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 koinè, 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 erémòsis 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
the fruit that was ejected over the heads of the Roman theatre-goers at the scene of Caligula's assassination as "scattered" rather than "poured", but there is no such license for lexicographers. I have found other examples of this phenomenon. These may seem to be quibbles, but no translations at all would have been far better than unreliable ones. As it is, we are constantly forced back to Liddell and Scott (as well as to Josephus). The presentation was presumably intended to assist the novice; in fact, only an expert is safe with the Concordance.

TESSA RAJAK


In this detailed and comprehensive study of the title Christos in the Johannine literature, Professor Sabugal undertakes a thorough historical, literary, and form-critical examination of the relevant material, and attempts to discover whether Christos denotes exclusively the "Christ of faith", or whether the Johannine traditions about Jesus as Messiah have some historical value. After an analysis of the title as it appears in the Old Testament, the Judaism of the Apocrypha, Qumran, and the Rabbinic writings, Sabugal turns to the use of Christos in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, the Pauline corpus, the letter to the Hebrews, and the Catholic Epistles. After discussion of the relationship between the Synoptic and Johannine views of Christos, he deals with the christology of the Fourth Gospel, and concludes with remarks about the title as it appears in the Johannine Apocalypse, and the Fathers of the Church.

Sabugal begins by stating that, in the post-Exilic period, "Messiah" referred primarily to the ideal Davidic King who was to come as the instrument of eschatological salvation; Messiah soon became an apocalyptic term, equivalent to the cosmic Son of Man who is described in the Parables of Enoch (pp. 26–8; 359), and was identified by the Qumran sect and IV Esdras as Son of God (pp. 31–2; 37, n.53). In Rabbinic Judaism the Messiah appears as a human being with super-human powers derived from his anointing; he is Son of David who is to redeem Israel, replete with wisdom, judgement, and knowledge of secrets, a new Moses, a King, not a priest. (pp. 63–5). Most important, the Messiah takes on the characteristics of the Deutero-Isaianic "Servant of YHWH" (pp. 55–60).

These very traits are evident in the pre-redactional stages of the Fourth Gospel as they stand revealed by Sabugal's analysis. Messiah's Davidic descent, his birth in Bethlehem, his proclamation by Elijah, the religious aspects of his person and mission, bridge the gap between the Jewish and Johannine ideas of Messiah. Indeed, after careful analysis of the text, one can perceive in the Gospel both Jesus' self-awareness of his messianic status, and the Evangelist's development of the title in his polemic against Pharisaic ideas of the Messiah (pp. 128ff.). For the Evangelist — as opposed to Jesus — the title Messiah is defined by expressions like "Lamb of God", which Sabugal understands as a reference to the Servant of YHWH and his expiatory self-sacrifice (pp. 166–7), while at the pre-redactional stage the title was equivalent to "King of Israel", as in Nathanael's confession (John 1:49). Jesus thought of himself as Messiah, particularly as the suffering prophet-Servant with a universal mission (pp. 363ff.), and the Evangelist has interpreted this in the light of Jesus' divine Sonship and his status as incarnate Logos, whose revelatory function is authenticated with signs (pp. 368–9). Sabugal strongly denies any priestly element in the title Christos as John uses it (p.358, n.7). He then notes the connections between the pre-redactional material on Christos