say it) that Plato was just "Moses talking Attic Greek" (Μωυσῆς Ἀττικὴς). What is more, if he said it, did he really believe it?

Wolfson College, Tessa Rajak
Oxford


It is to be hoped that the appearance of this concordance, which has been twenty years in the making, will stimulate new lines of enquiry in Josephus studies. This first volume will, we are promised, shortly be followed by at least two of the remaining three; already we have the supplement, Schalit's Namenworterbuch (1968). Since lexicons to Josephus have, as the introduction to this volume shows, an unfortunate record of failing to reach completion and publication, we should perhaps not count our chickens quite yet, although there is cause for optimism. So far, we have not got to ἔμψυχος, where the lexicon begun by Thackeray and continued by Marcus is stuck.

The reader is certainly pampered by what he has so far received. The work is a dictionary as well as a concordance, and both English and German definitions are supplied. The introduction, too, has been translated into more or less intelligible English. There is no stinting of space or of any typographical device to render the volume easy on the eye. Occurrences of all but the most trivial of words are quoted with generous context, and the main textual variants are given throughout, clearly with the intention of making recourse to the text unnecessary. It would be churlish to complain—were it not that the cost of all this is well-nigh £100.

A full assessment of the Concordance can only spring from prolonged use. But at least one grave drawback to the editorial policy is immediately apparent. Under each entry, the citations are simply arranged in the order in which Josephus wrote them. No indication is given as to which meaning of the word in question is illustrated by any quotation. The gain is minimal—Josephus's usage in a particular work stands ready for instant comparison with that in his other works. But this could anyway quite easily be managed by the reader. The loss, on the other hand, is great: when the user is interested in one special sense of a word, he has to wade through all the citations for that word, reading every one carefully, and sometimes looking it up as well, before he can distinguish the relevant examples. If, say, he wants to know how often Josephus uses the word ἀδελφός in the sense of "comrade" or "fellow", he has to study twelve closely-packed columns. For βασιλέας there are fourteen pages of three columns each, and although here a few distinctive examples are offered in the course of the initial definitions, the list is still an undifferentiated mass. The problems are compounded where the definition is itself deficient, as occurs in the case of the word διοίκησις: no indication is given that Josephus applies this title on occasion to God (as at AJ II, 270), and this is not apparent from looking at the quotation offered of the above passage; only consultation of the text could show that the quotation is from a prayer.

Thackeray's lexicon followed the more orthodox, and more convenient arrangement. Indeed, as far as it went, it was an admirable piece of work; and it is hard not to feel that a re-working of the same ground in volume I of the new concordance was unnecessary. The only substantial additions lie in the systematic admission of
textual variants, and in offering exhaustive entries for some words, such as *εἰραθος* and *ἀγω* where Thackeray admitted to being a little less than exhaustive. The editors regard his work as vitiated by that theory of his which apportions the composition of Josephus’s work among at least two assistants (Introduction, xiii). But the only impact of the theory on his lexicon lies in a system of occasional asterisks which it is easy to ignore.

However, there can be no doubt of the immense value that this concordance will have when it is complete. Students of Jewish thought, of the Greek used by Jews, and of Atticism, are some of its obvious beneficiaries. Nor can there be anything but admiration for the labours which have produced this great enterprise, without (apparently) the aid of a computer. A computerised concordance would have been a far clumsier tool for the user.

Wolfson College, Oxford

Tessa Rajak


Lindner’s book has two underlying convictions: the first is that *Quellenforschung* ought not to have been rejected as a tool for the study of Josephus’s works and that it can teach us something about Josephus’s methods and attitudes; the second is that Josephus’s primary aim, in the *Bellum Judaicum*, was to communicate a serious, personal interpretation of the Jewish war, and that that interpretation was essentially a Jewish one. Both these are, in themselves, admirable propositions. It is more difficult to accept the particular way in which Lindner puts them to work.

His source analysis of the *Bellum* (concentrating on parts of book IV), is heavily dependent on that of Wilhelm Weber (1921). Lindner accepts Weber’s thesis that a Flavian account of events in Judaea underlies much of Josephus’s account, and differs mainly in insisting that Josephus adapted this version so as to make his own points through it. Unfortunately, Weber’s hypothesis has no secure evidence behind it, and little plausibility. There are no grounds for supposing that the *commentarii* (war reports) of the Emperors Vespasian and Titus, which are mentioned by Josephus were of such a character that they could have provided him with the substance of his own account. It is sheer perversity to hunt out written sources for a history whose author was himself in a better position than anyone else to observe, understand and record the events which he had to write up. In other words, while some kind of source analysis is useful, up to a point, in the study of Josephus’s *Antiquities*, it is useless for the *Bellum*.

As for Josephus’s own contribution, in Lindner’s eyes what is central to it is the doctrine that God was now on the side of Rome, and had not intended the Jews to succeed in their struggle. Lindner analyses in detail the passages where this doctrine, or material which bears some relation to it—for example Josephus’s prophecy to Vespasian that he would be Emperor—makes its appearance. The trouble is that he invests this “theologisch-heilsgeschichtliche Belehrung” with an importance out of all proportion to that which it occupies in the scheme of Josephus’s work. However we interpret the fact that Josephus presented himself as a sort of prophet to Vespasian—and, certainly, it requires interpretation—it cannot be allowed to obscure