Insgesamt ist das Thema, das sich S. zum Ziel gesetzt hat, nicht unproblematisch. Auch wenn es um eine in Relation zur gesamten Kaiserzeit vergleichsweise kurze Phase geht, so erstreckte sich die Regierungszeit des Augustus doch über einen Zeitraum von mehreren Jahrzehnten. Zudem war es ein langer Weg von den Bürgerkriegen bis zum weitgehend konsolidierten System der spätaugusteischen Zeit; in allen verschiedenen Phasen galten aber auch deutlich verschiedene Bedingungen. Auch die Gruppe der neuen Ritter und Senatoren ist nicht homogen. Bei manchen handelt es sich um Relikte aus der Bürgerkriegszeit, bei anderen (z.B. den einheimischen Kommandeuren von Hilfstruppeneinheiten) war die Erhebung in einen *ordo* persönlich motiviert und blieb für deren Nachkommen ohne Folgen, wieder andere wurden zwar unter Augustus in die *ordines* aufgenommen, treten aber für uns erkennbar erst unter seinen Nachfolgern in Erscheinung. Diese verschiedenen Personenkreise sind deutlich voneinander zu trennen. Vor allem aber ist die Quellenlage problematisch. Schon literarische Nachrichten sind insgesamt nur spärlich verfügbar, sodaß auf viele Fragen gar keine oder keine zufriedenstellende Antwort möglich ist. Die epigraphischen Zeugnisse sind zudem weder unter chronologischen oder geographischen Gesichtspunkten noch in ihrer Verteilung auf Personen unterschiedlichen Ranges oder Standes repräsentativ; überdies erschließt sich ihre Aussage nur unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen und unter Berücksichtigung grundlegender methodischer Kriterien. Auch können Phänomene einer späteren, geregelteren und vor allem besser dokumentierten Zeit nicht einfach auf die augusteischen Verhältnisse übertragen werden.

Dies alles ist S. jedoch sehr wohl bewußt und wird in der Untersuchung stets berücksichtigt, bis hin zur Entwicklung eigener Kriterien für die Auswertung des epigraphischen Materials. So gelingt es ihr, in einer präzisen und methodisch sehr sauberen Untersuchung, die bisherigen Erkenntnisse der Forschung zu einzelnen Personen und Personengruppen zusammenzuführen, darüber hinaus aber auch allgemeine Strukturen und Entwicklungen nachzuvollziehen und herauszuarbeiten. Sie lassen den Willen und die Bereitschaft des Augustus, mit Blick auf die Zukunft Provinziale in die *ordines* aufzunehmen, klar erkennen (auch wenn hier die Erklärung manchmal eher in pragmatischen als programmatischen Motiven liegen könnte). Zwar hielt sich dies unter Augustus noch in engeren Grenzen, und erst die Nachfolger praktizierten dieses Vorgehen in stärkerem Maße. Doch hatte Augustus auch dafür die Grundlagen geschaffen, durch Berufung auf seine Autorität ließ sich auch diese extensivere Praxis sanktionieren.

Dirk Erkelenz Köln

Maren Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001, xvii + 294 + indices. ISSN 0340 9570.

This is an important book on four counts: 1) It is the first systematic inquiry into the ways that Philo saw himself as a Jew and viewed Jewish culture against the backdrop of the Egyptian, the Greek and the Roman culture of Alexandria of his era. Previous books on Philo have investigated whether Philo was a Jew in Greek clothing or a Greek in Jewish clothing. Niehoff shifts the emphasis away from the supposed dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism. 2) It is the first work on Philo that applies the theories of ethnicity and culture developed by Frederik Barth's *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Oslo 1969) and Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York 1973), particularly their insistence that components of ethnic identity must not be imposed from outside upon any group but rather must consider the standards set by the group itself. Hence, Niehoff insists that Philo's discussions on Jewish identity and culture cannot be understood by reference to external criteria, such as the Bible and rabbinic literature, but rather by asking what made Philo a Jew in his own eyes. 3) It is the first work that makes a convincing case that it is the presence of Rome that is most vital for a

proper understanding of Philo's Jewish identity. 4) It is marked by mastery of the primary sources, which the author has invariably read afresh, by unusually comprehensive knowledge and critical appraisal of the secondary sources, and by original insights on point after point. If the present reviewer mentions a number of points on which he questions what she says or adds thereto, it is, rather, that he is inspired by such a challenging work.

Niehoff differs sharply from those studies that see Philo as nothing but an apologist. Basing herself on Victor A. Tcherikover's seminal article, 'Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered', *Eos* 48 (1956) 169-93, she concludes that each author wrote for his immediate friends and intellectual community. Hence, aside from a few specific studies, such as his *De Vita Mosis*, Philo, she claims, does not indicate any awareness, let alone hope, that his readers would be anything other than congenial Jews. In support of this, we may add, despite Philo's obvious mastery of Greek literature and philosophy and despite his excellent Greek style, there is only one instance, Heliodorus' novel *Aethiopica* (9.9.3), where there is no doubt that a pagan writer had read Philo and where he quotes (almost) *verbatim* from one of his works (*De Vita Mosis* 2.195). We may further add that of all of Philo's essays there is only one, the fragmentary *Hypothetica*, that is clearly and directly apologetic. On the other hand, to be sure, there are a number of comments in Philo that would seem to indicate that he was addressing a non-Jewish audience and that he was eager to attract converts to Judaism. Thus, Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.59.320) seems to allude to missionaries, since he berates the mystics who restrict their knowledge to three or four alone instead of proceeding to the midst of the marketplace so that every man might share in securing a better and happier life. He urges people (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.59.321) to walk in the daylight through the midst of the marketplace, 'ready to converse with crowded gatherings', clearly a scene of missionaries preaching the Bible. We Jews should, he adds (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.59.323), display in public all that is profitable and necessary for the benefit of those who are worthy to use it — another reference to preaching the Bible to the uncommitted. It seems unlikely that Philo is saying that Jews should display this publicly to their fellow Jews; rather, the audience would appear to be non-Jews. Again (*De Virtutibus* 39.217), he praises the example *par excellence* of the missionary, Abraham, as one whose voice was invested with persuasiveness and whose hearers were invested with understanding, clearly an allusion to his success as a missionary. Niehoff herself (pp. 29-31) notes that Philo (*De Virtutibus* 40.220-222) dwelt to such an extent on the conversion of Tamar; it would seem that Philo is addressing Gentiles, who, he hopes, will follow her example. Niehoff (p. 31) says that Philo was the first Jewish exegete who retroactively improved the status of foreign mothers in order to protect their offspring. If the case of Tamar is an example, it is not Philo who improved their status; rather, it was they themselves who improved their status by converting to Judaism.

Niehoff rightly insists (p. 46) that distancing oneself from the Egyptians is for Philo a crucial factor in becoming and remaining an authentic Jew. We may remark that a major reason for this attitude is that Philo is commenting on the Pentateuch, a goodly portion of which tells of Joseph and the Israelites dwelling in and being enslaved in Egypt, being accompanied by a mixed multitude of Egyptians who joined the Israelites when they left, and from time to time while in the wilderness expressing the wish to return to Egypt. Another reason is perhaps the recollection of the experience in 410 B.C.E. when the Egyptians, assisted by the local Persian authorities, destroyed the Jewish temple at Elephantine in Egypt. Niehoff (p. 58) notes Philo's construction of the biblical Egyptians as Persians; perhaps, we may suggest, this reflects the Elephantine experience. This identification of the Persians with the Egyptians may also reflect the fact that the great enemy of the Jews' protector, the Romans, were the Parthians. And, of course, a final reason would be the anti-Jewish outbreak in 38 in Alexandria, which, says Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium* 18.120), had been smoldering for some time.

In connection with Philo's attitude toward Egyptian culture and values, Niehoff has an excellent and convincing explanation (pp. 63-9) of Philo's apparent ambiguity in his treatment of

Joseph. As Niehoff (pp. 67-8) remarks, Philo is the first Jew, among our extant sources, who constructed him with such ambivalence. On the one hand, he is positive toward Joseph in *De Josepho*; Joseph is second only to his three great forbears (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) in directing his life toward the ideal good (*De Josepho* 1.1). He is the very model of self-control, decency and chastity, particularly in resisting the advances of Potiphar's wife (*De Josepho* 9.40-10.53). But, we must add, in the very same treatise (*De Josepho* 7.34-36) Philo criticizes him as a politician who, when the prospect is one of labor, stands aside and leaves others to serve him. On the other hand, as Niehoff remarks, he is critical toward him in *De Somniis*. Thus, his dreams are viewed disparagingly in *De Somniis* (2.1.5-7, 4.30-33, 12.78, 14.93-99, 16.110-116); yet, we may add, they are given a positive interpretation in Philo's essay *De Josepho* (2.5-11, 18.95). Again, we may add, in the essay *De Migratione Abrahami* (4.19) Philo gives Joseph credit for saying that God is the author of interpretations of dreams, whereas in the same essay (*De Migratione Abrahami* 29.159-160) he criticizes Joseph as the politician who is equally in touch with the concerns of his body and those of his soul. Yet, in the same *De Migratione Abrahami* (4.17) he speaks of Joseph as a soul untouched by corruption and worthy of perpetual memory. In particular, he praises Joseph for his confidence that God would visit the race that has vision and not hand it over to ignorance, for his discernment between the mortal and incorruptible portions of the soul, and for his avoidance of bodily pleasures and passions (*De Migratione Abrahami* 4.18-5.22). On the other hand, in *De Cherubim* (35.128) the same Philo blames Joseph for saying that the interpretations are through God rather than by Him. Indeed, Erwin R. Goodenough (*The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory* [New Haven 1938] 43) says that the portrayal of Joseph in Philo's essay *De Josepho* is so contradictory to everything that Philo says in several of his other essays that he wonders why no one has yet claimed that it comes from a different author.

Goodenough explains the apparently blatant contradiction by postulating two different audiences for Philo's treatises. This, we may remark, will not explain why there are contradictory attitudes within the same treatise. Niehoff makes a much more convincing case for her view that Philo is telling his Jewish audience, with a clear lesson for his own time, that to the degree that Joseph was integrated into Egyptian society and Egyptian attitudes he is to be criticized; and to the degree that he was not integrated he deserves praise.

To this self-contradiction in the treatment of Joseph we may add a parallel in Philo's attitude toward Jethro. The most severe criticism that Philo, the Platonist, can make of anyone is that he prefers seeming to being, conceit to truth; and that is precisely the charge that he makes against Jethro, deriving these traits from the very name of Jethro, which, he says, means 'uneven' (περισσός) (*De Agricultura* 10.43). Indeed, Philo completely transforms the biblical account of Jethro's visit to Moses. Rather than praise Jethro for giving such excellent advice to Moses, as we find in the Bible (Exodus 18:17-23), namely, to appoint subordinate judges to handle minor matters rather than to handle personally all matters, great and small, Philo (*De Mutatione Nominum* 17.105, *De Ebrietate* 10.37) describes him as δοκησίσοφος ('seeming wise') and as being concerned with little else than things human and corruptible. Yet, in the treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* (4.33.173-174), Philo compliments Jethro for having given Moses 'excellent advice' (ἄριστα συνεβούλευσεν) which was συμφέροντα ('useful'), namely to choose others to adjudicate less important matters while keeping the greater matters for himself and thus giving himself time to rest. Niehoff's thesis will not, however, it would seem, explain such a contradiction, unless we say that he had a different audience in mind.

Niehoff (pp. 68-74) sees Artapanus in the context of a Jewish party that supported acculturation in the Egyptian environment, whereas Philo, she says, criticized any sign of personal integration as a warning to contemporary Jews. Niehoff argues that this was Philo's view, especially when we consider that he was the leader of the Alexandrian Jewish community. However, we must remark, Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.18.1, 9.23.1-4, 9.27.1-37) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1.23.154.2-3), who cite Artapanus at length, nowhere mention that he was a Jew. Philo never mentions him at all. Josephus never mentions him; and while there are some

parallels with his account of Moses as general in Ethiopia (*Ant.* 2.238-253) there are considerable differences as well. It seems hard to believe that a Jew, however liberal he might have been, could have stated, as Artapanus (Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.27.4) says, that Moses became the teacher of the pagan Orpheus, that he established the worship of cats, dogs and ibises (9.27.4, 9.27.9, 9.27.12), and that he was deemed worthy of divine honor by the priests and was called Hermes because of his ability to interpret the sacred writings (9.27.6). If he was Jewish and presumably acquainted with the Bible, it is hard to understand how he could have said (9.27.20) that the Pharaoh Chenephres died because he had ordered the Jews to be clothed with linen and not to wear woolen clothing and that he did this so that once they were so marked they could be harassed by him, whereas the Bible prohibits wearing cloth that *combines* wool and linen (Lev. 19:19, Deut. 22:11).

Niehoff (p. 69) says that Philo's *De Vita Mosis* was meant to correct all stories about Moses, especially Jewish ones, which identified him in varying degees with Egypt. Consequently, as she insightfully remarks, he is directing his account to contemporary Jews who were seeking to be assimilated. Yet, in the opening of the essay (*De Vita Mosis* 1.1.2), he says that Greek writers have refused to treat Moses as worthy of memory, and it is clear that Philo has them in mind in his intent to correct their misapprehension. Moreover, we may ask, why does Philo add to the biblical account a description of Moses' education by Greek and Egyptian teachers? In reply, as Niehoff notes, Philo, probably referring to his own education in the liberal arts, is presenting a model of how one can and should receive such an education and yet remain loyal to Jewish ideals. Thus, he insists that Moses never became part of the Egyptian court, even though he was raised there.

Niehoff makes a convincing case for her thesis that it was with the Romans rather than the Greeks that the Jews of Egypt are most closely allied. This will help to explain Philo's glorification of Augustus and Tiberius. Indeed, the qualities of these emperors that he praises are precisely those that distinguished the Jews, according to him. Caligula is the exception that proves the rule. Niehoff (p. 74) convincingly demonstrates that one major factor that brought the Jews closer to the Romans was their common abhorrence of Egyptian values.

One of the most valuable contributions made by Niehoff is her analysis of the similarities between Philo's and Roman views. Indeed, as she demonstrates (p. 112), Philo's writings are of special value because they are the first detailed expression of a sustained pro-Roman attitude on the part of a Jewish intellectual. In particular, she notes (p. 86) the common abhorrence displayed by both Jews and virtuous Romans such as Macro and Silenus towards Caligula. She indicates (pp. 93-104) how Philo shared the views of Seneca in matters of ethics, notably the centrality of self-restraint, sexual matters, female modesty, as well as his criticism of Caligula's claim to divine status.

Niehoff (pp. 130-1) draws a contrast between Philo's attitude toward the temple of Caesar in Alexandria, which he praises in the highest terms (*Legatio ad Gaium* 22.151), and Josephus' mention of the temple of Caesar in Caesarea (*Ant.* 15.339) and his condemnation of Herod for erecting temples (*Ant.* 15.328-329). However, Josephus does not condemn the erection of the temple in Caesarea any more than Philo does the erection of the temple in Alexandria, inasmuch as both were erected by Augustus. His condemnation was of Herod for erecting temples. He notes that the cultic veneration of Augustus in Alexandria was in his view compatible with Jewish values and Jewish identity. Philo, we may remark, does not say that Jews were permitted to worship in that temple. His view is compatible with his adoption (*De Vita Mosis* 2.38.205 and *De Specialibus Legibus* 1.7.53) of the Septuagint's θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις (Exodus 22:27) forbidding disparagement of other people's religions.

In answer to the apparent contradiction between Philo's abhorrence of assimilation to Greek values and his tremendous knowledge of and constant reliance on Greek sources, Niehoff (p. 138) presents the original and convincing insight that Philo's construction of the Greeks is the discrepancy between his open admiration for specific philosophers and playwrights of the classical

period, on the one hand, and his open criticism of Alexander the Great (for example, he picks the most critical version of the story of Alexander and Calanus), the importance of which, as Niehoff rightly insists, can hardly be overestimated, and Greek philosophical culture, on the other. In particular, he assimilates individual Greek writers, notably Pythagoras, Plato and Zeno, into Jewish ethnicity. They are said to have derived their ideas from Scripture or to have reached the same insights as Moses. Where they do not agree with Jewish attitudes, he criticizes them, for example, Plato and Xenophon in their *Symposia* (pp. 148-50). As Niehoff (p. 182) points out, Philo felt that the encyclical studies naturally led to Jewish commitment because the best of Greek philosophy is nothing but an imitation of the Torah.

An important contribution by Niehoff is her explanation of Philo's concept of Divine language (pp. 188-202), which, he says, is natural and without grammar and which serves as the archetype for human language, and which, she rightly says, represents a considerable philosophical achievement. In remarking that the Divine word functions like a seal, leaving both written signs in Moses' mind and structuring patterns on the material realm, Philo applied this image, which he borrowed from Alexandrian Middle Platonism, for the first time to language and literary creativity.

Niehoff's meticulous analysis of parables in Philo (pp. 210-46), the existence of which had previously been overlooked or even denied, is an important original contribution, especially her comparison of Philo's parables with those in the Gospels and in rabbinic literature and with figures of comparison in Graeco-Roman literature. If her analysis is correct, as there is reason to believe that it is, Philo could potentially play a role similar to that of the Gospel of Thomas in elucidating the origins of early Christianity. Additionally, her analysis of rabbinic king parables indicates, most importantly, unmistakable Philonic traces.

Finally, Niehoff (pp. 247-66), pursuing Geertz's theory that religions strive to objectivize their moral and aesthetic preferences 'by depicting them as the imposed conditions of life implicit in a world with a particular structure', presents an important and original discussion of Philo's connection between nature and the Jewish way of life, analyzing Philo's arguments inscribing into nature Jewish customs that preserve health and that reflect the objective structure of the universe.

In sum, this is a ground-breaking work, representing creative and responsible scholarship in the best sense, that opens up a new dimension to the study of both Philo and Alexandrian Jewry.

Louis H. Feldman Yeshiva University

Tessa Rajak, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 18, Leiden: Brill, 2001 xix + 579 pp.

For more than two decades Tessa Rajak has been one of the most prolific and influential scholars of the Jewish interaction with the Greco-Roman world. In addition to her indispensable book, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (1983), she has produced a raft of important articles that give insight into the relationships of Jewish texts, traditions, and history to the wider society of the Greeks and the Romans in the Second Temple and early rabbinic periods. The present volume constitutes a collection of twenty-seven articles, three of them new, illustrating Rajak's breadth of interests and contributions. The assemblage is most welcome, an inspired idea, and a boon for scholars and students of this subject.

The pieces fall under four headings. In Part I, six essays treat various aspects of the interconnections between Hellenism and Judaism in a broad sense. Josephus serves to unite the nine articles in Part II that cover matters ranging from his political thought to his use of Parthian source material. Part III gathers some of Rajak's most significant publications (nine of them) on Jewish