
The Hebrew title is more informative than the English: the author's concern lies in the political and legal status of the Jews of Egypt and, in particular, in the political aspirations of the Alexandrian community. This is a hoary problem that only the energetic tackle. Kasher did so in his 1972 doctoral dissertation of which this book is an updated version, and his views have already received some airing both in his articles and in the section on Diaspora Jews written by Applebaum for the Compendia. This extended presentation of Kasher's detailed arguments will prove to the Hebrew-reading public that he has made an interesting and novel contribution to the continuing debate.

Kasher's main thesis is controversial. He argues that Jews in Alexandria were not, and, in general, did not want to be, citizens of the Greek *polis*; that the struggle between Jews and Greeks in the city was solely over the right of the Jewish *politeuma* to remain separate from, and become equal in power to, the Greek *polis*; and that a demand for such institutional equality, and not the desire of individual Jews for full *polis* citizenship, lay behind the frequent Jewish demand for *isopoliteia* both in Alexandria and in other Greek cities of the period.

This is a bold conclusion and is reached after thorough inspection of all the disparate evidence. Each source is examined in turn and at leisure. The accounts of other scholars are weighed and refuted with often forceful logic. Numerous key terms in the literary texts are analysed, with special attention to the use of *isopoliteia* in Josephus and Philo. The methods are scrupulous and deserve, and in many cases achieve, success. Kasher fully establishes the importance of *politeumata* in Greek cities in this period and in the course of the work illumines many other much debated topics such as the significance of the pseudo-ethnica in the papyri and the authenticity of Josephus' version of Claudius' edict. His argument for separate Jewish military units in the early Ptolemaic period may now be supported by a demotic exorcism text from North Saqqara (J. D. Ray, *Enchoria* 1978, p. 29).

But the main thesis, for all its subtlety, fails to convince. There is some, even if admittedly only scanty, evidence that at least some Jews had citizenship in the *polis* and it is clear that such Jews did not agree with Kasher's view that membership of the Jewish *politeuma* could be considered as prestigious as membership of the *polis*. These exceptions cannot be explained away by talk of 'extreme circles'—if Kasher was right, the extremists would have no incentive to be extreme. Kasher pushes his argument further than it can safely go, and he does so only because of the need to counter firmly entrenched assumptions. It would be more balanced, and fairer to the evidence, to allow both *politeuma* rights and *polis* citizenship to be at issue in the Roman period. Kasher's analysis is sufficiently cogent to show that the former was often important, not that the latter never was.

The exaggerated polemic and the straining for originality presumably come from the origin of this work as a thesis, which also explains the laborious and not very helpful wade through the papyrological evidence for the Jewish communities of the Egyptian *chora*. Similarly, the desire for completeness is responsible for the rather naive glance at the Talmudic evidence. One also suspects that less space would have been devoted to demonstration of some of the familiar problems (e.g. Chapter 5 on the term 'Alexandrian') if work on the book had commenced after Smallwood's and
Fraser's publications—Kasher has brought bibliography and argument up to date but is not prepared to rely on the work of others to shorten his lengthy text.

Perhaps this hardly matters very much, for this work is, after all, designed for Hebrew readers who would otherwise be prone to rely on Tcherikover, and for them this book will provide an excellent corrective to earlier studies. And Kasher has made a considerable contribution for all scholars in challenging widespread assumptions by pointing out how little evidence there really is for Jews wanting to participate in the politics of the gentile polis.

MARTIN GOODMAN


This is a translation of Hengel's Juden, Griechen und Barbaren, 1976, which was itself an enlarged version of two articles that will appear in English in the Cambridge History of Judaism. After the two volumes of Judaism and Hellenism, little new was to be expected here. Nonetheless, the appearance of the book in English is very welcome for a number of reasons: it is extremely readable, it is sufficiently brief not to put off students overawed by the weight of learning in the larger work, and it is, as one would expect, conscientious in stressing the limitations of the evidence while using what is available to the full.

The opening chapters provide an excellent detailed account of the political history of Palestine from 333 to 187 B.C. Social and economic aspects are discussed in each phase in connection with shifts in political authority. The second part deals with the problem of the Hellenization of Judaism in all its different spheres and, again, Hengel describes clearly the difficulties inherent in his investigation before going on to outline arguments familiar from his earlier work. Finally, a comparison is made with the culture of the Diaspora and especially the Egyptian Jewish community before attention returns to Palestine and the basic assertion that 'we may term Judaism of the Hellenistic Roman period, both in the home country and the Diaspora, 'Hellenistic Judaism'.' (pp. 125-6).

This book, then, will be most useful and much used. Detail is included, but only when it serves a purpose; for the rest, the careful brevity is never misleading and the omission of extensive discussion of particular theological motifs is probably an advantage. Objections to the main thesis proposed are the same as those to Judaism and Hellenism (see F. Millar in JJS 1978) and the tendency to cull material from disparate periods is found as much here as there. But the value of this work, like that of the greater opus, is beyond doubt, and the clarity of the arguments put forward and the extensive footnotes will enable students to evaluate Hengel's important thesis for themselves. The author calls this 'no more than . . . an introduction' to 'prompt further study'. As such, it could hardly be bettered.

MARTIN GOODMAN