

Hebrew edition, but not for a book published in 2002. The first half of this book should have been revised to include this material.

Meir Ben-Dov is a brilliant scholar. His views, although sometimes 'minority opinions' and sometimes somewhat radical, have often become accepted in Jerusalem scholarship. He is truly an expert on all aspects of Jerusalem and he has made important contributions to Jerusalem scholarship. His *Historical Atlas of Jerusalem* might contribute to a future real historical atlas of Jerusalem,<sup>8</sup> but the present work is a far cry from the real thing.

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

JOSHUA SCHWARTZ

JAMES M. SCOTT (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 72). Brill, Leiden, 2001. xiii, 600 pp. €169.00. ISBN 90-04-11580-3.

This bulky volume is to be understood as a sequel to the 1997 volume in the same series, also edited by Scott, on *Exile*. That suggests that the focus might be on the post-exilic restoration as described principally in the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and indeed some of the seventeen contributors understand it so. There is another scholarly usage of these terms, however, which finds in them a more metaphorical sense of how the Jews saw themselves for centuries after those events, something (as Bauckham here rightly mentions, p. 436) more closely akin to subjugation. This has been an issue that has been much debated in New Testament circles in terms of how the historical Jesus may have envisaged his ministry, and this too receives detailed attention here. Finally, restoration can have a more general application to the return to some kind of golden age, the old *Urzeit/Endzeit* model, and this understanding is also represented, though less prominently.

Each of these topics is of interest and importance in its own right, and it is not surprising to find that the contributors have little difficulty in filling many pages (up to fifty in one case, and several in the region of forty) as they expound their version of restoration in the literary corpus which the editor has presumably assigned to them. What is sorely lacking, so far as I can see, is any attempt to discuss how these may be related to one another, and what the implications of such differences may be. The result is a collection of papers with less overall coherence than might have been wished. It seems that there was a lack of firm editorial rationale in conceptualising the project (or if there was, it is not explained) and/or of control in the treatment of the contributions as they were received.

The biblical (Old Testament) material is covered in three essays of very variable quality. J. G. McConville undertakes a solid survey of the relevant issues as they are raised in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic literature, and he shows good awareness of the interplay between the canonical literature and strictly historical issues. The prophetic literature is surveyed by the late O. H. Steck and one of his distinguished pupils, K. Schmid; how they divided the work is not explained, but it seems likely that the fundamental work was Steck's with Schmid preparing the whole for publication. They first survey the theme of restoration 'canonically' in the texts as we now have them, nicely basing the themes for discussion on the content of Zechariah's night visions, and then moving on to a tentative diachronic reconstruction of salvation sayings, it being well known that these were often added much later to the books in which they are now included. Finally in this section, Lester Grabbe looks at arguably

<sup>8</sup> A good historical atlas is usually a collaborative work, and perhaps some team of scholars will take up the challenge of producing such a work on Jerusalem.

the most important books for this topic, Ezra and Nehemiah. Unfortunately, he tells us nothing whatever about what they say concerning restoration, but rather rehearses once again the subject on which he has already written several times elsewhere, namely that they can well be historically misleading, that they include more than one point of view, and so on. All this may be conceded for the sake of argument, but that does not mean that the books do not manifest one or several understandings of restoration, and whether or not they are based on the actual course of history it is this literary embodiment which will have exerted influence in the following centuries (as indeed some other contributors make clear). So this is a return to a form of scholarship whose domain assumptions have been largely abandoned in recent decades; Grabbe would have done better to follow the Steck-Schmid approach.

Fortunately, in the first of the chapters on the Greco-Roman period, S. Talmon does not in fact survey what his title in such a section promises ('"Exile" and "Restoration" in the conceptual world of ancient Judaism'), but rather goes through all the biblical material once more, including filling in some of the major gaps left by Grabbe. (Only in two pages at the end does he write about anything later than the biblical period, and that is exclusively on Qumran.) He is clear that there was a significant restoration, but neither he nor any other contributor tackles head-on the problem that R. Albertz has been raising in recent years, that the whole definition of what happened in Judah under the Persians was anything other than restoration, given the lack of one of the essential ingredients of that which had been lost, namely a Davidic monarch. David Aune's contribution surveys six themes in ten apocalyptic texts, some of which relate to restoration of exilic losses and others to *Urzeit/Endzeit* issues. J. Tromp sides with K. E. Pomykala and others in maintaining that there was no real Davidic-messianic hope prior to the first pre-Christian century, and that even when it did arise it was really only a local variant of a widespread Hellenistic eschatology. This, of course, is fiercely controversial, and in view of what has been said just above, it is also of central importance to the theme of the book. It would have been helpful, therefore, to have had the two sides of the debate more representatively set out so that readers could have a better understanding of the issues involved. L. Schiffman helpfully distinguishes between restorative and utopian hopes in some of the major sectarian texts from Qumran, concluding that the sectarians envisaged restoration as something still in the future. Finally, L. H. Feldman's survey of restoration in Josephus briefly suggests, on the basis of a word study, that Josephus had little of his own to say about the matter, before then analysing at length, on the basis of some of his previous publications, Josephus' treatment of the restoration period.

The section entitled slightly strangely 'Formative Judaism' is again a disparate collection: C. Milikowski has 'Rabbinic Judaism' in his title, but limits his short contribution to an analysis of a single passage in *Seder Olam* on the double return of Elijah and the war of Gog. S. C. Reif looks at three related themes as found in liturgical texts (especially the *'amidah*), G. Porten collects much useful and scattered material on what the Rabbis thought about Ezra, and B. Chilton reiterates his understanding of temple restoration in what, in one of his books, he has famously maintained are the two principal chronological horizons in the Isaiah Targum (first and fourth centuries), before, with only artificial and minimal connection, extracting a section from another of his books on eschatology in the Psalms—another instance where stronger editorial control seems to have been needed.

The final section of the book mostly concerns the New Testament. J. P. Meier defends the view that historically Jesus had twelve disciples and that this points to an aspect of his understanding of the restoration of Israel (rather as in the Dead Sea Scrolls); S. Freyne reprints an article from *NTS* on the 'Geography of Restoration' (Jerusalem-Galilee relations); R. Bauckham, in the longest chapter in the book, at-

tends to the theme in Luke–Acts; and the editor himself writes on Romans 11:26. The last chapter, by S. F. Jones, deals with a passage in the Pseudo-Clementines on chilias-tic restoration.

It will have become apparent that this is a diverse collection of somewhat varying quality. Without denying that the book is already quite long enough, some disap-pointment may nevertheless be registered that no place was found for a treatment of the Samaritan hopes for restoration, given the obvious centrality to the topic of their expectation of the *Taheb*, which may have had some influence on parts of the New Testament, and which relates restoration even more closely to a coming messianic figure than in the case of the Jewish Davidic equivalent. While I remain puzzled by the project's concept as a whole, there is nevertheless bound to be material here which will prove to be of value to scholars working in a wide spectrum of fields in Jewish and Christian antiquity.

Christ Church, Oxford

H. G. M. WILLIAMSON

JOHN VAN SETERS, *A Law Book for the Diaspora: Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003. xii, 236 pp. £40.00 (hb). ISBN 0-19-515315-4.

One thing with which all biblical scholars are painfully familiar is the *Documentary Hypothesis*, which divides the sources/authors of the Pentateuch into the Yahwist (J), the Elohist (E), the Priestly Writer (P) and the Deuteronomist (D). In short, D's legal corpus is supposed to date from the period of the late Judean monarchy, and aims to centralise and reform religious practice in Judah. P is dated later still, to the Persian period, and relates to the institution of the Second Temple. Within P is the distinct legal corpus of Lev. 17–26, called the Holiness Code (HC), which is supposed to date from the early part of the Babylonian exile. According to this theory, we have two distinct legal codes corresponding to two different periods of Jewish history, one shortly before the exile and one just after it. Van Seters is in agreement with this much, but this is as far as any such agreement goes.

Van Seters takes J and E as one source (J), which in itself is not so controversial. What is controversial, at least in respect of the *Documentary Hypothesis*, is Van Seters' suggestion to assign a late date to J. More specifically, whereas J's legal section, which is found in Ex. 20:23–23:33 and called the Covenant Code (CC), has previously been given an early date in relation to D and HC, with the corollary that the legal material in D and HC was to some degree dependent on CC, Van Seters argues that D and HC actually predate CC, thus reversing the direction of dependency.

To summarise thus far, the standard hypothesis puts the various strata in the fol-lowing chronological order: CC–D–HC–P. Van Seters is proposing the following order: D–HC–CC–P, thus moving CC from the period of the early Israelite monarchy to the period of the Babylonian exile. According to Van Seters, what has thus far been considered the earliest legal corpus in the Pentateuch should now be considered to be one of the latest, composed not for the Israelites in the infancy of their nationhood but for the exiles in Babylonia, hence the title *A Law Book for the Diaspora*, a statement of the place, period and purpose of the composition of CC.

In order to establish this, Van Seters begins in chapter 1, 'The History of Research on the Covenant Code' (pp. 8–46), with a convenient summary of prior scholarship on CC. Van Seters contents himself with presenting the significant contributions and explaining why certain ideas are so entrenched in modern scholarship, often because