

other figures who are mostly absent from Wright's book. I expect that this is because such figures were crucial for the contemporary justification of David's reign, but less so for later groups attempting to "negotiate belonging."

And herein lies the major contribution of Wright's book. Although I remain unpersuaded by Wright's overarching framework for understanding the development of the David story, I expect he is correct about how he fits together several of the later accretions. I see his work not as an alternative to those who ascribe to a genuine historical connection between David and Saul, but as something that can be incorporated into this scheme. Oddly, it strikes me that most of Wright's well-executed study bolsters, rather than undermines, the view that has prevailed in recent decades. Another scholar interested in the apology, Jeremy Hutton, introduced the idea of viewing the biblical text as a palimpsest. Applying this apt analogy here, I would contend that whereas most recent work has emphasized the "original" layer of writing, Wright emphasizes the texts that appropriate the earlier work by overwriting it. He lucidly shows how later groups utilized extant material to negotiate belonging in (primarily) Judah. But if they manipulated David's relationship with Saul and Israel, it seems almost inevitable that there already existed such a relationship to be manipulated. Wright's powerful introductory image supports this. He describes a sculpture on Boston's Beacon Hill commemorating the service of "Americans of African descent" in the Civil War (15–20). By commemorating the acts of valor of these men, the sculpture reminds its audience "that African Americans have what it takes to be citizens" (16). Wright's analysis is perfect—but he neglects the fact that such war commemoration would not make any sense if African Americans had not actually served in the war. By chalking up David's relationship with Israel to later fabrication, Wright composes a book about war commemoration when there was no war to commemorate.

This critique notwithstanding, Wright deserves credit for his excellent analyses of passages in Samuel too often overlooked, and for doing so in a knowledgeable, engaging manner. He has done a service to Hebrew Bible scholarship specifically and Jewish studies more generally by advancing the conversation about David's role in both history and tradition.

Andrew Knapp  
Eerdmans



JUDAISM IN ANTIQUITY AND RABBINICS

Joshua Ezra Burns. *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016. 304 pp.  
doi:10.1017/S0364009416000519

If the only compelling feature of this book were its bibliography, it would be easy to recommend. That it also contains concise and up-to-date descriptions of

the basic contours of the scholarly debates surrounding topics including the “parting of the ways,” “Jewish identity” in the first century, the demographic parameters of Paul’s mission, Matthew’s “Jewishness,” and how to mine tannaïtic literature for history, warrants its place on the bookshelf of anyone who teaches rabbinics, New Testament, or early Christianity. Yet Joshua Burns, while returning to the well-studied parallel development of rabbinic Judaism and apostolic Christianity and their eventual antipathy towards one another, manages to make a compelling new argument for the relative paucity of information about Christianity and Christians in the earliest sources of rabbinic Judaism. In so doing, Burns maps out an intermediate space between those, like Lawrence Schiffman and Jacob Neusner, who argue that Christianity was already largely a non-Jewish phenomenon by roughly the time of destruction of Herod’s temple in 70 CE, and those, like Daniel Boyarin and Annette Yoshiko Reed, who wish to see Judaism and Christianity as poles on a messy spectrum until the heresiology of both camps succeeded in defining the other by the fourth century CE. According to Burns, tannaïtic literature contains few references to Christianity, because though they knew enough about “Jewish-Christianity” in the second and third centuries to dislike it, the early rabbis saw their Jewish-Christian neighbors as one of many misguided yet thoroughly Jewish sects encompassed by the term *minim*. What they did not know was Paul’s thoroughly gentile Christianity, which slowly came to dominate late antiquity; that is what, conversely, the Amoraim talk about when they talk about Jesus.

In order to make this subtle and convincing argument, Burns lays out a comprehensive yet clear project. He begins in chapter 1 by summarizing the history and providing a good critique of the “parting of the ways” model, arguing not only for the continued existence of Jewish Christians into the third century, but for classifying (at least some of) them as Jews. In chapter 2, Burns returns to the discussion of identity, eschewing narrow ethnic or religious definitions, preferring to sketch a history of Jews and Judaism from biblical times to argue for David Goodblatt’s notion, which he terms “Continuity over Change” (77). As someone who has long attempted to teach his students that the terms יהודי, Ἰουδαῖος, and *Judaeus* are all best translated as “Judean,” I found this chapter as challenging as it is compelling. The final section, concerning 2 Maccabees, is especially convincing. Chapter 3 delves into New Testament and early Christian sources, setting up a dichotomy between Paul’s letters to a thoroughly gentile church in contrast to Matthew’s gospel, the Didache, and the Pseudo-Clementine texts as directed towards Jewish-Christians. In this schema these camps are not antagonists but simply separate streams; one camp included the heirs to Jesus’s initial Jewish followers and the other was the product of Paul’s novel notions about faith and works. This is all well and good, though I take issue with Burns’s tendency to see Matthew as a single coherent (if conflicted) work, ignoring the position, based on higher textual criticism (especially the two-source hypothesis), that the First Gospel is multivocal and layered. Chapter 4 turns to Mishnah and Tosefta, to show that the Christianity with which the Tannaim were familiar was that of Matthew’s Jewish gospel, the Didache, and the Pseudo-Clementine texts, and not that which stems from Paul. He writes, “As a function of the broader Tannaïtic

## Book Reviews

discourse on heresy, the targeted indictment of Christians preserved in the Tosefta and subsequent rabbinic texts contribute to a distinct impression of just who the early rabbinic sages thought those people were. The Christians with whom they were acquainted were, in the first place, Jews. In other words, they were active players in the lives of the same Galilean Jewish communities frequented by the sages and their disciples” (207). Here too, Burns demonstrates impressive mastery of the contemporary modes of interpreting Mishnah, Tosefta, and the textual witnesses of both. Finally, in chapter 5, Burns makes his biggest contribution, arguing that the reign of Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus Augustus from 198–217 CE brought economic benefits to the province of Syria and thus to the Jews of Palestine, the office of the *nasi*, and in turn to the rabbis. He performs clever readings of Origen to show that it was in the beginning of the third century that a schism between Jewish and gentile Christianities led to the gradual disappearance of the former, and with it a concomitant reevaluation of Christians and Christianity as gentile Other in the literature of the Amoraim.

In tackling not only history as such, but also “Jewish Memory,” Burns enters a burgeoning mode of discourse, not unlike the stance of Sarit Kattan Gribetz’s analysis of rabbinic engagement with the Roman calendar in *AJS Review* 40, no. 1 (April 2016), in which she posits and describes a Jewish collective unconscious process of negotiating complex identities. Fascinatingly, Burns does not pretend to complete scholarly detachment, but rather, “write[s] as a Jew committed to [his] religion and the collective welfare of [his] people” (17). Given that the study of earliest Jewish/Christian encounters began within the domain of a particular strain of Protestant supersessionism, this book is a welcome corrective.

Noah B. Bickart  
Yale University



Gregg E. Gardner. *The Origins of Organized Charity in Rabbinic Judaism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 235 pp.  
doi:10.1017/S0364009416000520

The field of “rabbinics” has in the last several decades branched in two directions: the history of ancient Judaism, which endeavors to provide a deeper portrait of people, institutions, and societies that populated the late ancient Jewish world; and the literature and culture of rabbinic Judaism, which attempts to plumb the depths of rabbinic texts to discover ideas or cultural attitudes that are often ignored or mischaracterized by casual readers. A book on organized charity, informed by the former approach, might be expected to consult rabbinic literature as one of several bodies of evidence in order to accurately describe the redistribution of wealth in the ancient Jewish world. Informed by the latter line of attack, the book might rather be expected to draw on modern political, economic, and social theory, while closely reading rabbinic literature, in order to