debate seems tied ultimately to power in a society. Where does power reside—with individuals or groups of people, with processes, with institutions or traditional patterns of behaviour? It seems safest to contemplate a mixture, and so a little more emphasis upon this fact would possibly have made S’s book even better than it is.

Of course, one can only contemplate such questions because of the novelty of S’s approach, and I am conscious of personal preference in the preceding paragraphs. S’s is the kind of approach, and the kind of introductory book, which should in fact be welcomed warmly.

Tom Stevenson
University of Auckland.


‘One of the most noticeable activities of Christians,’ Sherman Johnson (whose comment on Lucian is quoted by David Frankfurter at 136) argues, ‘... is the writing of books and exposition of scriptures.’ Canonical biblical literature gave scope for this which was broad, but not so broad that ventures beyond the Old Testament would seem unusual.

The impulse to draw on apocalyptic from the Jewish tradition was central in the early Christian expository project—more central, arguably, than VanderKam and Adler allow in the
Preface to this collection of five substantial essays by themselves, Frankfurter and Theodore A. Bergren. They scarcely needed to posit a paradox over interest in Jewish apocalyptic, in order to justify their claim that Christian appropriation of it has not received enough attention.

Adler in the Introduction argues (21) that Christian apocalyptic was likely to be welcomed in ‘sectarian Christian communities interested in circumventing the orthodox models of institutional authority developing in the second and third centuries AD’. Maybe: and heresiological writings against apocalypses, purporting to ‘expose’ the circumstances of their composition, can be taken as pointing in Adler’s direction; yet such arguments should be tempered by consciousness of how close to the surface expectation of the wrath of God was in all early Christianity. Think of Eusebius quoting Psalm 89 against the leaders of the Church of the generation before the Great Persecution: a hierarch speaking ill of other hierarchs (HE VIII.1.9).

VanderKam contributes a substantial piece (33-101) on the figure of Enoch, built around a summary (33-60) of Christian references to Enoch up to Origen. More briefly (102-128), Bergren discusses the transmission history of 4, 5 and 6 Ezra (= 2 Esdras 3-14, Jewish, AD 90-100; 2 Esdras 1-2, Christian, 2nd/3rd century; 2 Esdras 15-16, Christian, 3rd century): he focuses on ‘textual modifications that appear to betray identifiably “Christian” biases or interests’ (103).

Frankfurter’s ‘The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories’ (129-200) could have borne expansion (perhaps there is still hope): the case for a regional approach is well made at 131-2, but space to flesh out the context might facilitate a more developed synthesis. Adler’s second contribution (201-238), on Daniel’s prophecy of seventy weeks, traces Christian exegesis, or adaptation, of Daniel 9.24-27, down to Eusebius.
This well-conceived book covers important ground and delineates an area of study whose fuller development will be an important element in advancing knowledge of the Christian communities of the first four centuries AD.

Paul McKechnie
University of Auckland


'This edition is intended primarily for students' (v). The format is the usual format of the Aris and Phillips series of Greek and Latin texts; but for those 'who are not yet very familiar with Homer's Greek' (v) forms and some syntax are explained at least at first appearance within each book at the foot of each page of the Greek text (as in P.V. Jones' edition of Odyssey I-II in the series). Few Homeric forms are missed (e.g. ταφών 9,163, ὅρνυμεν 9,353). The explanations are succinct and clear; some are referred to a conspectus of Homeric forms and syntax (30-42). Some Attic forms and syntax are also explained, in the notes and in the conspectus (e.g. in 9,19-22 ὑπέσχετο, ἐκπέρσαντ[α], ἰκέσθαι, ὅλεσα). Students at some levels may want more repetition of explanations, and for some the bibliography might have included Autenrieth and Cunliffe, with appropriate cautions. The conspectus might be more useful still for more flesh on its bones (and perhaps for fewer Attic bones). But these additions to the format of the series are a very welcome encouragement to students (probably the most numerous users of the series) to look at the language more closely. For better and for worse texts are beginning