

Review: Jews and Antisemites in Ancient Alexandria

Reviewed Work(s):  
Archiv für Papyrusforschung  
by U. Wilcken

Review by: Ernst von Dobschütz

Source: *The American Journal of Theology*, Oct., 1904, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Oct., 1904), pp. 728-755

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3153776>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Theology*

JSTOR

## CRITICAL NOTE.

### JEWS AND ANTISEMITES IN ANCIENT ALEXANDRIA.<sup>1</sup>

FROM out the cemeteries and rubbish heaps of Egypt a new world has come into view—a long-concealed civilization. All branches of science are highly concerned in the preservation of these newly discovered treasures. Around these papyri there has grown up a special science, and a special journal is devoted to the daily increasing literature which concerns them.<sup>2</sup> In the domain of philology we need only mention the Mimiambics of Herondas, and the fragments of Hyperides and of Demosthenes. The jurist discovers numerous records of sales, manumissions, etc. The student of medicine finds remarkable prescriptions. More than all others, students of constitutional history and political science are profiting by these finds. Thanks to these numberless documents pertaining to taxes, we now know more concerning the system of taxation of the Ptolemies than we do about many systems of more recent times.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, theology also, besides finds belonging to the Byzantine age, has discovered rich treasures of an earlier epoch. It is well known that Professor Deissmann, of Heidelberg, has undertaken to found a new system of New Testament lexicography on these freshly discovered monuments of the popular language, of which the writings of the New Testament form the single literary deposit hitherto known. He has already shown in his *Bibelstudien* the outlines of this new system, and has illustrated it with copious examples.<sup>4</sup> I need only mention the discoveries for the text of the Bible, and more especially of the Apoc-

<sup>1</sup> This article was written in 1900, as an addition to SHAILER MATHEWS's excellent *History of New Testament Times in Palestine*, before the paper of AD. BAUER in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Vol. I (1901), pp. 29-47, and the new edition of SCHÜRER's standard work had appeared. In revising the author has been able to add some remarks on these recent utterances.

<sup>2</sup> *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, herausgegeben von U. WILCKEN (Leipzig: Teubner); Vol. I, 1901.

<sup>3</sup> U. WILCKEN, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien*, 1899; C. WACHSMUTH, *Wirtschaftliche Zustände in Aegypten während der griechisch-römischen Periode*; CONRAD's *Jahrbücher für Nationalöconomie*, Vol. LXXIV (1900), pp. 771-809.

<sup>4</sup> DEISSMANN, *Bibelstudien*, 1895; *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897; *Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel*, 1898; article "Hellenistisches Griechisch," in HAUCK's *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie*, 3d ed., Vol. VII, pp. 627-39.

rypha, such as the Fayum Fragment, the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter, and the Behnesa Logia.

In addition to these I desire to call attention to the fact that a few years ago two genuine copies of a famous *libellus*, the certificate of recantation of a Christian in time of persecution, unexpectedly came to light. One copy is preserved in a Berlin papyrus from Fayum and published by Krebs.<sup>5</sup> Another copy from the collection of the Archduke Rainer is published by Wessely.<sup>6</sup> Both are given by O. von Gebhardt in his *Acta Martyrum Selecta*, 1902, pp. 182, 183.

The first of these two documents, which is practically preserved entire, and which the second copy closely resembles in its essential points, may be translated as follows:

To those (persons) chosen (for the supervision) of the sacrifices in the village of Alexander's Island: from Aurelius Diogenes, the son of Satabus, of the village of Alexander's Island, seventy-two years old, with a scar on the right eyebrow. Just as I have always regularly sacrificed to the gods, so now in your presence in accordance with the (imperial) decree have I sacrificed and (drunk) and (tasted) of the offerings, and I beg you to attest the same.

May you ever prosper!

I, Aurelius Diogenes, have presented the (foregoing).

That Aurelius has performed sacrifice and . . . is attested.

In the first year of the emperor Cæsar Gaius Messius Quintus Traianus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, the second day of Ehiphi [June 26].

With a marvelous vividness the circumstances of the Decian persecution are here presented to our view. How colorless in comparison with this documentary testimony is the picture given us in the ancient literary sources, especially the *Church History* of Eusebius!<sup>7</sup> This same quality is met with in the documents which we shall treat in detail in this paper.

Among the most important finds of the last few years are different papyrus fragments which illuminate in a peculiar manner the history of the Alexandrine Jews, and establish beyond doubt the conclusion that in ancient Alexandria—at that day the center of Greek culture and civilization, and at the same time the seat of the strongest Jewish colony in the empire—the conflict which has lasted through centuries between the Jews

<sup>5</sup> "Ein libellus eines libellaticus v. Jahr 250 n. C., aus dem Fajjum," *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Academie*, November, 1893, pp. 1007-14.

<sup>6</sup> *Anzeiger der Wiener Akademie, philologisch-historische Classe*, 1894, No. 1, pp. 3-9.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, VI, 39 ff., and thereon A. HARNACK, *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1894, pp. 38 ff.; TH. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht*, 1899, p. 568, n. 5.

and Antisemitism broke out, not only once, but repeatedly, in a fashion threatening the peace of the empire.

Something was already known on this matter from two writings of the Alexandrian philosopher and theologian Philo, in which he narrates the outrages inflicted by the Alexandrian mob on the Jews under the rule of Governor Flaccus in 35 A. D., and also his journey with the deputation sent because of this affair to the court of Emperor Caius Caligula. I pass over the problems in literary history which these two works present. Evidently they are parts only of one or two larger works, the one comprising, according to Eusebius,<sup>8</sup> five books. Massebieau and Schürer<sup>9</sup> have endeavored, each in his own way, to reconstruct their contents. From them we might, perhaps, have learned interesting particulars concerning the period of Sejanus's ministry. Still, that which is lost can not be restored through hypotheses, but only, perchance, through fortunate discoveries. It is more important for us to bring before our minds the personality of Philo—this man, thoroughly versed in the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, who writes in good classic Greek, and who has won for himself an honorable place in the history both of Greek philosophy and Greek literature, and who yet, if in his culture a Greek, was in his heart a Jew through and through. From the study of the Holy Scriptures of his nation he deduced by means of an allegorical exegesis both the ideas of the Platonists and the ethics of the Stoa. Although he expounded nearly the entire law in a symbolical way, he would yet by no means acknowledge the conclusion drawn by many of his contemporaries, viz., that one might release himself from the fulfilling of the law in its literal sense, from circumcision, from observance of the sabbath and of feasts, from forbidden foods, etc. This enlightened Judaism, which ceased to be Judaism at all, meets us in characteristic form in Philo's own nephew, Tiberius Alexander, the son of Alexander, the opulent chief farmer-of-the-taxes, who went through the entire Roman *cursus honorum*, was even for a time procurator of Judea, and during the last great Jewish uprising was one of the most influential advisers at the imperial headquarters—against his own people. Absolutely different was Philo, who, however much he stood beyond the pale of his people by reason of his culture, placed both himself and that culture unservedly at the service of his nation, even in the hour of danger.

<sup>8</sup> *H. E.*, II, 5.

<sup>9</sup> L. MASSEBIEAU, "Le classement des œuvres de Philon," *Bibl. de l'école des hautes études*, 1889; E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, Vol. III, pp. 525–30; L. COHN, "Einleitung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos," *Philologus*, Suppl. VII (1899), pp. 421 ff.

It was the year 38. Tiberius was dead; Caius, surnamed Caligula, began to reign, and at once invested his old friend, the Jewish prince Agrippa, with royal dignity in his native country of Palestine. This prince, equally worthless and immoral, had recently been obliged to suffer close confinement under the suspicious Tiberius. Shortly before, he had been happy to hold the place of market superintendent in Tiberias from his brother-in-law Herod. Now on his journey home he appeared with incredible pomp. The equipments of his body-guard gleamed with gold and silver. On the way he touched at Alexandria. Here people still remembered well how, not so long since, he had infested the great banking houses, begging in poverty. The contrast incited the fun-loving Alexandrians to a malicious satire. They dragged a poor, crazy fellow, Karabas by name, a character known to the whole city, into the theater, clothed him with royal insignia, and mocked in him the Jewish king.<sup>10</sup>

On Agrippa himself no further attack was made. But the anti-Jewish passion of the mob, now become violent, was directed against the wealthy Jews of Alexandria. Caligula's "imperial madness" and self-deification were well known. Therefore some sly rogue hit on the idea of employing this against the Jews. Also it might be hoped that by this means the bad impression which the insult to his friend Agrippa might possibly have made on the emperor could be removed. A proposition was made that in all the synagogues statues of the emperor should be set up to receive divine honors.

Flaccus, the governor of the city, who, according to Philo's own testimony, for six years under Tiberius had performed the duties of his office with entire justice and with the greatest prudence, not sure, under the new régime, of the imperial favor, and consequently of his post, permitted anything. Naturally the Jews refused to allow the statues of the emperor to be placed in their synagogues relying on their privileges which assured them the protection of their own form of worship untainted by such images. This refusal led to the seizure of their synagogues. Even private dwellings were broken open, completely plundered, and the inmates horribly tortured. For the horrors which then followed—the scourging of the eldest of the community before the people in the theater, the burnings, stonings, etc.—we have, it is true, only the *ex parte* testimony of Philo, who may have indulged in rhetorical exaggeration. But there is no good

<sup>10</sup> The affair was a wanton jest conceived at the moment, and it had as little to do with the Roman license of the king of the Saturnalia as had the mocking of Jesus by the Roman soldiery. WENDLAND, "Jesus als Saturnalienkönig," *Hermes*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 175-79.

ground for denying that an outbreak of Antisemitic fanaticism in this populace, accustomed to horrors of every sort, might have produced such cruelties.<sup>11</sup>

How much farther matters went we do not know. It is at least certain that Flaccus in the autumn of 38 was suddenly imprisoned and sent into exile. Also we know that the Jews exerted themselves both to pay homage to the emperor in other ways and to establish their loyalty to him. Already at the time of his accession to the throne they had decreed all manner of honors for him, so far as was possible within the bonds of their religious principles. But the decree of homage kept back by Flaccus came to the emperor's knowledge only later through Agrippa. Thus even now both parties were endeavoring to come into direct communication with the emperor. Accordingly, in the winter (probably 38-39; according to Schürer, not until that of 40), two deputations went to Rome, one headed by the Greek *littérateur* Apion, the other by Philo himself. The result was, as Josephus also informs us,<sup>12</sup> in the highest degree unfavorable to the Jews. While Apion had bribed a slave of the emperor's, Helikon, this method of procedure, the only one practicable at the court of Caligula, was completely unsuccessful in the case of the Jews. Therefore they suffered endless delay. After a short audience in the Campus Martius they were obliged to follow the imperial court to Puteoli; only to wait there in vain. Finally the emperor deigned to grant them the requested audience after he had returned to Rome. He received them while inspecting his new buildings in the gardens of Mæcenas and Lamia, walked noisily back and forth, hurrying and giving orders. The Jews had to follow him about constantly—a feat which at their age was by no means easy—only from time to time they were honored with a scornful question amid the plaudits of their opponents: "Are you the mad fellows who won't believe in my divinity?" and more of the same sort. Finally he dismissed them as "more foolish than criminal," thus exposing them still more to the persecuting zeal of their adversaries.

Here Philo's account leaves us, and thus ends all further accurate information. It might well be that the missing portion of Philo's work, if ever discovered, would give new particulars concerning the period immediately following.

In the meantime, however, an entirely new perspective has suddenly opened before us. A series of discoveries of papyri establishes beyond a

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also PHILO, *Adv. Flacc.*; MOMMSEN, *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. V, pp. 515 ff.; SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 495 ff.; MATHEWS, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities*, XVIII (257 ff.); SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 500 ff.

doubt that the events narrated by Philo are not a unique occurrence peculiar to the reign of a Caligula. The bitter hate of Greeks and Jews in Alexandria appears as a chronic evil, which, ever breaking forth afresh, produced entirely similar scenes, not alone under Caligula's successor Claudius (41-54), but even under Trajan (98-117) and Commodus (180-92).

We are concerned with the three following documents, preserved, unfortunately, in a very fragmentary condition.

I.

The first consists of two fragments, both from the same roll. The one, with two columns, is in Berlin,<sup>13</sup> and has been edited and annotated by U. Wilcken.<sup>14</sup> The other, now in the Museum at Gizeh, was found by Pierre Jouguet and was published by Th. Reinach.<sup>15</sup> It describes a scene at the court of Claudius. In Wilcken's judgment, the writing belongs to the end of the second century, both on account of its paleographical character and since it is found on the reverse of a papyrus of the second century.<sup>16</sup>

I differ somewhat from Wilcken's filling out of the Berlin columns, since these were considered by him to be wider than is actually shown to be the case by the Gizeh fragments which are preserved in their entire width (twenty-eight to thirty-three letters).

I, 1. B. G. U. (II), 511. U. Wilcken. 19 + 14.5. Ca. 200 A. D.

	. . . ]ωρον <u>Ταρκύνιος</u>	13
	. . . ]αρι ἀναστὰς	10
	. . . ]ατον ὄλην τὴν	11
	. . . ]ον ποιήσεις	10
5	. . . ὕ]πὲρ πατρίδος	11
	. . . ]μεν ὑπερ	7

1. Perhaps *νύξ* τὸ W. (486).

<sup>13</sup> *Berliner griechische Urkunden* = B. G. U., 511.

<sup>14</sup> "Alexandrinische Gesandtschaften vor Kaiser Claudius," *Hermes*, Vol. XXX (1895), pp. 485-98.

<sup>15</sup> "L'empereur Claude et les antisémites Alexandrins," *Revue des études juives*, Vol XXXI (1895), pp. 161-78.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. further U. WILCKEN, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, Vol. XVI (1896), pp. 1617-21; Vol. XVII (1897), p. 411; TH. REINACH, *Revue*, Vol. XXXII (1896), p. 160; Vol. XXXIV (1897), pp. 296-98; E. SCHÜRER, *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1896, 21, pp. 289 ff.; *Geschichte*<sup>3</sup>, Vol. I, pp. 67 ff.

	. . . ]νίζετο δίκαιον ἦν	15
	. . . ]δὲ Ἀουῖολαος (sic) συνκλη-	16
	. . . ]ιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ	14
10	. . . ]πετα . Διὸ ἐρωτῶ	12
	. . . ]. τω τοῦτο τὸ ἄπαξ	13
	. . . ]. τοῦ τηλικούτου	13
	. . . π]ολὺ προσηκούσης	14
	. . . ]ς εἰ μὴ οὗτοι παρε-	14
15	. . . ἐ]ν συμβουλείῳ	11
	. . . ]ἐκάθισεν. Ἐκλήθησαν	17
	[οἱ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων (?) πρέσ]βεις καὶ μετετάξατο	(20 +) 17
	. . . εἰς αἴ]ριον ἀκούσαι αὐτῶν.	15
	[Ἔτους ιβ' (?) Κλαυδίου Καίσα]ρος Σεβαστοῦ	(20 +) 11
20	[ Ἀντοκράτορος (?) Παχῶν ε̄ .	(12 +) 6

17. . . . . οἱ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων (?) πρέσ], Wilcken: These twenty letters are surely too many.

18. Perhaps ὁ Καῖσαρ εἰς τὸ αὐ] 14 + 15 = 29 letters.

19. Ἔτους τρισκαιδεκάτου (?) Κλαυδίου Καίσα], Wilcken (thirty-one letters). Supported principally by the fact that only this combination fills out the line. The number to be restored must remain uncertain, yet ε̄ (the tenth year = 50), is the earliest, and ιδ' (the fourteenth year = 54) the latest possible limit.

20. Γερμανικοῦ (?) Ἀντοκράτορος (?), Wilcken.

I, 2.

	Ἡμέρα [δε]υτ[έ]ρα Παχῶ[ν] ε̄	May 1 (53?)
	Ἀκούει Κλαύδιος Καῖσα[ρ Σεβαστὸς Ἰσιδώρου (?)	19 + 17 (27)
	γυμνασιάρχου πόλεως Ἀ[λεξανδρέων]	19 + 10
	κατὰ Ἀγρίππου βασιλέω[ς ἐν τοῖς Λουκουλ]-	19 + 13
5	λιανοῖς κήποις συνκα[λέσας συμβούλειον (?)	18 + 16
	συνκλητικ[ῶ]ν εἰκο[σ]ι π[έντε] . . . .	18 +
	ὑπατικῶν δέκα ἕξ, πα[ρούσης Ἀγριππίνης μετὰ]	16 + 20 (28)
	τῶν ματρωνῶν . Εἰς . [ . . .	14
	Ἰσ[τ]ιδώρου, Ἰσίδωρ[ο]ς ἐν . . . [ . . .	18 (21)
10	κύριέ μου Καῖσαρ, τῶν . . . [ . . .	17 (20)
	ἀκούσαί μου τὰ πονοῦν[τα] . . .	18
	ὁ, αὐτοκράτωρ, μερίζω σο[φ] . . .	19

2. [ρ Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς Ἰσιδώρου, Wilcken (twenty-seven letters).

3. [λεξανδρέων λόγους ποιούμενου, Wilcken (twenty-six letters).

4. [ς τῆς Χαλκίδος (?) ἐν τοῖς Λουκουλ, Wilcken (twenty-five letters). The filling out Λουκουλ seems certain. But the first portion which gives to the βασιλέως a more definite location is without any foundation.

5. After συμβούλειον (βουλήν would be too short a form) there is no need for further additions.

7. [ρούσης Ἀγριππίνης Σεβαστῆς μετὰ, Wilcken (twenty-eight letters). Possibly we should write it πα]ρουσῶν Σεβαστῆς καὶ (seventeen letters), since the completion above (twenty letters) is somewhat wide.



	ἡμέραν συνεπένευ[σας . . .	15
	καθήμενοι [π]άντες σ[ . . .	16
15	εἰδότες, ὁποῖό[ς ἐστ]ιν ὁ [Ἄγραππας(?)] . . .	19 +
	Κλαύδιος Καί[σαρ] . . . .	11
	κατὰ τοῦ ἐμοῦ [φίλου(?)] . . .	11
	μου δύο φίλ[ους(?)] . . .	9
	Θέωνα ἐξηγη[τὴν] . . .	10

I, 3. Gizeh, XXXI, 132.

	..... ε πρόσβεια [.....] ἡ πατρίς.	
	Δά[μ]πων τῷ Ἰσιδώρω· ἐγὼ μὲν ξ[ί]φειδον	28
	ἤδη] τὸν θάνατ[ον] . . . . . Κλαύ[δ]ιος Καίσαρ·	33
	πολ]λούς μου φίλους ἀπέκτ[ει]νας, Ἰσιδώρε	33
5	Ἰσι]δώρος· βασιλέως ἤκουσα τοῦ τότε	29
	προσ]τάξαντος· καὶ σόι, λέγε, τίνος θέλεις,	33
	κα]τηγορήσω. Κλαύδιος Καίσαρ· ἀσφαλῶς	31
	ἀνευ] μουσικῆς εἶ, Ἰσιδώρε. Ἰσιδώρος·	29
	ἐγ]ὼ μὲν οὐκ εἰμι δούλος οὐδὲ μουσικῆς	31
10	κεν]ός, ἀλλὰ διασήμου πόλεως [Ἄ]λεξαν-	29
	δρ]εῖ[as] γυμνασάρχος· συ δε εἶ. δωμα . .	(31)
	. . ιος . νδα . . . . . βλητος· διὸ καὶ ἀπο	
	. . ειας ετ . . . τη . . . ως. Ἐφ[η] Δά[μ]πων	
	τ]ῷ Ἰσιδώρω· τοίγαρ ἄλλο ἔχομεν εἰ παρα-	33
15	φρ]ονοῦντι βασιλεῖ τόπον δεδέναι;	29
	Κ]λαύδιος Καίσαρ· οἷς προεκέλευσα	28
	τ]ὸν θάνατον τοῦ Ἰσιδώρου καὶ Λάμπων- [os	30

11, 12 *συδεεξ. λωμν [..] ησιουδα [.....] βλητος, Jouguet, in Wilcken, B. ph. W., 17, 411; = οὐ δὲ ἐκ Σαλώμης τῆς Ἰουδαίας W.*

12. . . ης Ἰουδα[ι]. Jouguet, in Wilcken, B. ph. W., 16, 1619, 2.

14. I. τί γὰρ . . . ἦ, Reinach. Schürer.

15. *dedenai = διδόναι, Reinach = δεδωκέναι, Schürer, Wilcken, B. ph. W., 16, 1619, 2.*

16. *Instead of οἷς προεκ: Ἰσιδώρε ἐκέλευσα, Wilcken, B. ph. W., 16, 1629 (withdrawn, *ibid.*, 17, 411).*

Of the beginning too little has been preserved to permit a translation to be given. At the end of the first column the document reads:

The deputies of the Alexandrians were called,  
and (the emperor) promised to hear them tomorrow  
(In the twelfth year) of Cæsar (Claudius)  
Augustus (the emperor), on the 5th Pachon. [April 30.]

Thus close the minutes of the first day. Manifestly there had preceded a discussion in the Senate or in the imperial council, in which two

senators at least had spoken, Tarquinius and Aviolaus; names which astonish us in those times, and which appear learned reminiscences of old Etruscan history—Claudius wrote, as is well known, an Etruscan history in twenty books—but which nevertheless must be ascribed to contemporary senators. What these gentlemen had said can no longer be established with any accuracy; nor is it certain whether the discussion was only concerning the admission of the Alexandrian embassy, or whether possibly some other embassy, perhaps that of the Alexandrian Jews, had previously had an audience.

The minute continues in the second column:

Second day, 6th Pachon [May 1].

The emperor Claudius (Augustus) hears (Isidor) the gymnasiarch of the city of Alexandria who brings a complaint (?) against King Agrippa, in the gardens of Lucullus after a (council of state ?) had been called together, consisting of twenty-five senators (among them) sixteen of consular rank, in the presence of (Agrippina ? with) the matrons.

It does not appear doubtful to me that here before this brilliant assembly in the gardens of Lucullus the deputation of the Alexandrians, at whose head stood the gymnasiarch Isidor, had the audience which was granted to them the day before.<sup>17</sup>

What follows is again uncertain. Isidor advanced and evidently requested a hearing for his bill of complaint against Agrippa. The emperor, however, replied that he was now speaking against his (the emperor's) friend, just as he had already murdered two of his friends, one of them the exegete Theon—probably a high Egyptian official.

In the further proceedings preserved in the Gizeh fragment there appears along with Isidor an associate of the same sort, Lampon, encouraging him through reference to the fact that he (Lampon) had already looked death close in the face. In answer to the emperor's repeated reproach that he had already killed many of his friends,<sup>18</sup> Isidor vindicates himself with the declaration that in so doing he had only executed the orders of the then reigning emperor, and proffers the present emperor the same service; truly a very awkward expression of unconditional loyalty, which the emperor

<sup>17</sup> Schürer's doubt as to whether one condemned to death could serve as a member of a deputation arises from the mistaken supposition that the condemnation mentioned at the end of the Gizeh fragment occurred at an earlier date. It may well have resulted as a consequence of the commission of *lèse majesté* in the course of this very audience.

<sup>18</sup> AD. BAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 33, referring to LeBlant understands *Amici Caesaris* as only loyal subjects. But the application to Agrippa and the exegete Theon which immediately precedes points in the opposite direction. In John 19:12 it is not an ordinary subject but the procurator that is so described.

repels with the rebuke: "Verily, thou art an uncultivated fellow, Isidor." He, however, takes this very ill: "I am neither a slave nor without culture, but the gymnasiarch of the celebrated city of Alexandria.<sup>19</sup> Thou, however. . . ." (the following revilings are unfortunately no longer legible). Wilcken believes that there was here an offensive allusion to Claudius's relations with a Jewess Salome. In spite of Bauer's agreement, I consider this very doubtful.

At this point his companion Lampon puts in, as it were, a conciliatory word: "What else have we (done) than given place to (obeyed) a crazy emperor?"—a reference, as it appears, to the murderous service rendered to the predecessor of Claudius (Wilcken, Schürer); since the other meaning of the word as a rebuke—"What else have we (to do now) but to give place to a crazy emperor" (Reinach, Bauer), surely exhibits such an excess of freedom, when directed to the emperor in his very presence, that it can scarcely be credited, even from a Lampon. On the other hand, it is to be noted that the characterization of Gaius Caligula as a "crazy emperor" in the presence of his successor is not an unheard of thing; it is used in almost these terms in Claudius's decree, preserved by Josephus, in favor of the Alexandrian Jews, as follows: "on account of his great insanity and madness, he oppressed those who would not abandon their ancestral religion and address him as God."<sup>20</sup>

If we accept the genuineness of these words, which, however, is not to be done without some doubt, we may suppose that Lampon in the above-mentioned sentence desired to refer directly to that imperial edict. Nevertheless this expression in the mouth of the Alexandrian was an impertinence; and, in fact, punishment followed instantly. The document continues: "to whom I have already given orders for the execution of Isidor and Lampon . . ." Here the fragment breaks off, but it is plainly to be completed, "these shall carry out my orders." Later we find the execution of both mentioned as an accomplished fact.

This whole matter, scarcely intelligible in itself, first appears in its true light when we consider it in connection with the report of Philo, on the one hand, and the fragments to follow, on the other. So it becomes

<sup>19</sup> Compare with the *διασήμου πόλεως Ἀλεξανδρίας*, Acts 21:39, *Τάρσεως τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης*.

<sup>20</sup> JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities*, XIX, 5, 2 (278–85), 284, *τοῦ διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀπόνοιαν καὶ παραφροσύνην ὅτι μὴ παραβῆναι ἠθέλησε τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος τὴν πάτριον θρησκείαν καὶ θεὸν προσαγορεύειν αὐτὸν ταπεινώσαντος αὐτοῦς*. The words *διὰ τὴν Γαίου παραφροσύνην* are repeated in 285. The two epistles, while they are under strong suspicion of being fabrications, may be genuine. Cf. RANKE, *W. G.*, Vol. III, p. 97; MOMMSEN, *R. G.*, Vol. V, p. 523.

manifest that the matter in question is a quarrel between the Antisemites and Jews of Alexandria. The latter are indeed not mentioned in these fragments. But of that more hereafter.

## II.

The second document exists fortunately in two different texts.

a) The first is preserved in a papyrus written on both sides of the sheet, all in one piece, with three columns on each side. It is found among the treasures of the Louvre (Pap., 2376 bis, ol. 68); while an additional fragment with only one column is in the British Museum (*Fayum Papyri*, I). These three tattered remnants, concerning which Letronne had remarked, "rien à en tirer," were published by Brunet de Presle,<sup>21</sup> and later, with very much better text, by U. Wilcken.<sup>22</sup>

The London fragment, published meanwhile by F. G. Kenyon,<sup>23</sup> U. Wilcken has connected with the others.<sup>24</sup>

In addition there is also—

b) A Berlin fragment, published by Krebs<sup>25</sup> and reviewed by U. Wilcken.<sup>26</sup> This latter (b), corresponding to about an eighth part of the former (a), is of essential service in the filling out of (a), just as (a) in turn first becomes entirely legible through (b). This mutual completion is shown below by the use of different styles of type. Its usefulness extends also beyond the part common to both documents; for through (b) the original width of the columns of (a) is established. This is not so large as Wilcken at first supposed.

The relation of these two texts is not, however, that of two copies of the same text. Rather are they two different recensions. Now one, now the other, shows important additions. Therefore they may be considered either as two different accounts of the same transaction, or as two independent extracts from the same minute.

<sup>21</sup> *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale*, Vol. XVIII, 2 (1865), pp. 383 ff. (tab. XLVI).

<sup>22</sup> "Ein Aktenstück zum jüdischen Kriege Trajans," *Hermes*, Vol. XXVII (1892), pp. 464–80; and TH. REINACH, "Juifs et Grecs devant un empereur romain," *Revue des études juives*, Vol. XXVII (1893), pp. 70–82; cf. also F. KREBS in the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1895, No. 48, pp. 1524–26.

<sup>23</sup> *Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, 1893, p. 229.

<sup>24</sup> *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1894, p. 749.      <sup>25</sup> *B. C. U.*, p. 341.

<sup>26</sup> *Hermes*, Vol. XXX (1895), pp. 482–85. Cf. DEISSMANN, *Bibelstudien*, 1895, 62 ff.; VOGELSTEIN UND RIEGER, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, Vol. I (1896), pp. 17 ff.; SCHÜRER, *op. cit.* 3, Vol. I, pp. 65 f.

II, a.

I, *recto* (Par. E).

[Πα]ύλος πε[ρι τ]οῦ βασιλέως ἐν[...]  
 [...] οὗ ὡς προήγαγον καὶ εἶπ[...]  
 [...] ο ἀνηγ[όρε]υσσε, καὶ Θέω[ν]  
 [π]ερὶ τούτ[ου] διάταγμα ἀνέγνω [του?]  
 5 [Α]ούπου ὡς προάγειν αὐ[τ]οὺς  
 [ἐ]κέλευε χλευάζων τὸν [ἀ]πὸ  
 [σ]κηνῆς καὶ ἐκ μείμου βασιλέα.  
 [Ο]ὕτως ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ  
 [ἐ]σχενδιάσειεν εἰπὼν πρὸς  
 10 [Π]αῦλον καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρου[ς]  
 [π]άντα[ς], Ἐν ταῖς τ[οι]αύταις π[α]  
 [ρα]τάξεσ[ι] τείνε[τ]αι ἐμοῦ ἢ  
 ἐν τῷ Δακικῶι πολέμ[ω]ι  
 [...] θυλιε[τ]ων π[...]  
 15 [...] ὡν ἐκεῖ ατον [...] .  
 [...] ἄνδρας ἕ τὸν [...] .  
 [...] πόλεσι μόνου[...] .  
 [...] ας τι ἔχειν [...] .  
 [...] σα αυ[...] .  
 20 [...] και κα[...] .  
 [...] [...] .  
 [...] πος [...] .  
 [...] ν[...] .  
 [...] .  
 25 [...] .  
 [...] .  
 [...] .  
 [...] .  
 30 [...] .  
 [...] .

2. ετος? R.  
 3. [ορευ] R.  
 10. ἡμετέρου[ς] | τα]ῦτα ἐν R.  
 12. γείνε[τ]αι ἐμοῦ . η R.  
 13. .εν R.  
 14. ευ]θυλειτωτων π . . R. Perhaps λεγκιώνων.  
 15. . . ατος [τ]ων ἐκεῖ? α(ὐ)τὸν R.  
 16. . . ῶν R.

II, *recto* (Par. A).

[...] Καῖσαρ Ἰουδαίους· Ἐμαθον·  
 [Ἰουδαῖοι . . .] ουτω θον . . αρχηι τῆς  
 [...] καὶ τοῦ πολέμου ἤρξηται  
 [...] ὀλίγα καὶ πε[ρ]ὶ τοῦ Ἀνθίμου  
 5 [...] δειχθῆι τῷ κυρίω ἐφ' οὗ  
 [ὅδε ὁ πόλεμ]ος ἐκινήθηι, ὅτι καὶ με-  
 [τ' αὐτοῦ? τῆν] ἀποδημίαν ταῦτα ἐγένετο  
 [. . . εἰς τὰς] κωστωδίας ἤρπασαν καὶ  
 [ἀρπασθέν?]τας ἔτρανμάτισαν·  
 10 [Καῖσαρ· Περ]ι τῶν πάντων συνέγγων  
 [τοῖς Ἀλεξ]ανδρέυσι. Ἀλ[λ]ὰ τοῖς ποιη-  
 [σασι ταῦτα δ]ε εἰ ἐ[π]έρχεσ[θ]αι·  
 [Ἰουδαῖοι . . .] ἀνος θεων ἐμ  
 [...] αὐτο] κράτ[ω]ρ, χάρις σου  
 15 [...] ρον[.]α περὶ τοὺς  
 [...] μάλ[λ]ον αὐτῶν  
 [...] σ κε[.]ς πιστευ-  
 [...] ἡμει[ν] περὶ ὧν ἐ  
 [...] ειν .[.] θόνων  
 20 [...] αθοι ὀλι-  
 [γ . . . . .] δ] ψέ.  
 [Καῖσαρ . . . . .] Ἀλεξ]ανδρεῖς  
 [...] τοῖς  
 [...] παρα] κριθεν  
 25 [τες ἦσαν ἐξήκοντα] Ἀλεξ]ανδρεῖς  
 [τε καὶ τούτων] δοῦλοι, καὶ οἱ μὲν  
 [Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ἐξεβληθησα]ν, οἱ  
 [δὲ δοῦλοι αὐτῶν ἐκεφαλίσθησαν] . . . . .  
 [...] .  
 30 [...] .  
 [...] .

2. . . . ου τω θον ἢ ἀρχή(ι) τῆς. R.  
 3. σταςως? R.  
 5. ἀπε-] δειχθη(ι) R. 10. Περὶ μὲν] ὡν R.  
 6. <ὅδε R. 11. οὐκ Ἀλ. W.  
 7. <τῆν R. 12. ἐπεξέρχεσθαι W.  
 8. ὡς ἐκ τῆς R. 12. <ταῦτα R.  
 8. ἐκ τῆς W. 22. Ἐλληνες? W.  
 9. στρεβλωθέντας? W. 27. οὐ W. (Possibly) οἱ.

## II, a.—Continued.

	III, <i>recto</i> (Par. B).	
	ἡ τὸ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις [δεδομέ- ]	
	νον δάκρ[υ]προπεμψ[άντων . . . ]	
	ὥστε εἴ τινες ἐδ[ει ἐκβλη-	
	θῆναι ἀπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρ[ειας τούσ ]	
5	οὐδὲ ἦπτον καὶ οὐ[χ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ]	
	ἀρπασθέντας ὡς [φασιν, ἀλλ? ]	
	ὑπὸ τούτων ἡρπάσ<θ>ησ[αν . . . . . ]	
	εἰς ἡμετέραν συκο[φαντίαν . . . ]	
	ἄσοι μὲν τελέως δια[σωθησθ-	
10	μενοι πρὸ[s] τούς κυρί[ους κατέ-	
	φ[υγο]ν αὐτοὶ εἰς αὐ[. . . . . ]	
	παρεστάθησαν; Κα[ῖσαρ· 'Παρεστάθη? ]	
	σαν.'	
	[Ἰο]υδαίῳ· 'Κύριε ψεύδον[ται οἱ ταῦτα λέ]-	
15	[γιν]τες οὐδ' ὅσοι ἦσαν ἀν[θρώποι ἴσασιν.] ]	
	[Κα]ῖσαρ Ἰουδαίῳ· 'Φανε[. . . . . ]	
	άτους οὐ δύνασθε δέ[. . . . . ] δ]-	
	μ' εἰσιν Ἀλεξανδρεῖς [. . . . . ]	
	νες Ἀλεξανδρεῖς εὐχ[. . . . . ]	
20	πεποιηκέναι ἢ ἄλλον [. . . . . ]	
	ὁ ἔπαρχός μου ἐν ᾧ [ἔγραψεν δια-	
	τάγματι δηλοῖ δυνα[. . . . . ]	
	μῶν εἶναι. Καὶ γὰρ το[ύς πρὸς . . . ]	
	ἀμαρτάνοντας δ[ο]ύ[λους γενέσθαι ]	
25	εἰκός. Πάντας γὰρ κα[κούργους? καὶ οἱ ]	
	Ἕλληνες καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς [ὑμᾶς? νομίζομεν?]	
	[τ]οὺς ἀχρείους δούλου[s . . . . . ]	
	καὶ π[ε]ρὶ τῶν κα[. . . . . ]	
	[τα]ῦτα καὶ πόσοι ε . η[. . . . . ]	
30	[. . .]ς πεποιηκότες ἐκολ[άσθησαν . . . . . ]	
	[δι]ότι [ἐ]κολάσθη σαν[. . . . . ]	
	1. εἰ τὸ W. 484.	
	7. ἡρπάγησαν W.	
	12. Παρεστάθησαν κα[ὶ ἐκολάσθη] W. παρεστάλησαν R.	
	15. ἀν[δρες] R.	
	16. φανε[ρὸν ὅτι τοὺς αἰτιω]τάτους οὐ δύνασθε δε[ῖκνυ-	
	σθαι . . .] Bauer.	
	22. δύνα[σθαι] R.	
	23. μῶι R.	

	IV, <i>recto</i> (Lond.)
	] Καῖσαρ· 'καὶ οδ[
	]ων Θέων ἀνέγν[ω]
	] μὸν Δούπου . [.]
	] τα ὄπλα καὶ ἀνα[.]
5	] . ποίας ἔσχεν αφ.
	] απα[ιτ]εῖ[ν] ὑμᾶς
	] ερχαν θε[λει]ετ . .
	] νομένους στρατι-
	] οριανους καὶ η[. . .
10	ἐρ]ωτήσω σιτες
	] περὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ σκηνῆς
	] . ἀκριβὲς τε
	] καὶ Κλαυδιανῶ
	] ντω

illegible up to l. 31.

7. εν λετε Kenyon. Wilcken, G. G. A.,  
1894, 749.

II, a—Continued.

<p>V, verso (Lond.)</p> <p>] ν . . . . .</p> <p>] . εις . . . .</p> <p>] . ε θησον</p> <p>] γτο δυσι</p> <p>5 ]ς . . . . ωι</p> <p>] ὑποφε-</p> <p>] ν και χειρο-</p> <p>ἡ] μέρας θ</p> <p>πε] μφθε [. . . ὑπὸ</p> <p>10 ἐ] ναντίας νε</p> <p>] ου Καί[σ]αρος</p> <p>ἀν]θρώποις</p> <p>] αλλα . . . ι και</p> <p>] φέρονται</p> <p>15 ] αις καθ' ἡμῶν</p> <p>] να κατε [. . .]</p> <p>] . ω [. . . . .]</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>20 . . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>25 . . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p> <p>30 . . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p>	<p>VI, verso (Par. C.)</p> <p>[Π]αῦλο[ς . ] ' Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρεία τάφος μοι</p> <p>μό[νος] πεφροντίσθαι ὃν νο-</p> <p>μί[ζω]ι καταλαβεῖν. Ἐπὶ τοῦτον</p> <p>δὲ πορευόμενος οὐ δειλιά-</p> <p>5 σω σοι τὴν ἀλήθειαν εἰπεῖν.</p> <p>Οὕτως ἀκουσόν μου, Καῖσαρ, ὡς</p> <p>μεθ' ἡμέραν μηκέτι ὄντος'.</p> <p>[Ἄ]ντωνεῖνος· 'Κυρίε μου Καῖσαρ,</p> <p>μὰ τὴν σὴν τύχην ἀληθῶς</p> <p>10 λέ[γ]ει, ὡς μεθ' ἡμέραν μίαν</p> <p>μηκέτι ὦν . εἰ γὰρ τοσοῦτων</p> <p>ἐπι[σ]τωλῶν ἡμᾶς ὡς</p> <p>ἐπι[γ]όντων ἡμᾶς ὡς διέτα-</p> <p>ξαν ὀσίους Ἰουδα[ί]ους προσ-</p> <p>15 κατοικεῖν ο . ου πα[ρα]βόλως</p> <p>ἔσχον ἀναπ[ε]πτειν καὶ πο-</p> <p>λεμεῖν τὴν εὐπ[ε]ρίωνυμο</p> <p>ν ἡμῶν πόλιν περὶ τούτων</p> <p>σου δέδιαν, ἐπιστολὴν ἐ-</p> <p>20 δέξωι εἰς τὰς εὐερ[γ]εσίους</p> <p>σου χεῖρας, ἐξ ὧν φανερόν</p> <p>ἔστιν περὶ τῶν ἀ[ληθ]εστάτων</p> <p>σου λόγων. Δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι</p> <p>καὶ τοῦτο πεποιήκε κατὰ σοῦ</p> <p>25 μηδεμίαν ἀπόδειξιν ἔ-</p> <p>χων τῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς γε-</p> <p>γεννημένων γ[ . . . . . ] . ων.'</p> <p>[Κ]αῖσαρ· 'Παῦλος [. . . . .]</p> <p>θωι Ἄντων[ειν . . . . .] εἰς</p> <p>30 . . . . .</p> <p>. . . . .</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

12. ἐπι[σ]τολῶν R.  
 13; ἐπ(ε)ιγόντων R.  
 14. ξαν < τοὺς ἀν > οσίους R.  
 15. οἱ οὐ R.  
 19. οὐδεμ[ί]αν ἐπισ[τ]ολὴν R.  
 21. φ[α]νερόν R.  
 22. ἀ[ρ]εστάτων R.  
 24. πεποιήτ[α]ι κατὰ τ( ? ) οῦ R.  
 27. γ[ραμμά]των R.  
 28. [μὲν ? ἀφ]εἰς | θω(ι) Ἄντων[εἰνος δὲ.

## II, a—Continued.

VII, verso (Par. D + F).		VIII, verso (Par. E).	
		ταῦτα τ[	
		πιγνοῦς [	
		γ[εγ]εννη [	
		Ἄντων[	
5	τοὺς δ. [.....] νον κο-	5	ἀναιρεθ[
	λάζιν κα[ι ἀγειν?] ὑπὸ ξύλον		μέλλωι [
	καὶ ὑπὸ κα[.....] ὄντα κάβα-		μέβλε[
	σον εἰς . ν[.....] Ἰουδαίων		σως. Ἐ[
10	τοῦτον φ[.....] αλλοντριου	10	τοῖς ορ[
	προς αν[.....] πρεσβέα γε		διαταξ[
	γεγεννημ[ένον . . . .] φανερός ἐστιν		ται εν[
	α[.] τατ[.....] . . . [.] ἀρξας κα		κλη δυ[
	θ . . . . .] σμα κατὰ		.....
	Ἰο[υδαίων . . . . .] των		.....
15	α[.....] εν στοι	15	.....
	λ . [.....] μφα .		.....
	τ[.....] ασης		.....
	κ[.....]		.....
	.....		.....
20	.....	20	.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
25	.....	25	.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....
30	.....	30	.....
	.....		.....
	.....		.....



II, b B. G. U. (I), 341.

[... πα]ύσασθαι σιω[π]ησαν[τ.....]  
 [.....]των ἐνίστασο μ[.....] ἐκ  
 [τῆς κωστῶ]δίας ἤρπασαν καὶ σ[τρεβλωθέντας? ἐτραυμάτισαν. Καὶ]-  
 [σαρ· 'συν?]έγγων οὐκ ἄλεξ[ανδρεῦσι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ποιήσασι?.....]  
 5 [...]πολ[λ]άκις ἐπέξέρχεσθ[αι.....]  
 Αὐτο]κράτω[ρ]. Ἄλεξανδρεῖς οὐκ...[.....]  
 ]σον...[.]κριθεντες ἦσαν ἐξ[ήκοντα Ἄλεξανδρεῖς τε καὶ τούτων ]  
 δο]ῦλοι καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἄλεξανδρεῖς [ἐξεβλήθησαν? οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι αὐτῶν ]  
 ἐκ]εφαλίσθησαν (sic) μηδενὸς τῶν...[.....]  
 10 ]αντων αὐτῶν εἰ τὸ πᾶσιν [ἀνθρώποις δεδομένον? δάκρυ προ- ]  
 πεμ]ψαντων ὥστε, εἴ τινὰς εἶδει [ἐκβληθῆναι ἀπὸ Ἄλεξανδρείας οὐ ]  
 δε]ν δὲ ἦττον ὥς φασιν τοὺς ἀρπασ[θέντας καὶ οὐχ ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ']  
 ὑπὸ] τούτων ἠρπατήσαν εἰς ἡμέρα[ν <sup>τε sic</sup> συκοφαντίαν. "Ὅσοι μὲν τε- ]  
 λεω]ς δ[ι]ασωθῆσόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἰδι[ο]υς κατέφυγον, αἱτοὶ εἰς αὐ ]  
 15 ]π[...π]αρστάθησαν καὶ ἐκολάσθησα[ν ]  
 ]ε[...ο]ὶ περὶ π[.....]ος[.....]..[

4, 5. [ἀλλὰ τοῖς ποιήσασι ταῦτα νῦν καὶ] πολλακίς ἐπέξέρχεσθ[αι] δεῖ... Bauer.  
 6. αὐτοκράτωρ, W. (vocative), cf. P. II. 14.  
 7. [...]ο παρ[α]κριθε W. 484, 2. with ἐξήκοντα, cf. P. I, 16.

This document takes us to an entirely different period. Very unfortunately, the ruling emperor is not mentioned, but with the greatest probability Wilcken considers him to be Trajan (cf. Schürer, Bauer); while, with less likelihood, Reinach supposed him first to be one of the Antonines, most probably Marcus Aurelius; later on Reinach changed his opinion and suggested Hadrian. Before him, it seems, are arrayed two deputations, one Jewish and the other Alexandrian, to which belong a certain Paulus and Antoninus, perhaps also one Theon, who, as it happens, produces and reads an edict of the Roman governor Lupus against the Jews, and also a similar one of a certain Claudianus. The matter under discussion is clearly a revolt of the Jews, which Wilcken has, with the highest penetration, connected with that well-known rebellion which, originating in Cyrene, later spread over all Egypt under Trajan in the year 115. In this rebellion a certain Andreas, surnamed Lukuas, made his appearance as king of the Jews, and at the head of the insurrectionary hordes is reported to have slaughtered several hundred thousand Egyptians. The Alexandrians took revenge for this by a fearful massacre of the Jews living in their city.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Cf. EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, IV, 2; SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 662 ff.

To this occasion we should refer both the mentioned edict of Lupus, who gave in derision the command to bring before him τὸν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς καὶ ἐκ μείμων βασιλέα—i. e., the king of the stage and actors—and also the complaint of the Jews that the prisons had been broken into and they themselves dragged forth and maltreated. To a chiding remark of the emperor to the effect that such a thing took place while he was engaged in the Dacian war, the Jews affirmed that the whole thing came from sixty men, and that after the departure of the lord (reference is made either to the emperor's predecessor,<sup>28</sup> or perhaps to the governor<sup>29</sup>) the matter had come to an outbreak. The emperor announces that he had pardoned the Alexandrians, but judgment must be entered against the ring-leaders. Hereupon the deputation of the Alexandrians (?) explained that sixty men had already been exiled and their slaves beheaded on account of this affair; much more reason was there for proceeding against the Jews, since they had contrived the whole affair themselves, to calumniate the Alexandrians. As the Jews are branding this statement as a lie, the emperor puts in a word for the Alexandrians, who had simply obeyed the order of his governor, as Theon had read it; the Jews were known to be ἀχρεῖοι δούλοι, "unprofitable servants" (cf. Matt. 25:30); moreover, it was admitted that those who had allowed themselves to commit violence in excess of the governor's orders had already suffered punishment. It is strong language that the emperor employs against the Jews, but that is easily intelligible if the trial took place after the emperor's military operations in the East, when a formidable rising of the Jews required to be rigorously stamped out. We should rather be surprised at the emperor's impartiality and justice; he dismissed the complaint of the Jews, but he did not entirely accede to the wishes of the opposing delegation who aimed at the rehabilitation of the exiles and at a complete defeat of the Jews. On this point their spokesman made a further and clearer statement. Paulus affirmed that he had now but one care remaining—to be buried in Alexandria (did he expect execution,<sup>30</sup> or was he already so old and weak that he was expecting his end?); so he would not fear to tell the emperor the truth. The emperor ought to listen to him as to one who would

<sup>28</sup> Reinach, who maintains this as an argument against Wilcken's date in the reign of Trajan.

<sup>29</sup> KREBS, in the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1894, p. 1525; SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, 3, Vol. I, p. 66.

<sup>30</sup> This is the common idea; cf. SCHÜRER. Bauer supposes, on insufficient grounds, that in the interval the trial took a turn which led to the condemnation of Paulus. The haphazard mention of an earlier condemnation is quite out of the question.

be on earth but a day. Antoninus, his associate, seconded him: "By thy fortune, my lord the emperor, he speaks truly, as one who will be living but a day;" and he goes on to say that the emperor could not have received letters from Alexandria in which it was set forth that the Jews had been compelled to herd together in a quarter, a *ghetto*, in order that they might never again be able to take by surprise the city of Alexandria.<sup>31</sup> The transaction ends with the dismissal of Paulus, while Antoninus is kept in custody. To what end?

By far the best preserved and clearest is a third document which is found among the Oxyrhynchus papyri. It is a leaf of papyrus, 15 cm. high and 44.7 cm. wide, whose front exhibits a copy of a contract from the archives of Oxyrhynchus, while on the back is seen our text in five columns, written in a hand belonging to about the end of the second century. It is edited by Grenfell and Hunt.<sup>32</sup>

	I.		II.
	[π]ατρί μου καὶ [...]ι[.....] ὅτι		καὶ [.....] καὶ [...]ας σε διώκω
	μη̄τε χρείαν[...]σ[.....]αι		ἐκ π[.....]ανῶ. Ἄτοκράτωρ με-
	[...]σ... δεισ[...].[...]υπε		τεκ[α]λέσατο αὐτόν. Ἄτοκράτωρ εἶπεν·
	[.....].. αμε[.....]νος .[.]εν κά-		‘[νῦ]ν οὐκ οἶδας τίνι [λα]λέεις;’ Ἀππιανός·
5	γὼ γὰρ κα[.....]ν[...] αὐτοῦ	5	‘ἐπίσταμαι· Ἀπ[πι]ανὸς τυράννω.’
	γε ταῦτα λέγον[το]ς στρ[α]φείδς καὶ		Ἄτοκράτωρ· [οὐκ,] ἀλλὰ βασιλεῖ.’ Ἀππι-
	ιδῶν Ἡλιόδωρον εἶπεν· ‘Ἡλιό-		νός· ‘τοῦτο μὴ λέγε· τῷ γὰρ θεῷ
	δωρε, ἀπαγομένον μου οὐδὲν		Ἄντωνεῖνω [τ]ῷ π[ατ]ρί σου ἔπρεπε
	λαλείς;’ Ἡλιόδωρος εἶπεν·		αὐτοκρατορεῖν . ἄκουε . τὸ μὲν
10	‘καὶ τίνι ἔχομεν λαλῆσαι μὴ ἔχον-	10	πρῶτον ἢ[ν] φιλόσοφος, τὸ δεύτερον
	[τ]ες τὸν ἀκούοντα; τρέχε, τέκνον,		ἀφιλάργυρος, τ[δ] τρίτον φιλάγαθος . σοὶ
	τελεύτα . κλέος σοὶ ἐστιν		τούτων τὰ ἐναντία ἔνκεται . τυραν-
	ὑπὲρ τῆς γλυκυτάτης σου πατρί-		νία ἀφιλοκαγαθία ἀπαΐδια.’ Καῖσαρ ἐ-
	δος τελευτῆσαι . μὴ ἀγωνία·		κέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀπαχθῆναι. Ἀπι-
		15	ανὸς ἀπαγομένος εἶπεν· ‘καὶ τοῦτο

<sup>31</sup> The suppression of the letters was an insult to the emperor's majesty, in seeking to predispose him against the Alexandrians.

<sup>32</sup> No. XXXIII, *vo.*, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. I (1898), pp. 62-68, Egypt Exploration Fund, Græco-Roman Branch. Cf. on this document TH. MOMMSEN, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Academie*, 1898, p. 498; AD. DEISSMANN, *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1896, pp. 602-6; VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORF, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1898, pp. 690 ff.; F. BLASS, *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1898, p. 1076; O. CRUSIUS, *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Beilage, p. 225; WEIL, *Revue des études grecques*, Vol. XI (1898), pp. 243 f.; TH. REINACH, *Revue des études juives*, Vol. XXXVII (1898), pp. 218-25; MITTEIS, *Hermes*, Vol. XXXIV (1899), pp. 88-91.

## III.

ἡμεῖν χάρι[σ]αι, κύριε Καῖσαρ.  
 Ἀὐτοκράτωρ· 'τί;' Ἀππιανός· 'κέλευ-  
 σόν με ἐ[[v]] τῇ εὐγενείᾳ μου ἀπα-  
 χθῆναι.' Ἀὐτοκράτωρ· 'ἔχε.'  
 5 Ἀππιανὸς λαβὼν τὸ στροφέιον  
 ἐπὶ τῆς κεφα[λ]ῆς ἔθηκεν καὶ τὸ  
 φαικάσ[ω]ν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας θεὸς ἀνε-  
 βόησεν [μ]έσης Ῥώμης· 'συνδράμε-  
 τε, Ῥωμαῖοι, θεωρήσατε ἓνα ἀπ' αἰῶ-  
 10 νος ἀπαγό[μεν]ον γυμνασίαρχον καὶ  
 πρε[σ]βευτὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων.' ὁ ἡβό  
 [κατο]ς εὐθὺς δραμῶν παρέθετο  
 [τῶ] κυρίῳ λέγων· 'κύριε, κάθη, Ῥωμαῖ-  
 οὶ γογγύζο[υσ]ι.' Ἀὐτοκράτωρ· 'περὶ  
 15 τίνος;' ὁ ὑπατος· 'περὶ τῆς ἀπάξεως

## IV.

τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως.' Ἀὐτοκράτωρ·  
 'μεταπεμφθήτω.' Ἀππιανὸς  
 εἰσελθὼν εἶπεν· 'τίς ἤδη τὸν δεύ-  
 τερόν μου ἄδην προσκυνούonta  
 5 καὶ τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ τελευτήσαντας,  
 Θεωνά τε καὶ Ἰσίδωρον καὶ Δάμ-  
 πωνα, μετεκαλέσατο; ἄρα ἡ  
 σύνκλητος ἢ σὺ ὁ λήσταρχος;'  
 Ἀὐτοκράτωρ· 'Ἀππιανέ, ἰώθα-  
 10 μεν καὶ ἡμεῖς μαινομένους καὶ  
 ἀπονουημένους σωφρινίζειν·  
 λαλεῖς ἐφ' ὅσον ἐγὼ σε θέλω λα-  
 λεῖν.' Ἀππιανός· 'νῆ τὴν σὴν τύ-  
 15 χην οὔτε μαίνομαι οὔτε ἀπονουό-

## V.

νείας καὶ τῶν ἐ[μοὶ προσηκόντων  
 ἀπαγγέλλω.' Ἀὐτ[οκράτωρ]· 'πῶς;'  
 Ἀππιανός· 'ὡς εὐγ[ενῆς καὶ γυμνασί-  
 5 ἀρχος.' Ἀὐτοκράτωρ· 'φῆς οὐδὲν ὅτι ἡμεῖς  
 ἀγενεῖς ἐσμεν;' [Ἀππιανός· 'τοῦτο μὲν  
 οὐκ ο[ἶ]δα ἐγώ, [ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἔμμου  
 εὐγενείας καὶ τῶν ἐ[μοὶ προσηκόν-  
 των ἀπαγγέλλω.' Ἀὐτοκράτωρ·  
 'νῦν οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι [οὐκ ἀγενεῖς ἐσμεν;'  
 10 Ἀππιανός· 'τοῦτο μ[ὲν] εἰ ἀληθῶς οὐκ οἶ-  
 δας, διδάξω σε. π[ρῶτον] μὲν Καῖσαρ ἔ-  
 σωσε Κλεοπάτρ[αν] . . . . .  
 ἐκράτησέν βασι[λείας καὶ ὡς λέγου  
 σί τινες, ἐδάνει[σε] . . . . .

II, 13 l. ἀπαύξενος, Blass.

Of this text a full translation can be given. There is no question that it describes the examination of an Alexandrian Antisemite, Appian, who was condemned to death for lese-majesty by the emperor Commodus—not Marcus Aurelius, as the first editors supposed.

As he said this Appian turned, and when he saw Heliodor, he said: "Heliodor, sayest thou nothing while I am carried off?" *Heliodoros*<sup>33</sup> said: "And to whom shall we speak, since we have no one who hears us? Hasten, child, go! It is glorious for thee to die for thy most sweet native land. Do not despair, I will soon follow thee(?)"<sup>34</sup> The *emperor* had him summoned. The *emperor* spoke: "Now, dost thou not know to whom thou speakest?" *Appian*: "I know: Appian speaks to the tyrant." The *emperor*: "No, but to the emperor." *Appian*: "Say not so; for it befitted the god Antoninus, thy father, to have sole imperial sway. Harken: first, he was a philosopher; then, free from avarice; thirdly, a lover of justice. But thou hast qualities just the opposite of these—tyranny, hatred of justice, boorishness." The *emperor* gave orders to take him away. *Appian*, as he was led away, said: "Grant us at least this boon, O Cæsar." The *emperor*: "What?" *Appian*: "Command that I be taken away as becomes my rank." The *emperor*: "So be it" (ἔχε, *habeas*). *Appian* took his headband and placed it on his head, and after he had put his white shoes<sup>35</sup> on his feet he cried aloud in the midst of Rome: "Run hither, ye Romans, see one being put out of the world,<sup>36</sup> a gymnasiarch and deputy of the Alexandrians!" The *veteran* straightway ran and told the emperor: "Lord, while thou sittest here, the Romans are murmuring." The *emperor*: "Wherefore?" The *consul*: "Because of the arrest of the Alexandrian." The *emperor*: "Let him be brought back." *Appian*, on entering, said: "Who, then, has called me back, when I was greeting death for the second time, and those who died before me, *Theon*, *Isidor*, and *Lampon*?" The senate, or thou, robber chief?" The *emperor*: "Appian, we are accustomed to bring to their senses even those who are crazed and mad. Thou speakest for so long a time as I am willing that thou should speak." *Appian*: "By thy fortune, I am neither crazy nor mad, but I demand my honor and privileges." The *emperor*: "In what way?" *Appian*: "As a man of good birth and a gymnasiarch." The *emperor*: "Dost thou mean that we are of base birth?" *Appian*: "About that I know nothing, but I stand for my honor and privileges." The *emperor*: "Now, knowest thou not that we are not of base birth?" *Appian*: "If thou really art ignorant of that, I will instruct thee: First Cæsar saved Cleopatra, then he seized the sovereignty, and as some say, he lent<sup>37</sup> . . . .

We should be eager to learn the further disclosures which this gymnasiarch of Alexandria, as impudent as he was punctilious for his due honors, had to impart; but the papyrus ends abruptly.

<sup>33</sup> I think Grenfell is not right in identifying this Heliodorus with the prefect of Egypt, 193 A. D., Avidius Heliodorus.

<sup>34</sup> At the end of Folio I one line appears to be wanting, not five, as Bauer says, further, the first two lines of Folio II are not sufficiently preserved.

<sup>35</sup> *Cj.* on this peculiar dress of the gymnasiarch PLUTARCH, *Marcus Antonius*, 33.

<sup>36</sup> Reinach connects ἀπ' αὐτῶν with γυμνασιάρχος, and translates: "un gymnasiarch perpétuel."

<sup>37</sup> Or "she seized . . . . and she lent" (Reinach).

## IV.

Finally mention should be made of a small fragment of the Berlin collection from Fayum, measuring 7×8.5 cm., which probably belongs with these others. Krebs, who has published it as *B.G.U.*, 588, places it in the first century. It is too small and too poorly preserved to allow us to make much out of it. I content myself with printing the text.

## IV.

..].σ.[.....].as θέσω  
 ...π]αρ' ὑμῶν φιλτάτων με[?]  
 ...]ν πορθοῦντες ὑμᾶς, οἱ γὰρ  
 ...] καὶ ἔργον καὶ πάθος ἔχιν εμα-  
 5 .μέ]ταφοράν τ' ἂν αὐτίκα τὰ πα  
 ...].πο λιμένος ὁ ὑπ' ἀνθρώ-  
 ...] παροξυνθεὶς εἰς τὴν ὑμε-  
 ευσ]ρωπον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ δίκαιον  
 ...]ν ἄλλ' οὐκέτι ἀπειλήσῃ λοι-  
 10 ...' Ἀλεξ]ανδρεὺς Βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων

What, now, do these documents tell us? Notwithstanding the fact that they are spread over a period of one hundred and fifty years, relations plainly exist between them.

Let us begin with the individuals.

Isidor and Lampon, who appear first in I before Claudius, are persons by no means unknown to us; they are, there can scarcely be any doubt, the same two demagogues with whose fatal activity we have already become acquainted from the account of Philo, first before Flaccus against the Jews, then at Caligula's court against Flaccus. In Philo's report Lampon is gymnasiarch; in this one it is Isidor; and both again unite in hostility to the Jews. Is there, as Reinach thinks, any direct connection between this fact and the riot depicted by Philo and the two Alexandrian deputations? Lampon and Isidor might be considered as colleagues of that Apion who headed the Antisemite deputation to Caligula. The conjecture might be hazarded that this deputation, especially if it did not come to Rome in the winter of 38/39, but (as Schürer believes) in 40, remained in the city until after the change of rulers on January 24, 41. Then we must further understand<sup>38</sup> that they were treated with hostility under the new régime,

<sup>38</sup> In fact, Claudius soon after his accession to the throne, when the Jews of Alexandria appeared disposed to avenge themselves on the Alexandrians, showed himself in the highest degree complaisant toward them through his confirmation of all their privileges (JOSEPHUS, *Arch.*, XIX, 5, 2, 278).

several members were even condemned to death, so that only the experiment of a complaint against Agrippa appeared to be of avail for them—truly a hopeless endeavor, for Claudius owed his throne almost entirely to the energetic measures of this prince. It was impossible that he should so soon forget this service.

In truth, a number of different facts definitely oppose Reinach's combination. In the first place, not Apion, but Isidor and Lampon, appear here as the leaders; then, it is not Lampon, as in Philo, but Isidor, who is the gymnasiarch; during the stay of the delegation in Rome the change could not have taken place; at the very least a second embassy must be supposed. This, too, should not be placed at the very beginning of Claudius's reign, but somewhat later. The question is then raised: Which Agrippa is meant? Reinach and Schürer consider that it is Agrippa I. (37-44), who is well enough known to us through Philo as the patron of the Jewish community of Alexandria.<sup>39</sup> But I think Wilcken has produced decisive reasons for believing that more probably his son, Agrippa II.—since his father's death at the court of Claudius, and, after the year 50, king of Chalkis—is meant. This man, as well as his father, was the mediator for his people at the imperial court.<sup>40</sup> In this case the affair would have taken place, not in the first year of the reign of Claudius, but at some later time; not in 41, but between 50 and 54. Now, it was in 48 that the emperor seized the gardens of Lucullus, after Messalina had removed Valerius Atticus to get them.<sup>41</sup> Reference is also made to Agrippina, from 49 Claudius's second wife, and not to her predecessor, Messalina, to the effect that she took a public part in affairs of state, the reception of deputations, etc.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, it is specially told of her that Agrippa II. made use of her intercession with Claudius in the affair of Cumanus in the year 52. Therefore precisely this twelfth year may conjecturally be considered as the time of these events, although the years 10-14 must also be regarded as possible.<sup>44</sup>

Accordingly, there exists no direct relation between Philo's deputation

<sup>39</sup> Cf. SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*<sup>3</sup>, Vol. I, pp. 505, 552; MATHEWS, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, p. 586; MATHEWS, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. TACITUS, *Ann.*, XI, 1 ff. REINACH, however, proposes to read *Σερονιλιανοίς* instead of *Λουκουλιανοίς*; cf. also SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 68.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Sittengeschichte Roms*<sup>6</sup>, Vol. I, p. 156; DIO, LX, 33.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, XX, 135, and thereon SCHÜRER, *loc. cit.*, p. 570.

<sup>44</sup> Wilcken's exact date, the 13th year (53), is the result of an incorrect supposition arising from his allowing too great a width to the columns in completing the imperfect papyrus.

to Caligula and this hearing before Claudius. Nevertheless an inner connection is not to be denied. The same Jew-baiters are the men who twice play the leading parts. Isidor and Lampon must have acquired a certain reputation among their followers as champions of Antisemitism in Alexandria. Clearly then, they are the same men whom the gymnasiarch Appian under Commodus calls his predecessors in martyrdom for the good cause of the Alexandrians. Through this reference we likewise learn that the sentence of death pronounced against them by Claudius was actually carried out.

As accompanying, or perhaps preceding, them, Appian mentions one Theon. This name, by the way, was exceedingly common in Alexandria. Curiously enough we find it used in all our documents. In I we have the exegete Theon, apparently referred to as one of the friends of Claudius murdered by Isidor in the service of Caligula; the other must surely be Flaccus. In II, Theon is a colleague of Paulus and Antoninus, and thus a member of the Antisemitic deputation. This is entirely consistent with the manner in which he is mentioned in the third document. But the fact that he is joined with Isidor and Lampon, and is even mentioned first, compels us, I believe, to admit another Theon of an earlier date. In that case it is not impossible that the same exegete Theon is referred to, in spite of the fact that, according to I, he rather appears as an opponent of Isidor. Isidor was so energetic a champion of Antisemitism, as well as so absolutely devoted a tool of Caligula's, that he broke with his associates as soon as they were inconvenient or became objects of suspicion to the emperor. No one from Philo's account will consider Flaccus as friendly to the Jews. Yet he fell a victim to Isidor. Such also was Theon's lot. It is but one of the many ironies of history that subsequently he and his slayer Isidor were classed together as martyrs to the cause of Antisemitism.

If in this interrelation of the third and first documents we may be permitted to discover the traces of a certain party tradition, we can on no account neglect the fact that gymnasiarchs regularly appear as leaders of the Antisemitic faction. We shall easily comprehend its significance if we endeavor to recall the place in national politics of the ancient gymnastic clubs. The gymnasium, rather than the school of philosophy, was the center of Greek public life. The influence of athletic training of the body reached a far wider circle and had a greater importance than the scientific training of the mind. In many Greek cities there were athletic societies for older men as well as for the youth, and participation in them was for citizens a matter, not only of honor, but of political duty.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>45</sup> ZIERBARTH, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Athletics and gymnastics were Greek, not Roman; cf. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Sittengeschichte Roms*<sup>6</sup>, Vol. II, p. 485.



This was the side of Greek life that the Jews had positively no inclination for. In the books of the Maccabees it is set forth as the ἀκνή Ἑλληνισμοῦ, the culmination of the Seleucid attempt at Hellenizing, that the high-priest Jason established a gymnasium in the temple, and here the prominent young men of Jerusalem, even including young priests, carried on their physical exercises naked, among whom some, ashamed of the circumcision, endeavored to change this condition by means of a difficult operation.<sup>46</sup> In the gymnasium the Greek character exhibited the side in which it was most opposed to Judaism. It is only natural that, just as the Jews hated and abhorred it, the Greek youths of the gymnasium, on the other hand, and at their head the gymnasiarch, regarded hatred of the Jews as bound up with their sport. What such a gymnasiarch fancied himself to be we see in Appian. And, in truth, his influence, although his functions were more honorable and expensive than politically important, may have been very great. He always had at his orders large numbers of turbulent youths. And in Alexandria the right of might was always strong. Indeed, it is well known that even the later Christian bishops, as Dioscur, decided questions, not only of ecclesiastical politics, but even of dogma, by the fists of sturdy parabolanes and monks.

There seems to be no other connection between the different transactions recorded in our three documents than this long-continued hostility between the Jews and the intensely patriotic Greeks of the gymnasium. This hatred, founded in the very nature of things, continually burst out into flames. And, because of the great size of the Jewish colony in Alexandria, these conflicts were of such importance that the imperial privy council itself was repeatedly occupied with them. The so-called rebellion of Lukias in Trajan's reign furnished the Roman empire plenty of trouble.

It is of considerable interest to observe what a different impression is made by the various emperors mentioned. While Caligula makes no concealment at all of his hate against the Jews, and takes unreservedly the part of the Antisemites, we see Claudius sharply opposed to the latter. This exactly corresponds with Josephus's account of the favor shown the Jews by Claudius. At the request of the allied kings, Agrippa and Herod, immediately upon his elevation to the throne he sent an edict, not only to Alexandria, but to all cities, colonies, and municipalities of the empire, and to the subject princes, in which he fully confirmed all the privileges of the Jews.<sup>47</sup> The same state of affairs is seen under Commodus. The Anti-

<sup>46</sup> 2 Macc. 4:13; JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, XII, 241.

<sup>47</sup> JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, XIX, 5, 2, 3 (279-92); SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 502; Vol. III, pp. 31-74.

semites appear here as demagogues dangerous to the state, from whom any violence is to be expected, while the Jews are loyal subjects, so long as they are not disturbed. Even Trajan holds his protecting hand over them, despite the fact that throughout he is not graciously disposed toward them; nor surely in their great rebellion had he any occasion for manifesting kindly feelings. But it was a principle of the Roman government to protect the chartered rights of the Jews as far as possible. Moreover, even in the great Jewish war in the reign of Vespasian the Roman authority protected the privileges of the Jews, particularly in cities with a partial Jewish population, against the inflamed hatred of their Greek fellow-citizens. Antoninus even revoked, so far as it affected Jewish children, the universal prohibition of castration—and circumcision—proclaimed by his predecessor Hadrian.

There is something singular in these privileges of the Jewish nation, originating with the Diadochi, alike increased and confirmed by the changing masters of Rome—a Pompey, a Cæsar, an Antony, and an Augustus. Clearly there was a desire to use this nation, long since spread abroad beyond the narrow limits of its home country, as a bond of union in the great process of amalgamating nationalities. Yet these numerous rights granted them, particularly that of *isopoliteia*, besides numerous exemptions, were ever the occasion for new and vigorous strife. During Titus's residence in Antioch the Greeks had no more urgent request to make of him than that he would expel the Jews from the city, or at least that he would annul their prerogatives, conferred on them by Antiochus, and engraved on a bronze stele. Titus refused.

How did the Romans come to adopt this policy? Was it because of the ancient treaties of friendship once made with the Asmonean princes? Was it because of the great services once rendered by Antipater and Herodes to the then rulers of Rome, under the most wise policy which Cæsar and Augustus adopted? Was it even some sort of a tendency toward Judaism itself, such as is discovered on the part of many distinguished Romans of the imperial period?<sup>48</sup> With a governmental policy so thoroughly utilitarian as was that of the Romans, the grounds of this line of action must be sought in some practical benefit. It was the old maxim, *divide et impera*, which induced them to make the Jews a counterbalance to the unquiet

<sup>48</sup> The satirical flings of Horace on this subject are well known. Especially noteworthy is a passage in SÆTONIUS, *Vita Augusti*, according to which this prince, so devoted to the old-established religion, and so scornful of all others, expressed to his grandson, Gaius, his approval of the fact that he had not paid his devotions in the temple at Jerusalem while on a journey in the Orient. Clearly to do so was the fashion of the day.

spirit of the Greek cities; while on their part the former, knowing that only by the strong arm of Rome were they protected from the wrath of their fellow-citizens, were generally the most loyal of subjects.

Now, however, the question arises: Does there exist, in addition to this inner relation between the events, an outer one between the reports? How shall these newly discovered documents be rated from the literary point of view? At the first glance they might be pronounced independent records (Reinach). But we must note that, according to Wilcken's account, the report of the hearing before Claudius (I.) exists only in an unofficial copy dating from the end of the second century, and is thus contemporaneous with the hearing before Commodus. A connection between these facts is plainly indicated. The report of the earlier time was copied, since it had again acquired real importance. But how was this copy secured? The rabbinic legend, that Marcus Aurelius, in gratitude for the cure of his daughter, had granted the Jews permission to rummage through the state archives, gives us no light at all. These documents were at that time preserved, not at Rome, but in Egypt itself, as is shown by the employment of Egyptian terms for the dates in I. They had been brought there from Rome previously, as Wilcken supposes, by the ambassadors themselves on their way back to Alexandria as part of their reports (*ὑπο μνηματισμοί*). Separate copies were made of the minutes of proceedings and given to the parties concerned, and even to others, and the archives, while not open to everyone, were nevertheless accessible.<sup>49</sup> Von Wilamowitz thinks of excerpts from the *Commentarii Caesaris* copied for the sake of local interest, resembling reprints of a local paper from the official gazette.

But are all these actually independent copies of reports? The form is by no means always exactly the same. Here we have something resembling a document, and there a piece of historical narrative. Therefore, Deissmann had put forth the conjecture, and P. Viereck agrees with him, that all the fragments which we have here are but parts of a single historical work—an account of the persecution of the Jews in Alexandria from a Jewish standpoint, after the fashion of the books of the Maccabees, with documents incorporated which are partly genuine, partly falsified, or at least highly colored. The view that we are concerned here, not with original documents, but with a literary production, which in its single "deeds" is sometimes mere rhetoric and untrustworthy, and sometimes strongly exaggerated at the very least, is accepted by Ad. Bauer. But—following Reinach—he considers them to be parts, not of a Jewish, but of

<sup>49</sup> Cf. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht*, p. 520.

an Alexandrian presentation of the dispute—a heathen martyrology. I think neither of those views can be proved. On the contrary, the common conception that all three fragments belong to one literary work is contradicted by the fact that the second is preserved in a double form. Two different versions of a separately transmitted document are easily conceivable. But that both should have been incorporated into the same work, or that the work itself should have existed in two different revisions, belongs to the realm of improbabilities. I confess that I am not myself able to give a final solution. We must wait until these few fragments are enriched by new discoveries, when for the first time they may be understood in their true character.

One matter, however, I may touch on briefly in conclusion; *i. e.*, the significance of these discoveries for the history of early Christianity. The intense hatred of the Greeks against the Jews, of which we have perceived unmistakable proofs in the documents we have been discussing, we meet again in the history of the apostles. This hatred enraged the populace and officials of Philippi against Paul, the itinerant Jewish artisan and proselytizer (Acts, chap. 16). This hatred caused the irritated assembly in the theater at Ephesus, entirely irrespective of the actual matter at stake, to break out in fury at the mere sight of a Jewish speaker, and to shout for two hours: "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!" which meant nothing more than, "Down with the Jews!" (Acts, chap. 19). We may regard it as an instinctive reaction, due to these experiences, that nascent Christianity made all possible efforts to destroy the impression that it was only a Jewish sect. Conceived in the womb of Judaism, it yet had within itself a strength which carried it irresistibly beyond the narrow limits of this religion. Out of the messianic movement in Israel an independent world-religion quickly developed. This the Hellenists had already recognized, but it was Paul who so magnificently worked out this conception. But, in spite of this innate necessity for breaking with Judaism, possibly a clear outward separation would not have come about so speedily. The privileges of Judaism afforded a protection which the new religion did not possess—had not a combination of circumstances required such action. Paul, the powerful founder of the church of the gentile Christians, who was so far above this opposition between Jews and gentiles, and who loved his people more than did a Philo (see Rom. 9: 1; 10: 1), still, at the head of a delegation of gentile Christians, brought to Jerusalem a collection for the mother-church which involuntarily recalls the contribution for the temple sent by the whole dispersion to Jerusalem.

But immediately after his time such relations were completely broken off. The Christian ecclesia appears as a definitely Greek society in contrast with the Jewish synagogue, which is even called the "synagogue of Satan" (Rev. 2:9).<sup>50</sup> "We . . . those," is the sharp distinction drawn by the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, who applies all the promises of the Old Testament to the Christians, and all the curses to the Jews. In the words of Christ against the Pharisees, the author of the Didaché understands the expression "Ye hypocrites" to mean all Jews without distinction: "If ye fast, it shall not be to you as to the hypocrites: they fast Monday and Thursday, but ye shall fast Wednesday and Friday." In its most conspicuous form this innate distinction between Christians and Jews is finally found in the gospel of John, where the opponents of Jesus appear, not as separate factions of the Jewish nation, the Pharisees and scribes, but simply as "the Jews." This is the counterpart of the fact that the Jewish people, as such, had turned away from Christianity. The gospel was given to the Greeks. No internal conflict between gentile and Jewish Christians drove Christianity into this sharp opposition. It was partly the frequently experienced hostility of the Jewish synagogue, which hated and persecuted Christianity as a dangerous rival and also as an apostate sect. An even stronger motive, however, was the Greeks' hatred of the Jews. As the Jews, not without success, sought to direct to the Christians the *odium generis humani* which pressed heavily on them, so also these were inspired to appear as something completely different from Judaism. It is the same apologetic interest which endeavored to free the Roman governor Pilate from any share in the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus, and which exhibited the Jews as the murderers of Jesus, in a manner entirely false to history, such as found expression in the gospel of Peter.

ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ.

JENA, GERMANY.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. HARNACK, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, pp. 46 ff.