

shows no knowledge of Reif's 1993 work on Jewish prayer,¹ nor of Rouwhorst's important study on the relation of Syriac paschal hymns to Jewish roots; in this field, too, he neglects the significance of the use of lists of biblical examples which are standard in both early Christian and Jewish writings. The final part of the book focuses on Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* as evidence that formal and 'informed' dialogue took place between Jews and Christians in the second century C.E.. The central question of 'the parting of the ways' naturally underlies much of the book's discussion. The notion that any single doctrinal issue or event determined that parting is decisively rejected, though Wilson stresses that the Bar Kokhba Revolt constituted a decisive turning-point.

Students and teachers alike will find in Wilson's study a rich resource for interpreting the crucial first centuries of the Common Era. The nature of the evidence, however, ensures that controversy must accompany its interpretation. Wilson's confidence, for example, in the plausibility of Justin's portrayal of Trypho, or of Jewish persecution of Christians, will not be shared by all. On the interpretation of Christian polemic against the Jews, much discussed in recent studies, Wilson is inclined to disagree with those who would separate Christian theological perceptions of the Jews from actual relations: angry words, in his view, will probably have reflected bad relations with contemporary Jews (not intra-Christian disputes). Wilson's decision to normally restrict his evidence to the period before 170 leaves out of consideration important things which reflect earlier Christian communities exhibiting a great deal of shared Jewish culture, most notably in Syriac Christian literature as discussed, for example, in Robert Murray's methodological essay on Jewish Christianity.² Finally, while Wilson nods to the need to recognise varieties of practice in early Judaism, he appears to refuse to allow these direct influence on Christianity. Key for him in the separation of Christianity from Judaism is the fact that Christians came to worship on different days and in different ways, but this was also characteristic of other Jewish sectarian practice, where it did not indicate separation from Judaism as such. Discussion of the last two points requires, however, speculation of the kind which Wilson seems to eschew in this study.

University of Southampton

SARAH PEARCE

JOHN BARCLAY and JOHN SWEET (eds.), *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996. xvii, 297 pp. £37.50/\$59.95.

JAMES D. G. DUNN (ed.), *Paul and the Mosaic Law: The Third Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism*. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1996. xi, 368 pp. \$182.50.

The nineteen essays from Cambridge University Press offered to Morna D. Hooker on her sixty-fifth birthday, and the seventeen collected and edited by James Dunn following the 1994 Durham-Tübingen symposium, together represent some of the most recent and most authoritative research by New Testament scholars on early Christianity interpreted with its cultural and religious matrix, late Second Temple Judaism. Questions of continuity and discontinuity—how Jewish was ancient Christianity, and

¹ He knows of this author's earlier work, but mistakenly refers to him as Rieff.

² R. Murray, 'Jewish Christianity', in R. Coggins and J. Houlden, *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London, 1990), in pp. 341-46.

in what ways? in what respects was it different? and which Christian figures or communities are to be compared with which forms of Judaism?—shape much of the discussion in both works.

The Barclay and Sweet volume addresses a broader range of texts and issues: social-historical surveys of Jewish life in Judea, Galilee and the Diaspora (Part I); examination of specific foundational figures (Jesus, by N. T. Wright; Paul, by E. P. Sanders) and texts (the canonical gospels and Acts; the deutero-Paulines, Hebrews, Revelations, and some major late first- to mid-second-century writings) (Part II); and explorations in the early literature of key themes (apocalypticism, land and sanctuary, atonement and martyrdom, etc.) (Part III). Some authors push a particular interpretive point, others survey appropriate ancient literature, and still others offer critical overviews of modern authors. While this wide spread of topics and approaches allows for little direct comparison between the essays, some interesting contrasts between them do emerge. Dunn's Paul, for example, believes that 'the Temple and its cult have been wholly left behind, no longer relevant now that the (final) sacrifice of Christ has been offered (Rom. 3:25; 8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; cf. Gal. 4:25)' (p. 132). This position would certainly come as news to Sanders's Paul, who conceives his mission as a preparation for the end-time Gentile pilgrimage to Zion (p. 113), and to Horbury's Paul, who retains 'an important place for the divinely prepared land and sanctuary of Exod. 15:17' (p. 222). And Wright's conclusion that a divine miracle is what distinguishes Jesus from other, seemingly similar messianic figures ('What makes Jesus different is the resurrection', p. 57) seems an incautious if not inappropriate conclusion to an ostensibly historical, critical study. (The best evidence we have can only support the claim that his followers *believed* that he was raised, as distinct from what Bar Kochba's or Arthronges' followers believed.) Taken *in toto*, however, the volume is fresh, well-written, generous in its provision of bibliography and enthusiastically appreciative of the work of its honoree, Professor Hooker.

The essays from the Durham-Tübingen symposium are much more exegetically focused. Lichtenberger opens the volume with a sketch surveying mid-first-century Jewish understandings of Torah, citing as a turning-point in modern scholarship Sanders' 1977 *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Hengel, combining Galatians and Acts, attempts to reconstruct Paul's position on the Law in the years between Damascus and Antioch: Paul, it turns out, was torn between soteriological alternatives—Law or Christ (p. 33)? God's grace or one's own works (p. 29)? Some version of this dichotomy underlies the interpretations of the remaining essays in the volume (though Tomson, on 1 Cor. 7, attempts to put the discussion on a different footing, pp. 251-270). Despite the periodic invocation of Stendahl's classic, *Paul among the Jews and Gentiles* (1977), most of these authors, whether anglophone or German, assume that when Paul speaks about the Law in his letters, he speaks generally, that is, of its (non)application to Jews or to Jewish Christians as well as to Gentiles or Gentile Christians, even though only the latter figure as his addressees. In other words, when Paul says not to worry about circumcision, or food laws, or days (understood: Shabbat), he intends this for Jews as well as for Gentiles. This leads to some curious exegesis, not to mention historical conclusions. John Barclay's essay, for example, a study of Rom. 14:1-15:6, takes its title from 3:31: 'Do We Undermine the Law?'. Barclay concludes 'Yes' on exactly the point where Paul urges an emphatic 'By no means!'

Dunn's conclusion gives an excellent overview of the whole volume, and provides hints of where and why its presumed reconstruction of first-century Judaism fails. These are essentially historically conceived essays in theology, and Judaism, stuffed and mounted, becomes a counter-theology in the process. Jews do not 'do' the Law or 'keep' the Law: they 'obey the Law'—which then sounds more like a traffic code than a way of life (p. 312). Judaism is too 'nationalistic' (which can only mean 'too

Jewish'): after his conversion, Paul did not much like that (p. 313; cf. James, also subject to 'nationalistic pressures', p. 315). 'How could Paul claim both that the law is holy and that nothing is unclean?' (p. 326). Perhaps in the same way that R. Jochanan ben Zakkai did—and more daringly, with specific reference to corpse impurity and the ashes of the red heifer. Despite the learned footnotes and Hebrew fonts, the Judaism of this symposium is constructed basically from a mirror-reading of twentieth-century Christian theological understandings of Paul. Perhaps if the next Durham–Tübingen symposium hosts historians of Judaism and of Graeco-Roman antiquity as well as New Testament scholars, more progress might be made.

Boston University

PAULA FREDRIKSEN

ROGER T. BECKWITH, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian: Biblical Intertestamental and Patristic Studies* (AGAJU 33). E. J. Brill, Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996. xv, 333 pp. Nlg 183.00/\$118.25.

Roger Beckwith is known to readers of the *Revue de Qumran* for his important and challenging articles on Qumran and related calendars. They are presented here, together with other previously published articles, and all considerably revised. The author's purpose in this volume is not to present a comprehensive study of ancient Jewish and Christian calendars and chronology, but only, as stated in the introduction, to 'solve' a number of problems that commonly remain unsolved (pp. xiii–xiv).

Chapters vary tremendously in subject matter and scope. The first deals with the day: its divisions, beginning and end. Beckwith concludes that two different reckonings, one from daybreak and one from nightfall, must have coexisted. This is quite plausible, but more attention should have been given to context and to usage. A distinction could have been made for instance between *legal* definitions of the day-unit (e.g. in contracts), *religious* definitions (for the observance of Sabbath and festivals, or the Temple cult), and *colloquial* usage.

This is followed with a series of chapters on the holy days of the Christian calendar. After some comments on Jesus' observance of the Sabbath, the author discusses the origins of Sunday as the Lord's day (ch. 2). He then argues—against the prevailing view—that the observance of Easter on Sunday must have *preceded* the Quartodeciman observance, in the later second century, of Easter on the 14th of the lunar month (ch. 3). The evidence, however, is slender, and the author's conclusions are as hypothetical as is the prevailing view. Much the same applies to ch. 4.1, where Beckwith argues—again, against prevailing opinion—that Christmas had early origins and was not just the adaptation of a pagan midwinter festival.

The origins of the Qumran calendar are studied at length in ch. 5; but the evidence again is slender, and Beckwith cannot do more than speculate. He does, however, present a sound refutation of the Jaubert hypothesis (that the Bible follows consistently the calendar of Jubilees, pp. 101–4), as well as of the common view that without some system of intercalation, the calendar of Jubilees could never have been followed at Qumran in practice (pp. 125–40). The latter represents perhaps one of Beckwith's most important contributions to this field of scholarship.

On other aspects of the Jewish calendar, the best chapter is ch. 9, where Beckwith cautions against the identification of the year of the Crucifixion on the basis of Jewish calendrical data. In this period, he demonstrates, the Jewish calendar was far too flexible to enable any reconstruction of it or of when the major festivals occurred. In ch. 4.2 Beckwith argues that the priestly courses in the Temple consisted of a one-year cycle (as opposed to the Qumran six-year cycle). This original theory implies, however,

that the first few courses would have served in the Temple more frequently than others, which is perhaps unlikely. Ch. 8 comprises an extensive survey of ancient Jewish computations of the Messianic era (and more on this in ch. 10), with some interesting suggestions about the Messianic causes of the great Jewish revolts. Ch. 7 has little to do with the calendar or chronology: it consists of a broad history of Judaism and of the Jewish sects in the intertestamental period.

Aside from the important contributions in chs. 5 and 9 (see above), I have found this book tremendously unsatisfactory. Most of its arguments are built on hypotheses that may be ingenious, but are far too speculative to convince. 'Evidence', particularly from Biblical sources, is believed and relied upon in a rather indiscriminate manner: for instance, Jesus' sayings in the Gospels are treated as all authentic and *verbatim* (especially in ch. 2), and the accounts of the Old and New Testaments as historically true (e.g. p. 11, on the Creation). Particularly disappointing in this respect are the author's studies on the date of Easter (3), on the origins of the Qumran calendar (5), on the Qumran Psalter (6), and on intertestamental Judaism (7).

The author is also insufficiently aware of present-day research. He places excessive reliance, especially in ch. 7 but also elsewhere, on dated text-books such as Finkelstein's *Pharisees* (p. 195), Tcherikover's *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (p. 212), Jeremias's *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (*passim*), or even the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (p. 47). The inevitable result is acceptance of outdated notions that historians would nowadays prefer to avoid: for instance, that Josephus and the Mishna or Talmud represent the same Pharisaic tradition (pp. 7, 239, 256), that 'Qumran sect' and 'Essenes' are identical and interchangeable (p. 112 and *passim*; or that the book of Jubilees is 'Essene', p. 217), and that 'the high priests were Sadducees' (pp. 92, 170).

Most problematic perhaps is the author's Christian religious bias, already evident in his treatment of Biblical sources (see above), but also in comments such as '[the Pharisees] concentrated men's minds on externals' (p. 196), and sermon-like discourses (e.g. pp. 50, 275) that are clearly addressed to a Christian readership but not suitable for an academic publication. This religious slant casts doubts, indeed, on the motivations and integrity of the author's arguments. I would point out, in particular, his tendency to argue for the *early origins* of normative Christian institutions, such as the Lord's day (ch. 2, especially pp. 39 ff.), Easter on Sunday (ch. 3), and Christmas (ch. 4); his preference, in the section on the Passion-week chronology (end of ch. 9), to assume that John and the Synoptic Gospels must be *consistent*; and finally his remarkable suggestion, in ch. 8, that the Essenes *predicted* the birth of the Messiah around the time of the birth of Jesus, and hence that many of them put their faith in him (p. 233). Given the speculative nature of most of these arguments, I suspect that without a Christian agenda different conclusions could equally have been reached.

Jews' College, London

SACHA STERN

FRANCOIS BLANCHETIÈRE, *Aux sources de l'anti-judaïsme chrétien II^e–III^e siècles*. Peeters, Louvain/Jerusalem, 1995. 190 pp.

JUDITH LIEU, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1996. xiv, 348 pp. £24.95.

In recent years the study of Christian origins has been marred by a desire to make belated reparations for the sufferings endured by the Jewish people at the hands of the Church triumphant; it is therefore good to find two books on early Christian attitudes to Jews which are so diligent in their scrutiny of the evidence and so measured in their conclusions. Blanchetière sees 'anti-Judaïsme' as an indefeasible part of Christianity,