



Rivista di Studi Indo-Mediterranei XI (2021)

Plurilingual e-journal of literary, religious, historical studies. website: <http://kharabat.altervista.org/index.html>  
Rivista collegata al Centro di Ricerca in "Filologia e Medievistica Indo-Mediterranea" (FIMIM) Università di Bologna  
cod. ANCE (Cineca-Miur) E213139 ISSN 2279-7025

## Recensioni di Ephraim Nissan

LUKAS BORMANN (ED.), *ABRAHAM'S FAMILY: A NETWORK OF MEANING IN JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, AND ISLAM*. (WISSENSCHAFTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT / WUNT I, 415.) TÜBINGEN: MOHR SIEBECK, 2018. IX+498 PAGES. ISBN 978-3-16-156302-7 (HARD COVER).

The founding characters, members of Abraham's family, in the Abrahamic traditions,<sup>1</sup> are the subject of the 22 chapters that follow the introduction to this bulky volume. Part I is "Abraham's Family in the Old Testament", whose four chapters comprise, e.g., Magnar Kartveit's "Abraham and Joseph in Samaritan Tradition". Part II, "Abraham's Family in Ancient Jewish Literature", begins with treatment in the Book of Jubilees, and with the constructions, found there, of masculinities in the family; then we have a chapter about Qumran biblical exegesis, the sacrifice of Isaac in early Jewish and Christian exegesis, and Philo's<sup>2</sup> treatment of Abraham's family.

<sup>1</sup> As for Abraham in particular, see Jon D[ouglas] Levenson (ed.), *Inheriting Abraham: The Legacy of the Patriarch in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Philo's reception of Abraham is the subject of Maren R. Niehoff and Reinhard Feldmeier (eds.), *Abrahams Aufbruch: Philon von Alexandria, De migratione Abrahami*, (SAPERE, 30), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Missing is how the subject was treated in early rabbinic literature. It is a glaring omission. In contrast, six chapters belong to Part III, “Abraham’s Family in the New Testament”, and three chapters to Part IV, “Abraham’s Family in Early Christian Literature”, but the third of those chapters is about Abraham in Julian the Apostate’s anti-Christian treatise *Contra Galilaeos*, “written in the winter of 363/364” (380): Michaela Durst’s focus is on him, and only “tangentially refer[s] to Celsus” (379), whereas of Porphyry’s *Contra Christianos*, “no fragments survive which deal with Abraham and his family” (378, fn. 6). Julian (unlike Celsus) evaluates positively the Chaldean descent of Abraham, just as Julian views (positively) circumcision as having been borrowed by the Jews from Egypt. According to Julian, Abraham “used the method of divination from shooting stars” (388). “Julian’s main point is that Christianity does not share Abrahamic origins<sup>3</sup> and thus is not legitimized through Judaism” (390).

How unlike the Jewish receptions, the patristic reception of Abraham is,<sup>4</sup> can be seen from Justin Martyr ascribing to Abraham “renunciation of law, tradition, and meaningless rituals” (378, fn. 4), and that typologically, “Christians were identified with Sarah, and Hagar functioned as a wildcard for groups opposing Christianity” (378): “Hagar can be identified with Judaism, but also with *paideia* [Greek education] or heretics” (378).<sup>5</sup>

Bear in mind that an early designation of Muslims is a term that may be analysed in relation to *Hagar*, but also to Muhammad’s migration, the *Hijra*:

This designation appears in Greek as ‘Magaritai’ in a papyrus of 642, and in Syriac as ‘Mahgre’ or ‘Mahgraye’ from as early as the 640s; the corresponding Arabic term is *muhājirūn*. There are two notions involved here. The first, rather lost in the Islamic tradition, is genealogical: the ‘Mahgraye’, as an early Syriac source informs us, are the descendants of Abraham by Hagar. But alongside this ascribed status there is also an attained one which is fully preserved in the Islamic tradition: the *muhājirūn* are those who take part in a *hijra*, an exodus.

In the Islamic tradition the exodus in question is from Mecca to Medina, and its date is identified with the inception of the Arab era in 622. [...]<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> At present the compound *Abrahamic religions* is a descriptor that encompasses Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and should also be applied to Samaritanism, but for good reason is not applied to the Gnosis. In German, there is the compound *Abrahamische Ökumene*. See the book by Hanna Nouri Josua, *Ibrahim, der Gottesfreund: Idee und Abrahamischen Ökumene*, (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie / HUTH, 69), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, and the article by Bernd Schröder, “Abrahamische Ökumene? Modelle der theologischen Zuordnung von christlich-jüdischem und christlich-islamischem Dialog”, in the Mohr Siebeck journal *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 105(4), 2008, pp. 456–487.

<sup>4</sup> As for an even earlier stage of Christianity, consider Paul’s reception of Abraham. See Jeffrey S. Siker, “Abraham, Paul, and the Politics of Christian Identity”, *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 16(1), 2009, pp. 56–70. Also see Benjamin Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4: Paul’s Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*, (WUNT II, 224), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> See in some of the papers in Martin Goodman, George Hendrik van Kooten, and Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten (eds.), *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (Themes in Biblical Narrative, 13), Leiden: Brill, 2010.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from pp. 8–9 (toward the end of Ch. 1, “Judeo-Hagarism”) in Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. Ch. 2, “Hagarism without Judaism”, begins on p. 10 by stating: “The mutual understanding that ‘you can be in my dream if I can be in yours’ may have provided a viable basis for an alliance of Jews and Arabs in the wilderness [I doubt there was such an alliance: there had been a long process of assimilation of the idea of ancestry from Abraham and of adopting forms of monotheism in late antique Arabia. – E.N.]. But when the Jewish messianic fantasy was enacted in the form of an Arab conquest

In the book under review, Part V, “Abraham’s Family in Medieval Jewish Exegesis and in Encounter with Islam”, begins with Reuven Firestone’s “Hagar and Ishmael in Literature and Tradition as a Foreshadow of Their Islamic Personas”, and continues with Mariano Gomez Aranda’s “The Conflict between Jacob and Esau in Medieval Jewish Exegesis: Reinterpreting Narratives”, and two chapters of which one considers an Islamic perspective (Bärbel Beinhauer-Köhler’s “*Maqām Ibrāhīm* and the Sacred Landscape of Mecca According to Ibn Jubayr”), and the other discusses two Syriac texts, “[w]hether these disputations took place or not” (475). This is “Syrians and the Appeal to Abraham in the Early Islamic Times”, by Catalin-Stefan Popa. A long index of sources, a short index of subjects, and an index of modern authors complete this useful, non-exhaustive volume.

*Ephraim Nissan*

MICHAL BAR-ASHER SIEGAL, WOLFGANG GRÜNSTÄUDL, AND MATTHEW THIESSEN (EDS.), *PERCEIVING THE OTHER IN ANCIENT JUDAISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY*. (WISSENSCHAFTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT, 394.) TÜBINGEN: MOHR SIEBECK, 2017. VIII+196 PAGES. ISBN 978-3-16-154962-5 (HARD COVER).

EDUARD IRICINSCHI AND HOLGER M[ICHAEL] ZELLENTIN (EDS.), *HERESY AND IDENTITY IN LATE ANTIQUITY*. (TEXTS AND STUDIES IN ANCIENT JUDAISM, 119.) TÜBINGEN: MOHR SIEBECK, 2008. VIII+407 PAGES. ISBN 978-3-16-149122-1 (HARD COVER).

The 2017 volume under review here, which I supplement by also reviewing a germane book of 2008, comprises 11 chapters. There is no introductory chapter. Albert Baumgarten is concerned with the disciples of John the Baptist. Matthew Thiessen discusses early Christian texts that liken pagans to impure animals. A rather shocking example of this is the Greek, Syrophenician mother who in *Mark* 7:24–30, is initially rejected (“for it is not good to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs”), when she asks for her daughter to be exorcised (20). She humiliates herself when retorting that “even the dogs under the table eat the crumbs of the children”. Nathan Eubank’s paper is about the boundary between insiders and outsiders in Matthew and Paul being permeable. Tobias Nicklas deals with how the Jews are represented in the Gospel of John (which, Nicklas points out on the first page, was praised for this in an infamous Nazi ideological work by Alfred Rosenberg). In the

---

of the Holy Land, political success was in itself likely to prove doctrinally embarrassing. Sooner rather than later, the mixture of Israelite redemption and Ishmaelite genealogy was going to curdle. For inherent in the messianic programme was the question once put to Jesus of Nazareth: ‘Lord, wilt thou now restore the kingdom to Israel?’ Jesus, of course, had been excellently placed to evade the question, and his followers had proceeded to shape a religion around this evasion. But the very success of the Arabs precluded a gradual dissociation from Jewish messianism, and required instead a sharp and immediate break”. But see Guy G. Stroumsa, “Jewish Christianity and Islamic Origins”, in Benham Sadeghi, Asad Q. Ahmed, Adam Silverstein and Robert Hoyland (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Patricia Crone*, Leiden: Brill, 2014, pp. 72–96; and see Guy G. Stroumsa, *The Making of the Abrahamic Religions in Late Antiquity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, paperback 2017.

chapter by Nicklas, his focus is on “how has the unique portrayal of the ‘Jews’ in the Gospel of John as the ‘others’, the representatives of the dangerous, non-believing world outside the community, been interpreted in the (mainly more recent) history of scholarship?” (50). Next, Ch. 5, Wolfgang Grünstäudl’s “Instant Polemics: Use and Reuse of Charges against Others in Early Christianity”, is followed by Patricia Duncan’s “The Case for Tolerance in the Early Christian (Pseudo-Clementine) Novel”.

Then, Katell Berthelot raises the question: “in which way(s) was the Roman ‘other’ perceived as a different ‘other’ than previous enemies of Israel known from Jewish scriptures and from the Second Temple period [...]?” (95). She “argue[s] that the Roman Empire did in fact represent a unique challenge for the Jews due to the similarities in how Romans and Jews each conceived of themselves as a people with a divine calling and a universal mission” (95), all the more problematic for the Jews as the Jews were repeatedly defeated by the Romans. I signal two recent co-authored articles of mine that are relevant for this subject.<sup>7</sup>

In Ch. 8, Isaiah Gafni discusses “various representations of the ‘other’ as reflected in the literature of the two rabbinic communities, that of the Land of Israel and their contemporaries in Babylonia” (111), including even their mutual otherness (more so in the Babylonian claim for primacy). Haim Weiss considers bodily images in rabbinic literature (which views him negatively) of Shimon Bar Kosibah (Bar Kochba, Bar Kokhva), the leader of the revolt of 132–135 C.E. Shimon is arrogant and endowed with a Samson-like, exceptionally strong body: he even hurls back catapult stone-balls he caught with one of his knees (126). Haim Weiss concludes his chapter by mentioning that in May 1982 at Naḥal Hever in the Judean Desert, a military funeral took place, attended by Israel’s prime minister and by the president, in which the remains of some of Bar Kosiba’s warriors, unearthed in 1960 by the archaeologist Yigal Yadin, were “buried exactly as Israeli soldiers” (130). “Bar Kosibah’s physical otherness ceases to be out of the ordinary when it converges with the new Jew, who was created to a large extent in Bar Kosibah’s own image” (130).

In her own chapter, Michal Bar-Asher Siegal’s point of departure is Babylonian Talmud stories of encounters with a sectarian (*min*). She “suggest[s] viewing the Talmudic texts as intellectual exercises in which the rabbis ask: if we were to participate in this larger conversation, how would we respond?” (133). An example she develops is readings of *Micah* 7:4, which as rendered in the Septuagint mentions a moth larva, unlike in the Masoretic Hebrew text (but a moth appears e.g. in *Isaiah* 50:9 and 51:8). In Second Temple literature, late antique rabbinic sources, Christian sources, and Persian Pahlavi literature one finds the idea of storing treasures of good deeds in heaven. Bar-Asher Siegal proposes to read the passage in the Babylonian Talmud at *Eruvin* 101a “in light of the Septuagint’s version of the Micah verse and the moth imagery in the famous passages in Matthew and Luke” (143). I am not so sure. At any rate, the passage is about the word that rabbinic tradition interprets as

---

<sup>7</sup> Ephraim Nissan, Arduino Maiuri and Felice Vinci, “Reflected in Heaven: Biblical and Roman Evidence for a Motif, Shared in Antiquity, about material Features of the Metropolis of the Chosen People Being Reflected in a Constellation in Heaven. Part One: Cassiopeia in *Isaiah* 49:16; the Heavenly Jerusalem; the μένουσα πόλις of *Hebrews*; and Andromeda, Onoskelis, Persinna, and the Rabbinic Sages”, *MHNE* [mene]: revista internacional de investigación sobre magia y astrología antiguas [Málaga], 18 (2018 [2020]), pp. 121–206; and “Reflected in Heaven, Part Two: (a) Ovid’s Evidence for a Motif, Shared by Rome and Jerusalem, of Material Features of the Metropolis of the Respective People Being Reflected in a Constellation in Heaven; (b) the Belief that Features of the Face of the Moon Are a Mirrored Reflection of the Contour of Earth’s Continents; (c) Divinatory Livers”, *ibid.*, 19 (2019 [2020]), pp. 87–166.

“brier”, and Christians understood to mean “moth”; she claims (144–145) that the passage is intended to retort to that other reading, and to expand punningly upon the word, so that (which it does) it would damn the infidels to Gehenna.

The last chapter in the 2017 volume (which is concluded by useful indices) is by Christine Hayes, and is concerned with non-Jews in classical rabbinic sources. “This pluriform other is different from, but not the fixed polar opposite of, the Israelite Jew” (147).

Let us turn now to an older, thematically akin volume from a different series of the same publisher. *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* begins with a chapter by its editors, Eduard Iricinschi and Holger Zellentin: “Making Selves and Marking Others: Identity and late Antique Heresiologies”. Then, Karen King considers the social and theological effects of heresiological discourse; William Arnal discusses the Pauline *Ecclēsiai* being self-constructed, and the boundaries of urban identities; and next, Averil Cameron is the author of the methodological “The Violence of Orthodoxy” (not only towards Christian heretics, but also towards Jews, for which, see her 2002 paper “Blaming the Jews: The Seventh Century Invasions of Palestine in Context”, in *Travaux et Mémoires*, 14 = *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, pp. 57–78). Averil Cameron’s chapter is followed by a chapter by Yannis Papadoyannakis on how orthodoxy is defined in Pseudo-Justin’s *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* – a collection of 161 questions and answers, in the longer recension – and then by the chapter “Citizens and Heretics: Late Roman Lawyers in Christian Heresy” by Caroline Humfress. Richard Lim’s chapter “examine[s] the uses of the *nomen Manichaeorum* [who is a Manichaean?] in Late Antiquity” (142). Next is Kevin Lee Osterloch’s chapter on the Judean (Palestinian-Jewish) society and communal identity in relation to Rome and the Hellenistic *Oikoumenē* in the second century B.C.E.

What is particularly striking about the emergence of Judea and Rome as active interlocutors within the shared, peer-polity discourse of the *Oikoumenē* is that it served to radically expand the cultural borders of the Hellenistic World through the inclusion of communities that, despite their newfound cultural parity, still insisted on a certain innovative non-Greekness, which set them slightly apart; Aeneas was Trojan, not Greek; the Spartans and Judeans were kinsmen, but through the Judean patriarch Abraham. Rome and Judea created legitimate cultural space within the Hellenistic World on their own terms [...]

(203)

In a sense, Osterloch’s chapter of 2008 can be usefully read along with Berthelot’s chapter of 2017, and Nicklas’ 2017 chapter on the anti-Jewish animus in the Gospel of John can be read alongside John Gager’s 2008 chapter “Where does Luke’s Anti-Judaism Come From?” After Gager’s chapter, Philippa Townsend asks: “Who Were the First Christians?”, whereas, next, in “The Social History of Satan, Part III”, Elaine Pagels contrasts the visions of the community of the believers as entertained by John and Patmos and Ignatius of Antioch. Next, Eduard Iricinschi’s “If You Got It, Flaunt It: Religious Advertising in the *Gospel of Philip*” was followed, in the 2008 volume, by a chapter on narrativised heresiological polemics in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*. Burton Visotzky was concerned with rabbinic anti-Gentile polemic in the Jerusalem Talmud, at *Berakhot* 9:1, and Gregg Gardner analysed a passage in the Babylonian Talmud (i.e., in the *Bavli*), in tractate *Shabbat*, folio 156, on astrological considerations about the prospects of those born on different weekdays. Holger Zellentin, in his 2008 chapter, “argue[s] that the story of Imma Shalom and the philosopher in *Bavli Shabbat* 116a–b is a nuanced polemic against Christianity, an apology for the Jews’ exile and the Christian rule of Palestine, and, at the same time, a

defence of Babylonian Rabbinic jurisdiction on inheritance” (340). That is quite a lot to be read in a tale about a brother and sister (Imma Shalom is the sister) faking a legal dispute to prove that a judge is corrupt, but in his fn. 1 on p. 339, Zellentin enumerates scholars who between 1876 and 1995 saw there a satirical reaction to the Gospel of Matthew” (338). “A woman bribes a judge with a lamp, but her adversary bribes him with a more valuable item, a donkey” (344), or rather: a colt, or at any rate a juvenile equid. Zellentin recognises that “we find cognates to such anecdotes in Greco-Roman literature” (345), and this advises caution about the intent in earlier versions, I would say. But in the Babylonian Talmud version, right before there is (which is exceedingly rare in the talmudic corpus) a reference to the gospels (see Zellentin’s pp. 346–347), and then the tale itself reverts to that reference in an expansion, so Zellentin and his precursors may have been right, after all. The last chapter in the 2008 volume is by Israel Jacob Yuval, who tentatively interprets some of the better-known daily prayers against the foil of “a rival Christian alternative” (364). This however perhaps was not a response, but rather a correlation, I suggest. All in all, I find the 2017 volume interesting, and usefully read in awareness of the thematically akin volume of 2008.

Ephraim Nissan

UZI LEIBNER AND CATHERINE HESZER (EDS.), *JEWISH ART IN ITS LATE ANTIQUE CONTEXT*. (TEXTS AND STUDIES IN ANCIENT JUDAISM, 163.) TÜBINGEN: MOHR SIEBECK, 2016. IX+381 PAGES. ISBN 978-3-16-154388-3 (HARD COVER).

Apparently, such figurative art that is thematically Jewish only developed in the land of Israel in late antiquity (except some earlier coins, of the Hasmonean dynasty). Contributing disciplines to this volume on late antique and early Byzantine Jewish art are art history, archaeology, ancient Judaism and rabbinics, and patristics and church history. Chapters consider the emergence of Jewish figurative art in the context of political, social, economic, religious and cultural constellation – “At least from the formal, stylistic point of view one may ask whether and to what extent late antique Jewish art constitutes an aspect of Romanization that had analogies in other eastern provinces” (2) – and what we can gather of how these images relate to biblical norm prescribing aniconism (the avoidance of sacred images: *Exodus* 20:4); “from the third and especially from the fourth century C.E. onwards we see the proliferation of figural images of humans and animals in both Jewish and Christian contexts” (1), and adaptations of pagan motifs appear there at a time when pagan cults had become marginal.

“The fact that rabbis [even though they tried to control liturgy] were not synagogue leaders in antiquity must warn against a too close association between rabbinic traditions and synagogue art” (5). Nevertheless, “[s]cholarship on Jewish art in antiquity has come a long way since Erwin Goodenough’s *magnum opus* on Jewish symbols” (6) – the 13 volumes, published in New York by Pantheon Books from 1953 to 1968, of his *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* – and “[s]ubsequent scholars have criticized Goodenough’s categorical distinction between Jewish art and rabbinic Judaism. Rabbis themselves lived in a Graeco-Roman environment and adapted Torah law to contemporary circumstances. In this process Hellenism would have had an impact on various aspects of rabbinic thinking and argumentation” (7).

Various “considerations suggest that rabbinic literature may serve as one possible interpretative basis for some of the images, at least as far as rabbinic Jews’ possible reception of these artworks is concerned” (7).

An introductory essay by the editors traces the development of scholarship on these issues since the 1950s. Part I, “The Development of Jewish Art in the Roman-Byzantine Period”, begins with a chapter by Orit Peleg-Barkat, who states that “[t]he Second Temple period is a formative one for Jewish art” (43), an antecedent for the appearance of motifs elaborated then in later art. Synagogal art was to be a form of self-definition. Lee Levine makes much of the rapprochement of the Jews to Rome in the late imperial period, and he thinks that Jewish art responded to late antique Christian art models. In a chapter on the Bet Alpha Synagogue mosaic, Peter Stewart sees crude imitations of Roman art as also found in other provinces. The fourth and last chapter of Part I is by Rina Talgam, the author of the 2014 Pennsylvania State University Press book *Mosaics of Faith: Floors of Pagans, Jews, Christians, and Muslims in the Holy Land*. Talgam’s chapter considers Jewish and Christian attitudes to figurative art, as does the first chapter of Part IV, by Markus Vinzent, who sees cross-fertilisation.

In Part II, “Synagogue Mosaic Panels”, Zeev Weiss writes about biblical scenes, these being typically on the walls of churches, but on the floor of synagogues. Talgam, in her chapter in Part I, sees a reason for the shift from wall paintings as found in churches, to floor mosaics in synagogues. In Part II, “Synagogue Mosaic Panels”, Uzi Leibner, who recently excavated the synagogue at Wadi Hamam, opines that one of its 12 mosaic floor panels can be understood on the basis of rabbinic Midrash. Roland Deines interprets the Zodiac mosaics in synagogues. Deines sees a link between the tripartite mosaic floors, combining “one or more biblical scenes, a depiction of the zodiac, and the Torah shrine” (155), i.e., the ark, and the tripartite structure of Psalm 19.

Part III, “Symbols and Iconography”, begins with a chapter by Racvhel Hachlili, “Why Did the Menorah and Not the Showbread Table Evolve Into the Most Important Symbol of Judaism?” Hachlili proposes that the candelabrum’s easily recognisable shape, along with its standing for both light and illumination, was the reason. In her chapter in Part III, Catherine Heszer discusses sun symbolism in Hellenistic Jewish literature and in Amoraic (third to fifth century C.E.) Midrashim. Hence, she argues, the sun was represented (and sometimes personified with its chariot) in synagogal art. Karen Stern concludes Part III with a paper on pictorial graffiti, in certain devotional or funerary contexts.

In Part IV, “Jewish and Christian Art”, Markus Vinzent’s chapter “Earliest ‘Christian’ Art is Jewish” is followed by a paper by Sean Leatherbury on mosaics from a church in Transjordan in relation to Psalm 51 (the main penitential psalm in Byzantine Christianity). Robin Jensen is concerned with Christian representations of Daniel’s three companions defying Nebuchadnezzar; she relates this to the problem of the Emperor’s portrait in early Christianity.

If most fourth-century Christians did not regard honoring the imperial image as an instance of idolatry akin to offering prayers or sacrifices to images of the gods, then the iconography of the three youths rebuffing Nebuchadnezzar’s bust portrait is not so obviously a depiction of martyrs refusing adoration to an idol as it might initially appear. It is possible that the image was a commemoration of heroism in the past or even intended to admonish contemporary viewers to resist extending excess honors to emperors (or their portraits). Nevertheless, it is also unlikely that the scene – developed as it was in the era of Christian emperors – was meant to be a clear repudiation of the imperial cult or its substitutionary portraits. Instead, perhaps it was aimed more at

identifying the true subject of Christian adoration in an almost didactic manner. This aim may be evident in the frequent association of the image of the three magi adoring the Christ child with that of the three youths with Nebuchadnezzar [...] The intended juxtaposition of the two sets of three boys (youths / magi) is manifest in the fact that they appear like two sets of triplets. They are identical to one another right down to their matching Persian costumes. Moreover, the link between these two scenes even becomes more emphasized in some instances when the star migrates from the scene of the magi to that of the Hebrew boys [...] (317)

Holger Zellentin's chapter is the last in the volume; it is about rabbinic opposition to imperial imagery. This is an important book, and scholars in the subjects covered will need to read it.

*Ephraim Nissan*