mentioned not seldom (e.gg. 32, 81, 91) and deserving elaboration, especially but not only for classicists, is the place of the Ari. *Po.* in (and out of) the Organon both in the Greek and Latin traditions in Late Antiquity, and, in particular, in its Arabic translations and subsequent acculturation into *falsafa*, and referred to in the literature as "context theory".[15]

One of the many merits of this volume is that its authors have gone the extra mile to contextualize and set out the evidence in a form that makes it accessible, often for the first time, to readers of Ari. *Po.* in the Greek, as well as those who have other interests in Aristotle, in non-textual aspects of the *Poetics*, in poetic theory, in translation technique, in philological procedure, and more. The Greek text in this new *editio*, with its introduction, apparatus, and philological commentary will stimulate the reader to take in the possibilities and invite him or her to think about the evidence and be an informed, actively critical reader.

Donna Shalev Hebrew University of Jerusalem

René Bloch, *Moses und der Mythos: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der griechischen Mythologie bei jüdisch-hellenistischen Autoren*, Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 145, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. x + 298 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-16501-4.

This book is a revision of Bloch's (henceforth, B.) Habilitationsschrift, submitted in Jewish Studies and Classical Philology to the Philosophical-Historical Faculty of Basel University in 2008. It consists of an Introduction (pp. 1-16), followed by chapters on '"Disgraceful Mythology": Flavius Josephus' Condemnations of Myth' (17-50); '"Mythless Rome" and "Mythless Judaism"' (51-70); 'Greek Mythology in Palestine and Rome at the time of Flavius Josephus' (71-88); 'The word-field *mythos* in Flavius Josephus' (89-104); 'The Life of Moses in Flavius Josephus: An Example of Ancient Mediterranean Hero-Literature' (105-120); 'Greek Myth in Hellenistic-Jewish Authors Other Than Josephus' (121-190); 'Greek Myths in Flavius Josephus' (191-230); 'The Limits of Apologetic: Concluding Remarks' (231-242). An Appendix of theophoric or "mythophoric" names from the Jewish catacombs in Rome, a bibliography, and an index of ancient sources conclude the volume, although a subject index is missing.

The title of the book suggests that it is comprehensive and that it covers Hellenistic Jewish literature in general, but the focus is on Josephus. Even when the discussion concerns another Jewish-Hellenistic author, it always treats Josephus' use of that other author, and includes a comparison and contrast between that author and Josephus.

The heart of the book is a comparison between Josephus' programmatic statements condemning Greek myth and his actual practice as a historian. In fact, Josephus was familiar with

---

Umdeutung und Umformung der Redeeinteilung bis ins orientalische Mittelalter'. In: H.-J. Niederehe – K. Koerner (eds.), *History and Historiography of Linguistics. Proceedings of the IVth International Congress on the History of Language Sciences, Trier 1987*, Amsteram: Benjamins, 111-121. Idem, 1994. 'Aristotle's Thoughts on Language — An Outgrowth of an "Intellectual Climate"'. In: J. De Clercq – P. Desmet (eds.), *Florilegium Historiographiae Linguisticae*, Leuven: Peeters, 87-96.

[15] Some discussion of this in the Greek tradition may be found in Richard Walzer's 1934 article on the history of the tradition of the Po. and in the Arabic tradition in I.M. Dahiyat's 1974 book on Avicenna's commentary of Ari. *Po.* — both items referred to in the very rich bibliography in Tarán and Gutas. I would add, for the Latin tradition, Friedrich Solmsen, 'Boethius and the History of the Organon', *AJP* 65 (1944) 69-74, and for the whole gamut, with special reference to the Arabic tradition and to *falsafa* and its tackling of the poorly translated text of Ari. *Po.*, Deborah L. Black, 1990. *Logic and Aristotle's "Rhetoric" and "Poetics" in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*. Leiden: Brill, esp. chapters 6 and 7.

Greek myth, attracted to it, deeply engaged with it, and the tension between his critical remarks and his detailed writing can be shown in many parts of his corpus. From that perspective, perhaps the most important source of inspiration for B. is David Biale, citing Robert Bonfil concerning Italian Jews (cited, 119-120):

> The Jews were not so much "influenced" by the Italians as they were one organ in a larger cultural organism, a subculture that established its identity in a complex process of adaptation and resistance. Jewish "difference" was an integral part of the larger mosaic of Renaissance Italy (D. Biale, *The Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, 2002, xix).

B. therefore argues that the tension between Josephus' programmatic statements and his practice is something of a misapprehension on our part. Josephus was so deeply embedded in the larger cultural world that even when he opposed Greek myth (as in *Ant.*1.15-16, 21-23 and *CAp.* 2.236-256), ostensibly in the name of Biblical faith, the arguments he used were the same as those familiar from the Greek debate on the place and value of myth, from Xenophanes in the sixth century BCE, through Plato in the fourth (41-45).

The most convincing parts of B.'s thesis are his discussion of the field of the word *mythos* in Josephus, his analysis of the life of Moses as recounted by Josephus, and parts of the discussion of Greek myths in other authors and in Josephus in Chapters Four, Five, Six, and Seven. I mention one example from each of these chapters. In Chapter Four, on the word-field of the term *mythos*, B. discusses Josephus's account in *War* 6.207-213 of the woman who slaughtered and roasted her child for food at the time of the Roman siege of Jerusalem. Josephus added that this would be a *mythos* for the world. B. aptly notes that this recalls Greek dramas by Aeschylus and Euripides (93-94). In Chapter Five, B. shows the numerous ways in which Josephus' account of the life of Moses, from birth to death, have analogues in Greek myth: Josephus' goal was to combine Jewish tradition with pagan myth to make an amalgam that expressed the story of the life of Moses as an ancient Mediterranean hero more strongly than the Biblical account (120). In Chapter Seven, on Greek myth in Josephus, B. shows that though Josephus did not mention Deukalion in his account of the Biblical flood, he called Noah's ark a *larnaks,* rather than a *kibōtos*, as in the LXX (*Ant.* 1.77). *Larnaks* recalled the term employed by Greek authors for Deukalion's ark. In this way, according to B., Josephus joined the Biblical and Greek stories of the flood, much as Philo mentioned the parallel between Noah and Deukalion unapologetically (*Praem.* 23; B. 198-201). Finally, in Chapter Six, on Hellenistic-Jewish authors other than Josephus, the analysis of Philo's reply to Jewish critics, who compared Biblical stories to Homer and dismissed both as ridiculous myths (*Conf.* 2-5), is outstanding. B. shows how Philo turned to allegory to help discover the hidden meaning of the story, much as Greek authors employed allegory to rescue Homer and Hesiod from criticism (179-182).

However, in arguing his thesis, B. often strings together possibilities, with many verbs in the conditional, in order to make his case: the rhetoric is a sign of just how far the argument is being stretched. One blatant example is the discussion of Josephus' knowledge of Greek and Latin literature (84-87). B. sets the stage by dismissing Josephus' remarks on the magnificent statues of the gods, made of rich material, paraded at the triumph celebrated by Titus and Vespasian (*War* 7.136), not as a means Josephus employed to distance himself from these "idols", but as an expression of Josephus' interest in pagan works of art (an interest for which B. brings no evidence, 84-85). B. continues with a citation from A. Cameron that 'a comprehensive knowledge of Greek myth was essential for anyone who wanted to hold his head up in polite society.' Therefore, according to B., whatever knowledge of these matters Josephus brought to Rome, he *must have been obliged to engage* with this material even more deeply there (*auseinandersetzen müssen*), since myths were in vogue in Flavian Rome, where Josephus was part of the literary scene (not a "provincial" historian). The numerous references to Greek authors in *Ant.* (B. counts 27) show Josephus' familiarity with this material, but this should not be explained away as the contribution of Josephus' assistants. *One should not doubt* that Josephus read much Greek literature in Rome. It *would therefore be surprising*, if his information about Homer, Plato, and the tragedians were not (*wäre ... nicht*) the result of direct personal reading (86).

B. contends that Josephus was also familiar with Latin literature, despite the fact that Roman Jews usually conducted their lives in Greek. But *there must have been* exceptions (*dürfte es geben*), and *it is very unlikely* (*ist sehr unwarscheinlich*) that Josephus was not one, after living thirty years in Rome (87).

Unfortunately, B.'s work contains cases of over-extended argument supported by rhetoric that sounds alarms. Since B. wants to prove the favorable engagement of Josephus and other ancient Jewish authors with Greek myth, he consistently understates any indications in the sources that distance their authors from Greek myth. This, however, is a serious disservice to Biale's summary of Bonfil, cited above, which also laid stress on the complex ways the Jewish subculture adapted and *resisted* aspects of the general cultural organism to which it belonged. Jewish "difference," crucial for Bonfil, seems minimal in B.'s analysis.

This is particularly true concerning the deployment of Euhemerism by ancient Jewish authors, which B. regularly underrates, in contrast to most other scholars (for example, compare B.'s analysis with Marek Winiarczyk, *Euhemeros von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung*, 2002, 176-181, not cited by B.). Thus, there is no discussion of the Euhemeristic conception of Greek myth in the Sibylline Oracles (159-165). While B. acknowledges that Aristobulos rejected Greek myth, the real issue for Aristobulos when discussing Moses and Orpheus, according to B., was not the primacy of Moses but the equivalence of the Jewish and Greek conceptions of God (151-152). Indeed, B. seems at pains to deny Euhermerism among Jews (or Samaritans) as much as possible, denying the Euhemeristic character of the remarks of Ps. Eupolemus, or of Theodotos the Epic poet. Other scholars have noted these Jewish (or Samaritan) authors as embracing Euhemerism to distance themselves from pagan myths (132, n. 72; 170-171). When B. cannot evade the Euhemeristic character of the analysis of Greek deities by the High Priest Elazar in Ps. Aristeas, he argues that the real purpose of this attack on Greek beliefs was to show that the Jews and Greeks had much in common, and to join the Jewish critique of pagan beliefs to that of the Greeks (157-159).

Perhaps the most disturbing example of this tendency to minimize Euhemerism is one omission. Despite the focus of the book on Josephus and the analysis of almost every possible reference in his works, there is no mention of the deification of Adados and Azaelos at Damascus, gods honored there 'because of their benefactions and the building of temples with which they adorned the city'. Accordingly, the people of Damascus 'have processions every day in honor of these kings and glory in their antiquity'. Josephus placed these beliefs and practices in a Euhemeristic context: these supposed gods were nothing more than glorious kings of antiquity, who were, admittedly, of great benefit to the city. In the end, however, belief in these gods was foolish, since these were human kings who were 'rather recent and lived less than eleven hundred years ago (*Ant.* 9.93-94)'. Josephus here employed Euhemerism in two senses: first, as usual for Jewish authors, as a weapon against Greek myth, but also to legitimate citation of Greek accounts.

B. also does not discuss Philo's attack on the divinity of Gaius. After a long summary of several Greek gods and their benefactions, Philo turned to Gaius and argued that the Greek gods 'received and still receive admiration for the benefits for which we are beholden to them and were judged worthy of worship and the highest honors. Tell me yourself what deeds like these have you to make you so boastful and puffed with pride (*Legat.* 86)?' Greek beliefs were at least plausible to Philo in Euhemeristic terms, but Gaius did not even meet that standard: he had no deeds that qualified him for divinity, even according to Euhemerus. Euhemerism thus provided Philo with a disclaimer, which permitted him to turn pages of Greek mythological lore into a weapon against Gaius' pretensions.

Finally, Celsus' Jew referred to numerous Greek myths as part of his attack against Jesus and fellow Jews who left their old identity for a new one, as cited by Origen in *Contra Celsum* 1-2. Thus, Celsus' Jew compared the story of Jesus' divine birth with that of Perseus, Amphion, Aeacus, and Minos. Celsus' Jew then hastened to add that we (Jews) do not believe these myths, but adopting a Euhemeristic stance, argued, nevertheless, that these stories were evidence of the great and truly wonderful works accomplished by these heroes, as opposed to the miserable deeds of Jesus, as he portrayed them (*Contra Celsum* 1.67). Here too, a Euhemeristic perspective was deployed. This passage is noted by B. (6), but without mention of its Euhemeristic aspect or its exploitation to allow numerous mentions of Greek myth in order to attack Jesus, while establishing this use as justifiable in Jewish terms.

I have pointed out some overstatements and omissions that might challenge the central thesis. Nevertheless, B. has written a thought provoking book that argues its case with much passion and conviction.

Albert I. Baumgarten Bar-Ilan University

Harriet I. Flower, *Roman Republics*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010, pp. xv + 204. ISBN 978-0-691-14043-8.

Dividing the past into successive units of time defined by a precise beginning and end is indispensable to the study of history. As Flower (hereafter F.) argues, it serves the '... same functions as the punctuation in a sentence and the paragraphing of a page' (4). Yet, at the same time, as she accurately perceives, it is anachronistic and based entirely on hindsight (6). It is therefore evident that although periodization is a vital tool in the writing of history, it is more often than not subject to interpretation.

In her intelligently argued book F. challenges the idea that the traditional span of the Roman Republic, covering some 450 years, should be treated as a "single time period" or regarded as a "monolithic republic". Re-evaluating the conventional division into Early, Middle and Late Republics, F. claims that this "quasi biological" division has become an orthodoxy molding our understanding of the republic, and generating the prediction of its inevitable fall. Instead she offers a new presentation of Roman chronology, identifying at least six republics in addition to several transitional periods — all distinguished, in her view, by particular political characteristics, strengths and weaknesses (23). F. takes her cue from the numbering of the French Republics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (five in all), but this comparison is somewhat infelicitous since the latter were not consecutive (save for the fourth and fifth) and each was based on a different constitution and dissimilar governmental practices.

F.'s chronology runs as follows: a pre-republican period after the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus (509-494);[1] a proto-republic before the first publication of the Twelve Tables (494-451/0); Republic 1 (450-367/6); Republic 2 (366-300); three republics of the *nobiles* (300-180, 180-139, and 139-88, i.e., Republics 3, 4, and 5); a transitional period during which republican procedures ceased (88-81); Republic 6 (81-60); a triumvirate (59-53); a transitional period (53-49); Caesar's dictatorship and a short transitionalperiod after his murder (49-44); and another triumvirate (43-33).

In comparison to the traditional periodization, F.'s division, with its numerous republics and transitional stages, is rather rigid, complicated to follow and allows few options for deviation or

---

[1] All dates are BCE.