as well. Doubtless some Palestinian Jews shared Herod’s and Philo’s enthusiasm for watching athletics. The rabbinic strictures against attendance imply the existence of Jews who disobeyed.

Some rabbinic passages support Harris’s more general conclusions. In the Mekhilta of R. Shimon b. Yohai Beshallah 52:14 some rabbis appear to know details of Gentile chariot racing (though this does not show they attended). Lieberman demonstrated that mShab. 22:6 shows Jews wrestling and taking emetics to help their athletic prowess, and that the rabbis do not disapprove. tShab 5:11 concerns Jews treating running as a serious pastime. However, these small signs of interest in keeping fit do not add up to a passion for athletics like that of contemporary Greeks.

Some other small points should be noted. The ban on Gentile oil appears not only in Josephus but in rabbinic texts passim (p.75). The explanation of the ‘menorah’ from the Priene gymnasium contains more ingenuity than plausibility. The nine-branched figure does not look much like a menorah, nor does quoting a five branched example from elsewhere help. The gymnasium was built in the second century B.C. whereas the menorah only became a common Jewish symbol in the second century A.D. — three centuries in which a graffitist innocent of Jews might draw a branch of a tree on a gymnasium wall. The appendix on Jews using Gentile names contains no new ideas apart from an unconvincing fanciful attempt to suggest the origin of the name of Peter.

Despite such faults this is an interesting book. The light that it sheds on Philo is considerable and unexpected, and the challenge to a long cherished misconception is welcome.

Trinity College, Oxford

M. D. GOODMAN


The emphasis in the title of this book must be taken as falling on ‘Roman Rule’. Its subject is essentially the political relations, as expressed in public contact, between the Jews and their Roman masters. It is a natural sequel to the author’s valuable commentary on Philo’s Legatio ad Gaium and her articles on the behaviour of different Roman Emperors towards the Jews. Its strength lies in its thorough and meticulous accounts of specific incidents, with searching and cautious analyses of the available evidence on the Graeco-Roman side (for example the complete account of the career of that rather neglected figure Agrippa I). Its coverage too is impressive, from the beginning of the Hasmonaeans, who come in as introduction, to the eve of the Christianization of the Roman Empire; and there is no scholarly work which collects together the material on the Diaspora for the last two hundred years or so of the period.

Miss Smallwood’s presentation of events is lucid and readable, but her explanations appear sometimes to be inadequate. Thus the Judaean troubles of 6–66 are briskly accounted for by the existence of a belligerent nationalist party, which objected, in the first instance, to Roman taxation. But the deep problem of why Persian, Ptolemaic and for some time even Seleucid rule had apparently been acceptable is not even hinted at. Nor is it easy to see how the story can be intelligibly told without investigation of the internal developments within Judaism which led to the emergence of the “Fourth Philosophy” and of the Zealot “movement”, though it is the author’s conscious decision to do just that. This narrowness of approach vitiates even her treatment of her own chosen area throughout the book. Thus, she needs to employ Jewish sources,
albeit peripherally, yet there is no discussion anywhere of their character or historical value. Nor is there any independent attempt to interpret those problems which revolve around Jewish institutions or responses, such as the role of the pre-70 Sanhedrin (s): we are simply referred to the basic modern discussions, excluding those in Hebrew. What is central to Judaism per se has been ignored to a remarkable extent. The entire Mishnah is given a small paragraph of text, in which we are just told that Judah reduced the “Jewish oral Law to writing for the first time” (without reference to alternative views of the process), and that the endeavour testifies to the stability of Palestine during the period (p.499). It is telling that there are no index entries for Tosefta, Halakhah or Talmud. The author’s self-imposed limitations impair her customary accuracy, as when she fails to realize that qorban means the sacrifice itself and not the “consecrated Temple funds” (p.162, n.65).

That such an error stands out is in fact a tribute to the book’s high standard. And generally, as the writer of a certain type of political history, Miss Smallwood could hardly be bettered. But the pity is that so much skill and labour have been expended on Hamlet without the Prince.

Department of Classics,
University of Reading

TESSA RAJAK


The Josephus Concordance of Rengstorf (with Bernhard Justus, Heinz Schreckenberg and others) has not got well beyond the point where the earlier Thackeray-Marcus endeavour stops. The second volume maintains the extraordinarily high standard of completeness, and of visual clarity and elegance set by the first. (See my review in JJS XXV, 2, 1974, 326–7.) For the theologian or Orientalist or student of Judaica the Lexicon, used in conjunction with the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament and Hatch and Redpath’s Septuagint Concordance is an instrument of infinite utility — and this is the volume which contains theos, hieros and eusebeia. At the same time, there is every reason to hope that the existence of a Josephus Lexicon will give new impetus to an area of Classical study where many problems remain — that of the Greek used in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The origins, function and scope of the koine, and of Atticism, and their interrelationships are still far from clear.

Sadly, my previous, perhaps ungrateful, cavils about method and presentation persist. It is presumably too late, since the third volume is said to be near publication, and the fourth exists in draft, to urge the editor to alter his policy of giving undifferentiated lists of instances, instead of organizing complex entries into categories of sense and usage. To learn that theos is used by Josephus of the Roman Emperor is of great interest; but everything depends on the contexts, which are to be found somewhere in the fifteen page entry for the word — but where?

Instead, for words other than particles, conjunctions etc., the possible range of senses and nuances is given at the beginning of the entry, accompanied by the odd reference. But the user must tread warily: these are not to be taken as straight translations, for the rendering is adapted to specific contexts, and sometimes mistakenly at that. Does erêmôsis really mean “profanation” and not “desolation” when used in the retelling of Daniel (AJ XII, 322)? Thackeray may have used translator’s license in rendering (at AJ XIX, 93) the epicheomenē which is applied to