

Croix, Kagan, Grote and others on law courts, rhetoric, leadership, identity and education, and other topics, and praises recent work by Forsdyke and Balot, noting the linkage between democracy and equality — a salutary comment as soaring Gini Coefficients in the US and Israel point to rising inequality. Ober writes so well that readers may not credit the incisiveness and sleeves-rolled-up breadth of his coverage: this is above all a *useful* survey, worth saving. (One might ask for an additional page in the final section on ‘the American Empire’.)

Good footnotes and bibliography contribute to the value of this collection. Angelos Chaniotis adds a useful short introduction that (perhaps inevitably) lacks the verve of his own and others’ essays (pp.1-14).

Daniel P. Tompkins

Temple University

Seth Schwartz, *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010. 212 pp. ISBN: 978-0-691-14054-4.

The book begins with the widest possible question: can we write a realistic social history of the ancient Jews, not from the top-down, and not from the ‘center-out’ (3)? That is, can we know much about ordinary life, as it was lived, rather than about a religious system, as described by those who were devoted to it and composed normative texts that were dedicated to setting out the rules that should be followed? Not surprisingly, when the question is framed in such broad terms the very real limitations of the evidence are such that a meaningfully complete answer is impossible.

Nevertheless, some light can be shed on these issues by reading the extant evidence with the help of known social scientific models that have proved their utility in other analyses. The role of these models is largely heuristic, sensitizing scholars to issues in the extant sources that can now be organized (better, reorganized), compared and contrasted, with similarities and differences noted, and with gaps in the evidence filled in with the aid of these theoretical constructs, to achieve partial answers to some of the largest questions (24). This is the path taken by Seth Schwartz (henceforth S.) in the book under consideration here.

What S. offers the reader is a treasure hunt for lost or concealed patterns and structures that will help explain the Jews’ social relations and cultural practices (5). Once these hidden structures are revealed, S. maintains, one can better understand ‘why the Jews’ integration was so much more difficult than that of other provincial populations’, and in what ways that integration did eventually succeed (5). Not surprisingly, in this endeavor, since the search is defined from the start as one for lost or concealed structures, there are few if any passages in ancient texts that explicitly articulate the patterns S. seeks to tease out. Instead, S. offers close readings of sources intended to prove that his hidden structures are in fact the basis on which those passages turn. S. concedes that an ancient Jew would probably prefer to explain his behavior and his response to events in other terms than those S. proposes, and that an ancient Jew might well not even recognize himself and his attitudes towards the world as portrayed in S.’s book (10). This state of affairs raises a legitimate problem: how can S. convince his reader that he has found the structures underlying ancient Jewish life, and analyzed and presented them accurately, when the reader is informed from the outset not to expect an academic “smoking gun”? To borrow a term from detective novel writers, how will the reader distinguish a successful solution from a “red herring”?

The book opens with an extended theoretical introduction (‘Reciprocity and Solidarity’, 1-20), in which S. emphasizes the place of reciprocity in the Jewish conception of the relationship of the Jews with God, expressed in terms of the mutual obligation to observe the terms of the covenant, with its attendant rewards and punishments — this is ‘one of the central theological tendencies of

the Hebrew Bible' (7). Matters were different, however, on the social plane of human life. There, the Jews were heirs to anti-reciprocal imperatives (10), despite the fact that reciprocal structures were conspicuous in many other societies that lived in their geographical zone, with whom they shared the same agrarian economy characterized as slightly above subsistence-level, living in hill country, dry farming of wheat, barley, olives, and grapes (11, 21, 25). Unlike their neighbors, the Torah and other Biblical books exhorted the Jews to build a society of corporate solidarity, to pursue equality and justice, a world that was 'anti-Mediterranean' to the core (16, 26-9). The Jews were not to love their patrons, clients, kinsmen, and friends (as one should in a culture of reciprocity), they were to love their group, whether or not they had personal connections with the far-flung members of this imagined community (15).

In offering these theoretical distinctions ('The Problem with Mediterraneanism', 21-44), S. notes an important point: the contrast between reciprocal and solidarity-oriented structures should not be overstated. In reality, these two systems usually co-exist to some degree or other: the two types of structure are mutually dependent and in conflict with each other at the same time (19; see also the discussion of the Biblical world as a utopian counterculture, 29-31). This state of affairs, however, according to S., provides the basis for formulating the master question of the work: 'How did the Jews, as adherents of a strongly anti-reciprocal normative system, cope with life in a world in which institutionalized reciprocity was very hard indeed to escape?' (19). The answer to this question will have the benefit of reducing the long-recognized abnormality of the Jews in the setting of the ancient world. It will help explain why the Jews revolted time after time from 66-132 CE, by placing the emphasis on the structural discrepancies between the Jewish culture of solidarity and the Roman Empire, based on patronage, euergetism, and honor, all prominent components of ethnographic mediterraneanism (33-42). S.'s argument unfolds in three different movements, each based on a set of sources: Ben Sira, Josephus, and the Palestinian Talmud. The summary and analysis of S.'s exposition to follow will concentrate on aspects most likely to interest the readers of this journal — texts translated into or written in Greek.

S. sees Ben Sira ('A God of Reciprocity: Torah and Social Relations in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira', 45-79) as a book negotiating the constant tension between simplistic Deuteronomistic piety, in which reward and suffering work as they should, since 'no evil befalls those who fear the Lord and observe his commandments' (47), and 'offering advice about coping with a world in which the poor and suffering are frequently righteous, the rich and powerful are unjust, and few people can be trusted' (48). As part of the attempt to resolve this tension, Ben Sira offered his readers a series of instructions on relations to one's fellows — friends, social superiors, hosts, guests, parasites, family members, slaves, and women. In this advice, reciprocity was a constant theme and gift exchange was frequently mentioned. As S. indicates, the overlap between these comments and the elegiac poems of Theognis is notable. As improbable as it might seem in the reality of Jerusalem in the early second century BCE, it would seem that the social setting of Ben Sira's practical advice was some eccentric Greek city (48). To support this analysis, S. offers studies of selected passages from Ben Sira, outlining several different solutions recommended by the author on how to resolve the conflict between the reciprocity demanded in everyday life with Pentateuchal piety to which reciprocity was so antithetic.

In sum, S. presents Ben Sira's work as an example of a culture of adaptation. Ben Sira argued that the universal Torah, given to all humanity as wisdom, also contained rules for correct social interaction. Accordingly, for Ben Sira, the wise man knows the rules of gift exchange (49-54). Ben Sira offered a solid hard-headed practical approach to crucial social relations: he was cautious about honor and rank (66-70), suspicious of the pursuit of money, but willing to consider the possibility of the theodicy of good fortune (70-4). The hidden structures S. intends to uncover, he argues, make best sense of this complex book, which has often puzzled scholars or been misunderstood (76-9).

The discussion is on a different footing when S. turns to Josephus ('Josephus: Honor,

Memory, Benefaction', 80-109). S. confronts the literary evidence with the epigraphic remains, arguing that they confirm each other (88). He offers an argument based on triangulation, or what might be called a cable argument, in which individual strands woven together support the structure, and a weakness in one place in one strand does not weaken the force of the whole.

S. summarizes the epigraphical culture of first century Jerusalem as 'largely informal and consisting overwhelmingly of personal names and little else' (90). This was highly eccentric in Roman terms, differing significantly from the vast and extensive epigraphic culture of the contemporary Roman East (92). S. connects these epigraphic facts with Josephus' scattered remarks on memory and euergetism. Many of these comments focus on the greatest (and most problematic) benefactor of all, Herod the Great. According to Josephus, while foreigners were impressed by the lavishness of Herod's benefactions, the native Jewish population thought that the very buildings themselves were alien to Jewish custom, and their use for shows and displays was not part of the tradition (100). Indeed, according to Josephus, the people forgave Herod for his infractions only when he spared no expense (even stripping his palace of gold and silver) in order to distribute food with exemplary care, being especially solicitous of the needs of the infirm and the aged, at a time of drought and famine. Charity, in Biblical terms, and ethnic solidarity were what mattered, and they helped atone for Herod's excessive euergetism in Greco-Roman terms (101). In sum, according to Josephus, Herod strived for memorialization, but this led him to be harsh to his relatives and subjects, and to insistence that he be deferred to by his subjects. Not surprisingly, Herod was often disappointed and enraged, since the sort of courting he craved 'was alien to the nation of the Jews, who were accustomed to love righteousness more than glory (*AJ* 16.159)'. 'Jews only cared for the Law and piety' (105); 'everything — politics, commerce, benefaction — was subsumed in piety' (107).

There is of course something utopian about this description of first century Jerusalem. Even Josephus supplies ample evidence with which to contradict this idealized and impossibly unreal portrait (106). For example, Jews did embrace patronage: Josephus himself was zealous to acquire dependents during his tenure in the Galilee, as real-life Judean landowners may have worked hard to accumulate clients (105). Nevertheless, the epigraphical culture of Jerusalem shows that Josephus was not entirely wrong or misleading.

The third set of sources analyzed is the Palestinian Talmud ('Roman Values and the Palestinian Rabbis', 110-65), and this constitutes the longest section of the book. Here too, S. sees a tension between inevitable accommodation to Roman values and the needs of Roman rule, their partial acceptance, and an insistence on their rejection (sometimes in the form of a hidden transcript as elaborated in the work of James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990]). At the same time, the Rabbis were concerned to carve out a place of honor and authority for themselves. Thus, while they rejected the Roman system and wanted to provide an alternative for Jews, they also adopted/adapted that same system to establish and enhance their own position (164-5).

This book shares important structural similarities with S.'s previous work, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004). Like that book, the new one is based on three portraits that range in time from pre-Maccabean Jerusalem to the first century CE, and on to the Rabbis of the Galilee. Overlapping responses to a central theme at each of these three moments in time are compared and contrasted. Material remains are invoked to bolster the analysis of texts. Not surprisingly, a few key but controversial conclusions from the earlier work are repeated (109, n. 65), and the writing is often polemical.

In conclusion, how convincing is all this? As already hinted above, I am most taken with S.'s analysis of Herodian Jerusalem. The structures he sees lurking behind Josephus' writings and the epigraphic culture make sense out of the data in a refreshing, enlightening, and instructive way. In my view, S. has not been misled by some "red herring". I am less convinced by some of the other analyses. For example, how much of Ben Sira's view of the world is a consequence of his

belonging to the retainer class, with all its social loyalties and peculiar cultural perspectives. Nevertheless, however one responds to any individual point in this book, S. forces us to think and to view the familiar evidence from new perspectives. For this, his reader is in his debt.

Albert I. Baumgarten

Bar Ilan University

Kai Brodersen and Jaś Elsner (eds.), *Images and Texts on the "Artemidorus Papyrus". Working Papers on P.Artemid. (St. John's College Oxford, 2008)*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 214, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2009. 171 pp. ISBN: 978-3-515-09426-9.

Der hier zu besprechende, im Jahr 2009 vorgelegte Band vereint insgesamt zehn Beiträge namhafter Wissenschaftler zu einem ebenso einzigartigen wie umstrittenen Papyrus, der zweifellos als die bedeutendste Entdeckung des letzten Jahrzehnts in diesem Bereich gelten kann. Gewonnen wurde der sog. Artemidorus-Papyrus aus einem Konvolut von ausgesondertem und willkürlich zusammengemengtem Papyrusmaterial, in dem sich auch noch unpublizierte Urkunden aus dem späteren I. Jhdt. n. Chr. befanden. Aus rund 50 Einzelstücken konnten bisher drei größere Fragmente zusammengesetzt werden, die insgesamt — Zwischenräume nicht gerechnet — die stolze Breite von 242 cm besitzen. Während das Verso von einer Fülle von Tierskizzen übersät ist, die selbst bei offenkundigen Phantasiegeschöpfen durch ihre lebendige Zeichnung bestechen, weist das Rektio höchst unterschiedliche Bestandteile auf: als Texte in col. I bis III eine als Proömium gedeutete Erörterung der Verbindung(en) zwischen Geographie und Philosophie sowie in col. IV und V eine etwas erweiterte Fassung von fr. 21 (Stiehle) des Geographen Artemidor von Ephesos, woher auch der Name des Papyrus rührt; eine geographische Karte, die jedoch ungewöhnlicherweise keine Beischriften besitzt; schließlich Zeichenstudien zu Köpfen und anderen menschlichen Körperteilen.

Die staunende Fachwelt erhielt erstmals im Jahr 1998 davon nähere Kunde, als Claudio Gallazzi und Bärbel Kramer im *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* eine erste Einführung in den 'Artemidor im Zeichensaal' gaben.<sup>1</sup> Die vollständige Publikation erfolgte zehn Jahre später in einer luxuriösen Ausgabe, die außer einer Textedition mit ausführlicher Einleitung und sorgfältigem Kommentar einen Tafelband sowie teilweise auf die volle Länge hin ausziehbare Tafeln mit schwarz-weißen und farbigen Abbildungen in Originalgröße, dazu noch eine reich ausgestattete CD-ROM enthielt.<sup>2</sup> Die hierdurch eröffneten Möglichkeiten zur genaueren Überprüfung des Papyrus waren um so willkommener, als während einer ersten Ausstellung aus Anlaß der Olympischen Winterspiele von Turin 2006 unvermutet Zweifel an seiner Echtheit aufgekommen waren.

Ausgelöst wurde die seither andauernde, äußerst lebhaft geführte Debatte von dem Publizisten und Ordinarius für Klassische Philologie der Universität Bari Luciano Canfora, der als engagierter Verfechter der Fälschungsthese auch zu so unorthodoxen Mitteln griff wie der Vorauspublikation des Textes nach dem Ausstellungskatalog, da die Editoren aus seiner Sicht zu lange mit der Edition zögerten, oder der unablässigen Präsentation immer wieder neuer Indizien selbst in der Tagespresse. Zumal die streckenweise erbittert geführten Auseinandersetzungen für Außenstehende nicht immer leicht zu durchschauen waren, der Papyrus selbst jedoch höchste Aufmerksamkeit verdient, luden Kai Brodersen und Jaś Elsner nur wenige Monate nach der endgültigen Publikation des Papyrus eine Reihe von Fachleuten zu einer offenen Diskussionsrunde nach

<sup>1</sup> C. Gallazzi – B. Kramer, 'Artemidor im Zeichensaal: Eine Papyrusrolle mit Text, Landkarte und Skizzenbüchern aus späthellenistischer Zeit', *APF* 44, 1998, 189-208.

<sup>2</sup> C. Gallazzi – B. Kramer – S. Settis, *Il papiro di Artemidoro (P. Artemid.)*, Milano 2008.