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-arets 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 lot 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,
however, less secure in his judgement here than in other areas because he has been
rather ready to be led by the Christian sources, even though he well understands
their literary flavour and their biases. Thus he surely overstates the desolation of
post-70 Jerusalem, and, on the other side, he gives a misleading picture of post-135
Galilee as in its entirety a Jewish zone, town and country alike, making no mention
of pagan inhabitants. At the opening of the book, he paints a picture of Palestine as
deprived and marginalized province, a 'vacuum', in the third century, which
overlooks the vigour of city life and is open to serious doubt.

In the spiritual sphere, many will find it hard to accept the claim that during the
years after 135 Jews lost interest in Jerusalem and ceased to see it as the centre of
their religious existence. The mishnaic treatment of the Temple suggests otherwise, to
look no further than that; and Jerusalem's elevated place in so many biblical
readings, a phenomenon which indeed plays a notable part in Walker's theological
discussions, would hardly have permitted a thoroughgoing re-orientation, at any rate
without a completely new allegorical interpretation. It would be hard to maintain
that there is real evidence of such a development in midrash.

Within the central concern of this study, Judaism figures chiefly because of its
vital role for Christian doctrine. The New Testament holy places are a separate
matter, but the question of how to approach those of the Old Testament was
entangled with the Christians' relationship to the Old Testament as a whole and even
with their self-differentiation from the Jews. Eusebius was more inclined to negation
of the Jewish heritage and to self-definition through contrast; Cyril, far more simply,
to appropriation. The Demonstratio Evangelica in particular contains a parody of
Judaism as place-bound and materialistic, with a conception of God that is tied to
one town and one Temple, and this is skilfully analysed by Walker, though he is
perhaps rather euphemistic about its abusiveness. Christianity had made it un-
necessary to 'run' to Jerusalem and God had no longer to be worshipped 'in one
corner of the earth'. There was no promised land, and there could be no holy city. It
is Walker's contention that this fundamental orientation of Eusebius did not alter,
but that he had to change his tune to a certain extent after 325, as emerges in the
speech on the sepulchre of Christ and occasionally in the Onomastikon. It was at this
late stage that a sharp distinction between city and Temple became necessary, thus
making it possible to endorse Constantine's plans by asserting that Jerusalem (in
contrast to Aelia, the name Eusebius had normally used before) could acceptably be
rebuilt (whether or not it was truly the city of God), while the Temple had to be for
ever a ruin, fulfilling Jesus' prophetic words and validating Christian preaching and
Eusebius' anti-Jewish triumphalism.

For Cyril, the fact that Jewish Jerusalem had been judged in 70 for its treatment
of Jesus served well to enable the new Christian Jerusalem to inherit the biblical
accolades and a unique status. It was, not surprisingly, Cyril's pragmatic enthusiasm
that held the field. Walker connects those ancient debates with the present: 'today
three major world religions claim Jerusalem for their own, giving this city a special
place within their life of faith. It is a situation always, but now especially, fraught
with political consequences. With Cyril, we mark the first explicit beginnings of this
process in the second of those religions' (p. 314). Later, Walker invites us to consider
whether Eusebius' more detached view of the meaning of a holy place might not be a
salutary influence on current disputes. In his epilogue, he also imaginatively suggests
that Cyril might well have felt at home in the east Jerusalem of today, where, in the
drama and colour of liturgical celebrations, the Christian faithful value their physical
proximity to the holy places which are for them, as for Cyril, a material reminder of
the physical reality of the incarnation. He admits to being less able to say how
Eusebius would have reacted to west Jerusalem.
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