Rome’s acquisition of a territorial empire in the eastern Mediterranean between the mid second and the mid first century BCE put all the numerous Diaspora communities of Greece, the Aegean islands, Crete, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Syria, and Cyrenaica under her rule. The annexation of Egypt in 30 BCE, closing the only gap in the ring of provinces bordering the Mediterranean, brought into the empire what was probably the largest of all Diaspora communities at the time, that of Alexandria, as well as many smaller Jewish settlements up-country in Egypt. In the west the Jewish community in Rome, apparently dating back at least to the mid second century, was dramatically enlarged in 62 BCE when Pompey returned from eastern campaigns which had included the capture of Jerusalem with thousands of Jewish prisoners-of-war, who were sold into slavery after walking in his triumphal procession and later, on regaining their freedom by manumission, settled permanently in the city.

With the annexation of the province of Judaea in CE 6, all Jews except the Babylonian Diaspora were under Roman rule. The pax Romana and the improvements in communications which followed the expansion of Roman power throughout the Mediterranean world facilitated movement and the development of Diaspora communities in Italy and the western provinces. No date or origin can be assigned to the numerous settlements eventually known in the west, and some may have been founded as a result of the dispersal of Palestinian Jews after the revolts of CE 66–70 and 132–5, but it is reasonable to conjecture that many, such as the settlement in Puteoli attested in 4 BCE,\(^1\) went back to the late republic or early empire and originated in voluntary emigration and the lure of trade and commerce. No accurate estimate can be made of the numerical size of the Diaspora in the Roman period, but it is clear that in the eastern provinces at least, Jews formed a significant portion of Rome’s subjects.

---
\(^1\) Jos., \textit{Ant.} xvii.328 and \textit{Bell.} ii.104 (Dicaearchia = Puteoli); see M. H. Williams, \textit{The Jews among the Greeks and Romans}, passages 1.28 (and n. 18), 1.74, vi.120. Sources translated with comment in this book are relevant throughout chapter 6.
The ability of the Diaspora Jews to resist assimilation into the gentile environment, except in the superficial matter of language assimilation for everyday contacts, and their refusal to compromise their religion by making modifications in their own practices or concessions to paganism, produced closely knit, exclusive groups. Exclusiveness bred unpopularity, which in its turn bred antisemitism. In taking over the administration of countries with Diaspora communities, Rome automatically took over the problem of antisemitism and with it the necessity of formulating a Jewish policy. In handling a religious minority which would countenance neither compromise nor assimilation and which, moreover, was liable to be at odds with its gentile neighbours, the alternatives facing Rome were suppression on the one hand and on the other toleration reinforced by active measures of protection against gentile molestation. There was no call for the suppression of Judaism, since as a cult it fulfilled the Roman criteria for permitted survival: it was morally unobjectionable and, among the Diaspora, politically innocuous. It was therefore accorded toleration in the late republican period, followed by positive protection when a charter of Jewish religious liberty was formulated by Julius Caesar and reaffirmed, with some extensions, by Augustus. The legislation of Caesar and Augustus established Judaism as a religio licita, an authorized cult, throughout the empire, the status which it was to retain for over three centuries apart from a brief period of restriction under Hadrian.

Toleration involved granting the Jews ad hoc exemptions from specific Roman requirements which caused them religious embarrassment. The earliest concerned the Temple-tax, first heard of in a Roman context in 88 BCE, when a large sum collected in Asia Minor and awaiting shipment to Jerusalem was looted by Mithridates. When, some time before 63 BCE, Rome prohibited the export of precious metals from the empire, an exception was evidently made in favour of the Diaspora to enable them to pay their Temple-tax. For one of the counts against Lucius Valerius Flaccus, proconsul of Asia in 62 BCE, at his trial for maladministration was that he had illegally rescinded the Jews’ privilege in his province and confiscated the Temple-tax collected in four cities. But he enjoys an almost unique position as a Roman official who flouted a Jewish right. Normally Rome’s representatives stood as the Jews’ defenders.

A second exemption was granted in 49 BCE and extended in 43, when recruiting was in progress in the east during the Roman civil wars. Though

---

3 Tertullian’s phrase in Apologeticus xxi.1; it is not found in any contemporary document.
5 Cicero, Pro Flacco xxviii.66–9.
6 See below, p. 181 for A. Avillius Flaccus in Egypt.
conscription into the Roman army had by then largely been replaced by voluntary enlistment, it could still be applied in times of crisis. Since dietary laws and Sabbath observance inevitably made military service in gentile units difficult or impossible for Jews, the Roman official in charge of recruiting in Asia Minor in 49 responded to an appeal by exempting practising Jews who held Roman citizenship from call-up into the legions. The numbers involved will surely have been too small to have made any appreciable difference, but the Roman action is significant as evidence that it was considered worthwhile to conciliate the Diaspora in the area by a gesture of sympathy towards their religion. When the question recurred in 43, the exemption was extended to non-citizen Jews who might otherwise have been called upon for non-legionary service.7

Meanwhile, shortly before his death in 44 BCE, Julius Caesar had replaced isolated exemptions by comprehensive legislation giving the Jews positive rights and putting the practice of Judaism in all its aspects on a legal footing. This had been necessitated by a problem which had arisen in the capital itself. For convenience Rome classified the separate synagogues into which a Jewish community of any size, such as that in Rome had recently become, divided itself as collegia, artisans’ social and mutual benefit clubs, though in fact the resemblance was confined to the possession of funds and the holding of meetings open to members only; synagogues had wider functions (administrative, educational and judicial) in relation to their members than collegia, and though individually autonomous like collegia, they jointly comprised the wider whole of the Jewish community in the city and formed a part of worldwide Jewry; and membership was both automatic for and exclusive to Jews and proselytes without question of admission on application. The collegia had for some years been misused for subversive political purposes and had developed into such a public nuisance that Caesar had them all disbanded except those of reputable antiquity and social respectability.8 The latter included the synagogues, and the Jews’ rights were then explicitly spelled out: they were authorized to build ‘prayer-houses’, to assemble for Sabbath services and festivals, and to collect and transmit the Temple-tax; their Scriptures and Temple-tax were declared sacrosanct, theft or damage by Gentiles being punishable as sacrilege; and their freedom of conscience as individuals was protected by exemption from summonses to law on the Sabbath, when they would lose their cases by default. This legislation, called for by the situation in Rome, was made of universal validity, since the basic identity of the position and needs of all Diaspora communities

7 Jos., Ant. xiv.223–34.
8 Suetonius, Divus Iulius xlii.3. For discussion see Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule, p. 135, n. 52 and (against the view that synagogues were classified as collegia) Williams, ‘The Structure of the Jewish Community in Rome’, 216–21.
gave no grounds for discrimination between one group and another in the empire, and Josephus quotes a number of documents from the time of Caesar laying down Jewish privileges in various cities in the province of Asia. Small wonder that Jews were conspicuous among the international crowd of mourners round Caesar’s funeral pyre in the forum.

During the political chaos which followed the murder of Caesar his ban on *collegia* lapsed. When the emperor Augustus found it advisable to re-impose it and to disband illegally re-established *collegia*, the synagogues, as old and legally authorized associations, received continued exemption on the same terms as before. But Augustus also made additions to the Jewish charter of religious liberty. By that time the descendants of Pompey’s war captives were acquiring Roman citizenship and so becoming eligible for the monthly ‘corn-doles’ to the poorer citizens which were a feature of the Roman social scene. Augustus enacted that if the distribution fell on a Sabbath, the share due to Jewish citizens should be held over until the next day. Two exemptions then completed Jewish privileges: the temporary exemption from military service granted in the east during the civil wars was made both universal and permanent; and the Jews were excused participation in the imperial cult which was in process of being established throughout the empire. Any attempt to force emperor-worship on a protected, monotheistic cult would have been a contradiction in terms, and just as the new cult was not introduced into the province of Judaea in CE 6, so for the Diaspora exemption was so automatic and integral an item in their religious freedom that the privilege, though implicit at every turn, is nowhere explicitly laid down.

The legislation of Caesar and Augustus putting Judaism in a position of privilege did not kill antisemitic feeling but may even have exacerbated it by adding jealousy to existing gentile emotions towards the Jews. The latter part of Augustus’ principate saw a crop of appeals by Jewish delegations to Roman officials in the east, and on one occasion to the emperor himself, against local attacks on their position in the provinces of Asia and Cyrenaica. Friction over the civic status which Jewish settlers had attained in Greek cities before the Roman period may have lain behind the hostility which the Greeks now manifested in infringements of Jewish rights, but where religious privileges were called in question the chief bone of contention between the Jews and the local municipal authorities was the Temple-tax, which was repeatedly confiscated on various pretexts,

---


10 Suetonius, *Divus Augustus* xxxii.1; Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 136–7; 311–16.

11 Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 158.

12 This is implied by the complaint against compulsory military service in Jos. *Ant.* xvi.28.

13 To be discussed below, p. 177.
while the emissaries carrying the actual cash to Jerusalem were an obvious prey for freebooters despite Roman declarations that they should be allowed to travel unmolested. In every case Rome answered the appeal with decrees reasserting Jewish rights, and her determination to enforce her own rulings on the position of the Diaspora seems eventually to have come home to the Greeks.\(^\text{14}\) The latest extant Roman decree dates from CE 2/3, and after that the silence of history witnesses, albeit not conclusively, to the establishment of at least a modus vivendi, even if not of racial harmony, between Jew and gentile in the two provinces.

I JEWS IN ROME

The Roman Diaspora, living under the eye of the central government, escaped the problem of the hostility of jealous gentile cities; but they present a different, and at first sight surprising, picture, occasionally suffering repressive action from the very authorities who were pledged to the protection of their religious liberty. Trouble had first occurred almost a century before Caesar’s legislation, when in 139 BCE the Jewish community in Rome, which must then have been very small, is said to have been expelled for activities which seem to have involved or consisted of attempts to proselytize among the Romans.\(^\text{15}\) The close coincidence of date between this event and the embassy from Simon Maccabaeus seeking a renewal of the alliance between Rome and the Jews suggests some connection between them,\(^\text{16}\) and the explanation of the expulsion may be that Rome’s favourable reception of the embassy suggested approval of the Jewish religion and encouraged the local residents to undertake some propaganda on behalf of their religion, but that Rome, though ready to support Judaea politically as a diplomatic move against Syria, had no wish to see an oriental cult getting a foothold among Italians. If so, this early attack on proselytism set a precedent which was to be followed for centuries.

From the second half of the first century BCE until at least the late first century CE the main area of Jewish residence in Rome was the north bank of the Tiber (modern Trastevere), which Philo describes as being ‘owned and inhabited by Jews, the majority of them Roman freedmen’:\(^\text{17}\) The oldest and largest of the Jewish catacombs so far discovered in Rome, at

\(^{14}\) Jos. Ant. xvi.27–60; 160–78.

\(^{15}\) Valerius Maximus i.iii.3 (surviving only in the fourth- or fifth-century CE epitomes of Julius Paris and Nepotianus discussed by Goodman, Mission, 82–3; Carleton Paget, ‘Jewish Proselytism’, 87).

\(^{16}\) The embassy appears to be dated 139 BCE in 1 Maccabees, but may be put back to 142 BCE on prosopographical grounds; see T. R. S. Broughton, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic (New York 1951), 1, p. 476, n. 1, cf. p. 491, n. 2.

\(^{17}\) Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 155.
Monteverde in Trastevere, was in use from the first century BCE until the time of Diocletian. It was only from the Flavian period onwards, when prisoners taken in the two Palestinian revolts swelled Jewish numbers, that settlements of any size were established on the left bank of the river and that catacombs were dug there for their convenience. The average social and economic level of Roman Jews seems to have remained consistently low. Literary allusions to them may be biased and selective, but the poor quality of most of the epitaphs from the Jewish catacombs, in material, style, spelling and syntax alike, point to a lack of both money and education, and only a small proportion of the burials rise to epitaphs even of this standard. (It is of interest to note in passing that a mere quarter of the epitaphs are in Latin, while the rest, except for a negligible number in Hebrew or Aramaic, are in Greek; the koiné of the emigrants’ homeland was evidently kept alive for this purpose, though it can hardly have been in everyday use.) The prosperous Jew, envied for his wealth, was a figure of the mediaeval world, not of the Roman.

The catacomb inscriptions preserve the names of eleven synagogues in Rome. Some simply designate localities, but others are the names of patrons, and of these the most significant is the ‘synagogue of the Augustans’. What, if anything, the imperial patronage amounted to in practice is unknown, but the choice of the name clearly recorded the Jews’ gratitude for Augustus’ protection of their rights. The patron of the ‘synagogue of the Agrippans’ is most likely to have been Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa who, as a friend of Herod the Great and Augustus’ viceroy in the east in 14 BCE, had answered one of the appeals of the Diaspora against gentile molestation discussed above (though the Jewish king Agrippa I is also a possibility). The Jews in Rome gave spontaneous testimony to their contentment and sense of security there when in 4 BCE eight thousand of them (evidence, incidentally, for the size of the community) supported a delegation from Judaea requesting direct rule for the country after Herod’s death.

This harmony, however, was to be broken before long. In CE 19, under Augustus’ successor Tiberius, a decree was passed by the senate conscripting four thousand Jews and proselytes in Rome for military service against brigands in Sardinia, and expelling the rest of the community, under pain of reduction to slavery without the possibility of subsequent manumission, unless they gave up their ‘outlandish rites’ by a certain date.

---

19 Tacitus, Annals ii.lxxv, 5; Suetonius, Tiberius xxxvi.1. The phrase ‘of the freedman class’ by which Tacitus describes the conscripts presumably covers the descendants of freedmen, since four thousand actual manumitted slaves would presuppose an impossibly large Jewish community in Rome.
The inclusion of proselytes in the order together with the offer of immunity from expulsion to apostates (likely to appeal more to proselytes than to Jews) shows that the Roman objection to Judaism at this point was religious, not racial. (It will therefore be clear that we have used the term antisemitism in this chapter without racial connotation: anti-Judaism might be more appropriate. ‘The basic cause of Greco-Roman anti-Semitism lay in Jewish separatism. This means, in the last analysis, that it lay in their religion, since the religion produced the separatism. Any racist element was entirely lacking.”)\(^{20}\)

The community at large can have been guilty of no indictable offence, if last-minute apostasy could save them; and the simultaneous expulsion of the devotees of the Egyptian cult of Isis marks the decree as a measure towards the religious purification of the city. The only reason given for it is a large-scale Jewish proselytizing campaign, and the immediate episode said to have provoked it was a confidence trick played on a wealthy proselyte from the Roman nobility by four scoundrels from Judaea, who extracted expensive gifts for the Temple from her and then absconded with their loot.\(^{21}\) At this period Gentiles who were finding formal state religious cults inadequate for their emotional and spiritual needs were in search of more satisfying substitutes, and while some turned to philosophy or eastern mystery religions, others turned to Judaism, though loose adherence to the synagogue by the adoption of monotheism, Sabbath-observance, food laws, and the main requirements of the moral code was probably commoner than full commitment to Judaism by circumcision. The conversion of Greeks or Syrians to Judaism probably mattered little in Roman eyes, and as long as proselytism in Italy had been largely confined to the lower strata of society, to which most Jews belonged, it had apparently been ignored of late. But now it had penetrated the Roman upper classes, and the conversion of a lady of rank was both conspicuous and disturbing to a conservative emperor; in itself it set an undesirable precedent, while the swindle revealed the risks run by wealthy converts. Steps were therefore taken to discourage proselytism by removing potential preachers of the faith from Rome, to encourage recantation by the offer of a free pardon, and to deter would-be converts by the sight of the punishment of obdurate proselytes along with Jews.

An expulsion order could be served only on aliens, who technically lacked the right of residence. Jews and proselytes with Roman citizenship could not be summarily ejected, and it was to circumvent this difficulty


\(^{21}\) Dio Cassius xvii.xviii.5a; Jos., *Ant.* xviii.64–84; see Carleton Paget, ‘Jewish Proselytism’, 88–90.
that the Jewish privilege of exemption from military service was withdrawn locally and temporarily and that conscription, a rare measure now, was applied to them. But despite the use of the double-edged sword of conscription combined with expulsion, a considerable number of Jews must have fallen outside the scope of the decree – all Jewesses with Roman citizenship, any male citizens who were above or below military age, and Jewish slaves under their owners’ control.

Philo credits Tiberius’ potent minister Sejanus with an antisemitic policy and a barely credible scheme for the extermination of all Jews in the empire, a scheme foiled in the nick of time by his downfall and death in CE 31. The measures against the Roman Diaspora just related were not a part of this, since Sejanus was not the power behind the throne as early as CE 19, and the nature of the ‘upheaval’ in Italy which Sejanus’ threat created is not recorded. But the danger passed and the security of the Jews’ position was restored when Tiberius reacted to Sejanus’ death with a reaffirmation of their religious liberty and the issue of orders to provincial governors to protect them. There is no inherent contradiction between this action and the measure of twelve years earlier. Rather, two complementary facets of the Roman attitude towards the Jews are here displayed: their universal right to practise their religion was recognized, but Roman protection was implicitly conditional on their conforming to normal standards of social behaviour, and if they traded on their privileges locally to contravene Roman law or to endanger public order or morality, they came under the penalties of the law; any resultant loss of privilege, however, was purely local and temporary, without effect on the overall rights and position of the Jews and Judaism elsewhere.

The duration of the Jews’ military service and exclusion from Rome is not recorded, but it is possible that Tiberius’ repudiation of Sejanus’ antisemitic policy was the signal for their return to Rome. They were certainly back in large numbers by CE 41, when they again came under restrictions. In the first year of his reign the emperor Claudius deprived them of their right of assembly. Their offence is not stated, but a gratuitous attack by an emperor who, however eccentric, was just and humane, is unlikely, and the link made by Dio Cassius, our sole authority for the episode, between this measure and a further ban on the perennial troublemakers, the collegia, suggests police action in the face of some kind of disorder.

23 Some scholars conflate this episode with that of 49 (below), some accepting 41 as the date and others 49. Others posit two episodes. The problem is addressed concisely by Barclay, *Diaspora*, pp. 303–6; see also H. Botermann, *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius*.
24 Dio Cassius l.x.vi.6.
synagogues instead of expulsion as his method of combating it may well have been, not an increase in Jewish numbers as such in Rome (as alleged by Dio), but an increase since CE 19 in the number of Jews with Roman citizenship, which carried immunity from expulsion. In the same year, as will be shown below, Claudius was reaffirming Jewish rights in the eastern provinces, but here again, as in the case of Tiberius, there was no fundamental incompatibility between a general defence of the rights of the Diaspora and the temporary withdrawal of a single right from a single community which had so abused it as to form a threat to public security.

A few years later disorder recurred in Rome, and in CE 49 Claudius expelled ‘Jews who were continually rioting at the instigation of Chrestus’. There can be no reasonable doubt that, despite Suetonius’ misspelling of the name, the reference is to Christianity, and that the trouble was disturbances in the reopened synagogues caused by the advent of Christian missionaries – disturbances such as had resulted from Paul’s attempts to evangelize in the synagogues. The offence, in Roman eyes, lay not in Christian doctrines in themselves but in the breaches of the peace to which their preaching led. Luke, mentioning the expulsion to explain the arrival of a Christian couple from Italy in Corinth, says that Claudius had expelled ‘all the Jews’ from Rome. But apart from the fact that some, or many, of them were immune from expulsion, there is no need to take Suetonius’ sentence to mean more than that the actual disturbers of the peace were ejected (after due trial and conviction, if citizens), whether they were Jews resisting the introduction of heretical doctrines or Christian missionaries of Jewish race. The number involved need not have been large; Tacitus’ silence about the episode suggests an operation on a much smaller scale than that of CE 19.

One of the most notorious events of Nero’s reign was the great fire which devastated the greater part of Rome in CE 64 and his subsequent attack on the Christians in the city who, according to Tacitus (but to no other ancient author), fell victim to a charge of arson fabricated against them to deflect the blame for starting the fire away from the emperor himself. The intricacies of the problems raised by this ‘persecution’ lie outside the scope of this work, but it is relevant from a negative point of view. There is no suggestion anywhere that the Jews were under any threat at the time, which would seem to be evidence that even at this early date Rome already recognized Christianity as a sect distinct from and hostile to its parent Judaism, even if not yet as a fully independent religion. And it is possible that if, as writers other than Tacitus imply, the

25 Suetonius, Divus Claudius xxv.4. Orosius, Hist. adv. Paganos vii.vi.15, gives the date.
III JEWS IN THE GREEK CITIES OF THE EASTERN PROVINCES

In Rome questions of public order brought the Jews into occasional conflict with the government. In the Greek cities of the eastern provinces, however, a different situation obtained. When friction arose there during the Roman period between the Jews and the local municipal authorities, flaring up at times into active hostility and mob violence, the basic cause seems to have been tension over questions concerning the civic status of the resident Diaspora communities *vis-à-vis* the Greek citizen bodies of the host cities. A large Jewish community in a Greek city not only formed synagogues but was organized as a unit known as a *politeuma*, a quasi-autonomous civic corporation with its own council of officials, exercising administrative and judicial power over its own members independently of the municipal authorities of the city in which it was established, and forming in effect a city within a city.  

This type of self-government, attested in such major cities as Alexandria, Antioch, Sardis, Ephesus, Cyrene and Berenice, was probably standard for Jewish communities of any size in the east, and some *politeumata* dated well back into the Hellenistic period. The members of a Jewish *politeuma* could describe themselves as ‘citizens’ (*politai*) of that corporation, but the evidence of Alexandria, where conditions are known in the greatest detail, indicates that most such Jews did not possess dual citizenship: as individuals they could gain admission to the Greek citizen body while probably still retaining their membership of the *politeuma* (a few cases, such as Philo’s brother in Alexandria, are known), but the *politeuma* as a corporation stood apart from it and did not share the franchise of the city with the Greeks. Technically, therefore, the majority of the members of a Jewish *politeuma* were not integrated into the body politic of the city in which

---

27 The view that Nero’s wife was an adherent of Judaism and as such likely to have protected the Jews is questioned by E. M. Smallwood, ‘The alleged Jewish tendencies of Poppaea Sabina’, *JTS* ns 10 (1959), 320–35. Poppaea is judged a sympathizer, not a close adherent, by Williams, ‘θεοσεβῆς’.


29 For the view that *politai* designates citizens of a city, not members of a *politeuma*, see Lüderitz, ‘Politeuma?’, pp. 194–5, and Barclay, *Diaspora*, p. 65 and n. 40.
they lived but were metics (*metoeci*), aliens with the right of residence. Herein, apparently, lay the root of the friction in the Roman period: by that time in at any rate some cities the Jewish community, or a section of it, coveted admission to Greek citizenship and were engaged in agitation to have it thrown open to their *politeuma* as a body, while the Greeks, annoyed at their importunity and jealous in addition of the privileged position in which their religion stood under Roman protection, gave vent to their feelings by attacks on Jewish civic rights. The rights of the parallel Greek and Jewish civic organizations may have been roughly equivalent overall, even though not identical, but in prestige Greek citizenship will undoubtedly have ranked higher than membership of a Jewish *politeuma*, and as such have been desirable in the eyes of some Jews. But Greek citizenship involved its holder in pagan civic life, including religious ceremonial, and for this reason it cannot have been coveted by the ‘orthodox’. It was presumably the Hellenized, ‘modernist’ section of a Jewish community, less strict in its observance of the Law than the ‘orthodox’ and ready to make some sacrifice of religious principle on the altar of political and social advantage, that aspired to Greek citizenship. But even they will hardly have envisaged the complete abandonment of their religion; rather they will have hoped, selfishly, to have the best of both worlds and to enjoy concessions over features of municipal life that were in total conflict with Judaism.  

The first recorded quarrel referred to Rome for settlement was at Sardis, where in 49 BCE the Greeks seem to have called into question the Jews’ independent internal administration and jurisdiction as a means of undermining their civic position, and the Jews appealed to a Roman official in the province for redress. He responded by informing the city authorities that the status of the Jewish corporation was to remain unaltered, and a few years later, when Caesar’s legislation on Jewish religious liberty was being implemented in the eastern provinces in the form of local enactments on the same lines, Sardis uniquely confirmed the civic as well as the religious rights of her Jewish community.  

Unprovoked Greek aggression is suggested here, but a clearer picture of the situation in the province of Asia emerges with the appeal made by the Jews of Ionia as a whole in 14 BCE against gentile infringements of their religious rights. One of their grievances was that they were ‘forced to take part in civic duties and spend their sacred money on them’ despite official exemption, the nub of the complaint presumably being that the

---


32 Jos. *Ant.* xvi.28.
civic duties in question conflicted with their religion. The Greeks countered with a claim that the citizenship of their cities should be restricted to Greeks, since the Jews ‘should worship the Ionians’ gods, if they were to be their fellows’. In other words, some at least of the Jews in a number of cities were claiming admission to Greek citizenship, while the Greeks, not unreasonably, felt that such admission should entail integration into pagan civic life and that the Jews could not expect to temper the privilege of citizenship with exemption from its uncongenial features, and had accordingly tried to bring the full implications of their claim home to Jewish aspirants to citizenship by imposing financially burdensome liturgies on them. The Roman answer to this item in the Jewish appeal is given vaguely as the maintenance of the status quo; to judge from the much more fully documented situation in Alexandria, this will have consisted of confirming the legal existence of the politeuma while supporting the Greeks in refusing the Jews wholesale admission to their citizens body.

III JEWS IN EGYPT

By the time of the Roman annexation of Egypt Jews formed a high proportion of the population of the capital. Of the five districts into which Alexandria was divided, not only the one allotted to the original Jewish settlers but a second also had a preponderance of Jewish inhabitants, while smaller numbers of Jews lived in the other three also. The Greeks of Alexandria bitterly resented the humiliation of annexation, with the prefect of the province resident in their city as an ever-present reminder of it and the army of occupation stationed nearby. The Jews on the other hand, who had played a part in bringing the rule of Rome to Egypt by co-operating with her invading armies in 55 and 48/7 BCE, now benefited by coming under the protection of her law, and the divergent attitudes of the two races towards Roman domination was a factor in the deterioration of relations between them: the Greeks could give direct expression to their feelings towards Rome only by petty acts of discourtesy and insubordination aimed at the visible symbol of her power, the prefect, but they could make indirect attacks on her via her protégés, the Jews. The early principate saw the development of a Greek nationalist, anti-Roman party, from which emanated an unpleasant but entertaining minor literary genre, The Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs, of which scraps survive on papyri. Most of the fragments recount hearings of Alexandrian embassies or trials of nationalist leaders before various emperors in Rome,

Jos. Ant. xii.125–6, in a briefer account of the same episode.
in all probability basically historical events, though the accounts have been coloured up for the propaganda purpose of representing the Greeks as the fearless opponents and innocent victims of the bias and cruelty of the emperors. The strong antisemitic tone of some of the Acts is subsidiary to their primarily anti-Roman tenor.

In organizing the new province of Egypt Augustus took steps to stabilize the civic position which the Jews in Alexandria had enjoyed for over a century by having the rights of their politeuma officially set out on an inscription in the city, and he continued to keep the situation under review, intervening in the internal affairs of the politeuma in CE 11/12 to
abolish the post of ethnarch (previously its administrative and judicial head) and put the community under the possibly more democratic control of the gerousia, the council of seventy-one elders. But while the Jews had their existing political and religious rights maintained by Augustus, in one important matter they received no privilege: they apparently did not share with the Greeks of Alexandria exemption from the laographia, the capitation tax which he imposed on the adult male population of the province, or even enjoy the concession of paying at a reduced rate granted to the Greeks of the capitals of the nomes (administrative divisions of Ptolemaic Egypt). Equation with illiterate Egyptian peasants in this matter provided the wealthy, Hellenized Jews of Alexandria with both social and financial incentives for working towards the goal, already desirable on grounds of political prestige, of admission to Greek citizenship, to which the gateway was education in the gymnasium, the Greek cultural centre, as a member of the ephebate. During the early decades of the first century CE the peaceful coexistence of the two parallel civic bodies broke down when some of the Jews, going beyond mere agitation for Greek citizenship, to which the gateway was education in the gymnasium, the Greek cultural centre, as a member of the ephebate. During the early decades of the first century CE the peaceful coexistence of the two parallel civic bodies broke down when some of the Jews, going beyond mere agitation for Greek citizenship such as seems to have occurred in Asia, managed to acquire it by dubious means or began to usurp its rights in advance and to try to insinuate themselves or their sons into the ephebate.

The smouldering friction of a generation or more blazed up into open conflict in CE 38, with the personal problems of Aulus Avillius Flaccus, prefect of Egypt since 32, playing a subsidiary role in the story as told by Philo. The accession of Gaius as emperor in CE 37 made Flaccus’ position precarious because of his close association with enemies of Gaius’ family in earlier intrigues at the imperial court, and when his preoccupation with his private anxieties led to a deterioration in his hitherto admirable administration. Two of the Greek nationalist leaders, Isidorus and Lampo, conceived the cunning idea of using his fears for their own ends. The former had previously had a passage at arms with Flaccus and had been exiled for instigating hooliganism, but now, with that quarrel ostensibly forgotten, he and Lampo posed as his friends with an offer to protect him from Gaius’ vengeance (by what means Philo does not say), if in return he would hand the Jews over to their mercy. Flaccus was tempted and fell, but the appalling sequel of riot and destruction is not wholly to be laid at his door. At this point physical violence and religious persecution were not necessarily in the minds of the nationalists, who apparently merely wanted from Flaccus an enactment which would rule out any possibility of the Jews’ advancement as a

34 Philo, In Flaccum 74; cf. V. A. Tcherikover, CPJ 1, p. 57, n. 22.
35 In Flaccum, Legatio ad Gaium 120–57; Mélèze Modrzejewski, Jews of Egypt, 161–73.
community to Greek citizenship and perhaps also curtail the rights of the 
*politeuma*.

Flaccus, prudently, did not court Jewish opposition by an immediate 
attack on their position, but tried to accustom them to a reduction in 
privilege by showing bias against them in lawsuits. All hopes, however, 
that this could be quietly followed by more drastic measures in the 
nationalists’ interest were shattered when in August, CE 38, Agrippa I 
called at Alexandria en route from Rome to his kingdom. The Jews, 
bewildered by the unexplained change in Flaccus’ treatment of them, 
asked him, as a close friend of the emperor, to appeal to Rome on their 
behalf by letter. Unfortunately the king, Agrippa I, was then so misguided 
as to make a flashy parade through the city with his bodyguard, which 
nullified any good that his intervention with Gaius might have done by 
underlining the Greeks’ loss of their independent dynasty and thus goad-
ing them into an anti-Jewish demonstration. After subjecting Agrippa to 
verbal abuse, they staged a parody of his parade, using a well-known local 
idiot to act as king in mock court ceremonial.

Flaccus’ failure to stop or punish this insult to Gaius’ friend put him 
more firmly than before in the nationalists’ clutches and gave them a free 
hand for the next few weeks, and at the same time encouraged the Greek 
robbery to make a vicious assault on the Jews by attacking the synagogues 
despite their sacrosanctity under Roman law. In the parts of Alexandria 
where Jewish residents were sparse, synagogues were burnt or demol-
ished regardless of the fact that this entailed the destruction of dedica-
tions to the emperors in them, while in the two predominantly Jewish 
districts, where attempts at destruction were more likely to be resisted, 
they were desecrated by the introduction of portraits of the emperor. But 
this may have been a mere sideline in the eyes of the Greeks, whose real 
purpose was the overthrow of Jewish civic ambitions. To satisfy them on 
that score Flaccus then issued a proclamation degrading the Jews from 
the position of legal settlers, metics, on which the existence of their 
*politeuma* depended, to that of aliens without the right of residence. But 
since the expulsion of such a large community was not a practical possi-
bility, the Jews were deprived of the privilege, without legal basis, of 
residing in all parts of the city and were confined to the one district 
allotted to the original settlers, which thus became the first known ghetto 
in the ancient world. The implementation of this enactment led to serious 
rioting, as the Greeks hounded the Jews into the ghetto, torturing and 
massacring those whom they caught outside, and looting Jewish shops 
and houses. Overcrowding in the ghetto caused the outbreak of an epi-
demic, while the impossibility of continuing with normal trades and pro-
fessions led to severe economic hardship. The Jews may have retaliated
with violence, though a search for arms in their houses is said to have produced nothing; for after a vain attempt to find a way out of the anarchy by negotiation, Flaccus arrested over half the members of the gerousia and a number of other Jews. Their punishment illustrated the Jewish loss of privilege: the elders were subjected to scourging, from which Jews had previously been exempt; and this was inflicted publicly in the theatre, where the other prisoners were tortured and hanged for the entertainment of the Greeks on the emperor’s birthday.

After that climax an uneasy peace seems to have returned, and in October the Jews were partly compensated for their inability to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles properly by the satisfaction of seeing Flaccus arrested and haled off to face trial in Rome (whether for maladministration or on some other charge is not known), where his erstwhile friends Isidorus and Lampo appeared among his accusers. Under his successor the situation improved further, to at least superficial normality, but it remained basically unstable until after the murder of Gaius and the accession of Claudius early in CE 41.

Meanwhile, during the winter of CE 39–40, the two sides dispatched delegations to Rome, the Jews to seek redress for their losses and the Greeks to exculpate themselves for the recent disturbances and to request the emperor to endorse Flaccus’ relegation of the Jews to an inferior status in the city. The Greek team of five included Isidorus and the anti-Jewish writer Apion, while the Jews were led by Philo, who describes their experiences vividly. Thanks to Gaius’ occupation with other matters, the two delegations did not receive a detailed hearing until the autumn of CE 40, and little heed seems to have been paid to the memorandum which the Jews presented in the meantime setting out the wrongs they had suffered and their claims for redress – the latter perhaps going beyond a request for the reaffirmation of their religious liberty and the reinstatement of their politeuma and raising the question of the admission of their whole community to Greek citizenship as a safeguard against further attacks on their position in the city. Philo represents the interview as a farce, conducted in a mansion undergoing renovation for Gaius’ use and punctuated by tours of inspection and discussions with the building contractors. But even his tendentious account reveals that Gaius did give some consideration to the Alexandrian problems as well as complaining about the Jews’ repudiation of the imperial cult (a complaint

37 Legatio ad Gaium 172–96; 549–73.
38 For a review of opinion on the citizenship sought by this and the later Jewish delegations, see Barclay, Diaspora, pp. 63–71.
inspired by the events of recent months in Judaea) and dragging in the irrelevancy of their abstention from pork. No answer, however, was evidently given on any of the questions submitted, for they were still open when Claudius came to the throne.

The new emperor tackled them almost at once, before word can have reached him of the fresh outbreak of violence in Alexandria which had greeted the news of Gaius' death, violence in which the Jews had this time been the aggressors. In March, CE 41, after giving each delegation a hearing, he addressed an edict to Alexandria reaffirming the Jews' religious liberty and their civic rights as legal settlers in the city, and thus reinstating them in the position which they had held there before August, CE 38. This was an immediate and perhaps only provisional measure to restore stability, going no further than a return to the status quo ante and containing no word on the subject of Jewish admission to Greek citizenship. Shortly after that Claudius sought to forestall the possibility that other cities would follow Alexandria's lamentable example by issuing a general edict confirming all Jews throughout the empire in the same privileges as he had just re-established in Alexandria, but reminding them that toleration must be repaid by toleration and that privilege depended on their treating gentile cults with reciprocal respect – a point which he made to the Alexandrian Jews by sending a copy of the edict there also.

That Claudius' fear of outbreaks of trouble on the Alexandrian pattern elsewhere was no idle one became clear within a few months, when in the Greek city of Dora, on the Syrian coast, a synagogue was desecrated, apparently gratuitously, by the introduction of a portrait of Claudius; the perpetrators were roundly rebuked by the provincial legate with a citation of the imperial edict.

Claudius' edicts provided the basis for the prefect's restoration of law and order in Alexandria, but tension remained high. In a papyrus letter dated August, CE 41, a Greek warns a friend in financial straits to 'steer clear of the Jews, as everyone does'. The reference is obviously to Jewish money-lenders to whom Greeks normally had recourse but who were now unpopular; but there may be the further implication that Gentiles were at risk if they entered areas of Jewish residence.

Meanwhile the Greeks had sent another delegation to Rome, to congratulate Claudius on his accession, to refer certain municipal problems to him, and to re-open the Jewish question by complaining about the

39 Jos. Ant. xix.278–9. News will have taken at least a month to travel between Rome and Alexandria in winter.
recent attack. The Jews replied with two delegations – a puzzling duplication, but perhaps representing the internal cleavage between the ‘modernist’ party which aspired to Greek citizenship and the ‘orthodox’ section of the community which was content with the status quo. Claudius’ answer to the letters laid before him was given in a lengthy letter, published in Alexandria in November, ce 41, and preserved on a papyrus. The tone of the last section, giving his final and considered verdict on the racial problems in the city, is noticeably sharper than that of the edict penned some six months earlier. Both sides are rebuked impartially for the recent ‘war’ and warned that any recurrence of violence will bring the imperial wrath down heavily on their heads; the Greeks are admonished to treat the Jews, as residents of long standing, with courtesy and consideration, and to respect their religious liberty as recently reaffirmed; the Jews, on the other hand, are told to rest content with their present civic status in a city in which they are strictly speaking foreigners, and not to irritate the Greeks by usurping privileges which are not legally theirs. This statement on the Jewish question goes further than the edict, not merely safeguarding the Jews’ religious liberty and the existence of the politeuma but trying also to remove the underlying bone of contention between the two races by a definite rejection of Jewish aspirations to Greek citizenship. With a firm and impartial hand Claudius thus pacifies the Greeks while maintaining Rome’s traditional Jewish policy. But the final thrust in which he threatens the Jews alone with dire consequences if they disobey his injunctions and accuses them of being an empire-wide nuisance may betray exasperation at having had to deal in a single year with trouble from the Jews in Rome as well as in Alexandria and also with a coda to the Alexandrian commotions played out at his own court.

Isidorus and Lampo met their end after a trial before Claudius’ privy council, probably in May, ce 41, known only from The Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs. The dilapidated state of the papyri leaves many details obscure, but it appears that the nationalists were attempting to prosecute Agrippa I for supporting the Alexandrian Jews in subversive activities not confined to their own city. In some way, however, the attack recoiled on their own heads, perhaps because their allegations against the king laid
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them under the serious charge of calumnia (false accusation), and they were condemned to death (after Isidorus had hurled some choice abuse at Claudius), to become heroes and martyrs of the Greek nationalist tradition in Alexandria. However little truth there may be in the lively picture of the actual trial, the execution of the two men can be accepted as fact, and with the chief troublemakers eliminated, acute racial tension subsided in Alexandria for twenty-five years.

Though quiescent temporarily, however, the volcano was still active, and the ever-simmering antagonism could erupt at any moment on slight provocation. In the summer of ce 66 a series of clashes (the origin of which is not recorded) occurred, and the efforts of the prefect, Philo’s apostate nephew, Tiberius Julius Alexander, to quell them by punishment rather than by mediation only aggravated the situation. The climax came when a large crowd of Jews invaded the Greek assembly on the occasion of a debate about the dispatch of an embassy to Nero, and were correctly, if summarily, ejected. Three of them, however, were dragged off by the Greeks to be burnt alive, whereupon the Jews in revenge made for the amphitheatre, where the assembly was still in session, with firebrands. The prefect, having failed to deter them from arson by an appeal to reason, had to carry out his threat of force and send the army in under orders to disperse the rioters, with bloodshed if necessary, and to ransack the Jewish residential quarters. In this they had the enthusiastic cooperation of the Greeks, and Jewish casualties were put, no doubt with exaggeration, at fifty thousand.47 In this incident the Jews appear to have been entirely in the wrong, but possibly they had reason to suspect that the purpose of an embassy to the notoriously phil-Hellenic emperor was to re-open the question of their civic position, to their detriment, and wanted to stage a protest.

Whatever its precise genesis, this first clash between the Alexandrian Jews and Roman authority was the unintentional outcome of their perennial feud with the Greeks, and it had no detectable effect on Rome’s policy towards them or on their position in the city. Not did Rome’s great clash with militant Jewish nationalism in Judaea, when shortly after the end of that war the question of the Jews’ civic status in Alexandria was raised again, though this time without violence. In the spring of ce 71 Titus stopped in Alexandria en route from Judaea to Rome, and the Greeks, playing on the hostility which they assumed him to feel towards all Jews after a long and hard-fought war, seized the opportunity to ask him to restrict or abolish the Jewish politeuma. Their request may have been made in ignorance of the fact that Titus had just refused an identical

one in Antioch, where there had recently been racial friction also. Titus naturally gave the same answer in Alexandria as in Antioch, and his action in both cities strikingly typifies the lack of vindictiveness which characterized the Roman attitude towards the Jews after 70.

IV JEWS IN ANTIOCH

Antioch produced no Philo, and in consequence information about the large Jewish community there, dating back to the foundation of the city by Seleucus I and organized as a politeuma from the mid second century BCE, is much scantier than it is for Alexandria. But it is known that there were three areas of intensive Jewish settlement, the chief one being the suburb of Daphne, and the city was sufficiently attractive in Jewish eyes that in the late first century BCE a company of five hundred Babylonian Jews, apparently under no local pressure, emigrated to Antioch. The annexation of Syria as a province in 63 BCE gave the Jews throughout that country the benefit of Roman protection in the exercise of their religion, and, as in Alexandria, so in Antioch and in other cities with conspicuous Jewish minorities racial tension developed, though its origin and course cannot be traced in equal detail. The evidence all comes from the period of the first Jewish revolt, apart from an isolated reference in the sixth-century chronicler John Malalas to a conflict between circus-factions in Antioch in CE 39–40 which turned into an anti-Jewish riot. Malalas’ general unreliability and the absence of the story from Josephus render it suspect, but the date is significant in suggesting some sort of connection, either with the civic disturbances in Alexandria in CE 38–41 or, more probably, with the geographically closer crisis of Gaius’ attack on the Temple in CE 38–40. If the riot is historical, it would help to account for Claudius’ general edict of CE 41 confirming Jewish rights throughout the empire.

Strangely, Antioch then escaped the epidemic of antisemitic violence which swept Syria hard on the heels of the outbreak of the Jewish revolt in CE 66. In the autumn of that year the expulsion of the Jewish residents from Caesarea, the administrative capital of Roman Judaea, by the Greek majority there provoked other Jews in the province to retaliate by raiding a number of cities on the coast of Syria and in the Decapolis beyond their inland frontier, and in revenge for this Greeks throughout Syria fell on
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Fig. 6.2 Plan of ancient Antioch.
the Jewish minorities in their cities, including proselytes in their massacres. The ferocity shown on both sides witnesses to long-standing mutual suspicion and hatred. Three cities stood aside from the general movement, Antioch, Sidon and Apamea, but Josephus’ opinion that they did so out of ‘pity’ for people who were causing no disturbance seems naïve.\footnote{Jos. Bell. ii.458–80; 559–61.}

Trouble did occur, however, in Antioch within a few months, though it followed a quite different pattern. In the spring of CE 67 a renegade Jew named Antiochus, who had acquired Greek citizenship and was holding office in the Greek municipal government, denounced his father, an official in the Jewish politeuma, together with other Jews for intended arson. This triggered off a general attack on the whole Jewish community, consisting first of a demand for pagan sacrifice and then of a prohibition of Sabbath-observance. To enforce the latter Antiochus used Roman troops of which he had somehow got command – perhaps an indication that the Jews had offered some unrecorded provocation and were not innocent and passive victims of oppression. But the Greeks may simply have been using the current Roman preoccupation with preparations for full-scale war in Judaea to abrogate a Jewish privilege with impunity.\footnote{Jos. Bell. vii.46–53.} For when they tried a year or two later to harass the Jews further by revoking a concession attested only in Antioch, that of having the oil-tax refunded to enable them to buy their own oil instead of using the forbidden ‘gentile oil’ issued by the city authorities, the legate of Syria stepped in to confirm it; and when he vindicated this comparatively minor Jewish right, he may, though it is not recorded, have simultaneously restored the major right of Sabbath-observance.\footnote{Jos. Ant. xii.120.}

Arson was the charge said to have been levelled against the Christians in Rome three years earlier. There had been a strong Christian church in Antioch for twenty years, of Jewish origin and general character despite its now numerous gentile members, and the choice of the same charge in Antioch suggests that the section of the Jewish community which Antiochus accused may have been the church and that his attack may have been motivated by resentment at his father’s conversion to a schismatic sect.\footnote{Barclay, Diaspora, p. 256 and n. 61, expresses scepticism over the involvement of Christians.} But if so, it was nationality rather than doctrine that impressed the Greeks; for when a serious fire actually occurred in the winter of CE 70–1, they readily heeded Antiochus who, in increased apostate fervour, now widened the scope of his charge and accused the Jews at large of responsibility. The Roman legate had difficulty in restraining the Greeks, panic-stricken and eager for a scapegoat, from wholesale reprisals on the Jews,
but his subsequent inquiry cleared them by revealing that the fire-raisers had been gentile debtors out to destroy the records of their liabilities in the public archives.\textsuperscript{56}

Despite the vindication of Jewish innocence, feeling was still running sufficiently high when Titus visited Antioch early in CE 71 that the Greeks proposed a drastic solution to the problem of racial tension by asking him to expel all the Jews from the city. After due deliberation Titus refused, whereupon the Greeks countered with a seemingly milder request, for the liquidation of the \textit{politeuma} and the cancellation of the Jews' political rights. This would have provided an indirect means to the same end, by degrading the Jews from metics to aliens who could be summarily ejected. Titus again refused.\textsuperscript{57} The Diaspora was not to suffer for the sins of Judaea, but a distinction was drawn between Jewish nationalism, which had to be crushed, and the civic rights and religious principles of the Diaspora, which there was no call to reduce or remove. For the Jews of the Diaspora had rendered little or no practical assistance to the rebels in Judaea, whether through lack of interest in the affairs of the homeland, which was to most of them no more than a name, or through fear of jeopardizing the favourable position which they enjoyed under Roman rule.

V CONCLUSION: THE DIASPORA IN THE WAKE OF THE JUDEAN WAR

When, however, Jewish nationalism was carried across to North Africa as part of the aftermath of the Palestinian revolt, the Diaspora got involved in Roman measures against it. In CE 72 some \textit{sicarii} escaped from the final Roman campaigns to Egypt and Cyrenaica, where they began disseminating anti-Roman propaganda. In Alexandria the bulk of the Jewish community, perhaps influenced more by the Roman massacre five years earlier than by Titus’ recent defence of their political position, were initially disposed to receive them sympathetically. But their authorities had no great difficulty in making them listen to reason and surrender their belligerent visitors to the Romans, and only minor military operations were needed to round up those who escaped southwards. But even this abortive show of anti-Roman feeling was alarming in the wake of the Judaean War, of 66–70 and during CE 73; when the episode was reported to the emperor Vespasian, he ordered the closure of the ‘temple of Onias’ at the tip of the Nile delta. That sanctuary seems to have been of purely local importance and not to have formed a religious focus for Jews throughout
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Egypt. But it may have been used by the *sicarii*, or Vespasian may have feared the possibility, however remote, that with its tradition of sacrificial worship it might now become a dangerous rallying-point for Jewish nationalism.\(^{58}\)

In Cyrenaica, where no attacks on Jewish rights in the various cities are recorded at this time, the fortunes of the *sicarii* followed somewhat different lines, with an attempt to further their cause by the exploitation of an unsatisfactory economic situation embroiling local Jews with Rome. In CE 72 the leader of the *sicarii* collected a following of impoverished Jews from the capital, Cyrene, for an apparently pseudo-messianic rising, promising ‘signs and wonders’. The Jewish authorities, aware of both the folly and the futility of opposition to Rome, reported the matter to the provincial governor, who broke up the gathering by military force. The captured leader then took his revenge on the Jewish authorities by accusing them and the wealthy class in general of secret complicity in his movement, and numerous executions ensued. But the fact that, when the complex web of subsequent intrigue was taken to Rome, the governor was not charged with maladministration suggests that the executions were not an atrocity but the punishment, even if over-severe, for some offence.\(^{59}\)

Cyrenaica was thus the only place where the Judaean revolt is known to have caused serious trouble between a Diaspora community and Rome. The silence of history about the Cyrenaica Jews over the preceding eighty years makes the episode difficult to interpret, but is in itself an indication that any friction which did develop during that time was only minor. But the great revolt of the Diaspora under Trajan began in Cyrenaica, and it is possible that the clash between Rome and the Jews there in CE 72 initiated a period of tension of which that revolt was to be the culmination.\(^{60}\)

---
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