for Tzaferis (p. 277, n. 38), Chachlili for Hachlili (p. 275, n. 7), Dupin for Dauphin (p. 54), Algavish for Elgavish (p. 306, n. 44), which may only confuse English readers in search of other works by these authors. When books originally published in Hebrew have also appeared in English, it would have been preferable to refer to the (often updated) English version rather than to the Hebrew one.

All in all, these two volumes contain a great deal of information, mainly concerning remains that are now mostly destroyed (or expecting destruction in the near future) in the wave of development works (see Preface), and Dar deserves our warmest thanks for having carefully surveyed them before it was too late and promptly making the results available for all.

Wolfson College, Oxford

FANNY VITTO


This study offers a 'sociological approach' to the religious and political role of Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees in first-century Palestine. The first and briefest section, on Palestinian society, lays out the social parameters within which understanding should be sought. Part II subjects the literary sources to detailed analysis. In Part III are found interpretation and synthesis.

Of these three sections, the middle one seems to me much the most successful. Saldarini's careful discussion of Pharisees and the others in the writings of Josephus and Paul, and in the Gospels and rabbinic literature, brings out well the great variety of views expressed in the ancient evidence. The book as a whole should go a long way towards eliminating the widespread belief that scribes formed a separate social group in the population of Judaea. The analysis of the fragmentary evidence about Sadducees is similarly helpful and clear.

In contrast to such excellent aspects of the book, the analysis of Roman Palestine in the first four chapters is rather disappointing. This part of the book contains not the description of Judaea you might expect but modern scholars' sociological generalizations about agrarian empires; such generalizations are then applied somewhat uncritically to the Roman state and to Jewish society. For Saldarini, the main justification for this procedure is his discovery in the writings of Gerhard Lenski of a term, 'retainers', which can be used to describe those people who in some societies serve the needs of the governing class as religious functionaries and in other roles. Saldarini simply asserts, without argument, that 'it is here that we will find the Pharisees and scribes' (p. 38). The rest of the book, including the discussion of the ancient evidence, simply presupposes that this term, with its implied judgement about the role of Pharisees and scribes, is applicable.

Now this notion of 'retainer' has the advantage that, if it is applicable, it would explain why Pharisees and scribes are sometimes portrayed as wielding political power, sometimes not (p. 156). But that does not in itself make its application valid. 'Retainers' are apparently necessary for the good functioning of complex bureaucracies. Saldarini therefore assumes that Jewish society was bureaucratic (p. 94, on the Hasmonaean period). But that is not obviously true. The early Roman Empire was in general strikingly unbureaucratic in its administration: if Judaea was different, evidence should be brought to demonstrate the fact. As it is, Saldarini's
concluding picture of the Pharisees as 'subordinate officials ... literate servants of the governing class' (p. 284) is no more than a reassertion of the original hypothesis that Lenski's category of 'retainer' should be applied: the examination of the sources in Part II provides neither support nor opposition for the suggestion.

It should be admitted that discussion of the role of the Pharisees is so horrendously difficult that it sometimes seems best to this reviewer simply to admit defeat in the face of the conflicting evidence. Saldarini has been much braver, and his picture of Pharisees acting as retainers of the High Priests in the first century has the merit of clarity. His picture reflects in its essentials (and despite his frequent admonitions to caution) the traditional belief that the Pharisees were a group with political influence (p. 196, citing the Gospel of John), concerned to oppose Jesus because of his contravention of purity laws (cf. p. 168, citing Matthew 9:6–13, which refers not to purity but to eating with publicans and sinners). For Saldarini the connection between Pharisees and purity is so strong that he even suggests that Paul's use of metaphorical purity language may indicate familiarity with Pharisaic purity rules (p. 138), forgetting the prevalence of purity concerns in many other spheres in first-century Judaism outside Pharisaism. This traditional view has been subjected to a number of attacks in recent years, particularly by E. P. Sanders, and recourse to sociological terminology does little to bolster it: in sum, I suspect that students will benefit much from Saldarini's analysis of scribes and Sadducees, but that they will look elsewhere when they seek enlightenment about the third and most controversial group in the title.

Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies

MARTIN GOODMAN


It is in some ways strange that this, the first and among the most influential of his books, has only just now been added to the mass of Hengel's writings published in English. The original version first appeared in 1961 and a second, enlarged edition in 1976. The English translation contains a new foreword and a characteristically thorough supplementary bibliography up to 1987. (Probably only the present reviewer will be upset by the incorrect attribution of the item on lines 23–4 on page 432.)

In the foreword (p. xiii), Hengel refers to the criticisms made by Morton Smith in 1971 and his own response, published here, as in the second edition, as an appendix. He asserts forthrightly that if he were to write the book again today, he 'would not make any far-reaching change in the fundamental theses of the work', suggesting rather plaintively (p. xvi) that 'I have gone into all these questions so exhaustively that I am bound to ask whether individual critics have really read what I have said about the matter'. When a book published in 1987 (R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, pp. 77–8) can claim that 'there is simply no extant evidence to support any of [Hengel's main] assertions', one is tempted to concur with Hengel's impression (p. xiii) that the controversy is basically going round in a circle. Thus