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.
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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

* R. A. Horsley is credited with Goodman’s book, The Ruling Class of Judaea (Ed.).
Hengel insists that all evidence about Jewish opposition to Rome which can be conflated should be conflated, while his critics argue that all evidence that can be distinguished from the Zealots proper should be so distinguished. The problem is that both views are possible and both create equally serious difficulties in the interpretation of particular passages of Josephus, whose account must on any view be reckoned tendentious.

I suspect that any more progress in understanding the significance of Jewish religious ideas in promoting active opposition to Rome will come not from further collation of the Jewish texts, which could hardly surpass Professor Hengel's own achievement, but by developing a more sophisticated model of Roman imperialism in general. It will not do to assert, as does Hengel (pp. xiv–xv), that, since the violence of the Jewish revolt was without parallel in the early empire and the Jewish religion was unique, the former was 'undoubtedly' caused by the latter. The reasons why Syrian and Egyptian peasants did not rebel could be manifold, and it is rash to assume that lack of open unrest signified satisfaction with the existing situation. And in much the same way, the fact that Josephus' term for the Jewish constitution, theokratia or 'rule of God, could be sharpened into the sense given to it by the Fourth Philosophy provides only a very partial explanation of why, by some, it was.
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This huge volume provides a worthy memorial to one of the greatest figures of Palestinian archaeology and Qumran studies. The contents reflect the wide interests of Yadin himself, and it is only possible here to pick out from the 69 contributions those which may be of particular interest for readers of JJS. In the non-Hebrew section can be found studies on Qumran by Laperrousaz, Lipinski, Ringgren, Schiffman and Vermes. Some of the most important articles in the Hebrew section are, or will be, published in English elsewhere, but among those to be found only here are notes by Hershkovitz on a Roman cupping vessel from Masada, by Meshorer on the mints of Ashdod and Ascalon in the late Persian period, by Meshel on the survey of the siege system at Alexandria, by Netzer on the defensive wall built at the last moment by the Jews on Masada, by Patrich and Arubas on a juglet containing a considerable quantity of plant oil which might, they suggest, have derived from balsam, by Foerster on two bronze ornaments from Masada, by Tsafir on the dating of the Galilean synagogues, and by Kloner on two lead weights of Ben-Kosba's administration from the floor of a hideout near Bet-Govrin.

Worthy of special note is the contribution by Naveh, which, among other things, brings up to date with additions and corrections his corpus of Aramaic and Hebrew inscriptions from ancient synagogues, ten years after the publication of On Stone and Mosaic.
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