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ABSTRACT

What does it take to activate mass hate between communities which have lived together peaceably for a long period? Literature on modern explosions of inter-community violence gives answers ranging between precious little and centuries of history. In the case of Alexandria in 38 the 'precious little' seems to have been the visit to the city of Herod Agrippa I, as one can judge by Philo's careful attempt to exonerate him. If history came into the equation, the root of the problem might be sought in Rome's dealings with Alexandria in the final phase of Ptolemaic rule and the Augustan principate.

Introduction

It could well be that a long history of 'demonisation' of Jews lay behind the pogrom that happened in Alexandria in 38, and indeed may have been a causative factor. The anti-Jewish literary tradition perhaps began in the early 3rd century BC with the Egyptian Manetho, who wrote in Greek, and Hecataeus of Abdera. Josephus names among other detractors Apollonius Molon (admittedly not an Alexandrian), and Lysimachus, like Manetho, a Hellenised

---

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the CASA conference in Pietermaritzburg in July 2005, and at a seminar at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in December 2005. As I am taking a perhaps unfashionable line in not focussing just on Greek, Egyptian or Roman culpability, it might be noted that I was busy with these ideas long before the events of July 2006.

I am grateful to Prof. David Wardle for comments on an earlier draft, and to him and Prof. Saddlington for help in collecting references. I am also very grateful to the anonymous referees for their helpful comments, especially as their approach to this subject would be somewhat different from mine. A recent short period of time in London at the Institute of Classical Studies and at the Warburg Institute proved beneficial. For the faults that remain I have probably only myself to blame.

1 Josephus, esp. Contra Apionem (hereafter Ap.) 1 228-9 and 251-2, D.S. 40.3.
Egyptian.² Josephus Apion 1. 304-11 offers a sample of Lysimachus' hostile history of the Jews. And then there was Apion, who was the subject of Josephus' diatribe long after the events of 38. Mendelson (1988:77-113) serves to illustrate how one can identify some lines of the attack on Jews by examining Philo's apologetic texts.

But, as Collins (2005: esp. 17-23) emphasises, there has been a tendency to exaggerate the anti-Jewish element in what we know of this Greek literature, and to take it even further as evidence of proto-anti-Semitism (p. 21).³ Furthermore, it has to be added that over against the volume of texts that are said to have exuded Jew-hatred (Van der Horst's term), there were plenty of texts by Graeco-Roman authors which expressed admiration for Jews and Judaism.⁴ But Van der Horst (2003:33) thinks that in Alexandria the hostile view predominated: 'This unabated anti-Jewish propaganda cannot have failed to have a dramatic effect.' Certainly non-literary texts provide some evidence of anti-Jewish sentiment amongst Egyptian Greeks,⁵ and, not surprisingly, Jews tended to be 'the usual suspects' when a crime had been committed against a Greek, and someone outside the community could be blamed. But it can be argued that prejudice does not absolutely depend upon a long history of stereotyping or demonisation: fault lines can be generated.

In the case of Alexandria divisions were marked by the application of a definition of citizenship that kept the majority of the free population in ethnically designated communities. But the principal partition between citizen and non-citizen arose from Greek tradition, and not from demonisation of the Jews, and it would seem that in many respects it did not overly impinge on personal freedoms. But the community boundaries, whether always rigorously policed or not, created opportunities for trouble-makers to exploit. Had the perpetrators, or victims, of the violence of 38 had their day before something like a modern tribunal, gacaca court or Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the history of the 'demonisation' of Jews might have been raised as respectively a mitigating, or aggravating, circumstance, but the focus would rightly have been on the facts of the case and individual responsibility. In this paper I propose to focus more on those immediate

---

³ Collins notes, for example, Gager 1983.
⁴ Modern references in Van der Horst 2003:32.
⁵ Modrzewski 1995:153-57, who counsels caution in dealing with texts such as CPJ 1.135 and 141. We may add that by 38 not all Greeks were Greek by any strict biological or ethnic definition and the test of acceptance was presumably applied de facto, as it was latterly in apartheid legislation on racial classification; cf. Birnbaum 2001:53 with references.
issues. Unfortunately we lack the evidence to be able to give proper weight to the socio-economic factors that may have been at play in the range of strata of the relevant communities in Alexandria, but there is still much to be learned from the material at our disposal, not least because Philo’s treatment of the events is so palpably tendentious, and because we can apply lessons from other manifestations of inter-community violence.

The Roman context

Long before the end of 37 it would have been common knowledge in Alexandria that, sometime after 18 October, Gaius Caligula had fallen seriously sick, but had pulled through the crisis. He was functioning again before the end of the year, but full recovery was slow, as the Arval records for early January 38 indicate that he was then still suffering from ill health. The initial report must have been unsettling, as Caligula had only relatively recently become the new Princeps, and there was no obvious immediate successor if he perished. A mark of the seriousness of the situation was that when he became ill, he designated his sister Drusilla as his heir, which presumably meant that in the event of his demise, her husband M. Aemilius Lepidus would be expected to take over the administration. In this Caligula signalled that he did not intend that his adoptive son Tiberius Gemellus should succeed him. Though his recovery averted a dynastic crisis, there was another political crisis in Rome, as Caligula took action against the Praetorian Prefect, Macro, and his wife; and within the imperial family he clearly gave notice to Tiberius Gemellus, and his father-in-law, M. Junius Silanus. All four

---

6 I have some sympathy with Jack Straw, who found himself having to apologise for a platitude when he answered a question in the House of Commons on 25 April 2006: ‘Iraq has a long history … Many countries have a long history. (Pause) But that is so blindingly obvious, I withdraw the last remark. (Laughter) I withdraw it without reservation. (More ribald laughter).
7 Pucci Ben Zeve 1990 offers a useful introduction to the issues.
10 Tiberius’ grandson Tiberius Gemellus, born in AD 19 would have been considered too young to operate independently as emperor.
served the Principate by committing suicide early in 38, presumably because they were all party to a contingency plan worked out when Caligula fell ill. Palatine-watchers in Alexandria would have known that their governor, Aulus Avilius Flaccus, had reason to be worried. He had been appointed by Tiberius, had played a part in the banishment of Caligula’s mother, Agrippina, had supported the claims of Gemellus to be appointed as Tiberius’ successor, and was a friend of the Pretorian Prefect Macro. It was apparent in Alexandria that Flaccus had become a lame duck governor. Indeed, shortly before Macro was put out of the way, Macro was told that he would be reassigned from the Pretorian Prefecture to the governorship of Egypt. Presumably news of this reached at least some in Alexandria. Flaccus’ days were numbered.

Philo indicates further political circumstances as helping to explain the wave of attacks on Jews in Alexandria in 38. First, Caligula was more prepared to promote ruler cult than Tiberius had been, and Jews as monotheists would have been isolated by any campaign to accord Caligula divine honours. This provided scope for Greeks to make trouble, and may possibly have become an issue as a result of the failure of Flaccus to transmit to the Emperor the Jewish community’s profession of loyalty and felicitations upon Gaius’ accession. The rhetoric proffered at the time of the accession may have seemed inadequate by the time it was discovered that the loyal message was still with Flaccus. If, as Philo implies, this problem only emerged after

---

13 On the deaths, Philo, Leg. 59-65. Dio 59.10.6 puts the deaths of Macro and his wife in 38, but those of Gemellus and Silanus in 37 (59.8.1 and 6). Again the Arval records can be invoked to suggest that all four deaths occurred early in 38; cf. Wardle 1998:113-14; Smallwood 1961:177 and 185.

14 Smallwood 1981:236; Philo, In Flacc. 9-11, on the purge.

15 Philo, In Flacc. 9 and 16-18.

16 Dio 59.10.6. The association between Flaccus and Macro might have been taken as an indication that the change of prefect would not herald a shift in imperial policy towards Alexandria. Thus the prospect of Flaccus’ replacement by Macro would not have been a matter of protest by restless Greeks, but rather an opportunity for the exploitation of some uncertainty.

17 The episode is referred to by Philo, In Flacc. 97-103, where he credits Agrippa with intervening to pass on the message which Flaccus held back. Philo deals with this matter out of chronological sequence, and does not refer to it in the Legatio, thus one is left to wonder what value should be attached to the charge against Flaccus. It became conventional for the governor to instruct Egyptian communities how they were to celebrate the accession of a new emperor (refs. at POxy 3781, pp. 14-15; Kayser 2003:443). Van der Horst 2003:188 notes that the Jews would have needed the Prefect’s permission to send an embassy to Rome (Strabo 2.3.5, POxy 1271), hence Philo’s point that Flaccus would have refused permission (In Flacc. 97).
the arrival of Agrippa in Alexandria, then it may have provided Greeks with ammunition against the Jews, but that would have been only after the riots began. The deification of Gaius' sister, Drusilla, probably on 23 September 38, would likewise have come after the pogrom began, but again might have provided scope for Greeks to challenge or provoke the Jewish religious community.\footnote{The consecration is referred to by Suet. Calig. 24.2 and Dio 59.11.3-4, and the dating is indicated by the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, as emended. But Drusilla had been accorded divine honours by various cities in the east well before her death: references in Wandle 1994:228.}

Secondly, Philo offers a conspiracy theory involving a freedman in Caligula's court, Helicon, 'the Egyptian',\footnote{Philo, *Leg.* 166 clearly implies that Helicon was an Egyptian, which, if true, would mean a Hellenised Egyptian. Smallwood 1981:243 considers him 'probably an Alexandrian', meaning presumably a Greek, and as is explained below, Philo had his own reasons for labelling trouble-makers Egyptian. But Kerke slager 2005:92 labels him a 'foreign slave'.} who was on cordial terms with the Greeks of Alexandria. They approached him to advance their cause against the Jews, and he was to be paid fees for acting as their lobbyist, and, as it was envisaged that Caligula might visit Alexandria, Helicon was led to believe that the occasion would be used to honour him.\footnote{Philo, *Leg.* 172-73; 250-53; 338. Claudius put Helicon to death for other crimes (Philo, *Leg.* 206), and this appears to have been soon after the accession. Thus Philo could safely attack Helicon, and the fairness of Philo's charges against him cannot be tested.} To these points one could add that Caligula's father Germanicus had visited Alexandria in 19, and had shown partiality towards the Greek community.\footnote{The issues were fully discussed by Weingärtner 1969. Germanicus' supposed role in dealing with a crisis in the supply of corn is raised further into this paper.} This memory and perhaps also the prospect of a visit to the city by the emperor might have encouraged the trouble-makers of 38.

**Race riots in Alexandria**

Rioting against Jews seems to have begun after Agrippa's visit to the city in the early summer of 38.\footnote{Dated to the summer of 38 by Josephus, *Ant.* 18.238; further indicators of the date occur in *In Flav.* 26 and 83. Van der Horst 2003:190 suggests August 38, but Kushnir-Stein 2000 argues that Agrippa could have left Rome as early as mid-May.} This was Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great, born in 10 BC, and on his way to take over control of the northern Transjordanian tetrarchy, with royal status. His visit to Alexandria was celebrated by a large turn-out of the Jewish community, and one may guess that this...
display of Jewish solidarity aroused some resentment in the Greek community, especially as it occurred in the context of the ongoing campaign by the Jews to gain confirmation and clarification of their rights as ‘citizens’ of the Jewish community (politeuma) in Alexandria, and to secure entitlement to privileges, and most notably exemption from the poll tax (logographia), which Greeks enjoyed as citizens of the Alexandrian polis. Any such enhancement of the status of the Jewish politeuma would have diminished the privileged status of the Greek polis. This would help to explain why there was tension when Agrippa apparently allowed himself to be paraded in town with royal insignia and surrounded by bodyguards with spears, in armour plated with gold and silver. The sources do not actually attest a parade, though it is generally stated as fact in modern accounts. Alexandria may well, like Belfast, have had its marching season, for processions were a feature of the Ptolemaic era, and in 41 Claudius gave permission for processions linked with a statue of Pax Augusta Claudiana and a throne on namedays. So there probably was a procession and some sort of mass meeting at which Jews hailed Agrippa. Greeks then staged a burlesque of this ceremony in the gymnasium, and enlisted a brain-damaged street person, Canabas (Cabbage), in the role of Agrippa, and hailed him as Marin (our king). Smallwood (1961: 19) suggests that Agrippa left Alexandria at this point. Then in a mass meeting in the theatre Greeks called for images of the emperor to be set up in all the meeting-houses, which meant the synagogues. This led to physical attacks on synagogues, and Jews, ‘though naturally well disposed for peace’

---

23 A papyrus document of 5/4 BC, BGU 1140 (Wilcken 1912: no. 58), is an appeal from an Alexandrian Jew to the prefect Turranius apparently for exemption from the logographia. The implication is that as an ethnic Jew he might still qualify for the tax exemption, but was not so automatically qualified (cf. Kasher 1976:148-51). Alexandrian citizenship might also be demanded as a prerequisite for Roman citizenship (Pliny, Ep. 10.6, though Delia 1991:41-44 argues that this was not an absolute rule).

24 This reflects the interpretation of Kasher 1976 and 1985 (cf. Delia 1991:26-27 and Bringmann 2005), as against the view that the Jews were campaigning for the advancement of their community as a whole to Greek citizenship (Smallwood 1981:237). Honigman 2003 analyses the development of the concept of the politeuma, and argues that not all Jews would have been members of the Jewish politeuma, and that Jews who aspired to full Alexandrian citizenship would have seen membership of the politeuma as an impediment to their case (92-93).

25 Philo, In Flac. 30, 38.

26 For example, Smallwood 1961:18; Barrett 1989:186, 191.


28 Philo, In Flac. 34, 36-39.

29 Philo, In Flac. 41, read with Leg. 138.
defended their meeting-houses.\textsuperscript{30} The rioting escalated and Greeks attacked the property of Jews, driving whole families out of their homes, and looting (Philo, \textit{Leg.} 121-22). This phase started when businesses were closed as a mark of respect for Gaius’ sister Drusilla, who died on 10 June 38.\textsuperscript{31} Gaius’ instructions for the period of mourning (Suet. \textit{Calig.} 24.2) may in turn have provided opportunities for trouble-makers to harass Jews. In any event, Jews were flushed out of various parts of the city of Alexandria, and driven into what was to become a Jewish ghetto. The ghetto was blockaded and those trying to escape were killed; Jews caught in town were burnt alive; some were dismembered and trampled to death (Philo, \textit{Leg.} 127-31; \textit{In Flacc.} 62-71). This was an exercise in ethnic cleansing. Jewish traders putting into harbour were robbed and their goods confiscated. Synagogues in each part of the city were desecrated, some being razed and others torched, and in the process the rioters destroyed shields, crowns, monumental stones and inscriptions that had been set up in honour of the emperors (132-33).\textsuperscript{32} Philo indicates that the rioting got worse because the governor, Aulus Avilius Flaccus, turned a blind eye, and instituted a wave of house-to-house searches, as he claimed to have received a report that Jews had been stockpiling weapons and armour. But the search for weapons produced no evidence of such military gear, if we can believe Philo (\textit{In Flacc.} 86-91), though it is quite possible that Philo tells less than the complete truth.\textsuperscript{33}

Caligula received word of what was happening in Alexandria, and sent word to Flaccus to explain his actions. But the governor compounded the problem by unilaterally changing the status of the Jews in Alexandria to that of xenoi (aliens) (Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 53-54), instead presumably of katoikoi (resident aliens). Smallwood (1981:240) suggests that this meant that the Jews would no longer be legally able to have their own politeuma. Philo specifically

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{30} Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 48. The defensive tone here may suggest that there were Jews who moved from defence to counter-attack or retaliation. Philo, \textit{Leg.} 132 puts the attacks on the synagogues as the crowning insult after the pogrom had run its course. Gruen 2003:273 notes that the range of functions of these meeting-houses also included community, study and judicial activities, and that they could serve as ‘repositories for sacred monies’.  
  \item \textsuperscript{31} \textit{Fasti Ostienses} (in Smallwood 1967:31). She was consecrated on 23 September 38 (Smallwood 1967:5), which appears as a critical date later in this story.  
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Van der Horst 2003:147, on Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 49, cites epigraphical evidence for Jews in various cities in Egypt setting up ‘places of prayer’ for the ruler of the day; but the cases he cites from the collection of Horbury & Noy 1992 refer to members of the Ptolemaic dynasty, and are not therefore strictly relevant.  
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Cf. Smallwood 1981:240-41; Box 1939:lx. At p. 88 Box comments on Philo’s unreliability at \textit{In Flacc.} 33.  
\end{itemize}
states that Flaccus took away from Jews their right of appeal to the courts. But if Flaccus specifically targeted *katoikoi*, then he was attacking the privileges of Jews who had been considered sufficiently Hellenised to be distinguished from ordinary 'Egyptians' and perhaps also to be allowed to own fixed property.\(^\text{34}\) Hence the following reference in Philo’s narrative to the expulsion of Jews from all but one of the five sectors of the city (*In Flacc.* 55). But it is improbable that Flaccus included in his decree clauses that sanctioned the physical attacks on Jews and the looting of their property.\(^\text{35}\) Thirty-eight members of the Jewish Sanhedrin were flogged in the theatre, and some of them died of their injuries (*Philo, In Flacc.* 74-78). The affront to the Jews was compounded because the men were stripped naked, which offended Jewish tradition, and if this happened in the context of the celebration of Caligula’s birthday, on 31 August, it would have fallen on the Jewish Sabbath.\(^\text{36}\) In this context Philo also mentions that Jews now lost a privilege which they had shared with Alexandrians. For, in the past, when a Jew had been sentenced to corporal punishment, he would be beaten with a rod, and not a whip as would any ordinary 'Egyptian' (*In Flacc.* 78-79).\(^\text{37}\)

Caligula now decided to recall Flaccus to Rome, but this may have been because Flaccus had been a friend of Macro, and the debacle in Alexandria provided an excuse for action against Flaccus.\(^\text{38}\) In any event a squad of troops under a centurion was sent to Alexandria to arrest Flaccus, and this would have been around the time of the Feast of the Tabernacles (or Booths), at the autumn equinox of 38, thus in mid-October.\(^\text{39}\) He was recalled to Rome, arraigned, with Lampo and Isidorus as prosecutors (*In Flacc.*, 135), exiled to the island of Andros, and subsequently liquidated.\(^\text{40}\)

\(^{\text{34}}\) Delia 1991:36 n. 142 for the definition of *katoikos*, and at p. 31 she finds it unlikely that all Jews were debarred from owning fixed property.

\(^{\text{35}}\) Cf. Box 1939:99; Van der Horst 2003:157. But Kerkeslager 2005 is more prepared to accept that Flaccus would have been capable of the thuggery, and certainly had the means to stop it, if he so wished.


\(^{\text{37}}\) Delia 1991:31-32 sees this as the import of Flaccus’ downgrading of the status of the Jews.

\(^{\text{38}}\) This would be consistent with the case of Kerkeslager 2005 that Flaccus was indeed behind the trouble and was perfectly able to control the level of violence, and that in all this he was ‘acting in accordance with accepted Roman policies’ (94).

\(^{\text{39}}\) *Philo, In Flacc.* 109-15, with the date indication in 116. Van der Horst ad loc. follows Schwartz 1982:190 n. 8.

\(^{\text{40}}\) The tale of Flaccus’ arrest, exile and murder is gloatingly stretched out in *Philo, In Flacc.* 109-91. Lampo and Isidorus appear in *In Flacc.* 135. Kerkeslager 2005 argues
The new governor was C. Vitratus Pollio, who seems to have arrived on 20 October 38. He established an inquiry into the riots, and then granted permits to groups from both the Jewish and the Greek communities to travel to Rome to petition the Emperor, but this may only have been in the winter of 39-40. The Greek delegation included Isidorus and Apion, and the Jewish delegation was headed by Philo. The issue was to be the status of the Jewish community in Alexandria.

**Background and causes of the riots**

As noted above, there may well have been a long history of 'demonisation' of Jews in some Alexandrian quarters, but it is argued that it was not the major determinant behind the riots of 38. Distinguishing ethnic markers may have been of some immediate significance, but that is disputed. There was the long-standing issue of the rights and privileges which the Jews would have as members of the Jewish community or *politeuma*, which was given some immediacy as Flaccus cancelled some of the rights which they had that Lampo and Isidorus were not directly involved in the troubles in Alexandria, and indeed must have been out of Alexandria long before the trouble began.

41 Wicken 1912: no. 59. The arrival of the unnamed governor is given as in Gaius year 3, which in Egypt would mean from 29 August. The calendar date given by Wicken was corrected to 20 October by Stein 1950:27. Vitratus is first attested in office epigraphically only in 28 April 39: *ILS* 8899, given in Smallwood 1967: no. 277. He remained in office till sometime in 41.

42 Which would mean that the two delegations only had to wait for about five months for a substantive audience with Caligula, rather than about 17 months. Philo anticipates the initial meeting with Gaius at *Legatio* 184-86, and introduces the substantive meeting at *Leg*. 349. The dating issues are reviewed by Smallwood 1961:47-50, 250-51.

43 Philo, *Leg*. 355; Josephus, *Ant*. 18.257-60. Isidorus is referred to as a gymnasiarch in the *Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs* (in Musrillo 1961:IV, cols. 2.2-3, 3.10-11 etc.), and Philo, *In Flacc.* 20 introduces him as the sedition leader (*stasiarch*). Apion was more famous as a writer, and was also seen as anti-Jewish. Josephus in his two-volume book *Against Apion* does for Apion what Philo did for Flaccus in his diatribe against the man (but Van der Horst 2003:1-2 recognises nobler purposes behind the *In Flacc.*).

44 Ethnicity was the key factor as Goudriaan 1992: esp. 94 presents it, though he lays greater stress than does this paper on the role of the Alexandrian Egyptians. But Modrzejewski 1995:172 argues that circumcision was the only physical distinction that marked out a Jewish male, and there was no such distinguishing feature of the Jewish woman, hence the use of pork as an ordeal imposed on women (Philo, *In Flacc*. 96).
enjoyed since Augustus’ day. There is scholarly debate about the legal standing of the politeuma and what precisely the Jews wanted short of full Alexandrian citizenship. Bergmann and Hoffmann (1987) follow Kasher (1985) in arguing that the Jews were fighting for equal rights for their politeuma, and not for full citizenship, and that the issues in 38 involved hard politics, conflicts of interest and organised political action. They conclude that attacks on Jews did not have a religious motivation and were not motivated by antisemitism.\textsuperscript{46}

Those who have explored the deep causes of the riots have commonly suggested that the Jews’ religion and exclusivist tendencies isolated the Jewish community and carried the risk of provoking resentment. But Judaism was not a model of uniformity and one has to examine the realities of the development of the Jewish community in Alexandria. The city was very cosmopolitan. The Jewish community was large, and may have accounted for over 30% of the population. Some consider that there may have been some 180 000 Jews living in the city, with a population density of perhaps 45 000 per square kilometre,\textsuperscript{47} but others, while accepting that Jews may have made up nearly a third of the population, would set the absolute number of Jews at more like 100 000.\textsuperscript{48} The Jewish community was concentrated mainly in two of the five wards of the city, but there were Jews living in each of the other three wards (\textit{In Flacc.} 55), and Jews were integrated into all aspects of the city’s social and economic life. By implication, middle class and very wealthy Jews were more likely to live outside the two Jewish suburbs (cf. Philo, \textit{Leg.} 123). Some intermarriage must have occurred, and Claudius’ letter to the Alexandrians in 41 clearly indicates that there were Jews who had crossed the line and had been accepted as full citizens;\textsuperscript{49} Claudius declined to

\textsuperscript{45} Kasher’s case is reviewed by Bringmann 2005.

\textsuperscript{46} Schäfer 1997:156-60 likewise finds that the issue was primarily political and did not have a ‘distinct’ religious dimension, but he argues that ‘Judaecophobia’ was very much a reality in Alexandria, and he rejects the Bergmann-Hoffmann line as too extreme.

\textsuperscript{47} The number of Jews appears to be given in Musurillo 1961:111, col. 1.15. Further on the population and density figures, Sly 1996: esp. 44-47, following Delia 1988: 275-92. Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 43 claims that the Jewish population numbered one million, which is clearly an exaggeration. D.S. 17.52.6 puts the free population of the city in his day at a more credible total of over 300 000.

\textsuperscript{48} Thus Haas 1997:45-47, 95 and 375-77 sets the total population at perhaps exceeding 200 000, arguing for a population density of c. 200 per hectare, while Van der Horst 2003:20 sets the Jewish population at more like 100 000, which is still too high if Haas’s total is of the right order.

\textsuperscript{49} Gruen 2003:275, but the references to Jews as Alexandrian citizens in Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 53 and Josephus, \textit{Ant.} 14.188 concern Jews as a class, and must denote their
unscramble the omelette. Furthermore there was no such thing as monotypical Judaism in antiquity and, in the context of Rome’s tolerance of religious pluralism and the openness of the ‘market place’ of religions, the Jews of Alexandria, as elsewhere, surely ranged from the orthodox to the radical, and to the irreligious. Ameling shows that they were certainly open to Greek influences, as Philo himself demonstrates, and Jews had been exposed to Babylonian and Iranian influences; and apart from the intellectual borrowings, many Jews were attracted to popular magical beliefs and practices, which represented a mix of Greek, Jewish and Egyptian elements.

There is debate about the extent to which the religious ‘market place’ operated at more than the intellectual level, especially in the special case of Alexandria. At one level, religion for both the Alexandrian Jews and Greeks was ‘embedded’ in their respective communities, but both now operated in the context of religious pluralism, says North, who argues that ‘the transformation of religious life’ did not wait upon the arrival of Christianity, and that Judaism itself was open to outsiders. This might have been true of Alexandria too, as Philo professed conversion to Judaism as part of his faith (De Virtutibus, esp. 102-04; De Specialibus Legibus 4.178), and looked to the day when all peoples would come to accept the wisdom of Jewish law (De Vita Mos. 2.43-4). He also claimed that there were ‘not only Jews but multitudes of others’ who were attracted to the Jewish festival held on the island of Pharos. But, as is emphasised in this paper, Philo is not always reliable on membership of the Jewish community of Alexandria: Kasher 1985: esp. 234-37 and 274-76. Van der Horst 2003:153-54 reviews the debate on In Flac. 53, and at 23-24 he argues that Josephus, Ap. 2.65 shows that some Jews became full Alexandrian citizens, while retaining their Jewish faith.

North 1992:174-93, esp. 180. An inscription from Aphrodisias shows that in some situations a distinction was made between proselytes and thosebeis (the pious), where proselytes were those whose acceptance into Judaism was marked by baptism and, where Roman law did not prevent it, circumcision, while the thosebeis would be those who adopted Judaism in a less formal way (the inscription is given in Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, with the commentary at pp. 43-44 and 48-58; cf. Rajak 1992:9-21, esp. 20-21. But that was Aphrodisias, and the inscription is of the 3rd century.

Philo, De Vita Mos. 2.41, noted by Reynolds & Tannenbaum 1987:50. This is not the place to join the debate on the degree to which Philo was genuinely open to the
matters of fact, nor on orders of magnitude. In the Empire as a whole the evidence does not suggest that Jews seriously engaged in proselytising on a significant scale, and the ban on self-mutilation must have checked any rush for circumcision.\textsuperscript{54} And in Alexandria there were positive reasons for Greeks not to endanger the privileged status which they acquired by passing through the ephebate to citizenship,\textsuperscript{55} the benefits including full exemption from the \textit{laographia} or poll tax. Thus, although conversion to Judaism was probably relatively rare, at various levels the concept of the market place of religious ideas was a reality. There was no inevitability about the clash between communities representing different religious traditions. The disaster was man-made.

It may be academically very satisfying to be able to trace the ‘troubles’ in Northern Ireland back to Oliver Cromwell and William III, 1689 and the Battle of the Boyne, or to explain Serbian violence against the Albanians by invoking the legacy of the battle of Kosovo of 1389, when the Ottoman Turks defeated Serbs and their allies. In this vein we might set the origins of the tensions that led to the riots of 38 in the context of the Maccabean Revolt. As noted in the Introduction, it can be readily agreed that there had been a long history of anti-Jewish literature among Greeks and Hellenised Egyptians, especially in Alexandria. But one is not readily persuaded that the more violent trouble-makers were steeped in history, or students of

\textsuperscript{54} The case is forcefully presented by Goodman 1992:53-78.

\textsuperscript{55} The situation was different in Rome, where one could be both Jewish and a Roman citizen (Philo, \textit{Leg.} 155, 157).
theology. Thus Schäfer 1997:144-60, while arguing that ‘Judaophobia’ was very much a reality in Alexandria, concludes that there was no distinct religious dimension to the conflict, and that the issue was primarily political.

It is at least worth taking into consideration what we know about violence as a social and psychological phenomenon. We have to consider the effects of peer pressure and attitudes to authority, and personality traits that predispose some to violence. Milgram found experimentally that it was all too easy to persuade intelligent subjects to administer ever-increasing electrical shocks to students who got answers wrong in a simulated teaching environment. And in the recent past we have seen some evidence in noting associated with football matches, at least in some situations in the northern hemisphere, of the leadership role played by mature-aged men with solid middle-class careers. It seems unnecessary to ask what such gentlemen understand about the dark side of the history of the city or community which they target. In the immediate case Pucci Ben Zeev (1990:230) finds it no less likely that the instigators of the trouble in 38 were from the Greek upper class than from the Greek proletariat. Obviously there are situations where the burden of the past is sufficient to explain why resentment may turn into uncontrolled violence. But in a community where people have learnt to live together in harmony and then have suddenly turned to violence, it is surely of paramount importance to examine the dynamics of the situation as it unfolded.

The proximate cause of the riots must have been Herod’s visit to the city. Philo’s apologetic handling of the episode is enough to suggest that the visit was the catalyst for the riots. Philo says that Caligula advised Herod to travel to his tetrarchy via Alexandria. Philo indicates that Herod took the advice as an instruction which he could not ignore, quite apart from the wisdom of Caligula’s advice; and he implies that Herod was all set to take the longer

---

56 As for the riots initiated by Protestant youths in Belfast in mid-September 2005, it may not be surprising that Peter Hain, the Minister responsible for Northern Island, ascribed the violence to ‘gangsterism’, but he may be right to question their historical and religious motivations.

57 Kressel 1996: esp. 177 ff.

58 I have in mind cases where the violence is not at a fault-line in society defined by some more general religious or political issue. Dunning 1994:153 suggests that the phenomenon of ‘middle-class’ football hooligans could be linked in the individual case with either upward mobility or downward mobility. Of course loutish behaviour by those who ought to know better can occur in the context of more gentlemanly sports. The haridans who stand on the rugby touchline, urging their sons on with bloodcurdling screams may be too removed from our subject, but they had their counterpart in the more serious business of the Nika riots in Constantinople in 532 (Procopius, Bella 1.24.6).
route via Brundisium and Syria before Caligula intervened (In Flacc. 25-26). Secondly, Philo claims that, when his boat approached the Pharos, Herod requested that the boat should only put in after dark, so that he could slip into the city without attracting attention, and then slip out again as quickly as possible without being noticed (In Flacc. 27-28). Thirdly, Philo implies that ‘the Egyptians’ made this impossible, and Flaccus’ advisers aroused his anger with the perception that Herod’s dramatic entrance into the city and the reception which he received eclipsed his standing as governor of the province (In Flacc. 29-32). Then in the Legatio Philo makes a passing reference to Agrippa, who had happened to be staying in Alexandria (Leg. 179). Philo even gives a hint that he was Agrippa’s host in the city. If Philo gives the game away, it was pride that got in the way of his purpose to show that the visit was unplanned, and that Herod Agrippa could not be charged with any premeditated action that might have upset the Greeks. If the Jewish community made a great show of welcoming the king into Alexandria, and Greeks chose to be offended, that was regrettable but not the Jews’ fault. If this were all so, one might say of the victims of the pogrom, to adapt a comment on another atrocity, most died because they were killed.

Clearly Agrippa’s procession through Alexandria was the catalyst for inter-community violence. There were surely features of the procession which made it seem provocative. There is a long history to show that such events can be developed to defuse tension and foster tolerance, or to cause no more than silent bewilderment. But the Orange Order marches of Ulster are a classic case of the confrontational model. The more peaceful the procession tradition the more likely that it is inclusive in nature. The more exclusivist the model, the more likely it is that it will, intentionally or not,

---

59 Smallwood 1976:238 adds the rather cynical note that Agrippa might have preferred to avoid the risk of an encounter with his creditor, who was the brother of Philo. Kushnir-Stein 2000:232 likewise notes that Philo goes out of his way to put the onus on Caligula, but notes that the southern route was ‘longer and more problematic’ (232), and as an honorary praetor Agrippa would have needed Caligula’s permission to enter Alexandria (241, citing Philo, In Flacc. 40), but Van der Horst 2003: 116-17 sides with those who think the southern route was quicker and more suitable for big ships.

60 Philo, Flacc. 103, with Van der Horst 2003:120. Van der Horst also notes that Philo’s brother had been persuaded to bankroll Agrippa in 36, when Agrippa got into debt: Jos. Ant. 159-60.

61 The list might stretch from Saturnalian rites in ancient Rome to the contemporary Notting Hill carnival or gay-pride marches in Johannesburg or Cape Town.

62 As with a grand procession of dignitaries from Masonic lodges from all over the UK through a north country city in April 2006.
provoking resentment. It is not difficult to imagine that Agrippa's procession might have caused offence – the message, the show of affluence and regal power, the expression of community solidarity, and perhaps the louche behaviour of a section of the community that took courage from the numbers.

This is not the only reason to suggest that the conventional view of the pogrom may not be the whole truth, if indeed it is fair to characterise the conventional view as tending to follow Philo's account and assuming that the pogrom was caused by a measure of deep-seated 'anti-Semitism'.

First, Josephus refers to the troubles of 38 as civil strife (stasis) between the Jewish inhabitants and the Greeks (Ant. 18.257). Then there is Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians of AD 41 in which he refers to the troubles as 'the disturbances and civil unrest, or really one should say the war, against the Jews.' This might imply that this was a one-sided action, but he is addressing the Alexandrian Greeks in the first instance, and the term war (polemos) might imply that this was not just a massacre of the innocents. The immediate context of Claudius' letter was that the two communities had sent fresh delegations to Rome, in the aftermath of a fresh wave of rioting that began in 41, as soon as news of Caligula's death reached Alexandria. Josephus reports that the Jews, who had been humiliated and treated violently by the Alexandrians in Caligula's reign immediately took up arms and rioted against the Greeks.

It would seem strange if the Jews could so easily arm themselves and mobilise against the Greeks in 41, but had been purely passive victims in 38. Furthermore, in 41 the Greeks made a counter-appeal to Claudius, and Claudius declined to investigate which side was responsible for the troubles, which again suggests that the blame was not all on one side. He said that, while he would not establish an inquiry, he would maintain a store of implacable anger against those who started the trouble again. Claudius was thus not going simply to allow the Greeks to engage in a witch-hunt against the trouble-makers of 41, and his reference to a war against the Jews must imply that he would take a longer view and would also consider Greeks' culpability for the riots of 38.

---

63 References are given by Schäfer 1997:272 n. 141.
64 Josephus, Ant. 19.278-9. Josephus refers to the Jewish action as stasis, a milder term than Claudius thought appropriate.
65 Smallwood 1967:370, lines 73-78. Strictly the Greek should mean that his target was those who had started the trouble again, but there is a touch of ambiguity that could allow a warning to any who should start the trouble again.
The role of the ‘Egyptians’

Something of the tension between Jews and Greeks can be gleaned by the way Philo attributes the troubles of 38 to the ‘Egyptians’ in Alexandria. When Flaccus heard of Macro’s death and was clearly concerned about his own position, the locals took this as encouragement to make trouble, as it was a characteristic of the Egyptian nation to fan the smallest spark into major disturbances (In Flacc. 17), and Agrippa’s visit to Alexandria led to trouble because the locals were jealous that the Jews had a king, for the Egyptian nation was malicious by nature (In Flacc. 29). Furthermore Gaius Caligula was incited into a confrontation with the Jews by the freedman Helicon and his Egyptian groupies, ‘whose souls were infected with the poison and bad temper alike of the crocodiles and asps of their country’ (Philo, Leg. 166, as translated by Smallwood). Flaccus allowed mob-rule to develop and the gangs which attacked Jewish synagogues claimed to be concerned to make dedications in the synagogues to the emperor Gaius, though they had had no such concern to honour any of the Ptolemies, which was odd, because the Ptolemies were at least human beings, whereas throughout Egypt these people deify dogs, wolves, lions and crocodiles and build altars, temples and sacred precincts for them (Leg. 132-39). Gruen argues that we should take all such references to Egyptians at face value, and thus recognise the importance of this factor in the riots. Schäfer (1997:145) likewise would accept the leading role taken by the Egyptians, but suggests that they may have been put up to rioting by ‘the Greek faction’. Clearly there were Hellenised Egyptians, like Apion (Van der Horst 2003:18), who were anti-Jewish, but it need not be assumed that they had sufficient credibility with ordinary lower-class Egyptians to be able to mobilise them as an independent force in Alexandria. The implication of accepting Gruen’s guidance would lead close to excluding the Greeks from the action, and would make nonsense of Claudius’ warning to the Alexandrian Greeks. In her translation of the Legatio, Smallwood helpfully writes in ‘the Greeks’ in several places where vague third person references might be taken to refer to Egyptians. Gruen (2002:280) justifiably objects to these insertions, but as misleading the reader into believing that Philo squarely blames the Greeks, and thus passes over the culpability of the Egyptians. The objection should rather be that the insertions conceal the way Philo in many places evades

---

68 As at Leg. 124 (picking up an earlier reference to ‘the Alexandrian mob’: 120), 130, 132 and 133.
direct reference to Greeks, and gives the impression that he is talking about Egyptians. One hastens to add that to emphasise the role Philo appears to give to Egyptians is not to subscribe to some Aryan model of denial, but to reflect Philo’s racial prejudices. Glossing over the way Philo refers to the perpetrators of the violence conceals the issue of why Philo is so often imprecise. Two explanations may be considered: first that Philo is quite simply engaging in some anti-Hellenic abuse by demeaning Alexandrian Greeks as no different from native Egyptians. This line is taken by Birnbaum (2001) in her careful analysis of Philo’s usage of the terms Hellene, Alexandrian and Egyptian, where she finds Philo consistent in his superior attitude to Egyptian Greeks, but the possibility remains open that Philo adjusted his vocabulary to suit the immediate context, especially when he switched from history and exegesis to politics. Thus the second possibility is that Philo was trying to find some way of getting to an accommodation with the Greek élite, if not the majority, in the aftermath of the troubles. Indeed there are comments in his Flaccus which show that his target audience included non-Jewish Greek-speakers. Both sides might have seen advantage in scapegoating marginalised, urbanised Egyptians or migrant workers. There was indeed tension between Alexandrian Greeks and Egyptians, who predominated in the Alexandrian chora, and were drawn to the city by the centripetal forces that operated in a wide range of economic, administrative, social and cultural fields. The tactic of shifting the blame onto Egyptians can perhaps be seen at work in Josephus’ Against Apion, where he says that Greeks and Macedonians and Jews got on well together, and Jews were left alone in the practice of their religion, apart from some Alexandrian troublemakers, like Apion. Tensions led to major disturbances when Egyptians moved in on the action in large numbers (2.69). Josephus essentially blames Egyptians for sweeping along the unsophisticated in a campaign against the Jews (2.70).

---

69 Box 1939:79 considers it undeniable that Philo uses Egyptian in this context as a term of abuse.
70 Van der Horst 2003:15 notes In Flac. 25, 37, 55, 116 and 191.
72 Philo does the same thing when describing the start of the troubles in Jamneia in AD 39: those who set out to upset the Jews were aliens, a ragbag of individuals from neighbouring territories sneaked in to make trouble for the indigenous Jews (Leg 200). In reality he was surely referring to Greeks.
Some concerns of the Alexandrian Greeks

A concern on Josephus' part to be diplomatic in his treatment of Judaeo-Greek affairs appears in his defensive remarks about two earlier episodes, concerning the distribution of the corn dole in famine years: first at the very end of Cleopatra's reign, when she did not have enough corn to distribute to Jews (Ap. 2.60), and again in AD 19 when Germanicus visited the city and organised a special distribution at a subsidised price (Tac. Ann. 2.59). Josephus' comment on the first episode is that the Jews could not be blamed if Cleopatra gave corn only to Greeks, and with regard to the second his comment is that if Germanicus could not distribute corn to the entire population of Alexandria, that is evidence of a poor harvest and a shortage of corn, and is not an indictment of the Jews (Ap. 2.63-64). Josephus does not use this episode to complain about discrimination against Jews who were denied corn at the cheaper price, but takes it up to counter unspecified charges made by Apion. We are left to guess whether Apion alleged hoarding, price-fixing, manipulation of the market, or corruption in the distribution of corn to Jews who qualified for the dole. Of course, this does not mean that Apion's charges were justified, but Josephus' defensive line suggests at least that there was another side to the story, or again that he did not wish to antagonise the Greek community unnecessarily.

For the Greeks of Alexandria there was clearly a tension between its cosmopolitan character as an 'international' economic and cultural centre, and the vision of those who wanted the city to be run as an independent, self-sufficient Greek polis. A trend in the Hellenistic period was for cities in the successor kingdoms to develop institutions that had characterised the democratic poleis of the Classical period: thus, for example, Alexandria organised itself into (five) tribes and demes on the Athenian model, even though the city was the capital of a Macedonian dynasty. By the time Octavian entered Alexandria, its chances of retaining a measure of independence as a Greek polis within the Roman province had been compromised by the

---

73 The technical questions relating to this episode are discussed by Weingärtner 1969:91-99.
74 Strabo 17.1.13. 798 states that by his day Alexandria was the largest commercial centre in the world; cf. Orosius, Pagan. 6.19.19 of its wealth at the time of the battle of Actium; Dio Chrys. 32.36.
75 References in Jones 1940:158-59.
76 Tribes and demes: Delia 1991:21-23; Alexandrian aspirations to be seen as in the Athenian tradition: Fraser 1972:1, 110-11, with regard to some of the laws, legal procedures and titles, citing evidence from the Ptolemaic Dikaiomata and the Acts of the Pagan Martyrs (POxy. 2177 = Musurillo 1961:X, col. 1, 4-18).
relationship Julius Caesar had established with Cleopatra, and then by Antony’s marriage to her. The city had been a target for vilification by Octavian. Now under Roman rule the polis was exceptionally denied the right to establish a Boule, the probouletic council that was a quintessential element of democracy. The Greeks raised the issue periodically, and by AD 41 they had only progressed as far as having Claudius undertake to establish a commission of enquiry into the merits of the case. Furthermore, and of relevance to the immediate exercise, Levick comments that the favour shown to the Jewish community by first Julius Caesar and then the early emperors ‘infuriated the citizens of a defeated Hellenistic capital.’

With the establishment of the Principate a policy of Romanising the provinces was developed, side by side with what we might call unplanned globalisation. This, too, worked against the idealised self-image of the Alexandrian Greeks. In AD 4/5 Augustus upset them more specifically by his rule that Hellenised Egyptians could be considered Greek for various purposes, if they qualified by ‘belonging to the gymnasion’, or by being ‘metropolitans’, which meant being inhabitants of Alexandria, Ptolemais or Naucratis. These Egyptians were still obliged to pay the poll tax, which had

---

77 Smallwood 1981:232 suggests that it was one of the Ptolemies who had terminated the operation of the Boule. Levick 1981:183 attributes the decision to Augustus. Kayser 2003:444-45 notes that a Greek boule had the important function of screening those who passed through the ephebate. Bowman & Rathbone 1992:114-19 discuss the functions of the Boule, but emphasise that the Alexandrian Greeks were perfectly able to run a functional administration without that formal constitutional element.

78 First attested in the Boule Papyrus, in Musurillo 1961:1, which refers to an approach made in 30 BC: Delia 1991:117-20, who suggests that this text may have been composed as part of the submission to the prefect Aemilius Rectus, who in AD 41 was instructed to look into the issue of the Greeks’ request for a Boule (119 n. 18, re Claudius’ letter to the Alexandrians, PLond. 6.1912 lines 68-72). Another approach may have been made in 13 AD (POxy. 2435, translated in Sherk RELAH, no. 25), and perhaps again when Germanicus visited the city in the winter of 18/19.

79 Claudius’ letter to the Alexandrians (PLond 1912), translated in Sherk RELAH, no. 44, lines 66-72. This might seem to be progress, but it amounts to little more than a diplomatic move to buy time, and the tone of Claudius’ letter at this point should not have been seen as encouraging.

80 Levick 1990:183; Box 1939:xix-xxix. Josephus, BJ 2.487-88 claims that after the annexation of Egypt, Augustus and his successors allowed the Jews of Alexandria to retain the privileges they had received from the Ptolemies, and ‘permission to reside in the city on equal terms with the Greeks’, an expression which is more of a rhetorical flourish than a legal definition.

81 Tcherikover 1957:1,50, citing i.a. POxy 2186, 257 (for AD 4/5 as the critical date), 258 and 1202.
been introduced in 24/23 BC as a liability of all non-Greeks, but while Jews paid the tax at the full rate, the Egyptian-Greeks paid at a reduced rate.\textsuperscript{82} This added to the tension between Jews and Egyptians, but the immediate point is that the extension of citizenship to Egyptians upset at least some of the Greeks of Alexandria, and added a new level of intra-Greek tension.\textsuperscript{83}

In reaction to all this – Romanisation, globalisation and the use of \textit{koinē} Greek as a language of empire – there was an intensified movement in Alexandria and more generally within the Greek-speaking world to assert their Greekness and pride in their history and traditions. This came to be known as the Second Sophistic Movement. It promoted, \textit{inter alia}, a return to pure Attic Greek, in reaction against \textit{koinē} Greek as the second language in the Roman Empire. It is suggested that an early manifestation of this movement emerged in Alexandria in the Augustan era.\textsuperscript{84}

Not surprisingly, there were rough-necks who turned such lofty ideals into a rather aggressive political programme. The Jewish sources naturally attack their opponents, and especially Apion, Isidorus and Lampon, as anti-Jewish and generally unsavoury;\textsuperscript{85} but we have in the \textit{Acta Alexandrinorum} evidence from their own supporters that they were proud of their hostility to the Jews. The martyr Isidorus is supposed to have told Claudius, 'I am not a slave, nor the son of a girl musician … but you are the reject son of Salome the Jewess.'\textsuperscript{86} Isidorus made his mark in Alexandria by the way he dominated most of the Greek clubs (\textit{thiasoi}), and that brought him into conflict with Flaccus, says Philo, \textit{In Flacc.} 135-45.

Towards a reconciliation

As we have seen, Philo and Josephus give hints that they had some concern to be conciliatory towards level-headed Greeks, and were careful to focus their attack on Greeks who had been otherwise discredited. Thus we have an

\textsuperscript{82}Tcherikover 1957:1.59; Smallwood 1981:231.
\textsuperscript{83}Dawson 1992:115-16; Dyck 2002:164.
\textsuperscript{84}In this sense it would be misleading to label Philo as one of the first representatives of the Second Sophistic movement, though Winter 1997 would be right on this score if the reference was limited to Philo’s role as a public intellectual and orator. (Winter also sees Philo as our best source on the Sophistic movement in the first half of the 1st century.) The political agenda of the Second Sophistic is brought out in Swain 1996.
\textsuperscript{86}Musurillo 1961:IV, col. 3, lines 8-12; text also in Smallwood 1967: no. 436.
explanation for why Philo attacked Lampon and Isidorus, but not Apion and Chaeremon. Claudius took action against Lampon and Isidorus, possibly even in 41, and thus before he sent his famous letter to the Alexandrians, though their condemnation was not directly connected to their role in the riots of 38. In his letter of late 41 Claudius informed the Alexandrians that he would not set up an enquiry into who was responsible for starting the riots, but threatened that if there was any further trouble, the events of 38 would be treated as an aggravating circumstance. One might applaud Claudius for cooling emotions by not stirring up accusations and counter-accusations. But, to adapt Slavenka Drakulic’s point about the danger of simply ‘turning a new page of history’, if the truth was not established about the ‘troubles’ of 38, the next generation would have to rely on ‘dusty images and bloody stories’, and would be ‘left with only memory, not history.’ A letter from a Greek to a friend in August 41 warns him to watch out for the Jews as everyone else does, which Smallwood takes to mean that if the friend was thinking of visiting a Jewish money-lender he should remember that ‘it was still dangerous for gentiles to enter the Jewish residential areas’. Mutual fears no doubt still lingered and sure enough the two communities were at it again in 66 when some Jews tried to infiltrate a mass meeting of Greeks in the amphitheatre. The rumpus escalated into a mass invasion of the venue by Jews armed with stones and firebrands. A pogrom followed. Then there was even more trouble in the region-wide Jewish uprising that began in 115. This dreary cycle of inter-community conflict is depressing, but we do have from the following decade or more the evidence from Babatha’s archive, albeit from distant Mahoza, that Jews, Greeks, Arabs and Roman officials could get along. It often took little to start a riot, but it also did not take much for those willing to get along with their neighbours to make a plan. Certainly Alexandria did not need people beating the tribal drum.

87 Apion may have been a Hellenised Egyptian (Goudriaan 1992:87-88; Fitzpatrick-McKinley 2002:82-83), as Josephus Ap. 2.28-29 claimed.
88 His writings are collected by Van der Horst 1984.
91 Josephus BJ 2.487, and 490-93, with Smallwood 1981:364-68.
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