

treatment they receive within the text: the Hellenistic period is given less than half a page, the Archaic and Classical together — 14. The book also contains two helpful indices, an index of passages cited and a general index. The presentation of the main sources throughout in Greek is followed by French translations, making the tome accessible to a large audience and an efficient tool in academic teaching, especially in the francophone world. The text is generously and pedantically annotated (on the basis of a respectable and updated bibliography); some footnotes are almost brief articles in themselves: e.g., n. 12 on pp. 76-8, nn. 56, 58 on pp. 253-4, n. 173 on pp. 416-7. All this, together with the very nature of the subject, the author's predilection for systematically detailed analysis, and a certain amount of reiteration, help explain the monograph's impressive length. One can only imagine that the ephors would have liked it shorter.

Despite my critical comments, some of which may well be too idiosyncratic, this is, on the whole, a valuable and important book, with many merits: diligently researched, copiously documented, well organized, clearly written — a comprehensive and perspicacious survey of the evidence, a major contribution to the study of Spartan history and an indispensable tool for further research in the field. It will certainly become a standard work of reference for the Spartan academic community.

Ephraim David

The University of Haifa

B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus On the Jews. Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*, Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1996. 396 pp.

In this study Bar-Kochva plunges into the problem of the passages attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. On the basis of an extensive and well-argued discussion he comes to the conclusion that these passages are not to be considered authentic. Bar-Kochva focuses on some major issues in order to refute the claims made by scholars in the past concerning the authenticity of the passages in question. He analyses at great length the motifs within the fragmentary text against the background of pagan literature from the Hellenistic era dealing with *ethnē*. He rejects the possibility that Josephus used a Jewish adaptation of Hecataeus of Abdera. Bar-Kochva's argument that there exists a distinction between the 'real' Hecataeus (Diodorus Siculus 40.3) and Pseudo-Hecataeus (in Josephus' *CA*) seems quite convincing. However, one has always to bear in mind the possibility that since we have two different 'summaries' of Hecataeus' *On the Jews*, made by two different authors in two different periods, either author might have placed a different emphasis on certain topics.

Bar-Kochva argues convincingly that the passages in Josephus' *CA* which are not authentically Hecataean can be dated to the later years of John Hyrcanus or the first years of Alexander Jannaeus, the period of the expansion in Transjordan and the swift invasion by Ptolemy Lathyrus into Palestine in 103/2. From the little we have of the so-called Pseudo-Hecataeus document (cited at the beginning of the book), Bar-Kochva comes to the ingenious conclusion that its author was a Hellenistic Jew from Egypt who had some knowledge of his Jewish tradition, but lacked a broader education in mythology and philosophy. According to Bar-Kochva this Pseudo-Hecataeus

used the Hebrew Bible and not the Septuagint. Although he was an Egyptian Jew he had a great interest in the Holy Land. The analysis is brilliant, the various points are well argued and based on enormous erudition. It is remarkable how much one can deduce from such a relatively small passage which has come to us via an author who was not necessarily quoted verbatim.

Bar-Kochva's analysis concerning the nature of *On the Jews* by Pseudo-Hecataeus is illuminating since he deals with the fragments found in *CA* against the background of the ethnographic genre. Hence we owe Bar-Kochva this excellent survey of ethnographic literature in English. One should emphasize that a sharp distinction ought to be drawn between the ethnographic genre that we find in the Classical period and that stemming from the Hellenistic era, a matter I hope to discuss in due course. Be that as it may, Bar-Kochva sees in the Pseudo-Hecataean document a typical arrangement of the sort which we usually find in the ethnographic literature. For instance, the *origo* section where Pseudo-Hecataeus describes the origin of the Jews in Egypt is followed by the customs of the Jews, their history and geography. Bar-Kochva elaborately argues that the origo section was the one in which Pseudo-Hecataeus describes the migration of Hezekiah the High Priest from Palestine to Egypt. This extensive migration, rather than previous migrations of Jews to Egypt, was according to him the origin of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt. This may be so. Bar-Kochva rightly maintains that such a story could be a good excuse for 'conservative' Jews in Egypt to legitimize their settlement there. This constituted a response to the biblical prohibition on Jews returning to Egypt. Within this context it is interesting to note the passage in the Temple Scroll where it is said that the ideal Jewish king will not return the Jews to Egypt to fight: *וְלֹא יָשִׁיב אֶת הָעַם מִצְרֵינָהּ מִלְחָמָה*. This text probably stems from Palestine from the same time that Bar-Kochva dates his Pseudo-Hecataeus, i.e. the reign of Alexander Jannaeus.

Bar-Kochva is right, I believe, in stating that there existed a lively polemical literature at the time in Egypt concerned with 'national' issues. Hence one should emphasize once again that Palestinian Jews were also involved in such literary activity, as I argued twelve years ago concerning Eupolemus (in my *Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* [Tübingen 1987], chapter 4).

Elsewhere Bar-Kochva claims that the Hezekiah story was in line with the 'lobbying' efforts of the two Jewish generals in the Ptolemaic army to spare Judaea from a renewed Ptolemaic conquest of the Holy Land. In other words, through his story Pseudo-Hecataeus wished to demonstrate the crucial role the Diaspora Jews had in advancing the welfare (and security) of the Hasmonean state. Although they lived in the Diaspora, they were nevertheless good Jews who were at no time indifferent to the Jewish state. Here we have yet another proof that the historian cannot be separated from his own *Sitz im Leben*. This book provides us with another excellent example why we historians rewrite history every now and then. Claims such as made by Bar-Kochva could not have been made a hundred years ago. Bar-Kochva even calls the document which he scrutinizes a 'manifesto of conservative Judaism in Hellenistic Egypt'. Hence 'secular' Jews in the Egyptian Diaspora are here portrayed as analogous to present-day secular American Jews who care for the state of modern Israel and insist that they contribute to it greatly by their well-rooted presence in the USA. This analogy is not made by Bar-Kochva, but it springs to mind when reading his study.

This is a learned book, full of insights, and it provides us with a new approach to Diaspora Jewry. It includes two important appendices (the Hezekiah coins and the dating of Pseudo-Aristeas) and a section of extended notes. Bar-Kochva's work is extremely professional since not only is he in full control of Greek material, but he has also mastered the literature in Hebrew, both source material and modern studies. Even if I do not always agree with Bar-Kochva's arguments, he has presented us with a well thought-out and useful book which will remain a milestone in the field of Jewish Hellenistic history and literature for many years to come.

Doron Mendels

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Renato Oniga, *Sallustio e l'etnografia*, Biblioteca di Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 12, Pisa: Giardini, 1995. 151 pp. ISBN 88-427-0258-7.

As a Roman historian writing in the first century B.C.E. and drawing inspiration from centuries of Greek literary tradition, Sallust weaved ethnographic detail into his historiography. In focusing upon this aspect of Sallust's extant writings, Renato Oniga examines a number of badly transmitted fragments from the *Historiae* (ch. VI), yet concludes that Sallust's ethnography finds its best and only complete expression in the digression on the Numidian and other North-African tribes in *Bellum Iugurthinum*, 17-19.

The first chapter of Oniga's book surveys the well-known history of classical ethnography prior to Sallust. Descriptions of peoples as well as descriptions of countries were at the same time both appendices to historiography and an integral part of it. The first Greek historian to apply this method was Herodotus who, as Oniga rightly states, might very well be called "the Father of Ethnography". The military campaigns of Alexander the Great in the East provided further rich material for ethnographic monographs which introduced both India and other remote countries to Greek audiences. Polybius continued this tradition, concentrating most of his ethnography into the 34th book of the *Historiae*. Finally, Poseidonius added an ethical dimension to ethnographic and sociological discussions.

This tradition of ethnological digressions in historiographical treatises continued up to Sallust's time, finding its way into the Latin literary corpus through Cato's *Origines*, Varro and Caesar. Oniga stresses the fact that Caesar initiated a new trend in ethnography in contrast to Greek theoretical and philosophical interest. Caesar was an eye-witness for his own material, and he wrote from a clearly political and pragmatic point of view, using ethnography as a means to know and to control conquered people. As a consequence his writings are imbued with strategic significance. In this sense, Sallust is more akin to the Greek tradition with its emphasis on the pure pursuit of knowledge, a matter upon which Oniga further elaborates in Chapters III-V.

In Chapter II, Oniga defines Sallust's cultural models, that is, some general concepts in ancient ethnography through which historians, geographers and philosophers described other human societies, and some of the methods they used for the analysis of their development.

The primary method of defining a foreign people was the analogy with a known people, a technique already extensively employed by Herodotus. This simple