
Although Feldman's judgment on the views of his predecessors may itself quite often require critical evaluation, there is no doubt that his unusual achievement in collecting, sifting, classifying and clarifying thousands and thousands of major and minor contributions to the study of the most important Jewish writer of the inter-
Testamental age is an unparalleled aid for the promotion of future scholarly research on Josephus.

Consultation is further facilitated by numerous indices (references to Josephus, to ancient literatures, lists of Greek, Latin, Hebrew and Aramaic words and modern authors).
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These are papers delivered mainly by Israeli scholars at a conference held in March 1981, which was ostensibly concerned with Josephus as historian of the land of Israel. The volume is an important one, which advances our understanding of the author in various directions even though its contents are heterogeneous and not all reach the same high standard. The study of Josephus thrives in Israeli universities, as is only to be expected, and it is good to see some of the results here.

The contributions fall into a number of categories. (1) The reassessment of Josephus from a particular angle, notably M. Stern on his attitude to the Roman empire (reminding us that this "Römling" never claimed Roman rule to be for the good of the subjects), and Lea Roth Gerson on the writer as a Roman Jew, contributing to our scarce knowledge of the history of the Diaspora of his day. (2) New arguments on old problems, such as the editor's presentation of the rebel John of Gischala as a moderate (like Josephus) but one who chose a different direction, and Yaron Dan's reconstruction, the latest in a line, of the position of another moderate, Justus of Tiberias, a figure still more ambiguous and more Josephan. Daniel R. Schwartz revives the claim that Philo on the episode of Pilate and the shields and Josephus on the standards fracas are recounting one and the same incident, and M. Broshi adds his voice to those who sensibly consider the Flavian emperors' war memoirs to have been a principal source of Josephus' topography. (3) Archaeology and topography are brought to bear on Josephus' text by B. Mazar, S. Applebaum and, notably, A. Raban, who draws on the first results of the maritime excavations in the ancient harbours at Caesarea to argue that Josephus' description was not overdrawn. This is not the only piece from which the historian emerges with
added credit (though Gideon Fuks's analysis of a passage in AJ XIV has the opposite effect). (4) Halakah is brought into the picture with especial effect in a wide-ranging piece on divorce by M. Rabello, suggesting Josephus to have been respectably Pharisaic in his marital behaviour. (5) On the Josephus tradition, the substantial contribution is R. Fishman-Duker's showing that the Byzantine chroniclers did not merely ape the Church Fathers in their use of Josephus.

The concluding bibliography of Josephus, 1976-81, by M. Mor and U. Rappaport reveals both how much is being done and also how much there is still to do, in tying together the disparate threads. And this volume as a whole should serve as a stimulus not only to further detailed study but to a deeper synthesis.
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MARTIN GOODMAN, State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132-212, Totowa, N.J., 1983. 305 pp. $34.50 (Obtainable in the U.K. from Costello, 43 High Street, Tunbridge Wells, at £27.00).

This study, originally a dissertation supervised by F. G. B. Millar and G. Vermes, deals with a clearly defined period (from the Bar Kokhba revolt to the Constitutio Antoniana) in an equally precisely determined geographical region of the Roman Empire (Galilee as—the most important—part of the province of Syria Palaestina). It is in a way a continuation of S. Freyne's Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian (1980), but is distinguished from that work by a more critical and considered use mainly of the rabbinic sources. In conscious rejection of the customary source mixture, which regards the whole of rabbinic literature as one unit from which one can cite at will, Goodman confines himself exclusively to Tannaitic sources (in the sequence Mishnah, Tosephta, Tannaitic Midrashim). Although it is certain that not all the material, particularly the Tosephta and the Tannaitic Midrashim, can be dated to the period A.D. 132-212, this limitation is nevertheless a wise choice, and in view of the known problems of early rabbinic literature still the best option.

Goodman traces in four sections a detailed picture of Jewish society in Galilee. The first part (Introduction) describes the sources and the methodology of the study, as well as the basic facts of the historical geography of Galilee. It is followed by a second part (Society) concerned with the settlement and population of Galilee, the relationship between Jews and pagans, commerce, and also village culture. The third part (Government and Law) examines the (somewhat limited) range of rabbinic authority in Galilee. The comprehensive section on the patriarchy is especially important (it was not until Rabbi Yehuda ha-Nasi that the patriarch began to establish himself as political leader). Further subjects are local Jewish as well as Roman administration, and finally the conflict resulting from the different administrative and juridical systems. The concluding fourth part sums up the findings.

All in all, the picture emerges of a society in which the peasant element predominated. Rooted in its native traditions, it showed itself to have been little influenced by Greek culture, education and way of life. Moved to the centre of Jewish life through the two wars with Rome, the Galilean peasants allowed themselves to be but little impressed by the religious demands and ideals of rabbis.