

Table of Contents

Preface	viii
---------------	------

Ancient Period

The Causes of the Alexandrian Pogrom and the Visit of Agrippa I to Alexandria in 38 CE.....	2
<i>Lionel Jehuda Sanders</i>	

Sectarianism in the Mishnah: Memory, Modeling Society, and Rabbinic Identity.....	31
<i>Naftali S. Cohn</i>	

Power and the (Re)Creation of Collective-Cultural Memory in Early Judaism: The Case of the Mishnah.....	55
<i>Jack N. Lightstone</i>	

Medieval and Early Modern Periods

Maimonides vs. Nahmanides on Historical Consciousness and the Shaping of Jewish Identity	92
<i>James A. Diamond</i>	

Community and Sacrality: Jewish Customs and Identity in Early Modern Worms	117
<i>Dean Phillip Bell</i>	

Criticism and Tradition: Leon Modena, Azariah de' Rossi, and Elijah Levita Bahur on Kabbalah and the Hebrew Vowels	147
<i>Howard Tzvi Adelman</i>	

Modern and Contemporary Periods

American Jewish Immigrants and the Invention of Europe	172
<i>Beth S. Wenger</i>	

North American Hasidim: Between Modernity and the Old World	192
<i>Steven Lapidus</i>	

The Challenge of Memory for Yiddish Language Activists in Montreal	211
<i>Pierre Anctil</i>	

Identities, Communities, and the Infrastructures of History: Creating Canadian Jewish Archives in the 1930s and 1970s	233
<i>Richard Menkis</i>	

The Shoah, the Sacred, and Jewish Victim Identity in Postwar Germany and North America: The Scar Without the Wound and the Wound That Did Not Close	257
<i>Benjamin M. Baader</i>	

Macro and Micro Insights into Contemporary Jewish
Identities: Europe, Israel, and the United States294
Calvin Goldscheider

Interfaces between Eras

Rallying All of Israel: David Ben-Gurion and the Book of Joshua 316
Rachel Havrelock

Who Is a Marrano?: Reflections on Modern Jewish Identity 337
Ira Robinson

The Authors.....365
Index..... 371

Preface

In May 2011, a conference was held at Concordia University that brought together specialists in Jewish history to take a fresh, panoramic view of the role representations of the past play in the construction of Jewish identity.¹ Since Yosef Haim Yerushalmi's seminal work, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, was published some thirty years ago,² there have been significant developments in the study of Jewish history, memory, and identity. Little of this scholarship, however, has brought these developments directly to bear on the interrelationships between Jews, Jewish culture, and the shifting nature of "Jewishness" throughout the ages.

Yerushalmi made a fundamental distinction between history, writing about the past for its own sake, and memory, preserving the past for its meaning according to archetypal patterns. This distinction has since been challenged. Scholars argue that the boundaries between ways of looking at the past are often blurred and that there are multiple ways of identifying, evaluating, and representing past events.

1 For more on the conference, including the program, see <http://religion.concordia.ca/jewishid/> [accessed September 25, 2014].

2 Yosef Haim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982).

Furthermore, the telling of a single, simplified narrative of Jewish history has become problematic. Given that there has always been a multiplicity of “Judaisms,” as Neusner has called them, the molding of a singular narrative of Jewish history constituted a highly selective interpretive act. “Judaism” and “Jewishness” have become recognized as highly problematic concepts and terms, and there has been a concerted shift toward the use of a polythetic or “family characteristics” definition of these terms.

As these trends have unfolded, numerous studies of particular Jewish groups in specific time periods have taken up the question of Jewish representation of the past. Many of these studies have recognized—as Harold Bloom did in his introduction to *Zakhor*—that the ways in which groups represent the past are fundamentally connected with the construction of their identities. The study of how Jews construct the past, therefore, can help in interpreting how they understand the nature of their Jewishness.

The chapters of this book, which developed out of the conference papers, illuminate the multiple ways in which Jews have responded to and made use of the past. They discern patterns of continuity and discontinuity, the nuanced imbrication of past-consciousness and identity, and the role that scholarship plays not only in uncovering but also creating relationships between the past and Jewish identity. The articles on Jewish individuals and groups included in this volume reveal surprising similarities across time and place at the same time as they reveal the diversity of these individuals and groups.

Both through its in-depth individual studies and its broader, collective perspective, this volume contributes not only to the study of Jewish past-consciousness and identity but also to the study of Jewish history and Jewishness more generally. If Jews’ choices of what to include, emphasize, omit, and invent in their representation of the past can be considered a fundamental variable or factor that contributes to a polythetic definition of Jewishness, this volume contributes to the creation of a nuanced, contemporary approach to the construction of the histories of Jews and their thought.

The reader should note that the editors did not impose on the individual authors a standard system of transliteration or reference to the books of the Hebrew Bible or Rabbinic literature.

The editors would like to thank Andrea Lobel and Cimminnee Holt, who worked with the editors to create this volume. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada's generous grant made the original Concordia University conference possible and is gratefully acknowledged. The conference was also supported by the Department of Religion and the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies, Concordia University, as well as the Canadian Society for Jewish Studies. The Concordia University Institute for Canadian Jewish Studies' support for the publication of this volume is likewise acknowledged with gratitude.

The editors would also like to thank Cambridge University Press for its permission to publish James Diamond's essay, which was first published in his 2014 book *Maimonides and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon*.

Ira Robinson
Lorenzo DiTommaso
Naftali S. Cohn
Montreal, September 25, 2014

ANCIENT PERIOD

The Causes of the Alexandrian Pogrom and the Visit of Agrippa I to Alexandria in 38 CE

Lionel Jehuda Sanders
Concordia University

Discussion seeking to discern the causes of the pogrom in Alexandria in 38 CE has tended to veer in two, not necessarily incompatible, directions. In the first approach, following Philo's lead in the *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, as well as that of these texts' counterpart, the *Acta Isidori*, emphasis is placed upon causation determined by the chief personages in the drama: on the one hand, Flaccus, prefect of the Roman Province of Egypt, the Roman emperor Gaius Caligula, the Alexandrian leaders Isidorus, Lampon and Dionysius and the Alexandrian populace; and on the other hand, Philo and the Jewish community of Alexandria. The alternate approach has been to consider the subject from the point of view of the social and political issues underlining the friction between the Jewish and Alexandrian communities, with particular emphasis placed upon the negative consequences of the Roman conquest of Egypt under Octavian (Augustus) for both

Jews and Greeks in Alexandria, and the quest by the Jews for improved civic status in the city.

This article is not concerned with these academically valid, though highly contentious issues. On the contrary, the focus here is on the one incident that, according to Philo, directly propelled the city of Alexandria to its path to violence—the visit of Agrippa I in 38 CE to Alexandria. I emphasize this event for two reasons. First, I maintain that the episode possesses greater significance than that which it has generally been accorded by the ancient sources and by modern scholarly consensus, which emphasize personalities and socio-political issues. Historical memory has, in fact, seriously obscured the incident's importance. Secondly, it places the search for Jewish identity in Alexandria in a broader context than one might initially suspect, involving rival identity quests by Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors.

The facts about this incident as described by Philo in the *In Flaccum* are simply stated. Agrippa I, close friend of Gaius, en route to his newly acquired kingdom¹ in Northern Palestine² (territory belonging to his uncle Philip's former tetrarchy, possibly with an addition),³ agreed to await the Etesian winds⁴ before embarking at Dicaearchia (Puteoli) upon the advice of the emperor, and take the

1 Of interest is the fact that Josephus (*AJ* 18.237) emphasizes that Agrippa was made king rather than given the title that Philip had possessed, tetrarch: καὶ βασιλέα καθίστησιν αὐτὸν τῆς Φιλίππου τετραχίας. André Pelletier, *In Flaccum. Introduction, traduction et notes* (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 26, believes that Claudius was actually the one who first bestowed the title of king on Agrippa, when he confirmed Agrippa's authority (*Jos.*, *AJ* 19.274). Daniel R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1990), 60, denies that real promotion characterizes the change from tetrarch to king. Descriptions of Agrippa as king are found in Philo, *In Flacc.*, 29, 33, 35, 39, 103; *Leg.*, 179, 261; *Jos.*, *BJ* 2.181; *AJ* 18.194, 237, 239, 273, 289; 19.236, 265.

2 Currently modern Lebanon.

3 Added to land belonging to Philip's former tetrarchy was that of Lysanias, the former ruler of Abilene (*Jos.*, *AJ* 18.237). This additional fact is absent from the reference in *BJ* 2.181. In *AJ* 19.275 and *BJ* 2.215, Claudius is associated with the grant of Lysanias' land. See Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 280.

4 I.e., the northwestern summer winds. See Pieter W. van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003), 111.

allegedly speedier southern, rather than northern, route to his kingdom, which necessitated a brief stop in Alexandria.⁵ A deliberate attempt to enter Alexandria unobtrusively by night failed.⁶ Agrippa was verbally attacked by the Alexandrian mob, mocked,⁷ and then subjected to a parody or mime⁸ of Agrippa's ostentatious march through Alexandria, which the mime followed.⁹ The parody was centered upon the town fool Carabas,¹⁰ addressed as *Marin*¹¹—Aramaic or possibly Syriac for “my lord”¹²—who was attired with a cloak made from carpet, a crown of

5 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 26. Disagreement on the date of Agrippa's visit is encountered between Alla Kushnir-Stein, “On the Visit of Agrippa I to Alexandria in AD 38,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 51 (2000): 225–242, and Sandra Gambetti, “A Brief Note on Agrippa I's Trip to Alexandria in the Summer of 38 CE,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 58 (2007): 34–38. While the former dates the visit to June 38, the latter favors July/August of the same year. Allen Kerkeslager, “Agrippa I and the Mourning Rights for Drusilla,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 37.3 (2006): 394, offers a compromise between these two views, opting for the last week of June and the first week of July.

6 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 28.

7 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 33.

8 On the prevalence of mimes in Alexandria, see Herbert G. Box, *Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939), 88, and van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 126, citing Cicero, *Pro Rab. Post.* 12.35; Dio Chrys., *Or.* 32.4, 86; Phil., *Agr.* 35; *Mos.* 2.21.

9 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 34–39.

10 Generally regarded as Aramaic for cabbage, though Pelletier, *In Flaccum*, 69, n. 4, regards it as related to the Greek word for a boat, *κάραβος*, while van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 128, refers to the possibility that it is related to the same Greek word *κάραβος* for crayfish or beetle. See “*κάραβος*” in Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry Stuart-Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 877.

11 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 39.

12 John P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), 130, regards the term as Aramaic. Similarly, Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 75; Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria* (New York, Oxford: University Press, 1979), 176, n. 23; Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Greek in the Ancient World* (Princeton: University Press, 1993), 115; Louis H. Feldman, “Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World,” in *History and Hate: The Dimensions of Anti-Semitism*, ed. David Berger (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1986), 23. On the other hand, Box, *Philonis Alexandrini*, 89, followed by H. Idris Bell, *Juden und Griechen im römischen Alexandria* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1927), 18, records it as being Syrian. Similarly Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1938), 8; Arnold H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (Oxford: University Press 1938), 192. Van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 130, notes the fact that Syriac is a Western Aramaic dialect renders the distinction between Syriac and Aramaic moot. Pelletier, *In Flaccum*, 71, n. 7,

bark, and a scepter made of papyrus.¹³ Carabas was saluted, received appeals for justice, and consulted on state affairs. Flaccus refused to support the Jews against the mob.¹⁴ Images¹⁵ were subsequently placed in the synagogues by the Alexandrians.¹⁶ Violence then erupted between Jews and Alexandrians, and the pogrom followed.¹⁷

In virtually every modern source consulted, this episode is either totally ignored as the direct cause of the pogrom¹⁸ or perceived as a relatively superficial cause of the pogrom, no more, indeed, than the spark that ignited it—in Thucydidean terms,¹⁹ as an αἰτία (a direct

followed by Katherine Blouin, *Le conflit judéo-alexandrin de 38–41: l'identité juive à l'épreuve* (Paris: l'Harmattan, 2005), 82, n. 245, on Marin as the equivalent of the modern use of the terms *duce* or *Führer*.

- 13 Sandra Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 CE and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction* (Leiden-Boston: E. J. Brill, 2009), 159, notes that that there was an historical logic to this display given that Agrippa until recently had been a penniless wretch. Also plausible is her suggestion that Isidorus who had witnessed Agrippa's change of fortune was the likely organizer of this demonstration.

- 14 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 40.

- 15 The images (εἰκόνας) in Philo, *In Flac.* 41, are not identified with any particular personage but are generally presumed to have been representations of Caligula. Thus van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*; 134; E. Mary Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 239–40; Pelletier, *In Flaccum*, 73; Erich Gruen, *Diaspora: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1998), 55–64; Kerkeslager, "Agrippa I," 395, on the contrary maintains that the images were of the emperor's late sister Drusilla.

- 16 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 41.44.

- 17 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 55ff.

- 18 Modern authorities who ignore discussion of Agrippa's role include Marcus Brann, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Agrippa I"; Hyman G. Evelow, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Caligula"; Isaiah Gafni, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. "Alexandria"; Menachem Stern, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. "Caligula"; Edna Elazari, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. "Agrippa I"; Joseph G. Milne, "Egyptian Nationalism and Greek and Roman Rule," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14. 3–4 (1928): 231; H. Idris Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco Roman Egypt* (Liverpool: University Press, 1953), 41; Naphtali Lewis, *Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 29; Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Penguin, 2007), 421, and Martin Goodman, *The Roman World 44 BC–AD 180* (London: Routledge, 1997), 269, who totally ignores Agrippa's visit within the context of Agrippa and Alexandria; Alan Bowman and Martin Goodman, "Alexandria" and "Judaea," *Cambridge Ancient History* 10, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 701, 744–55; Allen Kerkeslager, s.v. "Agrippa I," *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 613.

- 19 Thuc. 1, 23.5–6.

cause) as opposed to an ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις (the truest, i.e., long-term cause).²⁰ This minimalist interpretation of Agrippa's intervention is likely based upon the ancient testimony, which tends to downplay or

- 20 Leo Fuchs, *Die Juden Aegyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit* (Vienna: M. Rath Verlag, 1924), 20–21, barely comments upon Agrippa's role. Theodor C. M. Mommson, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, trans. William P. Dickson (London: Scribners and Sons, 1887), 2, 190, describes Agrippa's visit as a "trifling occasion." Similar views in Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius*, 130–31; Box, *Philonis Alexandrini in Flaccum*, xl–xlii; E. Mary Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini, Legatio ad Gaium* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 17–19; Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 237–38. On the "spark that ignited an increasingly tense situation," see Herbert A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 127; Anthony A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 186; Tessa Rajak, "Agrippa," *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. s. v. "Agrippa"; Pieter W. van der Horst, "The First Pogrom: Alexandria 38 CE," *European Review* 10.4 (2002): 483; van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 33. Bell, *Juden und Griechen*, 18, describes the Agrippa incident as relatively insignificant ("ein verhältnismässig unbedeutender Zwischenfall"). H. Idris Bell, "Egypt under the Early Principate," *Cambridge Ancient History* 10 (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), 310, where Alexandrian Jews and not Agrippa provoke the riot. H. Idris Bell, "Anti-Semitism in Alexandria," *Journal of Roman Studies* 3 (1941): 5, where the Agrippa incident is considered a "trivial, more or less accidental cause." Victor Tcherikover in Victor Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* I (Harvard: University Press, 1957), 65, on Agrippa's chance visit as a "pretext for violent agitation amongst the Alexandrian mob." Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* I, rev. and ed. Geza Vermes et al. (Edinburgh: T. S. T. Clark Ltd, 1973), 390, views Agrippa's visit as a signal for the outbreak of the pogrom. Emil Schürer, *Jewish Encyclopedia*. s.v. "Alexandria" on the Agrippa incident as a prelude to the riot and pogrom. Aryeh Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 20, on Agrippa's arrival as "unexpected"; Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities* 18–20 (London, Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann, Harvard University Press, 1965), 152, on Agrippa's visit as the "immediate cause for strife"; Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 115, on the visit as a pretext; Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 77, viewing Agrippa's visit as a "mere catalyst"; Arthar Ferrill, *Caligula: Emperor of Rome* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991), 145, and Peter Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes towards the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 139, on Agrippa's original intention to enter Rome incognito, implying its original insignificance. The view that the Agrippa incident was a mere pretext is also found in Joseph Mélèze Modrezejewski, *The Jews of Egypt from Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian*, trans. Robert Cornman (Philadelphia, Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 169. The incident is dismissed by Kerkeslager, "Agrippa I," 370, as "a crude piece of impromptu entertainment." See also Gil Gambash, reviewing Gambetti's *The Alexandria Riots in Scripta Classica Israelica* 32 (2013): 283, noting that "Agrippa's vilification in the Gymnasium adds little to our understanding of the reasons for the tension."

even dismiss the event's long-term significance. Thus, Josephus, in his discussion of the pogrom at Alexandria in the *Jewish Antiquities*,²¹ is succinct, concentrating his attention to Jewish Diaspora affairs upon events in the city of Rome.²² Hence, the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Tiberius in 19 CE, no minor event but clearly secondary in magnitude and importance to the first anti-Jewish pogrom in Western history in Alexandria, is allotted more attention and importance than the Alexandrian crisis,²³ where discussion of Agrippa's intervention is conspicuously absent. The brevity of treatment of the crisis in Alexandria and silence on Agrippa's role in the incident are initially surprising, given that Josephus was no stranger to Alexandria and to its Jewish community. After the fall of Jotapata and Josephus' surrender to Vespasian, Josephus informs us²⁴ that he accompanied Vespasian to Alexandria where he met and married an Alexandrian, who became the historian's second wife. Moreover, the evidence of the *Contra Apionem* indicates that Josephus was far from a stranger to the chief currents of Alexandrian intellectual opinion directed against the Jews in the first part of the first century CE.²⁵ Josephus' silence about Agrippa's role preceding the outbreak of violence and about the Carabas incident is particularly surprising.²⁶ Josephus, after all, wrote extensively about Agrippa in the *Jewish Antiquities*,²⁷ discussing both his early rather reckless life, spent largely at Rome, and the brief period when he was king in Judaea. In the light of Josephus' ample and broad interest in Agrippa, the inevitable question posed is: why would the historian pass over what seems, from Philo's narrative, to constitute an intervention by Agrippa in Alexandrian affairs, which had such major repercussions?²⁸

21 Jos., *AJ* 18.257–60.

22 In addition, Jos., *BJ* 2. 487, maintains somewhat unconvincingly that strife between the Jews and the Alexandrians went back to Alexander.

23 Jos., *AJ* 18.81–83.

24 Jos., *Vita*, 416.

25 See Menachem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1974), 382 and 386; Gruen, *Heritage of Hellenism*, 45–72.

26 Agrippa is covered relatively sketchily in the *BJ* 2.206–220.

27 Jos., *AJ* 18.126–252; 19.236–353.

28 Van der Horst, *The First Pogrom*, 470, conversely maintains, surprisingly in my view, that Josephus' brevity suggests that Philo exaggerated the significance of the pogrom.

Turning to the testimony of Philo's *In Flaccum*, the only narrative source of Agrippa's visit and the humiliating Carabas incident, the event is depicted as little more than a spark that ignited the subsequent crisis. Agrippa's arrival is described²⁹ as a matter of chance (συντυχία τις). A similar view of the Jewish monarch's arrival is sustained in a brief reference in the *Legatio ad Gaium*,³⁰ wherein Agrippa chanced to visit the city (ἐκ τύχης γὰρ ἐπεδήμησε τῇ πόλει). Thus, the king's appearance is perceived as an event quite independent of the schism between Jews and Alexandrians. The insignificance of Agrippa's intervention is, moreover, underlined by three facts furnished by Philo: Agrippa is described as coming to Alexander only on the friendly suggestion of the emperor because it was the speedier route to take;³¹ Agrippa, in order to avoid publicity, made his entry by night as unobtrusively as possible;³² and Agrippa appears to have departed shortly afterwards, as there are no other references to him in Philo until he reappears pleading the cause of the Jews before Gaius in the *Legatio ad Gaium*.³³

Three difficulties lead us to question Philo's thesis that Agrippa's visit was a matter of mere chance.³⁴ In the first place, there is some reason to believe that the description of Agrippa's entry into Alexandria is formulaic. As Willrich noted long ago,³⁵ this passage bears a

29 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 25.

30 Philo, *Leg.*, 179.

31 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 26.

32 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 27.

33 Philo, *Leg.*, 261–333.

34 Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 74, anticipates me in voicing suspicion regarding the historicity of Philo's overall thesis. Aryeh Kasher, reviewing Schwartz's *Agrippa I* in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 84.2–3 (1994): 331, sustains the veracity of Philo's account on the grounds a) that Philo possessed moral integrity, and b) was an eyewitness of the events that he described. Against such reasoning, I suggest that eyewitness accounts ought not to be automatically absolved of bias. As regards the issue of moral integrity, I can only emphasize that philosophic truth is not inevitably compatible with historical truth. Certainly Joseph G. Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (London: Methuen, 1898), 29, suspected that Agrippa I and, indeed, Agrippa II were more profoundly involved with the Jewish-Alexandrian schism than Philo was willing to admit. At the same time, the same scholar, in "Egyptian Nationalism under Greek and Roman Rule," ignores totally Agrippa's role in igniting the pogrom.

35 Hugo Willrich, "Caligula," *Klio* 3 (1903): 402, n. 3, followed by Fuchs, *Die Juden Aegyptens*, 21, n. 1.

striking resemblance to Philo's account of Bassus' later arrival to arrest Flaccus:³⁶ an emphasis on a rapid passage; a wait at the island of Pharos; the late afternoon arrival; the order to the pilot to remain at sea until sunset; and the avoidance of ostentation by both figures. Accordingly, the validity of Philo's account of Agrippa's chance visit to Alexandria is questionable since it seems to be based upon a template.

Secondly, the argument that Philo presents regarding the advice given to Agrippa by the emperor that determined Agrippa's decision to visit Alexandria quite by chance³⁷ is unsustainable on three counts. In the first place, had Agrippa awaited the Etesian winds before embarking at Dicaearchia (Puteoli) for Alexandria, this would have entailed considerable delay and, in fact, rendered the journey by the southern route the longer route.³⁸ Moreover, such reasoning would run counter to all we know about Agrippa's tendency to idle away time while in Rome.³⁹ Finally, at a later point in the narrative, Philo⁴⁰ admits that Gaius did more than simply advise Agrippa to take the Alexandrian route. Indeed, Philo admits that Gaius "compelled" (ἡνάγκαζεν) rather than suggested that Agrippa travel to his Palestinian kingdom via Alexandria.⁴¹ Once again, we are led to believe that much more than a quirk of fate brought Agrippa to Alexandria.

Thirdly, and most importantly, Philo may have reinforced his marginalization of Agrippa's role by deliberately excluding, and therefore actually expunging, significant evidence from his narrative pertaining to Agrippa's importance as an agent of the emperor sent to intervene in the Alexandrian schism, a phenomenon suggesting that the appearance

36 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 110.

37 Box, *Philonis Alexandrini in Flaccum* xl, describing Gaius' advice as "fussy interference."

38 See Kushnir-Stein, "On the Visit," 231; though against, see van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 116, following the implicit support for the emperor's suggestion in the works of Lionel Casson. See Lionel Casson, *The Ancient Mariners* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 236; Lionel Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971), 297; Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), 158.

39 Thus Kerkeslager, "Agrippa I," 369.

40 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 31.

41 See Kushnir-Stein, "On the Visit," 228.

of Agrippa at Alexandria was more than a matter of mere chance. This information, which is only admitted at a later point, includes details about the emperor's conferral of praetorian status marked by the bestowal of the στρατηγικαὶ τιμαὶ (i.e., *ornamenta praetoria*) upon Agrippa⁴² and about his meeting with the *Gerousia*, the representative council of the Jews. We are told that the purpose of this meeting was to deal with a letter that the council had sent congratulating Gaius on his elevation as emperor, the dispatch of which Flaccus had impeded.⁴³ Agrippa subsequently forwarded this letter to the emperor with another letter explaining the delay along with an additional document written by Agrippa underlying the injustice that marked the attack upon the Jews.⁴⁴ Together Gaius' conferment of praetorian status upon Agrippa and Agrippa's meeting with the Jewish community suggest that Agrippa went to Alexandria both on imperial business and to meet with the Jews of the city, not simply to expedite passage to his new kingdom.⁴⁵ Moreover, Philo makes no mention of a formal procession of the Jews of Alexandria in the city with Agrippa at its head within its proper chronological context. This omission certainly sustains the impression given by Philo that Agrippa's visit to Alexandria had no other purpose than to pass through the city as speedily as possible *en route* to his Palestinian kingdom. Only later, within the context of a reference by Flaccus' companions to the attention that Agrippa's bodyguard of spearmen being "decked in armour overlaid with gold and silver" inspired,⁴⁶ are we made aware of the fact that there was an ostentatious procession of Agrippa and the Jews of Alexandria that led to the procession of the mock king Carabas and the outbreak of the pogrom.⁴⁷

42 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 40.

43 Smallwood, *Legatio*, 16, argues that Flaccus' failure to dispatch the letter was a genuine error.

44 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 103; *Leg.*, 179.

45 See Kushnir-Stein, "On the Visit," 238, who believes that the chronological misplacement of the episode of Agrippa's meeting with the Jewish *gerousia* was deliberate.

46 Philo, *In Flacc.*, 30.

47 See Smallwood, *Legatio*, 18, on Philo's passing over the incident "as if aware that it made a wrong psychological approach to the situation"; similarly Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, 238.

The seeming difficulties posed by both Josephus' elimination and Philo's marginalization of Agrippa's important role in Alexandria are easily explained. Josephus' decision to minimize the significance of the Alexandrian crisis, concentrate on Rome as a Diaspora center, and specifically ignore Agrippa's intervention in Alexandria scarcely needs lengthy explanation. It is evident that for Josephus, a resident of Rome intimate with the Flavians, who, indeed, were his patrons⁴⁸ in the years following the collapse of the northern campaign of the Jewish War, the affairs of the city of Rome were of greater importance than those of Alexandria, notwithstanding Alexandria's pre-eminence as a Jewish center in the Roman world.⁴⁹ In this context, the superficial and brief treatment of the Alexandrian crisis by the Jewish historian, and the omission of any reference to Agrippa's role in the crisis are readily explained. It, moreover, stands to reason that precisely because Josephus eulogized Agrippa in his lengthy assessment of the Jewish king, he would have been disinclined to discuss Agrippa's Alexandrian intervention as a cause of the pogrom that could have compromised the historian's amenable portrayal of Agrippa.⁵⁰ The picture of Agrippa as a troublemaker in Alexandria would undoubtedly have diluted Josephus' overall positive depiction of Agrippa. Further, there is little doubt that if Agrippa II, Josephus' benefactor at Rome,⁵¹ was still living at the time that Josephus wrote about the Alexandrian crisis in the *Jewish Antiquities*, such a compromising portrait of Agrippa as a fomenter of violence in a major city of the Roman Empire would not have appealed to the Jewish monarch. Even if Agrippa II was no longer alive when Josephus

48 The evidence is Jos., *Vita*, 361–66, and *CAp.*, 1.50; though see the caution of Tessa Rajak, *Josephus* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 164.

49 On the importance of the city of Rome to Josephus, see H. St John Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929), 68.

50 Josephus' account of Agrippa's earlier years, of course, contains material less than flattering to Agrippa. The fact, however, remains that he never censures Agrippa and utilizes every avenue at his disposal to excuse Agrippa's less attractive traits. See Alla Kushnir-Stein, "Agrippa I and Josephus," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22 (2000): 153–61.

51 See Jos., *Vita*, 362–66; Thackeray, *Josephus*, 23; Roland J. H. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London: SPCK, 1961), 22–23; Rajak, *Josephus*, 164.

described the Alexandrian civil strife, respect for his former patron likely impelled Josephus to avoid discussion of Agrippa's questionable role in Alexandrian internal affairs at the time of his visit of 38 CE.

Philo's underestimation of Agrippa's intervention in the affairs of Alexandria, as a chance occurrence leading to the outbreak of hostilities between Alexandrians and Jews, can be equally easily accounted for. Overestimation of Agrippa's role would, quite simply, have jarred with the chief thesis that Philo was attempting to propagate, namely that all the trouble in Alexandria emanated from the enemies of the Jews—the prefect Flaccus, the Greek leaders of Alexandria Isidorus, Lampon and Dionysius, the Alexandrian mob and, to a more limited extent, the emperor Gaius.⁵² Casting Agrippa as an agitator would undoubtedly have weakened the strength of Philo's thesis laying the blame for the pogrom entirely on the enemies of the Jews. Moreover, in the *Legatio*, Agrippa is depicted as a positive force working responsibly for the Jewish cause. Depiction of Agrippa as a provocative and negative force would most certainly have undermined this estimate of Agrippa. Hence, there developed the need on Philo's part in the *In Flaccum* to minimize the significance of the incident and dispose of Agrippa's presence as expeditiously as possible.⁵³

Given my conclusion that Agrippa's visit to Alexandria was more important than Philo conveyed and was far from circumstantial, I am obliged to offer an alternative solution to Philo's assessment of the reasons for Agrippa's presence in and purpose in Egypt.

52 On the didactic nature of both the *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, see Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 40; Kushnir-Stein, "On the Visit," 51, 227; van der Horst, "The First Pogrom: Alexandria 38 CE," 469, 472–73; van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 1–2, 14. This leads Kushnir-Stein, "On the Visit," 237, to what seems to me to be a somewhat extreme conclusion that Philo concocted the idea that Gaius influenced Agrippa to travel to his kingdom via Alexandria. What I do believe is that while Gaius' friendly advice was concocted, this cannot be said of the compulsive character of this advice also attributed to Caligula. My reason for believing this is that the element of compulsion manifested by Gaius occurs in a later incidental context where the didactic element is absent.

53 This defensive attitude on Philo's part accounts for the statement (*In Flacc.*, 28) that Agrippa, having visited Alexandria before, was not impelled to come to the city to sightsee. Thus van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 119.

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Приобрести книгу можно

в интернет-магазине

«Электронный универс»

e-Univers.ru