alternative reading which Kreitzer does not consider is that the passage presents Christ as coming from heaven to remove the faithful (whether living or dead) from the worldly kingdom prior to its destruction, and to take them up into the heavenly and eternal kingdom of God. This would be consistent with 15:50-56, and also with 1 Thess. 4:13-17 where the dead and the living faithful rise up to meet Christ in the air. However, it must be admitted that Paul is not always so logically consistent, and Kreitzer's interpretation is certainly defensible.

This is in many respects an illuminating study, and Kreitzer is surely right to insist upon the importance of the pseudepigrapha for Pauline studies, especially with regard to Paul's christological and eschatological teachings. That these two facets of Paul's thought are closely interrelated is also correct, but Kreitzer's understanding of the nature of the relationship is open to question. He seems to imply (though he does not categorically state) that Paul's christology was developed entirely within, and hence largely shaped by, his eschatology. This implied primacy of eschatology over christology is unjustified. If account is taken of the apocalyptic and Jewish esoteric traditions regarding the visible appearance of God in his 'Glory' (τῶν) as a human form upon the heavenly throne, those of the Angel of the LORD who is the embodied Name (πατρίκος), and those of the heavenly enthronement of (for example) Moses, it becomes clear that the 'christology of subordinate identity' (my expression) which Kreitzer ascribes to Paul may have its roots in a context which is by no means wholly eschatological. Thus, while Paul's eschatological teaching undoubtedly reflects and interacts with his christology, it is not at all correct to insist on the former as providing the sole matrix of the latter.


This fine study is written to demonstrate a premise which is surely correct, that much of the evidence in the New Testament about the environment of Jesus and the early Church is best studied as part of the history of the development of Judaism from biblical to rabbinic times rather than considered in isolation or simply against the background of the Old Testament. The investigation is written with the enthusiasm and excitement of a pioneer, with missionary zeal. Readers of this journal will be easily persuaded, but the author's main readership is intended to be experts in New Testament studies, in which field there are still many converts to be won.

The problem of Jewish tithes was an extraordinarily complex issue to choose as the sample topic for this general thesis. The title of sub-section 3.4, on the different lists of tithes in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, is 'una vexata quaestio'. It could equally have applied to much of the rest of the book.

The first part (pp. 21-113) surveys the confused and confusing evidence about first-century Jewish tithes within the New Testament itself. Here is to be found close textual criticism of the variety traditional in New Testament scholarship. M. del Verme's main contribution is the exceptional clarity with which he lays out the different possibilities and gives the reasons for his preferred solution to each issue.

In the second part of the book (pp. 118-245), del Verme attempts a history of the laws about tithes in the period of the Second Temple and in tannaitic times. The analysis again concentrates on specific problems, of which there are many. What level of tithes was considered normative in these periods? How did the rules found in tannaitic texts evolve from those in the Bible? To what extent were the rules observed, and how did the degree of observance reflect the religious and social live of
the Jews in general? M. del Verme's technique is to pose such questions to groups of sources. Such a method is convenient, but sometimes the division of material seems somewhat arbitrary: thus, the Temple Scroll is placed with the Septuagint; the contrast between 'am ha-āres and haver is placed in the section on the Second Temple period, although the evidence cited is naturally tannaitic, which begs some major questions; the section on the tannaitic period contains evidence from the Didache, Traditio Apostolica and Didascalia, which may suggest more contact between the second-century Church and the rabbis than is warranted.

The study is completed by a synthesis of the Jewish and New Testament evidence to illuminate the function of the New Testament passages (pp. 237–245). The brief conclusion (pp. 247–9) simply points up the value of this sort of inter-disciplinary approach. The author is entirely right to castigate New Testament scholars for their comparative neglect of such legal realia as the background against which Jesus' sayings must be understood (pp. 23–4), but his own study can now usefully be read alongside the two investigations of his subject by E. P. Sanders, in Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah (1990), pp. 43–8, and Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E. (1992), chapter 9.
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This original, subtle and well-presented study is primarily a contribution to the history of Christian theology, but it is informed also by a strong interest in the nexus between historical events, ecclesiastical politics and developments in religious thought (though Walker is far from explaining the latter exclusively in terms of the former two). At the same time there runs through the book a strong feeling for place, and especially for the city of Jerusalem with its changing fortunes. In spite of its length—and it could have been somewhat more compressed—the endeavour is a less than the subtitle suggests, since it in fact concerns two individuals both active in the fourth century, but with two generations between them. The first and better known is the church historian and leader Eusebius (C.E. 260–339). Eusebius was bishop from 313 of Caesarea in Palestine, a see which could be regarded as a rival to Jerusalem; but matters changed with the foundation of Constantinople in 325, and Eusebius' close association with Constantine in the last phase of his life involved him in that emperor's 'plan for the Holy Land', the process which was to make Jerusalem the 'symbolic focus of his new Christian empire' principally by fostering pilgrimage to holy places. Eusebius' speech On the Holy Sepulchre, which has now been linked by Drake with the dedication in 335 of the newly discovered site, put the old man centre stage on the key occasion. The second individual had neither the learning nor the productivity of Eusebius: Cyril, unlike Eusebius, was born into a Christian empire and made bishop of Jerusalem in the late 340s, and he had every reason to take a clear line on the sanctity of the holy places and on the importance of Jerusalem. Walker is able to shed light on Eusebius by contrasting him with Cyril.

The transformation of Jerusalem, or Aelia Capitolina as Hadrian's post-Bar Kokhba foundation had been called, into a Christian city, and very soon afterwards, despite Eusebius' reservations, into a Christian holy city, is of course a chapter also in Jewish history. Walker has some interesting remarks to make about vicissitudes in Jewish fortune over these years so far as they touch upon his story. He is perhaps,