

certain minimalist position therefore runs consistently throughout the two-volume work. This approach emphasizes the perspective of sources rather than our ability to delve "behind" the sources in order to establish historical "events."

Conceptually, Grabbe's most important contribution is to include the Persian period within the same historical continuum as the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Previous scholarship had largely isolated the Persian period from later developments, despite the fact that many formative institutions within Hellenistic and Roman-era Judaism emerged at this time. While one might have desired more depth in the social and ideological analysis of shifts and developments within and between the eras, Grabbe has laid the agenda before us for future thought, discussion, and research.

Indeed, Grabbe's volume is not the final word on the subject, nor does it claim to be. It is, however, an important beginning. By carefully laying out the data and the issues, and by offering a synthesis for dialogue and interaction concerning the historical development of early Judaism, Grabbe has served us well. It is a unique and essential resource for all those with an interest in the subject.

Winamac, IN 46996

JOHN W. WRIGHT

Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992. x + 237 pp. \$24.95.

This publication is a revised version of Hill's Oxford dissertation, written under the direction of E. P. Sanders. It follows a path opened up by W. D. Davies when he questioned the trend locating Paul within a hellenistic cultural mix and argued for his Rabbinic Palestinian background. Davies' student, Sanders, then argued for the vitality of Rabbinic Judaism, exposing the prejudicial picture NT scholarship had painted of it. Now Sanders' student, Hill, argues against the prevalent denigration of Jewish Christianity by NT scholarship. For all three, F. C. Baur and his Hegelian Tübingen "school" serve as the foil against which the argument must be made.

Technically, the book wishes to exegete just one verse of Scripture: Acts 8:1b. In fact, on account of what has been built on this text, much more is involved. The scholarly consensus has been that the seven deacons of Acts 6 were, in reality, the leaders of a Hellenistic Christian community in Jerusalem. When one of them, Stephen, was martyred, those who had opposed him persecuted the other Hellenists, driving them out of Jerusalem, thereby unwittingly accelerating the Gentile mission, which advanced rather easily on account of its more liberal views on circumcision and the ritual law. Meanwhile, the Hebrews, led by the pillar apostles, remained in Jerusalem unmolested on account of their theological conservatism. Consequently, Paul had continuous difficulties with the

Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, who double-crossed him on some occasions (Peter in Antioch and James in Jerusalem) and may have sponsored the opponents Paul faced in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi. According to this reconstruction, at the core of early Christianity was a theological rift.

Thread by thread, very methodically, Hill undoes the canvas on which this historical picture had been painted. The point he particularly wishes to argue against is that the difference between Hellenists and Hebrews was theological, and therefore could serve to identify Christian groups. He is quite effective in demonstrating that Stephen's speech does not exhibit an animus against the law and the temple. Following H. I. Marshall, he thinks the difference may have been only linguistic, with some Hellenists, like Barnabas, being bilingual. About the Hellenists and the Hebrews, he advises that we might do well to follow the example of the author of Acts, who no sooner than he mentioned them forgot about them.

Now that the standard distinction between Hellenism and Judaism has been shown to be flawed, one should not be surprised to find that the differentiation between Jewish and Hellenistic Christianity is just as flawed. Hill has done a great service by mounting the argument that exposes the faulty foundations of the exegesis that had become standard. In place of the old reconstruction he argues that the past was much more complex and therefore our reconstructions must be much more nuanced. He offers an appealing reconstruction of the events referred to in Acts 15 and Galatians 2:1-10, as well as the Antioch incident recounted by Paul in Galatians 2:11-14. This reconstruction of Paul's journey to Jerusalem with the collection, which, according to Hill, held eschatological significance for Paul, is less convincing. Hill points out that in his reconstruction of the event, Baur almost fails to mention the collection (173), but Hill totally overlooks Paul's great expectations for his mission to Spain as soon as he had completed this obligation.

Hill's efforts fall well within the parameters set forth by the work of R. E. Brown, J. D. Crossan, and others who have been engaged precisely in giving greater nuances to our understanding of early Christianity. His book is an argument against an exegesis of either/or, and for a pluralistic early Christianity. Hill's reconstructions, however, while quite effective in proving the old dichotomy as groundless, are less successful in providing the nuances he finds desirable. In part, this may be ascribed to his interest to show that Paul and James were not theologically at odds, even if not in total agreement. Still, he does provide a most important corrective that should inform future work. While the argument about circumcision is one which concerns the conditions under which Gentiles may enter, the argument about table fellowship at Antioch is one important to Jews who wish to continue as members of the Christian community. This book is thus highly recommended as the spark that is sure to start some fires.