whose temple in Leontopolis was built, according to Josephus, precisely in order ‘to rival the Jews at Jerusalem, against whom he harboured resentment for his exile […] He hoped by erecting this temple to attract the multitude to it and away from them’. Onias can be said to have failed, since, although both Josephus and the rabbis were aware of his temple, neither saw it as a real threat to Jerusalem, and it seems to have been ignored by the Alexandrian Philo.

Most Jews, then, continued to look towards Jerusalem, imperfect though they believed the Temple cult to be. The Temple was for them not the cause of sectarian strife by groups which refused to view their opponents as valid Jews—Josephus did of course write in his account of the war of 66–70 about real struggles for control of the Temple in the last years of the struggle, but this was for political advantage not to impose a religious agenda—but a shared public space about which each group argued as it struggled to shape it to conform to its own notions of how it should be run.

Thus any change in the evidence for continued disagreements between groups after the destruction of the Temple in 70 should be interpreted not as evidence of the end of variety within Judaism but as evidence of the end of a public stage on which such variety was visible. When groups of Jews disagreed with each other after 70, they did not need to confront each other with their differences since each group could exist in untroubled isolation from other Jews. Other changes in the preservation of evidence about Judaism after 70 have added to the illusion that variety diminished, such as the end of Christian preservation of non-Christian Jewish Greek literature composed after about 100 CE because non-Jewish Christians started to have a literature of their own; the failure of the rabbinic tradition, whose medieval manuscripts provide the basis of most of our knowledge of Judaism after 70, to preserve anything composed by Jews in Greek; and the solipsism of the rabbis which

63 Acts 5:42.
64 See above, n. 31.
66 Jos. BJ 7.431.
67 On attitudes to the Leontopolis temple there has been a large amount of scholarship, much of it speculative. For a recent study, see L. Capponi, Il Tempio di Leontopoli in Egitto: identità politica e religiosa dei Giudei de Onia (150 a.c.–73 d.c.) (ETS, 2007).
discouraged interest in other groups except in so far as they had an impact on adult male rabbinic Jews.\textsuperscript{71}

All these factors make not only valid but desirable a search for any hints of continued variety after 70 even if evidence of variety does not dominate the surviving narratives in the way that the differences between Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes emerge so prominently in the historical narratives of Josephus. Doubtless, since many Judaean Jews died in the revolt, there were fewer members of each group after 70 than before, but it is not necessary for a group to be large in order for its ideas to continue. In principle, one might expect the reaction of many intense Jews to the fall of the Temple to have been a closer adherence to their favoured interpretation of the Torah, following the Deuteronomistic logic that disaster would have been avoided if only Israel had not sinned. To abandon altogether their earlier beliefs might seem perverse, except in the case of those Jews (and there must have been some) who gave up altogether their faith in the power of the God of Israel to save his people. That Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes were still the main philosophies of Judaism in the nineties CE was of course explicitly asserted by Josephus in his \textit{Antiquities} and in his \textit{Vita}, and there is no reason whatsoever to read his account of the present state of Judaism as an historical report on Jewish philosophies which had ceased to exist.\textsuperscript{72} In the Mishnah, R. Yose is reported in the mid second century as ruling (rather leniently) on the status of ‘the daughters of the Sadducees,’ although whether this reflected a current issue or just a theoretical problem is impossible to tell.\textsuperscript{73} The rabbis were not interested in differentiating between different kinds of \textit{minut}, a catch-all category which included any Jew whose ideas or behaviour were deemed potentially dangerous, through example, to a conscientious \textit{talmid hakham} or his family, from incorrect wearing of tefillin\textsuperscript{74} and ritual slaughter of animals\textsuperscript{75} to asserting that there is only one world (and thus no world to come)\textsuperscript{76} and, through false evidence, deliberately misleading a rabbinic court when it tries to fix the calendar by the new moon.\textsuperscript{77} It is perfectly possible that among the undifferentiated mass of ‘bad’ Jews to which the rabbinic texts darkly refer there were some who continued to think of themselves as Sadducees or Essenes: for the adherent of neither of these varieties of Judaism was it necessary for the Temple still to be standing for them to continue to interpret the Torah in the way they had done before 70, and in the case of the Sadducees, who were said to be positively boorish to each other,\textsuperscript{78} it was not even necessary to be part

\textsuperscript{72} Note the use of the present tense about Jewish philosophies in Jos. \textit{BJ} 2.119; \textit{AJ} 18.12, 16, 18; \textit{Vita} 10.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{m. Niddah} 4:2.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{m. Hullin} 2:9.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{m. Berachot} 9:5.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{m. Rosh HaShanah} 2:1.
\textsuperscript{78} Jos. \textit{BJ} 2.166.
of a wider group. It would be possible to be a Sadducee down to the end of antiquity, and indeed beyond.\textsuperscript{79} That this picture of the importance of minut differs from Shaye Cohen’s claim, discussed at the beginning of this article, of a broad church within Judaism after 70 CE, should be evident.

How, then, did variety within Judaism relate to the Jerusalem Temple? The strong sense of group identity among members of the Qumran yahad, Essene communities, talmidei hakhamim, and early Jewish Christians seems clear (although the borders of the Pharisee community, let alone of the Sadducees, if there was indeed a Sadducee ‘community’ of any kind, are less certain), but group solidarity did not require separation from the shared (and biblically mandated) institution of the Temple. Later rabbis were to assert that ‘causeless hatred’ between Jews had led to the destruction of Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{80} and the value placed by Josephus in \textit{C. Apionem} on unity for its own sake\textsuperscript{81} may be read as a reaction to the disunity and faction fighting among the defenders of Jerusalem which came to the attention even of the Roman historian Tacitus.\textsuperscript{82} In one of the more high-flown speeches in Josephus’ \textit{BJ} put into his own mouth in his record of events in Jerusalem on 17\textsuperscript{th} Tammuz in 70 CE, he quoted ‘the records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city and is even now coming true’, that ‘the city would be taken whenever someone begins to slaughter his own countrymen’: ‘God it is then, God himself, who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge his Temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions’\textsuperscript{83} But the religious civil strife, with the mutual violence and sometimes slaughter which disfigured Christian history in late antiquity and beyond, was precisely not standard among Jews. On the contrary, the most striking aspect of Jewish religious history in this period is not violence but the continual theme of grumbling tolerance. Where Christian history has often been a Shakespearian tragedy, with dead bodies strewn across the stage in the final act, the history of Judaism has more resembled a tragedy by Chekhov, with all the actors still alive and together at the end—but miserable.\textsuperscript{84}


\textsuperscript{80} On ‘causeless hatred’ as the cause of the disaster, see \textit{b. Yoma} 9b.

\textsuperscript{81} Jos. \textit{C. Ap.} 2.179.

\textsuperscript{82} Tac. \textit{Hist.} 5.12.3–4.


\textsuperscript{84} This comparison between different types of tragic outcome I owe to a talk in Wolfson College, Oxford, by Amos Oz some time in the 1990s, with reference to the current conflict in the Middle East.