

## Some remarks on Apion<sup>1</sup>

Walter Ameling

Apion ‘distinguished himself among all the opponents of the Jews by the depth of his hatred, and was therefore treated with particular bitterness by Josephus’.<sup>2</sup> This is how Apion is remembered generally — an author whose works are only preserved in a shamble of fragments,<sup>3</sup> and whose fifteen minutes of fame are due only to the openly hostile Flavius Josephus, whose last work is nowadays called *contra Apionem*, although this was not the original title. In this work it was Apion who got the longest and most detailed response to an individual opponent, ‘the most sustained personal invective in the treatise, and the most developed forms of ethnic vituperation’.<sup>4</sup>

Only the last ten years or so saw a somewhat different appreciation of the man and scholar. Apion was called ‘a multi-faceted scholar and a man who devoted his life to various studies’, and was seen as someone who achieved a ‘celebrity justly won by his brilliance’.<sup>5</sup> The reaction was prompt: Apion was rather ‘a scholar gone bad’.<sup>6</sup>

Apion was, first and foremost, a prominent intellectual, a famous figure of Graeco-Roman culture in the first century A.D. — as is attested by authors as different as Seneca and Pliny, Plutarch and Gellius. People might have criticized him, but Gellius

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay started out as an attempt to write about ‘Philon and Apion’; both had lived for some years in Alexandria, might have even met there or might at least have known of each other. Both were intellectually prominent, and at least Philon was also socially prominent. And, of course, their biographies touched at one all-important point — both participated prominently in the respective embassies sent by the Alexandrians and the Jewish community of Alexandria to Gaius in the wake of the pogrom. I wanted to demonstrate, among other matters, how Philo’s works, in *Flaccum* and *Legatio*, reacted specifically to the way Apion portrayed the Jewish people and the incidents in Alexandria. But, alas, time waits for no one, and it certainly did not wait for me. The present subject is perhaps not really suitable for this occasion — but it is nevertheless meant as a δόσις φίλη. St. Holder, Göttingen, was kind enough to show me chapters of her dissertation on intellectuals in Alexandria, including, inter alia, a detailed discussion of Apion, his civil status and personal background, to which I refer for a sometimes different, sometimes similar point of view.

<sup>2</sup> E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. A new English Version, Edinburgh 1987, III 1, 604 (G. Vermes/M. Goodman).

<sup>3</sup> The main collections are *FGrHist* 616 (see also J. Radicke, *FGrHist* IV A, fasc. 7, Leiden 1999, 22-7 no. 1057); M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism I*, Jerusalem 1974, 389-416; S. Neitzel, in: *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, Berlin 1977, 185-328. Most useful is the commentary by J. Barclay, *Against Apion*, Leiden 2007. — ‘F’ or ‘T’ with a number are references to Jacoby’s collection.

<sup>4</sup> Barclay (n. 3), 167.

<sup>5</sup> K. Jones, *JSJ* 36, 2005, 281 n. 7.

<sup>6</sup> The quotation is from the title of C. Damon, in: I. Sluiter – R.M. Rosen (eds.), *Kakos*, Leiden 2008, 335.

still found favourable things to say about him. Apion was not only a man about whom an emperor could joke,<sup>7</sup> but he had taught in Rome under Tiberius,<sup>8</sup> and had made a concert tour of Greece in the times of the emperor Gaius with resounding success.<sup>9</sup> He taught in Rome under Claudius too, but was perhaps already back in Alexandria during the pogrom of the late thirties and took (perhaps) part in it and may even have been one of the instigators: Josephus calls him twice ὀχλαγωγός (c. *Ap.* 2, 3; 135), and this term might hint at a role in instigating the Alexandrian ὄχλος.<sup>10</sup> Josephus uses court-language to describe Apion's work — terms like κατηγορία are prominent:<sup>11</sup> Philon and others certainly believed that they were defendants before Gaius: was Apion's κατηγορία in the Αἰγυπτιακά a reflex of his presentation before the emperor? On the other hand, Philo does not mention him among the culprits in Alexandria, and it was perhaps not even necessary for him to be in Alexandria in person to be elected as an ambassador.<sup>12</sup> Elected he was,<sup>13</sup> as the Jewish community selected Philo to head their embassy to

<sup>7</sup> Tiberius called him *cymbalum mundi* ..., *cum propriae famae tympanum potius videri posset*, Plin. *NH* 25 praef. (T 14).

<sup>8</sup> Suda A 3215 Adler (T 1): ἐπαίδευσε δὲ ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος καὶ Κλαυδίου ἐν Ῥώμῃ.

<sup>9</sup> Sen. *Ep.* 88, 40 (T 7): *Apion grammaticus, qui sub C. Caesare tota circumlocutus est Graecia et in nomen Homeri ab omnibus civitatibus adoptatus* .... Do the last words mean that he was voted honours by the cities or that the cities adopted him?

<sup>10</sup> P.W. van der Horst, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem*, Leuven 2002, 208, quoting L. Cohn, *RE* I 2, 2804. But see note 12.

<sup>11</sup> Starting with 2, 4: κατηγορία ... ὡς ἐν δίκῃ, and ending with 2, 148: ἄλλως τε καὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος (scil. Molon) οὐκ ἀθρόαν ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀπίων ἔταξεν. Some of this belongs to the 'use of the model of legal debate' by Josephus, cf. A. Kasher, in: L.H. Feldman – J.R. Levison (eds.), *Josephus' contra Apionem*, Leiden 1996, 170-1. — c. *Ap.* 2, 32 constitutes another link between Apion and the Alexandrian pogrom.

<sup>12</sup> This is, of course, not completely cogent, because Philo does not name him as an ambassador to Rome either. On the Alexandrian ambassadors see E.M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*, Leiden<sup>2</sup> 1970, 248-49, where she discusses the possibility that another member of the Alexandrian delegation, Isidorus, had received orders to join the delegation while still in Rome: finally, she discards this notion, not on general grounds, but rather on account of her chronology of the embassies to Gaius — which is still very unclear. But since Philo has no objections to name other, high-standing Alexandrians as enemies of the Jews, we might perhaps conclude that the role of Apion was not as important as Josephus imagines.

<sup>13</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 18, 257 (T 6): καὶ ἦν γὰρ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πρεσβέων εἷς Ἀπίων, ὃς πολλὰ εἰς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐβλασφήμησεν ἄλλα τε λέγων καὶ ὡς τῶν Καίσαρος τιμῶν περιορῶεν. — On the Alexandrian people as responsible for embassies, Joseph. *BJ* 2, 490: καὶ δὴ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησιαζόντων περὶ ἧς ἔμελλον ἐκπέμπειν πρεσβείας ἐπὶ Νέρωνα συνερρήσαν μὲν εἰς τὸ ἀμφιθέατρον ἅμα τοῖς Ἑλλησιν συχνοὶ Ἰουδαίων ... This is corroborated by *CPJ* II 150, 11, where an Alexandrian embassy is shown to ask for the re-institution of the Alexandrian council, ἔτι δέ, εἰ δέοιτο πρεσβείαν πρὸς σὲ πέμπειν, αὕτη προχειρίζεται τοὺς ἐπιτηδεῖους, καὶ [μῆτε ἀσε]μνός τις ἐκπορεύσεται [[μῆτε εὐθετός τις]] ... ὧν φεύγη τὴν τῆς πατρίδος ὑπηρεσίαν. But as far as we can see, the Alexandrian people chose carefully, often former gymnasiarchs, A. v. Premerstein, *RE* XII 1, 1140 (who relies mostly on the *Acta Alexandrinorum*).

Rome.<sup>14</sup> Apion certainly fulfilled most of the important social criteria:<sup>15</sup> he was an intellectual, who could speak and write well,<sup>16</sup> and he might have even been known to the emperor or at least to some of his lower charges. His words and his writings must have carried weight — and perhaps it was mostly his social standing and intellectual prominence that made Apion the main object of Josephus' rhetoric. To put it differently: Apion was not necessarily selected as an ambassador because he was a fervent anti-Semite (especially since his Αἰγυπτιακά were probably written only after 40 A.D.), but because he was expected to represent Alexandria efficiently. And this efficiency, to be sure, included denigrating Jews, and especially Alexandrian Jews.

Now, what do we know about the man?<sup>17</sup> His ethnic origins are debated: was he a Greek, an Alexandrian, or an Egyptian? Josephus strongly opted for Egyptian origins (*c. Ap.* 2, 28-32), to slander him and to activate the anti-Egyptian bias of his readerships, both the Graeco-Roman and the Jewish one. This is a trick Josephus shares with Philo, who calls the Jews' foes mostly 'Egyptians', even though they are Alexandrian citizens. Most of Josephus' remarks on Apion as an Egyptian, and a renegade Egyptian at that, can be discounted as mere rhetoric, a play with ethnic labels.<sup>18</sup> Apion was certainly an Alexandrian citizen, perhaps even a Roman one;<sup>19</sup> but was he born an Alexandrian, or

<sup>14</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 18, 259: Φίλων ὁ προεστὼς τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῆς πρεσβείας, ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ἔνδοξος Ἀλεξάνδρου τε τοῦ ἀλαβάρχου ἀδελφὸς ὢν καὶ φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἄπειρος. But perhaps it was just Philon's age that qualified him, cf. D. Kienast, *RE Suppl.* XIII 527: 'Ebenso erscheinen in der Rede des ... Claudius an die Alexandriner die griechischen Gesandten offenbar in der Reihenfolge ihres Lebensalters'. See now R. Bloch, *Jüdische Drehbühnen*, Tübingen 2013, 32 on 'Moses und Philon als Politiker', who detects 'Rückschlüsse auf Philons Selbstverständnis als Delegationsleiter, aber auch auf Philons Verständnis der Moses-Figur'.

<sup>15</sup> As Plutarch says (*in abstracto*), *Mor.* 805 A: αἱ δίκαι τε λείπονται αἱ δημοσίαι καὶ πρεσβεΐαι πρὸς αὐτοκράτορα ἀνδρὸς διαπύρου καὶ θάρσος ἅμα καὶ νοῦν ἔχοντος δεόμεναι. In this particular case, Philon mentions one Isidorus, *Leg.* 355: ὁ πικρὸς συκοφάντης Ἰσίδωρος.

<sup>16</sup> Damon (n. 6), 335 completely misconstrues the case when she writes: 'despite his philological profession he led an embassy to Gaius'. Another one who was chosen as an Alexandrian ambassador (to the emperor Claudius) because he was a known intellectual was Chairemon (*CPJ* II 153).

<sup>17</sup> It is perhaps a bit early to pose this question, but I believe that at least a rough sketch has to be made here. Hopefully, we will know much more in a very short time (A. Benaissa, *ZPE* 186, 2013, 115 n. 10: 'A papyrus copy of an inscription in honour of Apion will be published in P.Oxy. LXXIX and will shed new light on this figure').

<sup>18</sup> See Barclay (n. 3), 182-6. J. Bremmer, in: id. (ed.), *The Pseudo-Clementines*, Leuven 2010, 83: 'Although Josephus strongly suggests an Egyptian origin for Apion, this cannot be true, as it was extremely rare that a native Egyptian acquired Alexandrian citizenship', with reference to H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*, Göttingen 1895, 172.

<sup>19</sup> Roman citizenship would have enhanced his usefulness as a delegate — and I have always wondered about *IGR* I 1082 (F. Kayser, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d'Alexandrie impériale*, Paris 1994, no. 40): Τιβ(έριον) Κλαύδιον Ἀπίωνα τὸν πάντα ἄριστον καὶ φιλοστοργότατον ἀδελφὸν Κλαυδία Φιλορωμαία.

was he made an Alexandrian (as Josephus implies<sup>20</sup>)? And if he was made an Alexandrian citizen — was he originally a citizen of another Polis or was he an Egyptian? Most other writers thought he was a Greek or an Alexandrian,<sup>21</sup> which in itself is not very helpful.

The undisputed facts are ambiguous: Apion's father carried the Greek name Poseidonios, he was born not in Alexandria but in Oasis.<sup>22</sup> In the preserved fragments, Apion mentions Oasis only once, to tell us that it was founded by Samians (F 11), thus putting his home in a Greek context. Politically speaking, Apion was a citizen of Alexandria, culturally speaking, he was a Greek intellectual. But two different arguments may perhaps help Josephus' case that he was, ethnically, an Egyptian.

Apion might have understood the Egyptian language and might have had rudimentary knowledge of hieroglyphics — if we accept an emendation in Ammianus Marcellinus (17, 4, 17), where A. Benaissa reads: *qui autem notarum textus obelisco incisus est veteri, quem videmus in Circo Maximo, Apionis librum secuti interpretatum litteris subiecimus Graecis*.<sup>23</sup> The translation is said to give 'a fairly adequate picture of the original text, and it must undoubtedly have been made by somebody conversant with the fundamental principles of the script and able to read and understand the signs'.<sup>24</sup> He certainly knew single Egyptian words and tried to use them in his own work as a γραμματικός; the most famous example is his explanation of the word 'sabbath' (*c. Ap.*

<sup>20</sup> *c. Ap.* 2, 29: Ἀλεξανδρεὺς δὲ εἶναι καταψευδόμενος; but cf. 2, 32: μισθὸν ἐθελῆσαι παρασχεῖν Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι τῆς δοθείσης αὐτῷ πολιτείας. 69: *Apioni similes Alexandrinorum ... cives*.

<sup>21</sup> Athen. 1, 29 F; Georgios Synkellos p. 69 Mosshammer (T 3 b; Iulius Africanus T 47 Wallraff): οἱ τε ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ... Ἀπίων ... Hieron. *de vir. ill.* 13; Gell. *NA* 7, 8, 1: *Graecus homo*. One might even note the fact that Apion was circumcised only late in life (*c. Ap.* 2, 143; T 9), unusual for an Egyptian. — Only the late and Christian authors, following Josephus, call him an Egyptian: e. g. Suda A 3215 Adler (T 1): Αἰγύπτιος, κατὰ δὲ Ἑλικώνιον Κρής (and since this designation by an unknown author might be a pun on Apion lying as the Cretes do, we get a first taste of the veracity of the designation Αἰγύπτιος, see Damon [n. 6], 355); Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 101, 3 (T 11 b).

<sup>22</sup> Father's name: T 3, which is discredited by Damon (n. 6) 336 n. 3; but Iulius Africanus may have known something like this without recourse to Clement of Alexandria. — *c. Ap.* 2, 28-9 (T 4 a): καὶ τί γε δεῖ θαυμάζειν, εἰ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψεύδεται προγόνων, λέγων αὐτοὺς εἶναι τὸ γένος Αἰγυπτίους; αὐτὸς γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ τούναντιον ἐψεύδετο, καὶ γεγενημένος ἐν Ὀάσει τῆς Αἰγύπτου, πάντων Αἰγυπτίων πρῶτος ὢν, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, τὴν μὲν ἀληθῆ πατρίδα καὶ τὸ γένος ἐξωμόσατο, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς δὲ εἶναι καταψευδόμενος ὁμολογεῖ τὴν μοχθηρίαν τοῦ γένους ...

<sup>23</sup> *quem videmus in Circo, Hermapionis librum* etc. codd., the emendation (?) was proposed by Benaissa (n. 17) 115, who reminds us that already Athanasius Kircher, *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* III, Rom 1654, 250, thought that this translation was by our Apion.

<sup>24</sup> E. Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs in European Tradition*, Princeton<sup>2</sup> 1993, 50 (quoted from Benaissa [n. 17], 114 n. 60); Benaissa refers, too, to B. Lambrecht, *Muséon* 114, 2001, 89 ('une connaissance imparfaite de l'écriture hiéroglyphique').

2, 21 [F 4 b]). It would certainly be rare for a Greek to have learned even rudimentary Egyptian, but not impossible.<sup>25</sup>

What is more important, Pliny tells us that a large part of Egypt venerates the scarab *inter numina*, and then he continues that Apion gave a rather absurd explanation of this, *ad excusandos gentis suae ritus*.<sup>26</sup> It seems clear that Pliny deems Apion an Egyptian — and he had seen him in his youth.<sup>27</sup>

Apion, then, belongs to a group of thoroughly hellenized Egyptian writers that was thoroughly hellenized; they gave hints of their origin only in some subjects of their books. Thoroughly Greek, too, are both nick-names recorded for Apion, πλειστονίκης and μόχθος.<sup>28</sup> The last name was popular enough for a late scholiast to call him simply ὁ Μόχθος without giving his real name.<sup>29</sup>

Apion's first and most popular nick-name, πλειστονίκης, is an agonistic terminus technicus,<sup>30</sup> but it could be said of a poet, too.<sup>31</sup> What it meant can be best seen in an inscription from Aphrodisias (*MAMA VIII 417*):

<sup>25</sup> That Apion relies in some places on the authority of Egyptian priests for his information is neither here nor there.

<sup>26</sup> *NH* 30, 99 (F 19). Cf. Jones (n. 5), 292 with the following remarks on Josephus' use of the constructed Egyptian ethnicity of Apion. Jones (p. 302) then tries to prove that Josephus chose Apion as the arch-foe not because he could be easily refuted, which was not the case, but because this refutation could have the constructed Egyptian ethnicity as a starting-point.

<sup>27</sup> *NH* 30, 18: *cum adulescentibus nobis visus Apion*. Pliny was born at the end of 23 or at the beginning of 24; his earliest recollection of being in the city of Rome belongs to the year 35 (*NH* 37, 31: *Servili Noniani, quam consulem vidimus*). He may have seen Apion either during Apion's stay in Rome under Tiberius or during his next visit under Claudius. — On the other hand, Apion says in *c. Ap.* 2, 10, where Josephus quotes him verbatim, παρά τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, which Barclay (n. 3) 174 construes as proof that he himself was no Egyptian.

<sup>28</sup> Plin. *NH* 37, 75 (*cognominatus Plistonices*); Gell. 5, 14, 1; 7, 8, 1; Clem. *Strom.* 1, 101, 3 (ὁ πλειστονίκης ἐπικληθείς); Suda A 3215 Adler (T 1), mistakenly: ὁ Πλειστονίκου, ὁ ἐπικληθείς Μόχθος. Achill., *Isag. in Arat.* p. 29 Maass (F 35): μαρτυροῦσι δὲ Κράτης καὶ Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκης; Suda A 2634 Adler (T 8) on a certain Ἀντέρως: ἀκουστὴς δὲ ἦν Ἀπίωνος τοῦ Μόχθου. Apollonios Dyskolos, *Synt.* p. 154 Uhlig: οἱ περὶ Ἀπίωνος τὸν Μόχθον — where οἱ περὶ almost certainly denotes only Apion himself, not some academic pupils; see K. Lehrs, *Quaestiones epicae*, Königsberg 1837, 28\*: 'οἱ περὶ Ἀπίωνα est Apion, nihil amplius'.

<sup>29</sup> Schol. RV Ar. *Pax* 778 (F 40).

<sup>30</sup> *BGU IV* 1074, 18 (P. Frisch, *Zehn agonistische Papyri*, Opladen 1986, 16 no. 1): ἱερονείκου, πλειστονείκου, παραδόξου; Frisch's commentary refers to L. Robert, *Hellenica* 13, 140; R. Merkelbach, *Philologica*, Stuttgart 1997, 499; *POxy* 2476, 21; 22; 23; 33 (Frisch 50 no. 2), where archon and antarchon of the synodos are πλειστονίκα (besides other titles); *POxyHels* 25, 21; 36 (Frisch 74 no. 4): σαλπικτοῦ πλειστονείκου παραδόξου ... [ ... σαλ]πικτοῦ ἱερονείκου ὀλυμπιονείκου πλειστονείκ[ου παραδόξου ...

<sup>31</sup> *SEG* 4, 418 (Nysa) with L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris 1938, 45: ποιη]τοῦ πλειστονείκου — but, of course, there were competitions for poets. The reason for such a surname is, nevertheless, given by Damon (n. 6), 361: 'Ancient scholarship was feverishly competitive'.

πανκρατιαστής ιερονεΐκη[ς πλειστ]ονείκης ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡλικίας εἰς τὰς ὀδοὺς τῆς ἀρετῆς τραπεὶς ἰδρῶσι [καὶ πό]νοις ἐκτήσατο τὴν εὐκλεῖ ῥόξαν [·· c. 5 ··]τητός<sup>32</sup> τε παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις καθ' ὅλης τῆς] οἰκουμένης γέινεται διὰ τε τὴν ὀλόκλη[ηρον] αὐτῷ πεφιλοπονημένην σοφίαν.

pancratiast, sacred victor, [multiple] victor, who from his earliest youth having turned to the ways of virtue, obtained by sweat and labour his noble reputation, and came to be [?admired] by all men throughout the inhabited world for the complete wisdom which he obtained by his labours.<sup>33</sup>

The parallels are sufficient proof that the designation *πλειστονείκης* was complimentary,<sup>34</sup> and perhaps we know of one instance in which Apion himself used the nick-name to distinguish himself from other Apiones, even though the name is not that frequent in inscriptions. I mean, of course, the famous inscription on the colossus of Memnon: Ἀπίων Πλειστονείκης ἤκουσα τρίς.<sup>35</sup> A proof of the strength of the association of Apion with the name *πλειστονείκης* can be found in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, where we learn that Simon Magus left some of his followers in Tyre (while he himself had departed), among them Ἀπίωνα τὸν Πλειστονείκην, ἄνδρα Ἀλεξανδρέα,

<sup>32</sup> ἐπιζή]τητος *MAMA*; contra: Robert, *Hellenica* 13, 141.

<sup>33</sup> Translation by Ch. Roueché, <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/iAph120719.html#edition>.

<sup>34</sup> H. Johnson, *AJPh* 98, 1977, 414-15, opts for *φιλονείκης*, which can be found in some manuscripts of Gell. 7, 8, 1: Πλειστονείκης (but cf. *Plistonices* in 5, 8, 1); surely a worthless iotacism. Do we really know anything about the quarrelsomeness of Apion? Johnson's (p. 415) is surely no cogent argument: 'a name well suited to a polemicist who was, as Clemens Alexandrinus writes, φιλαπεχθημόνως πρὸς Ἑβραίους διακείμενος (*Strom.* 1. 21. 101)'. This was perhaps the opinion of Josephus and his Christian followers — but would a Greek sophist have concurred?

<sup>35</sup> *OGIS* 662 (with the old reading Πλειστον[είκης]), and now A. and E. Bernard, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du colosse de Memnon*, Paris 1960, 165-66, no. 71; Dittenberger made the connection with our Apion (*Apionem grammaticum hic agnoscendum esse, etsi Letronnio et Franzio aliter visum est, perquam probabile ac paene certum existimo*), others — as the Bernands — are more cautious. The old arguments against this identification were restated by Johnson (n. 34), 413; they are generally two: (1) 'One expects the graffiti on the Colossus to have been written by soldiers and public officials and it may be less likely (though not impossible) that a scholar like Apion would have scrawled his name there ... . A vain mercenary, however, calling himself Pleistonikes (like Plautus' Pyrgopolynices) might well have done so'. See the very different assessment of G.W. Bowersock, *Studies on the Eastern Roman Empire*, Goldbach 1994, 254: 'Most of the tourists who commemorated themselves on the statue had considerable literary pretensions ... Poets and prefects, rhetors and emperors, ladies and gentlemen all left their names on this great monument'. (2) Most inscriptions are said to be later than 65, and it is at least questionable whether Apion was still alive at this time. But there are many undated inscriptions, and I would be loath to put all of them on paleographic grounds in the second or third century; there is one dated inscription from A.D. 20 (Bernand no. 1), and we know that the colossus was a tourist attraction since the first days of the Roman rule, Strab. 17, 1, 46 p. 816 C: κάγω δὲ παρὼν ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων μετὰ Γάλλου Αἰλίου καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν συνόντων αὐτῷ φίλων τε καὶ στρατιωτῶν περὶ ὥραν πρώτην ἤκουσα τοῦ ψόφου. Germanicus went to visit it, too, Tac. *Ann.* 2, 61.

γραμματικὸν τὴν ἐπιστήμην ....<sup>36</sup> The knowledge of this epitheton does not derive from Josephus,<sup>37</sup> but shows again that later generations knew something about Apion.

Πλειστονίκης is an almost formal designation for a victorious athlete, whose victories are due to a certain way of living;<sup>38</sup> that the train of thought for Apion was similar, is proved by the second nick-name, μόχθος, which was also used in agonistic contexts.<sup>39</sup>

As the inscription from Aphrodisias said, an athlete ‘turned to the ways of virtue, obtained by sweat and labour his noble reputation’. The usual expression is φιλόπνοος and the πόνοι of the athlete are often mentioned in laudatory context — and as Louis Robert himself said: ‘Le terme μόχοι est fréquent pour les “peines” athlétiques. Il est équivalent de πόνοι’.<sup>40</sup> The term could be applied to sophists, too, and designated their dedication to their work (and sometimes this dedication was overdone).<sup>41</sup> Another designation of Apion, περιεργότατος γραμματικῶν, might have been derogatory, but it

<sup>36</sup> 4, 6, 2 — and it is perhaps helpful to name the rest of the company, too: Ἀνουβίωνα τὸν Διοσπολίτην τινὰ ἀστρολόγον καὶ Ἀθηνόδωρον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον τῷ Ἐπικούρου ἀρεσκόμενον λόγῳ. Hom. 20, 11, 1: Ἀπίων ὁ πλειστονίκης σὺν Ἀνουβίῳ ἦκεν; Recogn.10, 52, 2: *ingressus quidem nuntiat Appionem Plistonicensem cum Anubione nuper venisse ab Antiochia*. — On Apion in this context, J. Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*, Tübingen 2010, 417; 435-40; he opts for a Jewish source, see especially 451-9; Bremmer (n. 18), 82-90.

<sup>37</sup> Carleton Paget (n. 36), 479-80, arguing for a pre-Josephus source; see already C. Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen*, Leipzig 1929, 296.

<sup>38</sup> It is completely irrelevant to talk about ‘the virtual absence of evidence for such victories’ (Johnson [n. 34] 414), because these names were also given on a metaphoric level.

<sup>39</sup> This was not seen by Damon (n. 6) 336-37.

<sup>40</sup> *Opera Minora* VI 332 n. 2, where he refers to *Hellenica* XI/XII 345-9. L. Moretti, *Tra epigrafia e storia*, Rom 1990, 269, gives a new text of *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* 24 (Delphi), where he reads and supplies: [μόχθων οὐ κῦδος μ]ελέων ὁ Λεωνίδα υἱὸς [Νικόμαχος νίκ]αν ἄρατο Πυθιάδα κτλ. On pp. 272-73. n. 1, he quotes as parallels for μόχθος in an agonistic context: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2314; *Iscrizioni* 48; 64 A 3-4 (τίς πόθεν εἶ; τίνο; εἰπέ. τίνων ἐπινείκια μόχθων / ἀυχίσεως ἔστης Ζηνὸς ὑπὸ προδόμοις;); 98; Robert adds Vettius Valens 12, 2 Kroll: αἰτίον μόχθων τῶν δι’ ἀθλήσεως ἢ βασταγμάτων καὶ σκληρουργίας. For further instances of the agonistic use of μόχθος, see A. Wilhelm, *Kleine Schriften* III, Wien 2006, 91, starting from Peek, *GV* 762 (Cyzicus).

<sup>41</sup> Philostratus, *VS* 2, 1, 14, p. 565, on Herodes Atticus: εὐμαθέστατος δὲ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος οὐδὲ τοῦ μοχθεῖν ἠμέλησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ πότον ἐσπούδαζε καὶ νύκτωρ ἐν τοῖς διαλείμμασι τῶν ὕπνων ... 2, 26, 5, p. 614, on Heracleides, of whom it is said at first: δοκεῖ δὲ μάλιστα σοφιστῶν οὗτος τὴν ἐπιστήμην πόνῳ κατακτήσασθαι ... καὶ ἔστιν αὐτῷ φρόντισμα οὐκ ἀηδές, βιβλίον ζύμμετρον, ὃ ἐπιγράφεται Πόνου ἐγκώμιον .... A little later, p. 615, this is turned against him: καὶ αἱ διαλέξεις δέ, ἃς Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ναυκρατίτης κατ’ αὐτοῦ διελέγετο, ὡς νωθοῦ καθάπτονται καὶ μοχθοῦντος. But even reading this, the most derogatory use of μοχθεῖν, I do not understand how van der Horst (n. 10) 209, arrives at the conclusion: ‘a meaning such as “a pain in the ass” cannot be excluded’. — Joseph. *c. Ap.* 2, 29 talks about the μοχθηρία τοῦ γένους in relation to Apion, but I do not believe that this relates to his name as μόχθος.

might have been laudatory, too;<sup>42</sup> most probably it referred to Apion's superstitious interest in magic<sup>43</sup> — as attested by his necromantic attempts on Homer (F 15) and his otherwise attested interest in divination (F 28).

Apion, then, was famous in many ways;<sup>44</sup> some of them pertaining to his appearance before a public, whose evaluation was, at least, diverse, some to his literary work, especially the work on Homer and other poets,<sup>45</sup> and his work on Egypt, the Αἰγυπτιακά. Of the latter Jacoby collected twenty-one certain fragments, which he supplemented by an “Anhang” of another thirty, some of which may have come from the Αἰγυπτιακά, too. The overwhelming consensus is that Josephus argued and polemized against views in this work, especially in the third and fourth book of the Αἰγυπτιακά. Christian authors speak of a κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον, but this is generally discarded as a misunderstanding.<sup>46</sup> But the pseudo-Clementine Homilies speak of several works of Apion against the Jews, for what it is worth (5, 2, 4): πολλὰ βιβλία κατ'αὐτῶν συγγραφέναι.<sup>47</sup> Of course, ‘we should not forget that the Pseudo-Clementines are

<sup>42</sup> Africanus apud Eus. *PE* 10, 10 16 (T 5 e); LSJ s. v. περίεργος I 3: ‘of an inquiring mind, ... inquisitive, curious’; II 3: ‘curious, superstitious’. But see Antiphanes, *AP* 11, 322 (IX Gow – Page; date unknown, but an attack on Callimachus and his school): γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ριζώρυχα μούσης ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται, τῶν μεγάλων κηλίδες ...

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Dio 69, 11, 3 (about Hadrian): τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα περιεργότατος Ἀδριανός, ὡσπερ καὶ εἶπον, ἐγένετο, καὶ μαντεῖαις μαγανείαις τε παντοδαπαῖς ἐχρήτο; Hdn. 4, 12, 3 (about Caracalla): περιεργότατος γὰρ ὢν οὐ μόνον τὰ ἀνθρώπων πάντα εἰδέναι ἤθελεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ θεῖα τε καὶ δαιμόνια πολυπραγμονεῖν (with some remarks on oracles and astrologers following).

<sup>44</sup> Suda A 3215 Adler (T 1) calls him a θρεπτός of the great Didymos; usually, one would not put too much emphasis on this piece of evidence — but Ch. Theodoridis, *RhM* 132, 1989, 347-48, quotes a small tract by a certain Theodosios περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὤν βαρυτόνων, which seems to point at least to one similarity between Didymos and Apion: τὸ γὰρ Νέδων ὁ μὲν Καλλιμάχος (F 720 Pfeiffer) τῷ λόγῳ τῶν μετοχικῶν διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνει Νέδων Νέδοντος, οἱ δὲ περὶ Δίδυμον (p. 403 Schmidt) καὶ Ἀπίωνα διὰ τοῦ ω ἀναλόγως κλίνουσιν, οἷον Νέδων Νέδωνος.

<sup>45</sup> Bremmer (n. 18), 85-6, with references to work on Alkaios, Simonides and other poets (all fragments on papyri).

<sup>46</sup> Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 101, 3 (T 11 b); Eus., *PE* 10, 10 16 (T 5 e); Iulius Africanus F 34 p. 80 Wallraff): ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῳ καὶ ἐν τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστορίων; Ps. Iustin, *ad Graecos* 9 — the last two perhaps relying on Clement of Alexandria.

<sup>47</sup> It is perhaps worthwhile to quote the whole text: καὶ δὴ ἐμοῦ (scil. the narrator, Clemens) κατακειμένου ὁ Ἀπίων ἐπιδημεῖ τῇ Ῥώμῃ, πατρικὸς ὢν μοι φίλος, καὶ ἐπιξενοῦται ἐμοὶ καὶ κλινήρῃ μαθῶν πρὸς ἐμὲ εἰσέρχεται ὡς ἰατρικῆς οὐκ ἀμήτορος καὶ πυθάνεται τῆς κατακλίσεως τὴν αἰτίαν. ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἄνδρα οὐκ ἀγνοῶν πάνυ Ἰουδαίου δι' ἀπεχθείας ἔχοντα, ὡς καὶ πολλὰ βιβλία κατ' αὐτῶν συγγραφέναι, καὶ αὐτὸν Σίμωνα (i. e. Simon Magus) νῦν οὐ διὰ φιλομάθειαν αὐτὸν εἰς φιλίαν προσέμενον, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ Σαμαρέα αὐτὸν οἶδεν μισοιουδαῖόν τε ὄντα καὶ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων προεληλυθότα, διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν προσωκείωσατο, ἵνα δύναίτο κατὰ Ἰουδαίων τι παρ' αὐτοῦ μαθάνειν. This is certainly a novel, but that does not mean that all the facts are misrepresented — and one might even argue that the discussion between Apion and Clemens is another way to counter the prominence of Apion's views against the Jews. This Apion hates the Jews, Hom. 5, 27.



fiction and do not necessarily aim at providing precise historical knowledge'.<sup>48</sup> But at the end, Jan Bremmer remarked: 'Clement's erudition and Alexandrian origin, the complete loss of Apion's writings and the notice of the evidently well informed Pseudo-Clementines should make us wary of rejecting the notice out of hand'.<sup>49</sup>

The main question, of course, is whether Josephus used only the Αἰγυπτιακά, or whether he tried to refute other works by Apion as well. At this point we might remember that Alfred von Gutschmid, one of the first scholars to comment on *contra Apionem*, thought that Josephus had two works in mind — and that Apion's κατὰ Ἰουδαίων was supposed to refer only to the question of the Jews in Alexandria.<sup>50</sup> But since Josephus quotes only once from the Αἰγυπτιακά and never from any other book by Apion,<sup>51</sup> the decision in this matter has to be deferred.

According to Josephus, Moses is mentioned in the third book of the *Aigyptiaka*, whereas the Christian chronological tradition puts the exodus in book IV (F 2 a-c [as represented, inter alia, in Iulius Africanus, F 34 Wallraff]). Are we to believe that Jewish matters were covered in two books, and that Apion told stories about Moses that did not relate to the exodus? Do we correct Josephus, do we correct the Christian chronographs, or do we assume that one of them erred? If we can rely on Josephus, then Apion put everything in one book (or perhaps: in one section of one book), because in 2, 148 he says: ἄλλως τε καὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος (scil. Molon) οὐκ ἀθρόαν ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀπίων ἔταξεν, ἀλλὰ σποράδην καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς ... ('because Apollonius, unlike Apion, has not grouped his accusations together, but scattered them here and there all over his work' [transl. Thackeray]).<sup>52</sup> Apion, then, had grouped his accusations together, and I do not think that this could have been applied to a dispersion of the Moses story over two books.<sup>53</sup> Since we have almost no fragments which are assigned to a book, it is impossible to decide whether Apion placed his digression on the Jews in the third or the fourth book.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Bremmer (n. 18), 73. While this is true, we cannot exclude everything only because it is written in the Pseudo-Clementines; cf. Bremmer (n. 18), 78: 'Obbink has now also noted that the predictions in *Recognitions* 10.9 are authentically Anoubionic, both in the content of the horoscopes and their form'.

<sup>49</sup> Bremmer (n. 18), 87-8.

<sup>50</sup> A. v. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig 1893, IV 362; cf. 369.

<sup>51</sup> *c. Ap.* 2, 10 (F 1): φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν τάδε κτλ.

<sup>52</sup> The text is not quite clear, some editors (and translators) omit καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς.

<sup>53</sup> Jones (n. 5), 304, argues that τὴν κατηγορίαν ... ἀθρόαν means: not scattered in many different works, but in one work, even though at different places in this work.

<sup>54</sup> Mueller wrote in *c. Ap.* 2, 10, ἐν τετάρτῃ, and Jacoby mentioned this at least in his apparatus. The greater number of Christian authors quoting from book 4 is not indicative of their greater authority: if Clement had it wrong, the mistake will have been taken over by the others. Personally, I rather trust Josephus, because I believe that the exodus had no place in the fourth of the five books. Stern (n.3), 395 also assumes a mistake. Of the other fragments, only F 5 and 6 are numbered, both transmitted by Gellius, both belonging to the fifth book, both giving Apion's eye-witness account of fairy tales (as we would call this kind of stories). They may have been used as apologetics for the Egyptian animal worship, as scholars since v. Gutschmid (n. 50) 362, assume, but they would be very loosely connected with this topic.

Now, if we want to follow this line of thought a bit further, the remark in 2, 148 can also help us to resolve another question. When Josephus says that Apion grouped his accusations together, it becomes quite improbable that he looked at more than one work of Apion for his *contra Apionem*. That does not necessarily tell us whether Apion wrote more than one treatise against the Jews, whether he published his speech delivered before Gaius, or whether he used contexts other than the Egyptian history to polemize against Jews. However, it does open the possibility to take a closer look at the third book of the Αἰγυπτιακά.

Apion starts his treatment of the Jews with the exodus, as was only to be expected (and he even mentions Moses as lawgiver on Sinai, 2, 25). Josephus criticizes three, not directly connected, points of Apion's narrative: (a) the date of the exodus, (b) the traditions about Moses and religious rituals, and (c) the origin of the Sabbath. Let us have a brief look at these three points:

(a) At what point in time (and in Apion's story) is the exodus situated? Josephus gives us a simultaneously clear and grotesque solution (2, 17-18): Ἀπίων ὥριστο τὴν ἔξοδον ἀκριβῶς κατὰ τὴν ἑβδόμην Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ ταύτης ἔτος (= 752/1 B.C.) εἶναι πρῶτον, ἐν ᾧ, φησί, Καρχηδόνα Φοίνικες ἔκτισαν. τοῦτο δὲ πάντως προσέθηκε τὸ Καρχηδόνα τεκμήριον οἰόμενος αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐναργέστατον .... A great field for polemics. But our chronographical tradition tells us otherwise — or does it? Apion F 2 c, preserved by Eusebius, himself quoting Iulius Africanus, says: Ἀπίων ... φησὶ κατὰ Ἰναχον Ἄργους βασιλέα, Ἀμώσιος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος, ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους, ὧν ἠγεῖσθαι Μωσέα. This is usually discredited as wrong, and Barclay tries to explain the error:<sup>55</sup> 'According to Tatian (Ad Gr. 38 [F 2 a]), Apion reported the claim by Ptolemy of Mendes that Amosis destroyed Avaris, and followed Ptolemy in placing Amosis in the time of Inachus. In the same passage from Tatian, Ptolemy of Mendes is reported (whether accurately or not) as having claimed that the Judeans, under Moses, left Egypt in the time of Amosis. Tatian does not say that Apion either reported this last claim or agreed with it, but the juxtaposition of these remarks led Clement to imply (Strom. 1, 101, 5 [F 2 b]) that Apion followed Ptolemy in dating the exodus at the time of Amosis'.

That Ptolemy, priest of Mendes, dated the exodus under a certain Amosis, who lived in the times of Inachus, the king of Argos, is undisputed. Tatian, to be sure, does not say that Apion gave a report on the exodus, but only ὅτι 'κατέσκαψεν τὴν Αὐαρίαν Ἄμωσις κατὰ τὸν Ἀργεῖον γενόμενος Ἰναχος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Μενδήσιος Πτολεμαῖος. Tatian quoted Apion to assert the synchronism given by Ptolemy of Mendes,<sup>56</sup> and Clement of Alexandria does the same. It is only Iulius Africanus (in the version of Eusebius) who quotes Apion on the date of the exodus, and who puts Amosis in the eighteenth dynasty (F 46, 132 Wallraff): πρῶτος Ἀμῶς, ἐφ' οὗ Μωυσῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀποδείκνυμεν.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Barclay (n. 3), 177, n. 58. This is, essentially, the position of v. Gutschmid (n. 50), 362.

<sup>56</sup> F 3 (Excerpta Barbari p. 286 Frick; Iulius Africanus F 43 c Wallraff) gives the same synchronism and nothing more.

<sup>57</sup> The shepherd kings provided the fifteenth to eighteenth dynasty.

All of this, of course, does not prove that Apion gave a different chronology than Ptolemy of Mendes: it proves only that Tatian either did not use or did not need to use a date supplied by Apion. Evidently, Apion had read Ptolemy and must have known about his dating; furthermore it is widely assumed that Apion had read Lysimachus,<sup>58</sup> who sets the exodus (according to *c. Ap.* 2, 16) κατὰ Βόκχοριν τὸν βασιλέα,<sup>59</sup> τουτέστι πρὸ ἐτῶν χιλίων ἑπτακοσίων.

Under these conditions it is almost impossible to say what happened. Are we to assume that Apion made this enormous change against all earlier authorities, relying — perhaps falsely — on the name of king Bokchoris and conflating him with a king of the late eighth century B.C.?<sup>60</sup> But why should he have done so? Was he only *rerum novarum cupidus*, or was it Apion's aim to show that the Jews came to history only late?<sup>61</sup> If so, he omitted telling us, and the introduction to the treatment of Apion does not refer to an attack on the Jews' antiquity (2, 2) — but the later the Jews left Egypt, the more astonishing the lack of contemporary Greek testimony. Or did Apion hint at the enmity between Rome and the Jews? The simultaneous foundation of Carthage and Rome was to be a symbol of their enduring enmity — and perhaps Apion thought that the origins of the Jews in the same year could be taken as a symbol of continuing enmity between Rome and the Jews.<sup>62</sup> That Rome could not trust anybody who did not worship the emperor is true enough — at least in Apion's mind. But perhaps this symbolic interpretation of the “foundation of the Judean nation” takes things a bit far.

On the other hand, perhaps this is one of the little misrepresentations of Josephus to better argue against Apion — and Apion said only that the exodus was contemporaneous with the founding of Carthage. Josephus supplied the synchronism with Rome because most people knew the date of Rome — and Josephus certainly did not care that the

<sup>58</sup> *c. Ap.* 2, 20 is usually thought to show this.

<sup>59</sup> To be identified with king Βῶχος of the second dynasty?

<sup>60</sup> Even this is not really simple, because the usual, well known dates of Bokchoris do not fit the known dates for the foundation of Rome.

<sup>61</sup> *c. Ap.* 1, 2: ἐπεὶ δὲ συχνούς ὄρω ... τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γεγραμμένοις ἀπιστοῦντας τεκμήριόν τε ποιούμενους τοῦ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸ γένος ἡμῶν τὸ μηδεμίαν παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιφανέσι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱστοριογράφων μνήμης ἠξιώσθαι ...; 6: πρῶτον οὖν ἐπέρχεται μοι πάνυ θαυμάζειν τοὺς οἰομένους δεῖν περὶ τῶν παλαιωτάτων ἔργων μόνους προσέχειν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι ...; 58: ἰκανῶς δὲ φανερόν, ὡς οἶμαι, πεποικηκώς, ὅτι πάτριός ἐστιν ἢ περὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀναγραφὴ τοῖς βαρβάροις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι, βούλομαι μικρὰ πρότερον διαλεχθῆναι πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας νέαν ἡμῶν ἀποφαίνειν τὴν κατάστασιν ἐκ τοῦ μηδὲν περὶ ἡμῶν, ὡς φασιν ἐκεῖνοι, λελέχθαι παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν; 2, 1-2: διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου ... περὶ τε τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἡμῶν ἐπέδειξα ... ἄρξομαι δὲ νῦν τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους τῶν γεγραφότων τι καθ' ἡμῶν ἐλέγχειν.

<sup>62</sup> Barclay (n. 3), 178, following A. Momigliano, *Athenaeum* 55, 1977, 187-88; a different, rather pro-Jewish interpretation is given by L.H. Feldman, in: id. – Levison (n. 11) 253. One might argue that *c. Ap.* 2, 121 (cf. 95) — if reported correctly — is a reminiscence of Roman-Carthaginian history: καταψεύδεται δὲ καὶ ὄρκον ἡμῶν ὡς ὀμνούντων τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν μηδενὶ εὐνοήσῃν ἄλλοφύλῳ, μάλιστα δὲ Ἑλλήσι. Is it possible to read this without thinking of the oath of Hannibal? But cf. Philo, *spec. Leg.* 2, 16-7 and the general sentiment of Judaeen xenophobia; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 527 (Lyttos) is usually cited as a Greek parallel.

known synchronisms between the foundation of Rome and Carthage used an earlier date than the one for Rome that was made canonical by Varro's authority. But here his knowledge may have left him: Apion as an Homeric scholar certainly did not believe that Carthage was founded in the eighth century B.C. — a simple glance at the story of Aeneas must have convinced him that the origin of Carthage was contemporaneous with the end of the Trojan war.<sup>63</sup> Therefore, I am a bit uncertain about the validity of Josephus' arguments and the foolishness of Apion in this case.

(B and c) when Apion gives hitherto unknown "facts" about Moses in Heliopolis and about the origin of the word (and the custom of the) *Sabbath*, he plays to his own strengths. What Moses had done in Heliopolis, Apion had learned *παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν Αἰγύπτιων* (2, 10). Now, these facts may be true, garbled or untrue, what counts is Apion's use of Egyptian sources — which was certainly not — as *c. Ap.* 2, 13 implies — limited to oral information gathered from some old men. And Heliopolis was chosen carefully, not the least because Manetho said that Moses had come from there (*c. Ap.* 1, 238). One might adduce as parallel what Apion had purported to learn from priests in Hermoupolis.<sup>64</sup> And when he tries to give an explanation of the word *σάββατον* (2, 21; 26), Apion uses Egyptian etymologies to explain its origin.<sup>65</sup> Now, Josephus (and everybody else) is certainly right that this etymology was nonsense, but the argument is typical of Apion.<sup>66</sup> Indigenous sources and etymology, prominent in Apion's other writings, had been used here, too.

The starting point of this — and everything else to come — was the exodus, and the exodus narrative was present in Greco-Egyptian histories since Manetho, perhaps even longer than that.<sup>67</sup> Apion knew some, if not most of them — we mentioned the cases of

<sup>63</sup> Philistos, *FGrHist* 556 F 47, puts Carthage's foundation about a generation before the Trojan war — and he was a Syracusan!

<sup>64</sup> Aelian, *NA* 10, 29 (F 12): *ἐπάγεται τοὺς ἐν Ἑρμοῦ πόλει ἱερέας μάρτυρας* (the fact itself was utterly unbelievable, as Aelian noted).

<sup>65</sup> *c. Ap.* 2, 21: *τὸ γὰρ βουβῶνος ἄλγος καλοῦσιν Αἰγύπτιοι σαββάτωσιν*. — Josephus' rebuttal is possibly wrong: Apion did not say that the Jews' journey to Iudaea took only six days, but that they were afflicted six days before they reached Iudaea (a journey of six days is mentioned by Tac. *Hist.* 5, 3, 2). And see, in general, E. Gruen, in: C. Bakhos (ed.), *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*, Leiden 2005, 45-6: 'The connection may indeed be specious, and the joke sardonic, but the purpose need not have been malicious'.

<sup>66</sup> J. Dillery, *CIPh* 98, 2003, 389-90. On Apion's etymologies in general, see Neitzel (n. 4), 192. We tend to dismiss all of Apion's etymologies as nonsense, but that was not necessarily the reaction of the ancient, educated public: Theodoridis (n. 44), 347, showed that the etymology of *ἕνις* transmitted in the *Et. Gudianum* was Apion's and that Plut. *Mor.* 670 A used exactly this, i. e. Apion's etymology. Comparable are F 8-21 of Jacoby's collection. And even Josephus does not contradict Apion's etymology on scholarly grounds. Neitzel 208-9, ends with the statement, 'daß (die Etymologien) sich durchaus dem Bilde einfügen, das auch die übrige antike Etymologie bietet. Apions Deutungen homerischer Wörter sind ... keinesfalls so auffallend und ungewöhnlich'. On another Egyptian etymology, see Eustath. *Od.* 4, 563 (F 11).

<sup>67</sup> E. g., G.C. Hansen, in J.U. Kalms (ed.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999, Münster 2000*, 14: 'doch möchte ich nicht unerwähnt lassen, daß die Ausführungen über die Juden durchaus ein integraler Bestandteil der ägyptischen Ethnographie waren, wie denn

Lysimachus and Ptolemy of Mendes; and his additions to or corrections of earlier stories show the same. We saw earlier that Apion's treatment of the Jews formed a single digression in his work. Is this the typical way in which Jews were treated, or is this Apion's own way to tell the story? Or to put it differently: did Apion follow some historiographical or ethnographical model, or was his continuation of the digression solely inspired by the events of the Alexandrian pogrom?

Now, as Josephus says, Apion continued with disparaging remarks on the status of the Alexandrian Jews. Josephus starts this section with a remark stemming directly from the exodus narrative: Apion had called the ancestors of the Jews Egyptians (2, 28). Now, this is something all Egyptians do in one of two ways: 'either they feign to be our kinsmen in order to gain prestige, or else they drag us into their ranks to share their bad reputation' (2, 31; transl. Thackeray). But whereas this is a remark made about the Egyptians, Josephus then changes focus and concentrates on the Alexandrians, i. e. the people who had made Apion their fellow citizen (2, 32): τὴν ἀπέχθειαν αὐτῶν ἐπιστάμενος τὴν πρὸς τοὺς συνοικοῦντας αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἰουδαίους προτέθειται μὲν ἐκείνοις λοιδορεῖσθαι ... This is Josephus' starting point for a discussion of the civic rights of the Alexandrian Jews, and almost everyone agrees that this was inspired by the Alexandrian pogroms.<sup>68</sup>

How did Apion connect this topic with the exodus? Was it an abrupt change of topic, brought about by the mention of the Jews or was there some logical connection in his narrative? The first literal quotation given by Josephus regards the arrival of the Jews in Alexandria (2, 33). Following this there is a roughly chronological order — starting with Alexander and the first Ptolemies, with a focus on the second century B.C. (2, 43). One might perhaps argue that Apion's disposition went roughly thus: 'this now was their way out of Egypt, but, alas, they returned and were a plague and nuisance to Egypt ever since — as I am going to show to you'. This is, of course, only speculation, but it is the only way I see to get at least a superficially logical arrangement of Apion's narrative.

Josephus starts his refutations with a mention of Onias and Dositheus (2, 49): Ὀνίας καὶ Δοσίθεος Ἰουδαῖοι, ὧν Ἀπίων σκώπτει τὰ ὀνόματα.<sup>69</sup> The story continues with the services the Jews rendered to Ptolemy Physkon (2, 56).<sup>70</sup> Reading Josephus, it seems that Apion touched on everything he knew about Jewish history under the Ptolemies; some points had been already mentioned in Josephus' *Antiquitates*. Josephus turns even the fact that the evil Cleopatra<sup>71</sup> denied the Jews wheat into a compliment to his

---

generell ethnographische Abschnitte als Exkurse in historischen Werken seit Herodot eine lange Tradition haben'.

<sup>68</sup> See, among others, A. Sperling, *Programm des Gymnasiums zum Hl. Kreuz*, Dresden, erste Abteilung, 1886, XI-XII; and of the younger generation, S. Honigmann, *JJS* 48, 1997, 67-8; J.J. Collins, in C. Bakhos (Hrsg.), *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*, Leiden 2005, 13.

<sup>69</sup> Jones (n. 5), 305, does not detect much criticism in this story.

<sup>70</sup> *Apion autem omnium calumniator etiam propter bellum adversus Fysconem gestum Iudaeos accusare praesumpsit, cum eos laudare debuerit.*

<sup>71</sup> The implied characterization of Cleopatra must have appealed to the Roman readership of Josephus; cf. Feldman, in: id. – Levison (n. 11), 262-3.

compatriots.<sup>72</sup> Apion must have used this to deny the Jews Alexandrian citizenship,<sup>73</sup> and the next quotation shows that we are still dealing with the question of citizenship (2, 65): *quomodo ergo, inquit, si sunt cives, eosdem deos quos Alexandrini non colunt?* The question of citizenship is connected with *seditionis causae* (2, 68) and that applies most easily to the year 38 AD even though there must have been other times and instances when the general claim to Alexandrian citizenship by Jews must have been a cause for contention. Interestingly enough, Josephus concludes this train of thought with the remark that people like Apion were the *seditionis auctores*,<sup>74</sup> so that he fails to include Apion himself among these “Egyptians” who had become Alexandrian citizens only *propter confusiones temporum*.<sup>75</sup>

Now follow certain well-known stories concerning the Jerusalem temple and Jewish rituals.<sup>76</sup> Josephus himself does not indicate that these stories might have been connected (μέμικται), but it seems to me that Apion returned to the point where he left his narrative to insert his digression on Alexandria and the Jews, and continued with — sometimes well-known — tales about the demeanor of the Jews in Palestine.<sup>77</sup> Since this part of Jewish history is no real part of Αἰγυπτιακά,<sup>78</sup> we are back in a digression, a digression whose main point is, according to Josephus, hatred of the Jews; but perhaps Apion wanted only to round up his excursus on the Jews with some well-known stories taken from other writers, which might have been otherwise missed. But not everything fits the roughly chronological order, which he apparently left when telling of the origin of the Hasmonean state. The oath in 2, 121 does not fit, neither does the fact that the Jews were mere subjects of a long string of rulers (2, 125) and had produced no great intellectuals (2, 135) — all this is surely an accumulated denouncement without any connection between the different parts. The same holds true for the last point (2, 137): ἐγκαλεῖ γὰρ ὅτι ζῶα θύομεν ἡμερὰ καὶ χοῖρον οὐκ ἐσθίομεν καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰδοίων χλευάζει περιτομήν.<sup>79</sup>

The accusation that the Jews worshipped an ass’s head in the temple (2, 80) and the even more repugnant accusation of human sacrifice, perhaps even of cannibalism (2, 91)

<sup>72</sup> 2, 60: *putasne gloriandum nobis non esse, si quemadmodum dicit Apion famis tempore Iudaeis triticum non est mensa?*

<sup>73</sup> Josephus does not say explicitly that Apion reported Germanicus doing the same as Cleopatra: *c. Ap. 2, 63*.

<sup>74</sup> 2, 69: *porro etiam seditionis auctores quilibet inveniet Apioni similes Alexandrinorum fuisse cives*.

<sup>75</sup> 2, 72 is said for Roman ears, too: *nam Aegyptiis neque regum quisquam videtur ius civilitatis fuisse largitus, neque nunc quilibet imperatorum (civilitas in this sense seems to be late antique usage)*. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10, 7, 1 (Trajan speaking): *civitatem Alexandrinam secundum institutionem principum non temere dare proposui*. A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, Oxford 1966, 570: ‘such matters were under the administrative control of the Prefect, to whom Trajan sends his recommendation for implementation’.

<sup>76</sup> Barclay (n. 3) 211: ‘a variety of material which was originally linked either to his exodus account or to his attack on Alexandrian Judeans’.

<sup>77</sup> *c. Ap. 2, 80* is the point where he seems to return to the history of the Jews in Palestine.

<sup>78</sup> This point is not really addressed by Jones (n. 5), 306-7.

<sup>79</sup> *c. Ap. 2, 6; 137*.

are most probably not Apion's own invention, but will have come from Apollonius Molon, perhaps even from Poseidonios (cf. 2, 79)<sup>80</sup> — (also the next story, a variant of the ass worship, has a name attached to it, that of Mnaseas [2, 112]<sup>81</sup>). Why does Josephus report this in connection with Apion's libels, not in connection with other, even earlier authors? I believe that this is another case in point for Jones' statement that Josephus used Apion as a kind of scapegoat, as the perfect opponent whose credibility was easy to attack<sup>82</sup> — and who was therefore named as the source of particularly evil slander.

Apion's way to present things was certainly not philo-Semitic — he did his best for his Alexandrian fellow citizens (and he accepted almost everything other authors had written about Jews). But he did not distinguish himself by the depth of his hatred of the Jews, although he certainly was not their friend. But, 'even the arch-villain Apion may not be quite as bad as he seems'.<sup>83</sup> This was said as an acknowledgment of the fact that Josephus criticizes 'errors, ignorance, and stupidity, rather than prejudice'. Perhaps even some of the errors were consciously committed by Josephus.

Historisches Institut, Universität zu Köln

---

<sup>80</sup> On the source see Stern (n. 3), 410, 412, but especially E. Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History II*, Leiden 1980, 238-39.; Barclay (n. 3), 220. *c. Ap.* 2, 91 calls Apion in this context a *propheta aliorum*; even if we cannot give a name to these stories, there is no reason to call Apion the 'inventor of the libel of Jewish cannibalism' (van der Horst [n. 10] 221).

<sup>81</sup> Bickerman (n. 80); B. Bar-Kochva, in: Feldman – Levison (n. 11), 310-25. (with a stemma of the story on 326).

<sup>82</sup> Jones (n. 5), 281: 'Josephus selected a perfect opponent who was not really any more of an opponent than any other writer of the ancient world who had occasion to mention the Jews'.

<sup>83</sup> Gruen (n. 65), 45, who also provides the next quotation.