Hengel insists that all evidence about Jewish opposition to Rome which can be conflated should be conflated, while his critics argue that all evidence that can be distinguished from the Zealots proper should be so distinguished. The problem is that both views are possible and both create equally serious difficulties in the interpretation of particular passages of Josephus, whose account must on any view be reckoned tendentious.

I suspect that any more progress in understanding the significance of Jewish religious ideas in promoting active opposition to Rome will come not from further collation of the Jewish texts, which could hardly surpass Professor Hengel's own achievement, but by developing a more sophisticated model of Roman imperialism in general. It will not do to assert, as does Hengel (pp. xiv–xv), that, since the violence of the Jewish revolt was without parallel in the early empire and the Jewish religion was unique, the former was 'undoubtedly' caused by the latter. The reasons why Syrian and Egyptian peasants did not rebel could be manifold, and it is rash to assume that lack of open unrest signified satisfaction with the existing situation. And in much the same way, the fact that Josephus' term for, the Jewish constitution, theokratia or 'rule of God, could be sharpened into the sense given to it by the Fourth Philosophy provides only a very partial explanation of why, by some, it was.
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This huge volume provides a worthy memorial to one of the greatest figures of Palestinian archaeology and Qumran studies. The contents reflect the wide interests of Yadin himself, and it is only possible here to pick out from the 69 contributions those which may be of particular interest for readers of JJS. In the non-Hebrew section can be found studies on Qumran by Laperrousaz, Lipinski, Ringgren, Schifman and Vermes. Some of the most important articles in the Hebrew section are, or will be, published in English elsewhere, but among those to be found only here are notes by Hershkovitz on a Roman cupping vessel from Masada, by Meshorer on the mints of Ashdod and Ascalon in the late Persian period, by Meshel on the survey of the siege system at Alexandria, by Netzer on the defensive wall built at the last moment by the Jews on Masada, by Patrich and Arubas on a juglet containing a considerable quantity of plant oil which might, they suggest, have derived from balsam, by Foerster on two bronze ornaments from Masada, by Tsafrir on the dating of the Galilean synagogues, and by Kloner on two lead weights of Ben-Kosba's administration from the floor of a hideout near Bet-Govrin.

Worthy of special note is the contribution by Naveh, which, among other things, brings up to date with additions and corrections his corpus of Aramaic and Hebrew inscriptions from ancient synagogues, ten years after the publication of On Stone and Mosaic.
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