

took the Nabataeans some 100 years, well into the last quarter of the first century CE, to control the Wadi Musa flash floods and ensure that the main thoroughfare of their architectural assembly was not devastated every 10 to 20 years.

In sum: the volume is unnecessarily inflated and the treatment of the Semitic inscriptions is unreliable. The advanced Nabataean scholar will find one or other of the comments helpful, but the non-specialist is still advised to go to the original publications of the texts and to look for a historical synthesis elsewhere. As a textbook for students, especially in countries sharing in the Nabataean cultural heritage today, the volume is useless, due to the Late Germanic dialect in which it is written (and whose phonology, to the great irritation of this reader, is also presupposed in the Semitic transliterations).

Ernst Axel Knauf

Universität Bern

Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*, New York: Allen Lane, 2007. 639 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-375-41185-4.

Goodman sets out to show that the clash of civilizations between Jews and Romans should be considered as the background against which the revolts of the Jews occurred. He asks (29): 'Was there anything intrinsic in Jewish and Roman society that made it possible for Jerusalem and Rome to coexist? Were the tensions which had so dramatic an effect in August 70 already apparent in 30 when Jesus preached in Jerusalem and died there on the order of the Roman governor?' Whereas the title is borrowed from Moses Hess' book *Rom und Jerusalem, die letzte Nationalitätsfrage* (published in 1862), the sub-title of the book 'The Clash of Ancient Civilizations' brings to mind S.P. Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations*, a book that has aroused a great deal of debate, polemics and reactions, positive and negative. As far as I can see, Goodman does not refer to this masterful theory at all (since there is no general bibliography, and I could not find a reference to Huntington in the text, I assume that the book is not mentioned).

First and foremost, in order not to do an injustice to Martin Goodman, I would emphasize that the book appears to be meant for popular consumption and for a very wide audience, and not for specialists in the field. This would explain, I believe, the very long basic surveys of history, historiography, law, life-style and other matters that specialists would not need. Moreover, much of the modern bibliography is absent, and readers might get the (wrong) impression that most of the observations and analyses are original, and have not been tackled before Goodman's book. Goodman deals with a great many issues without even mentioning the most necessary bibliography, as if he had invented the whole field anew. Many examples can be given. For instance, his survey of the Maccabees (in particular 53-58), and later of historical writing as a medium for the forming of identity are matters that have been treated very often (in the cases of Eupolemus, Manethon, Jubilees, etc.), but the useful and important discussions of these issues over the last twenty years are altogether ignored by Goodman. An up-to-date bibliography is either missing, or else a minimal one is mentioned. The discussion of the early church and the spread of Christianity is extremely basic (for instance, [513]) '...In 300, Christians were only a small minority in the empire [does Goodman have any statistics concerning this unfounded statement?], and Constantine's conversion was a shock to them and to pagans alike. Nonetheless, there were certainly many more Christians in 300 than in 30CE. It is worth asking why...' In the following pages he again presents a survey beginning with Jesus ('finding the historical truth is not easy'. Really?). He does not refer to the hundreds of scholarly works that have been published in the last twenty years, some of which have asked these questions and given interesting answers. It would be useless to list the works one would have expected to find in such a book, even a popular one. There are also many observations, too many, that to my mind Goodman has not examined

carefully here. For instance, a writer with some awareness of (collective) memory (181ff., although he does not elaborate on the theoretical aspect of the theme), might have given an account of the peoples mentioned by Diodorus Siculus in his first books, that is information about the 'ethne' of the East that was transmitted to Roman awareness by this mid-century BCE author.

Much of what Goodman surveys here concerning social aspects would interest the wider public, and he indeed draws a good, if superficial, picture of the various topics. Some of these chapters (for instance on law and life style) are more suited to a compendium on Jews and Judaism (compared to Roman culture) than to the present book. In the age of the Internet, one can refer the reader to this useful medium for such topics, and give only the most necessary information.

The picture that emerges from the book (i.e. of the two opposite cultures) has always been quite obvious and well-known, certainly to scholars in the field. However, for the general public such an emphasis is perhaps useful. Although Goodman does not mention Huntington he seems to be aware of his grand theory. If he had used it in some depth, he would have profited considerably, in particular by arguing against it. One should ask whether this grand theory of Huntington's is at all valid. The answer is no. Most wars in history were fought between people belonging to the same civilization (according to Huntington's definition of civilization):

A civilization is the broadest cultural entity. Villages, regions, ethnic groups, nationalities, religious groups, all have distinct cultures at different levels of cultural heterogeneity... A civilization is thus the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species. It is defined both by common objective elements, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions, and by the subjective self-identification of people. People have levels of identity: a resident of Rome may define himself with varying degrees of intensity as a Roman, an Italian, a Catholic, a Christian, a European, a westerner. The civilization to which he belongs is the broadest level of identification with which he strongly identifies. Civilizations are the biggest 'we' within which we feel culturally at home as distinguished from all the other 'them' out there (43).

In many instances these wars were initiated by external intervention. Many examples can be adduced: A violent conflict occurred between north and south Israel in biblical times (Babylonian intervention). There were endless wars in the Greek world, to mention only the Peloponnesian war, between Greeks. Quite a number of struggles can be found within the independent Jewish nation during the second and first centuries BCE, bringing about the intervention of Hellenistic powers and then of Rome. Endless wars were waged among the Romans themselves (first century BCE and later; the battle of Actium, mentioned by Goodman, is only one example), England was long divided by inner conflicts, as was Germany during the Reformation (intervention from within). The Dutch in the sixteenth century can also be mentioned (intervention of the Spaniards). So did the two parts of Korea and Vietnam (intervention of the then super-powers). Several causes can be listed for such wars (religious, ideological, economic, personal), but not necessarily a cultural dichotomy (Protestant/ Catholic is not a cultural difference). All this means one thing: the war between Rome and the Jewish people in Palestine (to be distinguished from the enormous Jewish, Greek, and Latin speaking Diaspora that was integrated within the Roman Empire), like the civil wars between the Romans themselves, was basically a war that ensued because the Jews launched revolts against Rome (twice, if the 'Polemos Quietus' is not taken into account). It was a contest over the manifestation of power that from hindsight can perhaps be seen as a clash of cultures. Goodman himself mentions the ancient Germans; he would agree that the Romans fought the Germans not because they represented another culture or 'race'. To judge from Tacitus' observations in his *Germania*, there was a great admiration for Germans in Rome of the first century CE. Wars and clashes between nations are much more complex, and a great deal of economic, personal and political ideological motives are involved, rather than only cultural ones, as Goodman himself shows in his more scholarly works. Cultural differences between nations or larger entities are sometimes easier to bridge than differences that emerge within one and the same nation.

Finally, my impression on reading Goodman's book (and this was perhaps his initial intention) is that the two cultures (i.e. Roman and Jewish) co-existed peacefully for most of the time, showing that the revolts against Rome in Palestine were motivated by *ad hoc* and *ad rem* political, personal and nationalist motives rather than cultural clashes.

By and large, Goodman's book is pre-eminently a survey for the general public. Whereas the maps are clear, the lack of a general bibliography is disturbing and so are the many quotations that disrupt the flow of reading. Also, the work is too long for a general reader and some chapters are superfluous. The discussion on the spread of Christendom has, as far as I can see, nothing to do with the theme of the book, neither does the chapter on anti-Semitism, which really has nothing new to say.

Doron Mendels

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Fergus Millar, *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East (Rome, the Greek World, and the East, Vol. 3)*, H.M. Cotton and G.M. Rogers (eds.), Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006. 516 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-807-85693-2.

Wer nicht das Glück hatte, Fergus Millars (M.) Vorlesungen oder Konferenzen beizuwohnen, kann jetzt durch diesen Sammelband diese Gelegenheit nachholen:

*The Problem of Hellenistic Syria* (3-31). Welche Rolle spielte die griechische Kultur in Syrien während des Hellenismus? Diese Frage bildet den ersten Teil der Untersuchung (3-20). Wie M. hier unterstreicht, war der Einfluss der griechischen Kultur — zumindest in hellenistischer Zeit — begrenzt. Der zweite Teil analysiert die Rolle der nicht griechischen Kultur(en) in der Gegend (20-31) und betont 'the relative scarcity of direct and contemporary evidence for any non-Greek culture (...) in the region (...)’ (29).

*The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation* (32-50) untersucht den Hellenisierungsgrad der phönizischen Städte und geht der Frage nach, inwiefern man von der Durchdringung der phönizischen und griechischen Kulturen sprechen kann.

*Hellenistic History in a Near Eastern Perspective: The Book of Daniel* (51-66). Es handelt sich um eine Studie des Buches Daniel und insbesondere der Struktur sowie der historischen Perspektive des Werkes vom 6. Jh. bis 160 v.Chr. Das Buch Daniels nimmt einen bedeutenden Platz im Judentum und im Christentum ein: der Begriff von jüngstem Gericht erscheint in der jüdischen Literatur zum ersten Mal eindeutig. Obwohl die Schilderung verschiedener Königreiche (von den Neobabyloniern über die Seleukiden bis zu den Ptolemäern) eine große Bedeutung hat, schließt M. lapidar ab: 'For an understanding of Hellenistic history we still depend on Polybius, and on his greatest modern interpreter’.

*The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's 'Judaism and Hellenism'* (67-90). Ziel der Untersuchung besteht darin, die Ergebnisse Hengels (*Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Period I-II*, 1974) zusammenzufassen und aus neuer Perspektive die Ereignisse des 2. Jh. v.Chr., grundlegend für das Judentum, zu untersuchen. Hengel zufolge war die frühe hellenistische Periode 'a significant process of mutual assimilation and comprehension between Judaism and paganism' (68). Ein solcher Prozess wurde, so M., von der makkabäischen Revolution unterbrochen und später während der christlichen Expansion wieder in Gang gesetzt (68). M. hebt schließlich einige grundsätzliche Punkte hervor: 1) die Hellenisierung der jüdischen Gemeinde zwischen dem 3. und 2. Jh. v.Chr. war sehr oberflächlich; 2) ein isolierter Reformversuch des Judentums fand innerhalb der jüdischen Gemeinde statt, dies aber betraf nur 'the high priesthood of Jason' (89); 3) die Krise der Jahre um 160 entsprang aus dem Versuch des Antiochus Epiphanes, das Judentum abzuschaffen; 4) die Beweise einer hellenisierenden Bewegung innerhalb der jüdischen Gemeinde