The apocryphal works of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah are treated briefly and instructively by Gunneweg, but Janssen, the translator of the Testament of Abraham, has been unlucky: he was unable to utilise M. Delcor's large monograph which appeared in 1973. The German translation contains in parallel columns both the short and the long recensions of the Testament. Three Jewish Hellenists, Aristobulus, Demetrius and Aristeas, conclude the section "Teaching in didactic form". Their editor, Walter, defines them as "exegetes" although the suitability of such a title in the case of Aristobulus is rather questionable.

The date of the Prayer of Manasseh, edited by Eva Osswald, is left uncertain, but the antiquity and Hebrew origin of the five "Syriac Psalms", translated by van der Woude, are now established, thanks to the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11. In presenting the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, Hage has been able to avail himself of the recent edition of the text by J.C. Picard. Finally, the fragments of an Ezekiel Apocryphon are assembled by Eckart from patristic quotations. His bibliography includes no reference to Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca by A.M. Denis (1970).

The first seven fascicles augur well and it is greatly to be hoped that this promising series will proceed speedily. It will be fascinating to compare it with the parallel American Pseudepigrapha project now in progress, and if it ever sees the light of day, with the new "Charles", commissioned over twenty years ago by the Oxford University Press.

Oriental Institute, Oxford

GEZA VERMES


This book has been available in Hebrew since 1946 and in German since 1962. Publication in English will be welcomed by all students of Jewish and Roman history unfamiliar with these languages. The author stresses that it is a political history that he has written, and the most useful part of his work is his clear presentation of the sequence of political events that accompanied the formation of the Mishnah and Talmud in Palestine.

The new edition has received only slight alteration. The two new passages on Jewish art are good, as befits the author's expertise in this field, although they do not mention the recent dispute over the date of the Galilean synagogues (cf. S. Loffreda, "The Late Chronology of the synagogue of Capernaum" IEJ 23(1973)p.37). The section on inflation in the third century has been revised to accord with the work of D. Sperber, but the book's main arguments remain unchanged. Despite a warning by the editors against Avi-Yonah's excessive use of the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, the text is not altered to reflect the scepticism this source now deserves.

Avi-Yonah views his history as the record of a conflict between two nations, Romans and Jews, and the chapters on their attitude to each other after the Bar Kokhba war are illuminating. The same chapters, however, reveal the main flaw in the
book, for the author fails to investigate either the non-rabbinic inhabitants of Palestine or the local pagan (and later Christian) population among whom they lived.

The rabbinic origin of most of the literary tradition makes the first fault difficult to avoid, but Avi-Yonah's account would have been enhanced by greater caution. He asserts that Pharisees were "de facto" presidents of the Sanhedrin before A.D. 70 (p. 56), that the Sabbatical Year was universally kept in the second century (p. 22), and that Jews accepted cheerfully both the fourth century laws against mixed marriages (pp. 153 and 175) and the Justinian laws against Jews teaching in the public academies (p. 247). To construe rabbinic opposition to amme ha-aretz as evidence of political rather than religious divisions is rash (p. 107).

While Avi-Yonah's Jewish history concentrates too much on the attitudes of the rabbis, his Roman history reflects the views of the Roman governing classes — the Senate and the emperors. Of the local Syrian and Syro-Greek population of Palestine, whose dealings with the Jews are often far more significant than those of the far-off emperors, only the Christians are considered in any detail. As a result, local phenomena are attributed implausibly to imperial policy — thus Avi-Yonah claims that gentile courts and registries were granted jurisdiction in the second century as a way of crushing the Jews (p. 47). The author is also too ready to glimpse anti-Jewish legislation in ordinary administrative acts — he ascribes Roman dole distribution in cities to a plan to widen the rift between the rich and the poor of the Jewish community (p. 108). Measures taken to heal divisions within the Church should not be deemed to conceal other political aims. The prohibition against the Patriarch announcing the date of Passover was enacted to harm Christian sects in Syria and Cilicia, not to disrupt communication between Jews in Palestine and Babylon (p. 166), and the very preoccupation with religious unity in the Byzantine Empire emphasises the stability of political and economic life rather than the contrary — the forced baptisms of the seventh century were not calculated to ensure political unity.

This fault in perspective is most damaging in Avi-Yonah's account of the third century "crisis". Avi-Yonah asserts that economic collapse caused political chaos in Palestine. He writes of disaster and ruin and of the withering of Galilean Jewry (p. 133). The true picture is less alarming. A series of emperors faced disaster on the frontiers and the governing classes bemoaned the moral decline and social mobility caused by the rise to prominence of military men, but even to the most pessimistic the safety of the Mediterranean core of the Empire was only in doubt for the two decades after A.D. 250, and Palestine, being neither a frontier province nor subject to the destruction of prolonged civil war, suffered little. The rabbis' knowledge of such horrors is culled from abroad. Few Jews served in the Roman army, and the assertion that the inhabitants of the villages were, as soldiers, victorious in a struggle against the cities in the third century is particularly inapt for the agricultural communities of Galilee where a strong distinction between inhabitants of city and countryside is not valid (p. 90).

Rome's troubles did cause some distress in Palestine: incursions by desert raiders were more frequent and a wall was built round Tiberias. Demands for money and goods for the upkeep of the army increased in Palestine as elsewhere. It is important, however, to note that complaints about high taxation and arbitrary collection are common from the early second century to the end of Byzantine rule. Of Avi-Yonah's examples of confiscation by the government of the estates of tax-debtors, t.M.Sh 3:8 dates from c. A.D. 200, as does bSukk. 29b if it refers to Palestine, and of the passages that he cites to illustrate the concealment of goods from the tax-collectors, Lev. R. 12:1 dates from c. A.D. 350. Angaria was already a form of oppression in the first century (Matt. 5:41). The special features of this period are the increased insistence of Rome on payment and the new method of vesting responsibility for tax collection on the local
aristocracy. The bouleutai (town-councillors), and probably the patriarch, had to ensure that the government received its revenue and they complained volubly at the hardships they suffered as a result. Nevertheless they were not made bankrupt, and although requisitions might prove crippling to farmers in poor years, the rich land of Caesarea was still noted towards the end of the century (yKil 32c) and bYeb 63a only indicates that farming became less profitable when compared to business.

Other symptoms that Avi-Yonah adduces of decline in these years were endemic in the Roman world — rapacious governors, famine after a crop failure (Gen.R.20:10), and mockery of Jews for keeping a Sabbatical Year (Lam R.17). R. Zeira’s “Poverty is general” (yNed.41c) is a gnomic reference to the transience of wealth. Nothing indicates a vast increase in the number of poor. yPeah 21b mentions not the inability of the general populace to afford two sets of clothes, but that of the rabbinic students of Tiberias who may have lacked a regular income. Rabbis travelling to Babylonia might wish to study in the new academies or engage in the flourishing trade from the East and were not necessarily driven to emigrate by indigence. Trade reasons also lie behind the lending of money on interest by gedolim (yB.M. 10a). The concession of Judah I regarding the export of fruit and wine suggests a surplus in these products, and much of the leniency over the Sabbatical Year may be intended to facilitate Jewish settlement in the areas concerned rather than to stave off starvation. Nor is it clear that the Jews of Palestine were greatly diminished numerically in this period. Some villages disappear from history and there is an increase in the proportion of gentiles in the population as a whole, but a shift of Jews to the towns, particularly Caesarea, whose large Jewish community is first recorded again in the first half of the third century, would account for some of these phenomena.

The third century was a period of considerable independence for the Palestinian Jews. Avi-Yonah notes that anti-Jewish decrees were disregarded, the exercise of Jewish jurisdiction not prevented and the prohibition on entering Jerusalem forgotten. Abuse of Rome as the “evil government” is simply proverbial by this time. The King Midrashim gloat over Rome’s misfortunes and messianic passages show an upsurge in national confidence. The amme ha-aretz are no longer abused as the rabbis grow accustomed to a new role as administrators of a heterogenous society; the struggle of some rabbis with the Patriarch over the appointment of officials reflects no more than the strength of non-rabbinic leadership in local communities, and other disagreements that are recorded may be purely halachic (yShab 8a). Judah I’s monarchical position was exceptional, and although the patriarchs retained considerable power throughout the third and fourth centuries, their control was combined with efficient and largely independent administration at a lower level. The period witnessed stable government and sufficient prosperity for the establishment of the great academies of Palestine; the eventual decline of Palestinian Jewry must be explained by something other than the Empire’s “crisis” in the third century.

Other faults are only irritations. The introduction takes no account of recent work on the earlier period—the Bar Kokhba revolt, for example, should not be considered a reaction to the plan to found Aelia Capitolina, nor should the circumcision law or the enlarged garrison in Palestine be regarded as retaliation after the war (pp.13 and 36). The procurators of Judaea were not fiscal officials (p.10). Some of Avi-Yonah’s generalisations are startling, especially the theory of biological decline, which is particularly strange when applied over one generation (p.174), but the description of Julian as a Vorlauter des Zionismus has sensibly been left out of the new edition (German edition p.197). Misprints are too common in the notes (p.II4,n.123; p.135,n.50 and others), and “Antoniniana” should be read on p.46.

Despite such shortcomings, The Jews of Palestine remains the authoritative study of
the subject. It contains a great deal of material expounded with clarity and fluency and justifies the author's assertion of the importance of this period in the history of the Jewish nation.

Trinity College, Oxford

M. D. GOODMAN


The idea of producing a text, with translation and commentary, of Targum Jonathan to Jonah is a good one, and this makes it all the more regrettable that the present work turns out to be less than satisfactory.

As in his edition of Ruth (on the same lines), published in *Analecta Biblica* 58 (1973), Levine provides an introduction, an edition of Vat. Urb. 1 with an apparatus giving variants of a number of manuscripts and editions, an English translation and a commentary (where each verse is again quoted in Aramaic — this time unvocalized — and in translation). At the end is an appendix listing Rabbinic citations of Jonah, and a bibliography.

The section of the introduction on linguistic characteristics is more likely to confuse, than to clarify, the issue for the student, and that on the manuscript tradition likewise contains some obscure or misleading statements (the situation is not helped by the omission of the vocalization from the examples adduced on p. 23 to illustrate Babylonian elements in the Tiberian vocalization of certain manuscripts).

The apparatus usefully cites several manuscripts not used in Sperber's edition, but it is disturbing to find that Levine's and Sperber's citation of the two manuscripts they do quote in common is at times conflicting. Is it really sensible to use Latin (pretentious in style and not always correct) for the apparatus in a book primarily meant for students?

Whereas the main text reproduces Urb. 1 as it stands, the recapitulation of the text in the commentary normally corrects the mistakes of Urb. 1 (which are many), but in places errors are inexplicably kept (e.g. 2:7). The translation is not always a helpful one for the student: Aramaic singulars are gaily translated as plurals, and vice-versa; words not in the Aramaic appear in the translation (e.g. 4:7. 10); at 3:9 a whole phrase has dropped out of the translation. Several times the translation is dubious, to say the least.

Typographical symbols helpfully denote quantitative and qualitative changes made by the Aramaic translator. Unfortunately, however, the symbols employed are nowhere explained, and, though it will not take the reader long to interpret them, their use turns out to be very inconsistent and even misleading (at times the symbols in text and translation for the same verse do not even agree).

While the commentary includes some interesting references, from the point of view of linguistic guidance it is most unreliable, especially where the Greek and Syriac are quoted (here reference to any standard dictionary could have obviated errors). At times I find the commentary incomprehensible (e.g. note 2 to 4:11).

Extensive quotations of 'Philo, *De Iona*' and Jerome are given, but the sources for these are never indicated. (Jerome is evidently not from Antin's edition, mentioned in the bibliography). Surely the unsuspecting student should be warned that the *De Iona* (preserved only in Armenian) is hardly Philo's.

The whole work has far too high a number of mis-typings to be acceptable, and the Greek suffers appallingly in places (not only the accents). Indicative of the careless way