historical perspective, and to use methods of history of ideas and comparative religion, which he chose not to do. This book, therefore, is a meaningful achievement in the critical presentation of an important Hebrew text, enabling other scholars to proceed, on firm textual ground, in their research concerning the history and development of the story and its relation to Jewish culture as a whole and to the spiritual struggle between Judaism and Christianity which was probably its source and on which it had most impact.

Joseph Dan

1) The presentation of the versions in a synoptic way was done by the use of a special computer program, developed by Dr. Reec. Previously he assisted in the development of the program for P. Schaefer's Synopsis of Hekhalot Literature (Mohr, Tübingen 1981). It seems to me that this is one of the finest examples of using a computer program for textual presentation in Jewish studies.

2) Section 4.8, pp. 54-55.

3) This problem was dealt most clearly by S. Zeitlin (The Legend of the Ten Martyrs, JQR 36 (1945/46), 1-16), who concluded that an understanding of this text as a description of a historical occurrence was impossible, and that it should be understood as a fictional narrative.

4) Section 4.9, pp. 56-57.


This important work is divided into four major sections. The first (pp.15-48) surveys the sources utilized (Rabbinic, classical, Patristic, and archaeological), gives a brief summary of the political and social history of the period covered, discusses methodological problems and geographical terminology, and concludes with a discussion of the state of Judaea following the Bar-Kochba War. A brief appendix deals with the methodology and conclusions of E.R. Goodenough. The second, the main section (pp. 51-203), presents and discusses the evidence of Jewish settlement in each defined geographical area. The third (pp. 207-246) deals with the life and place of the Rabbis in Judaea during the Rabbinic era, their position in public life, the relationship and tensions with their Galilean counterparts, their ties with the Babylonian academies, and their activity in Jerusalem. The fourth section (pp.249-277) is a series of eight bibliographical appendices, each dealing with a group of Rabbis and their ties with Judaea. A map (p. 278) shows the settlements (Jewish, non-Jewish, and of mixed population) mentioned in the text. (The same map

Journal for the Study of Judaism, Vol. XVIII, no. 2
appears on the dust jacket of the book, but here it is misleading.) The remaining pages (pp. 279-319) are given to the bibliography and detailed indices (sources, Jewish and non-Jewish, and a general index covering names of places, people, and subjects).

The significance of this work is in its wide coverage of a variety of different kinds of sources. SCHWARTZ deals with literary sources, of all sorts, judiciously, well aware of the pitfalls that historical geography, with its own particular blend of "philology", can present to the scholar. In addition, the author has made great efforts to present all archaeological finds, both published and unpublished, applicable to his discussion. These very different sources are woven together, in order to provide as complete and up-to-date a picture as possible of the Jewish settlement in Judaea. His work is a significant addition to the recently expanding area of historical geographic studies of Roman-Byzantine Palestine (cf. the comments of D. SPERBER in JSJ 16/2 (1985), pp.279-281).

Here and there one notes some bibliographical lacunae. Thus, in the chapter on the relationships between Judaean Rabbis and their Babylonian counterparts (pp.240-244), the work of Z. M. Dor, The Teachings of Eretz Yisrael in Babylon (Tel-Aviv 1971), is conspicuous by its absence. The discussion of the possible synagogue from the Roman period on Mt. Zion (p.187) does not include the basic work on the subject, by J. Pinkerfeld ("‘David’s Tomb’, Notes on the History of the Building,” L.M. Rabinowitsz Fund for the Exploration of Ancient Synagogues, Bulletin III, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 41-43), or the extensive discussion in Y. Tsafrrir, Zion, Hebrew University diss., Jerusalem 1975, pp. 197-205. The discussions of Kerem Doron (pp.133 et pass.) take no account of Y. Dan’s comment in Tarbiz 41 (1972), p.342 (and that of D. Sperber in Roman Palestine 200-400, The Land, Ramat-Gan 1978, p.20). We also missed reference to S. Lieberman’s Talmudah Shel Kisrin (The Talmud of Caesarea), Jerusalem 1931, which contains pertinent material.

Not always is it clear what are the implications of the sources with which we are presented. What can we really learn from a list of “visits” from the North to the South? Thus, for example, the fact that R. Abbahu, a Caesarean, visited Lod is not very significant on its own (p.268). Obviously such major authorities moved around, just as did R. Abbahu himself when he came from Tiberias to Caesarea. On p.269, R. Hama bar Hanina is probably R. Hanina bar Hama’s son.

A more serious problem is the use of manuscripts. Thus the complex problem of the identification of Biq’at Beit Rimon (p.46 note 24 with full bibliography—discussed by SCHWARTZ himself in Mered Bar-Kochba -Mehkarim Hadashim, Jerusalem 1984, pp.219-220) is further complicated by the fact that Lamentations Rabba 1.16, which mentions a great massacre in this spot during the Hadrianic persecutions—which surely point to its being a Judaean location—only does so in one branch of the manuscripts.