

Diaspora: Historical and Religious Perspectives³⁵

In Jewish memory, the notion of diaspora is as old as known history. The patriarchs themselves spent significant periods of their lives in Mesopotamia and Egypt and dispersion, often combined with a life as a minority, has been part of Jewish existence ever since. It is thus necessary to limit oneself to a clearly defined point of view when discussing this complex topic. In this paper I examine the notion of diaspora from the point of view of Classical and Hebrew studies, with a methodology and perspective necessary for, and shaped by, the interpretation of Hebrew and Greek, Jewish and non-Jewish sources, primarily from antiquity.

Philologists take texts, terms and concepts as their points of departure, analysing and evaluating them and placing them in appropriate contexts in order to discover relevant aspects of their meaning and significance, employing the methods of scholarship. It is in this sense that I will take the term ‘diaspora’ here as my starting point. I will examine this term analytically from a number of angles in order to shed light on its layers of meaning as well as on some of its important contexts. I will proceed by discussing categories and dichotomies, including some dilemmas, taking my examples mostly from antiquity. The dichotomies I will discuss are the following: ‘diaspora’ and ‘galut’; Judaism in the sense of a people and as a religion; centre and periphery or boundary; and the two major types of diaspora environment: pagan and Christian.

The Jewish exegete Philo of Alexandria was among the first to articulate the idea that a sacred (authoritative) text may have several layers of meaning simultaneously.³⁶ These layers do not always agree with, and may sometimes even contradict, one another, but they all rest on a common foundation: the simple, concrete and everyday meaning of the text. The vesture of the high priest may symbolise the cosmos and therefore, his activity may have universal significance, yet his garment also exists as palpable reality.³⁷ In rabbinical hermeneutics, this layer of meaning is called *pshat* (פּשָׁט), to be distinguished from *drash* (דְּרָשׁ), i.e. the sense derived – literally, ‘explored’ – from the *pshat*, as well as further, more abstract, allegorical, philosophical or mystical levels of meaning.³⁸ One may observe a similar hermeneutical structure in Christian interpretations of the Scriptures.

³⁵ The last version of my study was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary (project nr. FK 138351).

³⁶ Cf. Philo: *De migratione* [The Migration of Abraham] § 89–93.

³⁷ *De vita Mosis* [The Life of Moses] II § 117–132.

³⁸ Cf. Julio Trebolle Barrera: *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Leiden, Brill – Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1998. 468–489, esp. 482 (“PaRDeS”).

There are various points of contact and mutual influence between both traditions.³⁹ Here we will concentrate mainly on the *pshat*, i.e. the basic significance of the concept of diaspora, from which we will infer a few simple conclusions, with regard also to the topic proper of this conference and the volume: the question of the identity, community and coexistence of Jews and non-Jews in Hungary.

Diaspora and galut

Let us begin with the term *diaspora*. This Greek word (διασπορά) is derived from the verb σπείρω (*speiro*, ‘scatter’, ‘disperse’), and it is also related to the noun σπέρμα (*sperma*, ‘seed’), evoking the idea of sowing and planting (the prefix *dia-* merely adds the meaning ‘asunder’, ‘in different directions’). Thus, the word *diaspora* does not carry a value judgment – Epicurus, for example, used it to describe the spatial distribution of atoms.⁴⁰ When used in the context of a people, this term merely refers to geographical dispersion, and it is basically neutral, or rather scientific and descriptive.

In the textual realm of the Bible, however, the notion gains an ominous overtone. “*And it shall be, if you do not listen to the voice of the Lord your God to keep and to do all his commandments, which I commend you today, that all these curses shall come upon you, and overtake you,*”⁴¹ Moses warns in the name of YHWH towards the end of Deuteronomy (דברים), when the sons of Israel are on the verge of entering the Promised Land. The curses in prospect include: “*May the Lord give you slaughter before your enemies (...); and you shall be in dispersion in all the kingdoms of the earth.*”⁴² The positive counterpart of this curse is the corresponding blessing, provided that the sons of Israel convert to YHWH in the diaspora and live according to His laws: “*If your dispersion be from an end of the sky to an end of the sky, from there the Lord your God will gather you, and from there he will take you. And the Lord your God will bring you into the land that your fathers inherited.*”⁴³ Thus, while in the sense above, being dispersed is a mere historical/geographical/sociological fact, in the biblical sense it carries a severe religious/theological value judgment.

The biblical quotations above have been taken from the Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation of the Torah/Pentateuch, which was approved by the Jews of Alexandria, the most significant Jewish diaspora community in antiquity.⁴⁴ In fact, the members of

³⁹ Cf. Mark Edwards: *Figurative Readings: Their Scope and Justification*. In James C. Paget – Joachim Schaper (eds.): *The New Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013. 714–733.

⁴⁰ Plutarch, *Adv. Colot.* 1109f.

⁴¹ Deut 28:15.

⁴² Deut 28:25.

⁴³ Deut 30:4–5.

⁴⁴ Trans. Melvin K. H. Peters. In: Albert Pietersma – Benjamin G. Wright (eds.): *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.

this community typically read and interpreted the Scripture in that version, i.e. in the *koine* or *lingua franca* of the Western world at that time, rather than in Hebrew. And it is this version that was to become the Bible of Christianity as well, a world religion that derives from Judaism.⁴⁵

The terminology of the Hebrew text differs from that of its Greek translation in numerous ways, and an investigation of the overlaps and intersections of the Hebrew and Greek expressions would require a paper to itself.⁴⁶ The concept of dispersion is also emphatic in the Hebrew text – e.g. in the characteristic metaphor of sheep scattered without a shepherd – but in the texts quoted above, where the Greek has *diaspora*, in the Hebrew text we find זְרוּחָה (za'avah, or זְרוּחָה zva'ah, 'horror') and נִדְּחָה (niddach, 'outcast').⁴⁷

Besides dispersion, expulsion and horror, however, the most important Hebrew term is *galut* or *golah*, a word that can be best rendered in its etymological sense as 'denuding', 'exposure', or 'deprivation'. The land is 'denuded', as its inhabitants have been taken away, and those taken away are 'deprived' of their land. All this happens as a punishment by God. In the Bible, this expression occurs mainly with reference to the event known as the Babylonian Exile or Captivity, but its meaning was subsequently extended in the rabbinic tradition to describe the entire period of almost two thousand years starting with the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem – Yitzhak Baer's *Galut*, originally published in 1936 in German, is a classic study of the concept and phenomenon.⁴⁸

Both the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint also use other expressions to describe the phenomenon of *galut* or *diaspora* (תְּפוּצוּת, *tfutsot* in modern Hebrew) that further modify and nuance the general picture. Servitude, exile, forcing people at spearpoint to move from their land, on the one hand; and resettlement, changing home (the same word is also used for colonisation), or migration, on the other. I have grouped these terms according to the dichotomy of both emblematic expressions, *galut* and *dispersion*, to illustrate the dual character of 'diaspora' – a term that bears both the value-neutral historical description of a fact, and the religious perspective laden with a value judgment, the notion of punishment. In what follows, I will proceed by keeping this twofold meaning in mind.

⁴⁵ Cf. Kristin De Troyer: The Septuagint. In James C. Paget – Joachim Schaper (eds.): *The New Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013. 267–288.

⁴⁶ Cf. John W. Wevers: The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version. In Magne Sæbø – Chris Brekelmans – Menahem Haran (eds.): *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Part 1: Antiquity*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 84–107.

⁴⁷ 'Dispersion' in Hebrew is פוּץ (*puts*) or its causative form הִפִּיץ (*hefits*); for the metaphor of sheep without a shepherd cf. 1 Kgs 22; for 'horror' see Deut 28:25; for 'outcast': Deut 30:4.

⁴⁸ Berlin: Schocken; English version: *Galut* (trans. Robert Warshow), New York, Schocken, 1947; for the Jewish diaspora in antiquity cf. John M. G. Barclay: *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1996; Erich S. Gruen: *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass. – London, Harvard University Press, 2002.

People and religion

There have always been groups of people who have lived in dispersion, deprived of their homeland; likewise, exile and deportation has been the fate of other groups, as well. Yet the Jewish diaspora is of special significance, which is largely to be explained by the exceptional character of the Jewish people. In what does this exceptionality consist? As a starting point, one could offer a summary: the fact that Judaism is both a people and a religion, i.e. a concrete group of people as well as an ideal and a set of beliefs at the same time. In antiquity, this was by no means unusual. However, as groups of people and their particular religious ideas became embedded in larger contexts, i.e. as they became Hellenised, Romanised or Christianised, such an inalienable connection between a people and a religion became increasingly uncommon. It is a matter of interpretation, and it is not our task here to take a stand on this, which of the two came first: whether it was the people who created the religion, or the religion that formed the people. In any case, the intertwining of the two aspects was supplemented by a third, as this religion assigns a concrete land to a concrete group of people, and the stories that are narrated in the sacred texts take place, almost without exception, in that particular region. The uniquely strong interconnection of people, land and religion is guaranteed by a further, even more fundamental element, namely the absolute authority that this people and this religion claims for their own origin: that it is none other but the creator of the world, who is furthermore the only God, who chose this people as His own property, and gave it a law which guarantees this exceptional status and affiliation to the end of time. Integral parts of this law are the shared holidays and customs defined by particular ordinances, the commemoration of shared historical experience, as well as the language.

In antiquity, it was above all its concept of God that made Judaism unique. Jewish monotheism was admired by some and loathed by others.⁴⁹ It was regarded as provocative by many that this small group of people ignored other gods and other people's customs, and considered only their own God a true god, rejecting the gods of all other peoples as false gods.⁵⁰ In antiquity, this often led to the charge that Judaism – and later Christianity – was a form of atheism.⁵¹ As a positive counterpart to this negative assessment, one could perhaps say that Judaism considers itself the guardian of an unutterable holiness in a world necessarily profane by comparison. Some philosophers valued very highly the radical purity of the Mosaic idea of God; and in Hellenistic and early Roman times, Judaism had an attraction for the wider masses as well, inviting many proselytes, i.e. people who

⁴⁹ Cf. Everett Ferguson: *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993. 512–517.

⁵⁰ The difference between true and false in matters of religion is described by Jan Assmann as 'Mosaic distinction', cf. his *Moses, the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, Mass. – London, Harvard University Press, 1998; and his *The Price of Monotheism*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2010 (trans. Robert Savage).

⁵¹ Cf. the anti-Christian polemic of Emperor Julian (the Apostate), *Contra Galilaeos* 43b (fr. 3.11 Masaracchia), 229d (fr. 55.8–9, 11 Masaracchia).

converted to Judaism.⁵² Thus, already in antiquity, a strange mixture of attraction and reserve, enthusiasm and repulsion surrounded the Jewish people whose geographical dispersion helped spread their religion and way of life.

This variety of identity forming elements (origin, way of life, memory, ideas/beliefs, land and language) make the Jewish people and the Jewish diaspora unique. The fact that this identity has profound and manifold roots has several consequences. On the one hand, it preserves unity and self-identity, and thus the religion or belief. If one element weakens or drops out, another becomes stronger: for instance, after the loss of the Temple in Jerusalem, the Torah became central to the Jewish people and became, for a long time, its virtual homeland.⁵³ On the other hand, this strong identity allows for diversity and freedom of choice, depending on what one prefers to emphasise: ethnicity, religion or the land. At the same time, this diversity ensures the possibility of dissension and schism, as well. One could mention the civil war between Hellenists who endorsed assimilation and their traditionalist opponents (the Maccabees) at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; or the exodus of the Qumran community to the Judean desert; or the clash between radical Zealots and those who were seeking a compromise, in the last days of Jerusalem.⁵⁴ And one could also mention here the birth of Christianity and its separation from Judaism.

Centre and boundary

After the Romans destroyed the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 A.D., at the end of a long war, the role of priests was taken over by the rabbis, who started assiduously to reorganise the Jewish people, living in exile (*galut*), with the Torah as their centre. In the roughly half a millennium before this, Jerusalem and the Temple had formed the centre of the Jewish people, who were already geographically dispersed at that time. The rest of the biblical Holy Land was inhabited mostly by other, foreign ethnicities, including Samaritans, Greeks and Romans – a state of affairs that did not change substantially even after the military expansion of the relatively short-lived Hasmonean kingdom, or with the pro-Roman reign of Herod.⁵⁵ On the other hand, there were Jewish communities living essentially undisturbed on biblical land until the Muslim conquest in the seventh

⁵² Cf. Louis H. Feldman: *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993.

⁵³ Cf. Peter Schäfer: *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. London – New York, Routledge, 2003. 134.

⁵⁴ Cf. Schäfer (2003): op. cit. 35–44 (Antiochus and the ‘Hellenistic reform’), 121–130 (the Jewish war); for the origin of the Qumran community cf. Géza Vermes: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London, SCM Press, 1994, Chapter VI.

⁵⁵ Cf. Günter Stemberger: *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius*. München, Beck, 1987. 24–27.

century.⁵⁶ Thus, in a technical sense, some of the communities living in the Holy Land were diaspora communities; the differences between those communities and the Jewish community of, say, a town in Asia Minor or North Africa were mainly of a theoretical, religious nature: they were living on a territory traditionally considered to be holy land. Thus the beginning of *galut* is marked by the destruction of the Temple and the loss of Jerusalem as a capital, rather than by the exile of the Jewish people living in the Holy Land in an ideal unity.

What did the Temple mean for Judaism? It meant a centre, in several senses of the word. Symbolically, it was a point of orientation and a common denominator. Ritually, it was the only place of sacrifice, as the Torah permitted sacrifice to be offered only in the Jerusalem Temple.⁵⁷ And last but not least, it meant the presence of God on earth. Although the Temple was reconstructed on several occasions, its concentric, hierarchical structure was always preserved – as one proceeded through its courtyards and halls, fewer and fewer of the chosen were allowed to advance further.⁵⁸ The innermost sanctuary, the Holy of Holies, was off-limits to all but the high priest, and even he was allowed to enter it only once a year.⁵⁹ There were several trends within Judaism which questioned the ritual purity of the Temple and the priesthood; therefore, in a technical sense, spiritual leaders of the people were not totally unprepared for the Temple's destruction.⁶⁰ They were thus able to apply the structure of holiness detailed above – the distinction between sacred and profane, pure and impure – successfully to the Torah and the people. Thenceforth, holiness – whatever it may mean in a concrete sense – moved symbolically with the people to various centres, from Babylonia to Hungary and beyond. On the other hand, the Torah, unless it is interpreted allegorically, ties Jewish religious practice unambiguously to the Holy Land and Jerusalem. Hence the hope of return to the real centre and the reconstruction of the Temple was kept alive in every actual centre, and the establishment of a new, definitive home was inconceivable – unlike in the case of other wandering peoples.

Although the Jews were few in number, they were already spread out across a very large territory in antiquity – not only in every corner of the Roman Empire, but even

⁵⁶ Cf. Günter Stemberger: *Christians and Jews in Byzantine Palestine, and Jewish-Christian Contacts in Galilee (Fifth to Seventh Centuries)*. In Günter Stemberger (ed.): *Judaica Minora, Teil II: Geschichte und Literatur des rabbinischen Judentums*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010. 124–145; 146–159.

⁵⁷ Deut 12; cf. John J. Collins: *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2014. 168–173.

⁵⁸ Cf. Dan Bahat: *The Herodian Temple*. In William Horbury – W. D. Davies – John Sturdy (eds.): *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Early Roman Period*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. 38–58.

⁵⁹ Cf. Lev 16; *Mishnah Yoma*.

⁶⁰ Robert Goldenberg: *The Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple: Its Meaning and Its Consequences*. In Steven T. Katz (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. 191–205.

in the Persian Empire, in ‘Babylonia’. In the absence of the Temple, their survival and unity among the peoples was ensured by the Torah, by learning, by a uniform way of life, a common language and shared memory, as well as by a common yearning to return to the ancient homeland. Besides preserving internal cohesion, the most important task of this people living in an insular or cell-like network of settlements was to establish boundaries prudently and protect them. A paradigm of these boundaries was the Jerusalem city wall, built by the biblical Nehemiah after the return from the Babylonian Exile, followed immediately by a decree to annul marriages with the local populace, i.e. by the building of a symbolic wall.⁶¹ If that was the case in Jerusalem, it seemed even more called-for in foreign parts and even more among foreign peoples.

What were the functions of the diaspora communities’ boundaries? First of all, they had to prevent oppression by the majority population, which – in the absence of weapons – the Jews tried to ensure by having good relations with their surroundings and the powers-that-be. Secondly, they had to prevent assimilation, especially in places where the local culture was significant, attractive and hospitable – as, for example, in Alexandria in the Hellenistic period – where Jews may have been tempted to assimilate.⁶² Assimilation, whether cultural or religious, often through mixed marriage, meant the end of Jewishness. Thirdly, however, the permeability of the boundary was also important, as it ensured the flow of goods and ideas that enriched the community which, ideally, managed to preserve its identity.

On the other side of the boundary

Besides the loss of the centre, the greatest turning point in the life of Jews in antiquity was the radical change in the situation beyond the boundaries: the rise of Christianity, the religion that grew out of Judaism, reinterpreting and appropriating its heritage.⁶³ The concept of God that had been known through Judaism was disseminated throughout the empire by Christianity, using, to a great extent, the infrastructure of Jewish diaspora communities, but discarding important constitutive elements of Jewish identity. Christianity did not insist on settlement in the Holy Land, although there were large-scale construction works in Jerusalem and elsewhere, especially from the fourth century onwards; and it rejected ethnic boundaries, as well as the imperative of observing the halakhic regulations laid down in the Torah.⁶⁴ And they justified this by appealing to Jesus

⁶¹ Neh 2:11–6:19 (the burdensome rebuilding of the city wall), 12:27–43 (the solemn dedication of the walls); 9:2, 10:31, 13:1–9 and 23–31 (separation from foreigners).

⁶² An emblematic figure in the first century was Tiberius Julius Alexander, who abandoned Judaism and became the procurator of Judaea, then the prefect of Egypt, and took part in the siege of Jerusalem with Titus’s legions.

⁶³ Cf. Henry Chadwick: *The Early Church*. London, Penguin, 1993 (1967), Chapter 1.

⁶⁴ On the apostolic council in Jerusalem, where the burning question concerning the observation of the Mosaic Law was discussed see Acts 15.

of Nazareth, a Jew, who, according to Christian belief, embodied in his person Israel and its history, the high priest, the sacrificial animal, and even God himself, extending the boundaries of spiritual Israel to all those who were baptised. It was not only to pagans that Christians applied the distinction, inherited from Judaism, between true and false religion, but to Jews as well, expecting the latter to convert to the religion of Jesus, since Christians regarded Jesus as the Jewish Messiah.⁶⁵ The Christians could not put their claim into action; in fact, they were themselves persecuted by the authorities at the time, whereas – from the end of the second century – Jews were for the most part allowed to live as an accepted religious community.⁶⁶ However, when in the fourth century the state and the emperors realised that Christianity should rather be considered as an ally, since that was the religion capable of restoring the unity of the empire, the state and the Church made an alliance, and power relations altered radically. Pagan religions and movements considered heretical were banned and persecuted. As for Jews, they were tolerated, but – as if fulfilling the Mosaic curse quoted above – they were looked upon as a ‘horror’, their rights were restricted, and the members of the community were often forced to give up their traditions and their separate status, or at least to live in a state of perpetual guilt.⁶⁷ Similarly, it was strictly forbidden to rebuild the Temple, as the restoration of the cult of sacrifice would have contradicted the doctrine of the eternal sacrifice of Jesus.⁶⁸ And after everybody became officially Christian, Jewish diaspora communities were faced with the fact that the usual oppression of minorities, fanaticism caused by religious tensions, and every evil that lurked beyond the boundaries now appeared under the banner of Christianity. Thus, the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, born of the same biblical soil and inspired by the same revelation, took a dramatic turn from the fourth century onwards, and often resulted in tragic outcomes. As it was Christians who were in power, they were largely responsible for having transgressed many times (often with the support of institutions) the most fundamental value of their religion, namely the protection of the helpless: in the case of the Jewish people. At the same time, the tension encoded in Jewish–Christian relations is, ideally, capable of reminding these communities, in the spirit of the biblical heritage, of their own shortcomings, and, by virtue of this uniquely competitive situation, encouraging them to reflect on the foundations of their identity, to reformulate them and thus be renewed.

⁶⁵ As is well known, ‘Christ’ (Χριστός, *christos*) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew ‘Messiah’ (משיח, *mashiach*) or ‘anointed one’.

⁶⁶ Cf. E. Mary Smallwood: *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden, Brill, 1976. 539–545; Stemberger (2010): op. cit.

⁶⁷ For the period cf. Schäfer (2003): op. cit. 176–190.

⁶⁸ Cf. David Levenson: The ancient and medieval sources for the Emperor Julian’s attempt to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, 35. (2004), 4. 409–460.

Some further thoughts

Turning now to the present, the establishment of the State of Israel – a state which, though struggling and not devoid of contradictions, embodies in its own way the centre destroyed in antiquity but promised in the Torah – brought a radical change for the diaspora, as well. In the eyes of many, this state seems even to fulfil the millennial messianic hopes.⁶⁹ Also, with the creation of the state, a new category of identity formation appeared: citizenship, which – though it is related to peoplehood and, indirectly, to religion as well – is a new element that partly overrides the others. In what direction this state will develop and in what way that will affect the diaspora and its environment is still shrouded in the mists of time.

The painful memory of last century's genocide on an industrial scale still casts a dark shadow on the coexistence of Jews and non-Jews in Hungary. Even the third and the fourth generation finds it very hard to shake itself free of it – and this is true on both sides of the boundary of the Hungarian Jewish diaspora. I believe that facing up to that tragedy, healing the wounds and reconciling with each other is the greatest challenge and at the same time the greatest opportunity. However, it is a *sine qua non* of any reconciliation that there be parties that can reconcile with one another. As far as the 'boundaries' (in the sense discussed above) of the Hungarian Jewish community are concerned, both exclusion and annihilation motivated by anti-Semitism and the birth of the State of Israel led to the reinforcement of the sense of identity based on ethnic origin rather than on religion, even though the two are thoroughly intertwined. The situation has become even more complicated as self-identity based on ethnicity and on religion have both become a possibility following an era in which ethnic belonging was taboo and religion was considered outmoded; therefore, these means of preserving identity had been taken away. In my view, the creative and responsible reconstruction of voluntarily chosen identities on both sides is essential to the reconciliation and coexistence of Jews and non-Jews in Hungary.

Finally, diaspora may be examined not only from a historical and religious perspective but also from an existential one. In that sense, diaspora – exile from the homeland, being an alien, being misunderstood, being exposed to dangers, vicissitudes and even annihilation, as well as the interminable waiting and yet the hope of return – is a remarkably powerful metaphor for human existence.

Bibliography

Assmann, Jan: *Mózes, az egyiptomi*. Tr. Gulyás András et al. Budapest, Osiris, 2003.
Baer, Jichak: *Galut*. Berlin, Schocken, 1936.

⁶⁹ Cf. Aviezer Ravitzky: *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1996.

- Bahat, Dan: The Herodian Temple. In W. Horbury – W. D. Davies – John Sturdy (eds.): *The Cambridge History of Judaism. III. The Early Roman Period*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. 38–58. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521243773.003>
- Barclay, John M. G.: *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora. From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1996.
- Buzási Gábor: „Mózesi megkülönböztetés” és hellénizmus a IV. században. A vallási radikalizmus természetrajzához. In Déri Balázs – Vér Ádám (eds.): *A véttlen nyíllövés. Tanulmányok az ókori zsidóság, kereszténység és újplatonizmus határvidékeiről*. Budapest, L'Harmattan, 2023. 197–221.
- Chadwick, Henry: *A korai egyház*. Tr. Ertsey Krisztina – Tornai Szabolcs. Budapest, Osiris, 2003.
- Collins, John J.: *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2014. 168–173.
- De Troyer, Kristin: The Septuagint. In James Carleton Paget – Joachim Schaper (eds.): *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013. 267–288. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139033671.016>
- Edwards, Mark: Figurative Readings. Their Scope and Justification. In James Carleton Paget – Joachim Schaper (eds.): *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013. 714–733. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139033671.038>
- Feldman, L. H.: *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Ferguson, Everett: *A kereszténység bölcsője*. Tr. Zsengellér József. Budapest, Osiris, 1999.
- Goldenberg, Robert: The Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. Its Meaning and Its Consequences. In Steven T. Katz (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Judaism. IV. The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. 191–205. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521772488.009>
- Gruen, Erich S.: *Diaspora. Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge–London, Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Kopeczky Rita: A görög antiszemita irodalom egyiptomi vonulatához. *Antik Tanulmányok*, 49. (2005), 1–2. 173–195.
- Levenson, David B.: The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, 35. (2004), 4. 409–460.
- Misna: *Jóma*. Tr. Enghy Sándor. In Görgey Etelka (ed.): *Törpék óriások vállán. Válogatott Misna-traktátusok*. Sárospatak, Sárospataki Református Teológiai Akadémia, 2010. 97–126.
- Ravitzky, Aviézer: *A kinyilatkoztatott vég és a zsidó állam. Messianizmus, cionizmus és vallási radikalizmus Izraelben*. Tr. Benke László. Pozsony, Kalligram, 2011.
- Schäfer, Peter: *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. London – New York, Routledge, 2003.
- Smallwood, Mary E.: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden, Brill, 1976.
- Stemberger, Günter: *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land. Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius*. München, Beck, 1987.
- Stemberger, Günter: Christians and Jews in Byzantine Palestine. In Günter Stemberger: *Judaica Minora. II. Geschichte und Literatur des rabbinischen Judentums*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010a. 124–145.

- Stemberger, Günter: Jewish-Christian Contacts in Galilee (Fifth to Seventh Centuries). In Günter Stemberger: *Judaica Minora. II. Geschichte und Literatur des rabbinischen Judentums*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010b. 146–159.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio C.: *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Leiden, Brill–Eerdmans, 1998.
- Vermes Géza: *A qumráni közösség és a holt-tengeri tekercsek története*. Tr. Hajnal Pirooska. Budapest, Osiris, 1998.
- Wevers, J. W.: The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version. In Magne Sæbø – Chris Brekelmans – Menahem Haran (eds.): *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. I. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300). Antiquity*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1996. 84–107.