Tannaitic sources. The continuation of Professor Falk's work is eagerly awaited.
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Even classical writers who knew very little about Jews had some acquaintance with Moses. Both the idealisers of Judaism, like Hecataeus of Abdera, and its detractors, who were more numerous, had a striking tendency to focus their discussions (judging by what remains of them) upon the personality whom they regarded as the sole creator of the peculiar Jewish way of life, as well as the author of that people's sacred books. For Jews, Moses was, of course, the most important single figure in their history. But the figure of Moses evolved by the pagans was invested with greater importance still. It seems that they could only understand, or only describe, a mode of existence which struck them as so antithetical to their own as the invention of a single individual. That individual was in the main a creation of their own imaginations.

The consequence is that this book by Gager is almost a chronicle of pagan authors' attitudes to Judaism—although, of course, some writers, such as Theophrastus, Megasthenes and Clearchus, can only be mentioned in passing, and the excursus of Tacitus is dealt with just insofar as it concerns Moses. The resulting selection is somewhat arbitrary. However, the conspectus of that material which does fall within its purview is thorough and reliable. Each author is treated in turn, and his remarks analysed from the point of view of their subject-matter and their implications. Scholarly controversies are admirably presented, and the important literature—with the exception of works written in Hebrew—referred to. By gathering together a quantity of scattered, and sometimes recondite material, the book fulfils a most useful function. The reaction of Greek and Roman intellectuals to Judaism is a subject which has not been discussed a great deal in recent years. And it is of importance not only in Jewish history but in the cultural history of the classical world.

It is a pity, however, that very few new interpretations either of specific problems or of larger issues are offered. In fact, what Gager has given us is a handbook. Could he have made more of his subject? Undoubtedly, the fact that most of the literary material is fragmentary, and that our knowledge of the history of Diaspora Jewry in the Graeco-Roman period is equally fragmentary, presents formidable problems. Still, two avenues might have been explored. First, to give more point to the examination of extracts about Moses, the relation of those passages to the literary context in which they would have appeared and to the wider outlook of their authors could have been explored. Alternatively, there could have been more about the historical background in each case—place, time, circumstances—together with some attempt to gauge the tension between traditional material, and what might be fresh additions. For example, the first approach would involve consideration of how

1 Such as Yehoshua Gutman's The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature (Jerusalem, 1969), which includes a long discussion of Hecataeus of Abdera on the Jews.
the brief attack on Moses’ secret book by the Roman satirist Juvenal (Satire XIV, 100–4) fits in with the attitudes expressed by the poet towards various other aspects of society. The second approach would see if there is any relation between what Apion the Egyptian wrote about Judaism, and his personal experience in the Alexandrian conflicts between Egyptian–Greeks and Jews, as well as in the Embassy to the Emperor Caligula where he presented various arguments against Judaism. This second method, attaching a text to a historical situation, is comparable to that advocated by Tcherikover for the study of Jewish apologetic literature, only in that case there was the additional, major problem that most of the material was undated. The dangers of circularity and of wild speculation are great when such difficult questions are raised; but the investigation has, at the same time, more possibilities.

At all events, Gager himself does not escape illicit assertions. In his introduction, he writes that “Our study of Moses clearly confirms the observation that anti-Semitism was not the constant companion of the Jews in antiquity.” Yet all he ever demonstrates is that certain authors bestowed qualified praise upon one or two aspects of what they took to be the Jewish way of life. He has not asked what connections existed between that, and the actual behaviour of the intelligentia, let alone ordinary people.

At some points, the book’s lack of historical perspective becomes acute. This is particularly so in the treatment of anything after the second century A.D., when Christianity was widespread. The neo-Platonists, Numenius and Porphyry, the convinced pagan Celsus who disputed with Origen, lived in a world where “Moses and the Prophets”; and their God, were becoming familiar conceptions to most men, just because of Christianity. Philosophically inclined pagans had either to assimilate or to refute the Judaic-Christan view of the world; they could not ignore it. So it was no longer solely, or sometimes no longer at all, a question of the relationship between Jews and pagans. It has not been sufficiently stressed by Gager that the issues are now very different.

It may be worth offering a few detailed criticisms concerning specific authors to whom Gager appears not quite to have done justice. First, writing on Hecataeus of Abdera, he seems to suppose that there existed by Hecataeus’s time such a thing as the standard Greek ethnographical account of a people, an account whose character we know and can use to explain both the form and the content of Hecataeus’ narrative. Such accounts, in Gager’s view, which is very dependent on Trüdinger’s, had a fixed form, consisted of topos, and were full of idealisation. But both early Ionian and Hellenistic ethnography are almost entirely lost. And one of the main pieces of evidence for suppositions about them is precisely the presumed fragments of Hecataeus. It is therefore scarcely remarkable that we find Hecataeus’s excursus on the Jews to bear out the suppositions.

Second, the section on Manetho is far too short to take account of the importance and complexity of the subject. Eduard Meyer’s view that the Egyptian priest Manetho (fourth to third centuries B.C.) did not, in spite of Josephus’ claims, actually refer to the Jews or to the foundation of Jerusalem in his Egyptian history, and that all alleged citations should be ascribed to a pseudo-Manetho, is, as Gager says, far from proven. The arguments badly need to be examined. If the principal Egyptian author to write in Greek did talk about Moses, it matters greatly what he might have said. For Alexandria was the source of nearly all the Moses traditions which spread around the Greek literary world. In this connection, A. Momigliano’s article

3 Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-romischen Ethnographie (Basel, 1918).
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(ignored by Gager)\(^4\) raised some important questions, especially about the possible relationship between material in Manetho, and the anti-Semitic writers Lysimachus and Chaeremon, which have not yet been tackled.

Third, Apion deserves more prominence than Gager has granted him. He was a distinguished scholar, as well as a prominent Alexandrian political leader. Josephus angled his refutation of Greek anti-Semitic writings specifically against the book which Apion had produced over fifty years earlier. All this means that it would be worth devoting some care to reconstructing Apion's work, and to considering with how much seriousness he put forward his calumnies of Moses. But Gager seems, on the whole, to have less time for the anti-Semites than for the philo-Semites.

One general idea, suggested by Gager himself, occurs in this book. He suggests that Jewish Apologetics made a significant contribution to pagan knowledge of Judaism (pp. 78–9). Otherwise, Gager argues, authors like Pompeius Trogus (as epitomised by Justin some centuries later) could never have acquired scraps of Jewish tradition; Trogus, for example, like Josephus and Midrashic sources, ascribes to Moses outstanding physical beauty. But Gager does little more than to state his theory, offering no strong support or defence. In the case of Pompeius Trogus, what is striking is the similarity between the approach of Trogus (or his source) and that ascribed by Josephus to Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod's historian and Trogus's near contemporary. For one of Trogus's beliefs was the Damascus was that Jewish land which was settled by Moses, and this, as Gager himself points out (p. 52) is reminiscent of Nicolaus's assertion that Abraham had been king of Damascus. Might there be some connection between the two accounts? This is worth considering: and it is quite possible that the spread of such traditions has nothing to do with Jewish apologetics.

A prop for Gager's theory appears to be A. D. Nock's idea that the excursus of the historian and geographer Strabo, which tells of the Egyptian origin of the Jews and of Moses's excellent government in Jerusalem, was the creation of a Jew familiar with the ideas of the Roman thinker Posidonius. However, that view was nothing but an unfortunate and unnecessary modification of Nock's basic position—that the excursus came from Posidonius. It is, in fact, extremely improbable that any kind of Jew would diverge so radically from Jewish tradition; the imaginative Hellenistic-Jewish authors of Artapanus's type, whom Gager cites as analogies, tended to add to, or to embroider upon traditional Jewish material, but not to contradict it.\(^5\) And there is nothing in particular in the Strabo passage to suggest the intrusion of Jewish apologetics, unless one finds it impossible to believe that Greek authors could say anything favourable about the Jews.

The matter can be put in a slightly different way. Gager is surprised at the extent of pagan knowledge of and sympathy for Judaism which he has discovered in the course of his work. But, although such glimmerings do exist, what is surprising, and demands comment, is still, surely, the lack of serious response on the part of Graeco-Roman civilisation to a culture which existed for so long in such proximity to it. The curious and apparently widespread use of Moses's name in Greek charms and spells—of which, incidentally, Gager gives a useful account—does not, of course, imply that the utterers understood what the name signified. It took a good few centuries of contact before that shadowy figure Numenius could say (if he did

\(^4\) "Intorno al 'Contro Apione'", Rivista di Filologia, 59, 1931, 485–503.

say it) that Plato was just “Moses talking Attic Greek” (Μωυσῆς Ἄττικῆς). What is more, if he said it, did he really believe it?

Wolfson College, Oxford


It is to be hoped that the appearance of this concordance, which has been twenty years in the making, will stimulate new lines of enquiry in Josephus studies. This first volume will, we are promised, shortly be followed by at least two of the remaining three; already we have the supplement, Schalit’s Namenworterbuch (1968). Since Lexicons to Josephus have, as the introduction to this volume shows, an unfortunate record of failing to reach completion and publication, we should perhaps not count our chickens quite yet, although there is cause for optimism. So far, we have not got to ἐμφιλοχωμέω, where the lexicon begun by Thackeray and continued by Marcus is stuck.

The reader is certainly pampered by what he has so far received. The work is a dictionary as well as a concordance, and both English and German definitions are supplied. The introduction, too, has been translated into more or less intelligible English. There is no stinting of space or of any typographical device to render the volume easy on the eye. Occurrences of all but the most trivial of words are quoted with generous context, and the main textual variants are given throughout, clearly with the intention of making recourse to the text unnecessary. It would be churlish to complain—were it not that the cost of all this is well-nigh £100.

A full assessment of the Concordance can only spring from prolonged use. But at least one grave drawback to the editorial policy is immediately apparent. Under each entry, the citations are simply arranged in the order in which Josephus wrote them. No indication is given as to which meaning of the word in question is illustrated by any quotation. The gain is minimal—Josephus’s usage in a particular work stands ready for instant comparison with that in his other works. But this could anyway quite easily be managed by the reader. The loss, on the other hand, is great: when the user is interested in one special sense of a word, he has to wade through all the citations for that word, reading every one carefully, and sometimes looking it up as well, before he can distinguish the relevant examples. If, say, he wants to know how often Josephus uses the word ἀδελφός in the sense of “comrade” or “fellow”, he has to study twelve closely-packed columns. For βασιλέας there are fourteen pages of three columns each, and although here a few distinctive examples are offered in the course of the initial definitions, the list is still an undifferentiated mass. The problems are compounded where the definition is itself deficient, as occurs in the case of the word δεσπότης: no indication is given that Josephus applies this title on occasion to God (as at AJ II, 270), and this is not apparent from looking at the quotation offered of the above passage; only consultation of the text could show that the quotation is from a prayer.

Thackeray’s lexicon followed the more orthodox, and more convenient arrangement. Indeed, as far as it went, it was an admirable piece of work; and it is hard not to feel that a re-working of the same ground in volume I of the new concordance was unnecessary. The only substantial additions lie in the systematic admission of