dance with the general Deuteronomic practice of making them equally liable with men under the law (Deut. 7:3; 13:6, 15:12-17; 17:2-5; cp. 12:12, 18; 16:11, 14; 29:11, 18), unless the offence took place in the open country. This also accounts for the addition of Deut. 22:20-21 to Deut. 22:13-19 which in origin is older than Deuteronomy as the reference to elders and the fact that the husband is not convicted under Deut. 19:15-21 indicates. Admittedly this law is something of a puzzle, but while we may not always understand the situation envisaged by the Deuteronomic legislator, the evidence indicates that he was motivated by more concrete concerns than the purely academic exercise of criticising the national heroes and heroines, whose astuteness in deception had ensured that God's purposes were not thwarted.

St. John's College, Oxford

Anthony Phillips


Six years after Volume I, which has in the meanwhile become indispensable, Volume II of the new English Schürer has appeared at last. It follows the principles of the first volume: the revisers have endeavoured to adopt Schürer's plan as far as possible, and to work the new archaeological and manuscript material into the course of Schürer's account. By this means, an exceedingly successful combination of translation and revision has taken shape which it would be hard to equal and which throws into the shade such larger-scale undertakings as the Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. The level of the revision naturally varies in individual paragraphs but is on the whole (contingent on the subject) even more outstanding in this volume than in the first.

Particularly remarkable is the revision in the preliminary bibliographies and in the notes. Here, quite correctly, there has been a radical clearance, and the fact that several dispensable titles nonetheless remain (such as the legendary Realencyklopädie by Hamburger) is no misfortune. The new bibliographical data are accurate and well-nigh exhaustive, and it is but rarely that one would wish for more, or newer, items. Among such instances are p. 191 with note 28, where har ha-melekh is introduced but without any reference to the thorough discussion of this notion; or p. 354 with note 57, where more important literature could certainly be cited and more criticism now offered on the alleged midrash exegesis of the New Testament; and on p. 462 note 163, the bibliography relating to birkat ha-minim is out of date. On the whole, publications in German lag somewhat behind those in English (French and Hebrew). Thus, to name but a few, H. P. Rüger's article (TRE III, 1978, p. 602 ff.) should now be added in connection with Aramaisms in the New Testament; with Rabbi Akiva, the article of J. Neusner (TRE II, 1978, pp. 146 f); with the golden rule of Hillel (p. 467), the monograph by A. Nissen, Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum (1974); with the suffering Messiah, S. Hurwitz, Die Gestalt des sterbenden Messias (1958); in Appendix B on the Sicarii and the Zealots (pp. 598 ff), the second edition of M. Hengel's Zeloten is given in the bibliography, but the composition
“Zeloten und Sikarier” reprinted there in revised form as “Supplement”, which first appeared in the Festschrift for O. Michel (Josephus-Studien, 1974), has obviously not been taken into account.

Paragraphs 22 (“The Cultural Setting”), 23 I (“The Hellenistic Cities”), 27 II (“Synagogue”), 28 (“Life and the Law”) and 30 (“The Essenes”), have also been thoroughly revised in regard to their content. Here, Schürer’s Section 1, “The Facts”, has been reformulated into, “The Essenes according to Philo, Josephus and Pliny”, and an entirely new section 2 inserted, “The Qumran Community according to the Dead Sea Scrolls”. Also new are two Appendices on the Therapeutae and the Sicarii and Zealots (the latter by R. Hayward).

Especially informative is the notorious §28, Schürer’s “Life under the Law”, now elegantly reformulated as “Life and the Law”, in which Schürer develops with particular immoderation and intensity the Christian theological teaching on the replacement of ethics in Judaism by the law. The revisers decided neither to adopt the chapter unchanged nor to delete it, but to revise it radically, and to do so “from a historical rather than a theological vantage point. Moreover, the purpose of the Pharisees and their rabbinic heirs is obviously no longer represented as a trivialization of a whole, but identified as an attempt to elevate everyday Jewish life to the sphere of cultic worship” (p. 464, note 1).

Compare for instance Schürer’s verdict on p. 548, “The saying of Antigonus of Socho, ‘Be not like servants who serve their masters for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to reward’, is by no means a correct expression of the keynote of Pharisaic Judaism, which was in fact like the servants who serve for the sake of recompense”, with the new English version on p. 466: “The saying of Antigonus of Sokho... foreshadows many similar counsels preserved in rabbinic literature”. Or compare Schürer’s (p. 566), “From what has been stated it is abundantly evident, what enormous importance was everywhere attributed to external correctness of actions, which is indeed a self-evident result, when once moral obligations are regarded in a legal manner. Highly characteristic of this strong tendency to externalism are the three mementoes, by which every Israelite, who is faithful to the law, is to be constantly reminded of his duties towards God”, with the new rendering on p. 479: “Highly characteristic of this powerful trend towards ritualism are also the three symbols intended to remind every observant Jew of his duties to God”. The moralising “tendency to externalism” becomes a trend towards the far more relevant notion of “ritualism”, which describes precisely and theologically the phenomenon intended. A further illustration. On the subject of formal prayer Schürer writes unsympathetically (p. 569): “... but when besides this even prayer itself, that centre of religious life, was bound in the fetters of rigid mechanism, vital piety could scarcely be any longer spoken of. The fatal step had also been already taken by Judaism in the time of Christ”. Instead of this, we now have the pleasing and reasonable statement: “A preoccupation with ritual is apparent in the Mishnaic treatment of formal prayer. Whether its rubrics were already as specific and universally binding in the age of Jesus is uncertain, but it may safely be assumed that at least some of them were in use before the final system was formulated at Yavneh” (p. 481).

These few examples may indicate how much work has been put into the revision of this chapter. The whole chapter has been cleared of its dogmatic bias — much that was impossible even to revise has rightly been omitted (cf. pp. 548-50) — and now appears in sober language and with an impartiality that has in addition not
succumbed to the (obvious) temptation to substitute apologetic bias for dogmatic prejudice.

On the other hand, §25 ("Torah Scholarship") could have benefited from somewhat more revision, particularly the chapter on halakha and haggadah (pp. 337 ff.). Although much more could now be said on these points, the paragraph on ma'aseh bereshit and ma'aseh merkavah (p. 353) follows the German original almost word for word. A certain amount of bibliographical information is included in connection with the important problem of oral tradition (p. 322), but nothing is given in the text. (The few references in the chapter on the Pharisees and Sadducees are insufficient.) The division of haggadah, taken over from Schürer, into "historical midrash" (pp. 353 ff.) and "reworking of the moral-doctrinal content of Scripture" (pp. 352 ff.) certainly derives rather from dogmatic premises than from criteria relating to content or even form. One would have wished for a really thorough-going revision of the entire chapter, which should also have broken away from the lay-out of the original.

Having regard, however, to the achievement as a whole, these remarks are of very little consequence. There is no doubt at all that the revisers have succeeded in maintaining the high standard of Volume I and anyone working on the epoch of inter-Testamental and rabbinic Judaism (students as well as teachers) can only hope that the concluding third volume will follow as soon as possible.

Martin Buber Institut für Judaistik
der Universität zu Köln

Peter Schäfer


The book is a revision of a doctoral dissertation prepared under the guidance of Morton Smith at Columbia University. The title is misleading: only two of the seven chapters, less than one fourth of the book, deal with Josephus in Galilee and Rome, and these chapters are by far the least successful part of the work. The first five chapters present a detailed and careful analysis of Josephus' historiography, particularly his use of sources (chapter II), the literary relationship between Vita and Bellum Judaicum (III), and the aims and methods of Bellum and Vita (IV and V). These important chapters amount to a persuasive demonstration that the aim of the book, as indicated by its title, can not be realized.

Cohen correctly wants to examine the opus of Josephus as a whole, and, again correctly, he understands Josephus as a Hellenistic historian who makes full use of the Hellenistic literary and historiographical conventions. "Like all ancient historians, (Josephus) molded his material to suit his own tendentious and literary aims" (p. 47). On the question of the relationship between the Bellum and the Antiquitates, Cohen argues that Antt. represents the order of the original source, whereas Bellum represents the Josephean revision, and this because of Josephus' fondness for thematic construction, which, in contrast to Antt., characterizes the narrative of the Bellum. Cohen does not explain why for the chronological presentation Josephus needed a separate source. He remains captivated by the dogmatic view of earlier source critics that for every line written by an ancient author