

I noticed misprints on pp. 69, 76 *bis*, 98, 127, 146. The work is provided with a bibliography, indexes to biblical and talmudic references, and a general index.

Benedict T. Viviano, O.P., Aquinas Institute, St. Louis, MO 63108

HERNANDO GUEVARA, *La resistencia judía contra Roma en la época de Jesús* (Meitingen: Guevara, 1981). Pp. xviii + 478. Paper N.P.

The present volume, which has been privately published, is a doctoral dissertation written under the direction of R. Le Déaut at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. The very first paragraph of the introductory section of this book summarizes quite well its main goal, viz., to determine whether the time of Jesus—which is subsequently defined more precisely as the period of administrative division in Palestine (4 B.C.—A.D. 41)—was one of constantly growing hostility and violence toward Rome or rather one of general peace during which genuine efforts were made to achieve a *modus vivendi* with Rome.

A proponent of the latter position, Guevara acknowledges that the former assessment has been by far the established position in scholarly circles and points to the work of M. Hengel (*Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* [AGJU 1; Leiden: Brill, 1961]) as the most thorough and comprehensive example of this line of argumentation. This position is briefly summarized as follows: from A.D. 6 to A.D. 66-70 there was in Palestine a resistance movement against Rome; this movement was characterized by a clear ideology, strict organization, and dynastic leadership; its adherents called themselves "Zealots" and exerted considerable influence on two generations of Jews, providing the nucleus for the growing rebellion against Rome. Joining a growing number of critics, G. argues that the available evidence does not support the acceptance of such a continuous and monolithic resistance movement during this period.

Guevara's own work is divided into three major parts. Part I is devoted entirely to the works of Josephus, which represent, of course, the main source of information for the period in question. A first chapter deals with the question of Jewish resistance against Rome in the periods prior to (63 B.C.—4 B.C.) and after (A.D. 41—A.D. 66-70) the designated time of Jesus. The second chapter addresses the same issue with regard to this latter period (4 B.C.—A.D. 41). The third and final chapter examines the nomenclature used by Josephus to refer to Jewish rebels against Rome throughout and within each of these three historical periods.

Part II turns to evidence from sources other than Josephus, e.g., Philo, Tacitus, the targumic and rabbinical literature, the apocalyptic literature, and the NT. Part III begins with an examination of the religious, political, and socio-economic conditions prevalent in Palestine during the time of Jesus. A concluding section shows how the positions adopted in the course of this study directly affect the interpretation of specific passages from the NT.

In my opinion, the section on Josephus constitutes the best part of this work. On the one hand, G. shows in the first two chapters that, in direct contrast with the

immediately preceding and following periods, the time of administrative division in Palestine was a rather peaceful one in general. Thus, after the uprising that followed the death of Herod and the costly intervention of Quintilius Varus, the only evidence of rebellion against Rome is that of Judas the Galilean in A.D. 6. However, as G. correctly points out, even this rebellion was rather limited and short-lived in nature. Indeed, as he also points out, there is no further mention of armed rebellion or resistance against Rome in the following decades, not even during moments of great tension, such as the incidents of the Roman standards in Jerusalem and the use of Temple funds for the construction of an aqueduct under Pilate (A.D. 26-36) and Gaius' order that a statue of him be set up in the Temple (A.D. 40). At the same time, G. shows very carefully in the third chapter that there is no specific technical term that is consistently used by Josephus to designate rebels against Rome.

In conclusion, I believe that G. is a good and thorough representation of that growing school of thought which questions the continuous existence of a monolithic resistance movement against Rome from A.D. 6 to A.D. 66-70. I would, however, express some reservations with regard to Part III: both the account of conditions in Palestine at this time and the proposed reinterpretation of certain NT passages are too brief and too general to be of any significant value.

Fernando F. Segovia, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53233

DAVID HELLMHOLM, *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse: Formgeschichtliche und texttheoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung. Vol. 1: Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse* (ConB New Testament Series 13/1; Lund: Gleerup, 1980). Pp. 211. Paper. N.P.

The key questions governing this study of the *Visions of Hermas* are the following: If *Hermas* can be called an apocalypse in form and style, yet a "pseudoapocalypse" in content (Vielhauer), then how do apocalyptic form and content relate to each other? And how do form and content relate to *Sitz-im-Leben*? Hellholm's Uppsala dissertation sets out to answer these questions through the application of semiotics to the text of the first four of the five visions (the fifth is really an introduction to the *Mandates* which follow). Thus H. in reality proposes quite an ambitious goal: the integration of "traditional" form criticism with semiotic method.

The first half of this first of a two-volume project gives a very helpful exposition of modern semiotic theory and *Gattungstheorie*. The semiotic models of G. Klaus are explained: the semantic relationship between sign and conceptual image; the sigmatic relationship between sign and object of conceptual image; the pragmatic relationship between sign and people for whom it functions; the syntactic relationship of sign to other signs. Following the work of K. Hempfer, H. stresses the necessity of distinguishing hierarchical structures of abstraction in communication patterns among sender, receiver, and readers. By observation of these functional relationships the *Gattung* of the text (understood as the interaction of genre, an ahistorical constant, with historical variables) is to be determined. Form criticism is seen as already anticipating the purpose of semiotics but with a less rigorously theoretical method,



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.