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 τύχη and ἐꞑμορφείνη are painstaking and sometimes interesting and can be recommended.

Wolfson College, Oxford

Tessa Rajak


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.
It is hard to think of strikingly significant material which should have been included and has not been, unless it be monographs such as S. Rappaport's collection of Aggadic parallels to Josephus, whose form made them unsuitable, or else works written before 1900. Where, then, is recent Josephus scholarship? We are left gazing in wonderment at Schreckenberg's large bibliography of Josephus, scarcely daring to ask ourselves whether perhaps the truth of the matter is that modern investigation of the writer has scarcely yet begun.

Wolfson College, Oxford

Tessa Rajak


An Oxford tutor of no little reputation, a critical appreciator of Jews, when he encountered a Jewish undergraduate who showed signs of being ashamed of his own origin, liked to set him an essay with a Jewish theme. One of these themes was, "Why did the Roman Empire fail to find a modus vivendi with the Jews?" This is surely a fundamental question which any book bearing the title of the work under review should endeavour to clarify.

Professor Grant makes it clear from the outset that he is a friend of the Jews, and I think he writes as objectively as he can. This applies particularly to his treatment of early Christianity. Precisely here, not his conclusion but his method of attack impresses the reader with an awareness that he knows his sources and source-criticism, and has thought strenuously and conscientiously. He emphasises the lack of direct reliable knowledge of Jesus of Nazareth as a historical figure, and supports the very convincing hypothesis that the aim of the Synoptic Gospels, written after 70 C.E., was to secure the dissociation of Christianity from Judaism in order to make it acceptable to the Roman world. He attributes to Paul the earliest Christian charge, which had such atrocious and enduring results, of Jewish responsibility for the execution of Jesus; and he makes his personal stand perfectly clear when, at the end of the book, he welcomes Jewish national rebirth in the State of Israel. Professor Grant, indeed, has rendered valuable service by placing early Christian development in both its Jewish and its Roman setting; but one wonders if the survey is not disproportionate to the subject of the work: the paucity of purely Jewish sources on Jesus prior to the second century makes it clear that Christianity attracted little attention among Jews till then, and only became an important issue in the third century.

In his narrative, Professor Grant seeks to ensure an understanding of his theme by preliminary chapters on the initial development of Judaism, and on the Macedonian liberation. Only then does he proceed to describe the relations of the Jewish people with Rome. He makes some keen observations on the political relationship between the Jewish High Priests and the various Roman governors of Judaea down to 70, and on the ideology of the Herodians.

But he is more controversial on other issues. He rejects the parallel between Herod the Great and Quizzing. Since there was no other power to stand up to Rome, Herod, he thinks, had no alternative. Nevertheless he chose to be King of Judaea; no one actually forced the role of Rome's jackal upon him. Herod is always a touchstone for judgment, and it is curious to see the moral acrobatics some historians are prepared to perform in order to exculpate a character whom they