textual variants, and in offering exhaustive entries for some words, such as ἀγαθός 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 Beleh rung" 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
the fact that in the Bellum Josephus is operating largely as an observer of political and social events, many of which he describes in political and social terms.

The picture presented here of a Josephus preoccupied with "Heilsgeschichtliche Theologie" is patently a product of Protestant theology. It is not likely to win wide acceptance. None the less, Lindner's analysis of Josephus's use of a few of the relevant concepts, such as τοῦχη and εἰμορμείη are painstaking and sometimes interesting and can be recommended.

Wolfson College, TESSA RAJAK
Oxford


The series Wege der Forschung, which now contains approaching 500 titles, sets out to present in each volume, through the medium of a selection of learned articles, a particular scholarly topic which for some time has been a centre of discussion and controversy. German readers are its principal beneficiaries, since all the articles are translated into German. In this volume, a little less than half the pieces were originally composed in a language other than German. At the same time, this Josephus collection has interest for others too, for its editor is a venerable scholar in the field. It has a pleasant introduction, which gives some of the reasons for the enduring importance of Josephus; as a presentation of the actual problems surrounding the author, this is perhaps less stimulating, however, than an earlier competitor—the essay "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Josephusforschung" which opens Michel and Bauernfeind's German translation. Here there is also an eighteen page bibliography, usefully arranged by topics, but no index.

It seems a pity that the book's theme is "Josephus-Forschung" rather than "Josephus". Schalit's desire to give a balanced picture of bygone research has led him to one or two strange decisions, in particular to the inclusion of two extracts from the works of Hugo Willrich. The editor explains that he wishes them to serve as a warning of the sterility of research when it is dominated by inordinate scepticism and a hatred of its subject. But the reader could spend his time better than in the contemplation of a memento mori. Schalit also seems to have striven, in deference to his title, to include at least one representative piece from every decade in our century.

It is, however, pre-war material which predominates (ten out of fourteen). And two more articles are pre-1955. The responsibility for this situation cannot be laid entirely at Schalit's door. He tells us, for example, that his search for a discussion which linked Qumran with Josephus forced him back to 1953 against his will. And in fact, the article in question, by Grintz, is more about the identification of the Qumran sect than about Josephus. Some of the other good material in the book has a similar relation to the main topic: I am thinking particularly of Elias Bickerman's two studies on specific Hellenistic documents in Josephus, which are a product of that scholar's interest in Hellenistic institutional history. Conversely, when it comes to an indispensable subject like Josephus as a Greek writer, we have to make do with a curious and rather unsatisfactory piece written by P. Collomp in 1947. And then we have three extracts from the books of Laqueur and Thackeray, now dated, but not superseded.