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It is through the prism of the Talmud that historians of early Judaism can cautiously shed light on certain phenomena in the social history of the Jewish community during the first centuries of the Common Era. Researchers have long emphasized the reciprocal nature of relations between Jews in Roman Palestine and those in Parthian and later in Sassanian Babylonia (that is, during the periods of the Mishna and the Talmud).[[1]](#footnote-1) While usually congenial and abundant,[[2]](#footnote-2) these relations also reveal the existence of strong tensions,[[3]](#footnote-3) which intensified during the second half of the 3rd century CE.

The deterioration of social relations at a given time generally suggests an historical context as at the source of the trouble. Our research therefore aims to identify several Talmudic and Midrashic texts that shed light on the differences between these two Jewish societies, in order to gain insights into their complexities. Although not exhaustive, our study will nevertheless consider some of the cardinal points of the subject,[[4]](#footnote-4) while suggesting a new line of research.

I

Most of the invective between these Babylonian and Palestinian Jews originated in the Land of Israel. As a number of sources indicate, most of the acrimony was usually directed towards the Babylonian Jews and rarely the reverse. Rav Kahana, a disciple of Rav [Abba bar Aïbou], the founder of the Babylonian rabbinical academy of Sura, left Babylonia on his master’s advice after inadvertently killing a Jewish informer.[[5]](#footnote-5) Historical research has shown that the Babylonian account of the events unfolding in Roman Palestine is biased, unlike the Jerusalem Talmud, which reconstructs the course of events with greater historical accuracy.[[6]](#footnote-6) This latter source recounts Rav Kahana’s wanderings in Galilee during which he had several altercations with ordinary Galilean Jews. According to the text, these Jews died after mocking Rav Kahana.[[7]](#footnote-7) He then decided to return to Babylonia, but not without first obtaining the permission of R. Yohanan, the greatest sage of his time [who died in 279] who was sitting in Tiberias. Presumably knowing that R. Yohanan would not allow him to leave the Land of Israel, Rav Kahana used resorted to a trick, posing the following question: ‘“A man who is hated by his mother, but whose father’s wife, who is not his mother, respects him, with whom should he reside?’ R. Yohanan replied, ‘He will go where he is respected.’ Rav Kahana immediately left [the Land of Israel]. R. Yohanan was then told that Kahana had returned to Babylonia.”[[8]](#footnote-8) The “mother” was none other than the Land of Israel, where Rav Kahana was very poorly received, while his “mother-in-law” represented the Jewish community of Babylonia, which was much more appreciative of him. The Jerusalem Talmud then recounts anecdote of R. Zeira,[[9]](#footnote-9) who was manhandled for no apparent reason by a Galilean butcher when he tried to buy some meat.[[10]](#footnote-10) The same passage continues by describing the misadventures of R. Yassa, who was beaten by a Galilean Jew while bathing in the Tiberias baths.[[11]](#footnote-11) It should be noted that in all three stories, the victims were Babylonian sages passing through the Land of Israel, and that it was clear that they were assaulted by their Galilean co-religionists because of their Babylonian origin.[[12]](#footnote-12) In the 3rd century, when R. Simlai, of Judean origin, went to Galilee to learn biblical hermeneutics and its art from R. Yonathan, the latter retorted: “I hold a tradition from my ancestors not to teach exegesis, neither to a Babylonian nor to a Southerner [Judean], for they are vulgar and poor in Torah.”[[13]](#footnote-13) R. Jeremiah, a native of Babylonia, working in the Land of Israel in the 4th century CE, considered Babylonian Jews inept (בבלאי טפשאי).[[14]](#footnote-14) This same sage was of the opinion that the verse in the Book of Lamentations (3:6) averring, “He has relegated me to dark regions like the dead, [asleep] forever,” refers to Babylonian study.[[15]](#footnote-15) According to R. Osh’aya and R. Itzhak, amoraim of the Land of Israel, the Palestinian sages are mutually affable, while those of Babylonia are mutually detrimental.[[16]](#footnote-16) R. Simon b. Laquish [Resh Laquish], who was swimming in the Jordan, refused Rabba bar bar Hanna the Babylonian’s outstretched hand to come out, exclaiming, “God, [that] I hate you [אלהא סנינא לכו].”[[17]](#footnote-17) Some Midrashic sources from Eretz Israel claim that it is the “pestilential” waters of the Euphrates which irrigate the Babylonian lands, leading them to represent only mourning and lamentation.[[18]](#footnote-18) According to R. Yohanan and Resh Laquish, Babylonia is none other than the vault of the dead from the Deluge, a place that relentlessly scorns the sages of the Torah.[[19]](#footnote-19) Resh Laquish is said to have exhorted a group of Babylonian Jews scouring the Tiberias market to disperse, while R. Yohanan pitied them.[[20]](#footnote-20)

II

We believe that the root of these reactions lies in several factors that were present in a specific historical context. First, it should be noted that texts of Judean/Galilean origin from the 3rd–4th centuries blame the Babylonian Jews for the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. Thus, in the examples mentioned above, Resh Laquish justifies his enmity toward Rabba bar bar Hanna by claiming that if his Babylonian ancestors had all rallied to the movement to return to Zion during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Persian era (6th–5th centuries B.C.E. ), they would have been seen as silver that never decays. However, because they were only a tiny minority who left Babylonia, they are compared to cedar subject to putrefaction.[[21]](#footnote-21) Resh Laquish invoked a similar motif when forcing them to disperse in the Tiberias market, declaring: “When you came [lit: ascended/ascended in Persian times] you were not like a wall, whereas here you have become one!”[[22]](#footnote-22) The Jerusalem Talmud’s account of R. Zeira’s difficulties with the Galilean butcher[[23]](#footnote-23) has a variant in *Cant. Rabba,*[[24]](#footnote-24) in which the story of the very same event is related differently:

If the Jews [in the text: Israel] had gone up like a wall of Babylonia, the Temple would not have been destroyed [at this moment] a second time. R. Zeira went [lit: went out] to the market to buy an object/good [מק(ו)מא].[[25]](#footnote-25) He said to the shopkeeper: “weigh up, evaluate accurately.” The latter then retorted: “‘Will you not go from here, Babylonian, whose ancestors destroyed [the Temple] [לית את אזיל לן מן הכא בבליי די חרבון אבהתי],” at which point R. Zeira wondered: “How do my ancestors differ [overall] from his own”? He then went to the study house and heard R. Shila’s voice interpreting the verse '‘if it be a wall’ (*Cant.* 8) by saying: ‘If the Jews [in the text: Israel] had come up from exile [Gola/Babylonia] the Temple would not have been destroyed a second time.” R. Zeira then says: ‘a beautiful teaching delivered me this uncultivated merchant [in the text: עם הארץ]].”[[26]](#footnote-26)

This eloquent passage suggests that the accusation that Galilean Judaism levelled at the Babylonians concerning their share of responsibility for the destruction of the Second Temple was shared by both the rabbinical class and the popular strata. The very likely possibility that the general populace based their position on an identical teaching frequently given by the Sages reveals a great deal about the deep cleavages dividing the Galilean Jewish community from its Babylonian counterpart. We are inclined to refute the proposition because the factual historicity of the Galilean Jews' claim is also questionable. There are two main reasons why it is hard to detect an ounce of authenticity in it. First, how could the Babylonian Jewish community of the second half of the 3rd century be incriminated and slandered for the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE? Second, assuming that the Jewish community of Babylonia had indeed joined their counterparts in the Land of Israel *en masse* during the Second Temple period, it is unclear whether the outcome of the 66–73 conflict against Rome really have been any different,[[27]](#footnote-27) There seems to be no evidence to the contrary, as this question is more a matter of slander than of scientifically sound history.

Despite the fact that such an indictment is chimerical and historically implausible, the historian must verify any assertion by giving exclusive priority to contemporaneous sources. These sources reflect an ancient mentality that is both singular and bygone. Consequently, we need to examine in greater depth the question of how the factual political history of the Judeans was interwoven during the great Jewish revolt against Rome (66–73/4 CE). We will try to demonstrate that the specific quotidian difficulties of the 3rd century likely fueled an amplified history of mentalities over the centuries, radicalizing positions.

III

It is plausible that during the great revolt against Rome, the Jewish insurgents hoped that their co-religionists in Babylonia would come to their aid. Indeed, a text by Flavius Josephus recounts the famous speech made in the year 66 CE by King Agrippa II (27–92 CE), who did his utmost to dissuade the Jews from rising up against Rome. The Jewish monarch, a vassal of Rome, invoked numerous theological, military, political, and historical arguments. For example:[[28]](#footnote-28)

What allies do you hope for in this war? Will you draw them from uninhabitable lands? *For on the habitable earth, everything is Roman*, *unless your hopes extend beyond the Euphrates, and you hope to obtain help from the Adiabenians, who are of your race[[29]](#footnote-29) (οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης πάντες εἰσὶν Ῥωμαῖοι, εἰ μή τις ὑπὲρ Εὐφράτην ἐκτείνει τὰς ἐλπίδας καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀδιαβηνῆς ὁμοφύλους οἴεται προσαμυνεῖν);* but they will not engage in such a great war for vain motives, and if they meditated such folly, Parthia would not allow them; for it is careful to maintain the truce concluded with Rome, and it would believe it was violating treaties if it allowed one of its tributaries to march against the Romans.

 This text demonstrates that the Jews of Palestine, in particular the insurgents, were eager to open a second front against Rome. This would be possible thanks to the potential support of the Babylonian Jewish myriads,[[30]](#footnote-30) in particular the extremely numerous Jews of Adiabene,[[31]](#footnote-31) who were likely to jeopardize, or at least destabilize, Roman hegemony in the Levant. According to A. Schalit and many other researchers, the Roman Emperor Nero (54–68) believed that, by *imitatio Alexandri*, he was reincarnating the Hellenic conqueror.[[32]](#footnote-32) It was in Alexander’s footsteps – and in contravention of the peace signed by convenience with Tiridates in the spring of 63 CE[[33]](#footnote-33) – that Nero was preparing an all-out war to take over Armenia[[34]](#footnote-34) and, most likely, the entire Parthian kingdom.[[35]](#footnote-35) According to Schalit, the main factor hampering Nero’s plans for conquest was the outbreak of hostilities in Judea in 66 CE,[[36]](#footnote-36) including the famous debacle of the *Legio XII Fulminata* under the command of the Syrian legate Cestius Gallus on October/November 13.[[37]](#footnote-37) In fact, this defeat was a serious military setback for Rome.[[38]](#footnote-38) Unlike Nero, who failed to realize his invasion plans, Trajan was able to carry out his Parthian expedition on October 27, 113 CE. Like Nero, Trajan was afflicted by a “passion for glory” [to quote the Roman historian Cassius Dio], and claimed to be the son of Alexander of Macedon.[[39]](#footnote-39) Marie-Louise Chaumont has written on this subject:

Trajan’s exploits were crowned with the title of *Parthicus*. He still had to descend the Tigris towards the sea. On the way, he imposed his law on the Mesene and Characene rivers. But the Persian Gulf was to mark the extreme limit of his conquests, as age no longer allowed him to carry his arms all the way to India, like a new Alexander.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Should Trajan, in turn, have feared an uprising in Judea, which would have had a major impact on the course of military events? The answer to this question is probably negative, because from the time of Nero until the destruction of the Second Temple, no legions were encamped in the province of Judea,[[41]](#footnote-41) where only auxiliary cohorts made up the Roman forces present.[[42]](#footnote-42) The Roman province of Judea’s military vulnerability was rooted in this shortcoming, which forced Rome to hastily dispatch the *Legio XII Fulminata* from the province of Syria in an attempt to quell the Jewish uprising. The disastrous outcome of this military operation has already been mentioned. It was only after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE that the Romans, learning from this military failure, revised the deployment of their troops in Judea, positioning the *Legio X Fretensis* permanently in Jerusalem.[[43]](#footnote-43) M. Ulpius Traianus, Trajan's father, was ordered by Vespasian to lead the legion in 66 CE to suppress the Jewish revolt in Perea, now Jordan. In 73/74 CE, Trajan was also consul of the senatorial province of Syria, where he fought against Parthian incursions by amassing formidable troops along the border.[[44]](#footnote-44) Trajan’s son even served for many months as *tribunus militum on the* banks of the Euphrates.[[45]](#footnote-45) It was therefore as an experienced connoisseur of geostrategic issues, well aware of the military capacity of the Jews of Palestine to hinder a possible Roman military campaign against the Arsacid Parthians, that Trajan dealt with the problem once he became emperor. With the *Legio X Fretensis* stationed in Jerusalem since 70 CE, Trajan thought he had protected himself from a Jewish diversion. However, this time, a Jewish revolt of far greater geographical and strategic scope for Rome broke out in 115 CE, in Egypt, Cyrenaica, spreading to Cyprus and ending in 117 CE in Mesopotamia [Adiabene, Osroene], including Babylonia. These were precisely the regions from which Trajan seems to have recruited the army for his military campaign. This revolt of the essentially Hellenistic Jewish diaspora against Roman hegemony has merited the attention of many scholars,[[46]](#footnote-46) and it is not our intention to dwell on it here. On the other hand, Schalit’s subtle suggestion that the Jewish revolt of 115–117 CE played a decisive role in Trajan’s decision to disengage from the Parthian empire, and then to abandon his conquests relatively quickly, is worth noting.[[47]](#footnote-47) concludes with the policy of his successor, Hadrian (117–138 CE), who was anxious to negotiate an end to hostilities in order to re-establish concord with the Parthians as soon as possible. [[48]](#footnote-48)

According to Schalit:

The haste with which Trajan retreated after the fall of Ctesiphon, and the suspension of his conquests in the Iranian *hinterland*, are first and foremost and directly attributable to the Jewish revolt. The role played by the Jews in the time of Nero was repeated in the time of Trajan, but this time with greater firmness. The insurrections of this little people sabotaged the foundation of a Roman state in the Far East, and in so doing, succeeded in stemming the Romanization of these regions. The Jewish uprising at the time of Trajan [much more than that of 66 CE] must therefore be attributed a universal historical significance, the consequences of which are felt to this day... The Messianic [Jewish] impulse not only fertilized the West with the birth of Christianity, but also unwittingly determined the future development of the Levant. [[49]](#footnote-49)

Schalit’s thesis is more of avisionary suggestion than a deduced historical certitude, and thus constitutes an unreliable ground for the belief that the Jews’ action was so decisive as to alter the universal course of history. That said, once the emphatic allure of this work has been filtered out, it is clear that it demonstrates several points directly linked to the dialectic of the Jews of Eretz Israelat thetime of the Talmud. These are:

1. The Jews of Judea, who rose up against Rome in 66 CE prevented Nero‘s campaign to conquer Parthian Babylonia, thus sparing Babylonia‘s extremely numerous Jewish communities from Roman domination.
2. The Jews of Judea who revolted against Rome in 66 CE eagerly awaited the opening of a second eastern front, both by the Parthians and by the Jews of Babylonia, which, had it had come to pass, would probably have improved the chances of the Jewish insurrection against Rome. But this was not to be.
3. The Jews of Judea were hoping for the arrival of Babylonian Jewish reinforcements to prevent the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple, or at least to act as a diversion. However, apart from a small number from Adiabene, the majority of Jews from Babylonia did not get involved in the armed conflict,[[50]](#footnote-50) being perhaps already perceived by their brothers in Judea as indirectly responsible for the destruction of the Second Temple.
4. The revolt of the Diaspora between 115–117 CE and the massacres of Jewish communities in Egypt (notably the annihilation of the flourishing Alexandrian community), Cyrenaica, and Cyprus provided a diversion. This spared the Jewish communities of Parthian Babylonia from a Roman conquest, which appeared inevitable given the increasing weakness of the Arsacid defenses against the Trajan legions, at least in the first months of the campaign.
5. Judea was devastated following the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 CE) against Hadrian’s legions. According to Cassius Dio, there were 580,000 victims, most of them believed to be Jewish.[[51]](#footnote-51) Did the Jews of Babylonia come to the aid of their Judean brothers? There is no confirmation of this based on current sources and historical research. The Jews of Judea were again desperately awaiting the opening of this long-awaited eastern front. This is clear from a midrashic text reporting the words of R. Shimon b. Yohai (generation of Usha in Galilee after 135 CE), condemned to death for criticizing Rome and its culture.[[52]](#footnote-52) He stated: “If you see a Persian stallion tied to the tombs of the Land of Israel, prepare to observe the footsteps of the King-Messiah.”[[53]](#footnote-53) Essentially, for the Jews of the Land of Israel, the Persian/Parthian cavalry – the only power capable of defying their sworn enemy Rome – would have been the source of this messianic impulse to liberate them from the Roman oppressor.[[54]](#footnote-54)

IV

These deeply painful historical antecedents must have shaped a discursive dialectic within rabbinic Judaism and among the rest of the Jewish population, aimed at identifying the agents responsible for the catastrophe of the three revolts. It is not improbable that from 70 CE until the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt, a heavy resentment towards the Jewish community of Babylonia was forged in the consciousness of the distressed Jewish populations of Roman Palestine. It seems fair to conclude that the former was, intentionally or unintentionally, spared from the Roman yoke by the successive uprisings of the Jews inhabiting the *imperium*. In addition, the Jews of Babylonia always remained outside the circle of conflict, most of them declining to participate in military activities in Roman Palestine.

This resentment appears to turn into open hatred precisely in the second half of the 3rd century. To explain this, an important element that must be considered is the economic crisis that the Jewish population of Roman Palestine time was enduring at the time. We know that in the second half of this century, the Empire was afflicted by a security and economic crisis unprecedented in the history of Rome.[[55]](#footnote-55) The Palestinian Jewish population was by no means spared this crisis.[[56]](#footnote-56) Let us briefly outline the economic context which prevailed in the cities of Palestine during this period of general slump. Economic difficulties were at the root of Patriarch R. Judah II’s (235–260) decision to commercialize magistrature appointments.[[57]](#footnote-57) Note the plea this patriarch made to R. Shimon b. Laquish, usually one of his fiercest opponents, to pray for him, as the Romans were demanding too much of him.[[58]](#footnote-58) In the second half of the 3rd century, the Roman authorities reformed the tax system with the aim, among other things, of identifying the wealth of large senatorial and local landowners. These people were then called upon to contribute more.[[59]](#footnote-59) Like other provincials, the Jews of Palestine were in no way exempt from these oppressive budgetary measures. In fact, R. Yohanan invited those newly appointed to the city council, now unlucky ones, to abandon the Land of Israel.[[60]](#footnote-60) This position clearly demonstrates the importance of the contributions required from individuals who were forced to take public positions. Rabbinic literature repeatedly depicts the abandonment of property in the face of such heavy.[[61]](#footnote-61) Examples include the Jews of Tiberias, who were no longer able to pay the *Aurum Coronarium*,[[62]](#footnote-62) and the Jews of Paneas/Banias, at the foot of the Golan Heights, who threatened the emperor Diocletian (284–307) with flight at the very moment when they were being extorted *en masse*.[[63]](#footnote-63) According to R. Levi (3rd–4th century), the Jews of Palestine no longer even had the strength to study *Halakhah* because of the financial challenges they had to face.[[64]](#footnote-64) Economic precariousness disturbed the peace of mind, an indispensable condition for the study of halakhic texts.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, we should recall the circumstances surrounding R. Zeira the Babylonian’s quest to buy a kilogram of meat. This was a common task in Babylonia, where the experience of droughts were exceptional due to the location of Jewish populations on the banks of the Euphrates and its tributaries. However, in the Land of Israel, where droughts succeeded one another in the 3rd century, meat was a rare and expensive commodity.[[65]](#footnote-65) The complexity of the situation, with the high cost combined with the extremely heavy tax burden imposed by the Roman administration on the Jews of Palestine, very probably contributed to exacerbating resentment towards these Jews who did not reside in the economically and politically conflicted circle of the Lower Empire, since they lived in the Parthian and later Sassanid empires. This context of general antagonism may well reflect a latent historical fact, submerged and repressed over the centuries, but now fully resurfacing, namely the ingratitude of these Babylonian Jews towards their brothers in Palestine, whose insurrections twice indirectly stopped the otherwise inevitable subjugation of Babylonian Jewry under Rome. In contrast, the Babylonian Jews never lent a helping hand to their Judean brethren in 66 CE or 132 CE. From then on, they were probably seen as bearing a heavy share of responsibility for the Jewish catastrophes, culminating in the loss of Jerusalem and its sanctuary, and the capture and ruin of Bethar in 135 CE. The intertwining of all these wounds, arising from painful historical contexts accumulating over the centuries and with the evolution of mentalities, can likely help explain the hatred and contempt felt by both the Galilean Sages and the various movements of this Common Judaismtowards their co-religionists from Babylonia.[[66]](#footnote-66)
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