Antiquity in Antiquity

Edited by
GREGG GARDNER and
KEVIN L. OSTERLOH

Texts and Studies in
Ancient Judaism
123

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Edited by

Peter Schäfer (Princeton, NJ)
Annette Y. Reed (Philadelphia, PA)
Seth Schwartz (New York, NY)
Azzan Yadin (New Brunswick, NJ)

123

Antiquity in Antiquity

Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World

Edited by

Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloh

Mohr Siebeck

Gregg Gardner, born 1976; MA in History of the Jewish People from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and MA in Religion from Princeton University; is finishing a doctorate in Religion at Princeton University.

Kevin L. Osterloh, born 1969, is an Assistant Professor of Ancient History at Miami University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151456-2
ISBN 978-3-16-149411-6
ISSN 0721-8753 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

From January 22–24, 2006, the editors of this volume together with Peter Schäfer held a colloquium entitled "Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World" at Princeton University. The papers explored how collective memory and group history played roles in identity formation, political propaganda, social relations, artistic expression, religious belief and practice, and the establishment of official corpora of ancestral traditions for Jews, Christians, and their pagan neighbors in the ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern world from the second century B.C.E. to the seventh century C.E. In short, the participants examined how people living in antiquity viewed their *own* antiquity. The contributions collected in this volume stem from the colloquium presentations. All abbreviations are according to Patrick H. Alexander, et. al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999).

The *Antiquity in Antiquity* colloquium was sponsored by Princeton University's Dean of the Graduate School, the Department of Religion, and the Program in Judaic Studies. We would like to thank Marcie Citron, Lorraine Fuhrmann, and Baru Saul for making the conference a reality, as well as Eric Gregory, Martha Himmelfarb, Adam Jackson, Lance Jenott, Daniel L. Schwartz, and Holger M. Zellentin for serving as session chairs. We would also like to thank our predecessors in the late antique religions conference-publication projects, Adam H. Becker, Ra'anan S. Boustan, Eduard Iricinschi, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Holger M. Zellentin, all of whom provided invaluable help along the way. At Mohr Siebeck, Ilse König and Henning Ziebritzki guided this volume to its completion. We would also like to thank Carey A. Brown, Laura G. Fisher, Rena Lauer, and Paul Westermeyer for their support. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Peter Schäfer, whose direction and confidence in us made this project possible. This book is dedicated with love to our families, the Browns, Gardners, and Osterlohs.

September 14, 2008
14th of Elul 5768

Gregg Gardner
Princeton University

Kevin L. Osterloh
Miami University

Table of Contents

Part Three
Antiquities of Late Antiquity and Today

The Significance of Antiquity in Antiquity

An Introduction

GREGG GARDNER and KEVIN L. OSTERLOH

I. The Nature of This Volume

Societies share a need to enshrine the present within the legitimating realm of the past.[1] This necessity leads successive generations to reshape "yesterday" – their received traditions, beliefs and customs – into line with their perceptions of "today" – contemporary reality. Indeed, the establishment and proper interpretation of tradition and "collective memory" was as important in the ancient world as it is in modernity.[2] In common with twenty-first century moderns and the many generations in between, the

[1] We would like to thank Wietse de Boer, Harriet Flower, Adam Gregerman, Martha Himmelfarb, Daniel Prior, and Peter Schäfer for their helpful feedback on this essay.

[2] In his posthumous *La mémoire collective* (1950), the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1877–1945) helped establish the socially constructed nature of "collective memory" while dispelling the notion of its separate existence as a quasi-metaphysical "group mind." Collective memory indicates, rather, the way socially embedded individuals recall and recreate the symbolic package – e.g. the sets of memories inscribed in monuments and literature – which evokes "the group." In his earlier *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte*: *Etude de mémoire collective* (1941), Halbwachs emphasizes the outcome of perpetual recall and recreation in the present, by demonstrating how each generation reinvests the collective past with new symbolic value. This insight has been labeled by some as the "presentist" approach, an emphasis on rupture over continuity, which can lead to the "presentist flaw" – all is rupture and change, there is no continuity with the past. In this view, present historical reconstructions do not represent plausible pictures of the past, but only images of present concerns; the rupture with the past and its meaning is total (see Lewis A. Coser, "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877–1945," in Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* [ed., trans., and introduced by L. A. Coser; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992], 1–34). However, as Amos Funkenstein notes (*Perceptions of Jewish History* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993], 10–24; see also below), it is a mistake to associate Halbwachs entirely with the "presentist" view, as Halbwachs holds that modern "objective" scholars are indeed capable of reconstructing distinct periods of the ancient past (e.g. Halbwachs' reconstruction of the Holy Land according to the Gospels in *La topographie légendaire*), even while our ancient objects of inquiry apparently were not!

ancients were often compelled to demonstrate continuity with – and the discontinuity of rivals from – a shared past through an ongoing interpretation of communal tradition.

The need for perceived continuity serves many purposes, such as the promotion of communal prestige and an individual sense of self. Down through the ages, established group histories and collective memories have continued to play decisive roles in the processes of communal identity construction, political advancement, religious legitimization and the enhancement of social status. These objectives are realized when elite powerbrokers and shapers of public imagination inscribe their own status and that of their perceived ancestors – i.e. their collective identity – into the symbolic literary and material package that is presented as "collective memory".[3] Of course, "elite society" is never monolithic. Competing claims to status, views of the past, collective memories, and accepted traditions often survive from the same time and place. Whether or not we are tuned into the nature of the competition, the past, *per se*, is a contested legacy for us all.

Ancient efforts to retrieve and reinterpret the past have left an indelible mark on the literary and material record of the Greco-Roman world. Such historical artifacts enable contemporary scholars of the ancient Mediterranean and Near East to study these reconstructions of the even more distant past. Indeed, the study of collective memory and identity in the ancient world has gained increasing prominence in scholarly circles in recent years.[4] Yet, the use of antiquity by the ancient peoples themselves is a

---

[3] In this sense, "collective memory" is shorthand for "the perpetually reinvented traditional view of the past." Funkenstein offers a helpful model for understanding the individual recall, and thus reinvention, of "collective memory" by reusing Ferdinand de Saussure's notion of *langue* (language) and *parole* (speech). *Langue* equals the symbolic package that evokes "the group", e.g. "signs, symbols, and practices: memorial dates, names of places, monuments and victory arches, museums and texts, customs and manners, stereotype images (incorporated, for instance, in manners of expression), and even language itself (in de Saussure's terms)." *Parole*, on the other hand, indicates the speech act of the individual as s/he is acted upon by inherited *langue*, and in turn acts upon *langue* through the reinvestment of contemporary meaning into inherited symbols, i.e. the reinvention of communal memory, tradition and identity, etc. Funkenstein relates *langue* to the biblical Hebrew terms *zekher/zikaron* ("memory") and *parole* to the verb *zakhar* ("memory as a mental act"), in order to show that this concept of collective memory existed already in proto-theory in ancient Israel. The imperative *zakhor* was a biblical call "to remember" the collective past, which in its perpetual recall by historically embedded individuals was consequently reinvented, as biblical and post-biblical intertextual references show. See Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History*, 6–10.

[4] For example, on ancient Jewish society and Judaism see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*: *Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of

broad topic that could conceivably cover many different aspects of the entire panoply of our ancient objects' already ancient legacy. So what do we mean to convey by *Antiquity in Antiquity*?

First, to which period(s) of antiquity, and to which specific places and peoples are we referring by the second part of the phrase *in Antiquity*? The answer is somewhat arbitrary, but nonetheless succinct. The timeframe, geographic *loci*, and social exemplars examined in this volume are restricted by the intellectual interests of its editors and contributors. Nearly all of the authors herein deal with aspects of Jewish and Christian communal history within the greater "pagan," or polytheistic, Greco-Roman world. They address the period immediately before the consolidation of the Roman Empire in the Mediterranean basin, through the years of the Empire's height, and finally the period of the decline of western Roman political power and the reconsolidation of Rome in the East, also known as the early Byzantine period. In other words, the studies in this volume cover slightly less than 1000 years of ancient history, or c. 200 B.C.E.–c.700 C.E.

Second, to what are we referring in the first half of the phrase, i.e. that which was already considered *Antiquity*, or ancient, *in Antiquity*? Generally speaking, our goal is to address the particular set of relationships which the ancient objects of our inquiries cultivated with their own past(s). This raises yet another question: What is distinctive about the approach of our ancient objects toward their own past(s) that makes its study relevant to the contemporary world? Indeed, many periods of ancient, medieval and modern history are replete with accounts of individuals, families, communities, and (later) nations that reinvent their past in the process of reinventing themselves. Furthermore, many themes of this volume – e.g. the nature of tradition, contested legacies, socially constructed identities and memories – are applicable to the study of any human society, ancient, medieval or modern, regardless of geography. But relevance is gained from similarity as well as difference. Thus, the ubiquity of these issues across space and time can only add to the present value of this volume, as it grants our

---

California Press, 1999), and David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); on ancient Greece and Rome see Simon Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek Under Rome*: *Cultural Identity, The Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001), and Emma Dench, *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); and, on early Christians and Christianity, see Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race*: *Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), and Aaron P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

ancient objects of inquiry contemporary, twenty-first century relevance. The ancients, in many ways, were not so different from ourselves.

On the other hand, the ancients do exhibit a certain approach to their own past that, while not entirely unique to them, does mark them as particularly interesting objects for contemporary reflection. In short, what the term *Antiquity in Antiquity* conveys most succinctly is an ongoing preoccupation with the reinterpretation of the past by our ancient objects themselves who are distinguished by an emphatically classicizing stance with respect to their own antiquity.[5] Their communal identity, memory, and tradition is often viewed as the continuation of an earlier glorious age, upon which they perpetually focused as the lens through which they understood themselves. This volume of articles, appropriately titled *Antiquity in Antiquity*, seeks in turn to use ancient literary and material artifacts for the twenty-first century reconstruction of the social history of three successive classicizing ages. These sequential epochs include the Hellenistic/Second Temple period, the Greco-Roman/Imperial period, and the Late Antique/Byzantine period,[6] during which the potential inherited legacy is perpetually augmented by syncretizing new traditions from old sources,

[5] Seth Schwartz, "Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine," *Past and Present* 148 (1995): 3–47, speaks of the literary classicism of such Judean works as Jubilees, Ben Sira, and the Temple Scroll, which are the product of "the tendency to emulate a more or less discrete body of writing which has come to be thought uniquely valuable and significant. The self-consciousness which classicism implies is, in fact, a novel and defining characteristic of Judaean literature from the third century B.C.E. onwards," (ibid., 30). Schwartz offers a view of a classicizing process which is primarily an act of imitation, while holding that the "detailed study, explication and commentary" on the ancient biblical corpus, i.e. its creative expansion, is best described as "scholasticism" (ibid., 31). For the purposes of the present essay, we mean to identify all such acts of self-reflection – imitation, creative expansion, reinvention, etc. – that take the inherited past into account as classicizing acts, thus we refer to the periods in question as "classicizing ages."

[6] We recognize that periodization is an exercise in the arbitrary. This is captured, for instance, in the Hellenistic/Second Temple period, since the Hellenistic Period is often viewed as ending in 31 B.C.E (the battle of Actium), while the Second Temple Period does not end till a century later in 70 C.E. In the subsection headings that divide this volume, we have altered this (due to the range of our contributions) to the Late Hellenistic-Early Imperial Period. Our point is not that each period is distinctly unique, but rather that each designated period represents a particular, sequential stage of ancient societies dealing with their own antiquity. As each period segues into the next (i.e. there is no "real" division between them) the antiquity in play for the ancient objects of our inquiry is continually compounded. At the same time, as a number of the contributions demonstrate, the interconnection between originally distinct antiquities – Jewish, Greco-Roman/Pagan, and Christian – often becomes stronger and deeper.

while the creative intellectual impulse remains focused on reinterpreting this "new" past.

It remains then to distinguish the particular approaches of our twenty-first century contributors. Generally speaking, the studies contained in this volume emphasize the analysis of communal over individual history, with implications primarily for affairs in the temporal domain.[7] Of major importance to this analysis is the process of communal identity construction (and/or reinvention) within the context of contested legacies, by which members of elite groups seek to form discursive group-border lines and associated claims of difference.[8] Equally important is the nature of tradition, and collective memory as inscribed in both literature and material remains, and as (re)interpreted by members of rival elite groups. Such reinterpretations are undertaken so as to remake individual and social-group identity in order to strengthen discursive borders between in-group and out-group and to establish group continuity with (and the discontinuity of rival groups from) the common ancestral legacy.[9]

Nearly all of the social groups examined in this volume define themselves and/or rival groups in light of a perceived set of shared pasts, or

---

[7] While the identity claims of the social groups analyzed in this volume occasionally impinge upon their, and their rivals', perceived standing in the heavenly realm, this volume's primary foci are the reinvented traditions, memories, and identities that affected our ancient objects of inquiry in the temporal domain. Of course, ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean societies were also greatly concerned with the implications of earthly actions on heavenly reality and vice versa, and the indelible interconnection between the divine and the temporal, see Ra'anan S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[8] Discursive boundary formation, i.e. the declared emphasis on Insider versus Outsider, serves to obfuscate the actual complexity of social interactions which are, ironically, central to the very same processes of identity formation. On digital (a dichotomous, "us versus them", 1:1 approach) and analogue (identity expressed as an accepted range of individual and communal practices) paradigms of identity formation in ancient Greece, see Jonathan M. Hall, *Hellenicity*: *Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 179, 220–26. On the discourse of boundary formation between ancient Judaism and Christianity, see Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003; repr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).

[9] For the rivalry between sects of ancient Jews, Christians, Pagans and the many groups in between these socially constructed, discursive categories, and the concurrent application of "heresy, heresies, heretical" to perceived outsiders and its impact on questions of ancient identity, see Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds., *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 119; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

legacies, of ancient Greece, early Rome, or the ancient Near Eastern world of ancient Israel, Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia. Indeed, the further along the timeline we move – from the Hellenistic to the Byzantine period – the more the trajectories of initially distinct shared pasts are perceived as a single Greco-Roman-Jewish/Biblical past. It is by reinterpreting this particular conglomerate past that certain Late Antique groups as well as some of our own twenty-first century contemporaries define themselves. In fact, the modern (or at least modern scholarly) obsession with reconstructing the ancient past began with our ancient objects of inquiry. As scholars have observed, while the ancients tended to blur the separate contexts for historical *data*, they were nonetheless imbued with a sense of historical consciousness.[10] That is, many of the ancients acknowledged and assiduously sought out the sources of their inherited legacy – if perhaps only to control

[10] See Peter Schäfer, "Zur Geschichtsauffassung des rabbinischen Judentums," *Journal for the Study of* Judaism 6 (1975): 167–88; repr. in *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums* (ed. P. Schäfer; Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 15; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 23–44. See also Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History*, where he takes issue with both Halbwachs' view of premoderns' supposedly uncritical reception of the past before the Enlightenment and the founding of the modern academy. In particular, Funkenstein challenges Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, who (in his *Zakhor*: *Jewish History and Jewish Memory* [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982]) reapplies Halbwachs' theory to the whole of the Jewish past from the first-century C.E. – the time of the last ancient Jewish historiographer, Josephus – until the rise of nineteenth-century *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Funkenstein notes, "Yerushalmi, like Halbwachs before him, inevitably polarizes the contrast between historical narrative and "collective memory"; while modern scholars compose "objective" historiography, premoderns were supposedly caught up merely in a perpetual cycle of unreflective modifications of communal memory over time," (Funkenstein, *Perceptions of Jewish History*, 10–11).

Funkenstein (ibid., 10–21) confronts this view as follows. First, while allowing that modern academics often apply self-consciously reflective methods to their studies of the past, he questions their "objectivity" – since, however self-aware they may be, they are still historically embedded individuals whose historiographic products also answer present needs. Second, he claims that even though the ancients, in this case the ancient Jewish objects of his inquiry, did not apply modern historical-critical methods to their examination of the past, they still approached their own past in a reflective manner. Indeed, they often occupied a taxonomic middle ground between the modern academic posture and the Halbwachs-Yerushalmi foil position: viz. un-selfconscious re-creators of tradition. As such, they often took part in self-reflective processes of creative reinvention of communal memory, tradition, and identity. More precisely, they were intimately aware of the common sources of their communal past, and were often ready to offer up novel reinterpretations of this past in order to defend contested, present interests and points of view. In other words, they possessed an "historical consciousness" (Funkenstein's taxonomic middle ground).

its interpretation and govern the application of its "new" meaning in the present.

II. Three Classicizing Ages: Contextualizing the Contributions

The Hellenistic Age (323–31 B.C.E.), ushered in by the conquests of Alexander the Great and the wars of the Diadochi, marks the immediate prehistory and beginnings of the first classicizing period of this volume: the Late Hellenistic to the early Imperial period (c. 200 B.C.E.–100 C.E.). The earlier glorious time of fifth-century Hellas during the Persian Wars and subsequent Athenian *Pentakontaetia*, and the even earlier Homeric heroic period, were idealized in the Hellenistic Age, as copyists and commentators collated the classical Greek heritage in centers of learning at Alexandria, Athens, Pergamum, and elsewhere.[11]

The coming of the Hellenistic Age marks a major turning point in the Second Temple period of Jewish History (539 B.C.E.–70 C.E.). Long before Alexander's conquests, the exiles of Judah had reestablished themselves and rebuilt their Temple in Jerusalem. As the self-proclaimed "remnant" of biblical Israel,[12] they had also begun to edit and augment their ancient literary and cultural heritage. The cultural interaction between the Jewish and Hellenic worlds – both already fixated on the past – amplified

---

[11] Arrian (*Anabasis* 1.11–12) tells how, before crossing the Hellespont, Alexander sacrificed upon the tomb of Protesilaus (the first of Agamemnon's expedition to reach Asia). After crossing the Hellespont, he set out directly for Troy (Ilium) and once there sacrificed to Athena. Plutarch adds (*Life of Alexander* 15.4–5) that, while at Troy, Alexander anointed the tombstone of Achilles, ran a race naked with his companions while anointed with oil in honor of the hero, and then crowned the tombstone with garlands. There he declared Achilles blessed, for in life he had had a faithful friend (Patroclus), and in death a great herald of his fame (Homer). Also, after the victorious Battle of Granicus in 334, Plutarch writes (*Life of Alexander*, 16.8) that Alexander sent 300 Persian shields (Arrian: 300 suits of armor, *Anabasis* 1.17) to the Athenians, an act surely meant to gain their good graces by commemorating both their symbolic leading role in the present "panhellenic campaign" against Persia, and their historic defense of Hellas against the Persians 150 years before. On the ancient library of Alexandria and other libraries of the Greco-Roman world, see Roy Macleod, ed., *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2000); and Lionel Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

[12] On Judeans as the "remnant" of biblical Israel, see Isaiah 46:3 – כל-שארית בית ישראל, and centuries later the Damascus Document 3.12–13 which labels the sectarians – ובמחזיקים במצות אל אשר נותרו מהם הקים אל את בריתו לישראל עד עולם "Those who hold fast to the commandments of God, who remained from them (i.e. all previous Israelite generations), with whom God made firm his Covenant with Israel forever."

this classicizing sensibility, due to the ensuing context of cultural competition between various Jewish groups and between Jews and non-Jews within the broader Hellenistic world.

With stereotypical *interpretatio Graeca*, Hecataeus of Abdera in the decades after Alexander's death bequeathed Judeans an honorable foundation under their enlightened lawgiver Moses, and a valorous and principled way of life. Judeans, in Hecataeus' words, maintained a disciplined and egalitarian lifestyle; they were a Near Eastern version of the Spartans. His contemporary Clearchus of Soli accorded Judeans a noble genealogy: descent from philosophers of India. According to this same Clearchus, Aristotle's Judean interlocutor not only spoke Greek, but was indeed a Greek himself in *psychê*.[13]

The Hellenistic-Jewish fragments found in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* (via Polyhistor) illustrate this new creative tension from the Jewish perspective, where the ancient past is recreated to benefit the prestige of contemporary Jewish society in its new Hellenistic setting, most likely Alexandria of Egypt. Ezekiel the Tragedian's second-century B.C.E. *Exagoge* retells the Exodus as a Greek tragedy, in which the hubris of Pharaoh and the Egyptians is punished by the Jewish deity who is thus linked to Greek ideas of Fortune, Fate, and Nemesis. The work is perfuse with Greek tragedy's stereotypical dramatic reversal, benefiting none other than Moses and the Israelites.[14] Likewise, in the history of Artapanus, the Jewish ancestors Abraham, Joseph, and Moses are re-imagined as culture-heroes who bequeath the benefits of civilization to the Egyptians, and correlative riches of cultural capital to the Jews living among the second-century B.C.E. descendants of their Egyptian beneficiaries. Indeed, as Holger Zellentin's article in this volume, "The End of Jewish Egypt: Artapanus and the Second Exodus," shows, such depictions of Judean ancestral heroes, especially Joseph as vizier and Moses as military commander, would have appealed to the Jewish military elite of Egypt, in particular those associated with the Oniad cleruchy at Leontopolis.

---

[13] For Clearchus of Soli's *On Sleep*, see Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1.176–82. Even leaving aside the potentially problematic citations of Hecataeus in Josephus (*Contra Apionem* 1.183–204), we are still left with Hecataeus' quite complimentary depiction of the Judeans (however inaccurate) from the fragments (of his *Aegyptiaca*?) found in Diodorus Siculus (40.3). On the skepticism of modern scholars regarding the authenticity of the Hecataeus fragments in Josephus, Bickerman (*The Jews in the Greek Age* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988], 18) astutely remarks, "Nobody…has ever explained why a Greek author who admired Egyptian wisdom could not have admired Jewish wisdom as well."

[14] See the excellent treatment by Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*: *The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 128–35.

Circumstances in Hellenistic Egypt, of course, could turn against the Jews. It is just such a context – the anti-Jewish agitation of Ptolemy VIII in 118 B.C.E. – where Zellentin locates Artapanus' account which constitutes, *inter alia*, a renewed call for the Jews to flee Egypt. Long before, Greek elites had already come to know of native Egyptian animosity toward the Jews, which Ptolemy VIII might easily call upon in pursuit of his own policies. In the first decades of Macedonian rule, when Hecataeus and Clearchus composed their generous albeit Greco-centric accounts, the Egyptian hellenophile Manetho composed his "counter history" of the Jewish people. Fragments of this account in Josephus' later *Contra Apionem* confirm Amos Funkenstein's sense of the concept: Manetho's "counter history" of the Jewish people inverts the biblical account of the Exodus in an explicit attempt to discredit the Jews, by delegitimizing their origins and association with ancient, and thus also present-day (i.e. early third century B.C.E.) Egypt.[15]

In Hellenistic-period Palestine, we witness Judeans before and after the Hasmonean rebellion engaged in ongoing discourse with their ancient Israelite past within a broader Hellenistic context. Ben Sira, c. 180 B.C.E., locates the source of Wisdom in the Law of the Most High God (Sir 24:23). But, when he – as a devotee of the Law – describes the dialectical process of attaining Wisdom, the reader is told to seek it through the insights of all the ancients, regardless of origin. That is, to be a student of the Law, or Torah, and truly discern its meaning one must do as Ben-Sira did: serve among the great, appear before rulers, travel in foreign lands (of other *ethnê*), and learn the nature of good and evil among all humans (Sir 39:1–4).[16] Surely, it is a mistake to view Ben-Sira as an anti-Hellenistic reactionary[17] – a view predicated on an unrealistic, dichotomous view of

---

[15] Funkenstein applies the concept of "counter history" directly to Manetho among other scurrilous accounts of the other, such as the later medieval *Toledot Yeshu*; see *Perceptions of Jewish History*, 36–40.

[16] Πλὴν τοῦ ἐπιδιδόντος τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ διανοουμένου ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου, σοφίαν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἐκζητήσει...ἀνὰ μέσον μεγιστάνων ὑπηρετήσει καὶ ἔναντι ἡγουμένων ὀφθήσεται· ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίων ἐθνῶν διελεύσεται, ἀγαθὰ γὰρ καὶ κακὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπείρασεν.

[17] See Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1959; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 142–51: "Ben Sira opposes the spirit of free Hellenism" (143); and "The new spirit [of Hellenism] noticeable in Ben Sira crept into his book without the author's intending that it should" (149–50). While Martin Hengel (*Judaism and Hellenism*: *Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* [trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974]) provides a more thorough account of Ben Sira's reliance on common tenets of Hellenistic "philosophical" thought, he ultimately maintains Tcherikover's conclusions: "We must…assign him to that conservative, nationalist-Jewish movement…[later]

identity and the all too easy dismissal of such passages as these, which inundate his discourse on Wisdom, i.e. on the meaning of the Torah itself.[18]

From the first, the Hasmoneans followed a similar course. From the diplomacy of Judah, Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus I, to the depiction of the Judean community in 1 and 2 Maccabees, we witness the interactive process whereby Judean elites sought to remain loyal to ancestral tradition by redefining it within a broader Hellenistic culture. The decree of gratitude offered up by the Judeans in 1 Macc 14 follows the form and function of a common Hellenistic benefaction decree.[19] Since the last days of Judah Maccabee, the Judeans had gained the goodwill of new friends and allies – the Romans – who provided them with a successful model of socio-cultural interaction within the Hellenistic world worthy of emulation. Judea's successful diplomatic overtures with Sparta, Pergamum and Athens from the time of Jonathan to John Hyrcanus I cannot be adequately explained outside of a newly triangulated relationship between Judeans, Greeks, and Romans.[20]

Already by the early third century B.C.E., members of the Roman elite had begun to reinterpret the nature of their own collective identity and ancestral traditions (the *mos maiorum*) within a Hellenistic world. From the 160s B.C.E. onward, they continued to do so within the dynamic context of a city-state republic transitioning to imperial rule over this same

represented by the Hasmoneans," (153), a movement Hengel subsequently describes in the context of the "repudiation of Hellenism" (247–54).

[18] As far as we know, the link in Ben Sira between the consensus view that Wisdom, *per se*, is equal to Torah (lit. the Law of the Most High God), on the one hand (as based on Sir 24), and the insight, on the other hand, that Torah must then be equal to the Wisdom Ben Sira acquires from all mankind on his travels (as Sir 39 describes the proper pursuit of Wisdom) has not appeared elsewhere. And neither, as far as we know, has the correlative conclusion that what Ben Sira has thus produced in his book is in fact Torah, i.e. Wisdom which he has acquired, in part, on his journeys to the lands of non-Judean, *ethnê*. Yet, to assume otherwise is to ignore the plain meaning of Sir 39:1–4 as understood with Sir 24. In other words, Ben Sira links Wisdom directly with the Pentateuch in Sir 24, while the interpretive lens of these Laws (as well as the accompanying customs and stories of the collective Judean past) is the great stock of ancient Wisdom available at cultural centers throughout the Hellenistic-period Mediterranean and Near East.

[19] See Gregg Gardner, "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 327–43.

[20] See Kevin Lee Osterloh, "Judea, Rome and the Hellenistic *Oikoumenê*: Emulation and the Reinvention of Communal Identity," in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (ed. E. Iricinschi and H. M. Zellentin; Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 119; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 168–206.

Greek-speaking *Oikoumenê*.[21] In Harriet Flower's "Remembering and Forgetting Temple Destruction: The Destruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in 83 BC," she utilizes the various episodes of the Capitoline Temple's destruction by fire (83 B.C.E., 69 and 80 C.E.) and the building of three successive temples on the ashes of the previous sanctuaries to explore how Romans dealt with the strife which brought on the end of the Republic and the loss of ancestral values. For the Romans, she writes, "To rebuild the Temple was to rebuild society." Yet, she continues, "Those who remembered the destruction later were always aware of themselves as inhabiting another age, as survivors looking back after the Fall."

The destruction and repair of the Temple in Jerusalem possessed a similar hold on contemporaneous Jewish imagination. For the Hasmoneans, the cleansing of the Temple (25 Kislev, 164 B.C.E.) by Judah Maccabee and his men, marked a new age, celebrated by Hanukkah. This Judean spin on Hellenistic festivals of liberation, propagated at home and in the Diaspora – as the festal letters prefaced to 2 Maccabees show – incorporated Hasmonean glory within the celebration of the Temple's liberation by their hands.[22] Later, when Herod lavishly rebuilt this Temple on a grandiose scale, it was told that rain fell only at night so that the builders, protected from above, could speed their work to its completion – a day heralded as coinciding with Herod's accession.[23] For other Judeans, Hasmonean high-priesthood meant not redemption but defilement. The Qumran sectarians, led by Zadokite priests ousted by Hasmonean usurpers, responded by rebuilding the Temple within themselves, and elevating their daily life to a consummate level of sanctity. This Temple-restoration *in corpore communitatis* signaled a new age for their sect: "A New Covenant in the Land of Damascus"; just as it signaled the beginning of the End Time for all humanity.[24]

---

[21] Kevin Lee Osterloh, "Empire and the Reinvention of Collective Identity: The Rise of Roman Hegemony in a Hellenistic World," *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, *Special Issue*: *Nation and Empire* (2005): 103–25.

[22] See Jan Willem van Henten, "2 Maccabees as a History of Liberation," in *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and the Talmud* (ed. M. Mor, et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003), 63–86.

[23] King, Temple, God and People are thus united in Herod's self-aggrandizement as *Basileus Ioudaiôn*; see *Antiquitates Judaicae* 15.421–25; the tale of the cessation of rain in daytime appears also in the Bavli, *Ta'anit* 23a.

[24] See the introductory comments of Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Scrolls in English* (rev. ed.; London: Penguin Books, 2004), 1–90, and his notes on the Damascus Document, 127–45. In his comments on the literary corpus of the Qumran sect/Essenes (*Complete Dead Scrolls in English*, 24–25), Vermes emphasizes the classicizing nature of the age: "The laws and rules, hymns and other liturgical works as well as the Bible commentaries of the Qumran community…add substance and depth to the historical

The Romans brought an end to the Qumran sect in 68 C.E. and two years later to the Temple in Jerusalem, causing yet another rupture in Jewish time, another point of intense reflection, and communal reinvention.[25] While the authors of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch dealt with this catastrophe by going back to the days of the first destruction in 586 B.C.E., the Judean historian Josephus – now a Roman citizen living in Rome – reflected on his involvement and that of his elite peers in the recent catastrophe. Steve Mason in "The Greeks and the Distant Past in Josephus's *Judaean War*," describes, among other issues, how Josephus draws upon images of proper elite leadership vis-à-vis the unruly masses among former and current Greek writers. Josephus remakes himself and Agrippa II into loyal Judean leaders who had sought to moderate the passions of the Judean mob destined to bring ruin upon themselves, their community, and the Temple.

All these attempts to selectively remember, forget, and reinterpret the past, explains Doron Mendels in his essay, "How Was Antiquity Treated in Societies with a Hellenistic Heritage? And Why Did the Rabbis Avoid Writing History?", leave us with a fragmented, disjointed picture of antiquity in antiquity. This view of the past, Mendels writes, is a product of the fact that the writing of "linear history" was the exception, not the rule. The past for the ancients was useful primarily for the present, and not as an object of study in its own right. Ancient historians employed a utilitarian editing process – e.g. Josephus' minimization of prior, successful Judean militancy (per Mason's description) – which led to further fragmentation of the past, by helping to create multiple versions of select, preserved events. This is true for all the classicizing ages of this volume, as we see upon moving from the Hellenistic-Early Imperial to the Greco-Roman period (c. 100–450 C.E.).

In the early third-century C.E. Mishnah, the rabbis, mesmerized by the temporal break of the Temple's destruction in 70 C.E., ironically mask their obsession through deafening silence. On the one hand, they pretend that it had not been destroyed at all. On the other, they write themselves into the pre-destruction narrative they preserved as part of their own communal reinvention. Tractate *Yoma* offers an example of the latter process; here we encounter an imbecile high-priest in the Temple on the Day of Atonement, and a class of sages (חכמים), the supposed early rabbis, who "naturally" instruct him in his duties, effectively running the show. Peter

period in which Jewish Christianity and rabbinic Judaism originated. They reveal one facet of the spiritual ferment at work among the various Palestinian religious parties at that time, a ferment which culminated in a thorough reexamination and reinterpretation of the fundamentals of the Jewish faith."

[25] Vermes, Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 49–66.

Schäfer, in his essay "Rabbis and Priests, or: How to Do Away with the Glorious Past of the Sons of Aaron," demonstrates how rabbinic self-aggrandizement led to the *ex-post-facto* replacement of the priestly caste by the sages in the earlier Second Temple Age throughout the rabbinic corpus. An aspect best exemplified, explains Schäfer, by their foundation document, Mishnah *Avot* 1:1 – where the chain of transmission proceeds from Sinai to Moses, Joshua, Elders, Prophets, the Great Assembly, and on to the Sages. Here, the Rabbis are the rightful heirs of ancestral tradition, the legitimate interpreters of the Sinai revelation and the Covenant between God and Israel. The Aaronide priests are nowhere to be found.

The Temple's destruction in 70, and the later suppression of the Bar Kokhba Revolt in 135, are part of a set of decisive turning points for both subjects and rulers of Rome regarding the identity of the Empire as a coherent sociopolitical unit. In fact, it is not until the reign of Vespasian (69–79) that Romans reconciled themselves completely to the concept of absolute rule by an Emperor, the *Imperator* of the *lex de imperio Vespasiani*.[26] For the Flavians, the capture of the symbols of Judean Antiquity vindicated their rule over the empire, as proclaimed by *Judaea Capta* coinage, the Temple of Peace housing the Jerusalem Temple treasures, and the arch of Titus which immortalized the transference of Judean Antiquity to the imperial city.[27]

As the Senate in 69 C.E. looked back in *lex de imperio Vespasiani* to Augustus as precedent for the permanence of imperatorial rule, the emperor Hadrian (117–138) looked to the antiquity of Greece and Egypt[28] in

---

[26] Colin Wells, *The Roman Empire* (2d ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 7: "only with the Emperor Vespasian…does *imperator*, whence 'emperor', become the usual title by which the emperor is known. …although it is convenient to refer to Augustus and his immediate successors as 'emperor', it is, strictly speaking, anachronistic. Augustus preferred *princeps*, roughly equivalent to 'first citizen'." Wells (ibid., 41) adds, "Vespasian's coin types hark back to those of Augustus; we remember that the *lex de imperio Vespasiani* keeps referring to Augustus's powers as a suitable precedent for those conferred on Vespasian." While Wells correctly downplays the actual change in *de-facto* political reality (ibid., 158–59, "It is wrong to see in this law any new departure, nor is the Senate…asserting its own *auctoritas*"), as his earlier analysis makes plain, this *lex* does mark a significant conceptual turning point. For the prior Augustan Age is now officially enshrined as the touchstone for imperial rectitude, while the importance of the republican formulae – which Augustus once prized – is greatly diminished.

[27] See Wells, *Roman Empire*, 160; and, in this volume, Ra'anan S. Boustan, "The Spoils of the Jerusalem Temple at Rome and Constantinople: Jewish Counter-Geography in a Christianizing Empire," 327–72.

[28] Hadrian embraced these particular eastern cultures of his empire while disavowing another cultural product of the East: Judean custom and antiquity. At least, such is the implication of Hadrian's imperial policy before, during and after the Bar Kokhba Revolt

order to make sense of imperial unity under Rome. His villa at Tivoli functioned, in part, as a map of the Empire, housing an amalgam of symbols expressing a cultural unity. Here he built his own *Poicile*, recalling Athens' famous Painted Stoa, and three structures named after Athens' Lyceum, Academy, and Prytaneum respectively. A majestic pool was constructed on the grounds, likely labeled after the Egyptian Nile-Delta town of Canopus, and ringed by Athenian-style Caryatids, and representations of the Nile and the Egyptian divinities Isis and Ptah, among other statuary.[29] The villa is more than monumental bricabrac for the Empire's most famous tourist, it is the reflection of Hadrian's attempt to craft in his person and in his empire a unifying Greco-Romanness.

Hadrian's coins declare a *saeculum aureum* (a "golden age") a claim connected not only to *Pax Romana*, but also to cultural rebirth; imperial elites had woken up to the cultural fact of Empire and its Greco-Roman identity.[30] Hadrian's older contemporary Plutarch (46–120), whose life and

---

(132–135), e.g. the re-founding of Jerusalem as *Aelia Capitolina*, the establishment of a temple to Jupiter on the ruins of the Temple, outlawing any Jewish presence in the city, changing the name of the province of Iudaea to Syria Palaestina, and by apparently outlawing circumcision, etc. On the Bar Kokhba Revolt see Peter Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand*: *Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 1; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981). For a recent collection of scholarly articles on a variety of issues related to the revolt see Peter Schäfer, ed., *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*: *New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt Against Rome* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 100; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

[29] Our primary source is the admittedly problematic *Historia Augusta* 26.5, where we read that Hadrian constructed the site in a manner that would allow him to inscribe upon it the names of the provinces and other famous places, such as those listed above, as well as the Vale of Tempe in Thessaly, and even Hades (*Tiburtam Villam mire exaedificavit, ita ut in ea et provinciarum et locorum celeberrima nomina inscriberet, velut Lyceum, Academian, Prytaneum, Canopum, Poicilen, Tempe vocaret. Et, ut nihil praetermitteret, etiam inferos finxit*). However, the remains of the site itself seem to bear out the veracity of the *HA*'s description; see William L. MacDonald and John A. Pinto, *Hadrian's Villa and Its Legacy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995). While MacDonald and Pinto are skeptical of the common scholarly identification of the excavated pool with the Canopus of *HA* (*Hadrian's Villa and Its Legacy*, 108–11), their comments on the meaning of the discovered sculpture within the context of the excavated Villa are revealing: "The wide range of sculptural styles and subjects at the Villa…is rooted above all in the eclectic nature of High Empire culture, the result in turn of the Romans' well-developed historical consciousness, a condition indispensable to eclectic thought and preferences. In this sense the Villa is very much an empire creation, a place where non-Roman images mix handily with Roman ones, some of them, in architecture particularly, unseen elsewhere… Villa sculpture did not comprise a collection or a museum so much as it expressed the historical awareness of the times and thus much of the scaffolding of contemporary civilization and education" (ibid., 141).

[30] See Colin Wells, *Roman Empire*, 203–7.

work parallel the beginning of the classicizing Second Sophistic, is at the forefront of the creation of Greco-Romanness from the Hellenic side. Whatever distinctiveness he may have ascribed to Greek culture, the direct comparison between Greeks and Romans in his *Parallel Lives* points to a perceived cultural continuity between ancient Hellas and Rome that continued in his own time. Indeed, Plutarch himself attained both Roman citizenship and, under Hadrian, the office of procurator of Achaea, if only in a ceremonial capacity. Plutarch's deep interest in the Egyptian deities Osiris and Isis, coterminous with his ongoing role as High Priest at Delphi, expose the merging multiple realms of antiquity from which the Greco-Roman elite drew inspiration.[31]

The Greco-Roman elite, of course, included Christian intellectuals, such as the North African Tertullian (c. 160–225). From his *De Anima*, 30.3 we read:

> The World is every day better known, better cultivated and more civilized... Everywhere roads are traced, every district is known, every country opened to commerce. Smiling fields have invaded the forests, flocks and herds have routed the wild beasts, the very sands are sown, the rocks are broken up, the marshes drained...Wherever there is a trace of life, there are houses, human habitations and well-ordered governments.[32]

Here we find a fitting description of Hadrian's *saeculum aureum* extended into the days of the Severids. Yet this idyllic depiction stems from an advocate of Christian martyrdom before Roman authority who exhorts potential martyrs to emulate the discipline and bravery of famous ancient Roman, Greek, and even Carthaginian heroes.[33] Again, Tertullian asks

---

[31] On Plutarch's public life and literary career see, R. H. Barrow, *Plutarch and His Times* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967); C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971); D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London: Duckworth, 1973); and also the more recent introduction by Robert Lamberton, *Plutarch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001). On aspects of ancient history and Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, see Philip A. Stadter, ed., *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1992); and Christopher Pelling, *Plutarch and History* (London: Classical Press of Wales, 2002).

[32] The translation is by Colin Wells, Roman Empire, 220; (Latin: *Certe quidem ipse orbis in promptu est cultior de die et instructior pristino. Omnia iam pervia, omnia nota, omnia negotiosa, solitudines famosas retro fundi amoenissimi obliteraverunt, silvas arva domuerunt, feras pecora fugaverunt, arenae seruntur, saxa panguntur, paludes eliquantur, tantae urbes iam quantae non casae quondam. Iam nec insulae horrent nec scopuli terrent; ubique domus, ubique populus, ubique respublica, ubique vita*).

[33] See in particular Tertullian's *Ad Martyras* 4, and *De Fuga in Persecutione*; for parallel lists of ancient heroes see his *Ad Nationes* 1.18, and *Apologeticum* 50. On Tertullian and the Roman social context for early Christian martyrdom, see in particular Timothy D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), and G. W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge

"What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"[34] Such binaries serve to demarcate communal boundaries while obscuring the complexity of Tertullian's social context and personality. A master of the rhetorical and literary crafts of the Second Sophistic, Tertullian sought not to destroy but co-opt the Greco-Roman past and wed it to his Christian "Jerusalem" – the beneficiary of Judaism's ancient heritage, from which contemporary Jews were conveniently excluded. Tertullian's writings abound with proof-texts and encouraging exempla from Greco-Roman and Jewish antiquity, a process of appropriation and reinvention born out of a necessity for proximity with the vitality of antiquity, which makes his move to Montanism understandable.[35]

The Montanist movement, with its call to return to the immediacy of direct revelation,[36] anticipates the enshrinement of a new period of antiquity, namely the Apostolic Age of the first disciples who had known Jesus in the flesh. Annette Yoshiko Reed in her essay, "'Jewish Christianity' as Counterhistory? The Apostolic Past in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* and the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*," demonstrates the responsibility of Eusebius of Caesarea (263–339) for this novel periodization in his early fourth-century *Ecclesiastical History*. In her essay she presents an insightful analysis of the "Jewish Christianity" of the contemporaneous Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* as a "counter history" of Christian communal identity and apostolic succession, which was constructed in direct competition with Eusebius' view of a Christian Church divorced from its moribund Jewish roots.

For Eusebius, all realms of antiquity in antiquity studied in this volume were grist for the exegetical mill. He turned to Josephus and Philo to refute Judaism, domesticating them into witnesses for Christianity. Plato was co-opted but subordinated to ancient Hebrew "philosophy," while the Hebrews were divested of any connection with the Jews, and remade as the first Christians, which gave Christianity a venerable, ancient pedigree. Greek paganism was shown to be derivative from astral religions of Egypt

---

University Press, 1995); cf. Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God*: *Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

[34] *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, 7.9; the parallelism of Jerusalem with the Christian *ekklêsia* is confirmed by Tertullian's subsequent two questions: "Or what has the Academy in common with the Church?, or heretics with Christians?" (Latin: *Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis*? *Quid academiae et ecclesiae*? *Quid haereticis et christianis*?).

[35] See Barnes, *Tertullian*: *A Historical and Literary Study*, 130–42; and the more recent David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 41–51.

[36] Michael J. St. Clair, *Millenarian Movements in Historical Context* (New York: Garland, 1992), 75–94.

and Phoenicia, and in its present forms controlled by demons.[37] Eusebius pursued this course not only against real and imagined heretical and Jewish competitors but also against the very real rivalry of learned pagan intellectuals such as the Neoplatonist Porphyry (233–309), who considered Christians "apostates, both from Greco-Roman religion and culture and from Jewish religion and culture,"[38] and who thus posed a direct threat to Eusebius.

For Neoplatonists such as Porphyry, Christianity's special dispensation held no meaning; no one religion was to be privileged, and certainly not Christianity which lacked antiquity. For Porphyry, Greek philosophy and religious revelation were in harmony; divine truth was revealed by all religions with an ancient pedigree. Neoplatonists, furthermore, tended toward a competing concept of the One, a single deity to which all other divine emanations are subordinate.[39]

This philosophical approach was part of a general monotheizing trend in pagan thought and practice, which also gains expression in the artwork of the time. In her "Tradition and Transmission: Hermes Kourotrophos in Nea Paphos, Cyprus," Elizabeth Kessler-Dimin describes the symbols of a monotheizing cult of Dionysus in Cypriot mosaics of the early fourth-century C.E., which preserve indications of Pagan and Christian competition over a common antiquity for the sake of contemporary legitimacy. Dionysus' ancient Hellenic legacy is here re-inscribed for singular devotion at the dawn of imperial sanction of Christianity, while the depiction of infant Dionysus on Hermes' lap indicates that the parallel image of the Christ child on Mary's lap owes much to iconic rivalry between Christians and pagans.

Jews were not unaffected by these common cultural and artistic trends. At the necropolis of Beit She'arim in Palestine, with third to fourth century burials, Jews were interred in sarcophagi which evoke contemporary Ro-

---

[37] As established in his *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*; see also Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), 179–86.

[38] Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 178.

[39] On Porphyry's views on Christianity (and other religions), see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 174–79. For a general introduction to Plotinus, Porphyry and Neoplatonism, see R. T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (London: Duckworth, 1972). For more on the Neoplatonic concept of the One, see J. M. Rist, *Plotinus*: *The Road to Reality* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1967); and, more recently (in a study of the commonalities between concepts of the divine in Neoplatonist and Gnostic thought), Curtis L. Hancock, "Negative Theology in Gnosticism and Neoplatonism," in *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (ed. R. T. Wallis; Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1992), 167–86.

man models, "decorated, for example, with a bucranium-and-acanthus design, with eagles, shells, or simplified hunt scenes."[40] One sarcophagus – displaying an image of Hercules on one side, Leda and the Swan on another – likely housed the remains of a local commemorated by a standard Greek epigram for a young aristocrat taken too soon. On a lintel in catacomb 19, a Dionysiac mask is displayed, while on a number of walls Jewish *menorot* are carved in crude graffito fashion.[41] While a few inscriptions are in Aramaic, most are in Hebrew or Greek. Two centuries of activity in this Jewish city of the dead point to the multiple antiquities with which Jews of the time associated, an image reflected – if the Babylonian Talmud can be relied upon – in the earlier, daily activities of the court of Gamaliel II, where 1000 youths pursued two curricular lines: 500 in Hellenic studies, 500 in Hebraic learning.[42]

This trend in Jewish artwork continues in the later synagogues of Sepphoris, Beit Alfa and elsewhere, where fifth- and sixth-century mosaic floors reveal Greco-Roman images of the Zodiac, replete with anthropomorphic symbols for the seasons, all centered on a depiction of Helios. These images rest comfortably next to adjoining panels displaying Jewish symbols: the shofar, lulav, and incense shovel; and biblical scenes like the Sacrifice of Isaac.[43] As Lee Levine shows in his essay, "Jewish Collective Memory in Late Antiquity: Challenges in the Interpretation of Jewish Art," the Biblical Age gained renewed meaning in the artwork of fourth-seventh century Palestinian synagogues. Retrieval of these images strengthened Jewish association with the Bible and Israelite history and thus bolstered Jewish communal identity in the face of competition with and hostility from Christian neighbors and rulers in the Byzantine Age.

With Levine's contribution, spanning the fourth-seventh centuries C.E., we move from the Greco-Roman to our final classicizing period: Late Antiquity. This span of time coincides with one of the more creative pe-

---

[40] Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 157.

[41] Ibid., 153–58.

[42] Bavli, *Bava Qama* 83a. Here Yehudah ha-Nasi says that Shemuel attributed this statement to R. Shim'on ben Gamaliel II regarding the House of his Father, Gamaliel II (c. 100 C.E.); cf. Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 104, and more generally on the study of Homer (or Greek wisdom) in rabbinic society, 100–14.

[43] For astrology and its juxtaposition with biblical themes, with references to the archaeological finds, see Gregg Gardner, "Astrology in the Talmud: An Analysis of Bavli Shabbat 156," in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (ed. E. Iricinschi and H. M. Zellentin; Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 119; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 314–38.

riods in the Jewish reclamation of Biblical as well as Second Temple (and Tannaitic) antiquity, and the consequent reinvention of Jewish collective identity, as evidenced by the gradual compilation and editing of the two *talmudim*: the Yerushalmi and the Bavli. Among other significant themes, Moulie Vidas' contribution, "The Bavli's Discussion of Genealogy in *Qiddushin* IV," tackles the issue of Babylonian rabbinic views on the precedence of geography and genealogy with respect to Jewish authenticity. In this particular conversation, the Bavli questions the legacy of the biblical hero Ezra who, in the fifth century B.C.E., spearheaded a return from Babylon to the Land of Israel predicated upon genealogical purity. Thus, the Babylonian Talmud problematizes the spatial and ethnic boundaries of the Jewish community in an age of the rise of Babylonia as the major center of Jewish life and learning under Sassanid-Persian rule, and the decline of Palestinian Judaism under Byzantium.

The reign of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian (527–565) provides an exemplar for the merging realms of retrievable antiquity in Late Antiquity. By committing his armies to the re-conquest of the "lost" western provinces (533–552), Justinian asserted the identity of his empire as true inheritor of Rome's legacy. But this was only one side of a much broader project of collective and imperial reinvention, which rested upon a re-association with the most potent symbols of Byzantium's composite heritage. The same emperor who commissioned the codification of Roman law redacted in the Latin of Old Rome, the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, lavishly rebuilt the Hagia Sophia on an immense scale, in part to recall and outdistance – if the apocryphal account holds truth – the Israelite Temple in Jerusalem: "Solomon, I have outdone thee!"[44] While claiming ownership over the Christian-Roman-Israelite past, Justinian subverted the role of potential competitors; he formally ended the Pagan-Hellenic curriculum at the

[44] On the source of Justinian's apocryphal self-proclaimed rivalry with Solomon, John W. Barker (*Justinian and the Later Roman Empire* [Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966], 183, n. 12) adds "This exclamation ["Glory be to God Who considered me worthy of this task! O Solomon, I have outdone thee!"] is…probably apocryphal. It appears only in a source of a much later period, the Greek title of which translates as *On the Structure of the Temple of the Holy Wisdom*, known also by the Latin title of *Narratio de aedifictione templi Sanctae Sophiae,* formerly ascribed to the fourteenth-century Byzantine writer Georgios Kodinos, but now held to be an earlier work of perhaps the eleventh or twelfth century." For more on this eleventh-twelfth century text, see also, as Barker cites (ibid.), *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum* (ed. T. Preger; Teubner Series; Leipzig, 1901), I:105.

Academy of Athens in 529, and placed restrictions on Jewish communal life and liturgy.[45]

Whatever their reality, the apocryphal sentiments attributed to Justinian reflect a prevailing Byzantine discourse on antiquity and identity. Yannis Papadoyannakis' "A Debate about the Rebuilding of the Temple in Sixth-Century Byzantium," reveals the depth of Byzantine Christian anxiety over Jewish associations with the sacred geography of Palestine in Justinian's day. The *Erotapokriseis* of pseudo-Kaisarios, explains Papadoyannakis, offers a counter-attack to antiquity-based claims of Jewish ownership of Jerusalem and the Temple. The work extends a series of "divinely-ordained" defeats of the Jewish people – from scriptural and post-scriptural prooftexts – into the Byzantine present to justify current Jewish suffering and alienation from their former sacred center. Regardless of the reality of sixth-century Jewish claims to their ancestral homeland, such exegetical practices reveal the problematic implications of Christianity's foundational basis in the expropriation of Jewish antiquity.

Yet, contemporaneous Jewish thinkers understood the nature of the challenge to their posterity and offered competing versions to Byzantine Christian ownership over the antiquity of both Rome and Israel. Ra'anan Boustan in "The Spoils of the Jerusalem Temple at Rome and Constantinople: Jewish Counter-Geography in a Christianizing Empire," explores Byzantine claims to have regained the spoils of Solomon's Temple in their wars of re-conquest. These claims were countered, Boustan reveals, by early Byzantine Jewish compositions that subverted both their ownership of these relics and the function of the latter in Christian supersessionist narratives. Such Jewish counter-narratives mark the eschatological re-appropriation by Jews of their most sacred relics. They work not only to reverse the victory of the Flavians 500 years before, but also to undermine Christian supercessionist notions of spiritual progression from Jerusalem to Rome.

Late Antique eschatology brings us to the Christian Kingdom of Ethiopia, c. 350–650. The ruling elites of this kingdom provide us with a striking example of communal reinvention predicated on the inheritance of a fully merged Greco-Roman-Christian-Jewish Antiquity, within a dynamic context of direct competition and/or co-operation with rival claimants to

[45] For a brief overview of Justinian's reign see George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (rev. ed.; New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 68–86. For a more detailed examination, see Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*; and Robert Browning, *Justinian and Theodora* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971). For the relationship between Justinian and the Jews, see Andrew Scharf, *Byzantine Jewry*: *From Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 19–41.

all or part of this same conglomerate past. Christianized c. 350 C.E., the rulers of Aksum rooted their origins in the son of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, Menelik. After Chalcedon (451),[46] monophysite Ethiopian kings reinvented themselves as defenders of Orthodoxy, the true inheritors of Rome's legacy versus the heretic emperors of Constantinople.

Yet this did not hinder an expedient, sixth-century alliance between them against a common enemy, the Jewish kingdom of Ḥimyar. With emperor Justin I (r. 518–527) as their ally, the Ethiopian forces of Kaleb Ellah Esbaha crossed the straits to Yemen where they fought a successful campaign against the army of the Jewish king of Ḥimyar, Yusuf Dhu Nuwas who was himself recently occupied by a war against the Christians of Najran. The defeat of Dhu Nuwas spawned apocryphal accounts of him riding his steed off the cliffs into the sea.[47] The epigraphic record provides us with Kaleb's celebration of this same victory over Jewish Ḥimyar in a monument he placed in Marib in Yemen which recalls, and thus associates the Ethiopian ruling house with, the Glory of King David.

A number of these aforementioned details are addressed in G. W. Bowersock's essay, "Helena's Bridle and the Chariot of Ethiopia."[48] According to Bowersock, monophysite mythmakers and propagandists – both Syriac Christians and Ethiopians – transformed the Ethiopian Kingdom from peripheral player into eschatological superpower by monopolizing both Urzeit and Endzeit. Through creative genealogy, an early king of Ethiopia was reinvented as the forefather of Buz (Byzantium), whose daughter married Romulus, making Ethiopia the forebear of both Old and New Rome. While at the End Time, when the apocalyptic horse is harnessed by Helena's Bridle, the Ethiopian "King of the Greeks" will return triumphant to Jerusalem with the Ark of the Covenant, the sacred relic of Ethiopia.

Turning to late antique Syriac Christianity brings us to the final contribution to our volume, which also returns us to our own day. Adam Becker's "The Ancient Near East in the Late Antique Near East: Syriac

---

[46] On the Council of Chalcedon, See Timothy Gregory, *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1979), 163–201.

[47] On Dhu Nuwas and the Jewish Kingdom of Ḥimyar, see Salo Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), 3:63–69, 257–60; Irfan Shahîd, "Pre-Islamic Arabia," in *The Cambridge History of Islam* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 1:3–29; and Alessandro de Maigret, *Arabia Felix* (trans. R. Thompson; London: Stacey International, 2002), 108–9, 227–56.

[48] Bowersock's essay is our source for Kaleb's monument, the origin-myths of Ethiopian kings, their espousal of monophysitism after Chalcedon, as well as all of the topics raised in the present paragraph.

Christian Appropriation of the Biblical East" tells the story of twenty-first century "Assyrians" who ascribe their own origins to the ancient Near Eastern Assyrians, antagonists *par excellence* of ancient Israel, whom they recast as generous city-builders and pious Christians. Eschewing both contemporary Assyrians' primordialist claim linking their ethnicity to ancient Assyria, and the skepticism of modern scholars who impute their origins to the creativity of nineteenth-century Christian missionaries, Becker locates their origins rather among Syriac Christian communities of Sassanid Mesopotamia in the sixth-century C.E. The late antique ethnogenesis of the Assyrians, a specific people tied to a specific land within a broader Syriac Christian culture, sheds new light on the categories of ethnicity and religion in a premodern setting. Such a scenario problematizes the conclusions of modernist/presentist scholarship – which privileges rupture over continuity between the modern and the premodern periods not to mention the ancient – while it opens up new possibilities for fertile cross-disciplinary exchange between scholars of the contemporary world and those of antiquity.[49]

[49] For a modernist/presentist approach in ethnicity and nationalism studies, see Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*: *Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso Press, 1983); and Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, *Programme*, *Myth*, *Reality* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1990). Hobsbawm's research, in particular, follows a modernist line, divorcing the modern nation from its pre-1789 (pre-French Revolution) foundations. For a critique of this position, see Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*: *Ethnicity*, *Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), who views religion as a foundational element of many modern nation-states whose roots are thus also found in a much earlier medieval context if not earlier; and also Anthony W. Marx, *Faith in Nation*: *Exclusionary Origins of Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), who demonstrates the rise of modern Spain in the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries on a "religio-cultural" basis, through galvanization of the Catholic population against heretics and Jews; see also Funkenstein on the modernist/presentist approach of Halbwachs and Yerushalmi (see above nn. 2, 3, and 10). Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), has done much to bridge the gap between modern and ancient studies by emphasizing the common ethnic basis for communal identity in both premodern and modern periods. For a survey of modernist/presentist, primordialist, and other approaches in the study of ethnicity and nationalism, see Anthony D. Smith, *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Hanover, N. H.: University Press of New England, 2000).

III. Conclusion

From the emic, or insider's, perspective of modern-day Assyrians, the antiquity of antiquity is clearly a matter of immediate twenty-first century relevance. From the etic perspective of the scholar-outsider, the case of the Assyrians and numerous other modern-day exemplars allow us to grasp the ongoing relevance of Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian antiquity not only for antiquity but for modernity as well.

Indeed, the broad perspective of the ancient historian allows for a necessary corrective to the modern intellectual tendency to ignore continuity with the ancient past at the expense of rupture. When we place the supposed premodern-modern rupture posited by the modernist/presentist camp against the backdrop of the ancient classicizing periods of this volume, it appears as simply one more stage in an ongoing discourse on continuity and rupture that has obtained from the days of antiquity through the present. In the wake of each classicizing age in this volume, former disparate antiquities are merged into a common legacy, ready and available for reinterpretation and re-appropriation. Within each new context the inheritance of the past is refashioned to meet present needs. But this legacy also helps determine present concepts, actions, and identities. While reinvention is perpetual, so too is the conversation on the past which allows for it; no mere artifacts have the ancients given us, but a set of discourses as well.

Our ancient heritage is malleable, just as it is undeniable. The body of articles presented in this volume establish the impact of antiquity in antiquity both in its own right and as an essential step for grasping the legacy of antiquity in modernity. To escape the ancient past is as impossible as escaping the present, it is always already there. Yet one must be wary of the primordialist urge (present reality has always been thus), on the one hand, and the modernist/presentist fallacy (rupture trumps continuity), on the other. Rather, by coming to grips with the significance of antiquity in antiquity, we become more aware of the possibilities offered by our contemporary intellectual context and our common ancient heritage. What follows in this volume are the results of interdisciplinary conversations in the aligned fields of twenty-first century ancient studies, the latest stage in a long, evolving conversation on the meaning of the ancient past, which began with the ancients themselves.

Part One

Jewish and Pagan Antiquities from the Late Hellenistic to the Early Imperial Period

The End of Jewish Egypt

Artapanus and the Second Exodus

HOLGER M. ZELLENTIN

"And 'mid this tumult Kubla heard from far
Ancestral voices prophesying war!"

– Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Kubla Khan. Or: A Vision in a Dream. A Fragment.*

Artapanus's writings come to us third hand: Eusebius, in his *Preparatio Evangelica*, presents materials from Alexander Polyhistor, a Greek, taken to Rome by Sulla, who taught and wrote in Rome until his sudden death in 35 B.C.E.[1] Among Polyhistor's material are two short passages and one extended passage attributed to a certain "Artapanus."[2] In these writings, Artapanus re-imagines, in a thoroughly Hellenistic way, the lives of three biblical figures in which Egypt figures prominently: Abraham, Joseph, and Moses. These patriarchs become founders of Egyptian civilization and the

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to David Frankfurter and Erich Gruen for reading earlier drafts of this article, and to the editors of this volume for their thorough suggestions. I dedicate this article to my teacher Martha Himmelfarb, whose inspiration and critical eye have carried this project through many unexpected turns.

[1] All dates in the study, unless otherwise noted, are B.C.E. Alexander Polyhistor was born in Miletus and taken captive to Rome during the Mithradatic wars.

[2] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio evangelica*, IX. 1.1, cited from Édouard des Places, *Eusèbe de Césarée, La Préparation Évangélique, Livres VIII–IX–X* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991), 239–41, 263–65, and 271–81. All subsequent citations of this work are from the same edition (herein after *Praep. ev.*). All translations are my own. The only other ancient source that mentions Artapanus is Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I. 154, 2–3. In addition, Josephus used a source akin to Artapanus in his account of Moses in the *Antiquities*; see Donna Runnalls, "Moses's Ethiopian Campaign," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 14 (1983): 135–56; Tessa Rajak, "Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1978): 111–22; Avigdor Shinan, "Moses and the Ethiopian Woman: Sources of a Story in the Chronicle of Moses," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 27 (1978): 66–78; Isidore Lévy, "Moïse en Ethiopie," *Revue des études juives* 53 (1907): 201–11; and Solomon Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Vienna: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1930).

heroes of his epic, surviving numerous dangers and acts of treachery. The tale comes to a dramatic end when the Egyptian king, jealous of the fame Moses had attained as his general, seeks to have him killed. As a result, the Jews leave Egypt and much of Egyptian civilization is destroyed during the Exodus.[3]

Neither Polyhistor nor Eusebius specify Artapanus's provenance or ethnicity. Nevertheless, almost all scholars have understood him to be a Jew from Egypt. If we accept this, then we must understand Artapanus against the background of growing tensions between people classified as "native" Egyptians and those who laid claim to be Hellenes – a hallmark of Ptolemaic Egyptian society.[4] Among the latter class, at least by their own understanding, figured the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt.[5] Yet Howard Jacobson's recent article points to the fact that it is premature to assume Jewish authorship of the Artapanus text solely based on its pro-Jewish attitude.[6] In line with this viewpoint, I will consider the text's implied audience – the audience inscribed in and recoverable from the text – and will only then turn to the more speculative question of the identities of the historical audience and author. One cannot simply assume that the text is Egyptian just because it deals with Egyptian subject matter, one of the most popular topics of Late Antique historiography. Rather, I suggest that an examination of Artapanus's perspective on Egyptian politics will allow us to situate him socially and chronologically in the following (indeed, Egyptian) context.

The Persian provenance of the name "Artapanus" reflects the author's choice not to cast himself as a clearly identifiable Jew.[7] Instead, I suggest

---

[3] For a more extensive summary, see the table below.

[4] See Per Bilde, ed., *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1992); and Koen Goudriaan, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Amsterdam: J. Gieben, 1988).

[5] Much to the dismay of native Egyptians like Manetho, there is little evidence of Greco-Egyptian anti-Judaism prior to the second century. See Aryeh Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985). Erkki Koskenniemi also seeks to construct a conflict between Greeks and Jews in Artapanus's time, though he does not provide historical evidence (ibid., "Greeks, Egyptians, and Jews in the Fragments of Artapanus," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 [2002]: 17–31). On the relationship between Artapanus and Manetho, see footnote 35.

[6] Howard Jacobson, "Artapanus Judaeus," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 57 (2006): 210–21. The suggestion that Artapanus might have been of mixed descent had been made earlier by Peter Marshall Fraser in *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), I:706, II:985 n. 199.

[7] We cannot know for certain whether Artapanus is only a pen name, or the author's real name; my observation is independent of this question. Indeed, Fraser has shown that Jews in Egypt occasionally had Persian names. A Persian name, therefore, would not be

that he chooses a name that allows for maximum ambiguity, in line with the ambiguity he creates for the Jewish patriarchs who also become Egyptian Hellenistic heroes. Artapanus uses the narrative of the biblical Exodus and Greek sources on the heroes of Egypt (which were also used by Diodorus Siculus) in order to recast the Jewish patriarchs in the tradition of the Osiris, Sesoosis (= Sesostris), and Dionysus myths.

In my view, Artapanus creates his own version of the biblical Exodus narrative in order to encourage his audience to flee Egypt towards "Syria," which denotes Palestine in Ptolemaic geography. His account focuses on the partially joint fate of the Greco-Egyptian Jews and that of ethnic Egyptian land laborers and soldiers, whom he contrasts with Egyptian kings and priests. He discusses the evolution of Egyptian agriculture, technology, warfare, and religion from the point of view that I here call "euhemeristic philanthropy." It is euhemeristic because the Egyptians allegedly deified the Jewish patriarchs who bestowed upon them a continuum of social and technological innovations that benefited mankind.[8] It is philanthropic in as far as Artapanus expects his audience to identify with the Jewish patriarchs' vain pursuit of the welfare of contemporary Egypt.[9]

I argue that Artapanus's implied audience is to be found among Greco-Egyptian Jewish military officers and governors. The text can be dated towards the end of the second reign of Ptolemy VIII ("Physcon") and his two wives Cleopatra II and III (145–116), which saw a radical emancipation of native Egyptian culture.[10] I further argue that Artapanus's work is a

---

an effective way to either disguise or emphasize one's Jewishness. See Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I:706, 2:985 n 199. Intriguingly, the town "Artapatou" is attested near Oxyrhyncus.

[8] The term "euhemeristic" derives from the fourth century scholar of religion Euhemeros, who tended to rationalize myths by tracing them to historical events. See Jan Dochhorn, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Religion bei Euhemeros – mit einem Ausblick auf Philo von Byblos," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 53 (2001): 289–301; Albert Baumgarten, "Euhemerus' Eternal Gods: or, how not to be embarrassed by Greek Mythology," in *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg* (ed. R. Katzoff; Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1996), 91–103; Carsten Colpe, "Utopie und Atheismus in der Euhemeros-Tradition," in *Panchaia. Festschrift für Klaus Thraede* (ed. M. Wacht; Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 32–44. On Artapanus's Euhemerism, see Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 42.

[9] I view Artapanus within the context of the much broader Greco-Roman custom of publicly displaying the donation of goods or services to a city. See Paul Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (Paris: Ed. du Seuil, 1995).

[10] Throughout this paper, I will make use of the phrase "native Egyptian," as opposed to "Greco-Egyptian," in a strictly rhetorical sense. I suggest understanding Ptolemy VIII's return to "authentic" Egyptian religion, and his program of advancing the case of his native subjects, in the same Hellenistic framework as the parallel intentions of his

response to Ptolemy's *philantropa* decree of 118, which sought to alleviate agricultural hardship by granting substantial relief to the small farmers, especially to the Egyptian veterans of the army. This decree also reprimanded corrupt officers and *dioiketes*, confirmed the rights of the priests to their land, and financed the (substantial) burial for the *Apis* bull.

In my view, Artapanus uses the memory of the Jewish patriarchs in order to create a Greco-Jewish contrast to the pro-native-Egyptian turn of Ptolemy VIII. *Pace* Ptolemy VIII, he conflates the interests of native Egyptian soldiers and the Greek elite. Artapanus associates Ptolemy VIII with native Egyptians by associating him with the rebel Pharao Chenephres (who had defied the rule of Ptolemy V), and insists that anything good in Egyptian culture was actually instituted by Abraham, Joseph, and Moses. He makes Joseph a *dioiketes* and Moses the hero of the Egyptian soldiers and officers. Moreover, he travesties Ptolemy's payment for the sacred bull's burial as the king's effort to bury the sacred animals alive. Artapanus portrays the Jewish patriarchs as militarily apt and as fertilizing the Egyptian soil and intellect. I propose to look for his audience among the Jewish military aristocracy of Ptolemaic Egypt. Most of all, Artapanus uses the antique story of the Exodus to promote his clear message to his contemporary audience: leave Egypt for "Syria;" this land is doomed.

Before presenting my argument, a word on Eusebius, our source for Artapanus, may be helpful in considering our primary uncertainty about Artapanus: his fragmentary nature. Given Eusebius's encyclopedic approach, we have little reason to suspect him of ideologically motivated distortion or deletion of any of his sources.[11] Eusebius came across Polyhistor's citations of Artapanus during his elaborate effort to collect evidence for his claim that "the most distinguished Hellenes seemed not to have been ignoring the issues of the Hebrews."[12] After providing general and ethnographic information on the Hebrews, his claimed intellectual and

---

Maccabean contemporaries. See Martha Himmelfarb, "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees," *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19–40.

[11] In the second part of Eusebius's presentation of the evidence (Chapter IX.10.7–42.4), he determines the sequence of the individual excerpts by the appearance of authors in one of his sources, namely Josephus (and probably also in Polyhistor). Alternatively, Eusebius at times arranges his sources thematically. Eusebius's and Polyhistor's wide range of topics – some of them (pro-)Jewish, some of them anti-Jewish – suggests their personal disengagement as well as their moderate care for detail. It also becomes clear, however, that Eusebius was unsuspecting of the political and ethnic context of Artapanus which I propose, leaving me with the text as we have it as the sole basis of inquiry. On Eusebius's ethnic politics, see Aaron Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius'* Praeparatio Evangelica (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[12] *Praep. ev.* IX. 1.1.

spiritual ancestors, Eusebius introduces the second part of his book IX, Chapters 10.7–42.4, with the words, "Concerning the history of patriarchs, look how many agree!" In this part of *Prep. ev.*, citations from Josephus and Alexander Polyhistor provide the main sources.[13] In Eusebius's long list of mostly gentile Greek authors (who are as diverse in their background as they are polyphonic in their respective accounts), Artapanus appears in three separate sections: the story of Abraham in Chapter 18, of Joseph in Chapter 23, and of Moses in Chapter 27.[14] Since Eusebius's cumulative argument depends upon the number of sources that he presents, it is possible that he might have shortened his text – yet we should not assume that he withheld any topic discussed by Artapanus. In most of this article, therefore, I will treat our fragments of Artapanus as fragments; however, I will later attempt to show that the inner coherence and literary structure of Artapanus's three textual units actually allows for a surprisingly coherent literary reading. Just as in the case of Coleridge's "fragment," we may not lack much of his work after all.

Artapanus's Sources

In order to evaluate Artapanus's text, it is important to understand both the sources he used and whether he would have presumed his audience's familiarity with these sources. Would Artapanus have selected Moses as the hero if he had targeted a contemporary audience entirely ignorant of the Exodus story? Erich Gruen's reading of Artapanus as employing humor becomes helpful when recast as follows: Artapanus expected that his audience would appreciate his intent to portray Moses as incongruent with the Moses of any other ancient text.[15] Indeed, the text's meaning changes

---

[13] Eusebius quotes Josephus mainly from *Jewish Antiquities*, Book I. Eusebius also cites parts of *Against Apion* in Chapter VIII and the end of chapter IX of the *Praep. Ev.*

[14] More precisely, Artapanus's first passage is preceded by the Jew Eupolemos, truncated by accounts from Molon and the Jew Philo the Elder, by Josephus, Demetrius, Aristeas, by a certain Theodotus of uncertain ethnicity, and by the Jewish Ezekiel the Tragedian. For a more detailed discussion, see Jeffrey S. Siker, "Abraham in Graeco-Roman Paganism," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 18 (1987): 188–208; and Geza Vermes, "A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus," *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 289–303.

[15] Gruen has drawn out humorous aspects of Artapanus in his *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 158, and more recently in *Diaspora: Jews among Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 201–12 and 331–34. The wholesale criticism against Gruen's suggestions (such as for example by Gideon Bohak, "Recent

dramatically when we assume that Artapanus's intended audience knew the established versions of patriarchal and heroic traditions. I contend that we can only fully comprehend Artapanus by assuming that his audience was familiar with the biblical account of the Exodus, Greek historiographical traditions about Osiris/Dionysus, Sesoosis, and possibly with the political situation following the amnesty granted by Ptolemy VIII (to which I will return later in this article).

1. The Bible

Artapanus's relationship with the Septuagint is not as clear-cut as most modern scholars have posited.[16] In fact, a close, synoptic reading of Artapanus and the Septuagint reveals that the supposed connection is far more problematic than previously realized. Lexical "dependence" of individual words can indeed be established for the entire work, as well as "dependence" of a cluster of words for one short section – Artapanus's narrative on the ten plagues.[17] That said, it is of course possible that Artapanus

---

Trends in the Study of Greco-Roman Jews," *The Classical Journal* 99 [2003]: 195–202) should be re-assessed in light of the present article.

[16] See, e.g., Jacob Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien I-II, Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars; Breslau: H. Skutsch, 1875), 216 and John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 38. For a different view and bibliography see also Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition, Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiograph*y (Leiden; Brill 1992), 174f. and Pieter Willem van der Horst, "Schriftgebruik bij drie vroege joods-hellenistische historici: Demetrius, Artapanus, Eupolemus," *Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese en Bijbelse Theologie* 6 (1985): 144-161.

[17] A few examples illustrate this form of textual "dependence." In Exod 1:12, Israel becomes numerous (πλείους) in Egypt, Artapanus describes his Syrians as πλεονάσαι in 23.3, using the same root. The bricks are called πλινθεία in Exod 1:14, Artapanus uses the same term in 27.11 (πλίνθου). Pharaoh's intention to kill Moses is expressed with the verb ἀνελεῖν in Exod 2:15 as well as in Artapanus 27.7. There are only two clusters of words in the Septuagint and Artapanus that I could identify as akin to one another. First, Moses's staff, the snake into which it transforms and the striking of the ground/water are described in terms of ῥάβδος, δράκοντα (LXX and Artapanus 27.30, but 27.27 has ὄφιν for Moses's snake!) and πατάξαν quite consistently. Second, the plagues themselves are called by very similar names in both accounts. In Exod 7:20 ἐπώζεσεν ὁ ποταμός, the water turns foul, the same term Artapanus uses in 27.28 (ἐποζέσαι). The same applies for the frogs (βάτραχον, Exod 7.26–29, Artapanus 27.32), the grasshopper (ἀκρὶς Exod 10, passim, Artapanus 27.32), the flies (σκνῖφες, Exod 8:12, Artapanus 27.32) and the hail (χάλαζαν Exod 9:26, Artapanus 27.22). But how decisive are these examples? The words in question are not particularly known to have endless synonyms in Greek. Even if the cumulative evidence of lexical proximity points to the Septuagint, it remains intri-

utilized a written, instead of an oral, version of the Bible that circulated during his lifetime. As such, it would be reasonable to posit that he knew a text of Genesis and Exodus that was closer to the Septuagint than any other Greek version that has reached us today. The lexical correspondences between Artapanus and the Bible, however, suggests that the former represents a reworking of the latter from the memory of a literate person – a point to which I will return.[18]

The more important issue seems to be *how* he treated this biblical text, and what he expected his audience to make of the discrepancies between the biblical narrative and his own account. Rather than following Eusebius and recent scholarship in attributing to Artapanus a more or less ignorant embellishment of a distorted biblical text, I believe that Artapanus indeed expected his audience to notice the differences between the Bible and his own work, and to generate meaning precisely through the implied audience's tacit approval of the ensuing ethical and historical incongruities. I argue below that Artapanus followed an intelligible pattern of imitation and distortion of the Bible, as well as of other historical sources, which can be illustrated by the example of Hellenistic historiographic material preserved by Diodorus Siculus.

2. Diodorus

In 1907, Isidore Levy argued that the work of Hecateaus of Abdera, possibly a prominent source of Diodorus Siculus, was important for the study of Artapanus.[19] Many scholars, from Freudenthal onward, have realized the importance of the materials preserved in Diodorus.[20] Some years later, Tiede argued convincingly that most of Artapanus's depictions of Moses were based on the Egyptian prototypical hero *Sesoosis* (known elsewhere as *Sesostris*).[21] Tiede draws most of his information about Sesoosis from

---

guing that neither Freudenthal nor his successors were able to prove a single, unambiguous textual relationship between Artapanus and the Septuagint. This topic, I believe, needs to be reassessed. The Exodus as described in Psalms 78, 105, or 106 is not any closer to Artapanus than the version in biblical Book of Exodus.

[18] Given our uncertainty about the exact chronology of the Septuagint's writing, I henceforth use the term "biblical" fully aware of the term's possible ambiguity. On the Septuagint, see most recently Anneli Aejmelaeus's collection of essays, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (revised and expanded ed.; Leuven and Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2007).

[19] Isidore Lévy, "Moïse en Ethiopie," *Revue des études juives* 53 (1907): 201–11

[20] See Jacob Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 216 and John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 38.

[21] David Lenz Tiede, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 1; Missoula: Scholar's Press, 1972), 153–55.

Diodorus and the latter's source, Herodotus. Ignorant of Levy, Tiede did not pursue the possibility that Artapanus might have used the material preserved in Diodorus in a more substantial way. Just as in the case with Artapanus's biblical source, the close literary familiarity with Diodorus does not necessarily point towards the author's precise adaptation of an extant written source.[22] I will cautiously use Diodorus's testimony as representative of some of the commonly accepted stories about Sesoosis, Dionysus/Osiris and Hermes, which Artapanus expected his audience to recognize as the garb in which he clothed Moses.[23] Furthermore, Artapanus's indiscriminate appropriation of these heroes' attributes for the patriarchs reflects the Diodoran practice of cross-identifying them. Likewise, and more importantly, Artapanus adopts the aforementioned model of "euhemeristic philanthropy" of which Diodorus presents various prominent examples, as well as a program to Hellenize the Egyptian cultural heritage comparable to that of Diodorus.[24] In doing so, Artapanus deviates from the agenda shared with Diodorus in order to establish the moral and technical superiority of the Jewish patriarchs even over the Greek heroes on whose model he had constructed their characters.

I present my analysis first in the form of a table and then in the form of a discussion of representative examples from this table. I suggest that, far more often than previously acknowledged, Artapanus's story is in direct dialogue with the Bible, or with the sources shared with Diodorus – and often with both simultaneously. My approach assumes that Artapanus follows one literary technique throughout his entire narrative, that of simultaneously imitating and subverting all of his sources. For the historian, the uncertainties of combining an analysis of textual imitation with that of textual subversion increase the possible margin of error when assessing literary dependencies. The same two modes of imitation and subversion of earlier texts are firmly joined in literary concepts of textual adaptation such as "travesty."[25] For an audience to decode the message created

[22] On Diodorus's relationship to his sources see below, note 38.

[23] Of these heroes, Artapanus names Hermes explicitly in *Praep. ev.* IX 27.6, see below.

[24] Diodorus mentions Euhemerus in VI.1.9–10.

[25] The term "travesty," i.e. dressing a sacred text in the clothing of exaggerated imitation, seems an appropriately loose description of Artapanus's project. Travesty is not necessarily comical; and the intention of the author need not be critical, hence the term leaves open these two fundamental aspects of Artapanus which I shall discuss below (on Artapanus's possibly humorous intentions, see footnote 15). See Gérard Genette, *Palmipsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982); Wolfgang Karrer, *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* (München: W. Fink, 1977). Needless to say, this basic literary technique is demonstrable from the time of Aristophanes to our own.

through narrative subversion, the identity of the imitated text must be clear enough to allow the audience to recognize the connection. Here, I will present evidence suggesting that Artapanus created his version of Exodus by combining and "travestying" two sets of texts: a version of the biblical narrative and stories about Egyptian heroes. While the travesty of the Bible and of the Hellenistic stories certainly reflected Artapanus's worldview of euhemeristic philanthropy, his criticism of the Bible and of Greek culture is that of an insider for insiders. His primary target was the anti-Hellenistic and pro-Egyptian political sentiment that had come to the fore during the rule of Ptolemy VIII.

3. Table

The following table provides a summary of Artapanus's account (*Praep. ev.* IX) in the left column. In the right column, I list the passages that Artapanus possibly shared with Diodorus (paraphrased or cited from the Loeb edition). In the center column, I reference pertinent material from the Septuagint (using paraphrases or modified quotes from the New Revised Standard Version) and, as indicated *ad loc.*, occasionally additional material presented separately by Diodorus that Artapanus combined in his adaption. The italicized and Greek words can be used as a guide to the manifold shared elements that the constraints of an article do not allow me to discuss here.

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
1.	Abraham teaches astrology, first *to* the Phoenicians, then *to* Pharaoh in Egypt (18.2). Abraham returns to Syria (18.1).	Abraham leaves Haran (Gen 12), passes Canaan on his way to the Negev, then flees to Egypt and returns to the Negev (Gen 12.10–13.1).	"And according to [the Egyptians] the Chaldeans of Babylon, being colonists from Egypt, enjoy the fame which they have for their astrology, because they learned that science *from* the priests in Egypt" (I.81.6).
2.	Abraham is the offspring of Israel, and the (fore)father of Isaac. The kings of Arabia are the brothers of Isaac. Jacob [of a later generation] is the father of Joseph. (23.1).	Abraham raises Isaac and Ishmael, Isaac raises Jacob/Israel, Jacob raises Joseph (Gen 20:18–35).	Osiris is Dionysus. The latter was born in Arabia (I.15.6). According to some, Dionysus/Osiris is buried in Arabia (I.27.3).
3.	Joseph exceeds (διενεγκόντα) his brothers in wisdom (συνέσει) and under-	Joseph's dreams (Gen 37).	Orpheus exceeds (διενεγκόντα) all other men in nature and learning (III.65.6).

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
	standing (φρονήσει, 23.1).		Hermes is deified for his wisdom (σύνεσιν) and philanthropy (I.13.1). His understanding (φρονήσει) exceeds that of Osiris's other friends (I.17.3).
4.	Joseph's brothers are jealous and conspire (ἐπιβουλευθῆναι) against him. Joseph predicts (προϊδόμενον) this and asks the Arabs to bring him to Egypt. He becomes governor *immediately* (23.2).	The brothers plot (ἐπονηρεύοντο) against Joseph because of his superiority, they predict (προεῖδον) his arrival (Gen 37.18) and sell him to the Arabs. Joseph is imprisoned but *later* becomes governor (Gen 37–41).	Typhon is the conspirator (ἐπιβουλεύσαντα) against Osiris (I.88.4).
5.	Egyptian agriculture is in disorder (ἀτάκτως), the region is undivided and the strong inflict suffering upon the weak (23.2).	During the famine, Joseph enslaves all the Egyptians for Pharaoh, taking their land and cattle (Gen 47).	The court of Isis and Osiris makes implements to work the soil (I.15.5). Osiris is a friend of agriculture (φιλογέωργον, I.15.6).
6.	Joseph reorganizes the land, re-cultivates barren land and gives land to the priests (23.2). He invents measurements (23.3).	Joseph only spares the priests and their land (Gen 47:20).	Isis gives a third of the land (χώρας) to the priests (I.21.7).
7.	Joseph is loved by the Egyptians. He marries Aseneth, the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis (23.3). Joseph had stocked (παραθέσθαι) the grain of seven years and had become the master of Egypt (23.4).	Joseph marries Aseneth, the daughter of the priest of On (i.e. Heliopolis) (Gen 41:44). Joseph gathers grain in the seven abundant years (41.35, 49)	Dionysus instructs on storing (παραθέσεως) fruit (II.38.5, cf. III.73.5, V.75.4). Sesoosis wins the goodwill of all the Egyptians by euergetism, amnesty, and elaborate gifts of money, debt-release, and land (I.54.2).
8.	The Jews settle in Sais and *Heliopolis* (23.3).	Jacob's family settles in the "City of the Heroes in the Land of Ramses" (Gen 46:28–29); or in the (Arabian) Goshen (Gen 46:34; 47:27).[26]	

[26] At this point, the Septuagint and Artapanus are clearly at odds in their geography. The Septuagint situates Goshen in Arabia and equates it with the "City of the Heroes," the present day Suez (cf. Strabo XVII, Pliny, *Natural History* VI, and Diodorus IV.12).

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
9.	After the death of Abraham, the new king of the northern part of Egypt, Palmanoth, dislikes the Jews and therefore builds temples at Sais and *Heliopolis* (27.2).	The new king makes the Israelites build Pithom and Ramses, and On, which is *Heliopolis*. They have to bake bricks and labor in the fields (Exod 1:11–14).	Sesoosis makes his captives build temples. Unable to endure the hardship, the Babylonian captives revolt against the Egyptians and ravage the neighboring territories. After accepting amnesty, they settle in Egypt (I.56.3f.).
10.	Palmanoth has a daughter called Merris (Μέρριν) whom he marries to Chenephres, king of lower Egypt (south of Memphis). She adopts Moses, *called* Mousaios by the Greeks, the teacher of Orpheus. (27.3f.).	The daughter of Pharaoh adopts Moses (Exod 2).	Orpheus visits Egypt and is initiated into the cult of Dionysus (I.23.2 and 92.3). The priests of Egypt say that they were *visited by* Orpheus and Mousaios (I.96.2).
11.	Moses invents many useful machines (εὔχρηστα παραδοῦναι), among them boats and machines to handle water (καὶ τὰ ὄργανα τὰ ὑδρευτικὰ, 27.4).	*Diodorus:* "The one most highly honoured by him [i.e. Osiris/ Dionysus] was Hermes, who was endowed with unusual ingenuity for devising things capable of improving the social life of man" (I.15.9).	Dionysus invents many things useful for life (τὸν βίον χρησίμων παραδοῦναι, II.38.5, cf. III.70.8). Sesoosis is the first to use large trunks for building boats (I.55.2). The Egyptian king Moiris builds a lake at Memphis, remarkable for its utility (εὐχρηστίᾳ), for irrigation (I.51.5). His canal opens and closes by a skillful device (κλειομένου φιλοτέχνως, I.52.2).
12.	Moses divides (διελεῖν) the *polis* into thirty-six *nomes* (νομοὺς), instructing each *nome* how to venerate God (ἑκάστῳ τῶν νομῶν ἀποτάξαι τὸν θεὸν σεφθήσεσθαι), ordering the priests to have hieroglyphs, cats, dogs and ibises. He also	*Diodorus's third reason for Egyptian animal worship*: the animals have a use (τὴν χρείαν). The bull ploughs the earth (τὴν ἐλαφρὰν τῆς γῆς ἀροῦν), the dog is useful for hunting and protection, the cat is useful against asps and other reptiles, the ibis is	Orpheus institutes many changes in religious rites (III.65.6). Sesoosis divides (διελὼν) the land into thirty-six nomes (νομούς) and appoints a *nomarch* over each of them, who is charged with tax collection and administration (I.54.3). Hermes prescribes

Artapanus, by having the Jews settle in the Nile Delta, places them much closer to the probable location of the biblical Goshen.

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
	assigns certain land (χώραν) to the priests (27.4).	useful as a protector against snakes, the locusts, and caterpillars (I.87.1f.). *Bible*: Moses gives land to the Levites (Num 35:1ff.).	(διαταχθῆναι) honors (τιμὰς) and sacrifices for the gods (I.16.4). Sesoosis builds a temple in each city for the god it honors the most (I.56.2). On the gift of land, see #6 and #13 in this table.
13.	Moses's reforms aim to defend the monarchy of Chenephres from the disorderly (ἀδιατάκτους) crowds that sometimes chased the king away, and sometimes instituted a new one – often the same king as before, but sometimes a new one (27.5).	*Diodorus's second reason for animal worship*: The Egyptian army had lost because it was in disorder (ἀταξίαν). The Egyptians used animals as standards to organize the army. The animals, therefore, became sacred (86.4).	*Diodorus's fourth reason for animal worship:* "Since under the early kings the multitude were often revolting and conspiring against their rulers, one of the kings who was especially wise divided the land into a number of parts and commanded the inhabitants of each to revere a certain animal or else not to eat a certain food, his thought being that, with each group of people revering (σεβομένων) what was honored among themselves but despising what was sacred to all the rest, all the inhabitants of Egypt would never be able to be of one mind" (I.89.6f.).
14.	Because he organized the country, Moses is loved by the crowds (ὑπὸ τῶν ὄχλων) and receives divine honors (ἰσοθέου τιμῆς) from the priests. He is called Hermes because he *interpreted* the sacred letters (διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ἑρμηνείαν, 27.6).[27]		The masses (τοὺς ὄχλους) accord divine honors (τιμὰς ἰσοθέους) to Dionysus (III.64.2, see IV.81.3 and I.20.5f.). Hermes invents the alphabet (τήν τε εὕρεσιν τῶν γραμμάτων γενέσθαι, I.16.1). He taught hermeneutics (ἑρμηνείαν) to the Greeks, therefore he is called Hermes. He was the sacred scribe

[27] Note also that the Jews are called *hermiouth* (18.1) and that Moses founds *hermopolis* (27.8, 9) – both of which probably play on the same root.

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
			(ἱερογραματέα) of Osiris (I.16.2).[28]
15.	The king is jealous of Moses's virtue (τὴν ἀρετὴν) (27.6).		Sesoosis humiliates the kings he has overpowered by using them to pull his chariot since they cannot compete with Sesoosis for the prize of virtue (ἀρετὴς, I.58.2).
16.	The jealous king wants to have Moses killed in war and sends him to fight off the invading Ethiopians with an army (δύναμιν) of land-laborers, hoping they would be killed. Moses prevails as the war lasts ten years (27.7f.).	Moses marries an Ethiopian woman (Num 12:1).	Dionysus had not been able to subdue Ethiopia (III.3.1). Sesoosis first marches against Ethiopia with the most able of men and appoints as commanders men inured (ἐνηθληκότας) to warfare (I.54.5). He prepared his army (δύναμιν) and conquered most of the known East; his campaign lasts nine years (I.55.1–10).
17.	Because of the size of the expedition (μέγεθος τῆς στρατιᾶς), Moses founds (κτίσαι) a city in Hermopolis of the same name, and consecrates it to the ibis because it kills the animals that are a nuisance to man (27.9).		Hermes founds (ἐκτισμένας) a city. The ibis is useful as a protector against snakes, locusts, and caterpillars (I.87.1f.).
18.	The Ethiopians and all of the Egyptian priests learn circumcision (τὴν περιτομὴν) from Moses (27.10).		Some of the Egyptians found the nation of the Colchi, the proof of their Egyptian descent being that they practice circumcision (περιτέμνεσθαι), as the Jews do (I.55.5).
19.	After the war, Chenephres conspires (ἐπιβουλεύειν) against Moses unsuccessfully (27.11).		After the war, Sesoosis returns to Egypt and his brother conspires (ἐπιβουλὴν) against him unsuccessfully (I.57.6). On the conspiracy, see #25.

[28] See also Pseudo-Eupolemos in *Praep. ev.* 9.26.

	Artapanus	Septuagint & Additional Sources	Diodorus Siculus, *Library*
20.	Chenephres sends Moses to Diospolis together with Nacherot, who has come with him to Memphis, in order to destroy the temple built of baked bricks and replace it with one of stone (27.11).	On bricks, see #9.	Osiris builds a temple in Thebes (= Diospolis) which is famous for its size and expense. Isis and Osiris are buried in Memphis (I.22.2).
21.	Moses then consecrates the cow (βοῶν) for its utility (εὔχρηστον), as it can plough the earth (διὰ τὸ τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ τούτων ἀροῦσθαι, 27.12).	*Diodorus:* "The consecration to Osiris, however, of the sacred bull, which are given the names Apis and Mnevis, and the worship of them as gods were introduced generally among all the Egyptians, since these animals had, more than any others, rendered aid to those who discovered the fruit of the grain [i.e. Isis and Osiris], in connection with both the sowing of the seed and with every agricultural labour from which mankind profits" (I.21.10f.).	*Diodorus's second reason for animal worship* (see #12 and #13) is the animals' utility, the cow (βοῦν) ploughs the earth (τὴν ἐλαφρὰν τῆς γῆς ἀροῦν, I.87.2). Dionysus is the first man to yoke cows to the plough (βοῦς ὑπ᾽ ἄροτρον)" (III.64.1, cf. IV. 4.2).
22.	Chenephres calls the bull (ταῦρον) Apis, he orders the masses to construct a temple to bury it (θάπτειν). The king is banned as a result (27.12).	Sin of the Golden Calf (Exod 32).	*Diodorus's first reason for animal worship:* The gods took on the form of animals in order to be protected from mankind. After they became rulers, they made sacred (ἀφιερῶσαι) those kinds of animals whose form they had assumed, and instruct man to maintain them while they are alive and to bury them (θάπτειν) at their death (I.86.3–4).[29]

[29] One of Dionysus's signs, according to Euripides, is the wild bull (*Bachae* 762, 1130–34, 1261, 1439, 1469).