

JEWISH CULTURE AND CONTEXTS

Published in association with the Herbert D. Katz Center
for Advanced Judaic Studies of the University of Pennsylvania

David B. Ruderman, Series Editor

Advisory Board

Richard I. Cohen

Moshe Idel

Alan Mintz

Deborah Dash Moore

Ada Rapoport-Albert

Michael D. Swartz

A complete list of books in the series is available from the publisher.

Jewish Studies at the Crossroads of Anthropology and History

Authority, Diaspora, Tradition

EDITED BY

Ra'anan S. Boustan,

Oren Kosansky,

and Marina Rustow

PENN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

PHILADELPHIA

Chapter 5

The Dislocation of the Temple Vessels:
Mobile Sanctity and Rabbinic Rhetorics
of Space

RA'ANAN S. BOUSTAN

Long residence enables us to know a place intimately, yet its image may lack sharpness unless we can also see it from the outside and reflect upon our experience.

—Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*

Over the past two decades, a growing chorus of scholars and intellectuals, both within and beyond the field of Jewish studies, has advanced the claim that the notions of exile and diaspora, despite their apparent affinities, stand in profound tension with each other.¹ While “exile” is configured, in historical sources as well as contemporary scholarship, as an abnormal and unsustainable state of crisis governed by a narrative of sin, punishment, and longing for restoration, “diaspora” has come to signify a dynamic and even generative politico-spatial condition that is characterized by porous social boundaries and cultural vitality.² This revisionist interpretation of the Jewish discourse and experience of diaspora has been most powerfully articulated by Daniel Boyarin and Jonathan Boyarin in a series of provocative and incisive essays.³ Blending historical analysis and political intervention, they advocate “a privileging of Diaspora, a dissociation of ethnicities and political hegemonies as the only social structure that begins to make possible a maintenance of cul-

tural identity in a world grown thoroughly and inextricably interdependent."⁴ This valorization of the essentially open-ended spatial horizons of diasporic existence glosses over the historical particularities of diasporic experience in specific times and places. As such, their formulation too readily assimilates "diaspora" in its heterogeneous historical forms to the highly particular phenomenon of "globalization" characteristic of capitalist postmodernity and its distinctive technologies of communication and movement (human, capital, and commodity).⁵ Moreover, their critique of the Zionist project of re-territorializing the world's Jewish population within the borders of a nation-state in the area of Palestine runs the risk of establishing an equally teleological counter-narrative in which the postwar Jewish experience in Western Europe and especially North America displaces the State of Israel as a truer realization of Jewish historical processes. Still, the Boyarins have played an instrumental role in bringing about a salutary re(e)valuation of those forms of Jewish collectivity, both in the past and the present, that differ from, or even compete with, the model—and the ideal—of the modern liberal nation-state.⁶

This theoretical paradigm has called renewed attention to the rich spectrum of discursive and embodied practices through which Jewish diasporic communities have historically succeeded and continue to succeed in maintaining their collective identities. Most notably, Erich Gruen has recently argued that the Jews of the Hellenistic diaspora did not perceive their dispersion throughout the Mediterranean world as a condition in need of remedy, nor apparently did scriptural representations of the Babylonian exile as punishment for Israel's sin and the concomitant "doctrine of restoration" color their experience of their contemporary situation.⁷ In fact, according to Gruen, the powerful image found in Greek-Jewish sources of the holy city of Jerusalem as the "mother city" (*metropolis*) of the scattered Jewish colonies (*apoikiai*) is an index of the profound sense of belonging that diaspora Jews felt in the local communities in which they and their more immediate ancestors made their lives.⁸ Affective attachment to and financial support of the institutions of the geographic "center" in Jerusalem proved to be particularly effective strategies for sustaining numerous highly localized forms of diasporic Jewish identity throughout the Mediterranean world.

The Boyarins' diasporic model of Jewish social and cultural vitality has also productively informed the recent work of Charlotte Fonrobert on the historical emergence and significance of the rabbinic legal institution known as the *'eruv hatseivot*, the ritual joining of courtyards, although her analysis also significantly modifies their assumptions about the nature of the relationship

between the notions of territoriality and sovereignty.⁹ Fonrobert argues that the *'eruv hatseivot* is a distinctive spatial practice that forges otherwise undifferentiated urban space into a residential community, thereby offering "a powerful model of a territory without sovereignty" that, "as such, would have much to offer the current discussions about diaspora cultures."¹⁰ It would seem that, from the perspective of this paradigm, diasporic practices are not only highly admirable and adaptable, but also accord well with traditional Jewish piety; in sharp contrast, exile belongs to the naïve and ultimately dangerous sphere of "mythic" thinking that requires careful historical deconstruction lest it lead to the fetishization of territoriality.¹¹

I think it important to stress that I myself am in full sympathy with these important "post-Zionist" correctives to the regnant approach to Jewish identity in nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship that was predicated on a cultural logic peculiar to the discourse of modern nationalism as well as to the institutional forms of the Western European nation-state.¹² This shift in perspective is particularly helpful when analyzing the sociocultural processes that obtained in the very different contexts of the multiethnic, multireligious, and multilingual empires of antiquity, with which this chapter is concerned. And the premodern cases, with their vast, contiguous territories and heterogeneous subject populations, in turn bear provocative similarities to the Russian, Ottoman, and Hapsburg Empires of the prewar period—and perhaps to contemporary, though still nascent, post-nationalist political arrangements as well.¹³

At the same time, I find something curious and even troubling in the way that the new scholarly discourse on diaspora maps so neatly onto traditional supersessionist narratives—both Christian and Jewish—concerning the replacement over the course of late antiquity of "cultic community" with "scriptural community" as the primary organizing principle for religious life. Indeed, the celebration in this scholarship of the mobility and dynamism of narrative, textuality, and hermeneutic creativity selectively recapitulates the perceived predilection within rabbinic Judaism—in its ancient and especially its modern forms—for Torah study as redemptive practice and its concomitant distaste for the sacred spaces of temple precincts, the genealogical exclusivity of priesthoods, and the bloody meat of animal sacrifices.¹⁴ Insofar as the sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem Temple represents an atavistic embarrassment for many moderns, scholars included, there are enduring predispositions to prefer the text-centered scholastic piety of the rabbis to what might all too readily be seen as the spatial "obsessions" of the Temple cult.

It is, of course, undoubtedly the case that the period of late antiquity

saw a profound historical shift in religious discourse and practice as societies throughout the ancient Mediterranean world ceased, albeit only gradually, to engage in animal sacrifice.¹⁵ Yet, it would be deeply misleading to characterize this complex process as the inevitable “spiritualization” of what had suddenly come to seem empty ritual forms.¹⁶ Blood cult remained the dominant paradigm for religious ritual and piety throughout late antiquity, providing the ritual logic and symbolic idiom for the novel modes of ritual-liturgical action that came to characterize Judaism and Christianity.¹⁷ As Jonathan Klawans, Ishay Rosen-Zvi, Steven Fraade, and others have compellingly shown, many of the traditions found in rabbinic literature that describe the sacrificial and purity practices in force when the Jerusalem Temple was still in operation seem to be neither a simple record of pre-destruction practice nor the fruit of scriptural exegesis. Instead, these scholars have argued that these traditions reflect the rabbis’ ongoing and creative engagement with—and even expansion of—cultic practice as they sought to address the contemporary religious and social concerns of post-destruction Judaism.¹⁸

Building on these insights into the enduring vitality of cultic discourse in late antique religions, I wish to explore in this essay how the spatial dislocation of the Temple vessels at the time of the destruction informs rabbinic attitudes concerning the physical reality and spatial fixity of the sacrificial cult. I will argue that the early rabbis of the second to fourth centuries articulated a far more nuanced attitude toward the dialectical tension between the “locative” dimensions of the physical cult and the more mobile forms of authority and piety that they sought to cultivate in the wake of the Temple’s destruction.¹⁹ I will focus on a series of early rabbinic sources of the third and fourth centuries that offer “eyewitness” testimonies concerning the cultic vessels that were taken from Jerusalem to Rome after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. and, in some cases, detailed descriptions of their precise location and physical form.²⁰ I will suggest that these sources are not pursuing what is often taken as the relatively straightforward rabbinic agenda of supplanting the physical cult with an edifice of learned discourse and pious prayer.²¹ Rather, these texts are marked by a palpable tension between appropriating the Temple cult to augment hermeneutically oriented rabbinic authority and prestige, on the one hand, and preserving sensual experience as a privileged site of religious meaning and authority, on the other. These rabbinic traditions betray an abiding fascination with the unique and inimitable power embodied in the concrete, but mobile, remains of a ritual system over which the rabbis are not quite able—or willing—to assert complete control. In emphasizing the visual ac-

cessibility of the Temple vessels outside the precincts of the Jerusalem Temple, these sources give expression to the productive tension that (some) Jews in late antiquity felt between the centering discourse of the traditional cult and the new spatial mobility of the sacred that characterized the post-Temple era in which willy-nilly they found themselves.

I wish to suggest that these traditions do not merely accord a central role to visual testimony in rabbinic halakhic debates concerning the form and function of the various Temple vessels, but in fact thematize the irrevocable visual power of these sacred objects. Visuality thus simultaneously indexes the experience of mobility, insofar as the act of seeing occurs in the imperial capital of Rome, and the enduring significance of the cultic center in Jerusalem, insofar as the very idiom of seeing hearkens to the materiality of the historical sacred center in Jerusalem.

In no sense, then, did rhetorics of space come to matter less to the production of Jewish identity in this period; nor were they replaced in rabbinic discourse, in any direct way, by rhetorics of textual authority. Rather, the spatial and material dimensions of the sacrificial cult—linked through the act of seeing—continued to function as primary parameters within which Jewish cultural forms evolved. It is thus my aim to show that a great deal is lost in our picture of early rabbinic Judaism if we emphasize its textual-exegetical nature to the exclusion of its deep and continuing engagement with the physical realities—both spatial and ritual—of the Jerusalem Temple.

I will thus suggest that at least some rabbinic sources betray an awareness that the new mobility of the post-destruction period did not merely present the potential for generating novel forms of religious authority and piety, but also generated a cultural and religious problematic that demanded far more than could be achieved through a straightforward supersessionist discourse. Instead, these sources transformed the long-standing link between visibility and cultic practice into a bridge between materiality and textuality, between the centripetal pull of the Jerusalem Temple and the centrifugal dynamism of the new “diasporic” piety of the rabbis.²²

The Temple Vessels on Display in Rome: Rabbinic “Eyewitness” Testimonies

Following the protracted, but ultimately successful, siege of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the Roman army under the command of Titus transported a vari-

ety of cultic implements from the now-destroyed Jerusalem Temple to Rome. Whether or not the Romans had initially intended to destroy the Temple complex and take its sacred vessels as war spoils,²³ these symbolically potent items were readily incorporated into the joint triumph celebrated by Vespasian and Titus at Rome circa June 71 C.E. for their victory in the (first) Jewish war.²⁴ This dramatic scene of the conquering Roman army parading the Temple vessels through the streets of Rome would subsequently be etched in stone for all time on the triumphal arch erected soon after the death of Titus, in 81 C.E.²⁵ Moreover, ancient sources report that Vespasian vowed—perhaps already during the triumphal ceremonies—to construct a temple to Peace in which the vessels would be placed on permanent public display.²⁶ This grand architectural project quite literally enshrined the Roman conquest of Judea within the public space of the imperial capital. Indeed, the Roman historian Fergus Millar has recently emphasized how significant this series of commemorative gestures was in legitimating the political aspirations of the new Flavian dynasty.²⁷

The *Apocalypse of Baruch* (2 Baruch), an apocalypse set during the destruction of the First Temple by the Babylonians in 587/86 B.C.E. but written in response to the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans, addresses quite candidly the anxieties of those who had experienced these events and were concerned about the fate of the Temple vessels.²⁸ The text reassures its audience in no uncertain terms that, at the bidding of the angelic emissary of God, the vessels will remain in or near Jerusalem, hidden beneath the earth: “Earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the mighty God, and receive the things which I commit to you, and guard them until the last times, so that you may restore them when you are ordered, so that strangers may not get possession of them.’ And the earth opened its mouth and swallowed them up.”²⁹ This evocative image of the sacred vessels from the Jerusalem Temple, secreted away in or near the Land of Israel in preparation for the future renewal of the cult, echoes a long-standing literary tradition from the Second Temple period.³⁰ In resistance to the centrifugal forces of exile that had scattered the Judean population, the vessels are saved from the sacrilege of falling into the impure hands of the enemy. Yet, in the context of the events of 70 C.E., it is quite striking that the author of 2 Baruch refuses to acknowledge the fact that Titus and his victorious armies had, in very recent memory, paraded the sacred implements of the Jerusalem cult through the streets of Rome in triumphal procession, enshrined this celebration in monumental public art on the Arch of Titus, and even placed some of these items on display in the newly built Temple of Peace.³¹

The rabbis of Roman Palestine in the third and fourth centuries were also fascinated by the fate of the Temple vessels but apparently accommodated themselves to the reality of their dislocation to Rome. Reports concerning the viewing of the Temple vessels in Rome already make their appearance in the earliest strata of rabbinic literature. These sources present rabbinic visual testimonials concerning the physical form of a variety of Temple vessels, including the seven-branched candelabrum (menorah), the Temple veil (*parokhet*), and various vestments of the high priest. These testimonies concerning the Temple vessels in Rome form a tiny subgenre of their own. In the examples considered here, a rabbinic authority—either Rabbi Eleazar ben Yose or Rabbi Shim'on ben Yoḥai, both of whom lived in the second century C.E.—reports having seen one or another of the Temple implements during a visit to Rome. The formulation of the tradition is almost identical for both rabbis: the only difference is that while R. Eleazar merely reports what he “saw” in Rome, R. Shim'on adds a verb of motion (“When I *went to* Rome...”) at the front of his report. As we will see below, this cluster of texts explicitly and repeatedly thematizes the act of visualization itself, linking these brief narrative snippets to a broader and highly contested discourse concerning the importance as well as the limits of visual access to the Temple vessels.

Because of the obvious similarities between these formulas, I would caution against the assumption that these third-, fourth-, and early fifth-century rabbinic sources represent transparent records of the actual experiences and words of second-century rabbis in the capital.³² Moreover, I do not believe we are well served by trying to interpret these strikingly similar episodes in the biographies of R. Eleazar and R. Shim'on as historical events. Rather, I think it more productive to analyze these traditions within their immediate literary contexts in order to consider the place of cultic imagery within late antique Judaism in general and rabbinic culture in particular.

Almost from the beginning, these “eyewitness” reports appear within elaborate narrative, exegetical, or dialectical contexts, often to resolve a dispute concerning cultic law. These reports generally address either the precise design of one of the Temple implements or some sacrificial practice that has left a physical mark upon one of these vessels. Their emphasis on visualization builds upon widespread traditions concerning the public viewing of the Temple vessels by the laity during pilgrimage festivals, although it is worth stressing that these rabbinic “memories” of the Jerusalem cult likely do not reflect the actual historical practices performed before the destruction of the Temple when the sacrificial cult was still in force.³³

Thus, for example, we read in the Tosefta (ca. mid-third century) that R. Eleazar ben R. Yose saw the Temple veil during a visit to Rome:

And thus did he [the high priest] count [when sprinkling the sacrificial blood during the expiatory ritual on the Day of Atonement]: "One, one and one, one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven." R. Judah said in the name of R. Eliezer: "One, one and one, two and one, three and one, four and one, five and one, six and one, seven and one." He went out to his left, along the veil [*parokhet*]. And he did not touch the veil. But if he touched it, he touched it. R. Eleazar b. R. Yose said: "I myself saw it [the veil] in Rome, and there were drops of blood on it. And they told me:³⁴ These [drops] are from the blood of the Day of Atonement."³⁵

R. Eleazar's testimony is here appended to a series of relatively disconnected rabbinic dicta concerning the precise dynamics of the Yom Kippur ritual: mention of the *parokhet* seems to have prompted the redactor to include the R. Eleazar tradition, which does not otherwise substantiate or refute an argument.³⁶

Details concerning R. Eleazar's sighting of the Temple vessels exhibit significant variation in the basic content of this tradition across the rabbinic corpora of the third and fourth centuries. For example, R. Eleazar elsewhere testifies that, while in Rome, he saw the head-plate (*tsits*) of the high priest—and not the Temple veil. More significantly, this tradition, which is found twice in the Jerusalem Talmud, likewise situates R. Eleazar's testimony within the context of halakhic debate regarding the precise appearance of the sacred object: "On the head-plate [*tsits*] there was written 'Holy unto the Lord.' 'Holy unto' [was written] below, while the divine name was above. Just as a king sits on his throne, so one [part of the phrase] is below and the divine name is above." But R. Eleazar b. R. Yose said: "I myself saw it in Rome, and actually, engraved upon it on one line was 'Holy unto the Lord.'"³⁷

The anonymous authority cited in this passage is apparently in possession of a received tradition that asserts that the words "Holy unto the Lord" were engraved upon the head-plate on two separate rows, with the divine name on top. This anonymous tradition does not rest on either an exegetical or an experiential rationale, but instead appeals to the obvious iconic function of the phrase: the vertical configuration not only embodies the elevated position of

God but also signifies the logical relationship between the priestly head-plate and God's divine kingship. By contrast, R. Eleazar grounds his conflicting position that the entire phrase was written on a single line in eyewitness testimony, which, while perhaps less graphically apt, carries with it the authority of visual experience.

Other tannaitic figures could similarly attract various cultic objects to their names. We find in the fragmentarily preserved halakhic midrash *Sifrei zuta* a statement attributed to R. Shim'on ben Yoḥai concerning the form of the menorah from the Jerusalem Temple, which he claims to have spent a long time inspecting while in Rome. But, unlike what is probably the earliest form of the R. Eleazar statement found in the Tosefta, R. Shim'on's report is here already embedded in a halakhic context and juxtaposed to an exegetical argument:

From where [in Scripture do we know] that all the lamps [of the menorah] must be turned inward toward the middle lamp? Scripture teaches thus: "(When you set up the lamps, let the seven lamps give light) toward the front of (*el mul*) the lampstand" (Nm 8:2). And [elsewhere] it says: "(There is a people that came out of Egypt; it hides the earth from view) and it is settled next to me (*mimuli*)" (Nm 22:5). R. Shim'on said: "When I went to Rome and saw the menorah there, all of its lamps were turned inward toward the middle lamp."³⁸

Perhaps unsurprisingly, this discussion in *Sifrei zuta* does not appeal to the authority of contemporary synagogue iconography. Instead, through midrashic exegesis, it substantiates its claim that the outer six lamps of the menorah were oriented toward the central lamp. The passage notes the echo of the verbal element *mul* ("in front of") in two unrelated verses from the Pentateuch—one stipulating how Aaron should arrange the lamps of the menorah and the other relating how the Moabite king Balak feared that he was being encircled by the people of Israel. The physical arrangement conjured up in the former verse is not, however, self-evident. The midrashist reasons that just as this element of the prepositional phrase implies encirclement in the Balak story, so should it be understood to do in the description of the menorah. The passage thus determines that the three candles on each side of the menorah were oriented inward toward the central flame. Unlike R. Eleazar's report concerning the head-plate, R. Shim'on's testimony confirms rather than contravenes the received tradition cited anonymously by the text.

Visualization of the Temple Cult among Jews and Christians

Beyond their varied halakhic aims, all these eyewitness testimonies participate in what seems to be an underlying cultural tradition—common in both early Judaism and early Christianity—that acknowledges the power and contentiousness of visual access to the Temple vessels. To report that one had laid eyes on the sacred objects of the Temple cult was no insignificant claim. Thus, for example, a noncanonical gospel (P. Oxyrhynchus 840), likely composed before the end of the second century C.E., not long before the motif would emerge in the Tosefta, relates that the high priest rebuked Jesus and his disciples for having entered the Temple sanctuary and gazed upon the Temple vessels in an impure state:

And having taken them, he [Jesus] brought them [the disciples] into the place of purification [*eis auto to bagueutērion*] and was walking in the Temple. And having approached, a certain Pharisee, a chief priest whose name was Levi, joined them and said to the Savior: “Who gave you permission to enter this place of purification and to see these holy vessels [*tauta ta bagia skeuē*] when you have not washed yourself, nor have your disciples surely washed their feet? But you, in a defiled state, you have entered this temple, which is a pure place that no one enters nor dares to view these holy vessels without first having washed themselves and changed their clothes.”³⁹

Much about this passage remains obscure, not least whether the author of this gospel was familiar with the actual functioning of the defunct Jerusalem cult. Daniel Schwartz has noted that, in its equal emphasis on prohibitions against visual and physical violation of the cult, the passage is perfectly consistent with other Second Temple sources that likewise proscribe the improper viewing of the Temple utensils.⁴⁰ Here, of course, the author understands the actions of Jesus and his disciples as an outright rejection of the exclusivist posture of the Jerusalem priesthood. Schwartz suggests that the anti-priestly impulse in this text was also shared by the Pharisaic and rabbinic movements.

François Bovon, however, has recently pointed out that Schwartz’s reading depends on the contradictory assertions that, on the one hand, the designation of the high priest as a “Pharisee” likely reflects later Christian criticism of Pharisaism rather than an accurate historical memory of the priest’s identity, and, on the other, the document provides reliable insight into actual Pharisaic

practice. Bovon instead argues, convincingly to my mind, that the gospel fragment should be read in the context of second-century Christian controversies concerning the need for purification during water baptism rather than as evidence for first-century Judaism or the historical Jesus.⁴¹ He points out that the expression “the holy vessels” (*ta bagia skeuē*) is precisely the same language used by early Christians to describe the liturgical utensils employed in the ritual of the Eucharist. On this reading, the lost gospel tells us neither about the history of the actual Temple vessels nor about their fate, but about how their memory was appropriated in early Christian culture.

Unlike Second Temple Jewish sources—but very much in the spirit of P. Oxyrhynchus 840—rabbinic literature nowhere places restrictions on the viewing of the Temple vessels.⁴² In a fascinating article, Israel Knohl has analyzed a variety of rabbinic sources that represent the laity’s viewing of the Temple vessels during the Second Temple period as a sacred rite, one almost akin to a theophany.⁴³ Knohl’s argument largely hinges on later rabbinic reports concerning sectarian controversy surrounding the display of the showbread table and the menorah outside the inner sanctuary of the Temple on pilgrimage festivals.⁴⁴ As I have suggested above, I doubt that these rabbinic sources can be used to reconstruct the history of actual cultic practice in the Jerusalem Temple.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, I do think he is fundamentally correct in identifying a strong “democratizing” or “popularizing” impulse within rabbinic literature itself. Quite clearly, the rabbinic authors of these texts wished to present the Temple vessels as the patrimony of all Israel—and not just the priesthood.

Yet, these diverse rabbinic traditions, including the eyewitness testimonies that I have analyzed above, are also marked by a provocative emphasis on the visual power of the Temple vessels. They carry within them a palpable and abiding interest in the very materiality of the cult. Of course, unlike early Christianity, late antique Judaism was relatively slow to develop liturgical practices and personnel that could be understood, however provisionally, to replace the Jerusalem cult; indeed, it was most likely not until the fifth century that the synagogue was gradually transformed, under considerable Christian influence, into a kind of surrogate temple.⁴⁶ But, while third- and fourth-century rabbinic sources do not provide the lost cultic implements with a tangible new referent comparable with the Christian Eucharist, rabbinic claims of special knowledge about the appearance and function of the Temple vessels paradoxically reaffirm their continuing cultural, religious, and political significance.

These rabbinic eyewitness reports serve as an antidote to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and the resulting dislocation of its cultic vessels. These

conditions might have prompted the rabbinic authors to reflect on the fragility of a place-bound Temple cult or to interpret the capture of the Temple vessels as confirmation that proper knowledge of the Jerusalem cult should henceforth derive solely from Scripture. It is significant, therefore, that these particular rabbinic sources explicitly value visual confirmation over scriptural exegesis. Indeed, they stress that the physical acts of travel and visualization serve as the basis for rabbinic knowledge of and authority over cultic practice. This affirmation of the sheer physicality of the ritual implements of the Jerusalem cult complicates the traditional picture of the rabbi as the paragon of a post-Temple Judaism in which text trumps object. Moreover, this narrative image of the act of visualizing the Temple vessels in Rome encompasses both the experience of mobility and attachment to the cultic center in Jerusalem. The rabbis may have celebrated the power of their own mobility to bridge, however tenuously, the spatial rupture between their community in Palestine and the displaced sancta in Rome. But at least for some rabbis of the third and fourth century, the recognition that the sacred was an increasingly mobile phenomenon was compatible with their enduring attachment to the concrete realia of the Jerusalem Temple. In this regard, the rabbis of late antiquity could, at times, not only reinterpret but also reaffirm the religious power that was bound up in the sacrificial cult. Their cultivation of diasporic modes of continuity—in particular, hermeneutic authority and activity—stood in productive tension with the cultic idioms and images with which they remained very much in dialogue.

(Post)modern scholars, both Jewish and non-Jewish, may recognize their own values in the rabbinic embrace of the utopian potential of increasingly mobile and dynamic forms of religious community. Nevertheless, they should guard against adopting a supersessionist stance that relegates spatial and physical attachments to a more primitive phase of religious and cultural life, whether that stage is associated with the bloody sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem Temple or with the nationalist discourses of nineteenth- and twentieth-century European—and Jewish—modernity.

Chapter 6

Sacred Space, Local History, and Diasporic Identity: The Graves of the Righteous in Medieval and Early Modern Ashkenaz

LUCIA RASPE

In 1470, the cantor of the Jewish community of Regensburg was questioned by Christian interrogators interested in hearing the Jewish view on Saint Emmeram, the city's patron saint. The cantor confirmed that his coreligionists believed that the saint had been a Jew named Amram and that he lay buried not in the abbey bearing Saint Emmeram's name, but in the Jewish cemetery. This was, he said, what he had been told by his parents. Although the grave was unmarked, the cantor was prepared to point out the hole in the ground that was believed to be the saint's burial place. It was said among the Jews, he added, that Amram "helped them."¹

In the Rhenish city of Worms, a story was told of how the twelve *parnasim*, or Jewish community leaders, had met their deaths during the persecution of the First Crusade in 1096. Their supposed mass grave played a major role in local custom from at least early modern times. The rich tradition of *minhagim* preserved from that period gives a detailed picture of how, on various occasions throughout the year, the Jewish community would walk over to the cemetery outside the city walls, encircle its circumference, say prayers, and give charity. On the public fasts commemorating the persecution itself, people would prostrate themselves on the martyrs' grave and invoke their intercession with God to have mercy on the community.²

In Mainz, during the persecution of the First Crusade, the Jewish cem-

the name of an evil spirit (*Shabriri, briri, riri, iri, ri*) inscribed in a triangular shape (cf. Schrire, *Hebrew Amulets*, 60).

30. Scholem, "Magen David," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 11:688. Note, however, that in Islamic culture the hexagram is commonly referred to as Solomon's Seal, based on legendary accounts of the wondrous signet that the biblical king received from heaven. For examples of Solomon's Seal in Islamic art and culture, see Rachel Milstein, ed., *King Solomon's Seal* (Jerusalem, n.d. [1995]).

31. In contrast to what Schrire writes (*Hebrew Amulets*, 68), the expression *melekh David* (King David) is far less common.

32. Examples of Hebrew amulets are reproduced and discussed in Schrire, *Hebrew Amulets*; Isaiah Shachar, *Jewish Tradition in Art: The Feuchtwanger Collection of Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1981), 237–317; Eli Davis and David A. Frenkel, *The Hebrew Amulet: Biblical-Medical-General* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1995); Nitza Behrouzi, ed., *The Hand of Fortune: Khamsas from the Gross Family Collection and the Eretz Israel Museum Collection* (Hebrew and English) (Tel Aviv, 2002); and Elka Deitsch, ed., *Kabbalah: Mysticism in Jewish Life* (New York, 2003).

33. Another example from Kyustendil was made a year earlier than the 1897 *ketubbah* preserved in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (private collection in New York, unpublished).

34. Gabriel Barkay, "The Priestly Blessing in Silver Plaques: The Significance of the Discovery at Ketef Hinnom" (Hebrew), *Cathedra* 52 (1989): 37–76. Barkay suggests the amulets were "probably worn on the body, maybe forerunners of tefillin."

35. The word בן is abbreviated as ב , which, among the Sefaradim, commonly indicates "son of" (as in the Arabic *ibn*).

36. See Hayyim Joseph David Azulai, *Petah 'einayim* (Jerusalem, 1959; 1st ed., Livorno, 1790), vol. 1, 18a–18b; Joseph Hayyim, *Adleret Eliyyahu* (Jerusalem, 1968; repr. of Livorno, 1864), 21b. Cf. Shalom Sabar, "From Sacred Symbol to Key Ring: The 'Hansa' in Jewish and Israeli Society," in *Jews at Home: The Domestication of Identity*, ed. S. J. Bronner (Oxford, 2010), 140–62.

37. For the Indian examples, see Shalom Sabar, "The Illuminated *Ketubbah*," in *The Jews of India: A Story of Three Communities*, ed. O. Slapak (Jerusalem, 1995), 166–202, nos. 1, 14, 15, 17. An example from Vienna, 1831, is reproduced in Sabar, *Ketubbah*, 239. For this motif, see also an example from Jerusalem, 1893, in Sabar, "Two Millennia of *Ketubbah*," 58.

38. For examples from Jerusalem, see Sabar, "Two Millennia of *Ketubbah*," 58, 68–70.

39. Gross Family Collection, Tel Aviv. Cf. Behrouzi, *Hand of Fortune*, 18.

40. Sabar, *Mazal Tov*, pl. 18.

41. See the example issued for Moroccan families in Pará, Brazil, 1911, reproduced in Sabar, *Ketubbah*, 366–68.

42. This notion is already implied in the midrash in *Numbers Rabbah* 18:21. This interpretation depends upon *gematria* (numerology): the numerical value of the letters in

"Avram" is 243, but when the *heh* is added to his name, the total reaches 248, according to rabbinic tradition the number of limbs in the human body. In a recent work on the evil eye in Jewish tradition, however, the Sefaradi rabbi Yitshak Peḥa explains that the *heh* was added to protect Abraham (Peḥa, *Sefer 'olei 'ayin* [Jerusalem: 1990], 210).

43. For example, Herat, 1880, No'am Bar'am-Ben Yossef, ed., *Brides and Betrothals: Jewish Wedding Rituals in Afghanistan* (Jerusalem, 1998), 84, and Herat, 1895 (Sabar, *Ketubbah*, 304).

44. Even when the sums did not reach the said amounts, at least the tens and units added up to fifty-five. See also the examples illustrated in Sabar, "Two Millennia of *Ketubbah*" (e.g., 41, 43, 46, and 47).

45. This practice was also followed by the Moroccan families who immigrated to Gibraltar, as our example shows.

46. An earlier example, dated 1898, is preserved in the collection of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (Ket. 179/157); see Sabar, *Mazal Tov*, pl. 36. The term *shiviti* derives from the first word of the verse quoted on this plaque: "I have set [*shiviti*] the Lord always before me" (Ps 16:8). Among the Jews of Islam, this plaque is generally called *menorah*, after its central design component (see below).

47. For the history, meaning, and analysis of the Shiviti Menorah in Jewish art and thought, see Esther Julasz, "The 'Shiviti-Menorah': A Representation of the Sacred—Between Spirit and Matter" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2004).

48. In 1933, only two Jewish families were recorded in the village. Cf. Ben-Yaacob, *Kurdistan Jewish Communities*, 99. The *ketubbah* is preserved by the descendants of the original couple, who reside in Zechariah (a moshav near Jerusalem).

49. Cf. Shalom Sabar, "Childbirth and Magic: Jewish Folklore and Material Culture," in *Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, ed. D. Biale (New York, 2002), esp. 683, and figs. 9–11, 15, 19.

50. The decoration of the *ketubbah* with biblical figures who bear the same names as those of the bridal couple was especially common in Italy. In some communities, it was more common to inscribe names of ideal biblical couples—in particular, Ruth and Boaz—but the names of the patriarchs and matrilarchs are rare.

CHAPTER 5. THE DISLOCATION OF THE TEMPLE VESSELS

1. See, esp., the general framework presented in the introduction to Howard Wettstein, ed., *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity* (Berkeley, Calif., 2002).

2. The theoretical and historical literature on the notion of diaspora as well as on specific diasporic communities is vast. Recent Jewish studies scholarship in this field has been profoundly shaped by its dialogue with a series of seminal studies, published in the 1980s and 1990s, on the historical emergence of the modern nation-state as the dominant politico-social form characteristic of "European modernity" and its contemporary ("post-modern") crises and transformations, most prominently: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined*

Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, rev. ed. (London, 1991); Roger Rouse, "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism," *Diaspora* 1 (1991): 8–23; idem, "Questions of Identity: Personhood and Collectivity in Transnational Migration to the United States," *Critique of Anthropology* 15 (1995): 351–80; Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), esp. 187–224; Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York, 1994), esp. 199–244, 303–37; James Clifford, "Diasporas," *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (1994): 302–38; Smadar Lavie and Ted Swedenburg, introduction to *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*, ed. S. Lavie and T. Swedenburg (Durham, N.C., 1996), 1–25; Vijay Mishra, "The Diasporic Imaginary: Theorizing the Indian Diaspora," *Textual Practice* 10 (1996): 421–47; and Arjun Appadurai, "Sovereignty without Territoriality: Notes for a Postnational Geography," in *The Geography of Identity*, ed. P. Yaeger (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1996), 40–59.

3. Daniel Boyarin and Jonathan Boyarin, "Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Identity," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 693–725; and idem, *Powers of Diaspora: Two Essays on the Relevance of Jewish Culture* (Minneapolis, 2002).

4. Boyarin and Boyarin, "Diaspora," 723.

5. See, esp., Boyarin and Boyarin, *Powers of Diaspora*, esp. 6–11; and Jonathan Boyarin, "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory," in idem, *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Timespace* (Minneapolis, 1994), 1–38. By contrast, Engseng Ho, *The Gates of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility across the Indian Ocean* (Berkeley, Calif., 2006), 3–5, cautions strongly against using "globalization" as the dominant framework for understanding the historical experiences of long-standing diasporic communities. As Ho observes, the practices that produced and sustained these diasporas in fact "expand the time and space of social life, rather than compress them" (4).

6. See now, however, David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge, 2006), which offers a thoroughgoing but, I think, ultimately unsuccessful defense of applying the category of nationalism to forms of Jewish collectivity in antiquity. For a critical assessment of Goodblatt's inattention to the fundamental structural differences in the distribution of power between the imperial states of antiquity and the modern system of nation-states, see Steven Weitzman, "On the Relevance of Ancient Jewish Nationalism: A Brief Response to David Goodblatt's *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*," *Jewish Social Studies* 14 (2008): 165–72.

7. Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002); and idem, "Diaspora and Homeland," in *Diasporas and Exiles*, ed. Weitzman, 18–46.

8. See, esp., Gruen, *Diaspora*, 232–52, here 243.

9. Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert, "The Political Symbolism of the Eruv," *Jewish Social Studies* 11 (2005): 9–35.

10. *Ibid.*, 29.

11. See Israel J. Yuval, "The Myth of the Jewish Exile from the Land of Israel: A Demonstration of Irenic Scholarship," *Common Knowledge* 12 (2006): 16–33, which argues that the connection between the destruction of the Second Temple and the notion of exile developed only gradually over the course of late antiquity and, in fact, represents a Jewish

appropriation of an originally Christian, anti-Jewish claim. The author seems to be suggesting that the Jewish notion of "exile" not only masks its own hybrid origins, but is both politically and ethically problematic. The article was first published in Hebrew in *Alpayim* 20 (2005): 9–25.

12. See the discussion in Ra'anan S. Boustan, "Imperialisms in Jewish History, from Pre- to Post-Modern," *AJS Perspectives* (fall 2005): 8–10; and Jonathan Boyarin, "Jews, Christians, and the Identity of Christian Europe," *AJS Perspectives* (fall 2005): 12–13.

13. Sarah Abrevaya Stein, "Modern Jews and the Imperial Imagination," *AJS Perspectives* (fall 2005): 14–16.

14. See Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York, 2006), esp. 175–211, which shows that much scholarship on rabbinic Judaism presumes the narrative of spiritual progress already found in some rabbinic texts in which the sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem Temple was replaced by increasingly meaningful forms of religious piety, such as prayer, Torah study, and good deeds.

15. See the classic statement of Peter Brown concerning the far-reaching process that occurred in late antiquity whereby a mobile class of exceptional individuals eclipsed the traditional Temple cults as the locus of the holy in "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (London, 1982), 103–52; and J. Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religion* (Leiden, 1978), 172–89.

16. For a thoroughgoing critique of the use of the concept of "spiritualization" in modern scholarship, see Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, esp. 147–74, 213–54; and idem, "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice," *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 1–17. For a nuanced and dialectical account of the "end" of sacrifice in ancient Mediterranean religions generally, see Guy G. Stroumsa, *La fin du sacrifice: Les mutations religieuses de l'antiquité tardive* (Paris, 2005).

17. On sacrificial cult as the paradigm for ritual action in late antique religions, see Stroumsa, *Fin du sacrifice*, 105–44, as well as the contribution in this volume by Michael Swartz.

18. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 175–211; Ishay Rosen-Zvi, "Bodies and Temple: The List of Priestly Bodily Defects in Mishnah *Bekhorot*, Chapter 7" (Hebrew), *Jewish Studies* 43 (2005–6): 49–87; and Steven D. Fraade, "The Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity Before and After 70 C.E.: The Role of the Holy Vessels in Rabbinic Memory and Imagination," in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. L. I. Levine and D. R. Schwartz (Tübingen, 2009), 235–63. I would like to thank Steven Fraade not only for generously sharing his paper with me in advance of its publication, but also for engaging with me in productive and enjoyable dialogue about the meaning of the rabbinic representations of the Temple vessels—about which we have come to strikingly complementary conclusions.

19. On the "locative" worldview of religious systems that are built around traditional sacrificial cults, see Smith, *Map Is Not Territory*, esp. 101–3, 132–43, 160–70, 185–89, 291–94, 308–9. For an important attempt to modify and nuance Smith's dichotomy be-

tween “locative” and “utopian” religions, see Sarah Iles Johnston, “Working Overtime in Afterlife; or, No Rest for the Virtuous,” in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, ed. R. S. Boustán and A. Y. Reed (New York, 2004), 85–100.

20. I analyze here only those traditions that are found in rabbinic compilations from Palestine from the third and fourth centuries (i.e., the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the halakhic midrashim, and the Palestinian Talmud). For discussion of the subsequent development of this material in later rabbinic and “para-rabbinic” literature, see my companion study, “The Spoils of the Jerusalem Temple at Rome and Constantinople: Jewish Counter-Geography in a Christianizing Empire,” in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. G. Gardner and K. Osterloh (Tübingen, 2008), 327–72. A number of recent studies have also addressed various aspects of these traditions: Fraade, “Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity”; Steven Fine, “When I Went to Rome . . . There I Saw the Menorah . . .”: The Jerusalem Temple Implements During the Second Century C.E.,” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the “Other” in Antiquity, Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers*, ed. D. R. Edwards and C. T. McCullough (Winona Lake, Ind., 2007), 171–82; and David Noy, “Rabbi Aqiba Comes to Rome: A Jewish Pilgrimage in Reverse?,” in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods*, ed. J. Elsner and I. Rutherford (Oxford, 2005), 373–85.

21. See n. 14 above.

22. For a characterization of rabbinic Judaism as a fundamentally “diasporic” religious and cultural formation, see Boyarin and Boyarin, “Diaspora,” esp. 718–23.

23. See now James Rives, “Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives (Oxford, 2005), 145–66, which argues that the destruction of the Jerusalem cult by the Romans was an intentional strategy for dispiriting and thus subduing the rebellious population of Judea.

24. The fullest source on the triumph is Josephus, *Jewish War*, 7.118–62. On Vespasian and Titus’s triumph, see, esp., Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986), 14–17; and Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, Mass., 2007), 152–53.

25. I follow the date for the erection of the arch given in Michael Pfanner, *Der Titusbogen* (Mainz, 1983), 91–92. For the most comprehensive discussion of the spoils panel of the arch, see Leon Yarden, *The Spoils of Jerusalem on the Arch of Titus: A Re-investigation* (Stockholm, 1991).

26. Suetonius, *Ves.* 9.1; Josephus, *Jewish War*, 7.158. On the Templum Pacis, see, esp., James C. Anderson, Jr., *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* (Brussels, 1984), 101–18; Eva Margareta Steinby, ed., *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 6 vols. (Rome, 1993–2000), 4:67–70; and Lawrence Richardson, Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1992), 286–87.

27. Fergus Millar, “Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. Edmondson et al., 101–28.

28. On the dating of the text to the period between the fall of Jerusalem (70 C.E.) and

the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135/36 C.E.) and, more specifically, between 100 and 130 C.E., see A. F. J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (New York, 1983–85), 615–52, esp. 616–17.

29. 2 Bar 6:8 (Klijn, “2 Baruch,” 623).

30. 2 Mc 2:1–8. Close parallels also appear in 4 Bar (*Paraleipomena Jeremion*) 3:7–20; *Vit. Proph.* 2:11–14. On this theme, see Steven Weitzman, *Surviving Sacrilege: Cultural Persistence in Jewish Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005), 96–117; and Isaac Kalimi and James D. Purvis, “The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994): 679–85.

31. On the image of the hidden vessels as a strategy of cultural resistance, see Weitzman, *Surviving Sacrilege*, 96–117; and idem, “Myth, History, and Mystery in the Copper Scroll,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. H. Najman and J. H. Newman (Leiden, 2004), 239–55.

32. In my view, neither Fine, “When I Went to Rome,” nor Noy, “Rabbi Aqiba Comes to Rome,” provides sufficient justification for reading these sources as straightforward historical reports. For a critique of their positions, see Boustán, “Spoils of the Jerusalem Temple,” 339–41.

33. See Fraade, “Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity,” which demonstrates convincingly that sources from the Second Temple period provide no evidence for the public display of the Temple vessels and explains the appearance of this tradition in post-destruction Jewish and Christian sources as a reflex of the growing importance that the visualization of the sacred held in late antique religions. See below for further discussion of this issue.

34. *yYom* 5:5 (42d) offers a slightly different version of this phrase, in which it is R. Eleazar who is the speaker: “I said: These [drops] are from the blood that they would sprinkle upon it on the Day of Atonement.”

35. *tKipp* 2:16 (Lieberman); my translation. Cf. *bYom* 57a.

36. R. Eleazar’s testimony is absent in the Mishnah’s parallel description of the sacrificial ritual carried out by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

37. *yYom* 4:1 (41c); my translation. Cf. *yMeg* 1:9 (71d); *bShab* 63b.

38. *Sifrei zuta, be-ha’alotekha*, 8:2 (Horowitz, 255); my translation.

39. P. Ox. 840, 2:1–3. I have followed the text and translation in François Bovon, “Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840, Fragment of a Lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 705–28, esp. 714–15. The text is also translated in Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols., rev. ed. (Louisville, Ky., 1991), 1:94–95. It was originally published in Bernard P. Greenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London/Oxford, 1908), vol. 5, no. 840.

40. Daniel R. Schwartz, “Viewing the Holy Utensils (P Ox V, 840),” *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 153–59. For example, Schwartz cites Josephus’s report that when Pompey and his men entered the Temple and saw various cultic vessels, they “saw what it was unlawful for any but the high priest to see” (Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 14:71–72).

41. For his assessment of Schwartz's argument, see Bovon, "Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840," 711–12.

42. This fact was already stressed by Abraham Sulzbach, "Zum Oxyrhynchus-Fragment," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 9 (1908): 175–76.

43. Israel Knohl, "Post-Biblical Sectarianism and Priestly Schools of the Pentateuch: The Issue of Popular Participation in the Temple Cult on Festivals," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, ed. J. T. Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1992), 2:601–9; also published as "Participation of the People in the Temple Worship—Second Temple Sectarian Conflict and the Biblical Tradition" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 139–46.

44. This material is found in increasingly expansive forms at mHag 3:8; tHag 3:35; yHag 3:8 (79d); bHag 26b. Knohl finds echoes of the debate between the Pharisees and Sadducees described in these sources in an ordinance found in the Qumran Temple Scroll, col. 3, lines 10–12. Knohl's view is in keeping with the interpretation of the rabbinic sources in Ya'akov Sussman, "The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*," appendix 1 in Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*, vol. 5: *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (Oxford, 1994), 199; Saul Lieberman, *Tosefta kifshutah*, 10 vols. (New York, 1973), 5:1336. But for a contradictory interpretation, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Immunity to Impurity and the Menorah," *Jewish Studies Internet Journal* 5 (2006): 141–45, which attributes Sadducean ridicule of the Pharisaic practice of purifying the menorah not to their rejection of Pharisaic liberalism (i.e., allowing the public to come into contact with the vessel) but to their conviction that the menorah was itself immune to impurity because of "the purifying power of its radiance" (145).

45. See also Fraade, "Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity."

46. Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Conn., 2005), esp. 236–49, 630–32. But a higher degree of continuity with earlier periods is emphasized in Steven Fine, *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1997).

CHAPTER 6. SACRED SPACE, LOCAL HISTORY, AND DIASPORIC IDENTITY

1. Raphael Straus, ed., *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Juden in Regensburg 1453–1738* (Munich, 1960), 29–31. For the full narrative, see the Yiddish *Mayse bukh* (Basel, 1602), now available in facsimile: Astrid Starck, ed. and trans., *Un beau livre d'histoires: Eyn schön Mayse bukh*, 2 vols. (Basel, 2004), no. 241.

2. Israel Mordechai Peles, ed., *R. Juda Löw Kirchheim: The Customs of Worms Jewry* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1987), 251–54; Binyamin Shlomo Hamburger and Eric Zimmer, eds., *Wormser Minhagbuch des R. Jusep (Juspa) Schammes* (Hebrew), 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1992), 1:102–7.

3. London, British Library, MS Add. 18695 (G. Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew*

and Samaritan manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. 2 [London, 1905], no. 683; Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, Jerusalem [IMFHM], no. 4981), fol. 56r.

4. *Mayse bukh*, no. 187, introduction.

5. bShab 33b–34a. On the way the posthumous image of R. Shim'on ben Yitshaq was modeled on that of his talmudic namesake, see Lucia Raspe, "Payyeyanim as Heroes of Medieval Folk Narrative: The Case of R. Shim'on ben Yitshaq," in *Jewish Studies Between the Disciplines/Judaistik zwischen den Disziplinen: Papers in Honor of Peter Schäfer on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. K. Herrmann, M. Schlüter, and G. Veltri (Leiden, 2003), 354–69.

6. For an account of the pilgrimage to Meron in the Galilee, where Shim'on bar Yohai's grave was located from the fifteenth century onward, see Elchanan Reiner, "Pilgrims and Pilgrimage to Erets Yisrael, 1099–1517" (Hebrew) (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1988), 237–39, 295–305.

7. Robert L. Cohn, "Sainthood on the Periphery: The Case of Judaism," in *Saints and Virtues*, ed. J. S. Hawley (Berkeley, Calif., 1987), 87–108; repr. in *Sainthood: Its Manifestations in World Religions*, ed. R. Kieckhefer and G. D. Bond (Berkeley, Calif., 1988), 43–68, esp. 46–47. On late antiquity, see, e.g., Allen Kerkeslager, "Jewish Pilgrimage and Jewish Identity in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt," in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*, ed. D. Frankfurter (Leiden, 1998), 99–225; for contemporary practices, see Shifra Epstein, "Les pèlerinages hassidiques en Pologne," *Cahiers du Judaïsme* 8 (2000): 100–111; and Oren Kosansky, "Tourism, Charity, and Profit: The Movement of Money in Moroccan Jewish Pilgrimage," *Cultural Anthropology* 17 (2002): 359–400.

8. Lucia Raspe, *Jüdische Hagiographie im mittelalterlichen Aschkenaz* (Tübingen, 2006); for a summary in English, see idem, "Jewish Saints in Medieval Ashkenaz: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 31 (2004): 75–90.

9. Thus R. Ya'aqov b. Asher (d. 1340), author of the *Arba'ah turim*, in a letter dated 1329 advising a German rabbi to follow his example and emigrate to Spain. Published by Alfred Freimann, "Erets gezairah," *ha-Soqer* 2 (1934): 37–38; on the subsequent fate of the addressee, see Moses A. Shulvass, "Würzburg," in *Germania Judaica*, vol. 2, part 2, ed. Z. Avneri (Tübingen, 1968), 933 no. 11. The same phrase recurs in the ethical testament of Ya'aqov's brother Yehudah: Israel Abrahams, ed., *Hebrew Ethical Wills* (Philadelphia, 1926), 166; for an impression of the controversy that it has raised in recent historiography, see Michael Toch, *Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Munich, 1998), 121.

10. Cf. Michael Toch, "Jüdisches Alltagsleben im Mittelalter," *Historische Zeitschrift* 278 (2004): 329–45, esp. 341–42.

11. Reiner, "Pilgrims and Pilgrimage," 14–15.

12. Elliott Horowitz, "Speaking to the Dead: Cemetery Prayer in Medieval and Early Modern Jewry," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 8 (1999): 303–17; Mordechai Breuer and Yacov Guggenheim, "Die jüdische Gemeinde, Gesellschaft und Kultur," in *Germania Judaica*, vol. 3, pt. 3, ed. A. Maimon, M. Breuer, and Y. Guggenheim (Tübingen, 2003), 2088 n. 57. See also Hirsch Jakob Zimmels, "Erez Israel in der Responsenliteratur des späteren Mittelalters," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 74 (1930): 49 n. 1.