

influence "in creating a critical, untraditional climate of mind can scarcely be exaggerated" (3:147). Whereas for Knowles, Wyclif is the villain in vol. 2, it is Erasmus rather than Cromwell or Henry VIII who holds the distinction in vol. 3.

Despite the title of the set, these volumes do not comprise a history of the internal development of the religious orders in England. Instead, Knowles paints with large strokes on a broad canvas and provides an overview of the religious orders. Many of the most significant chapters are topical, dealing with the exploitation of land, monastic boroughs, the role of the abbot, the spiritual life of the fourteenth century, vicarages, and monastic libraries. The approach does enable the author to provide a wealth of information about the religious orders in England which is available nowhere else.

Knowles's depiction of Wyclif and Erasmus, and of Henry VIII and Cromwell, can be questioned. But these were the men who criticized and destroyed the world to which he remains attached. Although his sympathies cannot be hidden, he writes with balance and candor and portrays the decline of the religious ideal with the compassion which only a Roman Catholic could bring to this subject. A reading of these volumes makes the Reformation much more comprehensible.

Andrews University

CEDRIC WARD

Rhoads, David M. *Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E.: A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976. viii + 199 pp. Cloth, \$9.95; paperback, \$5.95.

This book appears to be an adaptation of the author's 1973 Duke University dissertation, "Some Jewish Revolutions in Palestine from A.D. 6 to 73 According to Josephus," done under W. D. Davies. Though simplified, the prose and structure of the book are still those of a dissertation, clear but not adding much excitement to the content. The author builds his case step by step and ends each important section with a summary.

After stating his purpose and defining his terms in a brief introduction, Rhoads supplies a concise account of his main source, Josephus. The second chapter describes the historical background of the events dealt with, beginning with Maccabean times. Chap. 3 gives an account of the revolts and resistance against Rome from 6 to 66 C.E. Chap. 4 tells about the parties and other *dramatis personae* of the Jewish War. Chap. 5 attempts to reconstruct the motives for the War. Following the brief concluding chapter there are useful appendices and quite full indices.

The book challenges a number of conventional views, as well as such recent authorities as Martin Hengel. In fact, the author is largely concerned to contradict the line of interpretation put forth by Josephus himself. It is Rhoads's method to take Josephus as his source of facts, but not of interpretations. E.g., on the basis of indications gleaned from his source, Rhoads denies that a revolutionary sect founded in 6 C.E. by Judas the Galilean was ultimately responsible for the revolt of 66-74. He argues that Josephus' use of the word *sicarii* in the prewar period is generic (= brigands), not referring to the wartime sect. Rhoads denies the conventional wisdom that Jewish resistance centered mainly in Galilee. Until the late 40s the Jews tended to accommodate to the Roman occupation, but from that time on increasing corruption and incompetence of the Roman procurators and Jewish aristocracy created intolerable social and economic conditions, which when combined with religious motives led to the war. In spite of cleavage between moderate and radical factions, dividing along class lines, support for the war was popular and widespread, especially after the early retreat of Cestius Gallus raised hopes everywhere in Palestine and Idumaea that victory over the Romans was possible. The war was by no means a cause limited only to an activist minority.

In much of this Rhoads is quite persuasive, but some doubts arise. His argument to show that there was no unbroken line to be drawn between Judas the Galilean and the wartime sect of the Sicarii or other Zealots is visibly strained (see pp. 55-59). He has to rely heavily on an acknowledged argument from silence, and he has to explain away too much adverse evidence, notably the prewar reference to *sicarii*, which he explains as noted above. He seems to dismiss out of hand the testimony of the synoptic gospels to the existence of Zealots in Christ's time (Luke 6:15 and parallels). Perhaps growing a bit unsure of himself on pp. 58-59, Rhoads seems willing to concede that Judas the Galilean may have founded a sect after all, but that it was not active until shortly before the war. One wonders here, Can there be root and flower with no stem in between? One also wonders why Rhoads must constantly grind this ax, relying all too often on unsupported conjectures.

There are other minor annoyances. He repeatedly uses the word "honorific" idiosyncratically for "honorable" (pp. 84, 104n., 161, 166, etc.). He sometimes cites only secondary sources when primary sources are readily available (e.g., p. 46, n. 60). Asher is misspelled "Ashur" on pp. 84-85, nn. 78, 79. In view of the author's consistent tendency toward minimalist conclusions, e.g., about the role of the Essenes/Qumran community, one is startled to read his conjecture that some Christians remained in Jerusalem fighting to the end against the Romans (p. 158). If that were so, why the *Birkath ha-Minim*? Further, the reader sometimes wishes for omitted references.

Rhoads does not limit himself strictly to Josephus as his source; he refers on occasion to the pertinent Roman historians, to Philo, to the NT, to apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and Qumran scrolls, to archaeological data, and to the rabbinic literature. In the case of the rabbinic traditions, at least, Rhoads's use is disappointingly desultory. Since he has consulted Neusner on Johanan b. Zakkai, it is surprising that Rhoads says nothing about the four rabbinic accounts of the siege of Jerusalem and Johanan's escape (bGittin 55b-56b and parallels), which are sometimes tantalizingly reminiscent of Josephus. Josephus, upon surrendering to Vespasian, prophesied that Vespasian would become emperor, and when the prophecy was fulfilled he was released. The rabbinic literature recounts that Johanan escaped from Jerusalem, in a way strangely parallel to Josephus' escape from death by forced suicide, and he too prophesied that Vespasian would become emperor, and when the prophecy was fulfilled he was released and allowed to found the academy at Jamnia. Surely there is more than coincidence here. Has rabbinic tradition conflated Johanan and Josephus? We would be grateful had Rhoads ventured a comment here. Aside from that, there is much else in the rabbinic accounts which could have been fruitfully compared with Josephus. It is a distressing omission.

While this book is obviously not the last word, it certainly moves the discussion forward. Besides that, Rhoads has provided us a very convenient collocation of the relevant passages in Josephus and a provocative history of the great Jewish War and the conditions which led up to it.

Andrews University

ROBERT M. JOHNSTON